



**STAKEHOLDER AND PUBLIC FEEDBACK
ON**

***"TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE CITY: KEY
DIRECTIONS FOR LAND USE AND MOBILITY"***

COLLECTED ON LINE
APRIL 21 – AUGUST 5, 2008



STAKEHOLDER AND PUBLIC FEEDBACK ON

"TOWARDS A SUSTAINABLE CITY: KEY DIRECTIONS FOR LAND USE AND MOBILITY"

In January 2007, City Council approved an integrated approach for reviewing The Calgary Plan (Municipal Development Plan) in conjunction with The Calgary Transportation Plan. Plan It Calgary, an integrated land use and mobility plan project, was formed. The direction for the project is to achieve a more sustainable city in line with a Council's 11 sustainability principles for land use and mobility.

On April 16th, Plan It Calgary brought forth a report to the Standing Policy Committee on Land Use, Planning & Transportation (LPT) that identified 8 key directions for Plan It Calgary. These key directions were made available for stakeholder and public feedback through an on-line feedback form administered by *Weaver Marketing Research* (WMR) and available from April 21 – August 5, 2008.

As well as inviting public feedback via the City of Calgary website, PlanIt Calgary (through WMR) distributed personalized invitations to known stakeholders (sample invitation shown next page). Two reminder invitations followed in June and July. A passcode system was used to prevent individuals from completing multiple online forms.

A total of 21 online responses were received. This report reproduces the online form questions and all responses in their entirety.

April 21, 2008

Dear <insert first and last name from PlanIt-provided list>,

Invitation to provide feedback

Over the next two generations, Calgary is forecast to grow by another 1.3 million persons and 600,000 jobs. Managing where and how that growth is accommodated in homes and businesses is critical to ensuring that Calgary becomes a more sustainable city. Protecting the natural environment, ensuring the Calgary economy remains strong and ensuring our communities are vibrant and accommodating will define sustainability within the city.

The Plan It Calgary project has been exploring possible futures for Calgary through an integrated land use and transportation review. This review has identified that Calgary needs to begin moving towards a more compact urban form. To achieve this, Calgary will need to redefine the way it grows and institute some key directions for managing change in the future.

On April 16th, Plan It Calgary brought forth a report to the Standing Policy Committee on Land Use, Planning & Transportation (LPT) that identifies 8 key directions for Plan It Calgary. These key directions are being made available for stakeholder and public feedback through an on-line feedback form administered by *Weaver Marketing Research* and available **from April 21**. We are inviting you to review the Key Directions paper, "***Towards a sustainable city: Key Directions for land use and mobility***" available at www.calgary.ca/planit and complete the online form at <[www.link to survey](#) to be inserted here>.

A pass-code is required to complete the online form. As an identified stakeholder for Plan It Calgary, your unique pass-code is embedded within your link to the online form. Should you know someone else who wishes to complete the form, they are able to obtain a pass-code by contacting jamie@weavermarketingresearch.com. The use of a pass-code enables you to complete the form once.

If you have any questions about this invitation, please contact Megan Gauley, City of Calgary Land Use Planning and Policy, at (403) 268-2402.

This personal information is collected under the authority of the Alberta Municipal Government Act, Section 636(1) and the FOIP Act, Section 33© and will be used to communicate with respondents during the public participation process. It is protected under the privacy provisions of the FOIP Act. If you have any questions regarding the collection of this information, please contact the FOIP program administrator, Land Use Planning & Policy, P.O Box 2100, Stn "M", Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M5. Telephone: 268-5301.

ONLINE FEEDBACK FORM AND RESPONSES

Thank you for giving us your comments on the **Plan It Calgary** Project's *Key Directions* paper. Your comments will be valuable to us as we work to develop the new integrated land use and mobility plan.

Feedback on the *Key Directions* paper is being collected and compiled on behalf of **Plan It Calgary** by *Weaver Marketing Research*. All your comments will remain confidential and not associated in any way with your name or affiliation unless you expressly request that you be identified.

If you are unable to complete your comments in one sitting you may use your personal password to return to the site to complete the feedback form later.

Please note that if the document remains open and inactive for 60 minutes, it will automatically shut down and you may lose your work. To ensure this does not happen, please do not let the open document lay idle for more than 59 minutes. If you would like to stop work at any time and return to complete the form later, simply click EXIT and select 'I have no time right now but will return later' and EXIT again. Then you can use the same link you were provided to re-access the survey. As an option, if you prefer to prepare your comments separately (e.g. in Word), you can simply cut and paste your text into the appropriate sections of the online feedback form.

If you encounter any technical difficulties in completing the online form, please contact planitcalgary@madebasic.ca. If you have any questions or concerns about the feedback collection process please contact sheila@weavermarketingresearch.com.

INTRODUCTION

What are the Key Directions for managing land use and mobility?

Public opinion and indicators of how the city is growing and changing today suggest that Calgary needs to grow differently to achieve a more sustainable city. At this point in the project, a paper on *Key Directions* has been produced. It identifies how Calgary could move towards becoming a more sustainable city through changes to its land use and transportation networks and is available for download at www.calgary.ca/planit

Plan It Calgary is encouraging interested groups or individuals to take the opportunity to comment on the paper. Thank you for participating.

The **Plan It Calgary** *Key Directions* paper is made up of 5 sections. This feedback form is set up for you to provide your feedback on each of these sections separately.

When entering your comments about each section, please be as clear and specific as possible, and be sure to mention the areas you support as well those you feel should be revised.

Which of the following best describes you?

Representative of Builder – **1**

Representative of Developer – **1**

Representative of an interest group – **5**

Individual NOT representing a group – **10**

Representative of a community association – **4**

SECTION ONE: EIGHT KEY DIRECTIONS

Section One of the paper deals with *Eight Key Directions* for managing land use and mobility change into the future. Please provide any comments you may have on this section of the paper.

██████████ River Valleys Committee

1. “Achieve a balance of growth” is too vague; we can always find a “balance,” but whether it’s good or bad, sustainable or not... The plan should provide clearer DIRECTION on what that balance will be. Is the goal 50/50 between established and greenfield areas? What is a “significant proportion” of 1.3 million people – over half? Intensification, enhanced transit, infrastructure and service delivery, etc, etc are all feasible across a wide range of distributions or “balances.” Without clear targets, these directions will be open to interpretation or misinterpretation, and their implementation (i.e., success) will be determined by whoever can sway the approving authority’s discretion at the time. Also, many of the points in Key Direction #1 relate directly to housing choice or affordability, which is the focus of #2.

3. Providing more choices may entail significant land use CHANGES in established areas as well as Greenfields. One of the problems for realizing the goals of the Sustainable Suburbs Strategy, Jobs/Housing Balance Strategy, etc has been a long-standing and insidious priority to “recognize Centre City as Calgary’s pre-eminent mixed-use centre,” especially focusing on the downtown core (e.g., see The Calgary Plan policies 2-2C, 3-1A, 3-3A). Appropriate mixed-use developments should be encouraged everywhere equally (if not ESPECIALLY outside of the core), to diversify the city’s form, character and attractiveness to residents and businesses alike.

4. It is not enough to merely “identify” LRT and transit routes as planning priorities; they must be firmly entrenched in all RPPs, ASPs and outline plans. TOD objectives must be achieved, not just considered.

5. If we are to accept congestion as “an inherent outcome of a growing and vibrant city,” then we should stop providing for “single-occupant vehicles” — this kind of inconsistency at upper policy level leads to confusion and disputes. Instead of “develop special plans to facilitate police, fire and EMS,” we should: work WITH police, fire and EMS specialists to facilitate adequate service delivery in more compact urban communities.

7. What are the “required volumes of vehicular movement” or, more importantly, whose needs will define them? This is another conflict-generating policy inconsistency that should be edited out. The “right type of road in the right place” should be determined by “the place’s” limitations or carrying capacity rather than by demand; demand will more readily sort itself out.

8. The definition of “existing infrastructure” should be expanded to include natural or green infrastructure (e.g., wetlands and drainage channels, environmentally significant open spaces, etc). in particular, reference should be made to respecting, protecting and conserving the service capacities that are intrinsic to the existing landscape (i.e., PRIOR TO land use designations or transportation network designs). Figure 2: There are assumptions built into this map that will have serious implications for several areas of the city; for example, the three proposed transit-oriented river crossings (upgrade at 85 St NW plus Shaganappi Trail NW and 50 Ave SW). The “inner city” is also shown extending all the way through Shouldice and Bowness Parks and includes Montgomery but not Parkdale, Ramsay and Inglewood’s river park system but not Stampede or Victoria Park, an isolated Forest Lawn, Lynnwood and Ogden but not Riverbend or Quarry Park, and none of the currently industrial areas in the central-eastern region. What are the ramifications — for long-term land use redevelopment and mobility planning — of being considered within the “inner city” vs. outside of it?

Sustainable Calgary Society ...

Key Direction One In reference to growth in established versus new Greenfield communities SC agrees with the general goal of more growth in established communities and within the current built footprint of the city. However, we are concerned that phrases such as 'balance of future growth' and 'significant proportion' are too vague. In our view the long-range plan is too important to be written in such a way that minor departures from the status quo would meet the letter of the law. We feel it is important to establish a range of percentages to signal a serious intent by the city to change direction and to give citizens some assurance that indeed the city is serious about change. Both the scenario work of PLAN IT and graduate student design work undertaken in the Faculty of Environmental Design in collaboration with Sustainable Calgary in the winter of 2008, demonstrate the social, ecological and economic feasibility, and the potential and imperative for an aggressive change in the land use and transportation priorities of our city. We also feel that the change identified in key direction one has to be supported by an accurate assessment of the land supply within current boundaries. We recommend that PLAN IT include an inventory of in-fill sites, size, potential residential populations and potential jobs. How much of the 30 year supply can actually be supplied in other-than-Greenfields? The above noted studies suggest that in fact all of it could be. SC recommends establishing a target in the range of 75% of new growth in established communities. Without ambitious targets, it is just too easy to allow the status quo to continue. Point 4, key direction one discusses the need for 'greater levels of certainty for communities and the development industry'. SC agrees with this statement. We feel greater certainty is extremely important especially for the development of in-fill sites. It is also important to make sure we attain the full potential of innovative green and sustainable community design. We feel this certainty can be enhanced by:

1. A broad-based consensus on a process to ensure that in-fill and innovative development is a priority.
2. Innovative green and sustainable development in the established communities should be put at the front of the line in terms of approvals processes.
3. The resources of planning approvals have to be re-directed to in-fill projects. We support the idea of a greater housing diversity. Diversity should include housing type and cost. Social housing should not be segregated to low-income or low-land-value districts of our city. We recommend that inclusionary zoning be employed to ensure that new communities contain between 10 -15% social housing and that established community in-filling ensure movement toward the 10-15% target for every community. New social housing should be located within TOD districts.

SC agrees with the importance of 'critical job targets'. We also feel the analysis and design of new developments has to go beyond simple assertions of job targets. Experience has shown that this approach makes it too easy for a development to back away from job targets. Development proposals have to be tested for feasibility and the development process has to have the teeth to ensure targets are achieved. SC strongly encourages PLAN IT to stipulate that transit and public realm have to lead new development! It is a worthwhile public investment and it is a signal to developers that the city is a partner in ensuring the creation of sustainable communities.

Key Direction Two Point 1: SC is concerned with the phrase 'more complete communities across all areas of the city'. We would caution that the phrase could be interpreted as allowing development anywhere on the periphery of our city. SC strongly encourages the establishment of growth corridors and strong regulation to ensure that greenfield development occurs only along those corridors. Well defined and confined growth corridors ensures faster build out of communities and transit and infrastructure provision – PLAN IT goals we strongly endorse.

Key Direction Three SC strongly supports the intentions to 'create, places and destinations that support greater walkability'. We would also add that the spaces in between places and destinations are as important. We recommend amending the clause to read 'create places, destinations and pedestrian corridors that support greater walkability'.

Key Direction Four The phrase 'basic level of service to all areas of the city' does not go far enough. In our opinion a goal of PLAN IT has to be the design of a city where it is a practical possibility to live without a car, wherever in the city you live and work, if you choose to do so.

Key Direction Five Key direction five still imagines a city where the private automobile is a major aspect of the transportation system. SC feels that PLAN IT has to establish the goal of making the private automobile optional. It is not enough to 'make it easier for people not using a car'. The

goal should be to make the non-car option the easiest option. We challenge the assumption that 'increasing congestion is an inherent outcome of a growing and vibrant city'. This is only true if we continue to privilege the private automobile. Rather than simply making 'walking, cycling and transit effective alternatives to the car', PLAN IT should signal its intent to make these modes the superior to the car in terms of cost, convenience and safety. SC disagrees with the notion that we must 'continue to provide for the private and single-occupant vehicles in the future design of road facilities.' In terms of cost, fuel expenditure, land use, the private automobile is the most inefficient mode of urban transportation. Already, in the range of 80% of our transportation infrastructure supports cars. Given emerging trends in urban mobility, fuel costs, etc., SC recommends that over the 50-60 year horizon of PLAN IT we need move toward a city that restricts and phases out the use of the private automobile. If choice is rightly seen as an important aspect of housing, so too, the choice to live without an automobile should be a realistic one for all Calgarians.

Key Direction Six Point 2 'ensure timely investment' is too vague a statement. Transit in new communities must be made available from day one!

Key Direction Seven Point five: 'provide greater mobility choice to Calgarians while still supporting the required volumes of vehicular movement....' In our opinion, mobility choice is important. Given limited resources we believe creating choice will require that volumes of vehicular movement have to go down. The above quoted phrase can too easily be interpreted as continued support for current levels of road infrastructure investment and by extension, only investing in other modes when more money is found. We would like to see PLAN IT acknowledge that the overwhelming majority of new infrastructure money go to non-auto investment and that current auto-supportive infrastructure (such as road lanes) be transformed to support other modes. SC believes that we do not have the luxury of continuing to build infrastructure for the private automobile.

Key Direction Eight With reference to the first comment provided above SC recommends the use of stronger language and percentage targets to ensure that development is concentrated existing urban areas. Point 4: SC feels 'rebalance transportation spending....' is too vague a term. Targets are required to ensure that the spending shift is significant. The need for a significant shift in spending can be highlighted by including city estimates of the value of road and transit infrastructure already in place and by comparing per capita costs of the various mobility options. In our estimations we spend more on automobiles than on the entire city transportation budget, by an order of magnitude – 10 to 1.

Sustainability Principles

Principle Ten: It is SC's opinion that 'reasonable accessibility' is not strong enough. We recommend that this principle should reflect the goal of providing 'universal access to transit and the practical ability to live without a car in Calgary wherever you live, work and play.

Principle 11: It is SCs opinion that 'Green infrastructure and buildings' is too vague. We recommend that as a principle PLAN IT should signal its intent to match or exceed best practices. In the case of green buildings we recommend mandating a minimum of silver LEED and Built Green for all new construction.

Page 10 Discussion of key direction 4 on page 10 states that '35 people or jobs per hectare where auto dependency can be significantly reduced.' It is SCs opinion that 'significantly reduced' is not good enough. SC recommends establishing minimum densities so that all Calgarians have the option of living in our city without an automobile. Similarly, discussion of key direction 5 on page 11 states that 'Calgary's future transportation system will be designed to make it easier for people not using a car'. These statements are not strong enough. We recommend a statement to the effect that 'all Calgarians should have the practical option of living in our city without an automobile.

The page 11 discussion asserts 'the continuing need for automobiles in the future". Automobiles have only become the dominant form of city transportation over the same historic time period - 50 to 60 years – as PLAN IT looks into the future. There is no reason to concede that the most inefficient mode of urban transportation will continue to be part of the urban landscape 50 to 60 years into the future. The long range planning of our city can and should be done with the view of virtually eliminating the private automobile.

On page 12 key direction 7 states that 'the city is able to provide considerably more choice to Calgarians, while still supporting larger volumes of vehicular movement and access where necessary'. SC would like to caution PLAN IT with respecting to the use of language suggesting the intent to support 'larger volumes' of vehicular movement. We feel that a more sustainability designed city will substantially reduce if not virtually eliminate the need for a private automobile. Secondly, we feel it is not fiscally sustainable to provide the necessary non-auto investment while continuing to invest in infrastructure for the automobile.

██████████ TSH Associates (Institute of Transportation Engineers ...

I think the 8 directions are good. They are all linked to the sustainability principles and well described. The missing element is safety. This must be addressed early in the planning stage of a "complete community" as well as at the network level. Modal choice will not change unless people feel it is safe to do so.

██████████ Sustainable Equitable Transportation Group – Sustainable Calgary ...

I feel very positive about the key directions in Plan It with a few exceptions. Any development or redevelopment must be designed for universal access to quality sustainable and equitable transportation to enable an effective alternative to driving. We must speed up the building of complete communities and work to retrofit exiting suburbs to reduce dependence on the need to drive to obtain daily services. We need to shift sprawl - from growing in outlying areas to intensifying existing urban areas. We need to consciously shift spending to a minimum of 65% of the transportation budget to sustainable modes of travel including transit, walking and wheeling. Finally, We need to implement, monitor and resource activities at City Hall to implement the key directions to close the gap between policy and action. In other words it is time to do something not just create a plan and not implement it.

██████████ Sustainable Calgary ...

The Land Use plan for the City of Calgary should focus on development and intensification within previously developed areas. Development in greenfield areas should be severely limited because it is simply too difficult to reconcile with most of the other goals laid out in this Eight Key Directions section. It is very difficult to create any sort of regular transit access, multi-mode transportation, and employment opportunities in greenfield developments. These areas generally exist simply as places for people to reside while they travel to other areas of the city to pursue employment, shopping and leisure activities. True community development, as it is discussed in the eight key directions, does not occur in greenfield developments until well after they are developed as areas of residential housing. For these reasons future development, residential and otherwise, should be focused on areas where communities and employment opportunities already exist. Any greenfield development that does occur should only occur when guidelines regarding acceptable levels of employment, transit, and shopping are met by the development before it is constructed. The meeting of these standards should also be verifiable, beyond just the word or contract of the developer of said area.

██████████ Urban Strategies ...

As a whole, the document represents a fundamental shift in the way Calgary thinks about city building, sustainability and growth. It is a huge positive step toward achieving the goal of becoming a great global city.

██████████ Britannia Community Association ...

Key Direction 2. - The statement "each community can provide for greater choice in housing types to enhance overall choice and affordability" is a vast generalization. We do not believe that our community, Britannia, offers such an opportunity. Britannia is an extremely shallow community – bordered by the Elbow River to the west and Elbow Dr to the East. Elbow Dr. is defined in the document as a Primary Transit Network and we understand that Plan It is recommending densification around transit corridors and nodes. (Key direction 3). First off, we already have significant proportion of RM-4 and RM-5 residences in our community now and secondly, further densification would require rezoning of existing R-1 properties along Elbow Dr.

Most properties in Britannia have a caveat that defines, among other aspects; set back allowances and prevents subdivision. Ironically, the caveat was placed on these lots by The City of Calgary when the City developed the community in the 1950's. The residents of Britannia have fought to preserve the caveat and will continue to do so. In short, we do not support densification of our community or the immediate areas adjacent to our community. Densification requires transition zones. There is no opportunity for transition from high to medium to low density in, or adjacent to, Britannia. Densification along our periphery would affect the first few blocks with shadows, more traffic, noise and reduced property values. The City of Calgary must realize that preserving small, unique, high end communities such as Britannia is essential to supporting the continued economic development of our city by way of providing attractive housing accessible to down town, that meets the expectations of head office executives.

The following respondents indicated “Prefer my comments remain confidential” ...

** The Key directions are valid. However more emphasis needs to be placed on environmental/social values to frame the key directions. There is nothing that speaks to conservation of natural areas and rivers for enjoyment, habitat & biodiversity and health; nor about affordability issues, etc.

** Direction 1: I support the focus on promoting a diversity of housing choices along with encouraging proximity to transit. As our city moves into the future, we will need to properly accommodate alternative methods of housing and transportation with regards to rising fuel and energy costs, increased concern over climate change and other environmental issues as well as providing alternatives to the dominant single-detached housing style in Calgary. I believe this is a key direction for the city. Transportation-Oriented Development and densification in the inner and centre city is key to this goal.

Direction 4: I strongly support this direction. I would like to see in the future more concrete policies for promoting density around transit stations. This may include things such as density bonusing systems, reduced parking requirements or transfer of development credits.

Direction 5: I agree with this direction, but I would like to comment that there should be an increased focus on freight transport through rail. Commercial trucking is perhaps one of the transportation modes most susceptible to higher fuel prices. Fuel cost per tonne-kilometre of commercial trucking is significantly higher than rail transportation. This needs to be a key direction with regards to transportation infrastructure in our city.

Direction 6 and 7: I support these directions and would like to see it result in more transit-dedicated right-of-ways as well as more transit options outside of bus and LRT (such as a tram).

** The eight key directions are a good framework to start from. A higher priority on 3. Direct land use change within a framework of nodes and corridors, and 6. Develop a primary transit network will provide the highest impact on the city. With this focus the change to Calgary will be more visible and allow for greater participation.

** Greenfield development should be minimized or stopped. We should make better use of our current land, ensuring that people have access to transit, employment, recreation and shopping opportunities in their communities, all of which are not dependent upon the automobile.

** Land uses that gobble enormous tracts of agricultural land should be discouraged. Single family detached homes impose a disproportional long term operating cost upon the tax base and they draw down on those services in an inverse relationship to what they contribute via the tax base. Don't build any more. Land use policy should also preclude the removal of naturally occurring wetlands. (City policy up to now has been hugely unfriendly if not damaging to the environment.)

** On the whole, I am satisfied with the eight key directions identified in this section of the paper.

** I would like to see more public input on how older, residential communities can develop appropriately. Without design guidelines and a community plan, you will see a intensified mish mash of knockdowns, infills, and apartment/condo blocks not integrating with or transitioning with the older residential communities. Community Associations should be told to come up with how they would like to see their communities transition. There is no mention of where people go that are displaced or homes/apts knocked down to densify the opportune areas.

** 4. Link land use decisions to transit. One annoying thing about all this talk about "future LRT development" involving new communities, is in some cases - Seton and Coventry Hills come to mind - these areas could be not only well-established but darn near inner city by the time LRT lines are finally built. It's all nice to incorporate "a minimum of 100-150 jobs per acre within 600 metres of rapid transit stations" but if there are no rapid transit stations available, these people will either be forced to drive or overload the buses. Developers should be encouraged to help front-end costs of getting LRT lines built out to their new areas, or at the very least BRT options should be in place from day one.

5. Increase mobility choices. Calgary has a population of 1 million now, 1.3 million projected. There is no reason why this city doesn't have 24/7 public transit of some sort. Definitely the LRTs should be 24/7/365 at the very least, along with key bus routes. (I lived adjacent to the Sunnyside station for 7 years and to be honest there's little difference noisewise between an LRT going by your window at 11 PM and 5 AM than at 2 or 3 AM.). This is in fact mentioned as an option for the "Primary Transit Network" in a later section of the paper, and I'm all for it. Also related to point 5, it should be recognized that there are a growing number of people who live alone in our society. While the occasional HOV lane is fine, as well as "preferential HOV lanes" like you see on Hwy 1 in Vancouver, I do not want to see discrimination against those who don't happen to have a social network that allows for car-pooling, or a nuclear family or a significant other. I've heard talk of things like sin taxes for single-occupancy vehicles and the like. This is unacceptable and must not be considered. Further elimination of downtown parking options and/or unaffordable pricing for parking (which is already ridiculous) falls into this category, as far as I'm concerned.

6. Develop primary transit network. Per above, this should be 24/7/365, and not just during the Stampede or at New Year's Eve, either.

7. Create more multi-modal roads. Sounds interesting. Remember, though, people still need to go from point A to point B and if you make things too difficult (i.e. reducing the available driving space to make room for these different modes) they will find alternate routes.

8. Optimize existing infrastructure. "Completing the skeletal road network". If you mean getting Stoney and Sarcee trails finished ASAP, and making all applicable sections free-flowing, etc. I'm for it.

** General comments: - I would like to see a greater focus on "Preserving and Enhancing Green Space" within the established city. Nowhere in this document do I see any significant effort to consider this concept. Creative ways to use existing green space to support the 8 key directions should be developed.

1. Achieve a balance of growth between established and greenfield communities. - We must be careful that intensification does not encroach on established, thriving communities where single family dwellings are the norm. The plan to intensify the Belt Line is reasonable due to the run down nature of the remaining houses in that area. Other communities in the inner city should not be changed until their character evolves. Just because Mount Royal is in the inner city does not mean it should be intensified. The same applies to many other communities such as Meadowlark Park, Elboya, Britannia, Elbow Park. Windsor Park is undergoing a metamorphosis with its existing zoning. - Preserve and enhance green space. What precious little we still have will be under increasing pressure as the intensification proceeds.

2. Provide more choice within complete communities - Again, forcing increased variety of housing types within existing communities is not fair to the existing home owners. Allowing for increased affordability in these communities will depress property values and attract a different class of resident. - Create complete communities in the first place by, for example, including schools to prevent kids from having to be bussed for an hour each way.

3. Direct land use change within a framework of nodes and corridors - Serious attention must be given to providing better public transit to link these nodes. - Social interaction can happen in green space, and it is possible to turn marginal undeveloped areas into desirable outdoor areas. Intensification seems to be the primary focus of this paper, and overall land use needs to be considered as well.

4. Link land use decisions to transit - Transit needs to be enhanced, and perhaps some creative ways to not penalize the inner city during rush hour by ensuring there are spaces on the busses and LRT when it comes by. How about starting a bus or train closer in, so it isn't filled with Okotokians who probably don't pay taxes to support them anyhow!

5. Increase mobility choices - Focus on cycling! Many more would ride to work in the winter if the paths were cleared. Get the bicycles off the main roads! I personally have commuted by bicycle for 20 years, year round.

6. Develop a primary transit network - Again, I see a heavy focus on "Intensification of inner city communities". Only if this is truly "inner city", i.e. if the residents can walk downtown, will this support this transit issue. The beltline is a good choice. How about Kensington, and intensifying there? Intensifying in Elboya simply means more people can't get on those busses that are full when they get there. - Perhaps thinking outside the box is necessary... the transit is full long before getting downtown... make express busses and LRT from the outreaching areas and add additional units that start c

** Sometimes the language is vague and I worry about how leniently it can be interpreted. For example: "Over the next 50 to 60 years, aim to locate a significant proportion..." What is meant by "significant proportion"? Point to achieve a greater diversity of housing choice...I think we should also include affordability.

** I agree with multi-modal roads that encourage different ways of moving through the city. Choice of housing mix in a community is also encouraged to maintain diversity. I live in Triwood and this area was developed with walk up apartments and housing in close proximity. The low rise apartments increase density without sacrificing the frontage character or blocking views for others. Definitely have to make the best use of our infrastructure and ensure the inner city communities are not subsidizing or suffering from the development on the perimeter.

** The wording of the eight key directions seems so general that it seems to me to be disconnected from, or written ahead of, the excellent research documents on your site. For example the term "complete communities" speaks volumes, yet it does not appear within the "eight key directions". I find the eight key directions to be on the wordy side. Also, there are 8 key directions; 11 sustainability principles; 7 layers of the "decision support framework".....there are a lot of moving parts. I look forward to the day when the objectives and plan can be reduced to the three memorable points.

Two respondents indicated: "I have no comments to make on this section"

SECTION TWO: LAND USE

Section Two the paper deals with future *Land Use*. Please provide any comments you may have on this section of the paper.

██████████ River Valleys Committee ...

“Activity centres (nodes)” are defined in terms of economic (jobs) and social (population) elements, with an emphasis on economic intensification (commercial, retail, institutional). Environmental considerations are nowhere, aside from the potential for redeveloping “underutilized sites...such as vacant school sites...” At every section of the Plan-It project, an **EQUITABLE BALANCE** of triple-bottom-line aspects should be incorporated and cited. If Centre Street North is already identified as a future urban corridor, thought should already be going into aligning LRT there, rather than sandwiching it into such an improbable corridor as the Nose Creek valley, where there will never be significant commercial or residential densities, and where the flexibility to adapt to changing urban patterns and priorities will always be severely limited. Communities are described without reference to parks or open spaces at all, although “park and amenity area” is recognized (once), with respect to complementing increased densities. With the intensification of inner-city, established, recent and greenfield communities, the public realm (i.e., parks and open spaces) can not be neglected. Putting more people in any area leads to more pressure on public space — both to enjoy it as is and to develop it into “higher” (sic) uses. Attractive, functional parks and public open spaces are critical for Calgarians’ quality of life. The same is true in industrial areas.

██████████ Sustainable Calgary Society ...

Land Use Key Direction 1: Activity Centres, (p.15) What about big box auto oriented retail centres? The PLAN IT document is not explicit about the role of big box retail but the implication is that they will remain a key component of city land use. In our opinion PLAN It has not sufficiently examined the sustainability implications of auto-oriented big box retail. With reference to our comments to date about auto-dependence, the concept of activity centres as the places in the city where you could live without an automobile needs re-thinking. We recommend that a goal of PLAN IT is that wherever you live you have the option of living without an automobile. Within the PLAN IT vision the activity centres are still conceived of as existing within a car-dependent urban form. It is our recommendation that PLAN IT examine a phased process or a process of transformation over time that allows for a car-independent or virtually car-free city over the 50 to 60 year planning horizon. On page 31 we would caution that the assertion that “walking is available to everyone at no cost” ignores the situation of people with disabilities. We agree with the spirit of the phrase but would encourage the use of more inclusive language.

██████████ Sustainable Equitable Transportation Group – Sustainable Calgary ...

I feel that we need to rethink the way the city has been growing and reverse the impact of sprawl. With this in mind, we strongly need to intensify the city, create complete communities, increase density, create attractive places that people will want to live, create a mix of housing options in terms of type and affordability and ensure that people have access to sustainable and equitable transportation. I think the market is starting to shift in a new direction and is thinking about more sustainable land use. I firmly believe The City needs to create and enforce mechanisms to change the negative impacts of sprawl. We have such an opportunity to create a truly great city, let's do it now.

██████████ Sustainable Calgary ...

Although greenfield development is currently a major part of the City of Calgary's growth, this growth should be significantly reduced as it simply contributes to and exacerbates the many transportation and land-use challenges that have been identified throughout the PlanIt Process.

Urban Strategies Inc ...

1. The notion of a polycentric or multimodal city connected by transit is a fundamental principle that should drive growth in the City. The hierarchy of the Centre City as the dominant node in the city should continue, with a supporting number of Major Activity Centres, Community Activity Centres, Urban and Neighbourhood Corridors and so forth. These areas (such as urban corridors like Centre Street North) should all have supporting land use planning and implementation policy to guide their future growth. The Centre City, 16th Ave North, 17th Ave SE, nodes such as Brentwood, Anderson and Chinook Station Areas and a number of Community Activity Centres such as Kensington are supported by (or will be) strong policy frameworks. However, other priority places for growth such as Centre Street North are not. Corridor Studies in these location slated for growth should be completed to guide the right kind of growth.

2. The Plan has correctly identified the nodes and corridors that are appropriate, however, I would suggest 17th Avenue SW west of Crowchild Trail to Sarcee Trail should be considered an 'Urban Corridor'. It exhibits many of the same characteristics of a place like Centre Street North and is capable of handling more development. Further, it is along what is stated as a primary transit network area.

3. Northhill Shopping Centre (Lions Park Station Area) should be added as a Community Activity Centre (it's used as an example of one in the sidebar, but not listed as one in text or on the maps) The City identified this as an important node and is currently working on a Station Area Plan for this area. It shows on the map as part of the 16th Avenue Urban Corridor, but would likely be more appropriate as a Community Activity Centre due to the size of parcel at North Hill Mall.

Britannia Community Association ...

We are in absolute disagreement of the classification of Britannia as an inner-city rather than an established community (see colour coded map page 42 and descriptions on p 22-25). This classification seems arbitrary. Britannia was not built out until the 1950's, we do not follow a grid pattern of roads, and we do not follow a N-S/E-W orientation. We are not a through community. We have much more in common say with the communities of Mayfair and Kelvin Grove (classed as Established) to our immediate south than we do with the truly inner-city communities located North of the Elbow River. We believe that the river should be the boundary – not 50th Ave. Again, our objections relate to the potential for higher densification relative to what would be expected for an "Established Community". Several questions come to mind that are not addressed in the Plan It Calgary "Key Directions" document:

- A. What are the 34 communities in inner city (see page 22)?
- B. What are the criteria for defining communities?
- C. Why look at date first built out (i.e. built out by the end of the 1940's) if the relevancy is age and quality of housing stock? Britannia's housing stock is undergoing renewal right now.
- D. What is the intended densification... i.e. # people per sq km of residential zones combined vs now for each of... i. Inner City ii. Corridors iii. Established
- E. What would the city process be for redevelopment? Expropriation?
- F. What process must we go through to ensure that Britannia is redesignated as an "Established Community"?

The following respondents indicated "Prefer my comments remain confidential" ...

** A philosophy of stewardship should be deployed rather than the popular term "sustainability" as no one really understands what that means.

** We need to pay attention to the diversity of housing styles and price points so that affordable housing becomes part of the fabric of all communities as opposed to the pariah that is currently. In addition the switch to a pedestrian and cyclist friendly approach to a people centre urban plan will go a long way to having people stay within the community as opposed to driving to a community such as 4th street or Kensington to be part of their the atmosphere.

** The directions being proposed for land use are on the whole satisfactory. In particular, I would strongly support inner-city intensification and the development of urban corridors as being essential to strengthening mass transit and creating stronger, more vital city arteries.

** I like the idea of aging in place but unless developers are told to build senior type or affordable housing it doesn't seem to have happened as of yet.

** I have a big issue with Figure 2. Didn't you guys learn anything from the Go Plan fiasco of 13 years ago? The Shaganappi Trail extension through Edworthy Park and the 50th Avenue extension through Sandy Beach, both of which were met with resounding NOs from the community, appear to be back on the map! Even if they're just a concept, or symbolic of movement, I really recommend you rethink that unless you're willing to play the same song and dance you did back in 1994-95. I was there. In the Land Use section itself, pg. 15: as noted in my previous comment, a BRT and LRT systems should be more than 15 h/day, but 24/h. Calgary has a million people and they don't all work daytime hours. I know several people who were very inconvenienced and forced to drive or get rides because their work schedule did not coincide with transit's. Obviously I'm not saying the whole fleet run 24/7 - not even Toronto or New York do that. But Toronto and NY do have a nighttime fleet of buses and trains and do provide a level of service in the overnight hours. Activity centres: I'm not sure if this is the best place to say this, so feel free to apply this to another section if applicable. Especially given the stated intentions in section 1 of reducing auto use, the City needs to stop (or reduce) the encouragement of so-called Power Centre construction in their present form (i.e. Deerfoot Meadows, Crowfoot Town Centre, Signal Hill). These developments demand auto use because they're too big to walk on foot, and impractical to access via non-auto options during our unpredictable winter weather. The City should watch how Cross Iron Mills is received at Balzac and perhaps encourage a return to the traditional enclosed shopping mall format, which would encourage less driving and also, as a byproduct, perhaps encourage the development of transit nodes and more linked residential and multi-use. (See Century City in Edmonton for an example). Inner city communities and Established communities sections: Sounds good, but I'd like to see this part of the plan (or a related section) more strongly address the issue of condo conversions. This is one of the great sins of the current boom. I'm a victim, having lost my apartment to a conversion and to be honest if I hadn't lucked out in finding a replacement I wouldn't be living and working and paying taxes in Calgary anymore. As it is I live in constant fear that my landlord will drop the word that this building is going condo and I have X number of days to uproot myself. In my opinion, the support of such ventures runs contrary to your stated goal in this paper of facilitating aging in place. In a similar vein, another trend I've discovered in the last 3-4 years is the deterioration of commercial business diversity in some areas such as Kensington and Uptown 17th and 4th Street SW due to businesses being forced to move or close due to skyrocketing lease/rent rates or the business equivalent of condo conversions. Recent communities: The words "rental apartments" are conspicuous by their absence. There needs to be a stronger focus on encouraging the availability of rental units - and affordable ones.

** Too bad I ran out of space in the last section. For this section, I again suggest a focus on "Preserving and enhancing Green Space". Land use should be more than simply densification and packing more people in to the existing areas, using up all available land. Please consider supporting our parks, off leash areas, year round. BAN PIT BULLS! I feel the focus on the inner city intensification should be revisited, and more quickly increase the densification of the new communities. Why force change on established communities that are thriving in R-C1 when changes to the new communities could be done before they are built. Think 50 years out... stop the sprawl by increasing wherever we are now. As I said before, once an area is rundown and change is appropriate, proceed, e.g. Ramsay, beltline, Victoria Park.

** Good to emphasize the concept of "complete communities", but there needs to be attention to people who have to travel out of these communities. Also need to ensure that complete communities don't become too exclusive.

** The concept of Hybrid Scenario does lend itself to how some of the older communities in Calgary were developed and allows for the diversity mentioned in comment one. The frontage factors into the curb appeal and a tall imposing building built up to the sidewalk is not conducive to a healthy environment due to lack of sun, greenery or curb appeal in general. However in the Hybrid scenario there is some high rise development but this is balanced by those developments that have more curb appeal and is more conducive to people enjoying being outside. How a neighbourhood is accessed makes a big difference. In the newer neighbourhoods there are only a few access points and then a maze inside. In the older neighbourhoods there are numerous ways to access various streets and this lends itself to less congestion at one feeder point. Planning should include Transit and other types of commuting scenarios up front to ensure that it will be effective. Greenspace and wild parkland can also be a way to balance the increasing density in a neighbourhood.

** Better use of land (i.e. increasing density) and a decreased dependence on the automobile should be a key priority. Walkability, transit use and cycling should be made easy, safe and convenient, while the nodes should be attractive and vibrant. Green areas and community gardens must also be part of these communities.

** The approach for Land use is a great strategy. The sooner explicit nodes and corridors can be designated and communicated, the more private development will be focused to meet land use goals.

** I fully agree with the ideas regarding the urban and neighborhood corridors. I believe this is something that could really help the city with density and create some pedestrian friendly streetscapes, without much cost. I would also like to see inner city neighborhoods get rezoned for higher density, in particular hillhurst/sunnyside. That area is vastly underutilized, and inefficient use of inner city land.

** Although I support the general direction of land use decisions, I do not believe it is necessary to create specific typologies for these land uses. Typologies may prevent certain options from being realized, and may at times restrict appropriate densification.

** More attention to social / environmental issues needed, especially for existing areas. As higher levels of transit are added to these areas, the impacts of noise and the high speeds that buses like to travel at need to be addressed in the street design. Activity centres will have to be extensively retrofitted in order to be "pedestrian-bike" first; Chinook, Shawnessy, the U of C, West Hills - all are completely dominated by auto access, and the experience while there has little in common with a "vibrant urban place" - how will this be achieved?

** The concept of preserving view corridors is missing. Views are one of the joys of living here, even downtown. Views can be preserved, including for pedestrians, with judicious placement of buildings on the land that is used. Denver prides itself on having contained sprawl. However when one flies into Denver, the City's administrative boundary is made visible by the acreages and sprawl which has leapt over the boundary and continued into the countryside. I would like to see the land use goals of Calgary and Calgary Regional Partnerships merged into a single plan. There is one fact cited of roads consuming 29% of land under a dispersed plan and 25% under a compact plan. Even 25% seems like a huge allocation of land, which then becomes non-taxable, towards the use of roads. Use of rail transit minimizes land use consumption, and so this point has not as yet been drawn out.

One respondent indicated "I have no comments to make on this section."

SECTION THREE: ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

Section Three the paper deals with future *Active Transportation*, including walking and cycling. Please provide any comments you may have on this section of the paper.

██████████ River Valleys Committee ...

The inversion of the transportation hierarchy chart (Figure 1) is commendable. Pedestrian and cycling needs (e.g., crossings) must be incorporated into all street typologies, especially those with wider carriageways. If there are costs associated with the provision of more convenient pedestrian crossings, they will likely be in the form of capital construction costs (i.e., short-term) or increased inconvenience to vehicular travel modes (which is a corollary to Plan-It's key objectives #4, 5 and 7).

██████████ Sustainable Calgary Society ...

The active transportation strategic direction statement discussing 'creation of a more balanced transportation system that accommodates all modes of travel'. SC would recommend assertion of the priority for walking and cycling' signaled in the inverted pyramid for transportation priority. Pedestrian needs. SC supports the three needs identified on page 34. We would further emphasize the need to address the significant barriers of movement within and between communities with a curvilinear design. We would also like see an acknowledgment that freeways and expressways are inherently barrier-making and long term planning should endeavor to downgrade the designation of these roads so that they can be redesigned as pedestrian-friendly. Sustainable Calgary acknowledges that the current roadway system does not provide an efficient or safe environment for bicycles. We endorse the cyclists needs as outlined on pages 35 and 36 and the bicycle strategies of page 37. We recommend that PLAN IT establish a range of transportation spending for bicycle infrastructure to ensure that sufficient resources are allocated to achieve the stated goals.

██████████ TSH Associates (Institute of Transportation Engineers) ...

Active Transportation is a key element of sustainability, and will grow if people feel safe doing it. This section touched upon this issue, but perhaps it should be emphasized a little more? assured connectivity is the other issue that will help people to make this modal shift.

██████████ Sustainable Equitable Transportation Group – Sustainable Calgary

...

If our city is designed: for Universal access - quality transportation that is sustainable and equitable and available for all Calgarians. with complete communities that are transit -oriented and pedestrian friendly with neighbourhoods that are inclusive and allow a range of people to live, work and play to Reverse sprawl shift the focus from car dependent, segregated development in outlying areas to intensify existing urban areas to spend more money (at least 65% of the existing Transportation budget) on transit and sustainable transportation then I feel that transportation issues will be positive. If we use the points above as a screen for approving new developments and improving existing neighbourhoods and ensure that the developments include these conditions before projects are completed then I believe Plan It Calgary will be effective and our city improved.

██████████ Urban Strategies Inc ...

The City should prepare strategies for promoting active transportation, including better provision for walking, cycling. Infrastructure for improving the walkability of communities should be a priority. For instance in the Beltline, a walkable community, little attention is paid to improving infrastructure (sidewalks, street furniture, tree planting, comprehensive streetscape

refurbishments on streets with high pedestrian activity such as 8th street SW) while this is a major form of transportation in the area.

The following respondents indicated they “Prefer my comments remain confidential” ...

** Stop it already with walking and cycling! While some people choose to travel via these modes, we should not base our entire transportation philosophy on them. Besides, in many areas, especially down town, it is downright dangerous to ride a bike. I am 61 years old and I occasionally ride my bike to my suburban office. If you think I will do that in February, you are out of your ever loving mind! It is a fair weather activity. As well, the bike network was designed for recreational use and not commuting.

** There is one key point to encouraging pedestrian and cyclist use; the routes have to be convenient and functional. By functional I mean that the person on either mode of transport, foot/pedal is not isolated from their daily needs. Urban Planning will need to incorporate cycling and pedestrian design to allow for stopping by the grocery store en route home as opposed to isolated on a bike path. Currently all big box stores (where most of us get out groceries and other daily needs) are designed for those in single vehicles.

** Again, the strategies being proposed for active transportation are generally satisfactory. I would strongly endorse planning for parallel, separate networks for pedestrians and for cyclists, as these constituencies have distinct mobility and service requirements that do not generally overlap--the cyclist, the rollerblader, and the skateboarder require speed and a clear right of way, whereas the pedestrian requires streetscaping and amenities.

** I like this section of Active Transportation. The City is not in the Parking Lot business and should improve shuttle, express buses to LRT stations or Downtown from outlying suburbs and urban towns. Parking fees are a cost that can influence consumer behavior.

** All I'll say about this section is that for most of the people of Calgary, this really only applies for, if we're lucky, 4-5 months of the year. And much as we'd like to imagine the aging population as all being robust Jack LaLanne types, the reality is many in your "target market" won't really find anything in here particularly applicable to them. For those who do, one thing I wouldn't mind seeing is an increased number of shelters (preferably heated) that might actually make the walk-or-bike-commute a bit easier for people. Definitely, there should be more police bike patrols of the pathways, especially in some of the more out-of-the-way areas like Lawrey Gardens or next to the irrigation canal. As technology gets cheaper, the installation of cameras and panic buttons in identified trouble areas might not be a bad idea, either.

** The bicycle strategy is sound. Let's see some real action!

** There needs to be true acceptance of the transportation hierarchy. Better integration of multi-modal transportation with public transit is required. This section covers off some very important active transportation issues. If the guiding principles, could actually be enacted, this would be great.

** I live in Triwood and chose this neighbourhood because I could ride my bike to work from there in 1/2 hour. Also, I could walk to the LRT station, either Brentwood or University. I have been able to integrate these different commuting scenarios into my lifestyle and rarely drive to work. However in order to do this I ride my bike on some busy streets that don't have a bike lane. I am also willing to walk for 20 minutes to get to the LRT, even in frigid temperatures. Not everyone is will in to do those things. Feeder buses are important as are wide enough roads to accommodate a bike, even if it is not a designated bike lane. To encourage people to walk, shopping has to be accessible by foot without having to cross large areas of parking lot that has zero visual appeal. If

we want people to walk there has to be something enjoyable about it and it has to have clear pedestrian routes to avoid car/pedestrian conflicts.

** All good points. Cyclists need to feel safe and routes need to be direct. The river system is great but getting off of it must be user friendly. Designated bike lanes are a must; sharing them with buses is not an option. Particulate matter coming from buses is a real problem and no one wants to be sucking diesel fumes.

** Adoption and implementation of the street palettes will be key in encouraging active transportation. Continuity of the street under redevelopment must be required, inconsistent implementation improvements has a drastic impact on use (only as strong as the weakest link).

** As a cyclist, I am very encouraged to see such an emphasis on cycling. I agree fully that cyclists have very different needs than pedestrians and this should be reflected in the infrastructure. I believe the focus for cycling infrastructure should be on the areas which need most improvement (streets downtown, frequent crossings of arterials and freeways) rather than areas that are already well serviced (the river pathway systems).

** Absolutely critical that ped and bike access and service be improved **ACROSS THE CITY**. Why is it that not a single recommendation for bicycle improvements in the downtown has ever been implemented? - see Pathway/Bikeway Plan, 2000. The research has already been done; just get on with it, don't spend another 5 years figuring out what to do. Pedestrian treatment of downtown is equally abysmal. Everything about it is geared to autos - signal timing, size of the roads, speed of vehicles - all make for a very pedestrian-hostile environment. There is so much that is urgently needed to be done - **START NOW!** Moving between communities by walking or cycling is basically impossible in most cases. Stop designing communities separated by each other by 4-6 lane highways, like Sarcee trail, Crowchild, McKnight, 36 St NE or whatever. There is decades of retrofitting required for all of these huge barrier roads to make them even slightly useful for ped/cycle. Do not treat "pathways" as the one and only way to handle cyclists. Cyclists need to have safe and effective access to **EVERY ROAD**. They are entitled to be there - make sure it works. Furthermore, pathways should be designed for transportation and commuting as well as a leisurely stroll. People want to and do use them for transportation - accept this and start giving people what they need in terms of design.

** Well done. Even though a health paper is being developed for the future, the facts surrounding active transit are so well known that I think you should publish them now. (i.e. youth diabetes stemming in part because 50% of students are driven to school because they live in a neighbourhood that was designed for cars instead of walking and biking) I think the planners need to be cognizant that there is a huge portion of the population (young people and old people) who are relying on you to plan for active transportation on their behalf. These people do not go to your forums or get to reply to plans as I am fortunate to be able to do here.

Three respondents indicated, "I have no comments to make on this section."

SECTION FOUR: PUBLIC TRANSIT

Section Four the paper deals with future *Public Transit*. Please provide any comments you may have on this section of the paper.

██████████ River Valleys Committee ...

It's well past time to embed Transit Oriented Design principles into higher-level planning documents... Figure 3: In a general over-arching sense, provision must be built into this process from the beginning, to ensure that comprehensive studies and calculations are prepared in advance of more detailed planning, regarding opportunity costs and benefits, alternatives and potential mitigation costs, in order to minimize long-term problems and optimize Calgary's future SUSTAINABLE growth prospects.

██████████ Sustainable Calgary Society ...

Suggested changes P. 39 Under the heading of Transit Strategies we recommend amending the first sentence to read "to make transit the preferred mobility choice, strategic investments..." We also recommend stronger language addressing the need to make Calgary a city where the private automobile is an option. One of the key issues in our understanding of the literature on transit success is that it must be faster and more efficient than the automobile - a function of the relative infrastructure investments. We recommend making this assertion explicit in the Transit Strategies section.

Base Transit Network. SC recommends the strengthening of this section by inclusion of the following two principles in the plan.

1. The performance policy discussed in paragraph 2 should be challenged. Successful transit policy should include a commitment to individuals in new communities that high quality transit will be available from day one. Transit, just as roads are currently, should be viewed as a necessary infrastructure for any new community - not a luxury - or something to be built only at some threshold population. Road are not built under that condition, so why should transit be?
2. Levels of service city-wide. While we agree with a concept of different levels of service - frequency and capacity for example - we recommend that embedded in PLAN IT should be a minimum universal service target such that 'every Calgarian, wherever they live or work or play, has the practical option to live without an automobile". Many Calgarians already live without an automobile, by choice or circumstance, and without adequate transit. These individuals are marginalized by an auto-dependent city. From an ethical point of view this should not be tolerated in our city. Further to this point, on page 44 the discussion of Proximity asserts that greater 50% of the future city population and employment will be located within walking distance of the expanded primary transit network. This would mean in fact that almost 50% of Calgarians would live or work where transit service was likely insufficient to live without an automobile. Recognizing the complex mobility and relationship patterns of Calgarians - regular need to travel to workplaces other than your own or to travel to recreation centres of a friends home it would be very unlikely that with such a greater than 50% target, very few Calgarians would actually be able, in practice, to live without an automobile.

██████████ TSH Associates (Institute of Transportation Engineers) ...

Safety and security are key elements to growing transit ridership... as well as having the capacity to meet the demand. This also must be linked with the regional growth strategies.

██████████ Sustainable Equitable Transportation Group – Sustainable Calgary

...

Residents in communities in Calgary with limited transit are left with few options but to drive. Calgary needs a public transit throughout the City that is accessible, affordable, available and safe for all Calgarians. Research conducted by Sustainable Calgary in 2007 revealed barriers to the system. Transit users identified scheduling issues, overcrowding and long waits for buses . Road congestion resulted in buses sitting idly in traffic, wasting time and energy and creating

pollution. Shift workers described scheduling constraints and limited services at irregular hours. People with disabilities reported barriers to accessing public transit safely, particularly around LRT stations. Crowding on transit during peak hours presented difficult for seniors, people with disabilities or parents with small children to ride. Those on fixed or low incomes faced access and affordability issues. Calgarians relying on parallel transit described continually declining service due to funding constraints. In addition, negative perceptions of the system deterred some car owners from using transit. Accessibility is about the detail and effective placement of facilities such as ramps and curb cuts, elevators, wider fare gates, colour coding, flashing lights, audio signals for changing traffic lights (individuals with visual impairments), bike racks and long-term storage facilities sited for cyclists that are built correctly (adjacent to building entrances). Adequate infrastructure is key to all increasing opportunity for non-motorized transit. Access features benefit a wide market of customers: people with disabilities, parents pushing baby carriages, travelers with luggage on wheels, cyclists, and delivery folks. Additional features such as traffic calming and landscaping in parking lots to make the trip between the car and a destination's front door non-threatening and pedestrian friendly street crossings (e.g. sharper radii at exit ramps to reduce vehicle speeds and improve pedestrian / motorist sightlines). Residents in communities in Calgary with limited transit are left with few options but to drive. Calgary needs a public transit throughout the City that is accessible, affordable, available and safe for all Calgarians.

Urban Strategies Inc ...

4.Regarding the Primary Transit Network, it would be useful to differentiate what is LRT vs. other types of transit infrastructure such as BRT. It might be appropriate to consider a long term build out of LRT as the primary transit network, consider BRT secondary, and all other bus networks the 'Base Network'. Will Hamilton submitted a well thought out long range LRT expansion to the Plan It team that presents a sound vision that would meet many of the objectives of this Plan, including creating cross town routes connecting major nodes and serving urban corridors (i.e. Centre Street North, 17th Avenue SE).

Britannia Community Association ...

Page 43 of the Key Directions document the - a river crossing is proposed across the Elbow River at 50th Ave. We are absolutely opposed to this connection, even if it is to be limited to transit. It would be an eyesore, noise creator and potential pollution generator. We understand that interest groups representing the River valley are opposed to such a crossing on environmental grounds. This is an illogical and redundant crossing given the recent upgrade of Glenmore Trail that is only 1.5 km away. If the crossing is meant to hook up with Chinook LRT station, the route would have to jog down Elbow Dr. head east say at 58th Ave SW and cross McLeod. An east-west LRT route along Glenmore would be much more direct and perhaps an elevated design could be accommodated. On the other hand, enhancement of the cycling/walkway system through River Park and Sandy Beach would be welcome. Some of the questions that come to mind that are not addressed in the Plan It documents include:

- A. Why 50th Ave vs Glenmore Tr for the transit link?
- B. What attempts have there been/will there be to consult with other interests that would be directly affected?
 - i. Commercial – Britannia Plaza owners and merchants
 - ii. Calgary Golf and County Club
 - iii. Existing multi family residential along 50th Ave
 - iv. Potential development of the AltaLink property along 50th Ave east of Elbow Dr.
- C. What would the environmental impact to the Elbow River Valley be?
- D. What would the impact to park use be?

The following respondents indicated “Prefer my comments remain confidential” ...

** Is there a reason why Calgary Transit needs a monopoly? Some public transportation strategies in Europe, for example, provide that any service provider who meets certain standards can operate trains and buses on common routes. This drives competition to help manage costs and competes for customers through the services they provide. Calgary Transit's service plan

appears to be for its own convenience rather than the convenience of its customers. That's why I stopped using it 20 years ago. The service stinks and your facilities are falling apart from neglect. LRT has all the appearances of a third-world country. Heads should roll!

** The ideas of both a grid and radial system to enhance transit service is ideal. The frequency proposed for the primary network is also important. The current system does not allow for people to get across town to their work from less expensive areas to live in less than two hours. If the new system can guarantee this or if the previous section's comment of affordable housing embedded into all communities then we may have fewer people travelling so far to meet their daily needs.

** The public transit strategy being proposed has a degree of merit, but the context of the network being proposed misses some critical opportunities. While articulated bus routes are useful in building demand for light rail service along key corridors, the fundamental error many advocates of "bus rapid transit" make is in trumpeting the relatively low capital costs of buying busses while understating the high operating costs--particularly by way of fuel and staffing expenses--inherent to such systems. It will therefore be crucial over the long term to identify, develop, and take full advantage of light rail's scalability in transportation corridors over the live of this land use and mobility plan. Also, I must confess to some surprise at the short shrift given to tram service along higher-traffic inner-city corridors. Even though trams would of necessity have to operate in segregated traffic to be effective in the context of mobility in Calgary, many of the current bus routes within a Glenmore-Deerfoot-McKnight-John Laurie-Sarcee loop generate sufficient revenue passenger traffic for short-haul crosstown travel to warrant the capital infrastructure for trams on dedicated rights of way. The obvious comparison that comes to mind is with tram service in Toronto--most current Toronto tram routes run south of Bloor Street and Danforth Avenue, between Roncesvalles and Broadview, thus forming a relatively dense network accommodating higher passenger numbers than could safely and efficiently be transported by bus, and maintain their ridership in spite of the obvious disadvantages of having to operate mostly in mixed traffic.

** Make it on time, frequent, reliable and safe. keep LRT platforms and access pathways well lit and safe.

** As I indicated earlier, I support the 24/7/365 idea, for at least a portion of the transit system. Definitely the LRT and BRT portions at least, plus some key routes. If not already in place, this should be one of the first things implemented. It's overdue. IV: Proximity. I disagree that big box stores shouldn't be accommodated in activity centres near transit. If the developers are going to insist on building them instead of traditional (and more pedestrian-friendly) shopping malls or districts, as I discussed in an earlier response, then at the very least open the door for a bit more transit-access options for such developments, where feasible.

** For public transit, create express routes from the outlying areas. How about getting the Okotokians to pay their fare (pardon the pun) share and give them an express train to downtown. Then the rest of us would have a space when it gets to us. Start additional empty units part way to downtown (inject them just in front of the already full units).

** Good coverage of issues related to public transit. Need to integrate active transportation (i.e. cycling) into this and not treat it as a separate process. As the sprawl continues, its not really feasible for people to bike the entire distance to work...but the current conditions for mixing bike/transit travel are appalling.

** Frequency of transit service is important to the ease of use of the system. Key routes to downtown or LRT stations run in the 10-20minute range. This is the base transit concept. However when it comes to choice, I choose the train over a bus because of the frequency of service. If there were other alternatives that had the same frequency as the LRT then they would become viable options and perhaps help with the congestion on the LRT network. This would

form the primary transit network. This primary transit network I agree should have right of way to ensure timely delivery of passengers.

** Access and ease of use is critical. Accommodating bikes on transit gives greater flexibility for riders. Reliability is also key.

** Calgary's biggest limitation on Public Transit is capacity within the existing structure. Focus needs to remain on increasing capacity within the existing core areas (LRT/BRT). Additional BRT routes/capacity along existing LRT and BRT routes will increase use on secondary routes.

** I am strongly supportive of increasing access and operations of public transit. I do think the key piece that is missing in Calgary is a suitable inner-city transit system, such as a tram, that does not serve as a primary commuter network (as the LRT does). Public transportation should not just focus on the commute, but also on non-work trips as well as reducing automobile dependency overall, especially for transit-dependent groups. Public transit should be planned in coordination with affordable housing as well as land use in general.

** Expanding transit routes and service levels will be much needed. It is needed now. Currently, taking transit is about the worst experience one can have in Calgary. It is slow, trains are so crowded you can't get on, vehicles are always dirty and messy inside, there are no washrooms at stations, there is no one to get any kind of information or help from, the schedules are no longer even provided, you can't buy a book of tickets at the station, there is only one ticket booth per platform and they are slow and not adjacent to the schedule, the maps are very confusing and not helpful, there isn't even an explanation of the fact that it is an "honour" system for the LRT but not buses, how do transfers work? no way to find out! ; there are no bins to recycle newspapers or bottles or any other waste, the train doesn't run after midnight, the downtown stations are crime magnets, people are murdered at stations fairly regularly now and there has been no response in terms of increased surveillance (by people) or better cameras, the design of a station in the middle of a freeway is the most hostile environment you could possibly choose - there is no escape route and no help anywhere near by - extremely undesirable characteristics for women travelers; what is considered "peak" service here (train every 5 minutes) is the off-peak standard in Toronto (where peak service is a train every 45 seconds); above-ground LRT will never be able to be more frequent because of the surface level design - we need the underground bypass through downtown! - So, if these problems are fixed, I would consider taking transit again. However they are a long way off. Please don't continue to build more of this system with all of these flaws carried on into the future. The top picture on page 45 sums it up. Presumably it is meant to illustrate what a "great" customer experience transit is. Locating a station so that everyone must climb up 60 steps and down 60 steps to get over a freeway to access the platform is NOT PEDESTRIAN FRIENDLY! Only a chump would bother with this nonsense; and you wonder why more people don't choose transit.

** The maps of public transit should have commuter rail drawn in as a future possibility as this is a popular option in other large cities and there is a growing interest here. Showing a coloured line on your maps between Calgary - Balzac; Calgary - High River and Calgary - Cochrane plays a role in reminding people to allow for this eventuality so that something like a road overpass or other structure is not built so as to frustrate this eventuality. You have shown a green line for Edmonton - Calgary high speed rail which is an eventuality for the long term, and so this is good. Please do the same for commuter rail. While we are on the topic of commuter rail, nobody here knows what a commuter train looks like. A consideration could be to include a photo so that it becomes a known quantity. There are three schematics in the Workbook document that shows transit theory. There is a fourth schematic which is not included. This involves showing radial transit as being the base mover of people, with bus or other types of transit feeders connecting to it. (i.e. think London, Vancouver, Chicago, or any large city)

Two respondents indicated, "I have no comments to make on this section."

SECTION FIVE: **INTEGRATED ROAD AND STREET PALETTES**

Section Five the paper deals with future *Integrated Road and Street Palettes*. Please provide any comments you may have on this section of the paper.

██████████ River Valleys Committee ...

The integration of ecological and aesthetic elements in the proposed street-design palette is commendable. However, environmentally sensitive approaches to storm water management (e.g., bio-swales) can and should be incorporated into more than just "Parkway" roads. The proposed street typology requires a detailed analysis in terms of AT LEAST five principal factors:

- safety (for vehicular and pedestrian traffic),
- efficiency (of service for all users),
- livability (of the residential environment),
- interface (with adjacent land uses and activities), and
- economy (of land use, construction and maintenance).

██████████ Sustainable Calgary Society ...

SC is supportive of the increased palette of potential roadways particularly the creation of urban boulevards. SC recommends the timely conversion of roads not designated as industrial arterial to urban boulevards. In a transit oriented city there would be no need for car-oriented expressways and freeways, particularly with the existence of the ring road. SC further recommends that the city plan for the removal, over the 50 to 60 year planning horizon of PLAN IT, of interchanges on these roads.

██████████ TSH Associates (Institute of Transportation Engineers) ...

Freight mobility is a growing issue that needs attention at the planning stage. Emergency vehicle must also be accommodated at all level of street network planning

██████████ Sustainable Equitable Transportation Group – Sustainable Calgary

...

Increasing mobility choices is critical. Accessibility is about the detail and effective placement of facilities such as ramps and curb cuts, elevators, wider fare gates, colour coding, flashing lights, audio signals for changing traffic lights (individuals with visual impairments), bike racks and long-term storage facilities sited for cyclists that are built correctly (adjacent to building entrances). Adequate infrastructure is key to all increasing opportunity for non-motorized transit. Access features benefit a wide market of customers: people with disabilities, parents pushing baby carriages, travelers with luggage on wheels, cyclists, and delivery folks. Additional features such as traffic calming and landscaping in parking lots to make the trip between the car and a destination's front door non-threatening and pedestrian friendly street crossings (e.g. sharper radii at exit ramps to reduce vehicle speeds and improve pedestrian / motorist sightlines). Work developing three editions of the City of Calgary Access Design Guidelines (1988; 1991 and 2002) has been completed but implementation has lagged behind. Mechanisms need to be in place to implement the work completed by the committee at the City of Calgary and continually improve access issues. An inter-modal system An inter-modal or multi-modal system gathers many modes of transportation together and is strategically located to increase destination alternatives. Mixing modes of transportation (e.g. bicycling or walking distances to and from transit stations) extends the value of the system beyond the immediate sphere (800 m) of transit stations. A sustainable, equitable system would identify and promote universal design and accessibility in inter-modal public transportation and determine what types of access exist; who knows about and utilizes universal access; and where and how universal access and accommodations are being used, not just by citizens with disabilities, but by all transit customers. Investment in inter-modal infrastructure would provide funding for infrastructure that facilitates the transfer passengers

between modes of transportation, such as transit lines to airports, and better access parking facilities and car-sharing services at transit stations.

Urban Strategies Inc ...

This is a hugely positive move. Calgary needs to move back to a more grid-based road pattern over the current hierarchical system. Streets should recognize their role as places for pedestrians, cycling, transit, vehicles and active uses on their edges.

Britannia Community Association ...

The city will face huge challenges and expense in creating the kind of urban streetscapes and boulevards depicted in some of the illustrations in this section. We are faced with an impending water shortage. Trees are very hard to establish in Calgary, let alone along vehicular transportation routes. Are the tax payers of Calgary willing to front the bill? I understand that the majority of trees on our "urban forest" are on private lands. As densification occurs, lot sizes will shrink and the ability to establish and maintain trees on private land will diminish. We can't ignore the value created by the urban forest in terms of environment, carbon reduction, the economy, aesthetics and human health.

The following respondents answered "Prefer my comments remain confidential" ...

** The engineer standards for Calgary roads need to be revisited. In many cases they are too high and result in traffic behaviour which is incompatible with the associated land uses, such as residential collectors where speeding is endemic. Speeding is encouraged by design as those roadways easily support speeds in excess of 50km/hr. Likewise, multi-modal transportation is not desirable since various modes cannot co-exist like bikes and trucks. So unless the intent is population control, just don't do it!

** The integration of roads, with cycling and HOV/ transit lanes is really the only way to move forward.

** This section of the paper is generally satisfactory. I would heartily endorse the development of urban boulevards and parkways to accommodate tram and pedestrian rights of way.

** The cost of changing roadways and infrastructure is costly. Sidewalks must be put in there are too many places in Calgary already with out sidewalks and proper access for pedestrians and cyclists. I would like to see more green treatment but perhaps some or most could be food bearing trees and shrubs.

** The illustration on pg. 51 underscores my concern from a safety perspective. Unless that "typical urban boulevard after" is going to be a one-way street, you're looking at a real mess and plenty of distractions for travelers (note I didn't say motorists because I'm including cyclists, pedestrians, etc.). There's simply too much and I particularly dislike the idea (which I've seen in other cities) of putting parking lanes alongside designated bike lanes. You're asking for trouble. If you want to go this route, my thought would be to reduce the clutter. If you want multi-modal, then get some of the modes off the street; encourage or build off-street parking (and not at \$6 per half hour, thank you very much), or make a one-way streets, or do what Edmonton has done and create some bikeways where it's just bikes and no cars allowed, to get that element off the street. Green treatment: the more trees the better.

** This is a really interesting part of the document, but the car-centric culture of Calgary would really have to change to prevent outcry about not continuing with the investment in freeways/expressways in order to build nice road palettes. Parkway investment is important but not necessarily utilitarian. Investment here could detract from higher improvements in high volume commuter routes. Green treatment of roads and streets should be based on what is

natural for our climate and be water resistant and chemical free. Also need to ensure that sightlines of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers are not impacted.

** I agree with adding the new palettes to planning of neighbourhoods. I have addressed some of these items in the previous comments. The balance of efficient transit, major arteries and accessible streetscapes is important to how people view their neighbourhood. The more destinations that are accessible by walking the more people will walk if the conditions of the road allow it. I am all for boulevards and medians with tree canopies. these enhance a roadway and make it more pleasant for all users. Adding cycling space and transit space makes it even better.

** New facility types are a drastic improvement. Clear criteria for classifying existing roads into the facility types will be of high interest.

** I am strongly supportive of the transportation hierarchy and its emphasis on pedestrians and cyclists.

** The major difference between existing roads and the future desired roads in the diagrams appears to be the presence of trees. This is far too simplistic and hardly worth it as a strategy in Calgary given that trees are not native to this climate and street trees typically do very poorly. All the images show a rosy summer day. Why not focus on how these streets will look in the pouring rain, or winter, which it is most of the year. if there are any trees, they will be bare. What provision will be made for walking and cycling in those conditions? Why aren't there guidelines for keeping walking and cycling routes clear all winter, well lit, and protected from road spray? Additional road standards should be designed for all the varieties of transit that are proposed - BRT, high frequency regular buses, surface level LRT, etc. What will the bus stop pullouts look like? What about HOV lanes? where will cyclists fit in a street that has high speed or frequent bus service - how will they be protected? What will the intersection of two BRT roads look like - how will pedestrians be accommodated? There are a lot more details needed before a full evaluation of these options could be offered.

** There a road palette showing future types of roads which are more user friendly to active transit and trees. This is good. It is unclear if this is considered only for future expansion or if there would be retrofitting of existing roads. (hopefully the latter) Calgary's existing street calming efforts are very well done. There is an excellent body of work on this topic on the City of Calgary website. You should give yourself credit of having already embarked on this type of street design. At the same time, I continue to observe construction of hugely wide streets and arterials as the city expands at the edges. It seems like two separate policies are at work at the same time. Your plan is silent on this. A role of your plan could be to converge some commonality on why roads are designed and what their shape should be. This is especially important for developing your goal of re-deploying existing infrastructure and inner city neighbourhoods.

Four respondents indicated, "I have no comments to make on this section."

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Finally, do you have any additional comments specific to **Plan It Calgary's Key Directions** paper that you have *not already mentioned* in any of the sections above?

██████████ River Valleys Committee ...

Plan-It must be coordinated and consistent with the Calgary Regional Partnership's long-range goals and plans, including the Provincial Land Use Framework, as well as existing and emerging Water and Watershed Management Plans in the Calgary area. Also, regularly scheduled reviews of the Plan's goals, objectives and progress should be included in the implementation strategy.

██████████ Sustainable Calgary Society ...

In general Sustainable Calgary is supportive of the directions set by the Key Directions Document. The majority of comments provided focus on the need, in our opinion, to move more decisively in these directions. In particular, we recommend amending PLAN IT to move more decisively to curb sprawl (greenfield development), and to evolve into a city where the private automobile is optional, restricted and even unnecessary. We feel these twin recommendations are justified ecologically (e.g. the global challenge to reduce GHGs), socially (e.g. the marginalization of a significant portion of the population in a car-dependent city) and economically (given the vast amount of financial and land resources we devote to the private automobile). The only reason to not have created a car-independent city over the next 50 to 60 years is that we were unwilling to take up the challenge to do so. The commentary and recommendations contained herein are supported by Sustainable Calgary research. The supporting documents can be found at our website sustainablecalgary.ca State of Our City 2004 Smart Growth in Calgary A Citizens Agenda The Sustainable and Equitable Transportation Charter

██████████ Sustainable Equitable Transportation Group – Sustainable Calgary

...

While City Council has made efforts in the past including The Go-Plan in 1995, The Calgary Plan in 1998, to integrate features of smart growth into city planning, these plans were never implemented. Additional work at City Hall includes: three editions of the City of Calgary Access Design Guidelines (1988; 1991 and 2002), Sustainable Suburbs Study 1995 and Transit Oriented Development Guideline 2004. The failure to implement these policies and plans has resulted in unsustainable growth that will have repercussions for decades to come. Calgary is an auto-dependent city. Decades of low density, combined with automobile-dependent development with isolated land uses illustrates the building of our city. The result of this urban sprawl has been a sharp increase in vehicle-related greenhouse gas emissions, unsustainable infrastructure spending, loss of community, increased health risks and continued marginalization of Calgarians who do not drive. We need a more balanced transport system, meaning that consumers have a variety of transportation options. In December 2007, City Council approved eleven Sustainability Principles for Land use and Mobility . This approval, coupled with current work underway at City Hall, developing Plan it Calgary – the land use and mobility plan for Calgary, introducing new transit oriented development initiatives and steps to reduce the ecological footprint, creates new opportunities. Approved work by City Council, must be implemented and must include a detailed implementation strategy supported with adequate resources to ensure actionable results, specific time lines, success and continual improvement. Plan It is a bold step in a new direction and I am pleased with this direction - It is time for decisive, visionary, and courageous leadership by our City Council. Decisions made today about the city's overall development towards a 60-year vision through Plan It Calgary will have a direct impact on the quality of life of Calgarians and indeed the quality of environment for the remainder of most of our lives.

██████████ Urban Strategies Inc ...

Correction: 17th Avenue Neighbourhood Corridor is part of Beltline/Lower Mount Royal not Connaught (Vic Park and Connaught amalgamated in 2003) as stated in the document.

Britannia Community Association ...

The Key Directions document does not appear to have taken into account the economic implications of the changes proposed. We are most concerned about how the directions outlined in the documents will ultimately affect traffic, safety, the environment and future development in the community of Britannia. In short, we are concerned with our ability to preserve our unique neighbourhood, the high quality of life we enjoy, and our individual property values. These were the premises that we bought into. In our opinion, Britannia is the ultimate sustainable, mixed density, walkable community that already offers transportation alternatives, including walking, cycling, transit use and time-efficient private vehicle transport. While we support sustainability principles for the development of new communities and the redevelopment of derelict areas, we feel there are many better opportunities for densification and transportation routing than targeting communities such as Britannia. The concept of developing along major corridors makes good sense. For example, why not redevelop stretches of Macleod currently occupied by car dealerships? There is no logic to having car dealerships along routes serviced by transit. These areas should be high-rise residential with services and retail that meet the daily needs of residents who live within walking distance. Establish a land-use bylaw that requires infrequently visited commercial enterprises to locate off of transit routes. In conclusion, the "how" of Plan It Calgary in regard to the application to existing communities is not adequately defined. We object to the specifics of labels and routes pertaining to Britannia as they appear in the Plan It Calgary documents. If this is truly a Key Directions document, the last thing we want is something in writing and approved by Council that will dictate future development for our community in this manner.

The following respondents answered "Prefer my comments remain confidential" ...

** They are very prejudicial in that this whole format tends to direct answers.

** This city needs to intensify its inner city and its urban thoroughfares to achieve a critical mass for effective and sustainable mass transit. Let's better use the environment and resources we have, and reap the dividends of a less costly civic infrastructure and a more vibrant city.

** Our community is an established community and is by a TOD LRT station, transit node. We are being told what the new land use will be. I do not think the public has been informed and made aware of what is going to happen. People do not seem to be informed until these tall towers start popping up beside them. We are asked to inform ourselves and then to give opinion, input, and feel included in the process? Planners and Council should give more consideration for the future of our neighbourhood right next to this development. I hope questions will be answered on height, shadowing and density as it interfaces with existing lower density housing? This is a fantastic development but with no local concerns addressed as of yet. Taxes are going to go up much higher when this area takes off, or as real estate speculators slither in. Buildings will become rundown as properties are land banked for later development. How will PlanIt be implemented, executed? I feel land use should be in place before densification and TODs are brought to council, protect the homeowner from market up or down turns because of redevelopment. Senior housing must be in these redevelopments. Green spaces should not be taken out of any established community and exchanged for rooftop, plaza spaces.

** As I indicated earlier, I really recommend "not going there" with regards to even suggesting the extension of Shaganappi Trail through Edworthy Park or 50th Avenue through Sandy Beach. Besides causing a lot of ill-will towards the City, it also distracted a lot of people from the key messages of the Go Plan and it's one of the reasons why some people still snicker at the sound of the name. About 8 or 9 years ago there were all these plans for Shawnessy Towne Centre to be another Kensington, with tree-lined streets, pedestrian friendly access, etc. Well it never happened. One reason it never happened was the shovels were in the ground while the "pie in the sky" planning was still underway! If you're going to talk about these great new development

ideas and identify places like Garden Heights and Seton as where you hope they'll be put in place, get it set in stone before they start building the next Crowfoot Towne Centre instead.

** Respect the communities that are thriving even though they are in the "inner city". We don't all want low priced housing or intensification. Do that where it is warranted. Listen to the residents, but don't let the people who live in the suburbs dictate what happens in the inner city.

** I am very pleased with the directions suggested in this document, however I am skeptical of how the directions in this document will be implemented.

** For commuting on bikes to be effective options for accessing roadways and moving over or under major arteries is key. Now we need more transit, with better access to the roadways for bicycles. Educating drivers to the share the road concept would help too. I fully support moving into a direction of greening the roadways and providing options for people. We are fortunate in many of our older NW neighbourhoods that the tree canopy along roadways was initiated and large boulevards were included in the planning.

** We must endorse the "compact" urban model. Calgary's car dependency is deplorable and it is obvious that we need to put more resources into ridding the city of its "super centres" and replace them with people friendly (as opposed to car friendly) neighbourhoods/centres. Cities should be made for people and not cars.

** The key directions and PlanIt are a very strong move in the right direction for Calgary.

** I believe Plan-It is a very positive step in planning and development in Calgary. A focus on densification, public transit and a coordination of land use with transportation is essential to the viability of our city in the long term. This focus must be reflected in not only policy but in funding as well.

** Most of the key directions are restating existing policy that has not been applied. How will accountability for the future plan be built in? The reversed transportation hierarchy is the single most important decision that Calgary is ever likely to make in terms of how livable the city becomes. What steps are being taken to ensure that it will be enforced? This will require a complete re-programming of all the city engineers who like to do things "the way they've always done it" - please ensure that their pay raises are tied to the effectiveness with which they implement the peds/cycle first rule.

** Its good that you are taking the time to document the theory behind the plan as well as the plan itself. Some of this work is already done very well elsewhere) (i.e. active transportation, what it is and its benefits). It may be efficient to attach yourself to links or information sources that have already been done elsewhere so you can focus on understanding of what has already been done, and then execute. I like the few references that you have to how cities elsewhere have developed. More of this, with photos, would be good to underscore that there are other ways to develop. Examples from Europe would be good, as done by Toronto's Metrolinx plan. The documentation on greenhouse gas, compact infrastructure being lowest cost per capita, bar charts of kilometers of roads and transit in various scenarios are very good. The bar charts make the point very clearly. However the points made within these very topical charts don't seem to make it into the sustainable principles in a direct manner.

Four respondents answered, "I have no comments to make on this section."



Suite 268, 1500 – 14th Street SW
Calgary, Alberta T3C 1C9
T 403.244.2410
F 403.451-0060
W www.weavermarketingresearch.com

Sheila Weaver, Principal