



## Community Outreach on Planning & Development Applicant-led Outreach Summary

**Please complete this form and include with your application submission.**

---

**Project name:**

Did you conduct community outreach on your application?      YES    or    NO

If no, please provide your rationale for why you did not conduct outreach.

**Outreach Strategy**

Provide an overview of your outreach strategy, summary of tactics and techniques you undertook (Include dates, locations, # of participants and any other relevant details)

**Stakeholders**

Who did you connect with in your outreach program? List all stakeholder groups you connected with. (Please do not include individual names)



## Community Outreach for Planning & Development Applicant-led Outreach Summary

### What did you hear?

Provide a summary of main issues and ideas that were raised by participants in your outreach.

### How did stakeholder input influence decisions?

Provide a summary of how the issues and ideas summarized above influenced project decisions. If they did not, provide a response for why.

### How did you close the loop with stakeholders?

Provide a summary of how you shared outreach outcomes and final project decisions with the stakeholders that participated in your outreach. (Please include any reports or supplementary materials as attachments)

## Community Engagement Summary

Brookfield Residential and groundcubed undertook a comprehensive engagement process to inform the Outline Plan / Land Use Amendment application for the Jacques Lodge Redevelopment. Initial work on the application coincided with the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic and the engagement plan was adapted accordingly.

At the outset of the project, we established the key values for the engagement process, which were Transparency and Responsiveness. We determined that being open with stakeholders with respect to our development goals, considerations, and how we would use community feedback was important to us. Therefore, we decided to place all relevant information on our website and forward all relevant application materials to the Community Association and to any parties who requested them.

Being responsive and proactive was also important to us. We established a practice of responding immediately to stakeholder requests and comments and to providing information before it was requested. We kept our website up-to-date with the latest information and provided stakeholders with ample notice about upcoming events. The Community Association and other stakeholders were provided with verbatim Detailed Team Review documents and our responses to them. Our understanding is that all Detailed Team Review documents and our responses to them, as well as all versions of the Outline Plan, were disseminated to residents of the community that live north of Bow Trail. Also, when a stakeholder made a suggestion that we couldn't address, we transparently explained the reasons why. This all helped to develop a relationship of trust with stakeholders, and our uncommon level of transparency led to our engagement process being described as "first-class" by the Community Association.

We employed the following engagement tactics throughout the course of the application:

### March 2020

- Met with Community Association to introduce project and determine any special engagement requirements

### April 2020

- Launched website at [www.cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge](http://www.cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge)

### May 2020

- Hosted Online Open House and Live Q&A session to share Initial Development Concept and gather feedback prior to formal application submission (84 participants)
- Hosted Online Survey regarding Initial Development Concept (82 participants)
- Issued update to stakeholders to remind them to participate in the Online Survey and review engagement materials online
- Met with Community Association to discuss Lessons Learned from Online Open House and next steps

### July 2020

- Posted Video Update to website to go through feedback received from Online Open House and Live Q&A Session and explain how the Initial Development Concept was modified accordingly for the formal application submission
- Posted "What We Heard Report" to website, including detailed information as to how feedback was used

### August 2020

- Issued update to stakeholders to inform them about official application acceptance by The City of Calgary

### September 2020

- Became aware of community concerns regarding future apartment building site ("Site 5")
- Issued formal letter to stakeholders acknowledging concerns and outlining our strategy to address them

### November 2020

- Sent Detailed Team Review 1 to Community Association and met to discuss
- Hosted a virtual meeting for all Shaganappi residents who live north of Bow Trail to discuss feedback received to date and how it would be addressed (18 participants)

### January 2021

- Sent Detailed Team Review 2 and our response to Community Association
- Met with Community Association to discuss Detailed Team Review 2 and Development Permit submission

### February 2021

- Met with Community Association to discuss regulations for DC 3 / Site 5 (apartment building site)
- Sent Detailed Team Review 3 to Community Association

### March 2021

- Issued update to stakeholders through email list regarding changes to application and its progression to Calgary Planning Commission

# JACQUES LODGE

## REDEVELOPMENT

### Initial Development Concept:

---

### Stakeholder Engagement Summary and What We Heard Report

JULY 2020

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background

## 2.0 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT APPROACH

### 2.1 Engagement Principles

### 2.2 Stakeholder Identification

### 2.3 Engagement Tactics

## 3.0 WHAT WE HEARD

### 3.1 Online Survey

### 3.2 Community Association Meetings

### 3.3 Other Communications

## 4.0 What We Did

### 4.1 What We Addressed

### 4.2 What We Were Unable to Address

### 4.3 What Is Still To Be Determined

## APPENDIX A | Open House Advertising Methods

## APPENDIX B | Website Materials

## APPENDIX C | Online Survey Results



# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

## 1.1 Background

In advance of submitting a Land Use Amendment and Outline Plan application for the redevelopment of the Jacques Lodge site, Brookfield Residential and ground cubed planning undertook a comprehensive initial engagement process with community stakeholders. This report outlines:

- the approach we took;
- the stakeholders we identified;
- our special engagement considerations;
- the engagement tactics we used;
- a summary of feedback received;
- advertising and communication methods; and
- detailed results from our online survey.

The report also describes how feedback received was used to shape the Revised Development Concept, which was submitted to The City of Calgary as part of our application. In addition, where concerns were not able to be addressed, the report identifies the reasons for that.



## 2.0 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT APPROACH

---

### 2.1 Engagement Principles

A key goal of our application process is to engage the affected stakeholders through a transparent and accessible engagement process. To this end, we established a set of Engagement Principles to be followed throughout the Land Use Redesignation process. These principles were based upon The City of Calgary's Engage! Policy and are as follows:

- **ACCOUNTABILITY.** We will uphold the commitments we make to stakeholders.
- **INCLUSIVENESS.** We will make efforts to reach and hear from those who are impacted directly or indirectly by the project. We will also make our best efforts to accommodate diverse needs.
- **TRANSPARENCY.** We will provide clear, timely, and complete information where possible. We will also make efforts to ensure decision processes, procedures, and constraints are understood and followed. Lastly, we will ensure we report back the feedback we hear during the process and demonstrate how it influenced our decisions.
- **COMMITMENT.** We will demonstrate commitment to reaching those most impacted by the project and will do our best to follow through with any promises made to stakeholders.
- **RESPONSIVENESS.** We will provide timely information to stakeholders and will respond to questions in a helpful manner.

### 2.2 Stakeholder Identification

At the outset of the engagement planning process, we undertook a stakeholder identification exercise prior to submitting any formal applications to The City. Our team's values are such that stakeholder feedback is important to receive early in our design process.

Accordingly, we reached out to the Shaganappi Community Association at the outset of our initial design exercise to learn about how the Community Association would like to be engaged, and to understand if there are any special engagement considerations for the project. The Community Association provided us with helpful information regarding its membership, its "Street Beat" communication tool, and engagement tactics that may be effective for the community. Although the Community Association enjoys considerable membership, not all residents of the Shaganappi community are members of the Community Association and therefore additional tactics were noted as being required to non-member residents.

We also reached out to Ward 8 Councillor Evan Woolley to learn about any special engagement considerations for the project. As a result, we determined that we would undertake targeted stakeholder engagement with the Community Association but would also make efforts to speak with individual residents or landowners as required. In particular, the residents located in close proximity to the east side of the site (east of 24 Street SW) were identified as particularly affected stakeholders who may not be represented by the Community Association.

In addition, we identified the Killarney-Glengarry Community Association as another organization that may have an interest in the project.

## 2.3 COVID-19 Considerations

Given the public health restrictions in place regarding COVID-19, we identified that an unconventional strategy for stakeholder engagement would be required. The typical approaches of hosting in-person meetings and public open houses were not possible during our initial engagement period, and so we developed a comprehensive online engagement strategy to ensure we were able to provide transparent, accessible information out to stakeholders as well as collect meaningful information and feedback.

In discussions with the Community Association, The City of Calgary's Community Planning and Engage departments, and the Ward 8 Councillor's office, we determined that an online open house (including a recorded video presentation) was an ideal tactic to engage stakeholders on our Initial Development Concept. The recording of the open house would be available at any time on our development website, allowing for stakeholders to view and comment on the materials on their own time.

We also were able to have multiple telephone calls and virtual meetings with community residents and the Community Association, allowing the dialogue to continue during a time when in-person meetings are not possible.

Every attempt was made to facilitate an inclusive, transparent initial engagement process during an unprecedented public health crisis.

## 2.4 Engagement Tactics

To conduct stakeholder engagement regarding our Initial Development Concept, we employed four tactics, as follows:

### *Development Website*

At the outset of the project, we established a website to act as a repository for project information ([www.cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge](http://www.cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge)). The website provides information about the project, the landowner, frequently asked questions, and the Initial Development Concept. This site can be updated at any time as the need arises.

### *Live Online Open House*

On May 7, 2020, we hosted a "live" online open house. The event consisted of a pre-recorded video in which our team members introduced the Initial Development Concept and provided information about the landowner, the development / applications process, and opportunities to provide feedback. Following the airing of the video, we began a live question-and-answer period during which meeting attendees could ask questions on our website and we would answer them in "real time."

Stakeholders were invited to the Online Open House through several tactics, as follows:

- **Direct Mail.** Postcards providing information about the event were mailed to residents within the community with instructions regarding how to participate in the event.

- **Shaganappi Community Association "Street Beat" network.** The Community Association generously offered to advertise our event through their internal email list-serve, which reaches a large portion of the Shaganappi community.

## 2.4 Engagement Tactics Cont'd

- **Online Flyer.** The Ward 8 Councillor's office posted a digital flyer to advertise the event on their Twitter page on three occasions, thus reaching a wider audience than just the Shaganappi community.

- **Online Survey.** A survey was posted online to receive detailed feedback on our Initial Development Concept. The survey was available for a two-week period.

- **Email, Telephone, and Text Conversations.** Throughout the initial stakeholder engagement period, dozens of emails, phone calls, and text messages were exchanged with area residents. This allowed for a direct line of communication with interested stakeholders to be established.

Please see Appendix A for the materials used to advertise the Online Open House.

Stats	A. Online Open House	B. Online Survey
Dates	May 7, 2020	May 7, 2020 - May 24, 2020
Location	Online - Microsoft Teams	N/A
Time	6:30pm - 8:30pm	N/A
Advertising Methods	Development Website, Social Media, Direct Mail, Councillor	Website, Open House
Number of Attendees	84 (online)	82

**- Presentation to Development Committee of the Shaganappi Community Association.**

Following the closure of the online survey and the analysis of all stakeholder engagement results, we held a virtual meeting with the Community Association's Development Committee and two additional residents of homes adjacent to the site. We presented the feedback we received and shared our Revised Development Concept. We also explained how the feedback from our initial engagement period was used and how it shaped our revised concept.

C. Development Website	D. Community Association
April 14, 2020 - Present	June 29
<a href="http://www.cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge">www.cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge</a>	Zoom Meeting
N/A	6:30pm - 8:30pm
Social Media	Invitation from Community Association
N/A	10 residents

## 3.0 WHAT WE HEARD

---

### 3.1 Online Survey

An online survey was available on our development website from May 7, 2020 to May 24, 2020. A total of 82 respondents filled out the survey. An overview of the survey results is provided below, with a full transcription of results and explanatory charts and graphs provided within Appendix C.

#### 3.1.1 Respondent Characteristics

Nearly all respondents indicated their community of residence. Almost all respondents indicated they live within close proximity to the development site, particularly within the communities of Shaganappi and Scarboro/Sunalta West.

#### 3.1.2 Initial Development Concept Aspects

Respondents were asked to indicate how they felt about particular aspects of the development concept. A summary of the results to this question is provided below.

- The majority of respondents (69%) indicated they either loved or liked the curvilinear street network. A small minority of respondents (11%) indicated they either disliked or strongly disliked the curvilinear street network.
- The majority of respondents (69%) indicated they either loved or liked the amount of open space shown on the concept. Less than 10% of respondents indicated they disliked or strongly disliked the amount of open space.
- 48% of respondents indicated they loved or liked the mix of housing types proposed. 34% of respondents indicated they disliked or strongly disliked the mix of housing types. 19% were neutral.

- The majority of respondents (73%) indicated they loved or liked the walking and cycling connections. 5% of respondents indicated they disliked the walking and cycling connections.
- 37% of respondents indicated they loved or liked the amount of density proposed for the development. 44% of respondents indicated they disliked or strongly disliked the amount of density proposed.
- The majority of respondents (56%) indicated they loved or liked the view preservation afforded by the Initial Development Concept. 12% indicated they disliked or strongly disliked the view preservation.

Overall, the majority of respondents (57%) indicated they generally loved or liked the Initial Development Concept. 23% indicated neutrality, and 20% indicated they disliked or strongly disliked it.

#### 3.1.3 Housing Types – Mix and Location

Respondents were asked questions regarding the mix of housing types proposed and their proposed locations. A summary of results of these questions is provided below.

#### ***3.1.3.4 Mix of Housing Types***

A majority (58%) of respondents indicated they felt the mix of housing types proposed is appropriate for the development, with 42% indicating they did not feel the mix of housing types was appropriate.

The respondents who indicated they did not feel the mix of housing types proposed was appropriate were asked to provide supplementary comments. In general, concerns were raised about the apartment building location and its suitability with respect to the surrounding low-density residential context. Generally speaking, the respondents who provided supplementary comments to this question indicated a preference for single family homes on the development site and for the elimination of the apartment units. Some comments regarding concerns about high density and traffic were raised, as well as a lack of dedicated senior's housing units proposed for the site.

#### ***3.1.3.5 Location of Housing Types***

A majority (57%) of respondents indicated they felt the locations of the housing types were appropriate for the development, with 43% indicating they did not feel the locations of the housing types was appropriate.

The respondents who indicated they did not feel location of housing types proposed were appropriate were asked to provide supplementary comments. In general, respondents indicated they felt the apartment building would be better placed closer to the LRT station. In part, this is due to concerns about compatibility between the apartment building and the low-density residential development east of 24 Street SW. Some respondents also questioned the need for higher-density housing in this general location and shared concerns about congestion and traffic.

#### ***3.1.3.6 Additional Comments Regarding Housing Types***

Respondents were also asked to indicate if they felt that any housing types were missing from the concept. Some respondents indicated a desire for single family estate homes or estate villa bungalows, as well as just more single family homes in general. Other respondents indicated a desire for dedicated senior's housing or bungalow-style duplexes to enable older adults to enjoy single-level living. Respondents were also asked to provide any additional comments regarding the housing types envisioned for the development. Some respondents indicated a preference for higher-density housing, given the site's location next to an LRT station and in the inner-city and support for the stacked townhouses envisioned for the site. Many respondents indicated a preference for single family homes and larger park spaces, and concerns regarding the apartment building and the potential for this to be home to renters in the future.

### 3.1.4 Connections

With respect to connections, respondents were asked to indicate how they felt about both the connections provided within the development, as well as to and from it.

A majority (71%) of respondents indicated they loved or liked the pedestrian connections shown in the concept. A majority (58%) of respondents indicated they also loved or liked the bicycle connections provided in the concept. With respect to vehicle connections, 40% of respondents indicated they loved or liked the connections provided within the development, with 27% of respondents indicating they disliked or strongly disliked those connections.

A majority (67%) of respondents indicated they loved or liked the pedestrian connections to and from the development. Similarly, a majority of respondents (64%) indicated they loved or liked the bicycle connections to and from the development, and 69% indicated they liked or loved the transit connections to and from the development. With respect to vehicle connections, 40% of respondents indicated they loved or liked the vehicle connections provided to and from the development. 38% indicated they disliked or strongly disliked the vehicle connections provided to and from the development.

### 3.1.5 Open Spaces

Four open spaces were proposed for the development site. Respondents were asked questions regarding these spaces. A summary of responses to these questions is provided below.

#### 3.1.5.1 Connect

A majority (63%) of respondents indicated they loved or liked the Connect space, with 13% indicating they disliked or strongly disliked it. Supplementary comments indicated concern about the size of the space, potential overcrowding, and its adjacency to Bow Trail and the effect of that on the usability of the space.

#### 3.1.5.2 Play

A majority (65%) of respondents indicated they loved or liked the Play space, with 29% indicating neutrality and 6% indicating they disliked or strongly disliked the space. Supplementary comments generally indicated support for the concept of a “Play” space and for an all-ages play experience. Some concerns were raised regarding the size of the space and a desire for it to be larger, as well as a potential feeling of exclusivity for the park in that it could be interpreted that this space is meant only for the residents of the development. A concern was raised regarding the location of the space at the top of the hill and potential accessibility challenges for people to get to the park from further east.

#### 3.1.5.3 Celebrate

A majority (65%) of respondents indicated they loved or liked the Celebrate space, with 29% indicating neutrality and 6% indicating they disliked or strongly disliked the space. Supplementary comments indicated support and excitement for the space as a civic and/or gathering space. Some concerns were raised regarding a perception of exclusivity of this space and the potential for it to be interpreted as a space for the adjacent residents only. Concerns were also raised about accessibility to the space for wheelchairs and strollers, as well as privacy for the future residents whose homes will front onto this space.

#### **3.1.5.4 Gather**

A majority (56%) of respondents indicated they loved or liked the Gather space, with 37% indicating neutrality and 7% indicating they disliked or strongly disliked it. Supplementary comments indicated support for the blending of this space with the pedestrian overpass. Concerns were raised regarding the ability to provide parking to support a farmer's market or other high-activity outdoor uses to this location. Suggestions were made to better connect this space to the river pathway through a green corridor and to consider inclusion of retail space in this location.

#### **3.1.5.5 Ranking of Open Spaces**

Respondents were asked to rank each proposed open space with respect to which they could see themselves using the most. Generally speaking, the results indicated no clear preference, but the Connect space was ranked as the space the respondents would see themselves using the most by a small margin.

#### **3.1.6 Additional Comments**

Respondents were given an opportunity to provide additional comments regarding the development on the topic of their choice. Concerns regarding traffic and access were prevalent in the responses, as well as concerns regarding the placement of the apartment building and the consideration of an apartment building at all for this site. Desires were shared for retail and services to be provided on the development site, as well as for dedicated senior's housing. Some respondents indicated they were under the impression the site was gifted for the use of senior's housing indefinitely and wanted to understand how any other type of development could take place. Questions were also raised regarding the one-way lane shown on the west side of the site and the design intent behind it, with a preference shared for lanes with development on both sides. Many positive comments were also received indicating support for moving forward with development on the site, the proposed "downzoning" as compared to the current entitlement, and excitement for the neighbourhood to build out and provide new housing, park spaces, and connections within the area.

### **3.2 Community Association Meetings**

Throughout the course of the initial engagement period, regular telephone meetings were held with the Shaganappi Community Association's leadership. The purpose of these was to provide informal updates.

Following the analysis of feedback, we held a virtual meeting with the Development Committee, in addition to two landowners with properties adjacent to the east side of the site. During this meeting, we presented the feedback to date, as well as our Revised Development Concept. We shared how feedback had shaped our decisions, and then provided an opportunity for attendees to ask questions.

Generally speaking, the feedback provided was positive. However, the adjacent landowners were concerned about the potential impacts of the apartment building(s) on their properties.

### 3.3 Other Communications and Concerns

Given our desire to be transparent and accessible, we provided our contact information (including emails and cellular phone numbers) to stakeholders. Following our online open house, we received 13 emails and a handful of text messages from residents of the community. Many of these residents shared their comments and concerns via email. These are summarized as follows:

#### **Construction**

Some nearby residents are concerned about the impacts of construction activities. Given that the ultimate development of the site will be a multi-year long process, residents have expressed a desire to make construction occur as quickly as possible and to minimize disruptions where feasible.

#### **Previous Use of Land for Senior's Housing**

Some nearby residents are under the impression that the development site was gifted to The City in the past for the express purpose of senior's housing, in perpetuity. These residents were concerned that the development plans are not in keeping with the perceived intended use of the land. Upon review, we determined that no such restrictions are in place on the land title.

#### **Drainage Issues**

Some nearby residents shared concerns about drainage and underground streams, and potential flooding impacts to their properties as a result of the development. We confirmed that there are areas that may receive overland flow, and so our submission accommodates these areas accordingly to ensure flood risk is mitigated. Our Staged Master Drainage Plan will also adhere to all relevant policies and standards to ensure stormwater and drainage is handled appropriately.

#### **Potential Transportation Conflicts**

A resident shared concerns regarding potential transportation conflicts resulting from the "offset-T" intersection proposed for the east side of the development site. Given the use of 24 Street SW as an access point to the development and to the existing residential area, as well as its use as a cycling and pedestrian connection to the Bow River pathway, this resident was concerned about the potential conflicts that could occur between vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians as a result of the "offset-T" intersection. The TIA revealed that although there will be cars, bicycles, and pedestrians in the vicinity of this intersection and this introduces the potential for conflicts, the volumes of traffic are predicted to be low.

#### **Golf Course Traffic and 26 Street SW**

Some residents indicated that during certain times of day, the Shaganappi Golf Course generates traffic that results in queuing at the intersection of 26 Street SW and Bow Trail, inconveniencing residents trying to exit the neighbourhood. The TIA revealed that traffic generated by the golf course is generally "reverse-flow" and is not anticipated to materially affect the operation of this intersection during the vast majority of times of day and during the course of a year.

## 4.0 WHAT WE DID

---

### 4.1 What We Addressed

Upon receiving the detailed feedback from The City of Calgary (through the pre-application process), the online survey, Community Association meetings, and informal conversations with residents, we refined our concept to address feedback.

Below is a summary of stakeholder feedback we were able to address in our application submission.

#### **Apartment Building**

Many comments were received through the online survey and through informal conversations with residents regarding concerns about the massing, orientation, and location of the apartment building. Adjacent neighbours to the east expressed concerns about overlook and the streetscape along 24 Street SW, and potential incompatibility between an apartment building and the adjacent low-density residential homes.

To address these concerns, we drafted a Direct Control District for the apartment building site that specifically included a regulation intended to minimize any negative massing or shadowing impacts of the building. This regulation proposes to limit the height of a building adjacent to 24 Street SW to 23 metres, within 20 metres of the property line adjacent to 24 Street SW.

#### **Traffic**

Many comments were received informally and through the online survey regarding traffic and congestion within the area. Understanding that the transportation network in the area is constrained by the presence of Bow Trail and the LRT, and upon hearing from residents that traffic and queuing is a major local concern, we undertook a new Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) by a qualified consultant. The TIA used the most up-to-date “VISSIM” software

to predict travel patterns and behaviours in the area that could change as a result of the development. This TIA was undertaken by a consultant that had not been involved in any previous applications for this site and therefore was able to approach it objectively and with “fresh eyes.”

The TIA revealed that the intersection of Bow Trail and 26 Street SW will be at capacity by 2028 regardless of our development, and the traffic issues in the area will not appreciably increase as a result of our development.

#### **Bicycle Connections**

Comments received informally and through the online survey indicated a desire for enhanced bicycle connections through the area, particularly to access the Bow River pathway. As a result, we have incorporated a new multi-use pathway (to accommodate both pedestrians and bicycles) on the west side of 24 Street SW into our design. This will provide a continuous link from the pedestrian bridge to the Bow River pathway within a dedicated bicycle facility.

#### **Park Space on East Side of Development**

Some stakeholders expressed a desire for a park space to be located on the east side of the development to complement the connection to the Bow River pathway. This desire was echoed by comments from The City of Calgary’s Parks Department. As a result, we added an additional open space at the northeast corner of the development site called “Rest.” This park space will serve as a gathering place for residents and for cyclists and pedestrians coming to and from the Bow River pathway to rest before continuing on with their journey.

### **One-Way Loop Road**

Comments regarding the one-way loop road proposed for the west side of the site were received from both The City of Calgary and by respondents to the online survey. Given the desire to incorporate semi-detached homes on a public road along the west side of the site and to service the rest of the development through an internal private street network, our Initial Development Concept included a public one-way loop road on the westernmost edge of the site. The City of Calgary indicated that this was not supportable due to issue with addressing and street standards. Comments submitted through the online survey also questioned the efficiency of this design.

As a result, our submission eliminates the one-way loop road and rather, shifts the semi-detached homes west so they back onto the existing lane at the west edge of the site. This new concept still allows for a sensitive interface to the existing homes along 26 Street SW while freeing up space for parks and other activities on the site. This new layout addresses The City of Calgary's concerns about this portion of the site and allows for more efficient use of space.

### **Desire for More Low Density Housing**

Comments received through the online survey indicated a desire for lower-density housing on the site, including single-family homes. Given the new layout on the west side of the site, we were able to include the potential for two single-family home sites within our submission. Our concept now includes a full mix of single-detached, semi-detached, rowhouse, townhouse, stacked townhouse, and apartment units. This will enhance the choice available within the area and will allow for the development of more "missing middle" housing.

### **Stormwater and Underground Springs**

Comments were received informally from stakeholders regarding drainage on the site and the presence of underground springs. As a result of these comments and to fulfill application requirements from The City of Calgary, we are undertaking a Staged Master Drainage Plan for the site. This will indicate how stormwater will be managed on-site.

## 4.2 What We Were Unable to Address

Given site limitations, landowner goals, and technical considerations, we were not able to address all feedback from stakeholders. Below is a summary of the key areas of concern that we were not able to address.

### Apartment Building Location

Comments were received regarding the compatibility of the apartment building and its location relative to the LRT station. Some stakeholders indicated they would like to see the apartment building moved farther west or eliminated from the development plan completely.

Due to technical considerations with respect to site grading, we are unable to move the apartment building farther west and accommodate the necessary underground parking while ensuring an economically viable project.

We are also unable to eliminate the apartment building from the development plan. Given the development site's location in close proximity to the LRT station, it is important to provide higher-density housing to make efficient use of land in the city. It is also important to us to provide a mix of housing types so the development can be welcoming to a diverse group of people who may be seeking a variety of housing types. Therefore, our submission keeps the apartment building in its previous location.

### Desire for Retail and Commercial Uses

Comments were received regarding a desire to incorporate retail and/or other commercial uses on the development site. Due to the limited access to the site and the site's unique characteristics, retail and commercial uses are not viable in this location. As a result, we are unable to incorporate these uses within

the development. The development will be residential only, although there are commercial developments within close proximity (e.g., Westbrook Mall, 17 Avenue SW Main Street).

### Desire for Dedicated Senior's Housing

Comments and concerns were noted with respect to the use of the site for senior's housing. The previous application for the site (put forward by Silvera for Seniors, the previous site owner) included an intent to provide dedicated senior's housing units. Some stakeholders indicated they would like to see the entire site dedicated to senior's housing, or at least some portions. Although units within the development will be designed to be age-friendly, there is no intent to incorporate dedicated senior's housing. Rather, the development will feature housing types that will be suitable for seniors to "age in place," such as single-level apartments and townhouse flats that will be appropriate for independent seniors. The mix of housing types on the development site will allow for older adults within the existing Shaganappi community who may live in a single-family home to downsize to a maintenance-free home.

### Desire for All Low-Density Housing

Comments were received indicating a desire for all development on the site to be exclusively single family or semi-detached homes. This was seen as a way to maintain the prevailing low-density character of the neighbourhood that exists today. Given City of Calgary policies regarding development in close proximity to LRT stations, as well as inner-city development economics and landowner objectives, the mix of housing types envisioned for the site (including townhouse and apartment units) continues to be seen as appropriate. Dedicating the majority of the site to single-family or semi-detached homes is not feasible.

### **4.3 What Is Still To Be Determined**

There are some topics for which feedback was provided but decisions will not be made until the future. These include items related to Development Permit, Building Permit, or construction issues.

# APPENDIX A | OPEN HOUSE ADVERTISING METHODS

## Website

Project information and Online Open House registration were through the development website at: [www.cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge](http://www.cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge). This site will be live throughout the Land Use Amendment and Outline Plan application process and will be updated as necessary.

Cultivate Ideas
ground cubed planning

Discover
About

# JACQUES LODGE

## UPCOMING REDEVELOPMENT

Brookfield Residential has an exciting new vision for the Jacques Lodge site in the Shaganappi community. As we get ready to apply for a Land Use Redesignation (rezoning) application, we would like to share our vision with you and hear your thoughts.

PROCESS

CONCEPTS

ENGAGEMENT

FAQ

Register for project updates:

First name\*

Last name\*

Email\*

Community I Currently Live In:

## Direct Mail

The post card below was sent as direct mail to 239 homes within the community, including all of the homes located east of the development site and north of Bow Trail (Mail Route: LCD 20).

# JACQUES LODGE

UPCOMING REDEVELOPMENT

## LIVE Online Open House

Thursday May 7, 2020

6:30 PM - 8:30 PM

### REGISTER NOW

for the link to the live online open house:

[cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge](https://cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge)

We want your feedback!



[www.brookfieldresidential.com](http://www.brookfieldresidential.com)

Brookfield  
Residential



Hello Neighbour!

Brookfield Residential has an exciting new vision for the **Jacques Lodge** site in the Shaganappi community. As we get ready to apply for a Land Use Redesignation (rezoning) application, we would like to share our vision with you and hear your thoughts.

Please join us for a **LIVE Online Open House** on **May 7** to learn more about the project and to provide your input. The Open House will consist of an online presentation followed by a question/answer period. If you cannot virtually attend the event, the presentation and a recording of the question/answer period will be posted online to be viewed at your convenience.

Please register for the event at  
[cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge](https://cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge).

The link to the LIVE Online Open House will be provided to registrants closer to the event date.

For more information about the LIVE Online Open House and how to participate, or for more information about the project in general, please contact us at [planning@groundcubed.com](mailto:planning@groundcubed.com).

[www.brookfieldresidential.com](http://www.brookfieldresidential.com)

Brookfield  
Residential



## Community Association and Ward Councillor Social Media

The Shaganappi Community Association sent the following digital flyer through their Street Beat network, which reaches a total of 260 homes. The Ward 8 office also posted a link to this on their Twitter account on three occasions leading up to the Online Open House.

# JACQUES LODGE

UPCOMING REDEVELOPMENT

## LIVE Online Open House

Thursday May 7, 2020

6:30 PM - 8:30 PM

**REGISTER NOW**

for the link to the live online open house:

[cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge](https://cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge)



Brookfield Residential has an exciting new vision for the **Jacques Lodge** site in the Shaganappi community. As we get ready to apply for a Land Use Redesignation (rezoning) application, we would like to share our vision with you and hear your thoughts.

Please join us for a **LIVE Online Open House** on **May 7** to learn more about the project and to provide your input. The Open House will consist of an online presentation followed by a question/answer period. If you cannot virtually attend the event, the presentation and a recording of the question/answer period will be posted online to be viewed at your convenience.

**Please register for the event at [cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge](https://cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge).**

The link to the LIVE Online Open House will be provided to registrants closer to the event date.

For more information about the LIVE Online Open House and how to participate, or for more information about the project in general, please contact us at [planning@groundcubed.com](mailto:planning@groundcubed.com).



## APPENDIX B | WEBSITE MATERIALS

---

Materials from our Live Online Open House, including the video recordings, were posted on our development website and will be kept there throughout the duration of the project: [www.cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge](http://www.cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge).

### **Recording of Live Online Open House:**


[www.cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge-engagement](http://www.cultivateideas.ca/jacqueslodge-engagement)

## Online Open House

Pre-recorded Engagement Presentation – May 7, 2020




Recorded Live Q&A session – May 7, 2020



# APPENDIX C | ONLINE SURVEY RESULTS

This section outlines the results of the online survey. Please note that comments provided have not been modified and are provided here verbatim.


## TOTAL RESPONSES



# Q1

Which community do you live in? Please use the drop-down menu to select, or enter a different community name in the “other” box.


Answered: 80 Skipped: 2




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Shaganappi	48.75%	39
Killarney/Glengarry	6.25%	5
Spruce Cliff	2.50%	2
Scarboro / Sunalta West	38.75%	31
Sunalta	0.00%	0
TOTAL		80

**Q2** Please indicate how you feel about the following aspects of the Initial Development Concept.

Answered: 75   Skipped: 7






	LOVE	LIKE	NEUTRAL	DISLIKE	STRONGLY DISLIKE	TOTAL
Curvilinear street network	24.00% 18	45.33% 34	20.00% 15	8.00% 6	2.67% 2	75
Amount of open space	24.00% 18	45.33% 34	21.33% 16	9.33% 7	0.00% 0	75
Mix of housing types	12.00% 9	36.00% 27	18.67% 14	18.67% 14	14.67% 11	75
Walking and cycling connections	28.00% 21	45.33% 34	21.33% 16	5.33% 4	0.00% 0	75
Amount of density	16.00% 12	21.33% 16	18.67% 14	22.67% 17	21.33% 16	75
View preservation	25.33% 19	30.67% 23	32.00% 24	4.00% 3	8.00% 6	75

**Q3** How do you feel, in general, about the Initial Development Concept?


Answered: 74    Skipped: 8



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Love it	14.86%	11
Like it	41.89%	31
Neutral	22.97%	17
Dislike it	12.16%	9
Strongly dislike it	8.11%	6
TOTAL		74

**Q4** Do you feel the mix of housing types is appropriate for the development?

Answered: 74    Skipped: 8




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	58.11%	43
No	41.89%	31
TOTAL		74

## Q5 Why not? Please explain.

- We'd like to see a community similar to the one below. Too much for the roads to handle. Too much density. Leave that to the south and west. Again, the roadway was not designed for this amount of density even though the reports suggest otherwise.
- This is not a high density area. Devalue of our lands. Traffic.
- As already stated, I think the condo development is not appropriate for this site. Given the unique nature of the site, what would be ideal is estate single family homes. The infrastructure is not designed to accommodate the type of density proposed. When Jacques Lodges was operational, it may have housed 300 residents, but very few of them had vehicles. At that time, there was no LRT and access in and out of the area was far easier than what it is today. Understandably the developer will be looking to maximize return through density, however, more estate-style villa bungalows would be my preference. Townhomes and apartments will decrease the quality of life for the neighborhood through density and related problems.
- The mixed housing creates the situation where there is less interest for all demographics. I.e. If I'm looking at townhomes, I would not particularly enjoy being next to apartment and vice versa.
- 300 units with parking is too dense
- A higher amount of semi-detached would fit better with the surrounding neighborhoods, would fit better around the central open space and the east water feature
- Lose the apartments. They are out of place adjacent to the corresponding neighbourhood. It is also too dense for the area. There will be parking issues and access does not facilitate this kind of density.
- Should primarily be single family homes.
- Condo building should be close to train station.
- "As I previously mentioned, this neighborhood consists of non attached single family houses.
- It's a small community that's somewhat private. Once 360 units get added, it will be over crowded and extremely busy. "
- I think the apartment building reduces the value of development in a beautiful area
- Condos and townhouses significantly increases density, traffic and parking implications on the rest of the community.
- The housing types - are they set aside for low income seniors as the property was donated to the City of Calgary for?
- Don't love the thought of the apartment units. This area has a precedent of middle to higher income families who keep to themselves and are very quiet. The additional people and inclusion of lower cost living could negatively affect that.
- I have an issue with the large condo development on the corner. I feel that it feels like an afterthought and I live on the street right beside it. I also feel that the density is too high, as someone who lives in the neighbourhood I can tell you that we already have very long waits at the lights on Bow trail and 26th. I can't imagine how bad it will be when we go from 42 houses to 342!
- We hope more higher end town house and penthouse can be build. Highly against building condominium here
- The apartment will be an eye sore and add too many people to such a small area. It will negatively impact the neighbours.
- As mentioned in the previous question I don't think you need this kind of density when you have a 73 unit complex across the street.
- There should be dedicated Senior Living at this site. Until the parking, access and egress studies are completed, I can not agree with this much density.
- Does not fit in with the rest of the community.
- I think there should be some single family homes and I am not sure about the apartment building
- More specific details required to show how infrastructure will support this. There have been many concepts floated out in the past.
- Way way way too many townhomes. Apartment spaces will need parking structure
- where's the senior's housing?
- I think adding more high-end single family homes and attached townhouses while eliminating the condo complex would maintain the character of the neighbourhood. The condo complex looks like a forced design add-on and doesn't integrate well.
- Want all single family
- The area should not have a big condo development. I would like to see some single family housing to lower the density.
- The housing types on 24th street are too drastically different from the housing types east of the development.
- If this area is going to join the rest of Sovereign Crescent. It should reflect the same design principles. Large lots with several different and unique styles and builds. This should NOT be an opportunity to shove as many units as you can into this space. The reason several of us live in this area is because we dislike the way new communities are designed so densely.
- Single family not included
- the semi detached form is the most common in the immediate communities such as shaganappi and killarney. What I believe there is a desire for is smaller detached homes that are not confined to the typical 50x120 inner city plot. What you have done here is taken a blank canvas and reverted back to a legacy land use shape of 50 ft increments that never really made sense for the inner city. I would suggest cottage cluster types of single and up/down detached units or row houses that make better use of the side setback requirements than semi detached.

**Q6** Do you feel the locations of the housing types as shown is appropriate for the development?

Answered: 74   Skipped: 8



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Yes	56.76%	42
No	43.24%	32
TOTAL		74

# Q7 Why not? Please explain.

- This area struggles with congestion and traffic already. This high rise should you still consider it should be located south west end of the property. Not sure what made Brookfield this that people paying high prices would want to view a building at the case of the hill. Why do you believe the neighbors east of the property be comfortable with this? Something isn't right here.
- I have said there is no need for an apartment building in this immediate area. We do not need so many people. If apartment really has to be over there it should be up on the avenue where all those occupants are not in full view of my front door and bedroom window.
- I understand why the housing types are located where they are and not for a second do I believe it has anything to do with accommodating the residents of 26 St. by transitioning the type of housing adjacent to them. If that were true, what does that say to the residents of 24St, Sovereign Cres. and Sandhurst Ave. who will be butting up to the condo site?
- The apartment dwarfs the surrounding structures.
- Please look at the boring drawing you provided. Show me elevations. What a ridiculous question.
- Similar to the earlier comment, the semi detached should have better access to the open spaces, semi-detached around the central green space and the east water feature
- Too dense. Will attract rentals and will create a parking nightmare.
- They seem very squished together.
- Too much density unless westbrook mall is redone. Too many homes means too many cars etc
- Condo should be near train station.
- Same answer as previously
- Duplexes and townhouses, if not stand alone homes are adequate
- The apartment complex sits adjacent to 24th street which is across from RI homes. In conforming with the existing area's streetscape elevations the apartment complex would be better suited, placed west of proposed site. e.g. next to (north of) the bridge over Bow Trail.
- If there had to be apartments it would make more sense to have it along bow trail to be closer to the train station and so that it is surrounded on the other sides with townhouses. That way residents don't have to look at a big blocky building and the townhomes get a view as well.
- Wouldn't it make more sense for the highest density to be closest to the C-Train station?
- Again, I think that there could be a more integrated way to have condo/townhouses in the development. Currently the condos are just jammed into a corner of the development.
- Please remove condominiums and raise town house target market to form high end community
- The apartments should be right by the train. I'd rather not see any apartments to be honest. Too many people, low-end of cost spectrum - we want high end to help our property values.
- The semi detached should be mixed in with the other types of homes
- this does not fit in with the existing community.
- Concerned with placement of condo's.
- I am not sure the apartment building will work, I think it may make the other housing options less attractive
- Would prefer the apartment residence be located on the SW corner of the property closer to the c-train station
- Apartment location is difficult to appreciate. The vehicle access to that area is very limited/awkward.
- there is no senior's housing that the land was promised for!
- "If the condos are a requirement for density, because of the physical size, they should be located in the middle of the development.
- The challenge of having it along 24th Street is integrating it with the neighbourhood and not having negative impacts on existing homes. This complex will tower over the adjacent bungalows and as it is currently shown in the concept drawing looks like a giant wall. Shadowing, loss of privacy, inhibiting views and street appeal are all concerns and may negatively effect the property values of the adjacent homes.
- The community has gone through this exercise with the past land owner - Silvera where it was identified for continuity and community integration setbacks and building heights along 24th street needed to be addressed. Here is a excerpt of the Land use Redesignation document.
- ""The rezoning was approved after almost two years of working with city planners, in an expanded role which allowed them to add some transparency around the sufficiency of the plan. Last minute concessions from Silvera regarding planned set-backs for existing homes were sufficient to allow Shaganappi community board members to speak in favour of the plan at the July public hearing. The density proposed is unchanged, but focussed more appropriately to the middle of the site.
- If you are a resident adjacent, the zoning on the Jacques property adjacent to your houses is M-C2, which is medium density multi-residential, with varied building height and front setback areas that are intended to reflect the context of your houses. The MC-2 zone will be extend at least 50 metres from the property line across the lane at 26th Street, and at least 80 metres from the property line at the west side of 24th Street. Between these two M-C2 setback areas, 36 metre heights are possible in the middle of the site.
- On the east and west sides of the property, building heights next to existing housing will be capped at 10 meters for 25 meters from the Jacques property line into the site (24 meters if you live on 26 Street); after which there will be a 16 meter limit total to the end of the MC-2 parcel. Jacques site buildings will need to be set back 8 meters from Bow Trail, 6 meters from the Jacques property line in the lane of 26th Street and 3 metres elsewhere on the property.
- The Shaganappi ARP has some additional protections for residents adjacent to Jacques; a senior's designation for the area in the middle of the site, a requirement for "exceptional signature architectural design" for any tall buildings at that location and landscaping requirements for the site more generally.""
- Want all single family
- Already explained
- If there are to be condos, I think these should be located closer to the pedestrian bridge in the middle of the property vs on either 24th street or 26th street. In addition there should be semi detached on 24th street as planned for on the west side of the development to allow for a smoother transition from the current single family homes already located east of the site.
- This is a small community of detached homes. It should remain that way.
- Density is too high on 24St



Do you feel that any housing types are missing from the concept? If so, please share.


- Web would suggest 50-60 high end residential homes to set yourself apart from the same old generic developments popping up all over the city.
- Retirement Living
- The City of Calgary (Council and Planning Dept) will surely/likely want the Brookfield plan for the Jacques site to conform more to M-C2 and M-H2 criteria. I would be very much against that, as I was when the Silvera re-zoning took place, for many obvious reasons that the city refuses to recognize. I very much support the level of density that is proposed by the Brookfield concept plan and believe it is sensitive to the setting and infrastructure capacity.
- More higher class housing and larger properties as is consistent with this area.
- Single family estate homes or estate villa bungalows.
- There should be no 5 story condo and you Need to look at the parking and traffic issues.
- I would like to see detached housing in the mix but would be good with more semi-detached
- Larger homes similar to what the neighbourhood already has.
- Single family homes
- More single family homes
- Single family detached
- No
- Detached homes
- No
- No Housing types missing.
- Single detached homes as this is in keeping with the current zoning of the community.
- A tiny home complex would be way cooler.
- Specific low income housing for seniors.
- Live-work suites? Suites for non-seniors as well?
- Personally, I have nothing against taller buildings/more density, as long as they are not soviet Russia style cinder block monstrosities. But that's just me; so ALL Good.
- As long as no condominium
- Detached single family
- More duplex should be added
- Bungalow style duplexes to enable older people to stay on one level
- Single family homes
- n/a
- no
- I don't think any types are missing but I still think there should be more units.
- Perhaps a larger multilevel apartment tower.
- no
- Would like to see more smaller apartments in the 16-24 unit range.
- Seniors housing
- single family homes with reasonably sized lots. Or not develop it at all and make it a green space.
- Detached single family homes.
- Retail services
- Single family homes
- Surprised that there are not a few spots for single homes to break up the flow like in Currie Barracks / Marda Loop.
- More stand-alone (front lane or single-lane)
- seniors housing is a major missing element!
- Single family housing.
- No
- I am happy with the mix
- Single family
- Yes, single family housing
- Single family homes with carriage houses
- More detached R1 zoned homes.
- No
- I think there should be a larger attempt made to produce a ground oriented form that isn't available elsewhere in the grid areas that have to rely on lane access. in this design, much less land is allocated to lanes but I don't see the housing shapes really maximizing that opportunity

## Q9 Do you have any additional comments regarding the housing types envisioned for the development? If yes, please share.

- See above.
- Assisted Living type of building would allow for density without the traffic issues
- Please take the time to review the two DTR (Detailed Team Reviews) documents and the former owner's responses to understand some of the issues raised by the city's planning group. Also, review, if available, comments on the prior re-zoning from concerned residents.
- Go back to the drawing boards please!
- At the very least, please re-visit the condo site.
- "It is boring cheap and uninspired."
- 
- The market is overflowing with a surplus of housing. Do something unique that actually integrates with the neighbourhood. "
- I do like that at least the apartment complex is smaller so it wouldn't be too tall.
- Creating more density when the area already struggles with traffic and recreation etc cause issue for current residents. Property taxes are high and we are struggling with crime and traffic already.
- Concerned the condominiums could turn into rentals. I don't think that is favorable for this development
- I think it is a good mix and makes good use of space. Another option would be to locate the multi family housing further west beside Bow Trail.
- No comments.
- We would have liked to have had some commercial space included in the plan in order to have services available in walking distance.
- suggest 4 story max for condo development
- Am concerned about the comment that the land was initially given to the city exclusively for seniors housing. Can Evan Woolley comment on this?
- Wondering about the earlier understandings that there would be some focus given to accommodations for seniors.
- no
- No; in fact given the location on a major road, bikeway + LRT station, could be more dense.
- N/A
- Too many homes. Very crowded looking.
- would prefer no apartment
- don't like the condo idea, hope it is low ie 4 stories
- I love that you have included semi-D and towns. My only comment is that I think there could be even more townhomes to increase the density.
- They should be available to a range of incomes
- I am not opposed to a condo development but am hesitant to say I love it when I don't know what it might be like - a cement block or something more individual and ascetic
- Seniors
- I would prefer a green space with. i don't see a need for a large development in this space when there is plenty of space on the outskirts of the city.
- Concerned about condo's being half the density. Need to ensure height is kept to a minimum. 3-4 stories max seems appropriate for the neighbourhood.
- Condo building should be 3-4 stories only
- What is the planned height for the apartment? Can you please add this information to the artist renderings
- Haven't digested all the information but would be interested in examples of similar developments and housing mixes in the city.
- as above
- No
- No
- Also to be considered is that there is a new condo development going in already about 3 blocks away. The area does not need another one
- Condos, the most dense development type, should be placed closest to transit. I realize you're trying to preserve viewshed to downtown, but it doesn't make sense to make the most people travel the furthest from transit to reach their home.
- If there are to be condos, a lower rise condo would be preferable to maintain the city views. Hoping there will be ample parking within the development to ensure cars not parking into the east of 24th street
- There is already traffic issues entering and leaving this community. Speed of cars entering is already dangerous, adding such a dense amount of units and vehicles will increase the existing issues enormously.
- Maybe some single family houses!
- I think you have an excellent plan to create stacked flats in the central area. this is a type of housing least well understood in the calgary inner city. I also think you could find a way to add in some detached units around a private courtyard to allow a premium type of unit for those that wish the added privacy of a detached form but not the yard work.

# Q10 Please indicate how you feel about the connections provided within the development.


Answered: 72 Skipped: 10




	LOVE	LIKE	NEUTRAL	DISLIKE	STRONGLY DISLIKE	TOTAL
Pedestrian connections	20.83% 15	51.39% 37	20.83% 15	4.17% 3	2.78% 2	72
Bicycle connections	19.44% 14	38.89% 28	33.33% 24	6.94% 5	1.39% 1	72
Vehicle connections	8.45% 6	32.39% 23	32.39% 23	14.08% 10	12.68% 9	71

**Q11** Please indicate how you feel about the connections to and from the development.

Answered: 70   Skipped: 12






	LOVE	LIKE	NEUTRAL	DISLIKE	STRONGLY DISLIKE	TOTAL
Pedestrian connections	22.86% 16	44.29% 31	20.00% 14	8.57% 6	4.29% 3	70
Bicycle connections	24.29% 17	40.00% 28	28.57% 20	5.71% 4	1.43% 1	70
Transit connections	30.00% 21	38.57% 27	25.71% 18	5.71% 4	0.00% 0	70
Vehicle connections	7.14% 5	32.86% 23	21.43% 15	17.14% 12	21.43% 15	70

## Q12

Please indicate how you feel about the Connect space.

Answered: 69 Skipped: 13



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Love it	24.64%	17
Like it	37.68%	26
Neutral	24.64%	17
Dislike it	11.59%	8
Strongly dislike it	1.45%	1
TOTAL		69

## Q13


Do you have any additional comments about the Connect space? If yes, please share.

- There should be a better way to connect residents who live on Sovereign Crescent to the LRT station. Also, there should be a better connection for cyclists coming into the site from the bridge over Bow Trail whose objective is to get to the Bow River bike path system (and of course the return journey as well).
- There is not enough open space.
- Really you call this open space? This is left overspace along the highway
- We have our own space and quiet neighborhood
- pretty limited
- Open space immediately adjacent to a thoroughfare like Bow Trail isn't much of an open space asset. Not a great spot to contemplate nature or otherwise recreate.
- It's pretty, but it doesn't provide direct connections to where people need to go and people will not want to hang out facing bow trail.
- Great to see a pedestrian connection between the pedestrian overpass and the C Train station
- no
- It doesn't actually fill the critical pathway link between the north end of 24 St SW, and the Bow Tr overpass.
- nice buffer from traffic coming BowTr. What is the physical separation? Standard curb, jersey barrier?
- understand existing trees will be removed, and please be sensitivity and add trees that can reached 8 to 10 meters at their mature age
- Too crowded

## Q14

Please indicate how you feel about the Play space.

Answered: 68 Skipped: 14



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Love it	20.59%	14
Like it	44.12%	30
Neutral	29.41%	20
Dislike it	4.41%	3
Strongly dislike it	1.47%	1
TOTAL		68

## Q15


Do you have any additional comments about the Play space? If yes, please share.

- Will primarily serve the residents that live around this park.
- The apartment if your going to get to have it should be there. You could see the golf course from upper floors from there. Not going to see the golf course on the ground through the houses.
- This space could be bigger
- I like that it's a multi generational space
- The play space doesn't seem centered between the most 'family friendly units'
- it is small
- Not that many people in the community walk up that hill, so it doesn't really provide an attractive space. Does it have a view of the city? It's very good from that spot but doesn't seem to be showcased.
- Please don't fill this space with playground equipment
- no
- Please make sure it's easy to bike AND walk there from pathways / Bow Tr overpass so it's truly a regional amenity and not just for this development's residents.
- Feel a little exclusive for the homes around it
- There is no view of the golf course from your planned play space
- The idea is great, it would be good to see more details.
- Concept of these spaces is. Great but without knowing the actual design it's hard to be able to comment further
- Lawn Bowling?
- Seems small.
- Need to ensure significant access for wheelchairs at intergenerational park (not just a small ramp for the young kids - adults in wheelchairs too).
- What is an inter generational playground?
- Comment for Connect Space - It would be good to take the pedestrian and bicycle traffic away from Bow Trail. I was hoping there would be an option to continue on and connect further north to reach the path down to the river without mixing in with roadways that will now be busier.
- Awfully small for a "play" space
- We need a playground in this part of the community. Hopefully residents of the already established community can come play too!
- NO
- More is necessary.

## Q16

Please indicate how you feel about the Celebrate space.

Answered: 69 Skipped: 13



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Love it	30.43%	21
Like it	34.78%	24
Neutral	28.99%	20
Dislike it	2.90%	2
Strongly dislike it	2.90%	2
TOTAL		69

## Q17


Do you have any additional comments about the Celebrate space? If yes, please share.

- Will also primarily serve those living immediately adjacent to this park, but this will be more accessible to others because of its larger size, although the access pathways to the park do not appear to be particularly open or wide.
- Boring design
- Would sacrifice this space for more playground
- Looks good, like how it breaks the entire site almost to two smaller sites.
- This space is for future tenants/home owners. It doesn't apply to us.
- better
- I would think it would be farther up the hill to have a better view
- Really like the idea of civic/celebratory space.
- Likley only residents will use it. No view of downtown.
- Wonderful space if occupants of those units not bordering the space feel equal they are users
- no
- Please make it accessible to regional pathways / Bow Tr overpass with safe barrier-free connections across internal roads as needed.
- Hope to add a green space line like this along the 24 Ave side
- This looks like a great park space.
- Limited privacy for those homes backing on to it
- Noise pollution.
- replace with a few retail like coffee shops
- This will be a great gathering place for the community, love it!
- I think it's silly to have a dedicated space for this.
- Need to ensure ease of access for strollers and wheelchairs. Community is seeing revitalization with many new families in the ares. Need good wheelchair access.
- NO
- Could this area be a good place for a playground? Could it be bigger?

## Q18

Please indicate how you feel about the Gather space.

Answered: 67 Skipped: 15



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Love it	25.37%	17
Like it	31.34%	21
Neutral	37.31%	25
Dislike it	4.48%	3
Strongly dislike it	1.49%	1
TOTAL		67

## Q19


Do you have any additional comments about the Gather space? If yes, please share.

- Same comments as for the “playing” space.
- Do better.
- Probably a better buffer to existing homes if this was moved to the East of the higher density units.
- Where is the on street parking for the visitors to the farmer’s market?
- No road access... not good for a farmer’s market. Tucked behind an apartment, not great for inviting the community to events.
- Access to bring in anything of size might be a limitation
- no
- Does a lovely job connecting the Bow Tr overpass and Shaganappi Park to this parcel - but doesn’t connect this parcel to the Bow River Pathway at the north end of 24 St SW.
- Like this connection to the ped overpass
- What do you mean by high level of activity?
- Would rather see a grocery store/cafe/retail space
- Farmer’s markets? Really? And large gatherings?
- Don’t have enough details to give in an opinion.
- Ideally the Gather area could be reworked to provide a green corridor to migrate down to the river pathway with limited roadway interaction. That would be a fantastic legacy. The idea of a green belt to the river is possible.
- No
- I think having a bigger space here and potentially a smaller other area makes more sense

# Q20

Please rank the open spaces with respect to which spaces you could see yourself using the most. A rank of “1” indicates that you could see yourself using this space more than the others.

Answered: 58 Skipped: 24



	1	2	3	4	TOTAL	SCORE
Connect	40.38% 21	17.31% 9	21.15% 11	21.15% 11	52	2.77
Play	18.87% 10	28.30% 15	18.87% 10	33.96% 18	53	2.32
Celebrate	28.00% 14	14.00% 7	30.00% 15	28.00% 14	50	2.42
Gather	18.52% 10	35.19% 19	25.93% 14	20.37% 11	54	2.52

# Q21

Do you have any additional comments regarding the information and concepts we have shared for the development? If yes, please share.

- Better than previous proposals. Good builder. Traffic issues will destroy the site. Across Bow Trail a .mess. We are developers. House backs on site on 26th Street.
- Could brookfield show how it will incorporate the development into the existing topography, i.e. use the existing “plateaus” or “benches” to place the various units on, thus minimizing the amount of scalping that would have to take place. Please also show what is being done to preserve the existing urban forest.
- Please do not put in an apartment building. If I wanted to live in downtown setting that’s where I would be. I don’t want to see their bedroom windows or them to see mine.
- I understand that you are waiting on a traffic study to be completed but this issue cannot be understated. This proposed development will have a significant negative impact on the surrounding neighborhoods. Access east and south from this neighborhood is already problematic so adding the type of density being proposed will create chaos. The intersection of 17 Ave. and 26 St. cannot adequately handle the traffic as it is now, so spillover throughout the surrounding residential areas is inevitable.
- You need to come back with a better design. You also need to use a digital platform where people can speak.
- Timing of the development, most developments are somewhat phased but given the amount of available housing in the city, is the timing correct or is there a phasing that would spread the development over time that could level load a work crew that would be more appropriate with the current availability of housing.
- There are some great ideas here. Move away from the apartments and develop some better ideas around parking and access and there would be plenty of potential for this to be a great fit. Otherwise it will trash the area and cheapen its charm.
- No
- Again, concerned regarding the gift of these lands to the city for the purpose of seniors housing and that is being lost.
- Please consider move condo apartment closer to train station.
- “Putting in an apartment building is probably my least favorite part.
- It’s going to change everything about this area. Having rental units will bring lower income residents and families.

- will be good to see it proceed. The land has been neglected for many years...thanks...
  - The reduction in density will ease traffic burden and preserve the golf course as it will integrate well
  - Seniors should have access to retail - thinking in particular of corner store, small grocery store, pharmacy and/or cafe or pub space. Does the land use permit (or can it?) some commercial as well? Mixed use is essential to quality of life, and I have difficulty conceiving of seniors having to walk to 17th Ave. with its (still pretty limited) offerings, or to Westbrook. Would be great to see some small scale commercial on the site.
  - There was very little spoken about the style of the exterior. It would be a shame to have this unique space taken up by standard looking multi-family housing. It would be nice to have this positioned as a higher end version of the same.
  - Go for it, "guys"
  - A popular (apartment) building style these days will have 'retail' on the ground floor. I hope this is under consideration as a (mini) community like this (and drawing from adjacent folks) could benefit from a convenience store, dry cleaner, etc. and a place to get a (craft) beer (or kambuchka or whatever you like). Thanks for listening.
  - Overall very supportive, but please do what you can do enhance walking / biking connections through this area and not just to your new parks / within the parcel. 24 St SW north of Bow Tr is a big low-hanging fruit type of pathway missing link.
  - No condominium please. Donot make 24 Ave more crowded and generate more traffic
  - Too crowded for such a small area, in my opinion. Who is your target resident? How many cars will be in the area? What do you plan to do about the transient population currently in the area?
  - You have done nothing to appease concerns over traffic - you did not address any of the 26th Street concerns and gave no timeline for when the traffic study will be complete. It feels like you are disrespecting concerns of the existing neighbours. Traffic and access to and from This neighborhood is a huge concern,
  - because the condo attracts a lower economic group, they and that building will be the maim problem with your plan
  - I am really surprised at how Brookfield was able to make this site work at such a low density (relatively speaking). If the numbers work, I think the proposed site plan is pretty amazing.
  - I would like to see dedicated bike lanes and sidewalks on both side of the street. A grocery store space and cafe/retail space would make this a more sustainable community and destination (find a way to get around city parking requirements)
  - I thought the presentation was well done and I so appreciate your company taking the time to explain your plans and listen to our community concerns. I am hopeful that this can become a great development and addition to our neighbourhood.
  - I really hope that the landscaping that you are showing is true. Trees and a nice space is the most important. Density is not.
  - Guest and Overflow parking is a major concern. Sunalta West, Sovereign Cres, Sandhurst and 24th St would accommodate a lot of this. Garbage, Compost and Recycling is picked up at the front of properties. Congesting streets with parking will cause access issues.
  - "the site is not being used for the intended purpose
- of the donors. Why are we considering this proposal? Seems like we expected to accommodate a large development that will increase the density of the community with very little benefit to the existing community.
- I am not happy to see the alderman apparently giving his blessing at this point of the approval process."
  - Concerns with the condo piece. Need to ensure height and sprawling nature of condo building is minimized. Also need to ensure sufficient parking within the complex so parking on 26 and 24/Sovereign Cres/Sandhurst Ave are not being used for Brookfield residents/guests.
  - Glad to see some action finally happening. It is a unique space and could provide some well integrated connections to the existing community. Thanks for providing the opportunity for feedback. Many issue remain from prior development projects that didn't have enough open communication. There are opportunities to fix them to the benefit of all.
  - "It was mentioned that Brookfield has been working with the Community Association but this is the first I've seen of your plans. As I'm sure you are aware, the community went through an engagement process with Silvera and alot of the challenges that we worked through with them are the same that Brookfield faces.
  - As an adjacent property owner and neighbour, I urge you to look to the solutions that the community agreed upon in regards to traffic mitigation, site density placement and the development integration into the community as a foundation for planning your design."
  - the fact that you have no senior housing on land that was deeded to the city for this purpose is not going to fly and you need to re-evaluate your priorities.
  - Overall i am very happy with the concepts i have seen!
  - If you moved the condos to the SW corner of the site (closest to the train station) could you put some retail at the bottom, i.e. a small coffee shop?
  - The concepts are a great start and do look high end. The only concern is the condo development and types of housing on 24th street. As indicated before it is a drastic change from single family housing to multi family housing! Would prefer if other housing types were considered here such as semi detached or single family homes with carriage houses.
  - Park space should be placed on the west side of 24th Street to continue the feel of entering the river pathway.
  - There must be community meetings with both sides willing to compromise. Many Meetings!
  - I think the dual one way lane is a poor choice for this site. What is really peculiar is the space that is trapped between the lanes. your concept and presentation really minimizes this odd design. is this because you have not really considered what this will be like or you have other reasons for designing it this way that you have not shared? I would like to see another concept for the semi-detached and dual lane accessed lands as discussed elsewhere in the survey. I think you could do a lot more here while relying less on designing around lane access garages. To deal with the grade perhaps a series of narrow angled penetrations into courtyard type builds? detached homes with drive under garages? you stated at the beginning of the presentation you wanted to work with the slopes, but I think here you are letting the slope control the housing type too much. this is a blank slate and does not need to be built just as it would have been across the lane on 24st. thanks for the opportunity to comment.