



West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

Project overview

On November 24, 2016 Council directed Administration to undertake and evaluate an amendment to the West Springs Area Structure Plan (ASP), through the developer funded ASP Program. The developer funded ASP amendment will focus on approximately 34 hectares of land and is being reviewed concurrently with two applications, West District and West Park. There are two additional development applications that lie outside the developer funded ASP boundary, but also propose development in the West Springs area.

- West District: Approximately 22 hectares of land is being reviewed as an Outline Plan and Land Use Amendment application. West District is a proposal for a master planned neighbourhood in west Calgary that proposes a compact, higher-intensity (people and jobs), transit-supportive and mixed-use neighbourhood. Located within the community of West Springs, the West District plan area is south of Old Banff Coach Road S.W., east of 85 Street S.W., west of 77 Street S.W., and north of 9 Avenue S.W.
- West Park: Approximately 4 hectares of land is being reviewed as an Outline Plan and Land Use Amendment application to plan and develop a portion of West Springs, to be called West Park. West Park includes the area north of 9 Avenue S.W., between 77 Street and 85 Street S.W. (including the parcels of land located at 819 81 Street S.W. and 839 81 Street S.W.) The proposal is for residential development.
- LOC2017-0213 Site: This application on 1.9 hectares of land at the corner of 11 Avenue S.W. and 77 Street S.W. proposes an anticipated 30 single detached homes and an open space.
- LOC2017-0188 Site: Approximately 13 hectares of land is being reviewed as an Outline Plan and Land Use Amendment application to accommodate low density and multi-residential units, as well as commercial uses and a green space. The plan area is located to the west of 85 Street S.W. and north of Bow Trail S.W.

Engagement overview

A comprehensive engagement strategy has been developed to facilitate multiple touch points and ensure inclusivity for all who want to provide input and learn about the West Springs ASP Amendment project.

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

For this project, we have taken a multi-phased engagement approach. Phase one engagement occurred in April 2017 with an online survey and open house. This first phase informed the proposed changes to the ASP and development applications and resulted in changes made to land use, building heights and transportation improvements.

The purpose of this second phase of engagement is to share those revised changes and to gather input on the proposed changes and determine if there are still any outstanding community concerns. Overall we had 446 participants share 954 total ideas and concerns through phase two of engagement.

More information about The City's past engagement can be found at calgary.ca/westspringsasp. Please note that the applicant for West District has conducted their own engagement prior to submitting their application and more information can be found at westdistrict.ca

In-person open houses

Two in-person open houses were held at Calgary French and International School.

- Session one was held on Thursday, October 19 from 6:00 – 8:00 pm

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

- Session two was held on Saturday, October 21 from 11:00 – 1:00 pm

There were 277 people in attendance over the two sessions.

At each event, The City had representatives from business units to answer questions and share information about the project. The business unit representatives included Planning and Development, Transportation, Transit and Parks. The City had project display boards covering the topics of; project timeline, planning processes, past engagement, land use areas, transportation improvements, development specifics and next steps. The City also shared details of neighbouring development applications. The applicant for West District was also on hand and shared details of their development proposal.

Attendees at the open house were given the opportunity to share their feedback on a comment form. The City received 65 completed comment forms at the sessions.

Online survey

The online survey modeled the in-person comment form and was available for comment online from October 19 – 29. The website had a total of 1,667 unique visits and received a total of 169 completed responses.

What we asked

We asked community members to provide feedback, in-person and online through the following questions:

1. Density and building heights

Community Idea/ Concern: Citizens are concerned with high density development and tall buildings.

Proposed change: The overall density has been reduced from 2,758 to 1,789 units and commercial square footage has been reduced from 1.6 million square feet to 1.08 million square feet. Building heights have been reduced; along the north edge of Old Banff Coach Road from 30 metres to 20 metres, the height has been limited to 16 metres along 77 St S.W. and the height has been limited to 11 metres along the south edge.

Do the proposed changes and the detailed information provided adequately address the community ideas and concerns about density and building heights that were shared with The City? Tell us why?

2. Transportation

Community Idea/ Concern: Citizens are concerned about the impact of density on the transportation system.

Proposed change: Transportation impacts were reviewed and it was determined that a reduction from the original density ask would be more appropriate given the existing transportation network capacity. Several infrastructure upgrades will be necessary to ensure the network can support the proposed densities. Development will be phased as required transportation infrastructure is constructed.

Do the proposed changes and the detailed information provided adequately address the community ideas and concerns about transportation that were shared with The City? Tell us why?

3. Connectivity

Community Idea/ Concern: Citizens would like better and safer connectivity for all modes (bikes, pedestrians and vehicles).

Proposed change: The street network will feature short blocks and be grid-based, promoting the greatest connectivity for all transportation modes. The street design will promote active transportation (walking and cycling) choices and new regional pathway connections that fill the gaps in the existing pathway network.

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

Do the proposed changes and the detailed information provided adequately address the community ideas and concerns about connectivity that were shared with The City? Tell us why?

4. Open space

Community Idea/ Concern: Citizens are supportive of green space and have made specific suggestions for space programming

Proposed change: Approximately 8 acres of multi-layered programming will be available on the site. The open space will include a flexible development site where private or public recreational facility space, including community meeting purposes, could be provided

Do the proposed changes and the detailed information provided adequately address the community ideas and concerns about green space that were shared with The City? Tell us why?

5. Do you have any outstanding ideas and concerns about the proposed ASP amendments that you feel have been missed and/or have not been addressed?
6. Do you have any additional questions about the proposed amendments for the Project team? Common questions will be used to populate our Frequently Asked Questions.

What we heard

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

The top themes that emerged through the comments received in-person and online were:

- Citizen feel that the density is still too high for the area and is not compatible with the surrounding area.
- Citizens feel the reduction in height was not sufficient, specifically along 77th. Some feel that single family homes are more appropriate for the area as outlined in the original Area Structure Plan.
- Citizens reiterated the importance of the transportation improvements shared by The City and stressed the importance of these being completed prior to any additional density being added to the area. Citizens had uncertainty about these improvements and would also like to see more details shared about these.

All citizen feedback has been reviewed and a detailed summary of input has been compiled to reflect the diversity of comments that were shared by the community. These comments were organized into themes for the topic areas. Many of the comments within the themes represented varying points of view related to concerns outside of the plan area, however the majority of comments received were of a negative sentiment.

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

Summary of input

Below is a summary of the main topics that were most prevalent for each question. Each topic includes a summary and examples of verbatim comments in italics. These are the exact words that were used. To ensure all responses are captured accurately, verbatim comments have not been altered. In some cases, only a portion of the comment that was received on a particular topic was utilized.

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

Density and building heights

Community Idea/ Concern: Citizens are concerned with high density development and tall buildings.

Proposed change: The overall density has been from 2,758 to 1,789 units and commercial square footage has been reduced from 1.6 million square feet to 1.08 million square feet. Building heights have been reduced; along the north edge of Old Banff Coach Road from 30 metres to 20 metres, the height has been limited to 16 metres along 77 St S.W. and the height has been limited to 11 metres along the south edge.

Do the proposed changes and the detailed information provided adequately address the community ideas and concerns about density and building heights that were shared with The City? Tell us why?

Theme	Detailed explanation and sample comments:
Citizens are concerned about density.	<p>Citizens are concerned about the density being proposed and feel that;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is still too many people for the area, • the buildings are still too high, • it does not fit with the surrounding area and • it does not appropriately transition towards 77th Street. <p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>Absolutely Not! None of the requests along 77th Street have been considered. There has been no change to density along 77th Street. It still continues to be insensitive to those living along 77th Street. 5 storey buildings is NOT gradual intensification as promised. The density along 77th is WAY too high - this will lead to a drop in property values, invasion of privacy, sunlight, light & noise pollution.</i></p> <p><i>While I am pleased to see that density and building heights have been reduced, I feel both are still too high. This is a relatively quiet residential area, and the proposed density + 7-9 storey buildings just don't belong here.</i></p> <p><i>The building heights have NOT been reduced along the 77th street. These building heights of 5 stories is completely unacceptable to the current taxpayers and long term home owners along 77th street...A maximum of 3 story homes/condos is acceptable along the entire edge of 77th street, nothing higher. An overwhelming number of responses in the previous survey requested for a reduced density along 77th street to match that of the existing community.</i></p>
Citizens want low density development	<p>Citizens prefer low density development and would like development to be congruent with current low density development outlined in the current ASP.</p> <p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>It's better as long as NO changes are made to current bylaws & landuse. 10 m ONLY on 77 St is acceptable.</i></p> <p><i>I strongly recommend we retain the low density housing plan as the area is struggling today with the number of cars and transportation options. We also have sufficient area designated for commercial properties. Most people purchased their properties due to the actual and planned low density housing. least complete the area that way please.</i></p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

	<p><i>No. This does not fit with the current residential plan. We are a neighbourhood of family homes and this level of high density apartments is unprecedented.</i></p>
<p>Citizens are concerned about perceived impact of tall buildings.</p>	<p>Citizens are concerned that the tall buildings will;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • shadow nearby residential • result in a decrease in property value • create privacy/ overlooking concerns for nearby residential • create a loss of views <p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>The buildings are still too high. I don't like the idea of people looking into my back yard & house. The Traffic congestion is already bad so very serious thought needs to be put into this.</i></p> <p><i>Buildings higher than 3 stories will create an invasion of privacy, a drop in property value (that means less taxes, city!), increased light and sound pollution, traffic congestion etc.</i></p> <p><i>The height of the buildings are still to tall. They will cast shadows on already existing properties and leave them dark</i></p> <p><i>You are adding lower cost housing options which brings down the existing property values. You are going to be creating an ugly concrete jungle eye sore that brings down property values. You are going to be starting 10+ years of construction and disruption which will bring down property values. You are increasing density which will bring down surrounding property values. Bottom line, this is bad for the existing home owners.</i></p>
<p>Citizens are concerned about density impact on community infrastructure</p>	<p>Citizens feel that the current community infrastructure in the area is not equipped to handle additional density. This includes; roads, transit, and schools.</p> <p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>The density does also not consider our overwhelmed schools and roadways. It takes away from natural green space which in numerous studies has show to impact health. The community cannot handle and does not welcome a high walled, high density development in our community.</i></p> <p><i>Very worried about height & added density to the community.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Schools are already at capacity. - Roads cannot handle added drivers <p><i>They area has no room, infrastructure, schools, transit to support this building & development.</i></p> <p><i>I have a very serious concern that there is no plan for additional education facilities. The communities in the West need additional schools, especially Middle, Junior High and High Schools. I understand that the CBE has apparently evaluated that no additional schools are require, but that is a bad joke!</i></p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

Transportation	
<p><u>Community Idea/ Concern:</u> Citizens are concerned about the impact of density on the transportation system.</p> <p><u>Proposed change:</u> Transportation impacts were reviewed and it was determined that a reduction from the original density ask would be more appropriate given the existing transportation network capacity. Several infrastructure upgrades will be necessary to ensure the network can support the proposed densities. Development will be phased as required transportation infrastructure is constructed.</p> <p>Do the proposed changes and the detailed information provided adequately address the community ideas and concerns about transportation that were shared with The City? Tell us why?</p>	
Theme	Detailed explanation and sample comments:
<p>Citizens have current concerns about traffic in the area</p>	<p>Citizens feel that the traffic congestion in the area is unmanageable and additional density will further exacerbate the traffic issues.</p> <p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>The density is already pretty high with the current plan, and there is only one way to access to downtown area, which is by the Old Banff Coach Road, the added residents will make the traffic even worse. In winter time, when it snows, the Old Banff Coach Road is basically a big parking lot</i></p> <p><i>85th and OBCR can not currently manage the traffic existing in the community.</i></p> <p><i>Congestion is a serious issue already - especially at bow/69. This development will only feed the problem.</i></p> <p><i>There are serious transportation issues with the existing population. These need to be addressed asap or resistance to growth will become worse, not better.</i></p>
<p>Citizens expressed the importance of the transportation improvements</p>	<p>Citizens reiterated the importance of the transportation improvements outlined by The City and the importance of these being in place prior to future development.</p> <p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>I am concerned about the increased traffic into the area as of now, there are only 2 ways in and out. The proper infrastructure, should be put in place before allowing more building.</i></p> <p><i>I think the road enhancements need to occur before construction of the buildings as the congestion in the neighbourhood is already problematic.</i></p> <p><i>The City must ensure that no development can proceed in advance of getting those projects updated.</i></p> <p>FINALLY, YOU MUST ADDRESS INFRASTRUCTURE PROBLEMS WITH CONCRETE FUNDED PLANS BEFORE YOU CAN PROCEED WITH THE DEVELOPMENT</p>
<p>Citizens expressed uncertainty over the transportation improvements</p>	<p>Citizens shared feelings of uncertainty about the transportation improvements and questioned whether these would be feasible to implement given most are not currently funded nor planned for in future budgets.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

	<p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>Nine out of the Eleven proposed transportation improvements shown on page 13 of the new presentation boards are unfunded and undefined. Many of the remaining 10 proposed transportation improvements do not appear to be technically feasible given the quantity of space available and the nature of the terrain (i.e. Sarcee changing from 4 to 6 lanes, lack of funding coupled with the fact it is technically un-achievable will guarantee this idea never proceeds).</i></p> <p><i>Too many dependencies are still 'unfunded', including the Ring Road - at present the transportation corridors aren't sufficient for the population that is there now.</i></p> <p><i>The majority of the transportation improvements are unfunded. Until the funding is available and the construction has started, the developments should not proceed.</i></p> <p><i>no, the proposed changes are mostly unfunded and require government, i.e taxpayer support. this is not a tenable formula and unconscionable. the developer will profit while the people pay.</i></p>
<p>Citizens expressed a dislike for t-intersections</p>	<p>Citizens expressed their dislike for t-intersections and specifically requested the one at 77th Street be removed as this will cause car lights to shine into nearby residential.</p> <p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>Having a busy street T against housing on 77th. This was clearly asked for on the previous feedback (multiple times). There are existing streets that can be tied into. Missed the mark again.</i></p> <p><i>There will be a SIGNIFICANT amount of traffic funnelling onto 77th, and there is a proposed T intersection against housing!.</i></p> <p><i>Proposed T intersection onto 77th will be terrible! That road will be a feeder road with maximum amount of traffic. There will be constant noise and headlight pollution onto the housing!</i></p>
<p>Connectivity</p> <p><u>Community Idea/ Concern:</u> Citizens would like better and safer connectivity for all modes (bikes, pedestrians and vehicles). <u>Proposed change:</u> The street network will feature short blocks and be grid-based, promoting the greatest connectivity for all transportation modes. The street design will promote active transportation (walking and cycling) choices and new regional pathway connections that fill the gaps in the existing pathway network.</p> <p>Do the proposed changes and the detailed information provided adequately address the community ideas and concerns about connectivity that were shared with The City? Tell us why?</p>	
<p>Theme</p>	<p>Detailed explanation and sample comments:</p>
<p>Citizens expressed safety concerns</p>	<p>Citizens shared concerns about safety for pedestrians and cyclists due to traffic congestion in the area.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

	<p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>There is a genuine concern that children will be endangered with an increase in traffic (OBCR & 77th), (9th & 81st), (9th & 85th).</i></p> <p><i>Safer areas for pedestrians is important and safer roadways are important.</i></p> <p><i>We want our kids to continue walking to school like they do today, not in an environment that resembles the busy streets of the Calgary downtown beltline. A highly congested community (even with adequate connectivity) comes with added security issues, safety concerns for our children, and elevated crime concerns like we see in busy inner cities.</i></p>
<p>Citizens value pedestrian and cyclist connections</p>	<p>Citizens value good pedestrian and cyclist connections.</p> <p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>Pedestrian & cyclists should always be priority #1.</i></p> <p><i>More pathways. More green space with path ways should be better.</i></p> <p><i>Connectivity is important and happy to see some green space and cycling paths proposed.</i></p>
<p>Open space</p> <p><u>Community Idea/ Concern:</u> Citizens are supportive of green space and have made specific suggestions for space programming <u>Proposed change:</u> Approximately 8 acres of multi-layered programming will be available on the site. The open space will include a flexible development site where private or public recreational facility space, including community meeting purposes, could be provided.</p> <p>Do the proposed changes and the detailed information provided adequately address the community ideas and concerns about green space that were shared with The City? Tell us why?</p>	
<p>Theme</p>	<p>Detailed explanation and sample comments:</p>
<p>Citizens want more green space</p>	<p>Citizens desire more accessible green space.</p> <p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>Bigger park please.</i></p> <p><i>The community needs more green space. This development only reduces the green space per capita.</i></p> <p><i>I do like the proposed green space but feel there should be more.</i></p>
<p>Citizens made specific open space suggestions</p>	<p>Citizens made suggestions for specific green/ open space uses.</p> <p>Sample comments:</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

	<p><i>We need an indoor gym. Just like the Westside recreation center, with a pool and a hockey rink. The outdoor park is not good enough. We also need a public library. The closest library is 20 min away and it is too small for all the new residents.</i></p> <p><i>Just the desire to see a more tangible activity space like an ice surface for public skating in the winter and maybe beach volleyball ins summer like in New Brighton. We don't have any public spaces close by. I would pay a yearly community fee to help with the upkeep and maintenance.</i></p>
<p>General questions</p> <p>Do you have any outstanding ideas and concerns about the proposed ASP amendments that you feel have been missed and/or have not been addressed?</p>	
<p>Theme</p>	<p>Detailed explanation and sample comments:</p>
<p>Citizens have concerns about the engagement process</p>	<p>Citizens feel that their input does not matter and will not change components of the application. They feel that The City has already approved the application as is.</p> <p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>It just seems like it will go ahead no matter what & this is just part of the game. The developer starts high & just backs off a little.</i></p> <p><i>At none of the other open houses has feedback been meaningfully use. A change from 8 to 6 stories is not listening.</i></p> <p><i>I have filled out multiple surveys on line, I don't feel that adequate changes have been made to respect the existing homeowners & residents.</i></p>
<p>Citizens would like to see more detailed information</p>	<p>Citizens feel the information provided is vague and would like to see more detailed information, specifically with reference to transportations studies and improvements.</p> <p>Sample comments:</p> <p><i>I went to the open house, I read all the reports but there is so much vague information here. There is a lack of funding, lack of timelines and really a lack of details in general.</i></p> <p><i>there is no actual details about what the “transportation hub” actually is or how it functions.</i></p> <p><i>Need more accurate information and answers, and proof of the city listening.</i></p> <p><i>Please we'd like current numbers for traffic & transportation stats. Those should be made public.</i></p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

	<i>There was not enough information provided about the proposed changes to determine whether community ideas are adequately addressed.</i>
Citizens reiterated the concerns already shared above.	Citizens shared their concerns again about density, building heights and transportation improvements. See above for sample comments.

Next steps

Citizen feedback provides Administration and City Council with valuable, local knowledge of the community and the proposed development area. The citizen input provided through our engagement program has informed Administration's review of the applications and amendments.

Administration will be recommending and presenting the amendments to the Calgary Planning Commission (CPC). Prior to CPC, we will be sharing the final ASP, the results of public engagement and how we made our decision in upcoming information sessions this December. The application will then proceed to Calgary Planning Commission (CPC) on December 14 and then to City Council for their decision in winter 2018.

All input gathered through all phases of engagement will also be used in reports provided to Calgary Planning Commission and City Council. You can still get involved by submitting your written comments to City Administration or members of Council, and by attending the Public Hearing of Council.

Verbatim Comments

Content is captured as it was provided by citizens. These are the exact words used. To ensure we capture all responses accurately, verbatim comments have not been altered, unless there was personal information or offensive language, which are removed with an indication that this has happened.

Question 1. Do the proposed changes and the detailed information provided adequately address the community ideas and concerns about density and building heights that were shared with the City? Tell us why?
No. It still doesn't address concerns about added traffic volume in existing streets. 77th St will become busier and there doesn't appear to be a plan for traffic calming. I'm worried about vehicles travelling at increased speeds and my children crossing the road.
Absolutely Not! None of the requests along 77th Street have been considered. There has been no change to density along 77th Street. It still continues to be insensitive to those living along 77th Street. 5 storey buildings is NOT gradual intensification as promised. The density along 77th is WAY too high - this will lead to a drop in property values, invasion of privacy, sunlight, light & noise pollution.
The buildings are still too high. I don't like the idea of people looking into my back yard & house. The Traffic congestion is already bad so very serious thought needs to be put into this.
I live off Old Banff Coach Road so still have concerns with 4-6 storey buildings going in behind me. I feel this will compromise my privacy. Can it be changed to 11 m along the south edge?
- NO - Minor Roads Traffic Plan is not detailed - Traffic plan D-G is moving from 4 to 6 lane. What is plan for neighbourhood around this area with regards to noise pollution

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

- In April 2017, Open House, area residents were concerned about losing green space to community hall - its not addressed
Not really. No timeline for transportation improvements, just what is funded and what isn't. With the increase of density will constitute a problem if these improvement projects are not carried on or delayed, especially with the ones that are funded by developer.
No! Still no infrastructure to support such high density!! Transportation concerns <u>not</u> funded!!
Very worried about height & added density to the community. - Schools are already at capacity. - Roads can not handle added drivers
1. From original plan Feb 2017 to revised plan ratio of dwelling units had been reduced but not at same level no of people ratio of change makes no sense. Since issue of traffic, green space, school is still retain & will not solve problems. Org plan: 2758 > 1789 - dwelling unit 4714 5495 > 3389 - no of people (???)
They inform but don't address. Residents of the neighbourhood never intended on living with a radius of development that has been proposed, we are lacking schools and greenspace. We don't have adequate roads to accommodate this! Extremely frustrated that the city would ever consider this on the west side! That's not the community we paid for!
While I am pleased to see that density and building heights have been reduced, I feel both are still too high. This is a relatively quiet residential area, and the proposed density + 7-9 storey buildings just don't belong here.
West District Plan is more density with very heavy rise buildings. Impact - Traffic - School - Green space (proposed 8 acre plan green space is not enough for density)
Yes from what was seen tonight the concerns previously voiced have been more than adequately addressed specifically w density & building heights.
Unfortunately this has not improved at all along 77th. We live on the corner of *Personal information removed* and the major entrance into this new development goes right past our house. The traffic will more than triple and the size of the buildings means we lose all privacy in our yard. We would need to keep our blinds closed all the time.
This proposed plan does not fit with the existing community. We are a family friendly, largely suburban area. People have bought homes here to have easy access to schools and community infrastructure. Having a <u>high</u> density area will change the dynamic of this community.
I would have liked to see <u>current traffic stats</u> . Traffic in the area is quite congested in rush hours (sometimes other times). - Old Banff Coach Road - Bow Trail (what is traffic numbers now?) - Bow Trail 69 St (?) - 85 - Bow Road (?) Example: 8 am [drawing with traffic volumes] The congestions do not allow for any high-rise development as it stands. Not without significant changes in road infrastructure. Most of what I've seen is still <u>unfunded</u> so no talking about <u>developments</u> should be made without a clear timeline of transport. infrastructure.
No - There doesn't need to be any high rise/multi-story buildings in this area for multiple reasons - there is no way the infrastructure can handle a large influx of population/traffic, it is already a clustered mess trying to get down the hill at any rush hour times as it is right now. - the high rise buildings backing onto old Banff Ro is going to be a privacy issue for those of us who live on the other side of the road and it will block out the sunlight to a large area of Cougar Ridge negating any solar incentives that we were looking at setting through the city's program/plan - Security - adding lower income multi level apt/condos tends to bring with it a higher crime populace with it.
NO. We need single detached houses along 77 St SW. Just like the area along the south edge. [note pointing at "reduced from 2,758 to 1,789 units...": But the residents are not lowered by 3000 > only 1000!]

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>1. I believe the main problem of the density study is based in access roads that are not available and there is no forecast on when these will be built (Stoney Trail) or improved (Bow Trail, Sarcee etc.)</p> <p>2. It will be great to show in a drawing where the different blocks will be available and how this relates to the transportation improvements</p> <p>3. Consider elevation of 11 m along 77 Street in front of the existing residential area for better privacy</p> <p>4. The number of 1789 dwelling is still too high if you consider the 2014 basis. A more reasonable number would be 1500 dwellings</p> <p>5. The jobs basis doesn't look aligned with the economic reality of the city</p>
<p>Density issues are NOT addressed. The original ASP - on which most residents chose to move here - was primarily low density. This should be the starting point for change. Not a developers vision (\$\$\$)! Above 3 stories is completely inappropriate for the area. There is not enough infrastructure in place or planned & funded to manage this increase in density - schools - swimming pools - roads - rec facilities</p>
<p>No, still too high too dense.</p>
<p>No. We bought this house in 2015, mainly because this area has low density, but now this great feature will be lost, thanks to the greedy companies like Truman.</p> <p>The plan for the residential area only 77 Street definitely needs improvement. That is to say, we need to continually lower the density. <u>We want to have that area only for single-house families, instead of mid-rise buildings.</u></p>
<p>Yes - The scaled height development is a positive, less impact on environment & transportation routes & overall congested feel.</p>
<p>No. Transportation is already an issue in the area. Infrastructure is already a concern. The increased density does not fit with the current community setting. The building heights do not fit with the current residents. They are too high!</p>
<p>It's better as long as NO changes are made to current bylaws & landuse. 10 m <u>ONLY</u> on 77 St is acceptable. Builder is saying 10 m townhouses. But apt buildings behind these will 'overhang' them for a 4 storey building on 77 St. <u>Not OK. NO more than 10 m buildings in the first row of units along 77 St.</u></p>
<p>Lower density is always better! It's easier than having many traffic problems especially going to work and coming home from work. Building heights that are lower, are better in that the community looks "friendlier" and not like a building jungle. Who wants to live in a concrete and wood jungle? Height of buildings block the sun shine and makes areas UGLY and DARK & unfriendly. They add no beauty.</p>
<p>Adding more density will only help the livability. However, I do not feel that the road network has been thought through enough. Heights are contained within the development and transitions nicely to streets and surrounding houses.</p>
<p>No, very little has been planned or approved to deal with infrastructure constraints (roads, transit, schools, parks, rec) to deal with the current density, never mind 1800 more dwellings and 7400 more people. (And 7000+ more vehicles) Building heights are okay and tapering heights is a nice compromise.</p>
<p>It would help if the "map" labelled the Main roads and streets so one could actually read them to get an idea of actual location. Lots of pretty pictures don't tell one anything. More detail needed on map!</p>
<p>I'm not concerned about density as long as there is an abundance of public transportation and dedicated walk & bike ways. Also, I am concerned about housing affordability: this neighbourhood already has very expensive housing, higher density should prioritize at least a portion of low-income residents.</p>
<p>I think a bigger concern in this area is the increased traffic on residential roads. There is already a very high volume of traffic on our community roads. This needs to be addressed.</p>
<p>Th heights/density are better but the eastern edge (77th street) still is too high at 16m/26m. With the tall buildings and narrow roads/streets I'm worried the buildings will create a cold dark tunneling effect for pedestrians.</p>
<p>Before you approved additional development in this area of the city, you need to consider the lack of road infrastructure! We are completely trapped within our own community. First we desperately need a light at the intersection of Cougar Ridge Drive SW and Old Banff Coach Road! This is an extremely dangerous intersection for left hand turns and for pedestrians! The crosswalk lights you have installed do nothing to help the situation. The volume of cars on this road has increased dramatically and we need a light NOW! SECOND, how many times must they dig up 85th Street? We have lived here for 12 years and this never stops. You tried to improve the intersection</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>of 85th and Bow Trail but what we need is two lanes on both sides all the way on 85th. We are all stuck trying to get out of this area and you have done nothing in the last 12 years.</p>
<p>No, they do not. The proposed density is still way too high, and does not match up with the density in the adjacent neighborhoods. The area closest to the proposed development is still going through different kinds of constructions, from retail and commercial space to low and higher density residential dwellings. There are enough retail stores and amenities for the community right now, there really is no need to add more to it, and most certainly not to the extent that is proposed under this development.</p> <p>There is no information to suggest that the city is growing to such a rate and degree that would justify a development of this magnitude, especially in this part of town. The majority of people who move to this area are interested in quiet and peaceful neighbourhoods and less congestion and traffic. The proposed plan would do away with that attractive characteristic of this area.</p> <p>This will also have an adverse effect on the price of properties and houses in this area. I certainly would not want to buy a property in close proximity of a development such as this.</p>
<p>No, This is the suburbs not inner city!!! Not fair to the properties who will border the City's new "Watts". They loose all their natural light. I am sure they will find a way to make it low cost housing, the west can equal out the east with all the shottings and the other. I got screwed once in Patterson with your seniors complex behind Patterson, here we go again, devaluing the property of current owner who bought in good faith!!!</p>
<p>I do not feel that the number if high density units adequately addresses the concerns within our neighbourhood. Currently traffic is at a max and much of the green space in our community is being bulldozed to fit more people and businesses without making concessions about the schools available, park and green space, as well as overall noise pollution. Our community is saturated with businesses already and the availability of more will certainly impact those in place. How many Starbucks do we really need?</p>
<p>This is better certainly but still a concern as far as height</p>
<p>I strongly recommend we retain the long density housing plan as the area is struggling today with the number of cars and transportation options. We also have sufficient area designated for commercial properties. Most people purchased their properties due to the actual and planned low density housing. Iest complete the area that way please.</p>
<p>Absolutely not! High density condos fill almost the entire area. Especially along 77th. It is the opposite of what the feedback said. I feel like Truman is calling the shots. This a a long way away from the original plan for the area.</p>
<p>No it does not. The city and developers clearly deceived the residents who purchased their home back in 2002; the area was promoted by Qualico and other developers/ builders like Shane Homes, Morrison as an exclusive area where residents would enjoy the best of both worlds residential living with mountains and wildlife. The addition of 4000 new residents will lower the value of homes as per realtors feedback, increase the area's crime rate, increase and the area's traffic congestion and accidents. City representatives (male) at the open house were advising residents that the buildings were 8 stories tall (30 metres) that the above is a lie.</p>
<p>Reasonably so except from my perspective, 1 issue.</p> <p>The drawings viewed at the open house today for Westpark development, had 8 houses zoned R1s. Existing houses along Westpark Crescent (backing the Westpark development) are 60 feet wide lots . With 8 houses, each R1s zoned house has 37.5 feet wide lots. I think that is not a reasonable transition from the adjacent existing 60 feet wide lots</p> <p>6 (50 feet wide lots) or 7 houses (43 feet wide lots) will definitely be more appropriate to ensure a reasonable transition.</p>
<p>Absolutely not. The only thing that should be going in to this development is medium to low density housing with moderate retail/commercial development. It is absolutely insane and ridiculous to be proposing what is still a massive increase in density with limited resources for schools, roads, transportation and green spaces already in the area. Plain and simple, the residents in the area, for which I am a concerned one, do not want this type of development at all!!</p>
<p>The buildings are still to tall and dense for this area. They area has no room, infrastructure, schools, transit to support this building & development.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>No. There is too much development in the area already for the infrastructure in place/proposed. No more please!!! We moved to the area to see a small amount of green space and the city is taking it all away!!!</p>
<p>No. Making the units for 1000 less is not enough, we were expecting 1000*3 RESIDENTS less, but it's only around 1000 less of residents. Which means, you only lowered the unit number, but increased the residents of certain units.</p> <p>For the area along the 77 St. S. W., you should have single-detached houses, instead of mid-rise residential buildings. The mid-rise residential buildings will only make the existing house residents on the other side of the road losing their privacy and making living in West Springs a horrible experience for the existing residents.</p>
<p>No. This does not fit with the current residential plan. We are a neighbourhood of family homes and this level of high density apartments is unprecedented.</p>
<p>I believe these are great changes and certainly have my vote.</p>
<p>In the "what we heard" documentation provided by the city of Calgary after the April 2017 consultations, it was acknowledged (by the city of Calgary) that the feedback received was mainly negative, and there was absolutely no positive comments supporting the project (this is a fact). Further, within the "what we heard" documentation, nearly all of the feedback provided shows that the community does not want to see any higher density development proceed. It was absolutely clear within the feedback provided to the city that the community does not want to see any further high rise condo/apartment development permitted in our community due to various concerns (real estate value retention, insufficient transportation infrastructure, not enough schools, no continuity with the established community, etc.). It is insulting to see this question asking if the proposed changes address the community ideas, it is clear that the city is not listening to what the community is saying! It is quite simple, the community wants nothing more than residential single family homes developed within this area, with meaningful and adequate parks, schools, and transportation infrastructure to support reasonable development that seamlessly integrates with the community atmosphere that already exists. The existing community atmosphere is why most of the residents within our community chose to move and live in this area; and any proposed ASP amendment allowing for higher density development cannot be allowed if the city is to honestly listen to what the community is and has been saying for years. The city needs to close the book on this idea being pushed by Truman homes, and put the community concerns first, ahead of entrepreneurial plans proposed by developers that don't even live in our community. Lastly, I must comment on the "What We Heard" section shown on page 6 of the new presentation boards. It states that "Where there is no dividing lane or street to the south, development will complement the height and density of the existing homes." This statement does not hold true with what is now proposed. Me and my family live in a house that directly adjoins the south edge of this development plan, where there is no proposed dividing lane or street, yet the new proposed plan suggests that 3 story houses would be permitted. 3 story houses, DO NOT complement the height and density of the existing homes in West Park. No 3 story houses were permitted when the existing West Park houses were constructed, and as such, no 3 story houses should be ever be permitted on the south side of this undeveloped area, especially where new structures directly adjoin the back yards of existing homes.</p>
<p>No they don't address community needs. The retail space, while a nice idea, will be too expensive for many small business owners. You will have many shops that will be empty, or have quick change over. The cost per sq foot is not affordable.</p> <p>The whole west end currently doesn't have infrastructure that can handle the population in existence. You want to add an even higher density and no budget to fix roads.</p> <p>Our schools are way over capacity and cause many local kids to be bussed. The resources should be put into place before more building.</p> <p>The current proposed height of the new buildings are also not in keeping with the neighbourhood. Why so high. 4 stories should be max. Our playgrounds/schools/community resources also don't have wiggle room.</p>
<p>The density and height of the buildings is still too high for this part of the City and compared to all the surrounding developed areas. Also I am still very concerned about the infrastructure, education and recreational options in this area given the proposed development density. See comments below.</p>
<p>No. Too much density is being planned for what should be a mostly low-density residential neighbourhood.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>The road along 85th needs to be completed, before all of the other development should come into play. It has been almost 5 years and there is still no solution. Complete the roads, before you start increasing density.</p>
<p>Living in the adjacent community many residents are concerned that the existing infrastructure simply can not support a community of this density. 85th street, Old Banff Coach Road, 9th Ave and 77th Street are already very congested and experience traffic flow issues. There are only 2 ways off the hill for this community and adding an additional 3000 vehicles will have a serious impact.</p>
<p>A second concern is the neighbourhood lacks public school space to support the population proposed. The community lies adjacent Cougar Ridge which doesn't have a single school to support their community.</p>
<p>No, it doesn't address concerns. Everyone in this community moved here for the "out-of-the-city" look and feel. We don't want the city to move to us. We don't want that kind of massive business sector, even with the reduced height. If people in this community wanted to live near where they worked, they would have chosen to live downtown. We don't want that kind of elbow-to-elbow living situations either. NOBODY WANTS THIS, how can we make this more clear.</p>
<p>I missed the original survey, but as a younger resident in the area, I would strongly advocate for more density. Sprawl and more low density development is absolutely not what this area needs. If any new commercial development could also be mixed use with residential above, that would be an excellent start.</p>
<p>I think the previous proposed height restrictions are fine and do not want to see them decreased.</p>
<p>Not adequately address the concern of density. Density still increased almost 3 times from the origin ASP. Not acceptable at all.</p>
<p>I think the building heights are too high for a residential area. There are few tall buildings in the area and there doesn't need to be high density in this area.</p>
<p>Density is an issue. The number of residents will cause major congestion in the area.</p>
<p>The density and building heights are still too high for the neighbourhood. Adding this many people to an area that is not properly designed to handle this density does not make sense.</p>
<p>Not at all. 16 m is still 4.8 stories. I do not want 4.8 stories behind my yard. This is insane. When we bought the house it was zoned large estate lots</p>
<p>I bought in a residential neighbourhood, not a concrete village. There is no need for this level of density and the services and infrastructure will not support it.</p>
<p>I still feel that this density and height is too great. It won't fit in esthetically with the rest of our community and our infrastructure can't support this density. There is already lack of parking at all commercial spaces and schools are over capacity.</p>
<p>The reductions are not even close to what was originally agreed. There should be single family housing along 77th 3 stories (if a walkout). There should be no commercial buildings, and no block condos. It is a terrible plan that Truman has pushed on the city. There are literally one strip of housing in the entire plan! That is NOT what the area wants or needs. STOP Truman from calling the shots. Scrap the amendment, and resort back to the original plan.</p>
<p>The building heights have NOT been reduced along the 77th street. These building heights of 5 stories is completely unacceptable to the current taxpayers and long term home owners along 77th street. Let us recall that the 2012 city of Calgary development plan planned for low density housing. Truman's and the city of Calgary's supposed "gradual" and "sensitive intensification" of density is complete insult to the current residents along 77th street. The proposed 5 stories is neither sensitive nor gradual. A maximum of 3 story homes/condos is acceptable along the entire edge of 77th street, nothing higher. Buildings higher than 3 stories will create an invasion of privacy, a drop in property value (that means less taxes, city!), increased light and sound pollution, traffic congestion etc.</p>
<p>An overwhelming number of responses in the previous survey requested for a reduced density along 77th street to match that of the existing community. This was COMPLETELY ignored by both the developer and the city of Calgary. The city has a responsibility to take the concerns of existing tax paying and voting citizens seriously. Listen to the community!!! The density proposed along 77th street is NOT welcome.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>The density does also not consider our overwhelmed schools and roadways. It takes away from natural green space which in numerous studies has show to impact health. The community cannot handle and does not welcome a high walled, high density development in our community.</p>
<p>NO! 77th street continues to be a far cry from gradual increase in density. 16m is equivalent to 5 storeys! Is the city aware that on 77th street there are only 2 story homes lining the entire length of 77th street? These massive apartments will be towering over us despite a road between them. This is unacceptable. This will result in a complete lack of privacy, shadowing of our entire properties, light and noise pollution and a significant drop in property value.</p> <p>We always knew that the area would be developed and that is ok. but we bought out home believing the 2012 proposed plan for the area which showed low density homes (2 storeys) all along 77th street. Not 5 storeys!</p> <p>There have been overwhelming number of responses that have requested and pleaded of LOW density along 77th street. Low density is 2-3 storeys, NOT 5! Putting 5 storeys will effectively wall out the existing west springs, and distinctly segregate us from the the new development. I thought communities was about building connections, not building walls.</p>
<p>No. While aligning density with traffic concerns, the building height is still outrageous and a significant departure from the remainder of the area.</p>
<p>The proposed 'reduced' density is still extremely high for the community. Roadways - particularly primary and arterial corridors are not and will never be adequate for that density as they are already struggling with capacity. Retail/commercial space does not have adequate parking space for that many more customers. By comparison to other established suburban neighbourhoods - particularly in the deep south - the density is extremely high and completely out of place with the relaxed peaceful community neighbourhood this area was intended to be and sold as.</p>
<p>I believe so; in order to create a better community.</p>
<p>No. I still have concerns with the height - 8/9 stories is excessive and will completely change the feel of our community. While I support densifying the area, this can still be achieved by only allowing a 4 story limit and won't compromise the look and feel of the neighbour.</p>
<p>I'm glad the density has decreased. I would prefer more single family dwellings and less multi-level, multi family buildings. Density is my main concern</p>
<p>I do not agree with these "revised" heights and strongly encourage the city to reduce them further. The traffic and congestion is a key concern. The traffic on Old Banff Coach Road during rush hour to/from Bow Trail is continuing to get worse and there is still a lot of undeveloped land in West Springs, which will increase the population substantially more. Another area of concern is the school and walk zones, made worse by cuts to bussing. I understand the need to balance sprawl with urban density etc, but as has been done in Victoria, B.C., London, England and other cities there is a strong case for keeping building heights down. We do not want that portion of West Springs to be turned in a mini-urban jungle of mid-rises.</p>
<p>Absolutely NOT! The scope of the project is still completely out of tune with the surrounding area. I would not suggest a complete ban on apartments, but 20 metres is still 5-6 stories and the design suggested by the developer provides for "green space" with limited sun exposure since it is encased by 20 metre buildings.</p>
<p>This proposal is still very high density. It will decrease value of our property. It just shows that it was reduced the building size height, but also incremented the number of high density dwellings. We moved to this area because it was quiet and only single family dwellings.</p> <p>The higher density will increase traffic along Old Banff Coach Road which is 17,000 vehicles per day (as per 2016 city study).</p> <p>There is no plan to increase the size of Old Banff Coach Road at this moment, or the turn to Bow Trail. Just do a double turn on 85th and expand Bow Trail from two to four lanes between Old Banff and 8th.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>Nothing else has budget approved, and it could take years to have them built.</p>
<p>Right now it takes me 10 to 15 minutes to get to Bow Trail from Old Banff Coach Road (only 3Kms from my house) during rush hours, and going to 85th. add 4 Kms to my daily commute.</p>
<p>Other things that have not considered is the left turn from Sarcee Trail into Bow Trail, this also takes a very long time 15 minutes or more during rush hours.</p>
<p>The new plan is a vast improvement over the last, however I believe that the buildings planned to border 77 St. should be lowered to 1 or 2 stories from the current plan of 4 stories. This will improve the hours of direct sunlight for current housing on the other side of 77 st. and improve the optics.</p>
<p>Yes somewhat but I noticed you have your employment area and office district in the NE quadrant. To me it would make sense to have this more central (closer to the open space) or possibly SW quadrant. The NE quadrant would be perfect for residential as the Calgary French School is kitty corner and a hop/skip and a jump to it. I also think low/mid-rise residential is more suited in that area as opposed to large office towers.</p>
<p>I really like the development, particularly the recreational and community-oriented spaces that the development envisages. My primary concern is that the density is still too high and many of the proposed buildings are still too high. Specifically, along the northern edge of the development along Old Banff Coach Road, the plan envisages 20 meters of building height, which will negatively impact homeowners to the north end of the development.</p>
<p>The development should focus on building taller buildings in the centre of the development to minimize the negative impacts to existing homeowners. The maximum height allowable in areas that are directly adjacent to existing homeowners should be 16 meters or lower.</p>
<p>One of my other concerns regarding the density associated with the project is the demand on schools. Currently, Cougar Ridge does not have an Elementary school and West Springs only recently had a Junior school built. The high school for the area, Ernest Manning is already over capacity and while the development will take several years to complete, the development should include plans for the construction of a school.</p>
<p>This will help alleviate street on schools in the surrounding community and help create more public buy-in for the project. If the development cannot include the construction of a school, land should be set aside for the future construction of a school.</p>
<p>No these do not adequately address our concerns. The height of the buildings are still to tall. They will cast shadows on already existing properties and leave them dark. People have moved to the outer edge of the city to be away from tall city centre buildings. Now years later, you changed the zoning in this area of the city to allow huge buildings. This is extremely unhandled and dishonest.</p> <p>For the purposed buildings, there is not adequate green space being left. The "green" space is for flood and rain overflow. You are not building parks or green space that is usable. The green space that was put in on the corner of Old Banff coach road and 85th is a joke!</p> <p>Where is the infrastructure to support this development? There is none! The west portion of the ring road is not even on the budget books. The added lane to 85th and Bow trail has done nothing to help traffic. In fact, the changes in the lights has made it worse. We also have new lights popping up all along 85th, which has made traffic a nightmare. So no, the changes are only making things worse, and our neighbourhood less desirable.</p>
<p>The changes do not address the concern. The citizens who live along 77th street will be looking at high block buildings! This does not address the concerns and does not take into consideration of existing neighbors . They need to resort back the original plan and have low density housing along 77th.</p>
<p>No. There is still a significant increase in density vs. the current ASP upon which many immediately adjacent homeowners on the south edge based their decision to purchase their homes and raise their families. The same applies to building heights in the rest of the proposed development which are significantly increased vs. the current ASP.</p>
<p>I don't believe that there is enough community infrastructure to support the density. With this increase I would like to see more community centres or recreation centres and facilities provided to support the number of people.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

This density housing will decrease our property values.

Definitely not. Hundreds of residents asked for a decrease in the height of buildings along the periphery of the district. While this was mildly decreased along OBCR, this was NOT the case along 77 street. 77 street is even closer to the new development than OBCR residents. We purchased our properties to be across from low density housing as previously promised by the city, where as OBCR residents knew it was always going to be a large road and the development that goes along with that.

There has been no decrease in height of the buildings along 77 street for the entire duration of the road. The majority of the height of the proposed buildings remains at 5 stories and above. Did you not listen the hundreds of residents that opposed this? The development along 77 street should match of the existing homes along that area which is 2 storeys. For it to be gradual as promised, it should start at 2 storeys and gradually increased from there. Gradual means by 1 storey at a time, not 3 or 4.

I am very disappointed that hundreds of comments have not changed the point of view of the developer nor our elected officials at the city. Property values will drop, our yards will be exposed to prying eyes from above if high rise (greater than 2 storey) developments, there will be light and noise pollution. How can new developments trump existing taxpayers who have lived peacefully for 15-20 years?? Listen to your constituents, to the tax payers, to the residents that say NO development higher than 2 storeys for the entire length of 77 street!

Incorporating an additional 1700+ units which is likely to produce upwards of 4000 new occupants and at least an additional 1000 vehicles along 85th ave is still far too much.

85th is already beyond congested in the morning anytime beyond 730am even with the recent twinning near bow trail.

Bow trail east is also beyond congested at seemingly anytime between 5-6 and again, the addition of another 1000 or so vehicles will only exacerbate both.

Also, with all the development up in the general area, how about a school(s) in cougar ridge? Up until this year, when limited access to some of the surrounding facilities came available, children had to be bussed down to Ross Carrock. With the addition of Paskapoo, why was no consideration of school infrastructure actioned....a gross oversight. Now adding 1700 units just down the road, again without school development will only displace more kids from their local neighbourhood, probably again cougar ridge since we seem to be the ones always bearing this commute burden. Additionally, having to commute our kids in this increasingly congested roadway system with the addition of +1700 units will only add pressure to already time starved working parents. 1700 additional units is still far too many.

No. We do not want high density in our community, it brings down home values, it provides no privacy in already developed home and neighborhoods with yards, etc. Plus, we do not have room in schools, on roadways, etc.

No they have not. Creating 5 or more storey buildings along 77 street and obcr makes essentially a walled or gated community which segregates the existing west springs and cougar ridge communities. This wall of buildings fails to blend in with the existing communities. It is insensitive to those living along 77street and obcr who do not want their backyards privacy being invaded 5 storey buildings. The height of 5 storeys is simply too high- it will completely destroy the backyard quality of life of those in its shadow along 77 street. Privacy, pollution, shadowing, light and noise pollution are all what current residents along 77 street and obcr are facing. This was completely disregarded in the last open house and surveys.

Three half clovers need to be in place for this. At minimum. Bow and Sarcee, Bow and Old Banff, Bow and 85th. In addition the ring road should be in place. Developers should be in the hook for some of the infrastructural needs. The current traffic at those 3 locations is ridiculous. plus the precarious status of the ring road means those on the hill will suffer both trying to get in and out. This cannot be a wait and see where the city is responsible to build infrastructure after the fact.

No, the height of all directions should be limited to 11 meters.

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>No. Building heights are still not in keeping with the current look and feel of our community. Houses bordering this development will still be negatively impacted by shadows and sight lines. 3 and 4 stories backing onto and overlooking peoples yards is still too high. 30 metres isn't in keeping with anything in our community or the communities nearby. Very little offset of the buildings to the roads still leads to a tunnel feeling according the road schematics provided.</p>
<p>It's appreciated that the building heights are being reduced, the current commercial areas in the community are extremely difficult to use/access as there is almost no parking. I know myself and residents on my crescent, we leave the community for grocery shopping and the like as what has been built is simply not accessible. I would hope that this is a consideration for any new commercial construction, it's not fair to existing homeowners that they may have to share their streets with parking from the commercial tenants.</p>
<p>I think it's a reach to say that this density change is satisfying anyone's concerns. I understand that development is needed, and that not every house built is going to be a single family home. This is not a master planned community and I understand that. But to start with an absolutely enormous development that I suspect no one ever expected to get improved, and then scale it back to something a little smaller, that's not really listening to the concerns of the surrounding community.</p> <p>The community was clear that it is seeking development that's consistent with the surrounding neighbourhood. This is not a situation whereby we all moved into the neighbourhood but knew what was coming. This is an ASP amendment, and a huge one in a predominantly single home family area. It's not served by a major transportation hub so it doesn't logically make sense for this to be a high development area. It's an experiment in higher density residential development but without any kind of anchor (hospital, major shopping centre, educational institution).</p> <p>Let's leave the suburbs as suburbs and continue to focus on increasing density in inner city neighbourhoods and surrounding transit hubs (ie LRT and BRT). That plan actually makes sense and will let West Springs prosper as the traditional suburban, family friendly community that the current ASP contemplates.</p>
<p>No, The proposed density and building heights are still too high for area.</p>
<p>In regards to 77th stree sw, certainly not. The elevation of the buildings proposed along the majority of 77th has not changed, and remains at a staggering 5 stories. This is unacceptable to area residents as it does not take current residents into consideration, especially those who live along 77th street. This will completely shade their homes and backyards, will invade privacy to the point that they will no longer use their yard space- land which they paid for already. No, the proposed changes do not in any way adequately address the density and building heights along 77th street. Lower these heights to 2-3 storeys as an absolute maximum and you might see a happier community.</p>
<p>Why have the building heights along 77th street sound edge been lowered to 11m, yet the remainder of the 77th street remains at 16m. We are just as close to the new development, will be just as impacted if not more by the development especially with road traffic noise and light. The entire duration of 77th street needs to be lowered to no more than 2 storeys. By doing this, it will blend better with surrounding community's aesthetically and also in terms of community connectedness. This is a residential area in the suburbs, not a high rise development in downtown calgary.</p>
<p>No, this is still a significant amount more housing than this area needs/wants. Especially along 77th, the current plan creates a large wall of condos. This takes away from the integration of the current neighbours along 77th. The new development should have low density housing along 77th and NO commercial buildings. Any commercial buildings should be along 85th. this is a residential area, and lets keep it that way. The also need to add more green space along 77th.</p>
<p>The density continues to exceed what the area was originally designed for, especially considering that the building heights that need to accommodate these excess number of residents is out of control.</p> <p>The building heights along 77th street (especially the middle), have seen NO change in heights and continues at an atrocious 5 storeys. This is completely insensitive to the existing residents who long ago purchased our properties with the City of Calgary Plan to build low density housing only in that area. We moved out here to be in the suburbs, not shaded by large buildings and overcrowding of downtown. Why not put in high rises and dense developments on that large piece of land beside the Westbrook ctrain station. Any intelligent city planner would plan for higher development near train systems and malls where the area is build to accommodate such density.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>My suggestion, as previous stated, along with hundreds of other residents is LOWER the building heights to match the current area. Lower these to reasonable levels throughout the periphery of the district, most importantly along 77th street. Reasonable building heights are 2-3 storeys, not 5.</p>
<p>The height of the buildings is still way to high. The housing along 77th should be no higher than a standard house. Current plan is creating a wall of buildings, and will ruin the feel of Westsprings. There needs to be low density housing.</p>
<p>The changes do not come close to the residents needs. They all want low density housing that is no higher than a 2 story house. NO BODY wants any large, tall buildings. Please remove all the high buildings. Especially those that border along existing housing (77th).</p>
<p>I think the plan looks great. It is exciting to see the possibilities for development here. More amenities, public space and restaurants will add to the vibrancy and sustainability of this community.</p>
<p>No, I feel that our comments, along with many others were not adequately addressed. While there has been minor changes to the density and building heights, it was minor in compared to the hundred of complaints compiled from the last survey. The building heights along 77th street had only minor changes along the far south and far north edges, but even that was minor. The majority centre section of 77th street had absolutely no changes to density, which was exceptionally frustration, as well as disappointing.</p>
<p>Dozens of residents back on to 77th street, and nearly the entire communities of west worth and west springs utilize this road for commuting. We requested to have the density of the new development to match that of the current development along 77th street, which is low density. Low density is 2-3 stories maximum, no higher. The development needs to match the low density existing to ensure that properties bought maintain their values (which is the responsibility of the city to ensure that development does not significantly impair this). Residents along 77th still need to be able to feel comfortable in their homes and yards without the prying eyes of 5 storeys of residents peering in on them. We need to feel that there will not be excess noise and light that will impair the use of the land and health. We don't want to live in the giant shade of 5 storey buildings and want to continue to grow our gardens. We did not purchase properties in downtown calgary for this reason, we chose to live in the suburbs where the plan was always low density development until Truman came along.</p>
<p>No, we are not happy with the mediocre changes to density and building height along 77th street. For the reasons given above, we deserve to have a say in this, as constituents, as tax payers and as citizens of west springs and calgary.</p>
<p>16 meters Height along 77 St SW will still have a negative effect (Sunlight, view etc) on the residence backing along 77 st on the east side? Why can't this be 11 meters similar to the south side?</p>
<p>Constructing 20 meter buildings along the northern edge of Old Banff Coach Road is still too high. This is an area of detached single family homes. People purchased properties in the area in hopes of raising their families away from an urban center, in a low density environment. In order to preserve the neighbourhood and lifestyle the general public bought into, single family homes, townhouses and nothing taller than 3 storeys should be allowed to be built in the area. The transportation network cannot handle it. Although I am happy with the upgrades that have been identified, from the looks of the transportation report barely any of the necessary upgrades have funding. I do not believe the overall density of units has been reduced enough.</p>
<p>Yes, there will be some changes to our current western views, but we cannot expect the city to stop growing.</p>
<p>Engage- ha! More like enRAGE!!! Was the city and Truman even listening?? Those of us who live on OBCR and 77th street asked for low density housing on the periphery of the development so that it would match the existing homes in the area. Instead you lowered the building height by a couple of storeys and NONE at all in certain areas, like the majority of 77th street. The concerns of density and building height were not addressed whatsoever. Hundreds of people replied asking that the building height be gradual with the highest building along 85th street. Gradual means starting at the level that is currently existing- 2 storey homes and very slowly moving up from there- not jumping from 2 storey homes to 5 storey condo buildings. 5 storey will be an incredible invasion of privacy into</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>our properties, it will completely shade them so so much for outdoor play for our children and our gardens will be toast.</p>
<p>Definitely not. I wish that our comments were taken more seriously. The area cannot handle the density you are proposing now either, not can the residents tolerate the building heights proposed along quiet residential streets such as 77th street. Why were the comments of those living on 77th street not addressed?</p> <p>Building heights remain at 16M, which is 5 storeys! This is still well beyond what is tolerable for those people who have homes along this street and really 100 m in from this street. These 5 storey buildings will TOWER over existing homes, destroying our privacy, our lifestyle of outdoor living and our gardens which will die due to constant shading. Would you want 5 storey's of residents looking down on you as your children play, as you garden, suntan or even try to relax in your own yard that you paid for? I certainly do not, nor would I want my family be exposed to such an invasion of privacy. 77th street provides no buffers to that either, it will create increased traffic, noise and light pollution, exhaust from vehicular traffic and will contribute to an unhealthy lifestyle.</p>
<p>It is somewhat confusing but I had it clarified at one of the open houses.</p>
<p>Sadly, no, the changes have not reflect my own comments and the comments of my neighbours. We are frustrated and feel that the whole engage process has been simply lip service to the community. We are disappointed in the city of calgary and Truman development.</p> <p>The density of the housing, while reduced, does still not accurately reflect the capacity of the area to handle. The density proposed along 77th street will be exceptionally disruptive to those living along that road, as the will no longer use their outdoor yards for recreation for fear of breached privacy created by the 5 storey's of people peering down at them. Privacy is just one of the concerns, noise and light pollution, extensive shading, loss of view, and increased traffic caused by the density of 5 storey residential units all concern every single home along 77th street. We purchased our home, like everyone else because we wanted to live in a low density community. We want privacy, clean air, peace and sunshine in our yards, which is the opposite of what Truman is proposing. We moved out of downtown to be away from high rises and the invasion of privacy- but it seems that Truman doesn't care who it impacts, as long as they make as much money as possible.</p>
<p>This still doesn't do enough for the existing people in the neighborhood. Basically on 77th there is still 4 story buildings that are going up. These at most should be 3 story flat roofs to ensure that there is evening sun for longer and so that there are no peeping toms into the existing structures across 77th. As well, there is a road that connects to 77th but does not connect with an existing road making a T intersection. This makes no sense what so ever and should be connected to Weston manner. Truth be told, I think most people really I think this should be single family homes as what was originally on the plan when most people moved into the neighborhood. Dense population should be near main arteries (ie stony trail) not the suburbs. So move this development to 101 street area and build away as there is no existing development there.</p>
<p>no, the density is still to high for an area that was originally designated for single family homes. larger condo units with less overall units would be the only acceptable solution.</p> <p>the scale of the project should also be limited to recess it form the roadway to allow the adjacent community enough space to escape its shadow and potential noise.</p> <p>this asp is not in keeping with the character of the area or make it more livable/desirable.</p>
<p>No. While minor modifications were made, overall the concern of building heights directly across from areas of low density still remains a concern. We live a few houses in from 77th street and even we fear that we will be living in the constant shadow of the 5 storey building that will be going in along 77th street. I can only imagine that those living directly backing onto 77th fear even worse than we do. The 16m building height planned for the majority of 77th street fails to gradually increase in height, and does so rather abruptly. This is appear out of the place and be a major invasion of privacy for those of us living close to 77th street. The noise, light from street lamps, shadowing will decrease the quality of life for our community. Please listen to the comments from the pervious open house and this one- west springs does not want buildings higher than 2 storeys along 77th street. The current proposal goes completely against the west springs area plan created in 2012 under which many people purchased their homes by.</p>
<p>They do not. The density remains far to high for the capacity of the roadways and our schools and our public recreational facilities in the area which is dismal to begin with. The building heights along OBCR and 77th street still remain far too high for the residents across the street. They will be subject to a constant invasion of privacy for</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>their back yards. Their homes and yards will be shadowed by 5 or more storey homes. This drop in quality of outdoor life will no doubt lead to decreased physical activity and health for the community. The traffic congestions and associated emissions from a density that high will discourage people from leaving their homes. We are very disappointed regarding the building height of 16m proposed along the majority of the 77th street. This is a slap in the face of homeowners who moved to this area to get away from towering condos. I suspect a lot of people will be moving, and taking a mighty hit to their home value at the same time. Shame on the developers for failing to be sensitive to current residents.</p>
<p>No. The buildings are still so much taller than everything in the surrounding area. A cap of 4 stories would meet everyone's needs. 4 stories would still allow the neighbours to see daylight.</p>
<p>Ummm NO. Not even close. How are we going to have amenities to support all these people?! Our school are full, we have no library, rinks and fields are over committed now. Traffic is terrible getting on and off the hill. For once it would be nice if you thought about the negative impacts this will have on our community. We did not choose to move here so that we could live in a concrete, over populated jungle.</p>
<p>I have noticed a number of small businesses in the new complex at the corner of 85th and Old Banff Coach road have already closed their doors in less than 2 years of business. I am concerned about high vacancy rates potentially in the commercial spaces, and really question if the area needs more of that space.</p>
<p>They do address them, though 'adequately' will depend on whether transportation infrastructure and additional public services (e.g., schools, community centres) for this area are built at the appropriate time. I want infrastructure ahead of development and some fairly iron-clad assurances this will happen!! Otherwise I remain against these projects. I chose to build here for what this community uniquely offers. I have no desire to live in something resembling the East Village.</p>
<p>No they did not. While it was decreased in height along the south end of 77th street, the rest of 77th street is suffering. The proposed height of 5 storeys is inappropriate and does not match the existing development. The community of west springs will be backed against a wall of condos where our privacy, sunshine and quality of life will all suffer. It was requested that the building height along 77th street be limited to that of the existing homes along that street, period. Please listen to the constituents of this area and limit the building height along 77th street to 2 storeys.</p>
<p>Not even close. The infrastructure cannot handle this level of density nor can the school system no matter what CSB might suggest. In addition, the homeowners in this area were never interested in this level of density or living in a neighborhood with this type of development. This type of development should be located along a transit (train) line. The public transit is not sufficient and as a result there will be too many cars and increased traffic and parking issues.</p>
<p>No, the areas that use Old Banff Coach Road, 85th Street, Bow Trail and even 101 Street are at capacity for the current transportation structure. Trying to get any sort of changes to traffic patters including those that are safety issues are nearly impossible. Old Banff Coach Road and Cougar Ridge Drive continues to be a problem yet the city has put in minimum effort to change this intersection. Frankly, I feel like I can't trust the city to do what is right. Schooling also continues to be a problem in this area of the city with neighbourhoods like Cougar Ridge (which was the first community to be built) bussing their kids to Rosscarock which is known to be a terrible school and is in a ward this area doesn't even vote in. The infrastructure cannot handle high density.</p>
<p>It does not address the community ideas and the hundreds of concerns voiced by the community. The residents of cougar ridge and west springs have requested that the building along OBCR and 77th street be a maximum of 2 storeys high. Yet the builder and the city continues to ignore these requests to put in for 5-8 storeys. This is unacceptable to the community. we mvoed into this area to be OUT of downtown, not to live in the middle the high density and high storey housing. Our property values will plummet when we are living in the shadow of a 5 storey building. We will no longer use our backyard space because of the complete invasion of property of 5 storeys of residents looking down on us. The noise and light created from additional street lights, traffic and just a giant increase in population in general will create unlivable spaces for the homeonwners along 77th street. LOWER THE HEIGHT OF THE BUILDINGS TO A MAXIMUM OF 2 STOREYS ALONG THE ENTIRE LENGTH ROADS WITH EXISTING HOMEOWNERS</p>
<p>No -The building height along 77 St SW should be consistent (i.e. 11 metres) with the south edge. It is very</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>inappropriate to have varying heights along 77th St - they should all be the same height from an architectural and overall fit with the adjacent neighbourhood along 77th St. The lower the better !!!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The height progression moving westward from 77th Street should be less dramatic. The overall height of the inner buildings is too high
<p>No</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BUILDINGS ALONG 77TH STREET REMAIN TOO HIGH FRO AREA RESIDENTS. 16M MEANS DESTROYING PRIVACY TO RESIDENTS, SHADING HOME AND INCREASED NOISE. NO THANKS! - THE DENSITY REMAINS TO HIGH FOR THE ROADWAYS, AND WILL DESTROY THE SMALL COMMUNITY FEEL OF THE AREA. THE SCHOOLS ARE OVERFLOWING AS IT IS.
<p>No, it does not adequately address the concerns of myself of the majority of the respondents on the previous survey and open house. Truman and the city are failing to recognize the impact on the current residents of west springs, cougar ridge and wentworth- all of whom look like they are going to living in the shadows of a mega district. We did not move to the suburbs to be shadowed by 5 or more story buildings, to have our privacy invaded on a daily basis, and to have our schools and roadways overflowing with excess people. We have consistently asked for lower building heights from 16m to 2 story maximums to match the current communities and to limit overpopulation in an area that cannot handle the density. Projects like these need to be created in an area that originally had planned for such density so that the infrastructure of the area can accommodate it. In addition, people who move to high density buildings know what they are moving into, we moved to a low density area for low density housing. The city has no surprised us with mid to high density development that will greatly decrease our quality of life. No one will be out enjoying their yards due to excess noise along 77th street and OBCR. No one will want their children playing in yards shadowing by 5 or more story buildings invading their privacy. This development was not welcome from the start and is a far cry from the development planned by the city in the 2012 publication.</p> <p>The solutions are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lower building height on the periphery of the community (OBCR and 77th street) to a MAXIMUM of 2 story homes/businesses - limit traffic on 77th and OBCR by offloading more traffic to bow trail and 85th street which was always designed to be a larger capacity roadways - mitigate the effects of traffic with removing t-intersection, putting in heavily treed streets and high fences, limiting parking on streets, putting in roundabouts and no creating new intersections along 77th where they do not currently exist.
<p>No. Ultimately, we all bought in a neighbourhood zoned as low density, so low density is what we want. It seems we are being forced to accept something completely different than low density. Building heights should all be limited to be comparable to other existing buildings in the community. Nothing over 3 stories anywhere in the development please. I would like to see more Neighbourhood Limited buildings and no Community or Neighbourhood Mid-Rise buildings. This project is still bringing far too many people into an area where schools and roads are already stressed to the max.</p>
<p>The original density of 2758 was ridiculous but 1789 units is still far much greater than our area should have. Please include more single homes and less condos. It looks like crammed sardines in a can.</p>
<p>Although it is nice that the city is moving in the right direction, we are a miles away from the what the residents have been asking (please refer to the comments from the previous cycle). There is no interest in having high (greater than 2-3 story) buildings that are medium to high density. The current Truman plan has not captured any of the qualities of the neighbourhood that the city can be proud of. The current feel of Cougar ridge and Westsprings is well balanced with townhouses, and single homes. There is no reason to change that in the final phase of this quadrant of the city. I am worried the city will not take the right steps and listen to its people. 77th should not have a wall of condos, they should have a gradual integration into the new area with single family homes, a large green space with trees and park space. Try to capture some of the beauty of the current area. It is currently going to be lost behind ugly large buildings.</p>
<p>The density is still way to high. Along 77th there should be single family homes with plenty of greenspace. There should not be large ugly condos that create a barrier between the two neighbourhoods.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>The density and height is still significantly too high. If they wish to have some high density housing it should be placed along 85th. Especially along 77th, there should be low density housing. This will be a gradual integration to this new neighbourhood</p>
<p>They do not adequately address the concerns around building heights along 77th Street. There needs to be a one common level of building heights on 77th street (not multiple heights) set at street level and no higher than 11 metres. It is OK to have higher heights on the business side of Banff Coach Road since this is commercial. There needs to be a gradual transition in heights not the radical height changes suggested. The tallest buildings need to be shorter.</p>
<p>NO it does not.</p>
<p>Remove all buildings over 2 stories along 77th, especially commercial, this is a residential area.</p>
<p>NO it does not. There should not be any commercial buildings along 77th street, and the height should be limited to 2 stories. There needs to be a gradual integration of the existing Westsprings houses.</p>
<p>No, People want the original plan. Remove all density along 77th and move it to 85th, where there are no houses.</p>
<p>Current plan is crowded and old feeling. It will be loud, over crowded and will invade the other areas.</p>
<p>Seems like an adequate reduction in density. The area is dealing with sprawl from the neighboring communities (Aspen, Wentworth). Infrastructure can barely handle the current volume</p>
<p>No. The building heights have been reduced around the edges of the proposed development, but then they increase to 26 metres and ultimately 30 metres behind those edges. The concern about height is not only about an increase in density, but also about the aesthetics of the neighbourhood. 26 and 30 metre structures are too high for the general aesthetic of this neighbourhood. 20 metres should be the maximum allowable height for development in this area.</p>
<p>No- 77th street and OBCR cannot handle this increased traffic. The addition of more intersections along 77th street will only make it worse. Eliminate the T intersection at 77th street that is across from Weston Court, and move this intersection down to create a 4 way intersection at Weston Drive instead. Why create more noise from cars, excess lighting and congestion in an area that does not already have an intersection. The roads of connectors need to connect through to West Springs community via Weston Drive.</p>
<p>The roads surrounding the area do not support adding any more units (i.e. 0). This reduction is appreciated and hopefully will align to some upgrades on the roads (including Bow Trail that is over capacity as a single lane towards 85th street). The left turn lane heading south on 85 St SW to Bow Trail cannot support any more vehicles as well (needs a longer light). I witness cars turning on yellow as well as red since it is normally a 2-3 light change to get through.</p>
<p>I wish that the comments posted previously were listened to because the minor changes made to the proposed development does not reflect the community's concerns. Building height remains far too high for OBCR and 77th street. The area cannot handle buildings this height and the associated strain on the community. In addition to traffic, school overcrowding, congestion, pollution, those that live along 77th street and OBCR will be continually shadowed by 5 or more storey buildings. This is unacceptable. The invasion of privacy alone is enough to move far out of this area. We moved to this community to be away from high rises, so that we could enjoy the property that we purchased and earned through decades of hard work. The new district is going to destroy our outdoor life. No longer will be relax in our backyard and let our children and grandchildren play in the yard when 5 storeys of people will be peering down at us. No matter how many trees you put in, and no matter how wide 77th street becomes, our quality of life will drop significantly with the building height proposed. The building height should be limited to 2 storeys to match the existing residents, not a greedy 5 storeys proposed by Truman.</p>
<p>NO, WE ARE VERY UPSET BY THE BUILDING HEIGHTS THAT ARE STILL BEING PROPOSED ALONG 77 STREET AND OBCR. THE PROPOSED BUILDING HEIGHT OF 16M IS FAR TOO HIGH FOR THE AREA. THIS IS A LOW DENSITY HOUSING DISTRICT, SO WHY ARE YOU PLANNING ON BUILDING HIGH LEVEL CONDOS PEERING INTO OUR YARDS? 5 STOREYS IS UNACCEPTABLE TO ALL OF THE RESIDENTS ALONG 77TH STREET. THIS SHOULD BE LIMITED TO 2-3 STOREY MAXIMUM ALONG 77TH STREET, AND VERY GRADUALLY INCREASED FROM THERE WITH THE HIGHEST HEIGHTS NEAR 85TH STREET. GRADUALLY MEANS 1-2 STOREYS AT A TIME, NOT JUMPING BY 4 OR MORE STOREYS. IT IS HARD TO BELIEVE THAT</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

THIS MOST RECENT PROPOSAL WAS DEEMED TO BE AN APPROPRIATE COMPROMISE? IT IS NOT A COMPROMISE WHATSOEVER.
No, it does not adequately address the community's thoughts about density and building heights; - 77th street remains too high. 16m buildings will shade our homes, destroy our privacy and our gardens, contribute to excess noise and light in the area, occlude our view and impair our quality of life as a result. Limit building heights to that of low density along 77th street- that i means 2 storeys, 3 max, and gradually increase the height as it nears 85th street (a couple of floors at a time). - the density remains too high for the area. The roadways where the majority of the traffic appears to filter onto (77th street and oBCR), are in no way equipped to handle this now or even with improvements. 77th street and OBCR are entirely lined with homes, 85th and bow trail is not. Push the entrance and the exit points to 85th to remove traffic from the community that way. - schools and current public recreational facilities are completely lacking to support this population boom. Where are the libraries, hockey rinks, skating rinks, basketball courts, community centres. This area cannot handle any more people than low density
Absolutely not. You plan to add approximately 3,000 additional residents, that is increasing the population of the West Springs community by approximately 50%. Ridiculous. The schools and roads are already stretched. Medium to low density housing should go in, nothing more.
It's a start, but still too dense.
NOT FULLY. THE CURRENT DENSITY IS STILL A VERY SIGNIFICANT INCREASE FROM EXISTING DEVELOPMENTS. I AM GREATLY CONCEREND ABOUT TRAFFIC FLOW AT PEAK TIMES.
No, the building heights still remain problematic. We feel that our concerns are going unheard, as there has be no change to the building heights along 77th street to a reasonable level. - 5 storey building will complete shade the existing properties along 77th street (many of our gardens will not survive, we will not use our backyard again) - 5 storey buildings will invade our privacy. I will not want my children or their friends playing in place where they will be watched by 5 storeys of people. We won't dine outside, play, suntan, or use our yards at all knowing that we are being watched. We bought this property to be across from low density as promised in the 2012 asp, please keep it this way at 2 floor buildings - the light and noise that large buildings and their residents give off will invade the peace of our neighbourhood - schools, roadways, and community resources cannot tolerate the increase in density despite the minor proposed changes to infrastructure suggested
neither sensitive nor gradual enough for local residents along 77th street - building height of 5 floors is unacceptable- shadowing, privacy, noise, pollution, loss of view, loss of property value. consider 2 floor buildings along entire length of 77th street only, no higher - density too high, the proposed infrastructure changes can still not handle the flow of traffic. 77th is a quiet residential street and will turn into a congested, noisy road will the excess density - you talk about how it will take 20 years for it to be built so the area schools can handle it. 20 years from now means a lot of high school students- have you thought where they will go? - where is the accessible housing for seniors and environmentally friendly designs that completely discourage car use in favour of bikes and walking?
The proposed changes do address the public concern about density and building height. In my opinion, they could have gone further. The buildings across the street from us went from a proposed 5 stories to 4 stories. Not enough change to block sun in winter months.
Privacy is our number one concern. With building heights of 5 floors or higher along the perimeter of 77th street and even higher on OBCR, our privacy will be severely impaired. We bought in this community for privacy, for a location far from the noise and pollution of urban life- you are about to ruin this for us. More people=more noise and traffic, decreased school spaces, less green space= decreased quality of life

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>I am commenting about Elkay Development Land Use - LOC 2017-0213. I am a interested person of the adjoining landowner to the south of this development site. Subject to my comments below regarding ingress and egress from this development site, I have no objection to the current zoning.</p>
<p>The houses on the east side of 77th Street SW were all bought before the zoning change to high density. Since the backyards of these houses face the proposed development the right to peaceful and private enjoyment will be seriously impaired. Kitchens, living rooms, patios and decks will be directly visible by the proposed 4 story structures on the west side of 77th street.</p> <p>As stated the intend of the development plan is the to maintain the character of the existing neighborhood. A solid wall of 4 story building facing the back of the existing houses absolutely does not represent the character of the neighborhood.</p> <p>It is imperative that a buffer zone on the west side of 77th street SW will be established, starting with 3 story buildings and the gradually moving on to higher buildings towards the inside of the development.</p> <p>In general I am not opposed to a higher density development as long as careful consideration is given to the needs and expectations of all existing neighborhoods.</p>
<p>NO. Putting 4 story M2 buildings on 77 Street and 5 story MU-1 buildings right behind does not meet, as the MDP states, "Retaining the character of established neighbourhoods". Our back yard as well as the living portion of our house (which includes living rooms, kitchen, bedrooms, deck, patio) faces 77th Street. We have the right of expectation of the same level of privacy we expected with the original zoning of the proposed development site (single family homes) when we purchased our house. Building a wall of 4 story buildings across from our back yard eliminates ALL PRIVACY facilitated by a huge number of pairs of eyes looking into our windows and into our back yard. Replacing the M2 4 story buildings with M-G 3 story townhouse would allow for some privacy to be maintained. It was stated, at the open house, that driveways are not allowed on 77th Street, however, there are driveways on 77th Street further south starting @ 9th Ave. Alternatively, it could be arranged that any driveways for the townhouses are not on 77th Street (backs of the townhouses face 77th Street). As a solution, to maintain the current proposed density, the M2 4 story buildings could be moved back from 77th Street to where the MU-1 5 story buildings are and the MU-1 5 story buildings moved to Westward Way SW and the M-G 3 story townhouses, at Westward Way SW, moved to directly off the west side of 77th Street starting @ Westward GA SW. This would allow for an appropriate buffer zone between the established homes on the east side of 77th Street and the increased density in the new development on the west side of 77th Street.</p>
<p>I do not agree with the amount of high density building in this area. The infrastructure is not available and most people bought in this area to AVOID this type of "inner city" feel. Please do not approve this!</p>
<p>I am concerned with any increase to the current density of the area without road infrastructure improvements. The vast majority of current residents work downtown and need to continue commuting by car or transit to work.</p>
<p>I still believe the density is too high. The reduction is a step in the right direction but further reductions should be done.</p>
<p>These proposed changes are only a SLIGHT improvement, however the density component is still far to high. Truman, the developer is launching a major HIGH DENSITY project in an existing community of HIGH END SINGLE FAMILY HOMES. Not only will our family life be impacted, but the proposed added Commercial Retail/Office will add traffic & transportation concerns, parking concerns as well as construction delay concerns, specifically at the intersection of Bow Trail & 85th Street.</p>
<p>No, the density is still to dense, and the buildings will still be too high. They should be limited to three stories. The proposed density will be too much for the neighbourhood roads to handle with all the extra traffic.</p>
<p>More than adequately. The loss of additional density is actually a loss for the community and the city. This is a once in a lifetime chance to create a "village centre" for this community, and to ensure the health of businesses, schools and transit through having enough people to make good 24/7 use of existing infrastructure. Enhanced connectivity will provide opportunities for "vehicle-less" shopping and other day to day transportation within the area.</p>
<p>No. The building height levels were reduced in only two areas, leaving several 6-8 storey buildings in the development. The estimated level of residents seems low for the amount of buildings and units that will be included in the project. This, therefore, would increase the traffic levels even more. The businesses and retail that will be included will definitely not have enough parking on the streets. We have seen this based on the parking availability</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>in Aspen Landing, Shoppers Drug Mart on 85th, and the professional building on 85th. These retail and restaurant businesses attract so many people and there are not enough parking spots to accommodate them all. The community would prefer development of the type of housing that already exists in our community - single family homes, not a concrete jungle.</p>
<p>Absolutely not! We are aware that three of the major intersections in and out of the community are already at failure levels. The community infrastructure is unable to accommodate more development - especially at the high density level - as it isn't able to adequately manage what we already have. The entire community is concerned about the traffic, housing, schools and overall infrastructure that we currently have. Please stop forcing more and more density into areas that traffic infrastructure can not safely or adequately manage. The high rise/high density also does not fit with the community structure. And the future Stoney Trail is NOT an adequate response to the issue. It will not alleviate the traffic pressure on the current community roadways.</p>
<p>Building Heights: Although it is great that the City has taken into account the feedback from the previous public engagement session, I still have concerns with the building heights 6-8 stories due to shadowing and my potential view of the mountains: I live in West Springs Place.</p> <p>Traffic issues: the potential of even higher volumes of traffic on and around Banff Old Coach Road still concerns me, but I appreciate that the potential has been reduced from the original proposal.</p>
<p>Hi think that high density development is well served with what is already completed in the area. We need more residential because all of the connected roads on 9th, 81st, 77th and 85th are busy enough as it is with all of the schools and commercial. Any high rise development above three stories will devalue the homes that are already built in the area that are upscale homes.</p>
<p>No. 20 metres should be the max building height of this development. This development is on the north side of West Springs and logical roadway access is 85th Street North of Bow Trail and Old Banff Coach Road. No road changes are proposed that would impact these areas any time soon, and these are the only two roads allowing traffic in and out of that general area. These roads already struggle to handle the existing density, and we are not accounting for the other developments that are already underway in this area that will also impact the traffic/density. Again, 20 metres max.</p>
<p>No, because the building are still too high for a residential area and we already have enough high density</p>
<p>Even with the proposed height restrictions lowered in some areas, a further restriction of 15 metres max would be more considerate to the landscape and homes around the areas. These are condos and unlike homes will have longevity and maintenance issues. A mix of demographics of new and aging population should be consider (seniors home).</p>
<p>The proposed changes and information provided outline a great project that I believe will be welcomed edition to west springs</p>
<p>I don't feel that adding more to this area before making the necessary infrastructure changes. It has been a neglected disaster for many years (I have lived in Westsprings for the last 15years). The area is not streamlined AT ALL, it is not efficient. It is frustrating and adding more is not going to be helpful. I do like that they have lowered the buildings and the amount of people.</p>
<p>The overall density is much better now. Not sure however why we need 9 story tall buildings in the community center area. In my opinion such tall buildings change the character of the area too much and are not necessary. I would see 6 story buildings as a maximum acceptable height.</p>
<p>No I don't agree that the proposed changes fit at all into the community.</p>
<p>We don't need tall buildings or high density apartments and condos. The entire community is based on single family homes with schools, green spaces, and pathways. You can't just build high density buildings and expect the community residents to just blindly take what the city is feeding everyone!!!</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

<p>As a resident, I am extremely displeased at the lack of options and poor planning ideas presented by the city. I want to see LOW DENSITY housing plans not high density housing and commercial space right off my backyard!!!!</p>
<p>No. The entire West End was built (since the 1970s) on a mix of low density, medium density and high density with adequate provisions of walkways, parks, playgrounds. You are dramatically increasing density with little to no walkways, parks or playgrounds - the proposed water area/park is the developers way of caving into the City but does not fit into the West End style (i.e. it is better suited for Bridgeland, Hillhurst, or other downtown areas). With no alleys - this is a high density area well out of place in the West End. I know why it is being done here - Truman does not want to pay the price for the land where this project would be better suited (i.e. those downtown areas). Building heights were very limited back in the day - the City is throwing that away now - all for money.</p>
<p>First off, the match does not correspond to a 36% drop in units to the square footage decrease. What impact does this have to buildings that border along Wentworth Manor? This has not yet been defined. If the building heights are not adjusted down, the nature set back should be increased to 40 meters.</p>
<p>Not entirely, no. I like that the tallest buildings will be farther away from the roads and existing housing etc. But this is still a lot of density in an area that is underserved by transit and where the road infrastructure has been inadequate for years. The fact that nearly all the planned upgrades are presently unfunded does not allay my concerns at all.</p>
<p>It is still too dense for this family community. I am very concerned regarding the traffic increase, height of the buildings, and the huge number of residents it will add.</p>
<p>The proposed heights of the buildings are still way too high to be in alignment with this area. Proposed heights of 4 to 5 storeys along 77th street will completely dwarf all single family residential homes that are everywhere in this area. And proposed buildings of up to 7 to 9 storeys high is completely out of line with this neighbourhood. There are no buildings in this area over 3 storeys high, so to add multiple buildings that are over double that height does not create a gradual increase in density in this area. A REASONABLE gradual increase would have single dwelling, residential buildings along 77th next to the existing homes with a GRADUAL increase in height of buildings moving toward the centre of the development of no more than 4 storeys.</p>
<p>No. The proposed changes do not come close to adequately addressing the community concerns about density and building height. The development is still far too dense. Building heights are far above what currently existing and does not match the community. 30 metres and 7-9 storeys is far too tall for this suburban area. Also, having 26 metre buildings so close to 77th street (which has single detached homes on the east side of it) is not an acceptable "gradual reduction" in building height.</p>
<p>I think the reduced building heights are good in those three areas. One other way to address bldg ht along Old Banff CR so as to not result in so much shadowing to the houses across the street would be to have a step up design. I also feel that the buildings in the centre of the development, near the Central Park could go higher in order to accommodate more density, and then possibly reduce height along Old Banff, and/or 77th. In Coach Hill there are the very high 3 Odyssey Towers and I think something like that could be easily accommodated in West District. This would provide stunning views of the mountains, the city, and the Central Park without impacting the R1 residents. I think many residents have been pleased that the density has been reduced. My concern is whether this level of population is now enough to support the businesses and retail going in.</p>
<p>I think there is still some concern about a bait and switch manoeuvre here. Fundamentally, people bought in this part of the city for a suburban lifestyle. While this type of densification might look good to some on paper it would not fit in isolation in this neighbourhood. Why not look at the suburbs that have human scale development. The density and building heights need to be lower still in the core to reflect a liveable suburban densification that will be lasting. What I see here doesn't reflect a community and neighbourhood that will be welcoming and interactive. There are already too many pockets of sad isolated empty commercial in this city. This doesn't seem like a future forward mixed use design.</p>
<p>Question 2. Do the proposed changes...adequately address the community ideas & concerns about transportation that were shared with the City? Tell us why?</p>
<p>Why not connect westward way w/ weston drive - instead of a dead end T intersection connecting the two would make transportation easier.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

More planning needs to be put into this. Traffic is bad as is.
I still wonder how current roadways even w/ some minor changes + stoney trail will accommodate another 3000 cars on the road.
My concern is community transportation corridors and their effectiveness in the upcoming years, while all this development is still underway. 85th St in particular has become a real bottleneck and not just at rush hour. Lights every block cannot be the answer! If you and the developer want more support of development, making 85th a more effective traffic mover would do you a lot of good! And it <u>can't</u> wait till Stoney is a reality.
Existing roads, particularly in & around 85th Street & Bow Tr are already max'd for several hours during the day. The recent band aid work is not enough, and I'm severely concerned about the development immediately north of Bow Tr between 8t St & Stoney Trail. Bringing this traffic onto 85th Street will require yet another set of lights which is a complete joke.
What about improvements to parking at c-train stations to encourage ridership.
- Not to the extent - Conjestion currently on 85th Street with all minor road intersections eg Wentworth Drive & 9 Ave were not progressed
No. No improvements to add Banff Coach Road. Right now it takes us 20 minutes or more to get to Bow Trail. And I just live 3 kms away from the Bow Trail intersection.
No! Funding for infrastructure <u>not</u> yet funded. West LRT has insufficient parking now! Where are a couple of hundred more cars going to park!
They do but feel it won't meet the needs. When the final project is completed.
No. Plan for inner roads. How traffic & school issues solved. Noise due to lane change from 2-lane to 6 lane.
The roads are already overwhelmed. The ring road on the west side is unfunded and this development will ad over 3000 people! Unacceptable and very short sighted!
Again, the reduction is a good start, but it needs to go further. With only 2 ways out of this neighbourhood both are already overloaded - this huge increase in density will bring traffic on 85th to a standstill.
From the information provided tonight it appears concerns have been adequately addressed. Biggest concern was diverting traffic from using 81st Ave from 9th Ave.
NO - OBCR is still the main ent/exit it can't handle any more volume.
77 Street and 9th Avenue area already very busy as people are shortcutting down these streets to avoice OBCR & 85th Street. Adding more vehicles & people to this area will be an issue. Existing infrastructure is over used.
Again - where are the numbers? Why haven't the current traffic stats shown here? The ring road when/if constructed will also bring traffic into the area - not just take traffic off. What are the perceived numbers?
Timeline wise it's of no use adding a couple more lanes to one of the roads and that is only a small stretch of road tha funnels out into a already bad traffic mess so adding construction time that will conjest traffic to a bad traffic mess doesn't fix anything. Even once it will be completed the amount of traffic that it will deconjest will be minisquel and not everyone would use Stoney Trail most if not close to all traffic goes towards downtown or sarcee not the other direction.
NO. Wait for the winter time, and you'll see why we hate the old banff Coach Road!
The transportation plan is weak because relies in infrastructure that doesn't depend of the city. Need to show which development will be built based on the availability of the improved roads. Please take into account the economic reality of the city and province. Some of these road will be available in the long term.
No. Because the density is still too high. More roads, more intersections, more lights = MUCH MORE TRAVEL TIME
With the increase in development & the noise from cars / vehicles moving back & forth be sure to invoke some sort of sound suppression. Eg. Going up the hill from Sarcee Trail or Bow barnes have been put up. Trees have been planted etc. More up this hill should be considered of this type.
NO. The proposed transportation changes are required now without the proposed density increase.

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

No. Lowering units by 1000 less does not help at all. If you only lower the residents by less than 1000. The traffic jam is already horrible in the old banff coach road. Adding more residents will only make things worse. I would personally prevent any of my friends to buy a property in this new area, just for their own convenience.
Yes - funding is still an issue but proposed transportation routes / lanes / partial interchanges will work given number of residents - Ring Road is still a longer-term issue.
Allowing developers to plan such that transportation is at the brink of failure (but just slightly less) is not a sustainable development plan.
<u>NO</u> . There are no changes to Old Banff Coach Rd or Bow Trail which is already ugly in rush hour.
No. The area is already congested, especially at peak times - school in and out; before and after work. All of the road upgrades are currently unfunded.
Density needs to be "less" so that the roads can handle the traffic. There are traffic problems now, like today, what will change when the density increases? Longer waits in traffic, more fumes from exhausts and more irritated drivers & passengers.
It is unfortunate that density is limited due to unwillingness to expand road network appropriate for long term vision.
No. Still the same traffic choke points. Need more ways to get access to Bow Trail. There would be a big benefit to have another connection to Bow Trail @ 77 Ave or 73 Ave. Ring Roads needs to be funded to move people off Coach Hill to the rest of Calgary. More people will greatly compound these issues.
More detail would help.
It would be good to have a better sense of the timeline & what impacts this construction will have. Also, please increase road widths (lanes) <u>before</u> the congestion is high (ie in anticipation, not after the fact as usual!)
Still a very high volume of traffic on roads that are used by pedestrians to access community schools and businesses.
the developer still feels too dense given that there is no LRT connection. With the lack of LRT the vast majority of residents will drive. 85th street is already extremely busy and there is limited egress to Bow trail and old banff coach road.
No - see above!! No more development until road infrastructure can cope with the volume of cars in the area and until we can safely make left hand turns out of Cougar Ridge!!
Looking at the transportation upgrades planned for the intersection of 85th Street and Bow trail, I do not believe there is sufficient information (even that which is available seems largely unfunded) with Stoney trail coming up west of this intersection it is only going to be busier and worse for the people living north and south of this intersection on 85th Street. The proposed commercial development rezoning the land from residential to commercial will add to the traffic density and will worsen situation. I think this development is a very bad idea without there being adequate lanes north and south bound on 85th. The two southbound lanes on 85th are inadequate as everyone north of this intersection needs to get out of the area through this intersection. If the landowner who wants to develop commercial property will not give up some of his land to the city to make the additional lanes, why is the city entertaining the idea of allowing a rezoning of this property?
No, they do not. The proposed changes will have close to no impact on added load to traffic and transportation infrastructure, which the density of this development will bring with it. The only road which has any capacity to be widened is Bow Trail. All the other roads are quite firmly in place (85th St being worked on and modified currently). There is not a whole lot more that can be done to the roads to improve traffic as it is, short of digging them all out and re-doing the whole roads. And even then, with the majority of boundaries well defined, there is not much width that can be added to the roads. Currently, the traffic situation is pretty bad and cannot handle any additional loads. One could argue that the current road system cannot even handle the construction traffic which this proposal will create for many years.
Also 1789 units is a lot of traffic. In case of did not notice, Old Banff Coach Road is only 1 lane!!!! Bow Trail at the only also 1 lane!!! Also, my understanding is the Crestmount will be driving through the area as the City is opening the back road for Crestmount to access Old Banff and Bow Trail.
Old Banff is not 2 lanes consistently as well 85th is often closed or impacted with construction-with density increase and Stoney going in down the road how exactly is the city planning to deal with rush hour?

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>The 16th Ave part of the ring road has to be opened early. DO NOT feed ring road traffic via Bow Trail until that opens. Bow Tr and 85th is already a nightmare.</p>
<p>This is looking much better. The 11th access to Coach Hill is blocked which is so important. Coach Hill is a small community and there are already cut through traffic and increased traffic.</p>
<p>Yes as long as not change in density plans are made until all the infrastructure is in place; since most is unfunded, the Plan should stay as is. please</p>
<p>Nope! Way too much density for the area. Nobody wants it. Having a busy street T against housing on 77th. This was clearly asked for on the previous feedback (multiple times). There are existing streets that can be tied into. Missed the mark again.</p>
<p>No it does not. The proposed change only increases traffic volume, increases speeding infractions, and increases the risk of traffic accidents (pedestrians and vehicles). The area will lose its exclusivity, and its appeal; many residents will lose their investment in their homes. The ring project will be delayed according to Alberta Transportation and city representatives (male) due to lack of funds, therefore for the next ten years traffic congestion will remain high in ward 6.</p>
<p>A lot of the proposed transportation changes are not currently funded. Specifically, West Stoney Trail is not currently funded. Any approval of developments must be done in conjunction with appropriate transportation upgrades and development of the transit centre</p>
<p>This is a ridiculous response to a key concern. Whoever did this study should try living up here on the hill when you have only 1 outlet off the hill (Bow and then Sarcee) and it snows or they are driving in rush hour. Until Stoney Trail is a viable option, which could be a decade plus, the increased density will become a nightmare on the traffic in the area. Not to mention the time periods during construction which will make it even worse.</p>
<p>We currently have two ways to get off the hill - Bow Trail or 17th Ave. 85th Street & 69th street are the only two feeders to these roads to get off the hill. These roads during the LONG rush hour are jammed so badly we can't get out of our community, whether you are on the east or west side of either of these feeder roads.</p>
<p>No. The density is already pretty high with the current plan, and there is only one way to access to downtown area, which is by the Old Banff Coach Road, the added residents will make the traffic even worse. In winter time, when it snows, the Old Banff Coach Road is basically a big parking lot. You will see.</p>
<p>I definitely won't recommend any of my friends to buy a property in this new area, the living condition will be bad and it's not convenient to go anywhere. It's far from any C-train station. You will have to drive to go to work. And based on the current plan, there will be a big parking issue in the new area -- underground parking is just not enough.</p>
<p>This high level of density homes should be closer to a C Train. Put it off 17th Avenue not off OBCR. Also, take care of the existing transportation issues first!! We have major problems with our roads already. We cannot accommodate further traffic on the hill. As discussed at the Open House, we have a very concerning amount of traffic that is accessing 9th Avenue and 77th Street in our West Springs neighbourhood. People are using these two streets to shortcut the ongoing construction on 85th and the lights on both 85th Street and OBCR. It has created a situation that has me alarmed as the volume of cars is very high for a neighbourhood that kids are regularly using to access the neighbourhood schools. There aren't any stop signs/ lights/ speed bumps on either of these two roads and so it creates quite a drag strip environment that is distressing for all of us. As I mentioned we have been particularly unlucky as we have had two incidents where vehicles parked in front of our home have been hit by other drivers. I think it's ridiculous that we have had three vehicles written off and another one damaged for just parking on a residential street. This needs to be looked into immediately before a child or cyclist is involved in an accident.</p>
<p>I have taken my concerns to the Police and they have done a traffic study in which they did find a high volume of traffic. It should be noted that this study was done in the summer – I think you would find the numbers are even higher now that school is back in.</p>
<p>These ongoing traffic concerns need to be addressed immediately and certainly before we talk about bringing in an</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

<p>increased volume of traffic with further development in our area. I find it absolutely ridiculous that the city is considering bringing in more vehicles to an area that can't handle the ones we have!!!</p>
<p>I am not sure the planned transportation details will handle the population.</p>
<p>The proposed changes do not address the community ideas and concerns about transportation. Nine out of the Eleven proposed transportation improvements shown on page 13 of the new presentation boards are unfunded and undefined. The West Ring Road desperately needs to be completed just to accommodate the existing issues our community faces each and every day. Once the West Ring Road is completed the existing transportation issues may then be partially addressed. Many of the remaining 10 proposed transportation improvements do not appear to be technically feasible given the quantity of space available and the nature of the terrain (i.e. Sarcee changing from 4 to 6 lanes, lack of funding coupled with the fact it is technically un-achievable will guarantee this idea never proceeds). Further, understanding how the development of the West Ring Road has progressed, it is unrealistic to assume that these transportation improvements would actually proceed (even if they were technically possible). It must also be stated, even if there was some way to accommodate the transportation demands associated with the massive population growth proposed, it is not what our community wants. I want my kids and to walk to school like they do today, not in an environment that resembles the busy streets of the Calgary downtown beltline.</p>
<p>85th street is a nightmare for traffic. Old Banff Coach road is a nightmare. Roads built that can't handle the current traffic. It is only time before a major accident happens. Don't add another 1000+ vehicles. You have great ideas to upgrade the infrastructure but everything is unfunded. We already pay too much taxes.</p>
<p>The proposed infrastructure improvements are a step in the right direction, but they do not address all concerns: 85th street is already very busy and the access to the commercial areas at the intersection of 9 Ave SW and 85th Street will likely develop into a major problem with increased traffic. The cumulative effects together with the ongoing nearly complete development of The Rise West Grove Estates on 73th Street must be considered.</p>
<p>No. Too many dependencies are still 'unfunded', including the Ring Road - at present the transportation corridors aren't sufficient for the population that is there now.</p>
<p>Do the infrastructure upgrades FIRST.</p>
<p>The revised proposal does not address the issue of 2 already congested roads during peak times. 85th and OBCR can not currently manage the traffic existing in the community. A potential increase of 3000 residents plus employees coming into the neighbourhood will add to current stresses.</p>
<p>It is also very concerning that many residential roads will turn into collector roads. There are a number of spots which are used by children accessing school. There is a genuine concern that children will be endangered with an increase in traffic (OBCR & 77th), (9th & 81st), (9th & 85th).</p>
<p>Lastly, having built on 81st in good faith that this would remain a residential neighbourhood, I'm disheartened by a complete revision of the ASP over past 6 years. I truly believe many residents would not have chosen to build on quiet streets which have changed so dramatically in traffic. Increasing density decreases the walkability of existing neighbourhoods in exchange for an urban/suburban neighbourhood.</p>
<p>I would like full transparency and independent analysis of the traffic data. Many of the plans in the attached link are unfunded, plus, whilst I am no traffic modeller myself, I don't see the benefit of just widening these few areas when the bottle neck just becomes Bow Trail or 17th to get downtown. I'm sure if you checked the demographics there are a lot of people in the area that need to get downtown. I would consider the train if I could get a parking stall at 69th st without a multi-hundred person waitlist or having to get there at the crack of dawn for a non reserved spot.</p>
<p>No, the changes don't even come close to addressing the infrastructure concerns. They might address the infrastructure concerns with the population as it is now, but not even close for what is being proposed. It is unbearable right now and the proposed changes will help the current population level only; everyone filling out this survey and other surveys keep saying this.</p>
<p>These changes look fine.</p>
<p>Out of the 11 'improvements', only two are funded. What an illusory to cheat local residents!!!</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>We strongly against the amendment to the ASP until all 'improvements' are funded. Otherwise, it's an nothing but an illusory to cheat local residents.</p>
<p>I am concerned about the increased traffic into the area as of now, there are only 2 ways in and out. The proper infrastructure, should be put in place before allowing more building. Also, there needs to be improvement in the interchange at Bow Trail and Sarcee as so many people come out of Coach Hill, Cougar Ridge, Strathcona, West Springs and Wentworth and it all bottlenecks at Sacree and Bow.</p>
<p>With an additional 1500 vehicles in the area the volume of traffic going down town will increase the currently congested roadways of Bow Trail, Old Banff Coach Road.</p> <p>The biggest issue is the intersection of Bow Trail and Sarcee Trail. An overpass is needed immediately. I currently spend up tp 5 lights trying to turn north onto Sarcee Trail from Bow Trail and on other days spent 4+ lights trying to turn west from Sarcee Trail to Bow Trail.</p> <p>The city will have anoverpass at Richmond Road, an overpass at 17 Ave and then all the traffic going north on Sarcee will bottleneck at Bow Trail. Trying to turn west or north will even be longer.</p>
<p>While the traffic plan identifies improvements the majority of these improvements are unfunded. As a number of these intersections are already significantly strained adding high density housing does not make any sense until the interchange at Bow and Sarcee as well as the ring road have been have been completed to ensure there is proper access to the community.</p>
<p>Still have concerns about how adjacent established communities like Coach Hill will be impacted with cut thru traffic. We have seen this in other older areas like Crescent Heights where when the major roads get backed up non residents try to cut thru either due to bad weather or an accident and plug up our streets so bad that the actual residents are no able to get out of their own community safely.</p> <p>Actions will need to be put in place like no right turns onto Coach Hill Road in the morning hours to protect the local residents.</p>
<p>No all but one of the transportation options are NOT FUNDED. Which means headaches continuing entering and exiting the community .</p>
<p>Not enough. How will people not end up in gridlock every time they go out? Where will all the kids attend school? There are already significant shortfalls for schools in this area.</p>
<p>No. only 2 of the potential changes are funded, which means many many years before anything helpful will occur. Creating double turning lanes onto bow without twinning will have no beneficial impact. And there are no proposed changes to 85th street, which is the biggest concern. Try getting onto it out of a subdivision at rush hour or school times!</p>
<p>The proposed roads to be widened are an absolute MUST and the lights on 85th need to be synced for easy flow. Getting in and out of west springs is always full of congestion and widening Old Banff Coach Rd and improving the size and flow the Old Banff Coach Rd/Bow Tr intersection and the Sarcee/Bow Tr intersection would also be needed to allow for appropriate flow before the construction is finished.</p>
<p>There will be a SIGNIFICANT amount of traffic funnelling onto 77th, and there is a proposed T intersection against housing! That is terrible. This was clearly stated in the last session as not being sensitive to the existing neighbourhoods. There are two viable other intersections that could be used. It is not appropriate to ignore the residents along this road. Please move that intersection! This is by far the worst part of the plan. I also know it goes against city policy.</p>
<p>Should collector streets not connect with other collector steets?</p> <p>Why does the proposed westward way end in a useless t-intersection on 77th when it could so much easier connect with weston drive? If the plan is connect communities and actually integrate the current west springs with the west district, connect those communities through weston drive not ending at a t intersection on 77th street. Creating more intersections (such as that at 77th street and west ward way) as opposed to using current ones (weston drive), creates more light and sound pollution, decreased public transit connectivity, and fails to connect both communities.</p> <p>As per current city of calgary development guidelines, the plan is to REDUCE T -INTERSECTIONS AND DEAD</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

ENDS, and connect the community in a more grid like fashion, thus reducing traffic congestion. Use roundabouts instead of 4 way stops. Come on Calgary, put your own guidelines to work here.
Westward way ends at 77th in a t-intersection in your current plan. This fails to connect west springs with the new district. Why is there separation and not connectivity? It is clear that the new district plans to use our roadways, but this design very obviously keeps the current homeowners of the west springs out of the west district. Why would we drive zig zag into the west district. Zig zag means more traffic congestions, more intersections and more potential for unsafe pedestrian areas. Why on earth would west ward way not connect straight through to weston drive? It makes so much sense in terms of transit, pedestrian traffic, schoolchildren, light pollution, noise pollution and existing infrastructure. weston drive and 77th is already an intersection, why not use this existing infrastructure??
No there is no actual details about what the “transportation hub” actually is or how it functions.
No, see above.
If they built buildings for over 45 + there might not be as big of an impact on the transportation system at specific community challenges during the day.
Sort of. All I learned is that the buildings won't be phased in until ring road is complete. Congestion is a serious issue already - especially at bow/69. This develop will only feed the problem.
This is a good start. I think the road enhancements need to occur before construction of the buildings as the congestion in the neighbourhood is already problematic. Sidewalks also need to be a priority for children/families trying to walk through the communities and to/from school.
No. The majority of the transportation improvements are unfunded. Until the funding is available and the construction has started, the developments should not proceed. Traffic on Bow Trail, 85 Street, 69 Street and Old Banff Coach Road will be unmanageable when the South West Ring Road is opened and this will increase congestion even more. The West Ring Road must be built. The other improvements must be built. Then the building development can proceed.
Again the word "reduction" is used here. It's fairly obvious when you ask anyone who's ever been in a negotiation that a very basic tactic is to ask for much more than you'll likely get and then scale back your demands so that they seem more acceptable. I'm surprised that the city would "fall" for this with Developers. If you look at the rest of the West Hill, I can't think of any other area that has buildings more than 3-4 stories high. So why is it all of a sudden acceptable in West Springs? In particular, given we (and Cougar Ridge) are squeezed in along the Slopes and Bow Trail does not have an overpass with Sarcee. I've reviewed your Upgrades pdf linked above and see that much of the plans are unfunded.
Again: Absolutely NOT! The infrastructure (as it currently exists) is woefully inadequate for the current population. The "upgrades" we have recently received do next to nothing (specifically, the additional south bound lane of 85th at Bow Trail and the additional left turn lane from Bow Trail to southbound 85th). We leave the house at 6:50 am to bring the kids to daycare and head downtown for work. Southbound traffic on 85th is frequently lined up beyond the lights at Wentworth Drive. The twinning of Bow Trail would improve traffic TODAY. The Ring Road remains full of unanswered questions (and mysterious timelines), COP has closed their private road; leaving an overtaxed Bow Trail and OBCR as the only routes in and out of the area for the foreseeable future. I shudder to think of the traffic headaches the (much needed and long overdue) twinning of Bow will create. I fail to see the logic in dramatically increasing the population and density at the same time. As for public transportation, huge improvements in bussing would be necessary or an additional parkade at 69th street station would be required. With two small children, we cannot rely on public transportation to get us to the daycare on time at the end of the day.
Not really. There is no time schedules for these projects, just what is funded and what isn't.
Not sure - it is hard to imagine Bow trail, even with the improvement, being able to support all the new residents plus the increased traffic from Stoney Trail.
Let's face it, traffic will be a nightmare. That's why I would like to see a proposed development phase plan timeline. Also can the City please publish the traffic impact studies on the development online or provide the link to where one can find them.

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>No, there is no infrastructure to support and new development. Traffic is still horrible and the changes made so far are making things worse. There are lights everywhere and no flow to traffic. I wait 4 or 5 lights before I am able to turn onto Bow trail from 85th between the hours of 3:30 and 5:15. The lights on 85th and 9th are a nightmare when leaving Wentworth. The roads can not accommodate the area now and can only imagine how bad they will be if this development goes through.</p>
<p>Proposed T intersection onto 77th will be terrible! That road will be a feeder road with maximum amount of traffic. There will be constant noise and headlight pollution onto the housing! This is not necessary and can be avoided by having the intersection line up with an existing intersection. They can put in a round about at that intersection too</p>
<p>This does not adequately address transportation issues. There already is an issue either transportation and there is essentially one exit off the hill. Nothing is addressing transportation , as the City would like to add 1700 plus vehicles to a clogged road system</p>
<p>The major proposed changes that remedy the existing traffic issues are unfunded with no proposed timelines. Additional development should not occur until firm timelines and funding are in place for these upgrades. Additional congestion is not acceptable.</p>
<p>Will modifications to the proposed right road be completed to allow north and south exits/entrances onto the new ring road off of old Banff coach rd?</p>
<p>No upgrades have been proposed for the 9th Ave and 85th intersection. What will be done to ensure traffic both east and west through the intersection?</p>
<p>This is a positive change to have developments progressed AFTER the infrastructure is completed. A significant number of the required transportation projects that have been identified as needed for the proposed ASP amendment to progress.</p>
<p>85th Street and bow trail are already a mess. They can't handle current capacity let alone this type of change. Difficult to get out of the area. Parking in the area for retail services for stores, etc are already full on a regular basis.</p>
<p>Ok so the city wants to move to a grid system to alleviate traffic concerns- YES! let's do this. So my question is why are there going to be 3 t intersections along 77 street? You should eliminate the t-intersections and put intersections where they connect with the existing community, allowing both new district residents and existing homeowners access to the both commonutines and their ammenities. Connect the westward way with Weston Drive and eliminate the t-intersection there and the 2 farther up on 77 street. This will connect the communities, transit, pedestrians. Let's make this grid system happen, it will make for a much happier community in terms of commutes.</p>
<p>No - pls see above. Already becoming unmanageable at peak periods. Adding 1700 plus units will exacerbate it.</p>
<p>Plus, 85th Ave seems to under chronic construction over the last 10 years....every year it seems it's ripped up to re-do something. Adding all the new occupants and vehicles will once again require renovation of his roadway, creating more short term pain for what is seemingly marginal gain....we don't need more units up there until you can provide schools, etc.</p>
<p>No! All of the necessary changes, especially bow trail and sarcee, remain UNFUNDED.</p>
<p>I like the idea of the grid systems to alleviate traffic congestion but it isn't being applied to 77 steet. There will be 3 t intersections! This isn't connecting to the existing community, will create additional congestion and noise pollution, doesn't connect transit smartly, doesn't use existing intersections wisely and will decrease safety for commuters and residents. Move the westward way to Weston drive instead of a t intervention mid 77th- this just makes sense. Use roundabouts as well to reduce congestion.</p>
<p>No. See above.</p>
<p>No. Numerous intersections (the only way off the hill for wscr residents) have been at failure for years (old banff coach road and bow trail, bow trail at sarcee). Any increase in density before these problems are addressed should not be allowed. Furthermore, the traffic study assumed that the brawn land will be all seniors resident - I have had direct communication the developer who indicates the building along 85 street will likely be multi-family. The traffic study did not take this into account. No mention was made to residents about an additional traffic light that would be</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>added to 85 street that would add significantly to our difficulties in getting in and out of our community. I was told by the planner at this open house that all of this congestion and intersection failures are not city planners problem, they are our council person's problem. This isn't an acceptable approach to community planning.</p>
<p>I think the proposed change would start to get the traffic moving but would prefer to see at least some of the upgrades completed before the construction starts. It would ease the construction traffic to and from the sites and start to get traffic moving for the current residents. In the past it seems like the traffic concerns are always last and can take years to complete and would rather they start with these changes first.</p>
<p>Suburban transportation networks are pretty bad outside of those served directly by the LRT. When the option is to take the LRT from within your community, that's not a bad option, at least when heading downtown.</p> <p>Beyond that, when the option is to take a satellite bus into an LRT then suddenly that's not a very desirable option. It more than doubles commute time and in the winter it's really no fun to stand around waiting for a bus, and at that point people are just either going to drive to the LRT or drive to their destination. Neither of those scenarios are going to get cars off the road so I think it's a fallacy to believe that a neighbourhood built right next to a major transportation network (the West Ring Road) and no LRT option will become a transit focused community. It's not going to have a meaningful impact on getting cars off the road.</p>
<p>No, there will still be significant congestion on Bow Trail and Old Banff Coach Road, with the density proposed as well as traffic coming off of the SWCRR going into downtown.</p>
<p>I foresee a lot of traffic congestion along 77th street with 3 t intersections relatively close to one another. The westward way should be eliminated and should not terminate at 77th in the middle of nowhere, but should connect further south at westward drive. This is already an intersection, and creating additional intersections unnecessarily increases congestion, reduces safety and encourages light and noise pollution.</p>
<p>as per the diagrams provided the collector roads of westward way and weston drive do not connect. Why?? This only makes sense to connect the two communities and provide an additional exit out of the district and west springs- moving it up to a hazard prone t intersection higher up and creating a whole new intersection doesnt make any sense. I was told prior that the storm water pond is the reason for it being diverted higher up. The storm water pond should not be central to the community development- it can be moved since there is no storm water pond or pond at all in existence currently.</p> <p>stop creating intersections that do not need to be there- 3 t-intersections along 77th doesnt make any sense. Move it so that there is a 4 way stop or light at weston drive.</p>
<p>The transportation issue will go away if you do not have the density. Lower density equals lower traffic. Also, having a T intersection onto a row of housing is ridiculous. This does NOT consider the sensitivity of the housing, and will create a significant amount of noise and light pollution onto the housing. If nothing else gets addressed, this should be the biggest one.</p>
<p>roundabouts, bike lands and no more dead ends and t-intersections. I thought the city was moving to a grid system where collector streets meet up- so why do we have two connectors meeting at 77th in different spots? They should clearly meet together at an intersection with lights. This makes so much more sense and lessens the impact on the community by using existing intersections, not creating new ones that will be disruptive to areas that did not have an intersection. For example, westward way should be moved to meet up with the collector of weston drive. Let's use some common sense here.</p>
<p>The infrastructure will never support such a high density development. It is physically impossible to create an infrastructure plan to cope with the pending traffic. The city's justification for the plan is to have more busses??? That is not going to work. People who need to get anywhere will drive. The current plan will be pushing most of the traffic on 77th, and the current plan has a T intersection. This is not a great idea, this will create a huge amount of noise.</p>
<p>NO, too much density. all of the changes will still create a significant amount of noise and light pollution in the area. Especially along 77th. The T intersection onto 77th needs to be removed. It is not right to pose that kind of lights onto those houses.</p>
<p>Very concerned with the flow of traffic as this west end of the city is now having to be faced with fragmented parcels and each time there is a development the roads get torn up to put in services and all at the detriment of current</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>residents . Certainly not an effective way to use tax dollars. Here is hoping that maybe the new Ward Councillor in conjunction with city officials can work together to get developers to wait and buy up larger parcels before issuing development permits. Otherwise there is more wear and tear not just on roadways but existing residents wellbeing as they try to comfortably in the comfort of their home</p>
<p>I understand the communities concerns regarding transportation but I think these are more than being dealt with in the proposed changes. I have lived in the area for close to 10 years and have enjoyed a very easy morning commute and quick access to where I need to be. I have lived in other areas of the city and other major cities like Toronto which are far far worse.</p>
<p>Once again, there are minor changes that really have not impacted the overall concerns that were addressed. If a grid system is desired for the city to manage traffic flow, then why are we still seeing t intersections and connector roads not connecting with the connector roads of the existing west springs. I am particularly confused with the connector road going from 85th straight through to 77th street, failing to meet at 77th with no other connectors, when a mere 50 m to the south is a connector in west springs, weston drive. This doesn't make any sense at all. Why create additional noise, excess light at an area that is not designed for an intersection. Weston drive is already an intersection, why not use this area- connect pathways (which already terminate there), and transit which also already has multiple stops there.</p>
<p>Still concerned the Bow/Sarcee interchange is not funded yet. I would assume the West Ring Road would probably get funding first so then how far down the list would the Bow/Sarcee interchange be? Getting off the hill will be even more congested</p>
<p>Before any new buildings are added to West Springs, the deficiencies in the transportation network need to be addressed. The Bow Trail/Sarcee intersection is one of the most congested intersections in the city. I implore the city to upgrade to an over/underpass interchange to allow for efficient flow of traffic at this point ("E" in the Transportation Improvements Report). This type of interchange was necessary 5-10 years ago and is still unfunded by the City of Calgary. The same goes for the West Ring Road. Presently there is no efficient connection from the western part of the city to the northwest/ south west quadrants. We desperately need a corridor! Why entertain the idea of further congesting the area if the transportation network is insufficient for today's density. Adding 1700 additional units is still too much. If additional units will be added to the area then the c-train should also be extended to 85th street.</p>
<p>There are serious transportation issues with the existing population. These need to be addressed asap or resistance to growth will become worse, not better. Leaving the neighbourhood is too difficult. Capacity issues on Bow Trail, 85 Street and Old Banff Coach Road are problematic for 3-4 hours/day. Bow Trail Sarcee interchange is very slow (especially for those proceeding North on Sarcee). Sarcee and 16th Ave connection is worse since the pedestrian upgrades along 16 Ave NW, and Sarcee is backed up (doubling or tripling commute times 3-4 hours/day). A ring road connection out of the neighbourhood is vital to accommodate increased capacity - however it may create MORE drive through traffic (necessitating Bow Trail upgrades).</p>
<p>Infrastructure in the area can still not handle the proposed increased in population and use. Have you ever driven down OBCR during even a slight change to precipitation? Or bow trail? It is a skating rink or a parking lot depending on the season.</p> <p>77th street is already a super highway for speeders. This road is used extensively by students walking and biking to school and commuters. The proposed connector status of this street will make this even worse. there is no safe place for cyclists and the addition of the intersection at 77th street and westward ave is going to be a disaster. This will create a backlog of traffic that would be better shifted to weston drive which is already a connector street in the community. Those leaving the west district to head downtown will clog up 77th street with all the dangerous T intersections and lead to massive backlog. Why not connect the westward ave to weston drive so that at least some of the traffic can filter through west springs out to OBCR instead of having limited access to OBCR through 77th street along.</p>
<p>The addition of 2 more T intersections along 77th street will reduce this privacy further. There will be a total of 4 T intersections between 9th ave and OBCR- WHAT? that is ridiculous. Stop creating intersections and connect current roads with new roads such as weston drive and westward way. You will create dangerous intersections that will greatly threaten the safety of students travelling to local schools. Eliminate west ward ave exiting on 77th street and</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>connect westward way to 77th instead. You will connect 3 connectors at the same place, which certainly makes a lot more sense for having a light, transit, intersection safety. Putting in new intersections create pollution (light, noise and exhaust) and 77th has enough of that already.</p>
<p>There are still far too many buildings for the amount of road space. The traffic given the introduction of that many units would still cause significant congestion on old banff coach road all the way to bow trail.</p>
<p>There are currently 2 t-intersections along 77th street. By the proposed grid model, these are to be eliminated, right? But now it is being proposed that 2 additional t-intersections be added to this. I am confused by the lack of alignment of the city goals and truman's designs. Westward ave looks like it is to be a major road through the district, yet it ends in a t-intersection? It seems to make more sense to have westward ave terminating at 77th street where weston drive meets- thus creating a 4 way intersection. This would be appropriate for a traffic light, connecting of connector routes of travel, adding an exit route via weston drive out to Old banff coach road. This would also connect pathways through the area. 4 way intersections are much more controlled than t intersections. 4 way intersections with lights are safer for pedestrians. Weston drive is already a intersection so why not utilize it?</p>
<p>As well, there is a road that connects to 77th but does not connect with an existing road making a T intersection. This makes no sense what so ever and should be connected to Weston manner to ensure lights are not going into existing homes as well as starts and stops behind their houses. Icy roads and flying though intersections is also not a great idea when you are going into someone else back yard which may or may not have kids playing.</p>
<p>no, the proposed changes are mostly unfunded and require government, i.e taxpayer support. this is not a tenable formula and unconscionable. the developer will profit while the people pay. the only solution is 100% funding of these upgrades solely from the developer. the city is not in a fiscally abundant position and with a new Councillor the fear is there will be deals and arrangements made that benefit a privileged few while actually paid for by the citizenry. the provided visuals appear too bustling for the community as is and does not fit the current style and development of west spring or the neighboring communities like aspen and cougar ridge. it appears more like macleod trail south. perhaps advise the developer to seek a site there. should those that move in commute downtown the roadways are already congested and the improved parking at sirocco is already nearing capacity while 69th ave is above capacity. there is not the infrastructure to improve public transit to the core.</p>
<p>The major road of west ward ave is incorrectly placed. This leads to a dead end t intersection at 77ths, failing to connect with transit of weston drive. This will create a new intersection when one is not currently, and not needed. It makes much more sense to connect west springs to the west district via westward way. The current proposal goes completely against the west springs area plan created in 2012 under which many people purchased their homes by.</p>
<p>We are not satisfied with this as well. OBCR cannot handle the traffic and the west lag of stoney is years off. Regardless of how fast or slow this west district is built, the area does not have the capacity for such a giant leap in population. 77th will become a congested, polluted road of emissions as it is not built to handle the capacity, and by adding additional intersections that do not connect to other connectors as exit points such as failing to connect to weston drive, is going to make congestion heavy. No longer will 77th be a pedestrian and cyclist favorite, and school children will not use it to bike to school because of the dangers of poorly controlled t intersections. Stop putting in t-intersections and connect the main roads of west springs to exit points such as directly to OBCR and weston drive. leave 77th street north of weston drive alone! the noise and light pollution alone is enough to drive residents to sell.</p>
<p>No. There absolutely needs to be a street light at Old Banff and 89th (at the A&W). Someone (likely a child) is going to get killed there. No, the increase of people is not met with reliable transit options and turns our neighbourhood streets into freeways.</p>
<p>Our transportation system is not efficient up here. Good luck getting a bus off the hill in rush hour once this new community is built.</p>
<p>I am not satisfied with the plan. There is no timeline on the upgrades to provide more than a 2 lane exit off the hill towards downtown for a large number of communities in Westsprings Cougar Ridge and Wentworth. You note the developer is responsible for funding 85th and Old Banff Coach Roud to 4 lanes, yet several developments are underway in the area and there is no plan in place for eastbound OBCR to become a 2 lane segment. The bandaid for 2 lanes on 85th st to turn eastbound on Bow trail can only help a little since traffic immediately will have to merge</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>to single lane traffic. Don't put higher density in without the roads to support it! Get the developers to make these roadways happen or they don't get to put in their development.</p>
<p>It's good to see an acknowledgment that development will be phased as transportation infrastructure is constructed. But your transportation upgrades document has an awful lot of unfunded projects on it. I want you to lay out on one page the transportation upgrades next to the developments/phases so I can easily see what's tied to what and that community concerns have truly been heard and thought through in the planning.</p>
<p>No- 77th street and OBCR cannot handle this increased traffic. The addition of more intersections along 77th street will only make it worse. Eliminate the t intersection at 77th street that is across from weston court, and move this intersection down to create a 4 way intersection at weston drive instead. Why create more noise from car, excess lighting and congestion in an area that does not already have an intersection. The roads of connectors need to connect through to west springs community via weston drive.</p>
<p>No. Most of the proposed infrastructure upgrades are 'unfunded' and there is not certainty that they will be completed in advance of the development. The City must ensure that no development can proceed in advance of getting those project updated. Even with those projects, the public transit system is not sufficient for a development of this nature which should be situated along an LRT line only.</p>
<p>No, these changes are what should be in place NOW with the population we have here, not including the high rises already being built along with other high density housing. Traffic is terrible in this part of the city. I've seen cars tracking traffic in the middle of the day on Wednesday when traffic is at its lightest. Traffic needs to be tracked at it's worst. Additionally, try parking at 69th street station past 6:30 while most 'reserved' spots sit empty (I have pictures) although we are told they are all taken up. The system does not work.</p>
<p>I went to the open house, I read all the reports but there is so much vague information here. There is a lack of funding, lack of timelines and really a lack of details in general. 77th street will become a congested mess with all the roads emptying onto it, especially the main one of westward ave. Westward ave should be shifted to connect with weston drive. There is no rationale provided as to why this main road is not connecting with weston drive which is already an exit point for the community. There are pathways, an existing intersection and transit at weston drive. The road is already a main connector in the community, so why are we not utilizing this? Why is westward ave terminating at a t intersection on 77th when it could terminate at a 4 way intersection and connect the new communities. It is very obvious that the goal is to create west district as separated from the existing community. Isn't the goal to connect communities, not separate them?</p>
<p>I presume that the developer will pay for the transportation infrastructure versus tax payers. If not why not?</p>
<p>No</p>
<p>- STONEY TRAIL NEEDS TO BE FINISHED BEFORE THE BUILDING CAN START AS THE AREA CAN'T HANDLE THE INCREASE IN TRAFFIC - 77TH WILL BE SO CONGESTED, AS WILL OLD BANFF COACH ROAD. SOME TRAFFIC NEEDS TO FILTER OFF ONTO 85TH AND ONTO WESTON DRIVE. MOVE THE WESTWARD AVE OFF 77TH AND CONNECT IT THROUGH WESTON DRIVE SO TRAFFIC CAN FLOW OUT OF THE DISTRICT THAT WAY AS WELL</p>
<p>No it doesn't. The demand on the current infrastructure right now is incredible. For anyone to say that adding more residential to the area obviously does not drive these road ways. They are in ridiculously congested. Getting off "the hill" in rush hour traffic is a nightmare especially in winter. Reviewing the two changes outlined to the road infrastructure is hilarious!!!!!! You need to do better than that City of Calgary!!!! Fix the insanely dumb interchange of Sarcee and Bow Trail which should be an overpass. However that still won't fix the remaining portion of Bow Trail from Sarcee to 37th Street. People who are in charge of making these devious should be forced to drive the roads during winter for a couple of months then see what your opinion is.</p>
<p>Sincerely Not Impressed</p>
<p>No, OBCR and 77th street do not have the capacity for the population or the associated vehicular traffic. These streets are both lined with homes. People live here. We did not move in to live on major roadways that will pollute our yards with vehicle emissions, noise and light pollution.</p>
<p>- limit traffic on 77th and OBCR by offloading more traffic to bow trail and 85th street which was always designed to</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

<p>be a larger capacity roadways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mitigate the effects of traffic with removing t-intersection, putting in heavily treed streets and high fences, limiting parking on streets, putting in roundabouts and no creating new intersections along 77th where they do not currently exist. - remove the proposed t intersections of 77th street and connect them to existing roadways such as weston drive and 9th ave and north to OBCR and especially west to 85th street.
<p>No. There is still too much density for our roads and intersections to handle.</p>
<p>Unless you're planning to change 85 st to 4-5 lanes each way, the proposed change doesn't help unless we lower the density to 1000 units.</p>
<p>The proposed transportation solutions are not going to help. The current issues is the amount of people they are planning to cram into a small area. This part of the city was not designed for this type of traffic. You can't pretend that by having more busses making lots of noise through these neighbourhoods will elevate traffic issues. Similar to the thought that by adding bike lanes, you get the same result. There was a reason there was an original plan that was based on the low density.</p> <p>The other MAJOR concern in the plan is to have a T intersection to terminate at the base of existing houses. This MUST be changed. Given the proposed number of cars and (VERY LOUD) buses, starting and stopping will be a significant impact on the residents. There needs to be some level of sensitivity to the existing residents. I have heard the city say that they don't like to have T intersections like this. Please remove from the plan. they can easily move the street to meet up with one of the other existing intersections.</p>
<p>There should NOT be a T intersection that stops onto the houses on 77th. This will not only cause a significant amount of lights into the living rooms of the houses, it will increase the level of noise as people will be stoping and starting. The current busses that travel along 77th are extremely loud. They are significantly louder than any other mode of transport, by increasing the number of busses will make this worse.</p>
<p>The current transportation plan has a T intersection that will back onto housing on 77th. This road should be moved. There was very clear feedback on this issue and it was ignored. It will create a significant amount of light pollution on the houses. This will definitely affect the housing prices of these houses. The city can not disagree with this. So unless, they plan to compensate the homeowners, they should remove it.</p>
<p>Remove the intersection planned just west of Weston Court and have one continuous street along 77th. Install traffic calming measures (bike lanes, roundabouts, etc) to ensure safety of pedestrians and bikers also 77th.</p>
<p>No it does not.</p>
<p>The loud noise and light pollution of the T intersection onto 77th needs to be changed. This is the WORST part of the entire plan.</p>
<p>NO, the upgrades will not fix the problems. The density is the problem, this part of the city is not designed for this many people. You can not fix it.</p>
<p>There is a major issue with having the T intersection that is proposed to back onto the houses on 77th. This is not taking into consideration the extreme amount of light and noise. The CITY has an obligation to be sensitive to the existing houses, therefore they can not approve this change.</p>
<p>NO, they need to remove the intersection that backs onto the houses on 77th. Noise and light pollution will be brutal. I know this is against city policy. Please move, PLEASE!!!</p>
<p>The intersection at Old Banff Coach Rd and 89th street is now quite congested and a traffic signal should be strongly considered</p>
<p>No unfortunately some general ideas were shared and no detail answer to questions are provided. For example, adding two lanes to Bow Trail between 85 and old banff cannot solve transportation bottleneck on Sarcee and Bow Trail junction that already exists. How City is going to handle extra 3000 cars?</p>
<p>I cant tell what the actual upgrades will be or what the plan is. Old Banff Coach and Bow Trial is a nightmare in the morning, very aggressive driving with people trying to get into the left turning lanes. There needs to be another / better artery out to accommodate the existing traffic let alone this proposed development.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>No. The West Ring Road won't be finished for a number of years, and that would really be the only transportation improvement to alleviate the strain in this area. This development is on the north side of the West Springs ASP Area. The key roads that logically need to be improved to benefit this area are Old Banff Coach Road, 77th Street and 85th Street north of Bow Trail. As it is now, Old Banff Coach Road and 85th Street are the only two roads that actually allow a person to get in or out of the neighbourhood. When there is an accident in these areas, a person is literally trapped in there with nowhere feasible to go. None of the presented improvements give me any indication as to how they will alleviate transportation issues around the proposed development area. How does a dual left turn from Bow to southbound 85th Street alleviate transportation issues on northbound 85th Street between Bow Trail and Old Banff Coach Road? Old Banff Coach Road between Bow Trail & 85th Street is the key roadway that needs some kind of improvement to address the transportation issues in this area.</p>
<p>None of the proposed public transit changes give me any information of substance, so I cannot rely on that information to make a comment that relates to public transit.</p>
<p>No- 77th street and OBCR cannot handle this increased traffic. The addition of more intersections along 77th street will only make it worse. Eliminate the t intersection at 77th street that is across from weston court, and move this intersection down to create a 4 way intersection at weston drive instead. Why create more noise from car, excess lighting and congestion in an area that does not already have an intersection. The roads of connectors need to connect through to west springs community via weston drive.</p>
<p>Yes. As long as the development happens AFTER the upgrades to transportation. Not before and certainly not during.</p>
<p>77th street is going to be a super highway. The addition of more intersections, primarily t-intersections is going to create immense traffic congestion. The proposed changes do not reflect the impact to this road and the residents that live along it. If you were to connect the area to weston drive, much of the traffic will be offloaded to weston drive which is an additional exit point from the community via 73rd to OBCR.</p>
<p>Create the majority of exits and entrances to the community to 85th street which will directly lead onto OBCR and bow trail. Bow trail will be expanded to handle this pressure so push the traffic south instead of north.</p>
<p>OLD BANFF ROAD AND 77TH STREET CANNOT HANDLE THE TRAFFIC- PEOPLE LIVE ALL ALONG THIS ROAD. PUSH THE TRAFFIC OUT TOWARDS 85TH STREET AND BOW TRAIL WHERE IT IS MORE CAPABLE OF HANDLING TRAFFIC AND CAUSES DISTURBANCES TO FAR FEWER RESIDENTS. 77TH HAS FAR TOO MANY T-INTERSECTIONS. DELETE SOME OF THESE AND MOVE MAJOR ROADS TO CONNECT WITH EXISTING ROADS SUCH AS WESTON MANOR AND WESTON DRIVE IF EXIT ROUTES TO 77TH ARE NEEDED. CREATING NEW INTERSECTIONS WHERE THERE ARE NOT ANY (IE. ALONG 77TH STREET) INCREASES EMISSIONS, ACCIDENTS AND NOISE.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the density remains too high for the area. The roadways where the majority of the traffic appears to filter onto (77th street and oBCR), are in no way equipped to handle this now or even with improvements. 77th street and OBCR are entirely lined with homes, 85th and bow trail is not. Push the entrance and the exit points to 85th to remove traffic from the community that way. - there remains so few of the transportation upgrades to the area that are funded. There should not be a single shovel in teh ground until there is committed funding for everything, and before these projects are completed. - Congestion along 77th street will be a nightmare, push the traffic out to 85th street where it can be handled better by bow trail. 77th street is residential with countless homes on it. 77th does not need the major collectors of west district emptying onto it at t-intersections mid street, but should connect with roads already in existence for collectors to empty onto like weston manor or weston drive. Creating new intersections will not only dramatically drop property values of those along 77th street, but increase the safety hazards, noise, traffic light pollution, emissions.
<p>again, ridiculous to think that the transportation network can handle the proposed reduced density. Stoney trail is so far down the line and who knows, may never get built. Then we are stuck with limited routes off the hill.</p>
<p>No. These projects are unfunded and may not happen.</p>
<p>AGAIN, NOT FULLY. ANY APPROVAL OF A NEW DEVELOPMENT SHOULD INCLUDE A THOROUGH PRIOR EVALUATION OF</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>TRAFFIC IMPACT ON EXISTING RESIDENTS. NECESSARY UPGRADES MUST BE COMPLETED BEFORE ANY APPROVALS. THE WEST END OF STONEY TRAIL IS NOT FUNDED FOR AT THIS POINT IN TIME</p>
<p>85th street and bow trail are the only roads capable of handling increased capacity. these were always designed to be major roads, Old Banff coach road and 77th street were not build for this purpose. - Even if modifications are made, traffic congestion along 77th and old Banff road will be beyond a tolerable limit for the community. congestion leads to vehicle emissions, excess NOISE from traffic, extra streetlamp causing light pollution. - the addition of more intersections of 77th will push too much traffic to that road and all the residents along that road will suffer as a result. The traffic should be pushed to more exit/entry points on 85th street when they can leave the area via bow trail. - remove the t-intersections created along 77th street and only put roads from the west district that join in with existing intersections such as Weston manor and Weston drive. why create new hazards, more noise and more light when a current intersection is more suitable.</p>
<p>77th street is not built for congestion and the changes proposed cannot handle it. The parking will be atrocious, congestion and associated exhaust from cars will ruin the road for anyone living along it. 85th street is designed for this traffic. Westward ave connects to it, so why not have this road connect right through the west district to Weston drive instead of the through road leading to a dead end at 77th at people's backyard?! a single entrance/exit to 85th street!?! are you kidding? This is supposed to be a major community hub and you have only one exit and entrance? The majority of the west district should be diverted to 85th street so that they can use bow trail, the ONLY road in the area that will handle this density.</p>
<p>Widening Bow and Sarcee Trails is definitely a must for the area. I still see problems with Bow Trail being the only exit from the area to downtown with such an increase in population. I believe that phasing the construction to parallel are improvements is a wise and fiscally sound decision.</p>
<p>bike lanes have not been proposed. they occur in strathcona, along their major feeder roads so why not put one alone the east side of 77th street for minimal interruption by intersections. commuters and families would benefit from this.</p>
<p>85th street is the major hub road for the area, yet only one exit from the west district drains onto it. why? 85th street is the easiest route to bow trail and stoney trail, is already built for high traffic flow and density. push the traffic away from existing communities of cougar ridge and 77th street onto 85th where it is better suited.</p>
<p>The proposed access is from both 77 street as well as 11th Avenue. In view of the City's commitment to existing landowners in the area, I request that access to the homes in the development site be limited to access from 77 Street only. Access from 11 Avenue should either be permanently prohibited (in which case Westmore Manor SW would become a cul-de-sac) or alternatively, access from 11 Avenue should be restricted until such time as the property immediately south of the development property is developed. In this way, the impact of additional vehicles on 11 Avenue SW will be reduced and yet access to the development site will be fully enabled through the 77 street access point. Please note that the left hand turn from 77 street to 11 avenue is an uncontrolled intersection and I can say from first hand experience that such left hand turns should be restricted as much as possible as it is a dangerous corner due to left turning traffic on Wentworth Drive which consider they have the full right of way.</p>
<p>We continually have construction blocking access to roads, reducing roads to single lanes, etc.. This is not a "short term" pain because it has been happening every year since we moved here (2005!)</p>
<p>No they do not. According to the Transportation Improvements document nearly all of the projects remain unfunded. The West portion of the ring road remains unfunded with no timeline in place for even starting construction. The piecemeal improvements that have been made to 85th street and Bow Trail intersection over the past 18 months have not improved the flow of traffic from the area and intersections remain backed up requiring 3 or 4 lights to get through even during non-peak hours. Increasing the population of this area without improving the infrastructure will result in additional congestion and potential accidents. I am also confused why these projects involve crews mobilizing and demobilizing from site repeatedly over the course of a year rather than moving in and completing the job in one stretch which would be much more cost efficient than the way it's been completed.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>The reduction in density from the original proposal will help with traffic congestion however most of the upgrades proposed for the infrastructure are unfunded. As such, any significant increase in density will have a large impact on the current infrastructure which is already overwhelmed. It is my view since the infrastructure plans are unfunded, further reductions in density should be required.</p>
<p>Not at all. Essentially the density factor is still far too high for accommodation in the middle of single family homes. There is only Old Banff Coach Road, 85th Street & Bow Trail, which is now under construction, that are feeder routes into downtown. Adding significantly to the existing traffic volumes on these roadways is truly reprehensible on the City of Calgary.</p>
<p>The proposed density is too dense because we are too far away from the nearest CTrain station. Buses will have to compete with congested traffic to get people out of the area.</p>
<p>Yes - more than adequately. Over time, the use of existing roadways will be much more efficient, and transit will play a more vital role in all communities in Calgary. Stoney Trail (when built) and the upgrades to Bow Trail SW will provide more than adequate connections to allow egress and entry into the area from all directions.</p>
<p>The "funnel" that now exists on Bow Trail is temporary, and should not factor into long term planning for this area.</p>
<p>No. The hill traffic is already beyond capacity. The proposed changes would alleviate the problems that exist NOW, but with the proposed additional residents, the traffic gridlock will be ridiculous. When an accident or weather conditions occur, it takes several hours for traffic to clear on the hill. As the major transportation improvements are stated as "unfunded", it is premature to consider this type of development until transportation upgrades are completed to support the type of increase in population the new development will bring to the area. The proposed development will experience a great volume of traffic with the amount of businesses and retail it intends to provide. As well, Old Banff Coach Road, 85th and 77th Street will experience increased levels of traffic to gain access to the new development, making our community less of a family residential area to more of a commercial area. The noise from the increased traffic will also affect our community. If communities in Aspen continue to experience growth, they will also impact the use of Bow Trail. This needs to be considered as well.</p>
<p>As mentioned above, three intersections are currently at failure. NO additional construction should be taking place. The City is notorious for continuing to build and let traffic infrastructure, schools and community infrastructure continue to fail and lag behind.</p>
<p>Absolutely unacceptable abuse of power and desire for money at the expense of citizens and communities.</p>
<p>I'm not an expert at determining the degree which the proposed transportation changes will make an impact on alleviating the future traffic congestion. My main concern is how this work might impact my property taxes. At the information session, the representatives I spoke to, there was no one who could confidently speak to this concern.</p>
<p>See comments above.</p>
<p>There are no transportation changes proposed that I can see that will logically improve the traffic in the area of the development. You're just adding more people to the north side of west springs, but not changing any of the transportation in that specific area (i.e., 85th street north of bow trail and old banff coach road). Again, other developments are already underway in this area, and density is being added there. We haven't seen the density impact yet from those developments that are underway, and the roads are already struggling to meet current density in this area. When you add this new west springs development, to the existing and developing areas, it's just going to be a mess. 85th street north of bow trail and old banff coach road need improvements. None of the proposed public transit changes show anything to me of substance that will indicate an improvement. Until improved transit measures are actually in place, I will not accept that it will actually happen.</p>
<p>There is already transportation issues in this area without any additional development so the changes don't do much. Additionally there will be increase in traffic once the ring road is connected to bow trail because it's the quickest way to down town.</p>
<p>They have been address regarding adding a public transportation hub. Reduce number of parking AND street parking allowed will ensure new residents aren't adding too much to an overload traffic on bow trail.</p>
<p>This is uncertain as the traffic concerns by the residents of west srpings ASP could be easily addressed with the construction of the west ring road by the province. Next valuable upgrade would "G" Bow trail and sarcee interchange/ traffic circle.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>Those changes NEED to be made. I live in Westsprings. I have had it where it takes 15 min to get 1km away from my house. I have had to wait 4 lights to left turn from Westbound Bow Trail to Northbound Sarcee. That ring road needs to be secured in order to offer us another route off the hill. This area of the city has either been neglected, or redundant. Old Banff coach road was ripped up at least once a year for 10 years and 85th street has been a disaster for as long as I can remember.</p>
<p>Happy about the reduction in density, therefore lowered transportation impact.</p>
<p>NO THEY DON'T</p> <p>There is limited access in this community and cramming in 5,000 more people is only going to make traffic congestion worse.</p> <p>I see lots of children and people walking along 77th, putting more cars on the road will just make walking less safe for everyone. The community should be developed with SINGLE FAMILY HOMES in mind, not high density. Keep that downtown where it belongs!!!</p>
<p>No - the fact still remains to make this project feasible transportation needs to be addressed off the Hill. Those of us who have been living on the Hill for 30 years have been waiting for an interchange at Sarcee/Bow Trail. This has been delayed or put on hold for years - even with the continued growth in the area!! If the City puts in the West end of Stoney Trail (the Ring Road) - some of the problems will be alleviated - however neither of these projects are on the immediate list. Therefore the City is going to add ~1800 residential units (so with avg 3 people per unit) around 5400 people and 3600 cars to the area without having addressed any of the CURRENT transportation needs. Everyone is going to be funneled down Bow Trail and the problems will only get worse.....</p>
<p>No they do not!!! There is only project that is committed to begin in 2018. Currently, the recent upgrades do not adequately reduce traffic impact. Logistic issues need to be committed and resolved prior to any increase in the population in the current area. The impact will be further magnified when the West Ring Road has access to Bow Trail. All issues must be resolved.</p> <p>The transportation routes are burdened already and as each new resident lives here, there is incremental stress. Additionally, there is an increase from communities west of the city that travel through the area.</p>
<p>Given that most of the improvements don't have funding, no. Not at all. As well, there are only so many ways off the hill itself and none of the improvements here address the additional demands with respect to getting off the hill. It doesn't help that the recent changes to the Sarcee and 16th interchange seem to have made it HARDER to get on and off the hill, not easier. I can't believe there's just a one-lane off-ramp over the bridge for those of us heading south up Sarcee and that traffic from eastbound 16th has to merge and then merge and merge again. Same with northbound traffic from Sarcee to 16th.</p>
<p>How can we possibly add over 3000 new residents coming and going to work or live with no significant new infrastructure. Stoney trail does not help those going in downtown. 85th street is already congested. When the weather is bad with snow it's meham up here already on the hill.</p>
<p>Current traffic in the area during peak times is already very congested and slow. Transportation needs to be funded and resolved before further development.</p>
<p>None of these "proposed" changes to transportation are funded. The development of this size cannot proceed until there is certainty that these transportation changes can and will be made. Otherwise, the community could find themselves with a massive population increase that would bring already existing significant transportation congestion to a standstill. I own a commercial property that I intentionally purchased to be close to my home (about 10km), and it can routinely take 35 to 45 minutes to travel to my office (and longer in winter) because there is only 1 way off the hill. I also see that there are no proposed improvements for Bow Trail east of Sarcee trail. There are multiple sets of traffic lights heading east on Bow Trail that will not be able to handle an influx of this number of people trying to get into the downtown core.</p>
<p>Furthermore, the city talks about transit solutions to try to move more people. But these are unrealistic expectations as most of the citizens living in this community have families with children. When families are trying to get multiple family members between different activities (i.e. work, school, sporting events with large bags of equipment, music,</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

dance lessons, etc...) throughout the city, it isn't reasonable to expect families to take transit between these various locations.
No. While many of these changes would be very helpful to the current transportation situation in West Springs, they would address the CURRENT situation and not the addition of 3,389 new residents in the area. Also, almost all of these projects are unfunded and therefore, there is no guarantee that some or any of them will actually happen. Once these projects are FUNDED, this type of development application could be considered.
I am satisfied that as long as the DP's are approved as appropriate transportation (roads and transit) infrastructure is in place to accommodate the density, things will be fine. Transit improvements are key. Budgets for sufficient transit improvements are key as there is no option to build more roads and that would also not following a sustainable build model. If we have better transit we can have much higher density. A goal of higher density with more people working locally will result in less demand for roads.
The parking at the 69th St. C-train stop is already full as is the Sirocco. This was not addressed in these panels.
Since all transportation projects are unfunded what triggers funding? I am not confident that there is a robust process in place that restricts development until the transportation infrastructure is in place. It seems like "In place" doesn't restrict a development company at all over the next 20 years to move forward. The City should commit to holding engagement sessions at each transportation milestone to equal to certain development phases. That would be show cause and effect linked to transportation which is by far the biggest concern in any area.
Question 3. Do the proposed changes...adequately address the community ideas & concerns about connectivity that were shared with the City? Tell us why?
Yes. I like the park & plan for recreation.
No bike lanes?? No greened pathways connect old west spring w/ the new area.
Yes!
I didn't see any walking pathways on any of the maps.
- No - Concerns on traffic, noise around development on Old Banff Road, Bow Trail resident - Green space are loosing. But new development are greening.
Not a bike rider. I work to far to take the bikes pathways. Don't work in downtown.
I feel it doesn't meet the needs now then add in 500 more people - Roads can not handle - Traffic is a nightmare - one accident nothing moves.
No
Irrelevant. Traffic is the issue.
Definitely like the emphasis active transportation with walking & cycling pathways - lots of green space.
All these plans show is the interest of the developer. Keep the businesses & condos along 85th 77th should be parks & single residential only (like we were promised).
Pedestrian & cyclists should always be priority #1. Our current infrastructure is inadequate - don't make it worse. We need more crosswalks & traffic calming measures.
No - no matter how you arrange your "grid-based" blocks the influx of people increases the crime from drugs to break and enter to safety and security of families. The most low cost/highrise apt/condo's bring with it and also brings more renters and transists with it.
NO. Bigger park please.
1. Please include a drawing with proposed bike paths. 2. Consider as part of the transportation center a large bike parking with security so people can reach the transportation/transit center. If this doesn't happen the transit center will only benefit the large buildings that are at walking distance.
Grid design appears to be better for motor vehicles and detrimental to pedestrains & cyclists. Vehicles can travel fast.

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

They put in a underground water system but it has been never mentioned. Not a good use of money. Coming off Sarcee Trail up Bow Trail. Bike rides do not stop & go access the turning lane onto the ped where the lights are. Put up a barrier of two 1/2 redevelopments for the off there bike. There is only two polls there.
No, I don't see any regional pathway connection.
NO. I can't see any bike lane in the map. I want to have bigger park and tennis area. A "half" basketball area? Seriously? With all the new residents you are adding? No one would want to live in this area any more.
Yes - multiple options is excellent plus connectivity to network tremendous - walk more, drive less.
More pathways. More green space with path ways should be better.
Seems Ok.
Only time will tell! It is a <u>mess now</u> without more density. We need more bus shelters on the main roads and better bus service. Green space makes a happier, healthier community. Green space adds beauty and <u>class</u> . It needs to be in place <u>before</u> the buildings are built, not eventually, not maybe someday, <u>first!!!</u> Green space should not be an after thought but a fore thought.
Road network and improvements are well designed.
Yes, pathway structure has a good design. Sidewalks are planned for both sides of the road.
Seems ok, except I don't see bike/walking paths. Right now there are pathways cutting <u>through</u> blocks that are only for bikes/pedestrians. That feels much safer & more peaceful than roadside paths. We need areas in the middle that <u>exclude</u> cars/truck/even buses.
Keep the traffic off of 9th Avenue. It is already way beyond capacity
the grid system also promotes cut-through traffic and speeding so traffic mitigation will be very important in the build out.
No
Not really, because these designs and the changes seem to relate to the road system within this development. That is not really what the citizens are concerned with, their concern lies outside this development and how what is already in place out there connects to what is being developed.
We do not need anymore bike lanes. Old Banff Coach Road and Bow Trail need more driving not stupid biking lanes. All the decent walking pathways are the one done by Truman and other developers not the City.
Plans may promote active transportation however density will certainly impact the safety of this pursuit.
Yes, this is much more thought out - especially with kids riding as well as commuters in the dark
ok
The feedback did not ask for better transport of vehicles. It said it wanted less steers and more bike paths and walking trails. Not at all what was asked.
The pathway connections were not illustrated clearly at the open house; city representatives (male) were advising residents that these pathways will not be implemented. The proposed change is actually a lie. Some resident were advise to sell their homes now by city representatives.
It is a step in the right direction.
Safer areas for pedestrians is important and safer roadways are important. Traffic is becoming congested and horrendous. Don't bring more traffic into an already congested area.
No. We were expecting more playground area and more bike lanes. The roads need to be wider than what we have right now. I need more pedestrian paths so that I can walk my dogs.
The connectivity of bike paths are important and presently there are a lot of gaps which will be connected at sometime through the development stage
We need connectivity BETWEEN communities as well. The multi-use pathway (with green space) needs to be extended to connect Cougar Ridge and West Springs (under? over? Old Banff Coach Road). The multi-use pathway needs to connect Aspen and West Springs (the owner is wisely proposing a tunnel UNDER future Bow Trail so wildlife can travel unimpeded through that corridor and also so runners and walkers can easily go through

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>that green space and not up and over Bow Trail). Please do all in your power to make LONG, connected pathways through preserved forest areas.</p>
<p>The proposed changes do not address the community ideas and concerns about connectivity. This development is not what the community wants. The majority of the existing communities are families, with kids that walk to school everyday in a safe environment. We want our kids to continue walking to school like they do today, not in an environment that resembles the busy streets of the Calgary downtown beltline. A highly congested community (even with adequate connectivity) comes with added security issues, safety concerns for our children, and elevated crime concerns like we see in busy inner cities. I wouldn't let me kids walk to school within the busy Calgary downtown beltline, and if this community turns into a lower residential value, highly congested area, it will be home to safety and crime concerns that always follow these types of neighborhoods. You can make it look pretty on conceptual drawings and presentation boards, but take your kids down to the Calgary beltline and ask yourself if this is where kids should be raised. We like our neighborhood the way it is, please don't do this!</p>
<p>How are you going to make it safer? There are no plans for rec centres/ swimming pools/indoor activities. Westside Rec (not a city building) is already way over capacity. The city needs to also put in some resources</p>
<p>Currently there is no regional pathway connection for all of West Springs and Cougar Ridge to Coach Hill and further towards downtown. Local pathways are important and necessary, but that doesn't help if there is no connection to downtown or other communities such as Strathcona and Aspen. A pedestrian overpass over Bow Trail is much needed, especially when Bow Trail will be widened. The pathway along Old Banff Coach Road is not sufficient for shared use of bikes and pedestrians! On a separate note: The standard design of intersections in Calgary for pedestrians and bikers is extremely poor and should be improved: pathways leading nowhere, unconnected bike lanes, location of lowered curbs, room for pedestrians to stand and wait for their signal, etc. (you may want to check European standards).</p>
<p>Allowing proper and safe bicycle and walking paths for existing residents is a start. Adding more residents and vehicles to the mix is not a solution for the residents in the area.</p>
<p>I support increased connectivity and the overall proposal before it's amendments. The density is not reasonable (both residential & commercial) and fails to complement the existing lower density neighbourhoods. I would have liked to see the continuation of the parkway system continue onto OBCR to connect Cougar Ridge with Westsprings. I don't believe 1. With a 20-25% commercial vacancy rate downtown (at a much cheaper lease rate) that the city can even reasonably support 1 million additional sq feet of commercial space. West 85th has had many issues leasing the space they've added. I would recommend that the NE corner commercial space be reconsidered and green space increased as originally proposed.</p>
<p>This one is hard to gauge. We've had so many dangerous situations with crosswalks and roads in general, it's hard to know how safe it will be.</p>
<p>I definitely support more biking access. As it is, there is a large amount of bike traffic along Old Banff Coach road, but it is poorly supported. A dedicated bike path or lane would be ideal. Also, narrower streets to encourage slower speeds. The new development I've seen in the area recently has overly-wide streets which just makes the area feel completely unwalkable and car-centric, and just encourages higher speeds and makes everyone more unsafe.</p>
<p>Connectivity is important and happy to see some green space and cycling paths proposed.</p>
<p>We need a way to safely get across Old Banff Coach Road at the point where the multi-use pathway is (on the western edge of the area in question...near the quarry and beside where the ring road will be). OBC Road will be widened and we don't want Cougar Ridge and West Springs to be cut off from each other. We need some kind of bridge over (or tunnel under?) OBC Rd so that cyclists and walkers can EASILY continue on the multi-use pathways.</p>
<p>The biggest concerns / problems stem from adequate roadways and connectors.</p>
<p>Yes</p>
<p>With the closure of 10th ave and then the future closure of 11th ave most of the cyclists will be able to safely cut thru Coach Hill and access West Springs without having to ride on Old Banff Coach Road and pedestrians from both</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

<p>communities will be able to safely enjoy the pathways provided.</p>
<p>One concern is will these pathways have light standards so the citizens can enjoy it all hours?</p>
<p>No.</p>
<p>Love the green spaces. Too bad all the talk Building a will block out the sun</p>
<p>How will the design promote walkability? Short blocks don't help. In my opinion we need a continuous pathway, but I don't see that in the current plan,</p>
<p>NO! The proposed changes had lots of streets for cars, but do not have dedicated bike paths. Given all of the high density housing, the roads are going to be a mess. Nobody is going to want to share the road with bikes and walkers. This is brutal. Get rid of the highdensity housing and make it a place for people to want to go to ride and walk. With all of the commercial and condos, the traffic within the neighborhood will overwhelming. DON'T let TRUMAN dictate the fate of this wonderful neighborhood! The city needs to step up and listen to the residents. NOBODY wants this.</p>
<p>The grid based connectivity fails when connecting westward way to 77th street- this should be connected with weston drive to improve connectivity to the current west springs. The current plan does not follow current guidelines as far as reducing useless T intersections and dead ends. Improve the flow of traffic through the west district and offloading off of OBCR by connecting westward way to weston drive. Those of us who work west will be able to reach work and home much easier if westward way connects with weston drive.</p> <p>All streets should be heavily treed with mature trees to promote pedestrian traffic. These streets should be maintained by the developer for at least 20 years. Putting in tiny sticks and expecting them to live is a waste of everyone's time. Turn 77th into boulevard that has large mature trees in the middle. this will increase the attractiveness of the development and encourage pedestrian travel.</p> <p>There is not enough safe walkways away from roadways. Side walks along busy roads are simply not safe for young children, separate this by well maintained green space and trees.</p> <p>Please create a bike lane along 77th street connecting to old banff coach road. Many cyclists use this to get out to the mountains and to work and to schools. Let's put our cyclists in safer paths, and encourage a active lifestyle.</p>
<p>Westward way ends at 77th in a t-intersection in your current plan. This fails to connect west springs with the new district. Why is there separation and not connectivity? It is clear that the new district plans to use our roadways, but this design very obviously keeps the current homeowners of the west springs out of the west district. Why would we drive zig zag into the west district. Zig zag means more traffic congestions, more intersections and more potential for unsafe pedestrian areas. Why on earth would west ward way not connect straight through to weston drive? It makes so much sense in terms of transit, pedestrian traffic, schoolchildren, light pollution, noise pollution and existing infrastructure. weston drive and 77th is already an intersection, why not use this existing infrastructure??</p>
<p>Where are the tree lined pathways? Where are the bike lanes? Why not put a bike lane on the east side of 77th street to connect with OBCR and wentworth drive? This would be so much safer for commuters and students travelling to st joan of arc school and west springs elementary and junior high. You cannot expect people to be active when it is not safe. Reduce the number of intersections (as most pedestrian accidents happen at intersections) including removing westward way and 77ths- move this down to weston drive!</p>
<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Short blocks and grid-based?? So basically trying to re-create the downtown core in the suburbs - short, grid-based blocks does not provide a 'community' feel and is not at all better for driving, walking, cycling etc - it's traffic light nightmare.. stop and go. Since when has anyone enjoyed walking or cycling in a grid? The community has a few pathways but currently a bit of a dis-jointed feel - we should be trying to expand the current pathway system while improving continuity and flow</p>
<p>Better and safer connectivity for all modes of transportation is great for all walks of life. Walking and cycling helps keep people fit and healthy.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

<p>Concerned about Old Banff Coach Road and all the potential extra vehicular traffic heading east towards downtown and all the potential construction traffic. Can their not be extra wide shoulders for when accidents and broken down vehicles do occur? What about turning one west bound lane to make it 3 lanes going east during peak times? How about having no right turns onto Coach Hill Road during morning hours to try and stop the cut thru traffic and allow the school buses to actually pick up kids ?</p>
<p>This would be an enhancement to provide walkable access and greater safety for children.</p>
<p>Can I asked if these "Proposed Changes" were written by the Development Company? They seem written in such a way as to "sell" on something we don't like. I have nothing against Developers, but I would expect to find the above description in just about current day development in North America and would guess that in Europe these "changes" would be a given. Can I also ask that if the building height (and density) are reduced further, will these "Better and Safer Connectivity" aspects still be put in? Or I'm guessing they will be scaled back or removed?</p>
<p>No. Short blocks and grid-based means MORE intersections. How does that increase walkability?</p>
<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Yes although there's almost too many connectors and likely don't need so many; is a connector road on 80th Street between Westward Ave and Westward Way really required (same with 78th between Westward Ave and Westward gate)? It would be nice to connect the green space to some of the mixed use or commercial areas and not have to cross the street. I would like to see some coffee shops, restaurants, pubs etc that back directly onto the green/recreational space. They could have outdoor patios that open up onto the green space so you can have a drink or snack and your kids kick a soccer ball while you enjoy your meal.</p>
<p>We need to focus on roads before we worry about pathways. We have half the year with snow and cold weather where few people walk. Lets be honest with ourselves and look and how people actually move around.</p>
<p>More streets equals more cars driving. Less roads, and have more natural trails. Not a sidewalk along a road. Big difference</p>
<p>Will 77th street made no street parking?</p>
<p>What additional traffic lights, turn lanes will be installed to accommodate the increased traffic on old Banff coach road?</p>
<p>Integrate traffic calming proposed for the new development area into the existing street (i.e. 81st St from 9th Av).</p>
<p>Traffic and pedestrian management has not been handled well with increased development. Very high risk areas in 73rd, 77th and 85th Street for pedestrian crossing. This will get worse if not managed.</p>
<p>Ok so the city wants to move to a grid system to alleviate traffic concerns- YES! let's do this. So my question is why are there going to be 3 t intersections along 77 street? You should eliminate the t-intersections and put intersections where they connect with the existing community, allowing both new district residents and existing homeowners access to the both commonutines and their ammenities. Connect the westward way with Weston Drive and eliminate the t-intersection there and the 2 farther up on 77 street. This will connect the communities, transit, pedestrians. Let's make this grid system happen, it will make for a much happier community in terms of commutes.</p>
<p>Bike lane along the east side of 77 street would create a lot of use for school students, commuters, and recreational road cyclists who use that road to connect with OBCR to head out to the mountains. let's create safe place for children and cyclists and encourage physical activity. Similar bike lanes have been set up in strathcona for the same purpose with excellent use.</p>
<p>Bike lanes are necessary for this population increase to relive traffic and encourage environmentally friendly transportation. Put this along west ward way and 77street on the east side.</p>
<p>Connectivity is still a problem, given that the roads they connect to are inadequate to handle the traffic. The regional pathway connection looks fine to me.</p>
<p>It is appreciated with the shorter blocks. 9th Avenue and 77Street are essentially speed raceways in the evenings and at night and while one is walking at 10:00 in the evening, one wouldn't want to with the speeds that the vehicles drive. I did notice that signs were posted along 9th Avenue telling the driver how fast they were going but these were all positioned immediately upon turning on the street when one isn't even at the speed limit. If they were positioned</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>in the middle of the blocks I think the information received would read very differently from what was gathered before.</p>
<p>The details provided by the city are honestly too sparse to really understand. The pace of the buildout, and the direction of development leave this pretty unclear. I didn't get a lot of answers at the open house but my concern about increased traffic on 9th ave (a major corridor for students heading to school) was not addressed. Access to this development needs to come from a boulevard (ie Old Banff Coach Road) and not along streets with kids playing hockey and basketball in their driveways. My primary issue is traffic along 9th ave and I have to be honest, I don't even live on that street, I just use it to access it like many other in West Springs. I don't think it will ever get to a point where it's 'backed up' per se, I really just think it's a safety issue.</p>
<p>exactly- use the grid system and eliminate curvy streets such as westward way and keep it straight and connect it with weston drive. put in a bike lane along the south side of 77th street to promote safe and active travel for community residents both new and existing. This can easily connect with the OBCR pathway which leads to downtown through coach hill. Commuters need safe ways to get to work and this will further reduce congestion.</p>
<p>bike lanes throughout the community for the safety of commuters and school children who many bike to work green space that is safe to ride and walk in, not just sidewalks along busy roads which are a hazard to children</p>
<p>Lower density will create less traffic, and will allow for more parks, and pathways. Current proposal will have sidewalks along very busy streets. The traffic will spill onto 77th, which will cause a significant safety risk to existing people. the block style buildings are terrible. This is NOT what we need or want. They need to move to lower density and create more actual dedicated path ways throughout the area.</p>
<p>bike lanes!!!! pathways that are not just sidewalks but separated from high traffic areas.</p>
<p>connect the connectors ie. westward way and weston drive should be connected to promote decreased vehicle congestion on 77th street by offloading some into west springs on weston drive allowing for multiple access points to west district</p>
<p>No, the current density will create a inner city feel to the area. It is not about making it safer, it is about creating an environment that eliminates the hazards. Putting such a high amount of people in a small area, does not work. This is a suburb...come on.</p>
<p>No, it will feel like you are walking downtown. More actual path ways, not just sidewalks....</p>
<p>The community design looks to be good - pathways, sidewalks and easy connections to the rest of West springs.</p>
<p>Weston drive has an excellent pathway for bikes, as well is already a connector road for west springs- why would this not connect with the major collector in west district to connect both communities. By connecting the connector roads and the pathways at weston drive and 77th street, commuters (both vehicular and cyclists) will divert through west springs which will alleviate congestion at access and exit points from the west district.</p>
<p>we need to decrease t-intersections on 77th, there are far too many! there are already 2 t intersections from weston drive to obcr, putting another one in in the middle doesnt make any sense- it is creating pointless congestion, where it could easily be offloaded to weston drive.</p>
<p>what about bike lanes- strathcona has them and they are used well, we could use them too</p>
<p>Yes</p>
<p>I like this.</p>
<p>Yes</p>
<p>I like the grid system, but feel it isnt actually being applied as it is intended to in the west district. I am still seeing T intersections on the periphery of the community such as at 77th and westward ave- why create a new intersection if it is not needed. The major collector should be westward way through to weston drive and move the man made storm pond more north. This would connect 85th into west springs which is much more useful. Get rid of the 77th and westward ave! why create more traffic for those living on 77th street, more noise and light pollution, more intersections where accidents for pedestrians and commuters to occur?!</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>Again, no. I havent seen any plans for bike lanes. A lot of people on the hill commute via bike down OBCR to coachhill and through the river valley to downtown. Why is this not being promoted in the new district. Bike lanes should run along the entire length of 77th street along the east side for the safety of commuters and children. An active and safe lifestyle must be encouraged. Reduce uncontrolled or poorly controlled intersections for safety reasons and put in a light at weston drive and connect westward way through that road. Eliminate the itnersection of 77th street and westward ave and move it to a more suitable location such as weston drive- which is another route out of the west district and another route to OBCR.</p>
<p>No. How many traffic lights would be created for such short blocks would there be marked pedestrian crossing with flashing lights at every corner given the amount of car traffic?</p>
<p>There are currently 2 t-intersections along 77th street. By the proposed grid model, these are to be eliminated, right? But now it is being proposed that 2 additional t-intersections be added to this. I am confused by the lack of alignment of the city goals and truman's designs. Westward ave looks like it is to be a major road through the district, yet it ends in a t-intersection? It seems to make more sense to have westward ave terminating at 77th street where weston drive meets- thus creating a 4 way intersection. This would be appropriate for a traffic light, connecting of connector routes of travel, adding an exit route via weston drive out to Old banff coach road. This would also connect pathways through the area. 4 way intersections are much more controlled than t intersections. 4 way intersections with lights are safer for pedestrians. Weston drive is already a intersection so why not utilize it?</p>
<p>There is a road that connects to 77th but does not connect with an existing road making a T intersection. This makes no sense what so ever and should be connected to Weston manner to ensure lights are not going into existing homes as well as starts and stops behind their houses. Icy roads and flying though intersections is also not a great idea when you are going into someone else back yard which may or may not have kids playing.</p>
<p>no, although i appreciate the grid style, there was not a visual aid to identify or imagine the proposed changes and/or upgrades. if the proposed changes are correctly implemented as intended by the community they may be successful but as is, this concern is merely addressed with words and no tangible plan proposal. well the developer fund the "new regional pathway connections that fill the gaps in the existing pathway network?"</p>
<p>The major road of west ward ave is incorrectly placed. This leads to a dead end t intersection at 77ths, failing to connect with transit of weston drive. This will create a new intersection when one is not currently, and not needed. It makes much more sense to connect west springs to the west district via westward way. The current proposal goes completely against the west springs area plan created in 2012 under which many people purchased their homes by.</p>
<p>77th will become a congested, polluted road of emissions as it is not built to handle the capacity, and by adding additional intersections that do not connect to other connectors as exit points such as failing to connect to weston drive, is going to make congestion heavy. No longer will 77th be a pedestrian and cyclist favorite, and school children will not use it to bike to school because of the dangers of poorly controlled t intersections. Stop putting in t-intersections and connect the main roads of west springs to exit points such as directly to OBCR and weston drive. leave 77th street north of weston drive alone! the noise and light pollution alone is enough to drive residents to sell.</p>
<p>i didnt see and bike lanes planned- why is this?</p>
<p>My main concern was for there to be many more pathways, green space, parks, amenities and ways to walk and bike throughout the community. All I see are tall buildings side by side.</p>
<p>Sounds good. I hope the gaps in the area that make it necessary to cross main roads like 85th multiple times since there is no sidewalk in sections will be remedied.</p>
<p>No- 77th street and OBCR cannot handle this increased traffic. The addition of more intersections along 77th street will only make it worse. Eliminate the t intersection at 77th street that is across from weston court, and move this intersection down to create a 4 way intersection at weston drive instead. Why create more noise from car, excess lighting and congestion in an area that does not already have an intersection. The roads of connectors need to connect through to west springs community via weston drive.</p>
<p>No. This map appears to indicate that 81st street will be a major artery in and out of the new development. This is not acceptable to West Park residents; especially if the existing traffic circle is to be removed. This is not an appropriate change for the home owner in West Park and devalues their properties and increases risks to their children significantly. The design has way too few outlets to larger streets (77th, 85th, Old Banff Coach).</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>No, this city and up this part of the hill in particular is covered in snow most of the year. Frankly I don't care about cycling and pathways because they are used so little.</p>
<p>The regional pathway system is not very well addressed at the open house and the documents online. where is it? does it connect with roads like weston drive that have a pathway? where are the bike lanes?</p> <p>I went to the open house, I read all the reports but there is so much vague information here. There is a lack of funding, lack of timelines and really a lack of details in general. 77th street will become a congested mess with all the roads emptying onto it, especially the main one of westward ave. Westward ave should be shifted to connect with weston drive. There is no rationale provided as to why this main road is not connecting with weston drive which is already an exit point for the community. There are pathways, an existing intersection and transit at weston drive. The road is already a main connector in the community, so why are we not utilizing this? Why is westward ave terminating at a t intersection on 77th when it could terminate at a 4 way intersection and connect the new communities. It is very obvious that the goal is to create west district as separated from the existing community. Isn't the goal to connect communities, not separate them?</p>
<p>No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eliminate the intersection adjacent to Weston Court. It should be moved south to meet the other collector at Weston Drive. This will improve overall traffic flow. - Introduce traffic calming measures along 77th street and noise abatement measures
<p>No</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 77TH WILL BE SO CONGESTED, AS WILL OLD BANFF COACH ROAD. SOME TRAFFIC NEEDS TO FILTER OFF ONTO 85TH AND ONTO WESTON DRIVE. MOVE THE WESTWARD AVE OFF 77TH AND CONNECT IT THROUGH WESTON DRIVE SO TRAFFIC CAN FLOW OUT OF THE DISTRICT THAT WAY AS WELL - CONNECT THE REGIONAL PATHWAYS WITH BIKE LANES TO REDUCE DEPENDENCY ON CARS. A BIKE LANE ALONG 77TH STREET AND 9TH AVE WOULD HELP
<p>No, OBCR and 77th street do not have the capacity for the population or the associated vehicular traffic. These streets are both lined with homes. People live here. We did not move in to live on major roadways that will pollute our yards with vehicle emissions, noise and light pollution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - limit traffic on 77th and OBCR by offloading more traffic to bow trail and 85th street which was always designed to be a larger capacity roadways - mitigate the effects of traffic with removing t-intersection, putting in heavily treed streets and high fences, limiting parking on streets, putting in roundabouts and no creating new intersections along 77th where they do not currently exist. - remove the proposed t intersections of 77th street and connect them to existing roadways such as weston drive and 9th ave and north to OBCR and especially west to 85th street. - the regional pathways need to connect with bike lanes so that they are usable for commuters. Connect 77th street bike lanes with OBCR regional pathway. Eliminate street parking on the east side of 77th street to make the bike path safe for commuters and families and school children. - make sure that all pathways are safe for pedestrians, cyclists, elderly, children and pets- this means separating them from traffic.
<p>There was not enough information provided about the proposed changes to determine whether community ideas are adequately addressed.</p>
<p>In the diagrams, it still seems insufficient compared to 1789 units. I would propose we At least increase it 30%.</p>
<p>The city miss interpreted the comments (please see the comments from the first session), the concern was to have more nature paths, with parks, that promoted safe enjoyable places to run and play. The solution is essentially creating a cold concrete grid system that does the exact opposite. The current plan will NOT be inviting for people to enjoy. In fact, I will guarantee that the residents of this new neighbourhood will be using the path ways in cougar ridge, which (given the extreme large number) will ruin the experience....</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>Less density and add more natural trails. Similar to cougar ridge. wide trails that flow through the area. this is what the people want. NOBODY wants short streets, this will make it feel like intercity.</p>
<p>There is no actual paths through the area. it is simply sidewalks along large buildings. how does this attempt to address the concern. Try again.</p>
<p>NO, it is not even close. This is brutal. There are no actual paths that flow through the area...how am i supposed to walk from East to West? walk along a street with 2000 cars? That does not meet any of the concerns</p>
<p>NO,</p> <p>This does not meet any of the concerns. They need to have more actual pathways East to West, instead of more streets. Lower density with more green space between buildings will create a nice open feel. The current plan is very closed in and will not be appealing to anybody</p>
<p>The current plan is not inviting, it is cold and crowded. I will not want to take my son for a walk there. it will be way to busy with all of the vehicles, trying to escape this brutal area. It will be a disaster. They need dedicated pathways that go all the way through in different directions, and/or get rid of the tall buildings....</p>
<p>The area is currently suffering from lack of enough schools, libraries and so on. Adding too many units will amplify these issues and concerns.</p>
<p>Seems status quo statement .. what does this actually translate to in the plan ? More details would help make an informed decision.</p>
<p>I don't have any comments on this point.</p>
<p>no. where are the bike lanes for recreation and safe travel for commuters and school children?? where are the plans for mature trees along every roadway includign reinforcing the trees that have died along OBCR and 77ths street.</p>
<p>Need new methods to use bikes. All of the bike paths now are actually roads. Very limited bike and walk paths. Some off-leash parks would be also appreciated since most people are now using the soccer fields (and not cleaning up after the dogs).</p>
<p>77th street is going to be a super highway. The addition of more intersections, primarily t-intersections is going to create immense traffic congestion. The proposed changes do not reflect the impact to this road and the residents that live along it. If you were to connect the area to weston drive, much of the traffic will be offloaded to weston drive which is an additional exit point from the community via 73rd to OBCR.</p> <p>At weston drive AND OBCR there is a regional pathway, so why is there not a bike lane designated along the east side of 77th street to connect these two pathways.</p> <p>Eliminate the t intersections on 77th street to reduce congestion. T intersections are hazardous to pedestrians, and should be changed to 4 way lights at existing intersections such as weston drive. The additional intersection proposed along 77th street,e specially the one created by westward ave, will dramatically increase congestion, noise and light pollution and cause a decrease in quality of life to those living at that proposed intersection. In the 2012 development plans, there were no plans of an intersection at this location, so why is there such a push for it now?? If we had know it would have been a place of a major intersection, we would have moved or never purchased it.</p>
<p>BIKE PATHS, BIKE LANES, AND SEPARATED GREEN SPACE FROM MAJOR ROADWAYS WILL BE SAFER AND HEALTHIER FOR EVERYONE. THE STREET DESIGN ALONG 77TH DOES NOT MAKE SENSE. WHY DO WE AHVE SO MANY T-INTERSECTIONS ALONG 77TH STREET NOW? MOVE ALL THOSE NEW T-INTERSECTIONS TO EXISTING INTERSECTIONS SO THAT ROADWAYS WILL CONNECT. FOR EXAMPLE; MOVE THE T-INTERSECTION AT ENDS AT WESTON COURT UP NORTH TO WESTON MANOR, AND CONNECT THE MAJOR ROAD FROM 85TH THROUGH THE DISTRICT TO WESTON DRIVE. WHY CREATE MORE INTERSECTIONS THAT ARE NOT NEEDED AND WILL ONLY CAUSE CONGESTION AND DISTURBANCES TO CURRENT RESIDENTS. FOR EVERY INTERSECTION THAT IS BUILT WHERE IT IS NOT NEEDED, A SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE IN EMISSIONS, NOISE AND LIGHT POLLUTION WILL OCCUR. PUSH THE TRAFFIC OUT TO 85TH STREET WHERE IT CAN BE HANDLED AND ISN'T LINED WITH HOMES OWNED BY HARD WORKING PEOPLE.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Congestion along 77th street will be a nightmare, push the traffic out to 85th street where it can be handled better by bow trail. 77th street is residential with countless homes on it. 77th does not need the major collectors of west district emptying onto it at t-intersections mid street, but should connect with roads already in existence for collectors to empty onto like weston manor or weston drive. Creating new intersections will not only dramatically drop property values of those along 77th street, but increase the safety hazards, noise, traffic light pollution, emissions. - regional pathways should connect with bike lanes. regional pathways are existing along weston drive and oBCR, create a bike lane along 77th street east side to connect these two for use of commuters and children going to school, and families biking to recreational facilities. We need to maximize pedestrian and cyclist pathways to make them attractive to use. This includes heavily treed with large mature, sustainable trees that are frequently maintained by the developer for decades, not just a few years that they are selling condo units. - I am all for grid based, but where is the grid based leading out to 85th street- this should be priority for traffic flow, not out to 77th street which is a quiet residential street.
<p>Yes, looks a little better. Connect the pathways from Westpark Court & Place into West District. Also pathways from West District to the business areas on 85th so they don't have to walk all the way through Westpark Crescent.</p>
<p>SATISFACTORY</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Even if modifications are made, traffic congestion along 77th and old Banff road will be beyond a tolerable limit for the community. congestion leads to vehicle emissions, excess NOISE from traffic, extra streetlamp causing light pollution. - the addition of more intersections of 77th will push too much traffic to that road and all the residents along that road will suffer as a result. The traffic should be pushed to more exit/entry points on 85th street when they can leave the area via bow trail. - remove the t-intersections created along 77th street and only put roads from the west district that join in with existing intersections such as Weston manor and Weston drive. why create new hazards, more noise and more light when a current intersection is more suitable. - a regional pathway is located at Weston drive, so the traffic should be aligned with this at this intersection, in addition to more regional pathways - traffic and transit already converge at Weston drive, so join a through road through the district to terminate here, not at a t intersection farther north that will be more disruptive and not connect the communities - roundabouts are much more effective than t-intersections at controlling traffic.
<p>a bike lane should happen on the EAST side of 85th where it will not be interrupted by the large number of t-intersections proposed. The east side bike lane will appease some homeowners who currently live along 85th street. we do not want idling cars in parking spots of at intersections polluting our yards and homes. This of the existing homeowners first and foremost.</p>
<p>roundabouts</p>
<p>safe pathways for children</p>
<p>Connectivity with existing pathways as well as the addition of green space and community areas is nicely planned and meets community concerns.</p>
<p>bike lanes along 77th street- EAST side would be preferred. make sure that all pathways are lined with trees to increase the attractiveness. westward ave should connect all the way through the west district to west springs at Wesson drive. Why does this not connect as the grid system would suggest it should. The storm pond should be moved to accommodate this because increased congestion = increased emissions, noise and pollution and FRUSTRATION of residents. Once again, quality of life of residents will decrease.</p>
<p>See comments above.</p>
<p>More sidewalks and paths are needed for safe biking with children, as we can't ride on the road as it is unsafe. There is too much traffic as it is, and we do not want high density housing with more people, more traffic.</p>
<p>No comment</p>
<p>Yes the changes address the concerns. Grid design and interconnecting pathways will be appreciated.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

No, the developer is simply trying to "dress up" the area and give the appearance of a park. At the end of the day, HIGH DENSITY is still the issue and at the crux of the matter. The developer can put whatever "spin" they want on this plan, but this entire concept is wrong for this area.
N/a
Yes - very well. This area will be a pleasure to walk/bike and make use of.
No. The proposed development will experience a great volume of traffic with the amount of businesses and retail it intends to provide. With the little amount of street areas included in the project for as many buildings that will be constructed, it suggests a very congested type of environment. The area of Aspen Landing shops is always busy and congested.
There is too much planned. So I can't speak to this idea because the overall amount of development and high density in itself is a huge concern and the primary issue.
I like the concept of more pathways and active transportation choices.
The bike paths and walking routes are great as is, but will lose their charm and access to green space with more development that is office-based, high rise condos or more commercial.
No comment on this as of now.
Everyone will still resort to driving because it's winter 9 months of the year in Calgary, no one rides their bikes.
As long as there are sidewalks or bike paths on either sides of the road, this has been addressed.
I do like the courtyard concept that is proposed.
Short blocks are fine as long as the traffic isn't interrupted every 10 feet. My husband likes to bike and run to work (downtown core). It would be nice for him to have a safe route to do so.
It would be good to have separate bicycle paths (not sure if they are in the plan now) that are away from pedestrian paths AND streets. It would be unfortunate to do this as an afterthought, after the streets/neighborhoods have been designed, such as the abomination that has happened in the downtown area.
With your 5,000 residents, 'connectivity' will be a real problem since the traffic flow will be greatly reduced. Stand on the corner of 85th street and 9th ave and tell me how much traffic there is on any given day
No - again this community is a walking on sidewalk or in green space. There is little to none of that. Bike lanes are suited for downtown areas - not suburbia. Walkability is a joke because that is not what Truman is aiming for. Once again there project is not suited for this area of the City.
Some of the pathways are gravel and others are asphalt. Be consistent. What about lights. Will the paths be lit and if so, how will the lights affect the near by residents when they are no leaves on the trees.
Maybe. I don't know how a grid design helps.
Yes
This area is already very dangerous for many students trying to get to school and to cross busy main roads (77th street and 85th street) with no crosswalks. There are already multiple traffic jams at peak school drop-off and pick-up times with parents driving their children to school. Add in another 3000 people rushing around on these same streets and the children trying to get to school will be in significant danger due to the increase in traffic in this area.
While connectivity is a very nice concept, it is extremely inconsequential given the extremely important issues at stake. Density, building height and transportation deficiencies are far more important and the current proposal does not sufficiently address those issues.
The planned connectivity looks good. I agree that having most of the parking underground will encourage pedestrian and cycling traffic vs cars.
Where is bike path connectivity off the hill. There is no separate bike path on Old Banff Coach Road. If the bike path doesn't go anywhere except within the development it isn't very useful.
Question 4. Do the proposed changes...adequately address the community ideas & concerns about green space that were shared with the City? Tell us why?

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

NO. We need an indoor gym. Just like the Westside recreation center, with a pool and a hockey rink. The outdoor park is not good enough. We also need a public library. The closest library is 20 min away and it is too small for all the new residents.
No, what is being planned for the green space between 77th St and 81st? I do like the idea of the green corridor under Bow Trail West of 85th, but a citizen explained that to otherwise I wouldn't have known.
The community has enjoyed natural green space the removal of this and replacement with artificial green is detrimental.
This hasn't been addressed properly and will benefit the new developments and not the existing ones. You need to have more progress to define how the greenspace will be used.
NO. We need more trees.
What is to ensure that this will even be built as the size, proportions and placement are draining as fast as the weather shifts in this area. And from things the way they are drawn as of right now what good does this do for those except the ones who live right besides them this has no bearing on anyone in the other areas already here.
Not even close.
Yes, please start soon!
NO. 8 acre propose green space by Truman is not enough for density of dwelling coming here.
I like the green space.
The community needs more green space. This development only reduces the green space per capita.
NO.
Yes, <u>but</u> no rec centers, no more rinks, no more soccer fields > parks are ok but no place for activities.
Open space is adequate. Would really benefit a Rec Centre since West Side is not an option.
NO - Green space remain same since propose earlier - 10% of space to be reserved, but irrespective of density higher density is been developed but Green space to school issue are not been addressed.
Not enough scattered green space throughout the area - no tot lots etc.
Yes.
I do like the proposed green space but feel there should be more.
Truman can afford to put in a community centre/skating rink etc. They are taking so much from us and <u>NOT</u> giving back to the community.
This looks pretty great, especially the wetland and the community areas. Is there any attempt to maintain connectivity of green spaces (and not have <u>just grass!</u>) to ensure wildlife have a corridor to move in, as opposed to ending up as roadkill?
No. The amount of proposed green space is insufficient for the density. A significant amount of space is used for a storm pond and there isn't enough 'activities' like basketball or tennis courts or wide open space for active living.
Spray park is a nice touch.
The "green space" needs to be developed <u>before</u> all the residential density is achieved, not an after thought! Can't use green space if it is not there! Children and dogs don't play in the street or in high density, high buildings, it's about the happiness of the population, children and dogs count.
3389 people will destroy the proposed green space. This is a family oriented area.
Yes - array of site amenities and layout and location is great.
More green space. 8 acres isn't very much for such a heavily populated area.
Still not enough detail on the programming. The community will be living with the density so its important that the developer give back with some benefits. The green space/programming space needs to be developer funded. It is not sufficient for the developer to hand over 8 acres of raw land. The developer should design and pay for the community space and use as a feature when selling its new residential units.
No - we have nothing in our community. Little parks, no schools, no arenas or rec centres. Cougar Ridge gets shafted on all aspects every time. Don't tell me we have schools, because they are all private schools around here!

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

There are so many negative sides to this proposed development that the small added positivity regarding the green space and the rest will not have any effect in making the whole plan look attractive.
We all know that Nenshi wants no green space!! We need more parks and off leash areas. How an 2 acres for a nice off lease area???
Public meeting spaces are great-but I am concerned when I see mature trees and green space bulldozes. Where are the community parks, pathways, soccer fields and areas of play???
I don't think is very clear as of yet. I certainly won't be playing with my kids in a park along Old Banff anytime soon.
yes please
I am not convinced this area will even be useful. It is still a drainage pond.
Not it does not. The space is too small for the number of residents currently living in the area which is current over 4000. The WHO World Health Organization recommends a minimum of 9 square metres of green space per resident; the proposed 8 acres = 32,374.8514 square metres, which does not satisfy the current number residents in the area nor the addition of new 4000 residents nor does it meet the WHO guidelines for healthy living. If green space is to be used by residents then it should remain public not private at no cost to the residents new or existing. Green space should promote the areas ecology.
I think so
Congratulations, you are turning 22 hectares of nature and trees and grasslands into 8 acres of green space. You should be so proud. Here's a better idea, keep the area as medium to low density housing with significant green space and trails and recreation space. But of course that won't work, Truman homes can't make enough of a return on their investment with that idea.
No one will be able to get to or use the green space due to this giant construction site surrounding it during this 20-year proposed build site so the green space may as well be a parking lot, because this development is going to need it.
Leave green space as it is. Too much development is only good for developers pocketbooks.
NO. A "half" basketball court? Seriously? That's not a sincere plan. We need a recreation center that's indoor, with suffice parking space, just like the one called West Recreation Center. We also need a public library. With the new area, you will expect a lot young families with kids, so be prepared if they can't find a place for their kids during weekends.
We need more green space. We absolutely need to save some space from development.
This is a good plan, however there has always been an issue of completion for open spaces recreational facilities, sufficient green space.
The proposed changes do not address the community ideas and concerns about green space. The proposed greenspace benefits only the massive population proposed to move into this space. Much of the feedback provided to the city back in April, suggested that if higher density development (or any development at all) were allowed to proceed, green space should be utilized to segregate this development from the existing community. This is a very important suggestion that the city is not listening to. One of the largest concerns being raised is related to retaining the value of the homes we live in. We do not want to look our our windows and see these massive structures literally within a stones throw of our houses. If the plan proposed more total greenspace, with the greenspace located between all new structures and existing homes (especially the homes directly adjoining the south end of this area in West Park) the proposed plan may be slightly less offensive.
The green space will be nice. Maybe a splash park/ice rink

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>This is not good enough: This area of Calgary needs a public recreation facility. The Westside recreation center is fine, but is already at capacity (as far as I know). There is no public pool in all of west Calgary! Booking swimming lessons for our kids is a nightmare!</p>
<p>No. LOC2017-0188 falls outside of the other amendments and violates the intent of that residential neighbourhood and should stay designated R1.</p>
<p>I love this idea and have no concern other than that mentioned above.</p>
<p>No. "Could be provided" is hardly reassuring. And then we lose more green space if it is provided.</p>
<p>I personally feel we have plenty of green space and parks in the area, and would more advocate that any new development has good tree cover with plenty of smaller green spaces throughout, rather than any one large park.</p>
<p>Yes</p>
<p>I don't understand this. Is "multi-layered programming" green space? Green space means forests to me....not built community centres.</p>
<p>We want swaths of trees and wild areas and ponds and wetlands and community paths and maybe a park with a splash area (summer) and skating area (winter)...like McKenzie Towne has.</p>
<p>Yesno</p>
<p>Yes</p>
<p>No. what we need is our door spaces for kids to play. Splash park or skate park. Like auburn bay</p>
<p>Is 8 acres enough? What are the specific plans for the areas? Will the development still look out of place and not blend with the current community that has many trees and open areas?</p>
<p>The area has been developed in separate little pieces leading to no large, useable space.</p>
<p>Green space is important. Having nice walking/bike paths would be a huge benefit to West Springs</p>
<p>The green space is an improvement, but has not gone far enough. It still needs outdoor skating rinks, and parks to play in. Adding more commercial businesses, is NOT what we need. Make it wild space for kids to play. The amount of residents in the area will overwhelm the little green space allocated. May get rid of all the high and medium density housing. Especially along 77th. The current wall of condos and commercial is not sensitive to the residents. It literally blocks them.</p>
<p>"Multi-layer programming" ?? Really? What is this? This is not specific at all.</p>
<p>Truman is making millions off of this development, the least they could do is commit to building a community hall, a skating rink, a splash pad, a hockey rink etc and commit to maintaining it for a minimum of 30 years. I feel that 30 years is appropriate as they state it will take 20 years to build and it most developers pick up and leave as soon as it is done- they need to commit to making the community better for the long run, not just while it is financially beneficial for them.</p>
<p>Let's make this space about families and make it usable. Stormwater ponds is not a recreational area. They are dangerous with fluctuating water levels and children cannot play near them.</p>
<p>No - I would say it does not. The City's handling of green space in the West Springs Area has been exceedingly poor. There is no substantial green space of any kind which is leading to Edworthy Park operating at far beyond its capacity. The City even started to allow cars to park on the green space adjacent to the parking lot as parking is frequently not available on the weekends. The decline of the health of Edworthy Park over the past few years with no reaction from the City is irresponsible and unacceptable. The 8 acre lot does not begin to provide a destination park for the population living west of Sarcee Trail. The City should make this park a combination of play areas, walking paths and picnic areas in order to provide some relief to Edworthy Park. It should also look to purchase land in order to provide a larger green space elsewhere - the current allocation of 10% from developers is simply not practical in an area which was previously 5 acre parcels.</p>
<p>what is a multi layered programming? i want to hear real words such as a skate park or toddler playground or community centre.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

natural green space has been proven over and over in the research to improve health- let's make this a priority for these sites
No. This community needs an actual commitment to a community center, indoor arena, library. Having a designated site is not a strong enough statement. We want to see this as a reality.
Only 8 measly acres of green space when you intend to add nearly 2000 new units and over 1M sqft of commercial/retail space?? The community is already embarrassingly short on functional, enjoyable green space. I can't even think of a nice 'park' area where people can go and enjoy an afternoon picnic, for example. There are school-ground fields with playgrounds and soccer nets, that's about it. We have no outdoor baseball diamond, no outdoor hockey rink or pond for skating, no dog park (I don't even have a dog but these things are important) and none of this appears to even be in the plan.
The West Springs area probably has some of the highest per-capita tax rates in the city (property and income) - residents should be getting back what they paid for, given the premium paid to live in this 'desirable' neighbourhood that developers, with city approval, seem determined to ruin for the sake of profits. The desirable nature and premium housing value will disappear once the developers have milked everything they can and have moved people in to the 2000 new units.
Green space is important for everyone as the impact on green space and connecting with nature helps a community to stay healthy.
Always interested in having accessible green space that residents of adjacent communities can also enjoy!
This is desirable. Our community does not have a community centre for activities, gatherings or meetings. We would love a recreational facility as well since the increased density will only make westside rec centre less accessible. Too busy.
I would like to see a safe walking space for the hundreds of children that walk to the 2 public schools, which at capacity will hold close to 1500 students and staff. Given these schools are situated in the "hub" of commercial activity, children need safe transportation routes with good lighting, visibility etc, particularly given the attempted abduction near our school just last week.
Also, I'd suggest you put "multi-layered programming" in layman's terms.
I appreciate the change of unit! 8 ACRES is only 3.2 HECTARES. Given that the entire proposal is approximately 34 hectares, the green space proposal is less than 10%. Also, from earlier mock ups, much of the "green space" appears as courtyards between apartment buildings, which is not the same as a park.
No. There is very little information on green spaces.
Looks good.
I was very impressed with the proposals of the green space that incorporated public skating, splash park, skateboard park, amphitheater, community hall etc to name a few. I would actually like to see a playground though with swings and slides etc and in some of the S-SPR parcels. That would very popular amongst the families in/around the area. As mentioned earlier having some of the mix-use and commercial directly backing onto this green space would be most recommended. And definitely ensure there are lots of benches, picnic tables, around the green space area and the S-SPR parcels as I can see lots of families spending time there.
For the immediate neighborhoods (West Springs, Cougar Ridge, Coach Hill & Patterson) there is not a single community building or community recreation area of any kind. The proposed recreational spaces are highly desired and will act as a natural meeting area for a large number of community residents.
The development should include specific and detailed plans, to be developed in consultation with the immediate community association, to build a multi-use community facility that should include outdoor facilities such as hockey rinks and soccer fields to be administered by the community associations.
No, the green space is not functional.
More green space along 77th

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

<p>This does not address who will be paying for these spaces ? Taxpayers or the developer ?</p>
<p>Will original vegetation and trees be preserved ?</p>
<p>No actual details of what will be added is provided. Will it be an arena, ball diamonds, soccer diamonds or unspecified field space?</p>
<p>Not clear that the size of the community green space is sufficient for the proposed number of residents, both residential and commercial.</p>
<p>We need more details on what this is going to be. There have been suggestions for a community hall, skating rink, splash pad, skate park and simply natural green space with natural existing trees. Truman is making a lot of money off this deal- they should be responsible for creating this recreational space and maintaining it indefinitely. Developers typically pick up and leave after everything has sold- let's make them more responsible for the legacy of their communities and offload these expenses from the city.</p>
<p>We chose to build up in this area because of the open green space, low density buildings and space. Now the City intends on taking that all away.</p>
<p>Splash park and hockey rink is so needed!!!! Don't forget recreation for this area. Green Soave over buildings please</p>
<p>The community had asked for public recreational space and it was unclear how much of the space would actually be for public use and what type of private facility space they are proposing. I couldn't see any community centre type space which is what the community sorely needs and what had been asked for last time.</p>
<p>Maintaining green space and walking paths in the community is a top priority. I appreciate the future plans for recreational facilities but there are a lot in a very short distance from the community and at the very least getting the green spaces in and usable until future construction would be appreciated.</p>
<p>This still seems very vague. I think one big ask in the last round was for a skating rink and a community recreation area. Now your proposed change says "private or public recreational facility space for community meeting purposes". No one can actually figure out what that means, and the difference between public and private space is enormous. We're not looking for a gym or private option, we're looking for a public one, even if that means an HOA levy is required to fund it. Don't overcomplicate this. Build parks for kids (playgrounds, diamonds, soccer fields) and in the winter set it up for the community association to run skating and hockey rinks. No one is gathering in fields in Calgary for 5 months a year to do anything but play in the snow or skate so make sure it accommodates this.</p>
<p>No, much of the green space will be taken up by a drainage pond. Very little is left for active usable space. Need open park space where people can interact and be engaged (e.g., sheep meadow in Central park), not a pond surrounded by trees with a bit of grass. Current plan is a wasted opportunity to build a vibrant community.</p>
<p>natural existing green space will increase the health of the community, foster natural ecosystems, and encourage an active lifestyle. Disperse these natural green spaces throughout the community and not just in the center where it will be utilized by the west district only. put in outdoor low maintenance parks such as a basketball court, an outdoor hockey rink or splash pad. Make this area kid and teen friendly.</p>
<p>this should be an area that is usable by families especially children and teens. a rec centre any hockey rink would be especially nice.</p>
<p>The green space is not enough, it is still a storm pond. That is it. nobody wants to hangout near a stinky pond that will be fluctuating up and down all season long, and is completely useless to people. It actually becomes a risk to kids. If you are putting in a pond, make it a pond. Then you can have skating in the winter. Where is the parks? or outdoor rinks? it looks like a terrible incity wanna be park.</p>
<p>This public recreational space should be funded by Truman. They are making hundreds of millions on this project- they can at least sponsor the building of a simple basketball and tennis courts or hockey rink. let's keep our kids active and healthy.</p>
<p>large trees should line each road especially collector streets and maintained by truman to ensure that they live longer than a few years.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>The current plan is basically putting a postage stamp next to very cold, large, dense city. It is a bit of joke. The core of the issue is the density, the current plan will ruin the area. all of the current green space in the area will also be over run with people. Don't you get it!</p>
<p>The plan has a storm pond that can't be used. There needs to be more actual areas that can be used, like a splash park, or outdoor rink, or actual parks. This will create a community feel.</p>
<p>Although there was mention of a community centre I wonder since there is still this undeveloped land why can't there be a centre that can allow communities like West Springs, Cougar Ridge and Coach Hill Patterson Heights that currently do not have any physical building to have a "community home" where CAs can use jointly. Almost like a triservices or a joint venture place.</p>
<p>I think so - would like to see an outdoor ice surface/splash park but not sure if that's in the plans.</p>
<p>id like to see something that is useful for children and very safe. like a rec centre, natural space, park space, hockey rinks and tennis courts. right now there is no plan and that is frustrating- truman to step up and pay for this since they will be making so much money on this project</p>
<p>What about an out door rink? The closest one is at Strathcona Christie Aspen Community Building or the older one along Patterson Blvd, not a walkable distance for kids. Currently the kids are playing at various dugouts throughout the local communities which at times are not safe. This development would be central to the kids of Cougar Ridge, West Springs, and Wentworth and would be the ideal location!</p>
<p>Constructing a community center should be high priority. We do not have one to help aid in the lifestyle we hope top create for our families. Yet creating an urban center outside of the downtown core is up for consideration? That does not make sense. Rocky Ridge was provided 26 hectares for a regional community space with 8 hectares dedicated solely to the recreation facility. It would be nice to see a facility with an arena, aquatics center, fitness facility, raquet facilities, library, meeting room, etc., to create/support community. I would like top see something similar to that instead of a series of mid/high-rise multi-dwelling units.</p>
<p>Yes</p>
<p>This flexible space still has not been designated a purpose- give us some more information and we will tell you what we think. The more the better- tennis courts, outdoor hockey rink, playground, skate park.</p>
<p>No because no details were given. We want to see child and pet friendly park spaces that have multi-purposes. outdoor hockey rink, tennis courts, interactive and novel park, library and community centres. The least that Truman could do is build and maintain these- how many millions are they making off this project??</p>
<p>Large mature tree along the periphery the of the west district is essential. Don't put in little twigs that are going to die in a year because they were poorly maintained. There is an immense amount of research reinforcing safe outdoor, natural greenspace as crucial to the health of a community.</p>
<p>I would like to know exactly what type of community facility would be put in and if the outdoor component would have kids activities.</p>
<p>Is this area child friendly at all??I am seeing very adult use designs and that will be a great flaw for the area. If children and teens do not have a public place to hang out in, and they clearly are not going to have any green space in their yards due to the extensive density of the area, how do you propose to encourage healthy active outdoor lifestyles?? Obesity is an epidemic in this country and the lack of public recreational space safe for children and teens does not reflect this whatsoever.</p>
<p>Move that green space to the existing development on 77th street and then it may satisfy those people that were already in westsprings that back on to 77th. That way the existing development gets their views that they have been accustomed to and Truman gets their green space and drainage. Win Win for everyone. oh I forgot, then the price of the homes will go down and heaven forbid that is what this is all about.... MONEY, not what is good for the neighborhood or what is good for the city but what is good for Truman and Taxes. Go put this development in Councils back yard and see what they think.</p>
<p>no, there is not a balance of designated residential commercial and recreational a natural area. it is mostly developed area that supports the developers vision for commerce but doesn't serve the needs of the present community and disproportionate to an increase of 2000 new residents. It is contrary to the established character of the area.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

<p>this newly proposed asp does not fully address the factors that caused resistance in the first place. it is still self serving towards the developer than a document of compromise and unacceptable. the green space does not appear welcoming or connected to the wider community. it also does not appear large enough to accommodate the influx of people new to the area and from the surrounding communities, especially if its for all seasons (skating pond in winter and picnic area in summer as requested). the schematic appear incomplete with a great deal of shadow plan area that is hard to visualize.</p>
<p>what proposed changes? there is no formal proposal on what to do with the tiny space allocated for recreation. We want a community center, we want an outdoor hockey rink and tennis courts. We need to encourage a healthy active lifestyle and access to nature. Hundreds of studies support outdoor active lifestyles to improve the health of all community members.</p>
<p>We need more information on this "flexible development site" before we can give feedback. This term is far to open and leaves it very much up to the developer whom we have little confidence that they will actually try to make this a usable and safe place for children, teens and adults. Strathcona has a beautiful rec centre with an outdoor hockey rink, generous green space and plenty of natural areas- could this not be done in the west district?</p>
<p>The green space is flanked with high rise buildings, which will dominate the sightlines.</p>
<p>No. I was thinking residential homes baxkif into green space. I guess that doesn't line pockets the same way as a concrete jungle.</p>
<p>Maintaining greenspace is very important, and it would be great to have it link into the existing pathway systems with attention to safe crossings at the main roads. Also, sport fields, eg. soccer and baseball fields are limited in our area, so areas to support these activities would be great to put in place until a time that a community centre is built. It would be even nicer if a developer put in a community centre in the area.</p>
<p>no. where are the bike lanes for recreation and safe travel for commuters and school children?? where are the plans for mature trees along every roadway inclusign reinforcing the trees that have died along OBCR and 77ths street.</p>
<p>No.</p>
<p>It depends. Will this be city facility with reasonable pricing or another Westside or COP with ridiculous prices? There is a perception that this area of the city is plumb with money so we'll spend on all these facilities. Our closest city facilities are either Killarney or Bowness which are both old and tiny.</p>
<p>we need more detail before any opinion can be offered. what is going in here? we want a community hall, a hockey rink, a skating ring, a splash pad- something that will bring the community together not separate it. It is clear that i high wall of buildings on the periphery of the community is encouraged to separate the wst district from the existing communities.</p>
<p>No - What plans were there to build a buffer of vegetation or trees on both sides of 77th Street ? If not, why not ? - Are there any plans to curb noise pollution that will occur on the east side of 77th Street due to increased traffic flow on 77th Street (i.e. fences, traffic calming measures, bike paths etc) - The developer should pay for a noise abatement fence for all properties that abut on 77th Street since these properties will be adversely affected by increased traffic noise.</p>
<p>No</p>
<p>PUBLIC SPACE- WE NEED A PLACE FOR SENIORS TO BE ABLE TO RELAX, CHILDREN TO PLAY AND TEENS TO BE ENGAGING IN HEALTHY BEHAVIORS. WHEN YOU TAKE AWAY BACK YARDS AS YOU HAVE DONE FOR EXISTING RESIDENTS IN WEST SPRINGS BY SHADING AND PRIVACY INVASION AND THE NEW RESIDENTS OF WEST DISTRICT, YOU TAKE AWAY HEALTHY LEISURE ACTIVITIES.</p>
<p>"could be provided"? that should state will be provided and we want to know what. There is little green space in the new project, most of which is designated as a storm pond which has no recreational use whatsoever. Storm ponds are dangerous for children and merely breed insects and are fairly ugly to look at. We want usable tennis courts, basketball courts, outdoor hockey rinks, parks that everyone can enjoy with LARGE mature trees, not sticks that will eventually die or take 40 years to become a reasonable size.</p>
<p>No, not even close. We need more green space in this neighbourhood to accomodate outdoor community hockey rinks, sport courts, playing fields and splashparks/playgrounds. We also need a library, swimming pool, gym and</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

indoor hockey rinks and sport courts facilities. We would like a facility similar to the Southland Leisure Centre in this area of the city.
8 acres is not much considering how much land we have here. It wouldn't make sense unless it's at least 15 acres, even if it's scattered and to have more parks.
What is the city plan to do to take in consideration the expected noise and light pollution of the housing on 77th?
It is not clear what they are trying to do here. It does not come across as a usable space. They should keep it simple, and add a nice park, splash park, playground, outdoor rink, skating on the pond....
ummm....where is the parks, splash park, green space that can actually be used?
Tree / vegetation lined streets along 77 th street coupled with noise abatement fencing on the east side of 77th street is important. The developer should pay for the noise abatement measures
The green space is not usable. they need to make the pond and actual pond with skating, and other events. Storm ponds are ugly and are not safe.
NO, there is no actual space that can be used. they are missing basic nees like playgrounds, and parks. Ice rinks, splash parks....
No, brutal attempt. It looks useless. no actual parks, not splash parks, no places to play, skate....
Most of people have chosen this area to live because of green spaces and quiet environment. The proposed development will certainly affect that.
Like the green space, its needed given the current sprawl.
I don't have any comments on this point.
over and over again building height along 77th is inappropriate, limit this to 2 storey homes. see my previous comments.
the intersection where westward ave meets 77ths street will create major disturbances for those living there. There is no intersection there but by creating one you are destroying the homes of those who live there- think of the excess, noise, pollution, poor safety during icy roads, lack of privacy, need i say more???
What does 'could be provided' mean? We need a community meeting area as well as more spaces for off-leash areas. Personally, I think there is plenty of recreational space.
this area should be first to be planned and developed, including large mature and sustainable trees that actually grown more than an inch per year. Hire an arborist before planting tiny twigs that will die out or take 50 years to mature.
how are we supposed to comment of the recreational space when no details were provided? we gave plenty of suggestions in the previous engagement open house including tennis courts, hockey rinks (outdoor), skating rink, splash pad, permanent chess board seating, community hall that can be used for revenue for the community and also for community events that will include seniors and small children as well as teens.
NO, NO DETAILS WERE GIVEN. IS THIS A PARK, OR A REC CENTRE? IT SOUNDS LIKE YOU DONT KNOW WHAT YOU WANT. AS COMMUNITY RESIDENTS WE KNOW WHAT WE WANT; - NATURAL ENVIRONMENT WALKING PATHS - SHADED PARKS - OUTDOOR HOCKEY RINKS AND SKATING RINKS - OUTDOOR POOL - BASKETBALL AND TENNIS COURTS - COMMUNITY CENTER FOR MEETING AND EVENTS
A COMMUNITY NEEDS A CENTER WHERE WE CAN ALL GATHER FOR EVENTS. THE DEVELOPER SHOULD BE PAYING AND MAINTAINING THIS AREA INDEFINITELY. THEY ARE MAKING MILLIONS ON THIS PROJECT, THEY CAN GIVE BACK TO THE COMMUNITY A LITTLE.
- schools and current public recreational facilities are completely lacking to support this population boom. Where are the libraries??, outdoor hockey rinks??, skating rinks, basketball courts, community centres. This area cannot

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>handle any more people than low density. These things need to be promised and not just proposed.</p> <p>- patio restaurants along the storm water pond would be nice. Think garrison woods' development and the small stores at the base level, with patios that encourage strolling with children and elderly. put it large trees to that it is attractive. High isolating towers will destroy the area, we want a small town, close community feel.</p> <p>- we need a community centre so bad! think of its use for community meetings, seniors groups, toddler and mommy groups, teen dances, craft fairs and rentals for events and functions. we need an outdoor hockey rink for our teenagers. they need a fun safe place to go within biking distance of their homes. encourage an outdoor lifestyle.</p>
<p>Nice to see public and recreational green space, the pictures make it look nice but in reality, we know that it won't look like that and the maintenance of the area will be poor and it will look like a weed infested concrete dump.</p>
<p>A community centre with rink is badly needed in this area.</p>
<p>I THINK SO</p>
<p>I like the idea of a skating rink, but we really need a outdoor hockey rink that can be used in the summer for ball hockey or basketball and the summer for ice hockey. we need a place for our teens to spend their time.</p> <p>I would like to see patio restaurants, with predominantly underground parking.</p> <p>the more natural green space the better- I am not seeing very much of this in the plan.</p> <p>- the green space needs to be at least doubled to accommodate the needs of the current community and the giant leap in population.</p>
<p>community centre a hundred times over!!! we need this for our children, families and seniors.</p> <p>outdoor hockey rink</p> <p>splash pad</p> <p>lots and lots of existing trees to be preserved</p> <p>lots and lots of full grown trees along every road and water then so they don't die in a year</p>
<p>See above.</p>
<p>I like the idea of a varied space with a splash pad, skating rink/path, green space and orchard but we need a community hall pretty bad here. we need a hockey rink for our young athletes to practice on as well.</p>
<p>the pathways should exist along the east side of 77th street as it is already set up for ease of use.</p>
<p>In connection with LOC 2017-0213, some consideration should be made to moving the proposed green space from the NE corner to the SE corner or possibly the SW corner of the development property. This will provide a broader utilization of the green space by the community at large. The current green space proposal will limit utilization to only those few houses in the development.</p>
<p>Green space is important for people's mental health. We used to walk through this area of our community and we are very sad to be losing it to high density housing.</p>
<p>No comment</p>
<p>Green space is great and having more indoor recreation facilities would be helpful.</p>
<p>NO, please see comments above.</p>
<p>N/a</p>
<p>Very innovative plan, which allows for storm water retention while still providing an attractive central area, close to amenities and with a distinct feel - which will make the area attractive to future residents and businesses looking at new opportunities.</p>
<p>No. The sheer volume of the concrete that will be constructed on this small amount of land will not appear "green" from the outside. If this land was developed as residential, there would be grass yards and trees seen abundantly. It will be a concrete jungle. Your wording suggests "a flexible development site where private or public recreational facility space ... could be provided". "Could be"? This doesn't promote confidence in what the area "inside" the development will look like in the end.</p>
<p>I would need to see much more detail of what is proposed in the green space. But again, too much density and too much pressure on the area.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

I am in agreement with this concept.
What tends to happen is that these areas are viewed as belonging to a particular building or development and not public!
No comment on this as of now.
How about the developers have to build something for the community- they will only sell buildings/lots based on the high quality of homes out west yet don't contribute anything to the community. Splash park, community rink are needed.
Just having an outdoor space does not bring more people in. A community hall, playground and an outdoor rink (hockey winter/ basketball summer) where it can be made available to the public.
green space is great and could easily be changed to a play ground/ recreational facility
Green space is always a good idea.
I don't know what multi-layered programming means in reference to green space. Please use common English when dealing with the public, and don't try to complicate simple concepts.
I don't think the city and developer are taking into consideration the desires of the community residents.
No - where is our skating rink on the Hill? or gym, or usable community centre?..... none have been built in any of the new communities on the Hill. We want parks - with baseball diamonds, playgrounds, soccer fields.
What is the commitment to continue to reforest the area. What about foresting the lower levels at the aspen forest. These are top bearing leaves and the mid to bottom levels of the forest are bare. Who is responsible for up keep, the tax payer or developer and for how long?
The green space is tucked inside the area so I don't know. Will there be trees? The maps weren't detailed enough and plus there was some mention of a 6 storey community centre or something like that. Is that going to be on the green space???
Yes
Yes this is key having recreational space in the area. This is something required now and should be part of the beginning of the project. When compared to other areas, there are limited options here and with current traffic the city options are take long to get to during peak times.
The proposal discusses the provision of a space for such facility, but no plan of how or when such public facilities can or would be funded. Again, this is an example of an empty developer promise of an unfunded facility. I think it is highly unlikely that there will be public funds put towards a significant recreational space in this area given the proximity to Westside Rec Centre. This proposed amendment is just a superficial way of trying to placate citizens in this area, but again, is essentially an empty promise of an "open space".
While green space is a very important need for this community, it is secondary to the extremely important issues at stake. Density, building height and transportation deficiencies are far more important and the current proposal does not sufficiently address those issues.
I am excited about the proposed Central Park green space and how it connects to the green spaces to the south. Having the catchment pond be something other than just a catchment pond will be a very inviting. Having recreational space, meeting areas, and activity areas is very innovative. I sincerely hope the City will find a way to make these plans work. I realize there could be hesitation about activities around such ponds, but I believe that as long as the activities are around the edge of the pond it is no different than having the walking paths around the existing ponds in Cougar Ridge. I strongly hope that the separated pond portion that could be an ice rink in the winter, is approved. The community is yearning for an ice rink!
Question 5. Do you have any outstanding ideas and concerns about the proposed ASP amendments that you feel have been missed and/or have not been addressed?
Yes. We need: 1. A big indoor gym/recreation centre 2. A Costco 3. A public library 4. Single-detached homes along 77 Street.

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

It appears that extra developments are being lumped into this such as the 12th Ave/Bow Trail development. That was not part of the original communication.
What recreation facilities will be provided? For youth and adults. "Tot lots" & playground are not enough. What appears when all the small kids grow up - Nowhere to go.
1. This study not only affects West Springs but also the surrounding communities that area already affected by the excess of traffic. Need to get their feedback. 2. Need to work with province on when the ring road is going to happen in order to do proper phasing.
We need a superstore in this area. No frills & Co-op just do work with all the new residents.
The feedback they still seem to want to build a high rised complex backing on to Old Banff Coach Rd, no matter what complaints and concerns to the residents of Cougar Ridge is disgusting and arrogant, people moved out here to get away from this not to have it follow for no reason but builder green on Truman's part.
Traffic and road conditions. The city can not add any more development plan without addressing the EXISTING issues. Road intersections are difficult, some has no or little chance of upgrades without significant changes. This is all still <u>unfunded</u> so how theres talk about amendments with high rise construction with the current state of roads & intersections??!!
There is very little continuity or asthetics. It's coming across that all the developer cares about is \$.
When we bought our home the ASP called for single family in most of this area. To change it so dramatically really isunfair to those of us who have made a very large financial commitment on our homes.
This should be developed with homes.
- Traffic - Green space - school - shopping area & congestion
Yes. Population density for our over capacity schools from elementary to high school.
Building heights along 77th will greatly impact single family homes opposite them.
Left turn from Sarcee Trail to Bow Trail is inadequate. This is a problem if you plan to increase population in the area.
Yes - traffic congestion in minor roads - green space no reserved based - on development - school & play ground issues - noise with change from 2 to 4 to 6 lanes.
School capacity. I live in Cougar Ridge and already have to drive to take my children to Rosscarrock Elementary (designated school). Will 3000 more people put more pressure on already full schools (elementary, mid and high schools? There seems to be no plan to build any new shcools at this time.
Even smaller buildings and more green space.
Density!! Introduce lower density all along 77th Street. Be sensitive to exisint tax payers.
As mentioned above: - maintain natural greenspaces, both for public use & specially for wildlife (corridors) - low-cost housing - Paths/roads dedicated to non-motorized use
Map needs to be much clearer. Roads need to be shown.
Significant increase in people. No proposed schools. No proposed rec center. This project will greatly impact the people currently living in this neighbourhood and not enough is proposed to relieve the current infrastructure and amenities.
"Height" of buildings do not add to the beauty of the area!! Less height is better and more attractive and classier and friendlier. Taller buildings belong in the city center for those who choose to live in them!
We bought into this area with a certain density because we liked it. Now it sounds like what was approved can just be over-ridden, and we will end up in a concrete jungle. Schools up here already all full, in addition to existing congestion moving around the area. Not against development, but this high density, tower block approach is not in keeping with anything in this area.
Just the conflict between develop & city rules, if the bylaws & landuse aren't changed it's OK, but a change to current landuse is not okay.
Listen to the current residents in the area. They have had many complaints that do not seem to have been heard.

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

No.
Nothing that has not been raised already. The proposed density is a complete mismatch to the rest of the community and this development will become an eye sore and a point of negativity if given the green light. There is no infrastructure in place to support this high density development, and whatever has been proposed in ways of modifications will have no ultimate impact. This proposal is a very bad idea for the whole community.
The City does what they want to as I found out with your bad SENIORS DEVELOPMENT in PATTERSON!!! I sold my property before the construction started, now all my old neighbours who are selling are taking \$75,000 to \$100,000 less than I did!!!
The construction traffic is already a huge issue. We can take that if the end product is quiet and traffic is not opened up from West Springs.
The city is working down from Truman's proposal instead of working from the original proposal. Truman is calling the shots. I am losing faith in the city council.
I am nervous we will ending up a long way from what the citizens have asked.
Noise pollution has not been address within the proposal by the city nor the developer. Lower income houses promotes higher crime rates. Visual impact of 30 metre tall buildings in the area. The conflicting statements made by city representatives at the open house.
I am seriously concerned about the destruction of current property values for the surrounding communities. You are adding lower cost housing options which brings down the existing property values. You are going to be creating an ugly concrete jungle eye sore that brings down property values. You are going to be starting 10+ years of construction and disruption which will bring down property values. You are increasing density which will bring down surrounding property values. Bottom line, this is bad for the existing home owners. But what does that matter as long as Truman Homes can make their return on their investment right.
Another significant concern is the destruction of the community feel. An addition of this magnitude removes the close knit feeling of community. If we wanted to live near a place like that, we would live in a condo downtown.
Stop this development.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We need a Costco here. The No Frills and Co-op are not enough with all the new residents that you bring in. 2. We need a recreation center with indoor swimming pool and zomba classrooms. 3. We need a public library. 4. We need a bigger park with more playing facilities. 5. We need more trees. Do you know how many office space are planned to be turned into residential in Downtown area? What's the advantage of this WestSpringsASP? It's not close to downtown, not close to any C-train station, not even close to any Costco. What's the selling point?
I don't see any discussion on public transportation in and out the development. The population is going to increase dramatically, is there any discussion on additional LRT trains for this area.
The "What We Heard" section of the new presentations boards completely ignores and trivializes what the community is actually saying. Nearly everyone in the community believes that the city of Calgary is going though a process, only to say they went through the process. Our completely valid concern, that is not being addressed, is that the city is not listening. We have endured this consultation process for years now, only to have it flare up time and time again with the same ridiculous development plan causing the same community concerns. The proposal provided earlier this year had 4714 additional people, which is over 10 times the amount people the community would like to see for population growth within our community. It is frustrating to see the city of Calgary claim to be listening to our concerns, and bragging about how this plan now has only 3383 people expected to move into this area. This is still 10 time more that what the community wants. I am also concerned about the claim about Jobs that will be brought to our community. The city is claiming that more jobs will be created than people proposed to be living in this area. The city needs to look downtown, where apartments and office buildings are virtually empty, and

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

ask the question, why are we abandoning the city core. We already have a distressed downtown economy that needs help, we don't want another downtown build in our West Springs neighborhood.
INFRASTRUCTURE ROADS SCHOOLS
I have a very serious concern that there is no plan for additional education facilities. The communities in the West need additional schools, especially Middle, Junior High and High Schools. I understand that the CBE has apparently evaluated that no additional schools are require, but that is a bad joke! Even with the newly built schools in the area (West Ridge, Roberta Bondar School in Aspen) they are again at capacity and there is only one public Highschool (Ernest Manning) in all of West Calgary. Also please consider the cumulative effect of other development in Westsprings and Aspen. CBE may have assumed that a portion of the students in this relatively wealthy area of Calgary will attend private, boarding or catholic schools, but that is certainly not the case for more affordable and densely developed housing! On top of that, availability of gyms and gym time for sports activities is extremely limited and we had to drive across town last year for my son's basketball practices. We really don't want to go back to ridiculous approaches like lottery systems to determine which kid can attend the public school in the community.
The proposed amendments for LOC2017-0188 does not support the ASP directives and expectations of residents that have purchased high value properties in this location. This plan alters the not only the intent of the original design, but will surely impact quality of living and property values of the R1 homeowners. The area should stay COMPLETELY designated R1. Adding commercial and retirement facilities is completely out of line with the neighbourhood.
I think each and every one of us residents have voiced our concerns time and time again. Having to live in a suburban neighbourhood, with suburban infrastructure, we see daily the effects of overzealous planning. Traffic is an issue. Our 2 roads on and off the hill can not sustain the increase. I understand the desire to limit sprawl and have residential/commercial mix. I do not believe the existing infrastructure has the ability to support this development.
Nobody wants a business sector. Why aren't there questions about that? The number of jobs that the business sector will provide is so misleading. You can't make that kind of claim. The number of residents being added is also way too high. What about schools? Why isn't that ever brought up? The schools are BURSTING here.
I just want to stress again my desire for any new commercial development to be walkable. The existing development on 85th street is awful, and is completely inaccessible to pedestrians or bikes and I don't want to see more of this type of development in the area. Again I will recommend commercial development facing the street with parking around back, bike lanes, and ideally transit access.
None
NoTransportation
No
No schools proposed for this development , you are adding thousands more people with no educational facilities to meet these and exiting families needs.
I truly do not think this area can support this high density plan or do I think it exemplifies the qualities that I love in west springs. We moved to this area for the space, ease of commute, community feel and walkable amenities. With many recent and hasty developments we feel it is already losing many of these. This high density plan will only lead to more congestion on our streets, less parking, less space, and a crowded downtown feel.
I am concerned that TRUMAN is calling the shots. I know the city is legally obligated to look at the proposed amendment, but it doesn't have to accept it. The changes from the first plan to this one are only a minor concession and are not even close to the CURRENT APPROVED plan. I am very nervous that the city is not going to do anything and the final approved plan will be very similar to the current one, and will say "we engaged" the citizens. However, NOBODY will be happy. I want to say again, the T intersection on 77th is not sensitive to the housing, it will add a significant amount of noise and light pollution. At a minimum, they should move that intersection.

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>Density, density, density along 77th street! We have asked over and over since the very start of this process. Lower the density along 77th street to be considerate to those living on it. Start with 2-3 story homes and gradually increase it from here.</p>
<p>density and connectivity. I still feel that this is not being addressed in the way that the community is looking for. Reduce the density along the entire duration of 77th street. 16m is way too high! 2-3 storeys is acceptable. 2-3 storeys is gradual, and sensitive to the community residents directly living along 77th street.</p>
<p>Consistency in unit of measure would have been appropriate. For example in the fall the panels read “storeys” and the recent panels switched to “meters,” making the two unnecessarily difficult to compare.</p>
<p>I am very concerned that most of the concerns that were addressed were made by millennials. I moved into my neighbourhood in 2002 at the age of 42 and one of "younger" type (millennials) asked me why I would want to live in a neighbourhood with all young families. Unfortunately, this millennial does not know that one day she will be older too and not have that many choices of housing and affordability. Neighbourhoods should not be age specific and designed for only "young families" which is not really fair to the older population. All of the comments I read - they (millennials) want more schools, and more hockey rinks and more stuff for their "sweet" little children. What about the aging population and their concerns? Why do older people have to be forced to buy large two story homes when that is not what they want?</p>
<p>Why was not the closure of 11th ave noted in the current ASP? Interesting since all versions of the East Springbank ASPs had both 10th and 11th as closed so I find it very surprising that it was not included in this ASP even though I am sure these were concerns from past Open Houses and also with the recent Council decision to close it. Lets respect the wishes of city residents and close it both physically and legally! How many times do we have to show opening up 11th ave to have West Springs access is not beneficial to the adjacent community of Coach Hill as it was not our fault that it was only built to accommodate local traffic.</p>
<p>No further addition of street access points on 77th street. This street is already too busy as it is used as a side street access to main roads. There are no lights, no crosswalk signs/lights and no sidewalk on half the road. The speed limit is often exceeded by motorists and it is becoming a more dangerous road for families walking to the schools and for driving on.</p>
<p>I sincerely hope that the City of Calgary is able to act on our feedback. I understand and appreciate the need to balance Developers profits, City costs, urban density vs. traffic, congestion and not to be underestimated is the need for nature. When we moved to West Springs 12 years ago, we knew that it would eventually be developed, but we could never foresee that someone would want to put tall condos and commercial buildings in our neighbourhood.</p>
<p>Related to infrastructure: the schools in the area are at or near capacity. Residents of Cougar Ridge currently need to bus their children to out-of-area schools. Has the long term impact of the proposed development and increased population on our schools been considered?</p> <p>The proposal also includes a significant amount of commercial development. With the current vacancy rates, not just downtown, but city wide (including many in West Springs); is "Built it and they will come" prudent?</p>
<p>There is no information on having plans to build recreation centres in the area.</p>
<p>West Side is not an option since is not city owned and is out of reach because of household income.</p>
<p>Where are the online displays showing the traffic lights/ intersection changes on OBCR and 85th? I thought the City did those displays at the open house yet I don't see them online. Anyways the existing development at the SE corner of OBCR and 85th (DC209D2017) has no left turn exits...as result there are people that do U-turns at the intersection or make an illegal left turn at the north exit. Why doesn't the proposed road system of this development connect to this district through the adjacent MU-1 (1.30ha) / S-SPR (0.39h) parcel to give people the option to get to a set of lights so that they can make a left turn onto OBCR (to head west) or a left turn onto 85th (to head south). That would solve an existing problem. I would also have liked to have seen a parking plan of the development. I understand a lot of the parking will be underground for the residential users? What about the commercial or open space users what is available for them around those areas aside from the transit centre which is shared by a supermarket? Again another concern that has arose from the OBCR/85th SE development. There is very limited and tight parking in this area that cars actually park in the south lane of OBCR. This is obviously going to cause a problem when the south lane of OBCR is eventually doubled between 85th and 77th. I know the intent is promote</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

walking/biking but let's be realists here; people in the burbs love to drive in the winter which happens to be 9 months of the year; parking needs to be factored in.
Leave our neighbourhood alone, we like our quiet living.
Will original vegetation be preserved?
Home owners pay for communities with single family housing . This project is not welcome in this area
What additional policing will be in place with the increased density housing?
Are upgrades to the existing fire stations in the region required to accommodate the increased density of housing?
This new development will bring in significantly more light pollution than the current ASP due to the high number of multi-family and retail/commercial buildings and roadways. Propose requiring compliance to "dark sky" standards and use of down-lighting streetlights or low-height lighting.
How is the city planning on motivating businesses to set up shop and create these jobs when everyone is being taxed at high levels.
I feel that the height of the development along 77 street needs addressing again since it clearly was not addressed well since the last survey and open house. the residents have asked for homes no higher than 2 storeys yet this was sorely ignored and maintained at 5 storeys along the middle and north end of 77 street. Development higher than 2 storeys will invade privacy (and since there is a sad lack of green space planned, where are my children going to play otherwise??), drop in property value, light and sound pollution, excessive shading of our homes and yards- so much for growing a locally sourced, sustainable garden.
School infrastructure, specifically providing access for cougar ridge children.
The access to proper busing in existing neighborhoods has not been addressed. How does the city intend on developing the bus routes to ensure people have access and are able to travel by transit as opposed to driving everywhere??
Again the building height along 77 street is inappropriate and completely insensitive to current residents all along 77 street. Limit this to 2 stories.
Get rid of all t intersections as they are terrible for accidents and congestion. Connect Weston drive with the new district
See above
Almost no details were provided regarding the Brawn lands, which is a development which adds significant density and high rise development to the area. This asp change cannot be approved without better public consultation on the entire proposal. I believe the traffic study was flawed as it did not include the potential of multi-family residential in the brawn land proposal (which as i've stated earlier, i have confirmed directly with the developer that it will likely be all ages multi-family along 85 st.) West springs already has lots of high density, lots of retail and with current congestion and not being close to the c-train line, this is not an ideal place for this development. I truly believe we will be stranded here without funding for interchanges along bow trail to the east as well as the ring road. I have no confidence in the city when we are told that development will phased in with infrastructure improvements as, so far, we've seen rampant developments with very few infrastructure upgrades.
I truly believe this is already a done deal with the developer and I find that this is disappointing, when I purchased a home in the area 4 years ago was assured that it would indeed grow, which is good but the construction would be single family, not multi family. Multi family is a necessary and I get that but it would have been much nicer if it matched the current lay-out and style. I'm glad that this is going over a 20 year development as towards the end with the not as high high-rise, I'll be gone.
I feel like this was an extremely predictable process. Ask for a huge development to get approved, scale it back a little, and claim the high ground. It needs to get scaled further and the likelihood of truly efficient and useable public transportation needs to be further considered. People drive cars to the suburbs, and given the relative affluence of West Springs to other high density areas I just don't believe people are looking for an economic alternative to get to

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>work or school. They're going to keep driving and that's going to mean thousands of cars every morning heading onto 85th street, Old Banff Coach Road, 9th ave and all the other arterial roadways.</p>
<p>Three things remain concerning; 1) the building heights along 77th street are too high. It needs to start lower at 2-3 stories and gradually increase from there. see rationale as above 2)The intersection at 77th and westward way needs to go- move that to a more useful intersection at weston drive and eliminate excess intersections for the rationale given above 3) green space, trees, bike lanes, roundabouts, park space for children and teens</p>
<p>building heights!!!! way too high along the edge of existing developments- 77th and OBCR</p> <p>lack of bike lanes and ample green natural space</p> <p>school space</p>
<p>Please scrap the ridiculous plan that Truman has forced onto the city. The original plan, which many people bought based on, should still be the plan we are reviewing. The city needs to consider the residents on 77th. really think about what you would want next to you....</p>
<p>over and over and over again- building heights are way too high along 77th street and OBCR. Reduced them to 2 or 3 storeys to decrease the impact on the exiting communities of cougar ridge and west srpings</p> <p>where are all these people going to send their children to school?</p>
<p>Resort back to the original plan or at least start from that. Move the road, so it does not T onto existing housing, get rid of all the commercial, we do NOT need more stores or businesses.</p>
<p>move back to the original, current approved plan.</p>
<p>YES! Why is The adjacent community of Coach and Patterson Heights not listed as an affected community yet you list Strathcona which is South of Bow Trail? Coach Hill is dramatically affected on the east side of this ASP especially with</p> <p>1)11th ave if it is allowed to stay open for vehicle and transit traffic and then there is the issue of cut through traffic we have been seeing over the years as soon as Old Banff Coach road gets backed up either due to weather or accidents. Let's close 11 th ave and upgrade Bow Trail and get Stoney Trail going.</p> <p>2)since the east edge of the ASP incorporates 5 acre parcels that are actually part of the Coach Hill Community as decided under the past reign of Ward Councillor Bronconnier and whose residents access Coach Hill roads and are part of the cities community map and do not even use West Springs road names??? Where do these residents belong ...CHPH CA or West Springs CA?</p>
<p>Just the desire to see a more tangible activity space like an ice surface for public skating in the winter and maybe beach volleyball ins summer like in New Brighton. We don't have any public spaces close by. I would pay a yearly community fee to help with the upkeep and maintenance. Encouraging a community (and not residents) association to form and maintain such a space would be great.</p>
<p>building heights along the entire length of 77th street remain too high. 5 storeys is not acceptable to area residents. please focus on this.</p>
<p>The current combination of Trico/Brimor development is becoming an increasingly uncomfortable nuisance for Coach Hill residents. Coach Ridge Road and Coach Hill Road are now either caked in mud or dust much of the time. Water service has been fouled by the construction (rust in the potable water supply requiring City intervention) and numerous work time violations (some as early as 6:20 AM and as late as 11:40 PM!) have been noted. Dust in the immediate area has been a huge concern and is likely impacting the health of some residents. The City should be aware that such inconsiderate and disrespectful actions towards long-time area residents is not acceptable. Hopefully any future developments will be conscious of this.</p>
<p>I believe the proposed densities cannot be supported with the current transportation infrastructure - specifically around transit. With this much density, a direct bus route to downtown would be more appropriate and would help to</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>reduce the congestion during the peak periods. Taking a bus to the West LRT is not as convenient for many residents and I believe having an express bus service to downtown from West Springs would help.</p>
<p>no, I am in favor of development</p>
<p>Overall I do not agree with the West Springs amendment to construct multi-storey units because many of the current deficiencies (although identified) have not been addressed. It goes against the lifestyle that people originally bought into and should be more consistent with the original plan. Simply put, creating a high density neighbourhood in an already congested environment that does not have the means to fully support its current community seems like the wrong thing to do. I understand it is easier said than done but address/ find funding to fix the transit/transportation issues, build a community space and some high schools before considering creating high density dwelling units.</p>
<p>No</p>
<p>building heights, building heights, building heights along the entire duration fo 77th street needs to be lowered to match the existing homes which is 2 storeys.</p>
<p>Push traffic back out to 85th street where it is designed to handle it, instead of towards 77th street. Eliminate t intersections along 77th street, primarily that of west ward ave and 77th street- this is useless to commuters and will put so much more strain on those living along 77th street. Thing of the excess traffic, pollution, street lights, noise etc that will destroy our quiet living?</p>
<p>There is a school on the corner of 77 th street and old banff coach road that already causes SIGNIFICANT traffic delays at peak hours on school days , how will city ensure the safety of the kids that walk to that school or will modifications be made to redirect the internatio</p>
<p>trees, large mature trees on every street especially connector roads on the perimeter of the district. Don't plant anything that is growing to grow at the pace of a snail, die in a year, or is not native to alberta.</p> <p>Along 77th street and OBCR, developer fences are decrepit. If they propose to make the area nice, are they going to redo these fences? Increased traffic, noise and light pollution, dead and dying trees all suggest that they should take responsibility for the large impact (and primarily negative impact) that they are having on surrounding communities.</p>
<p>Yes. Put back to single family homes as was the original plan 5 years ago when most of the area was developed and put the high density where it belongs down town and on stony trail.</p>
<p>no, this asp should be rejected and not pursued further.</p> <p>this is a developer led initiative and planned and proposed for their benefit. it does not meet a need put forth from the community's current residents and does not attempt to address any of the needs of this community. i reside in multifamily housing and prefer it because of affordability and a sense of community but this proposal has not changed enough to meet the concerns raised by the community to support more of its kind.</p> <p>the plan still appears to have unattractive and uninspired features. they should have funding for municipal public art and an attraction or strategy to invite other Calgarians in tho the area for retail or business purposes. as is, that is a goal but not outline how they plan to achieve this outcome.</p>
<p>bike lanes?</p> <p>trees and lots of them?</p> <p>banning stores like adult stores, cash advance, etc. this attracts the wrong crowd of people and is too close to our schools.</p>
<p>trees</p> <p>bike lanes</p> <p>splash pads</p> <p>'underground parking and very very limited above ground parking- make park space instead. Let's move away from cars for this district, we already have enough traffic problems in the area.</p>
<p>SCHOOLS! LIBRARY! No community centre! No addition of streetlight at old Banff coach and 89th!</p>
<p>Perhaps you could ask [personal information removed] how HE would feel if we plopped this project down in [personal information removed] where he lives. I'm thinking he would never want this where he lives!!!</p>
<p>I think the transportation and roads need to be planned carefully and taken care of right. I would like to see a plan so that our main arteries in the area aren't dug up 15 more times in the next 2 years.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

<p>over and over again building height along 77th is inappropriate, limit this to 2 storey homes. see my previous comments.</p>
<p>the intersection where westward ave meets 77ths street will create major disturbances for those living there. There is no intersection there but by creating one you are destroying the homes of those who live there- think of the excess, noise, pollution, poor safety during icy roads, lack of privacy, need i say more???</p>
<p>See comments above. This development is not aligned with the values of the homeowners in the area.</p>
<p>I think the city completely misses the issue traffic problems are up the hill and how little options we have to get out of our communities. It's made doubly worse with snow or accidents.</p>
<p>bike lanes building height roundabouts instead of t-intersections redoing the horrendous fence line along 77th street on the east side to give more privacy and security since you plan a congested high traffic road there.</p>
<p>See above notes</p>
<p>No</p>
<p>TREES, GREEN SPACE, NATURAL SPACE BUILDING HEIGHT NEED TO BE REDUCED ACROSS THE BOARD, ESPECIALLY ON 77TH STREET BIKE LANES COMMUNITY HALLS FOR RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR SENIORS, CHILDREN AND TEENS</p>
<p>Is there any architectural control in these new developments. If they are cheap looking or ultra modern, you won't have much favor in the community either. It should blend in with the community, look classy and not obtuse.</p>
<p>Who is paying for the recreational facility possibly proposed, shouldn't Truman pay for it?</p>
<p>This community really needs some community-building facilities and gathering areas. Right now, we have to drive to Springbank for hockey, drive to Bowness for swimming, drive to Signal Hill for a library, drive to Killarney/Glamorgan areas for baseball diamonds etc. etc. It would be nice if we could actually play in the community we live in and our children could grow up with easily accessible (by bike) recreation and fitness options.</p>
<p>I, as many others can see that this added 1789 units, is bad news. If we need higher density living, then inner city would make more sense. There's a reason why others decided to live here, space is a major one. This ruins the whole environment. I am not opposed to no development but definitely not so many condos. There needs to be an increase of at least 30% to be single homes.</p>
<p>I am concerned that the city will be doing one more feedback session, with minimal concessions and implement a terrible amendment. They will then look back and congratulate themselves on being so engaged. The city needs to remember that the current approved plan is not what is being proposed, and they can simply oppose any changes.</p>
<p>Remove the T intersection onto 77th.</p>
<p>Add more greenspace along 77th</p>
<p>Remove all high density housing and move back to low density</p>
<p>Remove all commercial and buildings over 2 stories from 77th.</p>
<p>Remove the T intersection onto 77th.</p>
<p>Do NOT try to make this into an inner city neighbourhood, nobody wants it.</p>
<p>I find that the amendments tabled do not fully address the concerns raised by the adjacent communities surrounding the proposed development. We have been adversely impacted by this proposed development and do not feel that our concerns (ie. see above) have been fully addressed. We bought this property based on the original zoning that will now change - it has adversely affected our property values particularly for those living along 77th Street.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

Remove the density across the area. especially along 77th.
Remove the T intersection on 77th.
Say no to all amendments to the original plan.
Please remove the T intersection onto 77th.
Please remove all buildings over 2 stories along 77th, and all commercial buildings.
Remove all high density housing along 77th (max 2 story)
consider all of the impact along 77th, especially noise and light pollution. T intersection is a prime example.
I dont think traffic concerns have been adequately addressed. Please dont shove another 2000+ people on the hill without fixing the traffic problems.
Not right now.
bike lanes????
None
no high school planned? building height needs to be fair. It is obviously that million dollar home owners have achieved lower building heights towering over their yard- what about the rest of us along 77th street. Respect the community residents, respect our lifestyles and respect the hard work we put into earning our property- lower building heights to 2 storeys only. bike lanes, pathways++, green space that is safe for all ages, heavily treed street building fences are typically low quality- are they going to replace the one along 77th street since they are imposing so much intrusion of privacy and pollution?
THE DOCUMENTS POSTED AT THE OPEN HOUSE ARE VERY DIFFICULT TO ACCESS ONLINE. THIS IS SERIOUSLY PROBLEMATIC. INFORMATION IS NOT READILY ACCESSIBLE, THEREFORE CAN BE UNDERSTOOD AS BEING WITHHELD. THIS ENTIRE PROCESS HAS DEMONSTRATED THEIR PRINCIPLE. VERY POOR ENGAGEMENT PROCESS BY THE DEVELOPER AND THE CITY.
- schools and current public recreational facilities are completely lacking to support this population boom. Where are the libraries, hockey rinks, skating rinks, basketball courts, community centres. This area cannot handle any more people than low density - move traffic flow towards 85th instead of 77th street. 85th is a high density commercial area, 77th is a quiet residential street, think about the impact on those living on 77th street- between additional intersections, emissions, traffic congestions, noise from traffic and buses, and excess street lights. Even for the new residents of west district- no one is going to want to live across from a busy street, looking out onto a calm road is much more appealing.
yes, where is it addressed about how this development will ruin the community feel. You propose putting a small city in the middle of a nice community. You propose having 8 storey buildings directly across the street from single home detached communities. This will stick out like an ugly eye sore with no connection to the existing community.
Impact to attached residents on Westpark Cres, Place & Court. No more than 2 stories directly behind the already established houses who bought with the existing landuse agreement.
The number of proposed R1-s zoned houses along the south end of the development are still too numerous. The number should be reduced. 50 feet wide R1-s lots are more appropriate for transition from existing 60 feet plus houses/lots. ALSO, NO 3 STOREY HOUSES!!!
roundabout bike lanes more green space LOW density housing on the perimeter of the project (old Banff road and especially 77th street) to match the current community and to prevent massive invasion of privacy of current residents). this is the suburbs, treat it like that. outdoor hockey rink heavily treed streets that are well maintained- not twigs destined to die in a year

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

<p>reduce t-intersections and connect the current community via existing intersections push traffic out to 85th, not 77th. the capacity of bow trail is far higher than that of Old Banff coach road</p>
<p>There seems to be a large disconnect from what Truman thinks they are doing to be sensitive to existing homeowners as per their website and what they are actually doing. There has be a loud response that is concerned about the impact on our homes, our lifestyles, and our property values. We should be the main stakeholder in this. Lower building heights, move roads so that they decreased the negative impact current residents. Install bike lanes on the EAST side of 77th so that both communities can use them (it's a minimally intersected road at this point, less intersections mean less accidents!!!!)</p>
<p>PARKING should not overflow into west springs and should NOT occur on the east side of 77th. People live here, we don't want our yards polluted with emission of idling parked cars! A bike lane along the east side of 77th street would be much more appealing to residents and would be safer for children travelling to schools in the area because it will be interrupted far less than the west side of 77th street</p>
<p>roundabouts please</p>
<p>No. Again, I do not object to the LOC 2017-0213 development however, due to the desire to reduce traffic into the development property from 11 Avenue, we would request that this entrance area be restricted either permanently or temporarily until the lot to the south is developed.</p>
<p>We did not move here to be part of an inner city type neighbourhood. This change is too dramatic and is unfortunate and unwelcome.</p>
<p>Yes, all regarding the transportation infrastructure issue</p>
<p>No, my primary concerns remain the impact of the density of development on the traffic and roads as well as on the recreation facilities.</p>
<p>How is it that the City of Calgary is giving the developer the green light to impact an entire neighborhood of High End Single Family Homes? This development is wrong for this area, this concept belongs in the inner city, where other apartment/condo style buildings together with commercial reign supreme. Most of the residents in the inner city use public transportation therefore traffic concerns would also be low.</p>
<p>N/a</p>
<p>The amount of time, and the City planning group's emphasis on (unfounded) transportation concerns above all other considerations has made this a less than transparent process, which has taken much longer than necessary. From the outside eye - it appears to be obstruction, in order to further the agenda of other areas and the interests of owners in those areas.</p>
<p>Yes. I feel this entire process has been quietly introduced and the City is trying to approve this amendment as quickly as possible. Many, many residents of our area do not even know that this is happening. I have educated as many of my neighbours as possible, but the fact remains that if so many residents are not even aware of this potential development, the current method of informing the residents has not been effective. We collectively do not want this type of concrete jungle in our community. We have purchased our homes for the type of family living this area has provided and we have traditionally invested more money to do so rather than purchasing in other areas of the city. If the development was more reasonable in size - ie., limited to 3 or four storey buildings, that might be acceptable, but six to eight storey buildings will change the environment of our community. We have been advised that CBE feels they do not need to provide any additional schools in the area, and this seems unbelievable. The schools in the area are already at capacity! The developer seems quite interested in providing information as to the environment within the new development, but that doesn't address how this development affects our established community. Yes, change is always inevitable, but this type of development is not conducive to the area surrounding it.</p>
<p>I am under the impression that development is not supposed to be carried out when major intersections are at failure levels. I would like answers to that information. I would also like information about how this level of density in a small community area can be justified considering traffic, schooling and other loads on infrastructure. I'm also aware that the LRT/public transportation isn't getting the capacity of use that City Hall had hoped. So this</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

<p>push for density is an attempt to stifle that issue. I'd like to know why our neighbourhood must suffer because of that mistake.</p>
<p>Do not like the idea of multi-level buildings or any more commercial in this area. We are being well-served by what is available and some smaller businesses are finding it a struggle to make a go or it. We have already lost some!</p>
<p>Not at this time.</p>
<p>It's too high density for this already dense area. They are going to flood our schools with kids, use our roads and infrastructure without giving back.</p>
<p>If the target demographic is young family, ensuring school available space is adequate and not pushing others in the community out. Therefore a mix demographics and a seniors home may help in preventing this pressure.</p>
<p>The ASP addressed the concerns that I had</p>
<p>Just what I said about the bike path(s) in previous question.</p>
<p>I think the city and developer should come up with oipctions for low density single family homes with more green spaces and bike/walking pathways</p>
<p>Schooling, impact to existing residents, park space, no back alleys....</p>
<p>Dear Sir/Madam: Re: West Springs Area Structure Plan Application #LOC 2017-0213</p> <p>I submit this letter in regard to the development application #LOC 2017-0213. I have had an opportunity to review the plans and know the site well, having grown up in the area and my parents are current land owners within the proposed development area.</p> <p>It is proposed that future development of this site at the corner of 11 Avenue SW and 77 Street SW will include thirty single-family detached homes plus a small tot lot playground. Access to this subdivision will be via an entrance on 11 Avenue SW or via 77 Street SW. It is my belief that access via 11 Avenue SW to this subdivision will create a significant increase in traffic flow for current acreage residents along 11 Avenue SW, thus disrupting the existing environment and natural habitat. Specifically for my parents, the access will be directly across from their home. This will have the effect of increased traffic congestion, increased noise and increased light pollution, with headlights from cars shining directly into their living room. As an alternative, I strongly encourage you to consider one of the following options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Having access to this development exclusively via 77 Street SW 2. Having access to the subdivision via a collector street which branches from 77 Street SW into the middle of the subdivision. A cul-de-sac at either end would limit through traffic, while providing adequate accessibility for all residents. <p>Instituting such a plan to limit access via 77 Street SW would enhance safety and promote a healthy neighborhood with an inter-connected street network which is sensitive to the needs of all residents. Such development would be compact, well connected and integrated, thereby fulfilling the objectives of the West Springs Area Structure Plan. I trust you will take these ideas into consideration for future planning of the development and I will continue to follow further amendments and plans.</p> <p>[personal information removed]</p>
<p>Yes, Originally, the community was to have tennis courts? Where are they? Why was I not informed when this changed? Is the same way the City and the developer are going to inform us when the project changes. What is the responsibility of both parties to inform us as residents when they are changes to the project. How or will the residents be informed of any amendments?</p>
<p>Yes. There is no opportunity here to voice concerns about the Brawn proposal. We raised a number of serious concerns about it as a community and I see nothing here. Not to mention that those of us without a background know what the various designations actually mean.</p>
<p>Is anyone thinking about the COMBINED impact of all this increasing densification? It may be one thing to approve any one of these changes but what about their combined impact on transportation and density when you consider them all together?</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

The existing infrastructure in current commercial locations is already stretched over capacity. For instance, it is often impossible to find parking spaces in the shopping complex on the corner of 85th street and old banff coach road. Similarly difficult to find parking in the shopping complex at 85th street and 9th Avenue (Mercato/Starbucks/etc.). This leaves many citizens parking illegally on main streets (old banff coach road) because there are no other choices. How will this be alleviated in this amendment and how can this situation possible tolerate an influx of over 3000 people? And please don't suggest that people should just walk there or ride their bikes. That is not feasible when you are trying to run errands quickly with 2 or 3 small children in tow.

We have lived in this area in the same home for 15 years. We intentionally purchased our home in this area because of the style of the community with single-home, residential dwellings. If we wanted to live in a high density area, we would have looked to live further into the inner city. The developer and the city are trying to force a highly significant change in the density in this neighbourhood without consideration of the residents who have chosen to live here for many years. This is NOT a gradual increase in density. It is a MASSIVE change in density. Anyone who drives around this area can clearly see that a development such as the one proposed here does not fit in any way, shape or form with the existing community. If there is indeed a city initiative to increase density in residential areas, it MUST be done in a sensitive way that allows for a GRADUAL transition. Plunking down 7 to 9 storey buildings in this area does NOT accomplish that goal.

The revisions to the original plan show that the City of Calgary is aware that the residents of this community have significant issues with this development. However, the proposed changes do not address those concerns in any significant way. There is a serious concern among residents of West Springs that the management of West Springs Community Association is working to serve the developers needs and not those of the community. The City has an obligation to listen to the concerns of the actual residents of this community and deny this proposal. The developer obviously stands to profit far more significantly based on higher density. Those of us who have lived here for 15 plus years are keenly aware of the issues around transportation and space in local schools. This development is simply not in line with the characteristics of this community.

I would like to see height restrictions relaxed so that roof top gardens, green houses and solar panels could be included. We need to get as much new development off the grid as possible. Possibly provide incentives to the developer to do these things. Other examples: recycling grey water. Solar road panels etc. Let's make this a truly innovative development in Calgary! There is a Bylaw in Toronto that requires green roofs on new commercial, institutional and residential development with a minimum Gross Floor Area of 2,000m². We need this in Calgary. Also, please encourage architecture that fits in with the rest of West Springs and Cougar Ridge. This should NOT look like downtown with lots of glass and metal cladding. The newer buildings that have been constructed in the past couple of years in WSCR and that are going up now are ugly boxes with flat roofs, and coloured metal sides. This does not fit with the original classic architecture seen in the houses and, for example, in the Shoppers Drugmart and CoOp centres. There we have peaked roofs with stone and wood accents. Even the older town homes fit this description. The West District can be urban-like but still have a country, wooded feel that predominates in WSCR. We are bounded by Paskapoo Slopes, WinSport, and other treed ravines and therefore a Village feel should predominate eg. The Sunterra complex by Sirrocco Drive, or the Horseshoe Resort Village in Toronto are good examples. <http://urbantoronto.ca/database/projects/horseshoe-resort-village>

LOC2017-0213 - would request that this development plan be reviewed again to remove its access to 11 Avenue. Westmore Manor SW could be changed such that there is a cul-de-sac at each end and therefore eliminate the need for the road exiting onto 11 Avenue. Having access onto 11 Avenue will unnecessarily increase the traffic flow. Alternatively, we would request that the access onto 11 Avenue be kept close until such time as development of the property immediately south occurs.

Question 6. Do you have any additional questions about the proposed amendments...?

Yes. Can we veto this development plan altogether? Just put yourself into any buyer's shoes, would you like to live in this high density area? Knowing that it not close to any C-train station. There is only one way to access to downtown and it's always packed. NO Costco nearby. NO superstore nearby.

What can we do to further reduce the density to match the rest of the community? I don't want to live in a construction zone for 20 years while it's been developed.

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

Why is a high density agenda being pushed for the edge of the city? Why not utilize brownfield space in areas with appropriate infrastructure.
I have no doubt about the work the different groups in the city are doing, in their respective areas, but I feel better communication between the groups before presenting the work so the concerns can be addressed properly (Example. The planning group shall know more about the transportation bottlenecks and the rationale for going from 600 dwellings to 2758 and finally to 1789).
I need <u>Jeff</u> the new <u>Ward 6 representative</u> to be personally here and listen to our concerns.
Please we'd like <u>current numbers</u> for traffic & transportation stats. Those should be made <u>public</u> . When talking to developers they say they have to be vetted by the city. When talking to the city they say there's no funding for a study/analysis of traffic flow in the area/community.
Hoping the plan is approved shortly & development begins to take place. We are looking forward to an exciting self contained community!!
Revisit West District Plan. Reduce multi storey buildings for - improve traffic - school - green space
How can we stop this development?
Pls listen to residents almost all residents have one or same issues.
Transportation infrastructure is grossly under funded. West LRT parking insufficient. Building heights too high! Too dense!
Yes, What is forecast model plan for too many years? ??? 2000 in 15 years planned failed. No schools. Traffic congestion.
New schools?
Why have the issues of density, schools, greenspace not been adequately addressed?
How will the phasing of the project be tied to the road network improvements. Many are currently unfunded and there seems to be no plan to connect the market housing to infrastructure improvements.
When exactly will the green space be able to be used, preferably BEFORE the density explosion and ugly high buildings? Who exactly benefits from high buildings that block out the sun and a high density population? It is not the existing population. Is it not about profit and bank accounts, and <u>taxes</u> .
A 500% increase from the current ASP is ridiculous. It seems to just maximize the profits for the Developer(s) not what's in the best interest of the city and the residents.
Yes - There is no mention of a seniors facility for independent/assisted living with broad based amenities and services. This is a necessity given the demographic profile in this area. See University District and Mahogany developments for examples.
Hire better City Planners and listen to the people of the community!!!!
Why are city representatives at the open house telling residents to sell their homes? What is the developer or the city hiding? Why wasn't the new city councilor for ward 6 at the open house?
What are the timelines for decisions on the proposals provided by the develops? Where can we find more information regarding the developers plans?
Please stop this development
I wish JEFF DAVISON was here today hearing our concerns and voice. I need another round of the show-and-tell event before the final decision is made. Because I am pretty sure the current plan is not the one that I was expecting, not even close.
One of the big issues I see going forward is the lack of infrastructure to adequately handle the increased traffic flow. One of the biggest problems is the intersection at Bow Trail and Sarce Trail. this is a problem with the traffic flow now.
What can we do to make the city of Calgary listen to the community?
What can we do to make the city of Calgary place the needs and concerns of the community ahead of the entrepreneurial home developers?

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

<p>This is the real issue, we need a city council that understands this situation, a council that sees how the system is allowing our community to be pushed into something no-one wants, we are being ignored. Once we have a city council that learns how to listen to our concerns, we can then close the book on this re-occurring nightmare. Please stop this horrible development...</p>
<p>How are you going to ensure that the retail space will be utilized. Rent is too expensive up here and small businesses can't afford it</p>
<p>How is it that the existing residents are already suffering insufficient traffic allowance (vehicle, bicycle, foot) in the area, yet additional density planning is being proposed?</p>
<p>The existing desirability of the area is drastically being affected by supporting development over quality of life considerations for existing residents - why is this?</p>
<p>Thank you for taking the time to hear my concerns again.</p>
<p>I assume that the developers have paid a value for that land that assumes they can get the density they want and only pay for the development of roads etc as minimally possible. So I feel like this is a done deal otherwise the developers would not have invested to date. Would be nice to hear otherwise and get the details on agreements made to date with the developer.</p>
<p>My major concerns are traffic and density.</p>
<p>Transportation, roadways and density are the concerns. Build the infrastructure prior to building new communities with high density.</p>
<p>Complete the south leg of the ring road and at the same time complete the west leg of the ring road. When the south leg is completed without the west leg it will dramatically increase the north and south volume of traffic on Sarcee Trail. Down town workers will use Bow Trail to come out old downtown to Sarcee and then go south on Sarcee to the south ringroad again increasing traffic volume on this four lane artery.</p>
<p>Biggest concern is the density of the housing and lack of transportation funding to support it.</p>
<p>1. As an adjacent Coach Hill resident I have a question as to why the West Springs ASP south east borders enter over the cities community profile map of Coach Hill which reflects several 5 acre parcels which are currently addressed and access Coach Hill Road and NOT west into West Springs. Therefore, shouldn't the ASP reflect proper borders as this is confusing for the Which CA the properties belong to?</p>
<p>2. With respect to the 11th ave road closure at about 73 Rd street. Under the East Springbank ASP it was noted that both 10th and 11th ave would be closed, but somehow with the existing new West Springs ASP page 37 it does not even reflect the initial concept of an 11th ave road closure even though it went to Council in 2015 and it was decided to be a physical closure but somehow it turned into the possibility of a transit gate. Although, I am all for development we need to consider orderly development and respect that the current 1970s community of Coach Hill and its existing roads and residential layout cannot entertain additional transit service and vehicular traffic. Please respect councils decision and the voice of Coach Hill residents and close this 11th ave both physically and legally!</p>
<p>Schools are already full, how will we accommodate more kids?</p>
<p>Are our voices being listened to? Is there anyone in the existing communities who desire this high density housing? The infrastructure has to come first, and from what I can see there are no existing funded plans for that to happen.</p>
<p>Why does the city not care about the residents in this area? Why does the city feel the need to let developers call the shots? Why does this process appear to be engaged, but in reality it is all being decided behind closed doors?</p>
<p>Why was our councillor not at the open house???</p>
<p>Why were the truman staff so poorly informed on their own project.? None were able to show me on a map where the schools were. None were able to relate the city posters at the open house to their own design. And only one was aware of the 2012 city plan which stated low density along 77th street. Clearly, the developer is not in touch with the</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

<p>current community. It is obvious that money has become more important than creating healthy, happy and connected communities.</p>
<p>I have been to every engagement session, given feedback at every opportunity and read every comment published on this project. There is an overwhelming response from area residents that the density is too high, and continues despite changes to be too high especially along 77th street. Why bother having engagement sessions when hundreds of people have voiced concerns and no real changes that are acceptable to the community are being made? We are very disappointed in how this project has been rolled out. Our voices are not being heard, yet we are so strongly voicing them.</p>
<p>LOC2017-0213 - with only 30 detached homes in this area - access to the area should be limited to entrances off of 77 Street. There is no reason to add additional traffic to 11 Ave by providing access via 11 Avenue.</p>
<p>are we actually going to be heard?? We feel that all the comments that we made and hundreds of other people made are not being considered. Hundreds asked for low density along the entire borders of the areas, not just along the million dollar homes. We along with our neighbours are considering our options as far as leaving the community. We don't want to back out onto 5 storey condos- that isn't what we bought into when we reviewed the 2012 city plans. Please listen to us! We are rapidly losing faith in the city of Calgary's so called "community engagement" which feels more like lip service than anything else.</p>
<p>Please adhere to the existing building height standards for the area. Changing them now for this last pocket of development will negatively affect the entire community.</p>
<p>When are we getting more outdoor usable family park space, and outdoor common sports facilities (baseball diamond, skating rink or pond)?</p>
<p>What about lakes with main club or community areas where families can spend time, have sports, family reunions, etc? What about new schools and sport centers?</p>
<p>Does the Project team have a skill set in addressing requirements for the baby boomers and their concerns?</p>
<p>How about amending the east boundaries of the ASP to actually reflect the city community map, in particular the 5 acre parcels that actually access Coach Hill roads and street signs like Coach Court. They belong to Coach Hill and the CA and are not part of West Springs. We are confused when it comes to development issues!</p>
<p>I would like to suggest an overpass for access from Bow trail to and over Sarcee. This intersection creates a massive bottleneck out of the community due to lights at this intersection going in all directions. It is the only through street from the top of the hill to downtown or onto a highway to the north/south of the city.</p>
<p>Road construction and repairs have been almost constant on 85 St. with this and other commercial projects. There must be a development plan so that it can be all done and completed at this point. Let the developers pay and be finished with this. We are so frustrated with rough patchwork roads and closures over the last 5 + years. It will just get worse as the traffic increases. Why is there no master plan for this type of situation?</p>
<p>My sincere ask of the project team would be that they please work with the developers to further slightly reduce the heights and densities involved in this current plan. Thanks very much.</p>
<p>Why is the real reason of doing the ASP for this area?</p> <p>As I said, we choose this area for the low density. We don't want to live in an area that has high or medium rise buildings.</p> <p>We don't like the look of downtown in the place we live at.</p>
<p>I would like to see the time line for the various stages of development, understanding that the whole project will be 20 years.</p>
<p>I didn't see any information on the phasing. It's a 20-year project so what is the actual phasing plan for development? It would be nice if completion of the green space was part of the first phase of construction so that the affected communities that have to deal with the construction and traffic impacts can get some relief by utilizing the amenities of the green space early on in the project.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>How did you ever think that building 8 story building and higher is a good idea for a community on the edge of the city? Does anyone in the department have any idea why people have moved here? It was to leave the tall building of inner city living and enjoy a quiet community. We did not want a hopping new development like Quarry Park. It is a shame that no one downtown cares about the people of Calgary, all they care about is the money they can make off the developers and what follows.</p>
<p>I am concerned the city is working back from the Truman proposal versus using the original as the baseline. I am scared the city will fold and let Truman call the shots.... come on city!</p>
<p>What is the suspected impact to property value along 77th street expected to be and what compensation will be provided?</p>
<p>How will construction be managed over the likely 20-year development to minimize impact on the community, in particular the adjacent homes along the south edge (e.g. dust, traffic, noise, duration of each phase)? At what point do neighbours have the opportunity to provide input and feedback on the specific development plans (e.g. lot sizes, etc.)?</p>
<p>Are you listening to the hundreds of requests about building height along 77 street and following your OWN principle of grid system of roads when it relates to 77 street? Are you in fact listening to the taxpayers and constituents, or just to the big money of the developer. I am hoping for more response in this round of surveys.</p>
<p>We don't consider west of Sarcee to be inner city where the density is required. If you are going to build up our area, please visit areas like Elbow Park, Lower Mount Royal, etc. as well. We want to keep our neighborhoods low density and will fight this to the end.</p>
<p>Please release the entire traffic study and include the brawn lands as multi-residential. What effect would those have on the schools and roads? Why is West Springs/Wentworth subject to so much more densification than springbank hill when their ASP was changed? Please do not hold open houses again during an election week. Signs get lost amidst the election signs and peoples attention is naturally directed more towards voting than an open house? What would be the density increase for all the proposed developments, plus the ones currently under construction along 85 st? Can we take the planners and city councillors on our morning commute or have them try to get off the hill for evening sports activities so they truly understand the magnitude of the traffic problems. Why would we consider any increase in density until more of these required infrastructure projects are funded?</p>
<p>Would a second reduction in size/scope even be considered at this point?</p>
<p>Could you please more specifically lay out your vision for the community/park space?</p>
<p>Could you please advise on the number of transit riders you are forecasting in the area? How does that compare to the numbers using public transit from the area today?</p>
<p>why were the building heights along the entire length of 77th street not reduced, and only the ends were. Reduce the entire length of 77th street to 2-3 storeys maximum? listen to the residents- they have literally sent in hundreds of responses.</p>
<p>Why is there a push for high density on the periphery of the development, when it would be better suited for the centre of the development? Why have our hundreds of previous comments about building heights along 77th street not been taken seriously and fairly? Where the hell was our alderperson at the open houses? Why was Truman so poorly informed about building heights, school locations, school bus zones, transit routes at the open house. Shame on you for coming so poorly prepared</p>
<p>The team really needs to think about what they would want next to them. Would you want a T intersection facing your living room, with almost 2000 high density residents crammed into block style condos, with a mix of commercial building? The city is better than this (well I hope). This will ruin a very nice part of the city.</p>
<p>has anyone thought of schools? bike lanes?</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard
November 2017

<p>more walking paths? trees trees tress- and large ones, not flimsy sticks that will die in a year?</p>
<p>Why does Truman call the shots? Why does the city not shut down the plan based on over 500 very clear feedback, the plan is not wanted.</p>
<p>Why are we allowing the potential for such a large development when we do not have the necessary major roadways in place to take on not only residential commercial but also all the construction traffic that would be required to pursue such a venture? What would we do if there was a major accident or safety concern on OBC can Bow Trail with Sarcee Trail handle all the potential traffic?</p>
<p>Why are we not upgrading Bow Trail at Sarcee Trail to be free flowing traffic in all directions so we can move traffic better especially with increment weather on such a hill? This has been a thought since the 1970s.</p>
<p>No. Thank you for organizing!</p>
<p>where was our alderman? is there any thought into a dedicated community space that is useful for what is the timeline for building?</p>
<p>not at this time</p>
<p>A dog park would be nice to have.</p>
<p>Children need to be safe moving through the neighbourhood. Are you going to encourage controlled intersections with lighted crosswalks? Are there going to be lights at major intersections, rather than 4 way stops?</p>
<p>when will it be started and when will it be finished? Green space and parks should be top priority for construction any thoughts to bike lanes?</p>
<p>are we actually going to be listened to this time?</p>
<p>Too many buildings and the negative effect on property values!</p>
<p>truman should be held responsible for taking on the cost of all recreational facilities and maintaining them. They are making a lot of money on this, the least they could do is compensate the communities.</p>
<p>Where is our alderman? He is MIA. We have been disappointed with his lack of presence during this process</p>
<p>When is the City going to amend this again to be more reasonable and bring it down to 900 units, get the T intersection out of the 77th road and bring the green space and water storage onto 77th. As well as ensure that the houses that back onto 77th are actually single family homes or 3 story flat roofs to make them the same height as the existing structures in the neighborhood.</p>
<p>How was this developer vetted to determine its ability to follow through with this asp? their workmanship and business integrity are questionable from my experience working with them and living in one of their constructed homes. what does the new councilor think of this planned development? how does this asp impact the potential growth for the city? will there be more live engagement opportunities. i think the developer should speak in person about their proposals and help people understand their vision. right now it seems arbitrary and unwelcome.</p>
<p>are our comments going to be listened to this time?</p>
<p>who makes the final decision, truman or the city. It sadly sounds like truman.</p>
<p>Where will these kids go to school? How will they cycle safely across busy roads? Where will they go for library, tutoring etc?</p>
<p>bike lanes????</p>
<p>where was our alderperson at the open houses? can truman pay for 30+ years of upkeep to the community vegetation and recreational facilities/. Fairly minor cost when you consider the millions they are making on this project.</p>
<p>- Most residents purchased property based on original zoning plans submitted by the City. This is a significant change and will impact property values on homes on the east side of 77th Street. There needs to be recognition of</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>this fact and development of the west side of 77th Street needs to be carefully planned and suggestions such as those made above clearly built into the plans.</p>
<p>ARE MY COMMENTS AND THOSE OF MY FELLOW NEIGHBORS GOING TO BE TAKEN SERIOUSLY?</p>
<p>are building height requests going to be respected? it seems like these open houses and surveys are not even making a dent in the plans. is this simply a facade to satisfy the feeling of the public that we are actually contributing because it feels like we dont have a vote, and never had.</p>
<p>Why is Truman calling the shots?</p>
<p>How will the ensure that the people that leave clear opinions will be listened too?</p>
<p>How do we ensure that we get heard. I have attended each session, and have provided my feedback. My feedback is consistent with 100s of others, but the changes are not reflecting it.</p>
<p>- Have the project team identified the effect of the development on property values of homeowners who are adjacent to the development ? - This redevelopment is really focused on densification of a traditionally single family home community - I do not see any redeeming value for current residents who will face higher traffic, more congestion, blocked views, and higher noise. What other creative measures can the developer propose to ameliorate these issues.</p>
<p>When will the city stand up to the developers?</p>
<p>Why is Truman calling all the shots?</p> <p>Will the city actually stand up against the Developers?</p> <p>Where is the new alderman?</p>
<p>Not right now.</p>
<p>bike lanes????</p>
<p>None</p>
<p>bike lanes, pathways++, green space that is safe for all ages, heavily treed street</p>
<p>WHY ARE WE NOT ABLE TO SEE THE DOCUMENTS FROM THE OPEN HOUSE ONLINE? THIS SEEMS LIKE WITHHOLDING INFORMATION.</p>
<p>our alderman has been absent, can someone please engage him- we have certainly tried! reduce the number of intersections that are t-intersections along 77th street and move them to current intersections like weston drive and weston manor. funnel traffic out to 85th street and bow trail</p>
<p>please listen to the residents that live in the area and will be directly impacted as opposed to the developers that just want to make money on this.</p>
<p>Will there be minimum building quality and design standards (to match the existing houses) for the new developments? A common problem with multi-residential problems is parking. How will parking standards be enforced for the new developments? We often see 2 bedroom households accommodating 4 people , all with vehicles , parking on nearby streets. Though a few more changes are still needed, I wish to thank the city for engaging the community and listening as they move along with ASP modifications!</p>
<p>are we actually getting a say?I read the comments from the previous open house and it is not being reflected fairly in the most recent plans. The current residents of this area is really the most important stakeholder, not the deep pockets of the developer</p>
<p>is anyone listening?</p>
<p>I understand that the entire project is to be carried out in phases. I had a hard time, however, getting some kind of timeline for area construction. As an adjacent resident I'd like to know when my immediate area will begin construction. A twenty year plan could mean many years before my area changes.</p>
<p>No. Thanks for your consideration.</p>

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

Are you actually going to listen to community members and make any changes? Based on previous experience with this type of forum I highly doubt it. Likely you are just going to say you've consulted the community and do whatever you want to anyways.
How do they plan to fund more infrastructure development?
Dear Project Team, If you had spent over 1.5 Million building a high end beautiful single family home in the beautiful single family area of West Springs, would you be happy learning the some developer was planning to construct a group of high density apartments along with commercial and office space right next door?
N/a
Will our city taxes be increased to provide funding for the transportation development costs? This project will have a huge impact on transportation upgrades and as quite a few of these appear to be "unfunded" at the moment, I would like to know how the city proposes to get the funding. If our taxes will be affected, then the developer needs to step up and take on more of the costs as they will be the ones in the end to benefit from the development dollars.
Please see above. I can be reached at [personal information removed] for further answers to the above Thanks, [personal information removed]
No.
Certain space should be set aside for child care centers as the type of families the extra dense living brings will make demand of child care go up.
1. Is that a fake lake in the middle of the green space? Or emergency flash flood area etc.? 2. Why does pg 14(13) say the west ring road is unfunded? I was under the impression that the project is a go and construction has started (in other areas)
Why was this type of project even considered for this area? It is better suited to a downtown area - not on the Hill.
Being a forested area, BBQ areas as proposed to bring the community together is nice. What about fire protection? Would a Community Center that would have tennis courts, basketball courts and an outdoor skating arena be better suited. If the Developer wants to involve the community as a whole, hen this would be a very strong commitment to all, not just the seniors they want to develop the property for.
how are we supposed to comment of the recreational space when no details were provided? we gave plenty of suggestions in the previous engagement open house including tennis courts, hockey rinks (outdoor), skating rink, splash pad, permanent chess board seating, community hall that can be used for revenue for the community and also for community events that will include seniors and small children as well as teens.
Have people on the project team actually spent time in this neighbourhood? Have they driven around to see what the existing community is actually like to have a REAL sense of how much this proposed development is out of alignment with the community. You must do more than look at this question on paper proposals. You have to really SEE how this would impact the people who have lived here for many years. Please, come to our neighbourhood when it snows and actually try to drive out of West Springs, down Bow Trail to get into the city to experience what it is actually like to sit for 45 minutes to an hour in a parking lot that it is Bow Trail. My office is just under 10km from my home (which i purchased intentionally to reduce commuting time), and it is not uncommon in winter months for it to take close to an hour for me to get to work. That congestion problem will not be fixed unless there are SIGNIFICANT infrastructure changes to multiple intersections heading eastbound. FINALLY, YOU MUST ADDRESS INFRASTRUCTURE PROBLEMS WITH CONCRETE FUNDED PLANS BEFORE YOU CAN PROCEED WITH THE DEVELOPMENT!!! It is not enough to say that there are "proposed, unfunded" solutions that may never come to fruition and then the residents are permanently stuck with massive problems that come from this development that will never get addressed. Once the building is completed, the developers will have ZERO incentive to get the infrastructure changes implemented
If the majority of the feedback from the community is negative toward the proposed development will the City of Calgary insist on much more significant changes to the proposal?

West Springs Area Structure Plan Amendment – Phase Two

Stakeholder Report Back: What we heard

November 2017

<p>Can we please keep to numerically numbered streets and avenues in this area as much as possible? It would lend more of a “downtown” feel to the area and separate it from the other residential areas. It would also be much easier to navigate and reference such a densely built area. It is much easier to find a meeting place described as “at the corner of the park at 78 Street and 10 Ave.” vs “Westward Ave and Westward Common”. Also, should not the road on the opposite side of 77 St also be Weston Drive? Why call this tiny extension of a road a new name?</p>
<p>[re: green space] Who is responsible for up keep, the tax payer or developer and for how long?</p>
<p>[from Q5] Is there any architectural control in these new developments. It they are cheap looking or ultra modern, you wont have much favor in the community either. It should blend in with the community, look classy and not obtuse.</p>
<p>Who is paying for the recreational facility possibly proposed, shouldnt truman pay for it?</p>
<p>[from Q5] building fences are typically low quality- are they going to replace the one along 77th street since they are imposing so much intrusion of privacy and pollution?</p>
<p>[from Q5] I'm also aware that the LRT/public transportation isn't getting the capacity of use that City Hall had hoped. So this push for density is an attempt to stifle that issue. I'd like to know why our neighbourhood must suffer because of that mistake.</p>
<p>[from Q5] Yes, Originally, the community was to have tennis courts? Where are they? Why was I not informed when this changed? Is the same way the City and the developer are going to inform us when the project changes. What is the responsibility of both parties to inform us as residents when they are changes to the project. How or will the residents be informed of any amendments?</p>
<p>[from Q5] Is anyone thinking about the COMBINED impact of all this increasing densification? It may be one thing to approve any one of these changes but what about their combined impact on transportation and density when you consider them all together?</p>
<p>[from Q2] I'm not an expert at determining the degree which the proposed transportation changes will make an impact on alleviating the future traffic congestion. My main concern is how this work might impact my property taxes. At the information session, the representatives I spoke to, there was no one who could confidently speak to this concern.</p>
<p>[from Q3} No. How many traffic lights would be created for such short blocks would there be marked pedestrian crossing with flashing lights at every corner given the amount of car traffic?</p>