

Leslie Levant

7.4

## STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT:

I have lived in Calgary for over 55 years and have lived in Pump Hill for 38 years. I use the GL shopping centre almost daily and the reservoir walkway frequently in the summer months. My comments are about the engagement process.

### Rio Can open house at Heritage Park

- Rio Can suggested that they registered the complaints about tower height and brought down the height from 36 stories to 25 stories. They did not decrease the density. *R.C. took & filtered all comments.*
- The City planners were present as place holders. They did not provide any information about their own research into the issues presented for discussion. I was told that this was a real estate matter. Transportation did not offer effective solutions to the proposed increase in traffic at egress points from GL. because there are few options to improve the traffic flow in and out of GL.
- **My question to the members of this committee: how is this first and foremost a real estate matter: Doesn't planning have to be done in advance so that issues such as transportation, traffic, congestion, air and water quality, geology and hydrology, safety, schools come first? What is the logical sequence supposed to be? Are you planning to sell the parkland and then research the viability of the proposed project by Rio Can?**
- **QUESTION: Where is the area development plan for this area??** *None for P.H*
- A lot has changed since 2015 when council decided to have densification and the BRT.
- We have increased traffic coming from Tsuu Tina and Stoney Trail down 90<sup>th</sup> Ave. We have three age care facilities with seniors using walkers and wheel chairs crossing over to Glenmore Landing.
- We have a parking lot at Glenmore Landing that is already full.
- Where will the 3000 planned inhabitants park? There will be underground parking which will encounter a high water table. Where will this water go? Are the sewers taking this water away up to the new load? Will they need repair? Who will pay for this?

- Re City Engagement on your website: **All the agenda items posted show a predisposition on the part of the city to approve this land sale. At every juncture the approvals keep piling up.**
- **Those in opposition have asked for the city studies and we have not yet seen them.** At the HP engagement event, the city officials had no information to share. Why? We cannot rely on RioCan's assessments alone as they are self serving. We need to rely on the integrity and unbiased city research to add to the discussions. Where are they?

\* It behooves the city to state why they have not answered the objections offered.

We are seeking the transparency and accountability of the city here.

- \* • I would like the record on one of the agenda items to be corrected. The document is entitled *See copy from clerk*

Summary of Public Advertisement Feedback and Request for Approval – Ward 11 It is the first attachment listed.

Of the **2,698 responses** only 6 were in favor and 2692 against. YET:

**“Considering previous direction of Council related to the Property, Administration is recommending that Council receive this report for the Corporate Record, consider the public feedback received, and authorize the disposition of the Property.”**

*They say:*

\* **“IMPLICATIONS, no social implications have been identified.,**

\* **no environmental implications have been identified.**

\* **no economic implications have been identified.**

\* **no service and financial implications have been identified.”**

*Who is accountable & responsible for all foreseen consequences?*

**These statements are absolutely untruthful and not based on any examination of the objections.**

**It concerns us greatly that our objections have not been addressed and the issues have been misrepresented in official documents.**

*Is this engagement just a show?*

7.4

**2024 January 10 Summary of Public Advertisement Feedback and Request for Approval – Ward 11 (1630 90 AV SW & 8945 14 ST SW) Calgary,** it was decided to publicly advertise the proposed sale of the Property in order to avoid any confusion, and to ensure that due process is followed. A public notice was published in the Calgary Herald on six (6) separate occasions (2023 October 5 and 12, 2023 November 2, 4, 9, and 11). 2,698 responses were received. All responses received have been included in confidential Attachment 8. **The majority of the responses received were in opposition of the proposed sale as an enabler to the proposed redevelopment;** two separate and distinct processes. On 2023 May 12 the owner of the Shopping Centre submitted a land use and outline plan amendment application in support of a comprehensive redevelopment plan. As part of this application, a public hearing will occur prior to Council rendering a decision on the merits of the land use and outline plan application. The public hearing process provides the public with the opportunity to speak directly to Council in support or in opposition to the development proposal. This report and all information in it is solely about the public advertisement and feedback related to the



disposition of the Property. **Of the 2,698 responses received, 1,902 of them were signed statements both physical and online which stated opposition for the following reasons:**

- **Selling public parkland to a private developer without a public hearing is wrong;**
- **No parkland in Calgary should be surplus – given our Mayor called a climate emergency;**
- **The proposed nine (9) high-rise towers and the forecasted 3000+ residents and workers will have serious impacts on Glenmore Reservoir Parklands and surrounding communities; and**
- **Increased traffic flow from this redevelopment will cause unsafe emergency access and exit conditions due to traffic congestion; only one way out of Glenmore Landing traveling both east and west**

**The remainder of the responses were of similar rational, and highly focused on opposition to the actual proposed redevelopment. Some common oppositions include;**

- **Consider the Property as Park Land;**
- **Development will create access and congestion issues;**
- **Concerns with the process;**
- **Concerns with the overall design, density, and height of the proposed development and the potential negative**

OBJECTIONS

VALID

**impact to the surrounding neighborhoods;  
and – Concerns with the provision of  
Affordable Housing Six (6) responses were  
received in support of the proposed sale. The  
feedback received in support sees the  
proposal as a positive opportunity for transit-  
oriented development, affordable housing  
and better access to pathways and amenities.**

**Considering previous direction of Council  
related to the Property, Administration is  
recommending that Council receive this  
report for the Corporate Record, consider the  
public feedback received, and authorize the  
disposition of the Property.**

EXTERNAL  
ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION  Public  
engagement was undertaken  Public/interested  
parties were informed  Dialogue with interested  
parties was undertaken  Public communication or  
engagement was not required Page 4 of 5 Item #  
7.1 Infrastructure Services Report to ISC:  
UNRESTRICTED Infrastructure and Planning  
Committee IP2024-0065 2024 January 10  
Summary of Public Advertisement Feedback and  
Request for Approval – Ward 11 (1630 90 AV SW &  
8945 14 ST SW) Under Division 8 Limits on  
Municipal Powers, Section 70 of the MGA, if a

*Proof  
Research*



municipality proposes to transfer or grant an estate or interest in a public park or recreation or exhibition grounds, the proposal must be advertised pursuant to Section 606. A public notice was posted in the Calgary Herald on six (6) separate occasions (2023 October 5 and 12, 2023 November 2, 4, 9, and 11). **2,698 responses were received. All responses received have been included in Confidential Attachment 8.**

**IMPLICATIONS Social Pertaining to the public advertisement and feedback related to the disposition of the Property, no social \* implications have been identified.**

**Environmental Pertaining to the public advertisement and feedback related to the disposition of the Property, no environmental \* implications have been identified. Economic Pertaining to the public advertisement and feedback related to the disposition of the Property, no economic \* implications have been \* identified. Service and Financial Implications Pertaining to the public advertisement and feedback related to the disposition of the Property, no service and financial \* implications \* have been identified.**

Proof?  
Research?



CITY OF CALGARY  
**RECEIVED**  
IN COUNCIL CHAMBER  
  
JAN 10 2024  
ITEM: 7.1 (P2024-0065  
DISTRIB-DOCUMENT-8  
CITY CLERK'S DEPARTMENT