



North Silverado Outline Plan

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 7, 2017

Project overview

This application is for a Land Use Redesignation and Outline Plan approval for the subject site referred to as North Silverado in southwest Calgary. The Outline Plan area is comprised of approximately 16.77 hectares (41.46 acres). North Silverado will develop as the last northerly extension of Silverado.

The current land use within the Outline Plan area boundary is Special Purpose Future Urban Development District (S-FUD). The proposed land uses are as follows: Residential Low Density Mixed Use Housing District (R-G), Multi-Residential at Grade Housing District (M-G) and Multi-Residential Medium Profile District (M-2). This offers the opportunity for a variety of housing types, including single-detached, clustered townhouses, and low-rise apartment dwellings.

Engagement overview

Citizen input will be used in making recommendations to the Applicant about any proposed changes that could be made to the application itself. Citizen input is not the only factor in making the recommendations. Citizens were asked to share what they think are the benefits and challenges to this proposal and how they feel it would impact the community. We divided the area into three sections to collect more detailed responses; they did not represent anything further than that. About each area we asked participants open-ended questions about what they felt were the benefits and challenges of the current proposal. We also asked overall what kind of impact they perceived this would have as well as any other thoughts/ideas.

What we heard

There were some prominent themes from the feedback and also some ideas only mentioned a few times that are all outlined in the Summary of Input section below. However, those main themes were as follows:

Most of the comments we received expressed challenges with the proposed application. The most common concerns were:

- traffic (adding more cars and no new access points in/out of the neighbourhood),
- loss of wetland/green-space
- current density in Areas B and C was too high and should only be single-family detached houses
- the single-family houses only was felt to be a better fit with the existing neighbourhood

There were significantly fewer benefits mentioned and most were for the single-family detached in Area A.

Two other suggestions were made too, primarily about:

- the configuration of the roads within the area and if something could be done to make a direct entrance/exit point from the Outline Plan area to Sheriff King Road or Spruce Meadows Way.
- recommendation that the existing pathway system be preserved and enhanced by ensuring good trail connections in the new area, making the trail consistent with 'buffers' of open green space between the path itself and any 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.



North Silverado Outline Plan

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 7, 2017

Next steps

- City Administration reviews and makes any recommendations to the Applicant and to Calgary Planning Commission in spring 2017.
- Calgary Planning Commission meets in summer 2017 to make a recommendation about the application to City Council.
- City Council makes the final decision in early fall or winter 2017.
- Stakeholders who have signed up for email notifications will be informed when this engagement report is made available online and of the details of the process above. The project webpage will also be updated as required at www.calgary.ca/northsilverado.

Evaluation

For this engagement, an open house was held on May 25 including 3 unique projects. There was a total of 220 attendees, 130 indicated they came specifically for the North Silverado Outline Plan project. We also had an online engagement opportunity open from May 24 to June 6, 2017. There were just over 60 unique visitors to the engagement website.

We received a total of 57 responses for the North Silverado Outline Plan: 50 feedback forms from the open house and 7 online responses. The information and questions presented and at the Open House were the same.

Of those 220 who attended the open house, 51 completed an evaluation of the session.

Scale - 5= Strongly agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 2 = Disagree, 1 = Strongly Disagree	5	4	3	2	1
This session was a good use of my time	17	14	15	4	1
I am satisfied with the opportunity to learn about these projects	18	14	14	3	0
I had enough information to provide input	10	17	14	4	4
The session was at a convenient time/place	21	19	5	2	2
This session was an effective way to collect my input for this project	13	23	6	3	4

Additional evaluation comments included:

- About the meeting space being convenient or about ways to improve the space selected (that it should be easier to get to and have more open space)
- Providing aerial photos (not just maps) to help people locate, describe and share their comments
- Some participants said they needed to see how their input was used before they knew if the session had been a good use of their time
- Thanks expressed to staff for listening and being friendly, knowledgeable as well as suggestions to ensure all staff at the meeting are well-equipped to listen to citizens



North Silverado Outline Plan

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 7, 2017

Summary of Input

Themes called a “benefit” or a “challenge” are based on how the participants categorized their answers. General comments may have been framed positively, neutrally or negatively but were analyzed and added to the themes from the benefits and challenges or were a “general” theme.

‘BENEFITS’ THEMES (in order of most to least common)	Explanation and Examples
No benefit	This was the most common for Areas B and C. “none” “no benefit” “I do not see any benefit to developing this space”
Low-density/single-family detached houses	This theme was mainly for Area A, but also includes comments about how Areas B and C should be like Area A with regard to density/housing type. “the land was supposed to be used for single family” “{Area A} Fits in with adjacent properties. Just a cul de sac – doesn’t create massive change in traffic.”
A good fit or transition with current neighbourhood (mostly area A)	Mostly related to Area A, some comments about Area C. “Good transition from single dwelling to townhouses to Area B. Keeps community look and feel.” “Townhouses can be near townhouses... {Area C}” “Great to continue in that area {A}” “Good that it is put on the north side of the area {C}. Less impact for the shadows casted.”
Noise buffer to existing homes	Mostly related to Area A. “Blocks out noise to 22X” “Area A will provide a noise barrier for existing homes...”
Preserve or enhance wetlands/green space is good	“keep green space as shown or enlarged” “park area will be a benefit if more berms and trees are placed in this area {A}”
‘CHALLENGES’ THEMES (in order of most to least common)	
Prefer no development or only single-family	This theme also includes comments about the proposed density being too much/too high. “...prefer only single-family” “Ideally nothing developed here...” “please not more high density row housing.” “Areas B and C should be developed as low density, single-detached houses.” “Why not just single family homes.”
Traffic	“More people, more traffic, more lights. All negative.” “there will be ++ traffic concerns. The intersection at Sheriff King St and Spruce Meadows Tr has been very poorly designed.” “Traffic (2-3cars p/unit) has to be considered...” “Silverado Ponds [Road] is already a high traffic area. New school will increase traffic as will new Buffalo condos.”
Loss of green space/wetland /wildlife	“Can we make the whole area green space? This is what the community is known for.” “Kids play there currently and we don’t want to lose that.” “Major loss of natural habitat, such as birds, coyotes, deer, etc. Loss of major community recreation space.”
Safety	Includes many comments about road and pedestrian safety as well as crime safety and general, unspecified safety concerns: “Safety risk.” “With traffic there is a safety issue.” “Safety of kids on the trail/green space.” “Safety of existing residents.” “Increased crime is a concern...”
Parking	“Parking. More than 1.5 stalls/unit.” “Study to assess the impact of parking of additional cars on the streets should be conducted.” “parking especially along Silverado Skies Link SW.” “The increase in population density will be a huge negative impact on current residents. The streets are already narrow and parking is at best minimal.”



North Silverado Outline Plan

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 7, 2017

Property Value Concern	<p>“Silverado does not need any more, these [townhouses and condos] will bring the property values down if saturated with condos.” “Loss of property value.” “The loss of property value that will result from HUGE multi-family units looking into every window of our home... is going to make selling a challenge...”</p>
“Other” concerns	<p>These concerns are a sample of other ideas heard infrequently or only once:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Noise, dust and traffic control during construction - Don't make a playground in this area - School capacity issues - Elevation/topography in Area B and C means taller buildings built there will appear/impact higher - Speed limit should be 40km/hr - Ensure a good drainage connection between stream & wetland (Area B & C) - Protect the archeological resource at the top of the hill (Area B & C) - Will property taxes go up? Will citizens have to pay for anything of this? - Insufficient infrastructure to support this development - Increased light pollution
<p>‘GENERAL’ THEMES (in order of most common to least common)</p>	
Pathway extensions and consistency	<p>Include new pathway in the area that is consistent and a good match to existing pathways and general access to the green space. “area in the south of “C” needs a good transition between current and new buildings – kids play there and don't want to lose that” “Keep pathways continuous.” “Extend the path width in the SW corner and ensure to ring the path around areas B and C.” “Need a green space transition along” new “pathways like along path adjacent to Silverado Ponds Way.” “Developer needs to connect to pre-existing pathways.” Question: What distance from the pathway will the buildings be set-back – need a good transition green space.</p>
Road design suggestions	<p>Suggestion for the road design (entrance/exit) within the Outline Plan area some specific but mostly general. “Alternate roads/entrances to the new development should also be considered...” “Why can't there be a new access via Sheriff King instead?”</p>
“Other” general ideas	<p>These ideas are a sample of other general comments heard infrequently or only once:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make a part of the green space into an off-leash dog park, playground or memorial park to Mr. Sutherland (Spruce Meadows founder) - Would like to have retail/commercial rather than residential - Ensure the people who live near the environmental reserve (wetland) value and care for the wetland and nature - Wetlands provide value to the neighbourhood and the whole city and more should be protected - Make it a community centre - More residents will help support Silverado businesses - The new development should be paying into the SRA [Silverado Residents Association] to help maintain those areas - More information or studies are needed - Pet and dog issues (both that there will be too many pets and not enough room for current resident pets)



North Silverado Outline Plan

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 7, 2017

Verbatim Comments

This section includes all the comments we received at the Open House and through the Online Feedback Form. It is exactly in the original form as submitted by the participant, except in the case of

- Personally identifying comments (i.e. names, emails, addresses)
- Profanity
- Verbal statements recorded by staff as notes

Personal information and profanity are removed from this report but indicated with the word removed in square brackets "[removed]". The notes written by staff on behalf of the participant, may have been summarized but are included in this section and the report.

Question 1) What do you see as the benefits of the three areas? (When a number higher than "1" it was due to condensing for space. This only occurred when the *identical* comment was made by multiple participants.)

Area of Outline Plan			Comments
A	B	C	
1			Ok
	1		It's okay but there are a lot of townhouses already.
		1	None. Terrible Idea. When I moved here the land was supposed to be used for single family, fits better.
1	1	1	Don't see any benefits for current residents
1			Green space as shown or enlarged
	1		Preserve wet lands. Keep pathway continuous (existing and new construction)
1	1		More houses.
		1	do
1	1	1	No
1			More green space (developed)
1			Blocks out noise to 22X
	1		Transition from area A single family homes to town houses.
		1	A good transition from single dwelling to townhouses to Area B. Keeps community look and feel.
1	1	1	No
1			This should be the only type of development that should be permitted in the entire North Silverado area.
		1	None
1			Great for that side or that area.
	1		Great to continue in that area.
		1	Good that it is put on the north side of the area. Less impact for shadows casted.
1			A playground wouldn't be necessary in the east and west.
1			Comply with the current standards and community feel
	1		North section of "B" there is part that could be high-value property with the berm that's there
1			North of area facing ring road is okay.
		1	Townhouse can be near townhouse but prefer only single-family



North Silverado Outline Plan

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 7, 2017

1			Fits with the community
9	9	9	None
1			Low density which fits into character of Silverado
1			Lower density housing.
	1	1	0
1			Single family - appropriate
	3	3	None
	1	1	More residents to support Silverado businesses.
1	1		Respect the same density as now Silverado.
		1	Respect the density that are facing the existing green space: Must respect privacy & limited heights.
1	1	1	None / no benefit
1	1	1	Not many. Too many homes (??) terra (?)
1			The benefits are that the dwellings are single detached homes.
1	1	1	[check mark]
1	1		Slightly larger tax base not enough benefit to offset decrease property value.
		1	No benefit to large multi-family dwellings in this area.
1			Fits in with adjacent properties. Just a cul de sac - doesn't create massive change in traffic.
	1		Doesn't transition from single dwelling homes well. Would rather see single family homes.
		1	Doesn't transition from single family homes. Should match R1 homes transitions into slightly higher density such as duplexes.
1			No benefit
	1		I do not see any benefits to developing this space.
		1	I do not see any benefits.
1			Low density & single home makes it more accessible and affordable for residents. From environmental living quality perspective.
	1		More cost efficient for developer to develop.
1			I prefer the duplex /semi detached plan in Area A vs. the much higher density plan for B&C
1			Park area will be a benefit if more berms and trees are placed in this area.
1			Area A development will provide noise barrier for existing homes as this area is close to proposed stony trail.
1	1	1	There are no benefits as the connectivity will be very poor

Question 2) What do you see as the challenges of the three areas? (When a number higher than 1 is used it was in the case of summary notes taken by staff where a group of people made the same comment. In those instances the comment was not re-written but counted.)

Area of Outline Plan			Comments
A	B	C	
1			Traffic Increase
	1		Traffic. With traffic there is a safety issue.



		1	Way more traffic we have to deal with. Way less green space. Way more light (not as dark as it is now). Value of my house will go down. More children to attend the school, will it accommodate the new children?
1			Loosing green space
	1	1	Traffic and parking visability with parked traffic
1			don't skimp on the green space
	1		Due to high density, there will be ++ traffic concerns. The intersecion at Sheriff King St and Spruce Meadows Tr has be <u>very poorly</u> designed. We need to access in both directions on Spruce Meadows/Stoney Tr from Sheriff King St.
		1	do
1			Congestion. Privacy loss of the existing houses. Green space. Traffic.
	1		Trail walking will be congested. Dogs (pets) problems. Loss of openness.
1	1	1	Resident density too high. Traffic two crowd. Safety risk. Green space getting small.
1			More traffic. Pathway crossing new road.
	1		Keeping existing wetland (pond and seasonal stream). Increased traffic.
		1	Keeping existing wetland (pond). Inccased traffic. Concerns about pedestrian traffic crossing at Silverado Blvd & Silverado Ponds Way.
1			Residential breaks up green space.
	1		Please not more high density row housing (Buffalo). Parking. Traffic. More than 1.5 stalls/unit. Watch what happens once the Buffalo is occupied.
		1	Parking. Traffic.
1			Traffic going into new residential area. Property value concerns.
	1		Traffic (2-3 cars p/unit) has to be considered and planning accordingly. Parking for multi-units.
		1	Silverado Ponds [road] is already a high traffic area. New school will increase traffic flow as will the new Buffalo condos. Green areas and paths will be impacted as well.
1			high traffic
	1		high traffic through Silverado Blvd and Silverado Pond. High density of people close to a low density house area.
		1	Lack of parking spaces on the streets. Risk for kids in the school in the nearby (opening Sept 2017) due to increase of traffic. Decrease in value of properties.
1			Traffic increase in the community
	1		Multi-family housing why not single family housing.
1			Additional traffic in community. Very large density reduce to 3 stories. Long delays for leaving community.
	1		Additional traffic in community. Long delays to leave community.
		1	Lower density housing or single house dwellings along pathway is preferred as opposed to townhouses.
1	1	1	Too many people access. Busy traffic. Lose green space. Safety risk.
1			In this area better to make condos and multi-fam houses for brining mixed culture into the community.
	1		Single home should - estate houses should be made for mixed culture.
		1	Lot of congestion in this area. No openness. Build single houses for more openness.
1			Only "a" type development should be permitted.



		1	Increase density of population. Increased traffic. Safety of kids on the trail/green space. Future development of green space. Additional access road for the entire North development. If any development has to happen it is only "Type A" single family dwelling. That will restrict the # of people.
1			too close to the highway seems like a token development to suggest that they aren't treating bigger houses preferentially
	1		Density is much too high for community.
		1	Extra traffic getting out and turning left.
	1	1	Big traffic
1			Housing facing the ring road won't be appealing
	1	1	low density at the transition on the west of areas B and C and South of area C.
		1	Concern that area C (especially in the west end) is going to be even higher once built.
		3	Strong interest in having good pathway connections and a similar type of surrounding green space as the other areas of the pathways in this neighbourhood (such as pathway adjacent to Silverado Ponds Way)
		1	Pathway would be interrupted by the roads (extending into the new development area in B and C)
	1	1	Extend the path width in the SW corner and ensure to ring the path around areas B and C.
1	1	1	Too many people in all areas and that will lead to traffic concerns, noise, construction, parking (especially along SSLI sw) and property value loss.
	1		Need a better connection to the wetland from the stream
	2		Needs to be single family and semi-detached.
		1	Should be single family.
		1	Not enough space is being preserved for the wildlife. Need environmental reserve. Land protection provides a value to the City as a whole and to this community.
		1	needs a good transition (low density) backing onto environmental reserve
	1		Developer needs to connect to pre-existing pathway.
		1	Needs a green space transition of the south-most pathway like along path adjacent to Silverado Ponds Way.
1	1	1	Ensure for all development in the area: reduce impacts on density, privacy, traffic, safety and 1000+ more cars in an area already congested especially at rush hour.
		1	Privacy concerns, height concerns, drainage and water flow problems, south end of green space "C" is regularly as high as pathway and would spread into the proposed development area.
	1		Access, transportation problems
	1	1	Density = safety, traffic and risk of accident
		1	Access south of area "C" - needs a good transition between current and new buildings - kids play there currently and we don't want to lose that.
	1	1	The intersection of the (existing) pathway at SS LI Way and the whole area of B and C.
1			Gas Station nearby
		1	Community density: Traffic issue - too many: Walkway issue Safety: Kids Safety: River issue - Environmental Disaster: Wetland issue - will disappear
1			Increase community density: Rush hour traffic issue
	1		Damage environment: Cut off walkway: Traffic issue



		1	High community density: Traffic issue: Cut off walkway, increase safety issue: Damage environment
1			Traffic congestion: Safety of pedestrians. We have had pedestrian involved accident already.
	1		Traffics create more congestion
		1	Density not a actual representation of Silverado: safety of existing residents: Merging on to the existing Private green space: New developer must provide the same adjacent green space.
	1		Way too much density! The developer is not adding to the pathway network and they are wanting to bring in a <u>huge</u> population.
		1	This will increase demands on roads & parking in the area. This was not the development I bought into.
1			Increased traffic to/from area 'A' Along Sil Skies Drive
	1		Lower standard of housing will devalue property values, infringe on green space, incr traffic Silv Skies Link > density
		1	<u>Same as Area 'B'</u> , added traffic on Silv Ponds > density
1			Noisy high pressure gas
	1		Natural drainage/wetland protection & setbacks: Silverado Skies Condo access/egress - traffic congestion: High density (B&C) traffic concern: Archeological resources at top of hill.
		1	Same as B. Poor market conditions for townhouse development & low rise condominium.
1			Traffic: Wild life will be pushed out
	1		Traffic: more taxpayers money being spent
		1	Low-income people moving in
	1		Seriously increased traffic amount attempting to exit a single road that can't handle the excess.
		1	Huge environmental impact on the land that is home to important species and wetlands which <u>should not</u> be developed over!
1			Too much traffic will be forthcoming through the community: Green space & environment will be touched.
	1		Safety of our children will be put in jeopardy.
		1	Too much traffic & too many people & vehicles with townhouse & condo. My street will become a highway. School buses are on our street. Safety is a big issue.
	1	1	Increase in traffic: Increase in veh -> human collisions - school bus presence: Do not support med density housing units.
	1		- Informed in 2007 when I bought zones B&C area - no development. - Ecosystem currently. Currently supported in zones B&C
	1	1	High density is not condusive with the area: With so many proposed residences traffic on the two streets will be too much: It is already difficult to turn off these streets & the addition of the proposed high density will only add to the strain: traffic studies must be done on these access streets.
1			Crammed area for houses in a cul de sac
	1		Too much density in such a small area. Too many cars - not enough area for traffic & parking.
		1	4 story townhomes ridiculous: Loosing our parks: Make more park area less density: Move the density further away from path & green space: Have a dog park area: less housing
1			Crammed area for larger style houses.



	1	1	Far too much density in a small area. Current and future infrastructure not equipped to handle increase in vehicle traffic. Major loss of natural habitat, such as birds, coyotes, deer, etc. Loss of major community recreational space.
1	1	1	Roads in/out suggestion: 1. Enter from Sherrif King Drive RHT only into 'C' 2. Exit from 'A' <u>west side</u> over wetland onto Spruce Meadows Way.
1			Why would anyone want to build so close to a major road?? Honour the area of land that is there. The width to the road does not encourage a safe area for the current residents. The amount of traffic for a small residential road will increase significantly.
	1	1	Destroying the natural habitat - our city and communities need eco systems that are already in stable & constant state. Aesthetic of the community. Drive down to 22x and understand the beauty of the area. One of the draws of the community stems from the natural beauty surrounding it. One of the access roads is also not set up for the increased density. There is already a lot of traffic during peak travel times in the area. Honestly, if you were a home owner in the area would you want to look out your window and see high density housing when before you looked at gorgeous natural area? DENSITY! DENSITY! DENSITY! The main roads are going to become increasingly busier. Decrease the house values in the area. (This is the 'nice' side of Silverado. Keep it that way. Density (high) housing decreases aesthetically, (?), foster this areas where people have to work harder to afford their homes.
1	1	1	Traffic busy: Safety reason: Green space reduce
1			Single family homes along the ring road will not appeal to benefit property values increase traffic in already tight roadway.
	1		The density of these dwellings will increase traffic and endanger pedestrians and wildlife as they all will need to funnel through the singular controlled intersection.
		1	Loss of privacy as roads end in line with our homes - all headlights will shine inside. Loss of wildlife. Loss of property value as we bought with assurance that development would not impact our backyard. Four storey is taller than our home - ruins any view, privacy we have currently. Increase crime is a concern that comes with that type of density.
1			No Benefits! Too close to Stoney Trail. 19 homes in an area that should remain park, natural space. Too close to the "ranches" s/b made Memorial Park in honor of Ron Southern. Keep the Ranches the Estate area as it is intended!! Wildlife live here: Home values
	1		Too many low density housing in Silverado! Traffic is insane now this will only make it worse. With all future development coming with Belmont, etc.
		1	Single family homes, no <u>more</u> town houses or condos.
1			Need to develop nicer green space area. Maybe a creative play area along the path or more topography. Noise from Stoney Trail.
	1	1	No additional playgrounds or rec spaces. High traffic area. Parking may become an issue.
1			Increased traffic: Loss of property value: Loss or privacy: Increase crime: Along Stoney Trail will fence be put up.
	1		Increased traffic: Loss of property value: Loss of privacy: Increase crime: Road in proposed area ends with park, head lights will shine into established home.
		1	Increased traffic: Loss of property value: Loss or privacy: Increase crime: Limited crosswalks in Silverado as is, adding more people will put more people at risk.



1	1	1	Increased traffic: overloading of the new limited access via - 194/Stoney Trail interchange: Lost green space: Incompatibility with existing property's: Too many units proposed.
1			Cost for the developer will be much higher.
	1	1	High density housing creates more traffic flow increase dangerous level for all residents. Current structure, school, communities cannot handle such large increase. Increase risk for all residences.
1			1. To close to Stoney Trail: 2. There's no more exit for new area: 3. Worsen the current traffic problem
	1		1. To close to Stoney Trail: 2. There's no more exit for new area: 3. Worsen the current traffic problem: 4. Increase the dense of the community: 5. Too crowded.
		1	1. The new community is too crowded: 2. Make the traffic problem much worse: 3. Parking area getting worse.
	1	1	Area B&C are of the most concern to me. I live on Silverado Skies Drive and we are already awaiting the addition of congestion/traffic and overflow parking due to the Buffalo complex. I believe that adding more multi-family to an area that has significant population is a mistake that will impact traffic, parking, general quality of life and property values. I don't understand why so much density can't be more spread throughout the community of Silverado and the new communities planned further South. I understand the need for some multi-family, but this location is already congested, or will be when Buffalo is occupied and the school opens. Silverado Skies Link & Silverado Ponds Way do not appear to be built with significant future traffic in mind; if you restrict parking on those streets, it will only be displaced onto other nearby streets.
1			Stongly appose any type of housing in this area. This is directly behind the Silverado Ranches, which should remain only Park, natural space. The homes in the Ranches are estate homes, the homes planned are not. Building 19 homes in this space makes no sense. With all the homes planned for area B & C, plus all the new development in the dressage area and new districts, Belmont and Yorkville, there is no need. This area A is also too close to the ring road, who would want to live there? Plans of opening up the road on Silverado Skies Link will only increase traffic in and around the Ranches.
	1	1	Too many condo and townhouses! Silverado does not need any more, these will bring the property values down if saturated with condos. If anything, single family homes should be built there, with some retail. Traffic is a nightmare now getting in and out of Silverado, this will make traffic impossible.
1			Traffic will increase and existing home owners will loose home values as they will loose green belt and privacy. This area can be developed as nature park or so.
	1		Traffic will increase and existing home owners will loose home values. This area can be developed as nature park or so. Silverado was already developed on wetlands but by avoiding development you can prevent more environmental damage.
		1	Traffic will increase and existing home owners will loose home values. There will be lot of road parking as development is for multi family where developers provide just one parking per unit and no parking for extra cars and visitors. This will make difficult to navigate during the winter time . It will be difficult for transit, snow cleaning and emergency vehicles to serve this area. Silverado community has lots of families with young kids and extra traffic will limit their exposure and increase possibility of traffic accidents.
1	1	1	There are no benefits as the connectivity will be very poor



North Silverado Outline Plan

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 7, 2017

Question 3) Overall, how do you feel this proposal would impact you?

Strongly Positive	Positive	Neutral	Negative	Strongly Negative
2	2	1	12	31

Question 4) Do you have any additional comments or ideas about this project or area?

I would like to see only single family dwellings. It would be a shame to change the neighbourhood into a cityscape with multilevel buildings. This is not the reason we moved to Silverado. I really hope the city listens to the community and decides on single family dwellings only.
We do not see how there is any benefit to us or the current residents in any way with the proposal. Where is the green space? Closest playground? No new playgrounds in the proposal? More people, more traffic, more lights. All negative. Resident wildlife will be impacted negatively (coyotes, hawks, prairie dogs, etc.)
Please maintain the integrity and expand the potential in your new design - the pathways, linear parkways and walkways
Traffic density is going to be a major issue based on the initial plan what we have seen. There are other aspects as well that would need a thorough studies by the city to protect the current residents of Silverado.
Build attached single house. Less multi-home. Increase traffic road. Increase park of green space.
I am greatly concerned about increased traffic on Sheriff King St. and the design of the new interchange at Spruce Meadows Trail. I do not understand why this will not be a full interchange with access in all directions going into and out of Silverado. There is lots of room there to accommodate a full interchange.
The driverless car may have an impact on road/parking requirements but for now things are getting too busy - remember Shawnassy Shopping Area we suffered with poor flow for years.
Area B and C should not be high density multi-family units. Should be developed as single detached family homes. Alternate roads/entrances to the new development area should also be considered given the actual traffic that the community faces (Silverado Pond). The Silverado Community will also face the high traffic/noise that will come with the Ring Road. Value of my home will be impacted due to the fact that it will now be close to multi-family units.
Areas B and C should be developed as low density, single detached houses. Alternative access to areas A, B, C should be provided instead having only access for Silverado Pond and S.S.L.L sw. Q: study to assess the impact of parking of additional cars on the streets should be conducted.
We [personal information removed] where that construction is apparently going to be. Why are these multi family dwellings going. Why not just single family homes. Traffic going into these areas is going to be high volume in an area that has little traffic now. More green space would be nice.
There should be an off leash dog area included in some of the green space.
Increase park, outdoor recreation area. Build attach single house. Less multi-home. Increase traffic road.
Only worry is congestion in the area. Freedom of movement loss. No green space left. Trails and pet-walking difficult. Parking problem. ???
During construction phase: no night time construction should be allowed. No lighting should be left on, no generators or equipment should be left running overnight. Noise and dust control during construction. No dirt debris on the link road or on Silverado Skies Dr. Needs to be cleaned regularly. No heavy vibration equipment should be allowed during construction. Need to consider alternate access/egress road both during construction and on a permanent basis.



North Silverado Outline Plan

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 7, 2017

Seems like they've put forward a plan that they know will be rejected with the understanding that they are not going to get it approved. They don't want to do single family as surrounds this space so they have gone for the other extreme in the hopes of landing in the middle. I believe it should be single family as with the surrounding community.
That area needs to be developed along with east of Sherrif to allow more retail and commercial.
Too many cars on the Silverado Blvd... some cars speed are fast so that making noisy. Please set up the speed limit sign under <u>40km/h</u> on the Silverado
Question: Will there be any new transit route extensions or changes because of this development? Because of the Green Line?
Question: how much green space is required in this development?
Question: What distance away from the southern part of Area C will the buildings be set away from the pathway?
Traffic changes due to increased residents and Silverado Blvd and Silverado Ponds Way and the related safety issues both for driving and pedestrians
Ideally the people who live near the wetland and green space should be in villa-style homes and should be interested/care to protect the land in it's wild state.
there is no market for multi-residential housing
Silverado Blvd and SS LI and Silverado Ponds Way will be terrible for traffic. Cannot support all the traffic.
Question: Allocation for a playground possible? Can there be a playground in the area?
Concerns about drainage, wildlife (birds and frogs) - currently there is not enough drainage.
Suggestion: Can we just make the whole area green space (protected wetland)? This is what the community is known for.
Extraordinary concern about property values decreasing
Parking concern. Not enough parking spaces with/for new units.
Density results in low budgets, high-density means low budget with many renters and they don't appreciate or value the natural area and wildlife. Density should only be in downtown not here.
Original builders' vision and the current roads can only support single-family. Not the expectation of current residents either!
Direct impact to current residents.
SS LI sw -> traffic flow is already bad (already have - people parking in the grass at the north end of the road).
Question: Why can't there be a new access via Sheriff King instead?
Question: is the Area A single-detached?
Silverado Blvd connection to Sherrif King in the morning is currently a concern and adding the connection through Silverado Ponds Way will make it more issues for traffic flow.
Concern about road congestion and access there's lots of parking and safety at the intersection. Safety concerns at Silverado Skies Dr & SS LI sw and even for transit busses. Need traffic lights and parking reduction/enforcement.
Concern about the building site and related construction.
Ideally nothing developed here. But if it does go ahead, concerns about construction: no night-time construction, dust control during construction, no traffic disruptions from heavy vehicles and cleanliness.
is there another way for the proposed B and C areas to enter/exit?
Change to low density or to a park (lots of people like to walk to hill) or community city rec area
Change to a park or community centre
The developer did not respect Silverado's original design on purpose of <u>low density</u> community: Dev fail to show equality on allocating the same amount of green space to the existing <u>private green</u> space - They must plan in their design that ALL adjacent land (theirs) that are mergin on to an existing one <u>to be the same width & length</u> - Dev fail to



North Silverado Outline Plan

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 7, 2017

show new development has minimum impact to the <u>quality of life, safety & enjoyment</u> of the existing resident: Access to the existing green space must be a green space and no other element; Must be enjoyable to ALL resident
I think the developer is not truly interested in adapting their plan unless the City forces them. They have made no attempt to come up with solutions for residents concerns - they are simply waiting to see what the City will let them get away with.
The City staff were very friendly and knowledgeable I was really impressed with them.
Overall this plan destroys Silverado's North Green Space, provides little to no character to area. This is the first time I've even heard of this plan & I've lived in Silverado almost seven years. Way too much added traffic - <u>zero</u> benefit at all!!
Silverado North is ideal for single family - not multi - poor decision - not close to amenities: Overall density is low in Silverado because of the Estate Lots at the West end. However, the density is too high when looking at the local context: The Buffalo Development proves the City is not concerned about traffic, especially construction traffic that tracks mud and rocks across completed areas: Development (B&C) will be intense construction traffic for a long period: All in all too much construction/activities for a relatively small region. Should be staged to reduce conflicts.
#2 Yes, but without an air photo, it is difficult to point out areas of concern: #4 Should have been at the high school - like all the others: #5 The venue is confined, noisy, information was sparse.
Would like to review the wildlife along with nature if new houses are built: Traffic will be horrible & kids will be in danger.
1. I am very concerned with the amount of increased traffic that will be attempting to reach 22x from Silverado. It is a single lane road that is already very busy in the mornings without adding a very large amount of excess people attempting to leave through that single access point: 2. When Sheriff King Street eventually doubles to two lanes each way the noise and traffic will increase exponentially. Is there any plan or way to start planting a natural screen of trees and plants along the catch pond (before shopping complex) so that residents on our side will not be as negatively affected. It would be a good way to keep the noise down, pollution down and keep the area attractive for those of us who live close by. By doing it now or in the few years would give the trees time to grow so as to be effective and large enough to have a positive impact.
I believe regardless of what the Silverado citizens want the City of Calgary will do what they want: Taxes of property are they going up? Do the citizens have to pay for <u>anything</u> ? Terrible & unsafe idea to build more homes. Build South Silverado <u>not</u> North.
Further to the points noted on reverse: 1. Traffic - B&C Zones - 838 units have potential of 1,678 +- increase of vehicular traffic - increased risk of human - vehicle collisions - current narrow streets do not support such an increase traffic flow. 2. Land use policy as per section 1(a)(i) - <u>low density shall be predominant use of land</u> , 1(a)(ii) - med density where <u>compatible & appropriate</u> . Would support low-density in proposed <u>Zone C</u> would support med-density in proposed <u>Zone B</u> . 3. Green space flow - current proposal <u>does not</u> have existing green space between Silverado Creek Crescent & Silverado Ponds way flow into Zones B&C.
From front page [challenges to B]: 1. Current ecosystem is supported in current proposed development. - population of boreal chorus frogs - jack rabbit population - Swainson Hawk population



North Silverado Outline Plan

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 7, 2017

- Pack of resident coyotes in the east part of the subdivision
2. When I bought my home in 2007, I was told face to face by a city planning employee that the proposed area (Silverado North) would <u>not</u> be developed. This was a deciding factor in my buying my single family home. I was lied to.
I do not feel that the high density condos & town homes should be allowed due to the effect these will have to the residents of the two streets accessing areas B&C: Has the City considered how this will affect the residents and have they considered an access of Sheriff King allowing right hand turns in and out of this new area to alleviate traffic woes that are imminent: I realize that a project will be going into this area but they should consider low residential like single or duplex dwellings: There are already parking issues on these streets and there is currently single homes on one of the streets.
Biggest feedback is more straight forward transparent communication with notice. Talk about Silverado development not South Macleod: Do a test of that many additional cars with a no East exit on to 22x simulate what the congestion would like after develop & roads complete: More green space - less density: If you want the support from the community you better include them & <u>hear</u> them & <u>change the plans</u> . We can have a negative impact on the proposal.
re: #2 "almost" re: #5 "we will see" Next meeting = prepare the people hearing from the community to be more empathetic open & listen (do not be condescending). Civic works people too.
Progress can be measured in different ways; however many of these do not necessarily benefit a community, city or indeed a country. To propose such a dense housing plan in a small area with insufficient infrastructure is one of those instances where progress for the only reasonable assumption that the main motivation is greed is progress that is negative to both the current and future residents. To hear over and over again that this project will not affect the community is both frustrating and completely false. Traffic into and out of the community is already a concern, adding a minimum of 1000-1500 more vehicles will make this situation close to unmanageable, especially considering the options to access McLeod Trl from the north entrance/exit will no longer be an option. Overall the impact of this project will create an extreme negative impact on the community's residents, businesses owners and visitors. My hope is that our concerns are addressed and plans are adjusted to ensure a happy medium is reached for all concerned.
I live on one of the transpo routes to A,B&C: (?) line - keep traffic thru existing Silverado - at '0' to none
The amount of density that is set to be in this area is alarming. One example is the new development to the AVI Buffalo housing that is currently being built. There was absolutely no care taken to realize how many people are going to be in that area. The lack of parking and the streets that cannot accomodate the amount of people that will soon be living there. Add in this development of roads that were not created to accept the flow of people and you have a very frustrated community. The people who have already built their homes in the area, and the ones who have moved in to the area on the basis of the quiet suburb feeling of open space, and quiet are no longer being respected. The eco system of the area need to be addressed further. There is enough high density housing in the area.
There needs to be more communication regarding all of this!
Less home
The increase in population density will be a huge negative impact on the current residents. The streets are already narrow and parking is at best minimal. The volume of traffic will congest all entry points and endanger pedestrians due to reduced visibility. Transit buses take up most of the roads now, more vehicles will make that worse. The loss of property value that will result from HUGE multi family units looking into every window of our home and our neighbours is going to make selling a challenge if we decide to move on. This is very dissapointing as a homeowner, ther has been zero consideration for existing residents - develop multi family areas away from those of us that are already there - massive multi should not ever be put in next to single family existing - it's not like I can move my house.



North Silverado Outline Plan

Stakeholder Report Back: What we Heard

June 7, 2017

re: #1 "not really but no respect for current residents"
Changes need to be made! <u>Area A</u> : Being so close to Stoney Trail, this area should be left natural, parkspace. Adding more berms, trees to help restrict noise, traffic.
They are going to be using existing pathways, green spaces, parks. The new development should be paying into the SRA to help maintain those areas that will be affected.
When we purchased property we were advised that there were no plans for future development: Town homes in Silverado vehicles already park on street making roads 1 way traffic: We bought in area because there were no houses behind home: With the development south of Silverado Do not see need to build in North Silverado: Has environmental impact been completed for area: Believe this is huge mistake and will have a negative impact on the community of Silverado.
It may be a good solution to have all A, B and C change to single house development.
I suggest the city to develop this area as a park which service the around communities. It's better to have another public session to collect residents options: I also suggest to build a wall between the Stoney Trail and the houses to reduce noise.
I attended the open house on May 25th and a city representative said that the community itself and the eventual impact of the Stoney Trail expansion were not well planned. So having heard that statement, I sincerely hope that Council does not make matters worse by approving more high-density housing additions to an already densely populated area with several existing multi-family and a new school opening shortly. With school buses, parents driving kids back & forth to school, and the increased traffic from more multi-family I can only imagine what peak times are going to like in future, not to mention overflow street parking. I suggest more duplex/semi detached rather than high population, 4-5 story apartments. As it is, when Stoney Trail is developed we will all be driving south to exit/enter near Spruce Meadows/190th. Finally, please consider also the negative impact of property values if this proposal is approved.
Area A should remain 100% Park, natural space. If anything, rather than homes...why not a memorial park in honor of Ron Southern.
This area can be developed as nature park or so. Many affected people have paid extra money to get house backing onto green space. I think there is no infrastructure to support multi family home development in that area. Silverado community was already developed on wetlands and I hope City avoids further environmental damage.
Please leave this as an open area as most of the open spaces in Silverado are being used up for some sort of development and we are missing open spaces in this community.