



Applicant Led Engagement Summary

## Dominion – Engagement Overview

The Community of Bridgeland-Riverside  
LOC2018-0059 & DP2018-3108

### Summary of Engagement Events:

	Date	Event / Meeting
1	Feb. 6, 2018	Meeting held at City Hall with <b>senior planning</b> officials to discuss opportunities for the site. Present at the meeting was: Wallace Leung, Rollin Stanley, Lynn McKeown, Mike Bucci, Troy Abromaitis and Tony Casola
2	Feb. 20, 2018	Meeting held with <b>Bridgeland-Riverside</b> Community Association Board (BRCA) at the Bridgeland-Riverside Community Hall The majority of the board was present and Ali McMillan chaired the meeting.
3	Feb. 28, 2018	<b>First Public Open House</b> at Bridgeland-Riverside Community Hall Approximately 17 groups attended and 9 comment cards were collected. 
4	May 22, 2018	<b>Second Public Open House</b> at Bridgeland-Riverside Community Hall Approximately 50 groups attended and 31 comment cards were collected. 
5	July 18, 2018	Meeting held with <b>Bridgeland-Riverside</b> Community Association Board (BRCA) and approximately 3 invited non-board member community

### Applicant Led Engagement Summary

		residents. This meeting was held at the Bridgeland-Riverside Community Hall.
6	September 24, 2018	An <b>information session</b> was held at the Bridgeland-Riverside Community Hall to provide updates on changes to the project. Comments and questions were directed to Planning officials and to <a href="#">Bucci's project website</a> . Approximately 43 individuals attended the session.

### Summary of What was Heard at Engagement Events:

	Date	What was heard/discussed
1	Feb. 6, 2018	<p>At the meeting held with <b>senior planning</b> officials, initial thoughts on the potential for the site were shared. Some of the subjects discussed included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Existing land use and challenges with achieving maximum allowable density.</li> <li>2. Initial concept diagrams and images were shared and distributed showing alternatives in massing and site development.</li> <li>3. Desire of the applicant to get to construction by February of 2019.</li> <li>4. Timelines were discussed specifically related to how the proposed site-specific land-use and the already contemplated Bridgeland-Riverside ARP amendment would need to align/coincide.</li> <li>5. As an initial meeting it set very preliminary expectations and timelines to provide a guide to future conceptual development.</li> </ol>
2	Feb. 20, 2018	<p>The first meeting held with <b>Bridgeland-Riverside Community Association Board (BRCA)</b></p> <p>This meeting was intended as an introduction to the initial concepts and a chance for the applicant to hear initial thoughts and concerns from the members of the board. Some of the subjects discussed included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support for the architectural expression of the initial images but concern about the ability to feasibly execute.</li> <li>2. Challenges with on-street parking and the pilot project initiative that was being contemplated for the area given recent concerns voiced by residents.</li> <li>3. Mix of unit types in light of a perceived need for a better mix of including suites suitable for families (3 bedroom units)</li> <li>4. Strong support for commercial at 9<sup>th</sup> Street in order to increase pedestrian activity. Some uses discussed included, neighbourhood pub, grocer, fitness, cafe, general retail etc.</li> </ol>

### Applicant Led Engagement Summary

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Strong concern that no medical uses be proposed.</li> <li>6. Timing of project phases to buildout. Concerns about delayed projects given the economic climate and previous Bridges projects.</li> </ol> <p>The majority of the board was present and Ali McMillan chaired the meeting.</p>
3	Feb. 28, 2018	<p><b>First Public Open House</b> at Bridgeland-Riverside Community Hall</p> <p>This was the public's first opportunity to see the initial concepts being proposed. Approximately 14 Information boards were presented showing the basic concepts for the site, buildings and project statistics. A comment box was made available and the following summarizes the common issues / themes that were put forward:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Buildings look very attractive.</li> <li>2. Nice to have retail/commercial as part of the project.</li> <li>3. Concerns about the proposed height (one tower shown as 15 storeys) and that residents have always "been told" when they purchase their homes in the area that 8 storeys would be the highest level that any future buildings would be. Desire to keep height under at least 10 storeys.</li> <li>4. Shadowing from buildings a concern.</li> <li>5. Concerns about entrance to parkade on McDougall Road, given traffic anticipated as the area density increases. Would prefer it if entrance was off of 9A Street instead.</li> <li>6. On street parking would be nice for retail shoppers. Street parking is already very limited.</li> <li>7. Site lighting should be shrouded to avoid offsite spill onto neighbouring residence within close proximity such as The Crossings.</li> <li>8. More eyes on the street will be a benefit to the community.</li> <li>9. Preference for condos as opposed to rentals.</li> <li>10. Restaurant, Café and Bakery type uses preferred for the CRU's.</li> <li>11. Noise from construction a concern. Please follow bylaws and as a courtesy keep loud activities like jack hammering for later in the day.</li> <li>12. Love the landscaped podium roof top amenity.</li> <li>13. Additional traffic for the area a big concern.</li> <li>14. Bicycle parking should be conveniently located at grade.</li> <li>15. Desire at-grade units facing St. Matthew's Square.</li> <li>16. Allow for increased height with a guarantee of mixed use in the land use amendment.</li> <li>17. Limit retail space uses to those that activate the street (not office, fitness, medical, vet clinic)</li> <li>18. Concern with amount of glass being used and whether that is appropriate for historic Bridgeland.</li> <li>19. Size of units and number of small units will mean that the park areas and amenities nearby become even more important.</li> <li>20. Consider CEPTED issues to minimize opportunities for crime.</li> </ol>

### Applicant Led Engagement Summary

		21. Any allocation of affordable housing? Could changes be made to make it affordable?
4	May 22, 2018	<p><b>Second Public Open House</b> at Bridgeland-Riverside Community Hall</p> <p>This was the follow up to the initial open house to provide the community an update on the land use application that showed more detail and development of the design. Approximately 16 Information boards were presented showing the basic concepts for the site, buildings and project statistics. A comment box was made available and the following summarizes the common issues / themes that were put forward:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Commercial space on 9<sup>th</sup> would be great.</li> <li>2. Love the look of the building aesthetics.</li> <li>3. Building height as proposed is out of context with the rest of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>4. Increase in height would set precedent for increase on other sites in our historic neighbourhood.</li> <li>5. Proposed buildings could shadow Radius solar panels and cut-off views from St. Matthew church area toward Tom Campbell Hill.</li> <li>6. Lower podium height at the corner of the site is welcomed. Maybe some of the massing from the towers could be relocated above this lower massing.</li> <li>7. Too much glass usage for envelope. It's not energy efficient.</li> <li>8. Consider street benches for the 1000+ seniors who live further to the south east of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>9. Please factor in Crime prevention, we are getting too many condo thefts.</li> <li>10. Promote need for traffic light at intersection of 9<sup>th</sup> Street and McDougall.</li> <li>11. Concerned about traffic with so many added units and less parking. Especially on McDougall. Maybe more crosswalks?</li> <li>12. Don't think FAR of 5.3 for this area is appropriate.</li> <li>13. Concerned about shading of park in the winter months.</li> <li>14. Don't like the idea of a rental building for the community.</li> <li>15. Concerned about whether retail space will be successful.</li> <li>16. Buildings look to blocky/no curves and wouldn't it make sense to step back the upper storeys?</li> <li>17. Parking not sufficient. Parking in the community is lacking. Hard to find parking on the street already and it could get worse in the future with more development.</li> <li>18. Entrance to the parkade could be a problem at rush hour periods. It will add more congestion to McDougall.</li> <li>19. Loading and waste and recycling could be noisy and the trucks always idle while parked.</li> <li>20. Could the podium roof top garden could be accessible by the public?</li> </ol>

### Applicant Led Engagement Summary

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>21. Slender massing seems to be a good compromise to lessen impact of height &amp; big box look.</li> <li>22. Traffic study is a must to determine if traffic calming is required along McDougall Rd. McDougall Rd. is currently be used as an alternate shortcut from Memorial Drive congestion.</li> <li>23. Size of units is not family friendly.</li> <li>24. Bucci has created quality projects that are all interesting and well designed.</li> <li>25. Perhaps have parking for Car2Go to encourage less use of personal vehicles and thus traffic.</li> <li>26. Positive and exciting development for the area.</li> <li>27. We need more rental units ---- Good!</li> <li>28. Units are so small and they will attract almost only singles and not families. Consider proposing some 3 bedroom units.</li> <li>29. Appreciate maximizing density while not impacting comfort.</li> <li>30. Like the two towers instead of mass building.</li> <li>31. Developer must commit to executing the look of the building. Lesser quality is not acceptable.</li> <li>32. Nice modern design.</li> </ol>
5	July 18, 2018	<p>Meeting with <b>Bridgeland-Riverside</b> Community Association Board (BRCA)</p> <p>In addition to the board members, 3 invited non-board member community residents. This meeting was held to answer some questions that BRCA Board had about the development permit application. Some of the topics discussed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. General update on the development permit with discussion of latest developments of the proposed development.</li> <li>2. Discussion of height and shadowing and impacts on the neighbouring development to the north (Radius).</li> <li>3. Residents in attendance wanted better clarity on the shadow studies to better understand the impact on the adjacent properties/amenities.</li> <li>4. Discussion surrounding method and timing of notification of future residents of the community (specifically buyers of Radius condo)</li> </ol>

Summary of <u>Response and Actions</u> to What was Heard:		
	Date	Response/Action to what was heard
1	Feb. 6, 2018	<p>Meeting with Senior Planning Officials</p> <p>Although this meeting did not engage the CA or the public directly it did help set the path for the overall scope and timeline of the development. The main actions were:</p>

### Applicant Led Engagement Summary

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Aim to maximize density;</li> <li>2. Work with ARP amendment team to align with key elements of their application; and</li> <li>3. Set targets for March land use amendment application and late spring/early summer DP application.</li> </ol>
<b>2</b>	Feb. 20, 2018	<p>The first meeting held with <b>Bridgeland-Riverside</b> Community Association Board (BRCA)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Given the Board expressed concern about the ability to execute the architectural look of the concept, Bucci and its design team began exploring options for the skin or screen element of the buildings so that a feasible (buildable) solution could be found. Also, discussions regarding concurrent applications and approvals for both the land use amendment and the development permit were initiated with planning to provide better assurance to the CA that the design would be executed to the intent of the land-use amendment.</li> <li>2. On-street parking concerns raised by the board, led Bucci to engage Watt Consulting Group (Traffic Engineers) to begin preparation of a parking demand study and a traffic impact assessment (TIA).</li> <li>3. To allow for flexibility of unit plan layouts, structural systems for the typical floor plate were explored. This would hopefully allow for potential of unit combinations and potentially allow for some 3 bedroom units.</li> <li>4. The board voiced strong support for the commercial component. In response to this, we continued to development the retail street front to create the start of a high street experience along 9<sup>th</sup> Street.</li> <li>5. Given the concern with certain uses and support for others, we began compiling the permitted and discretionary uses that we would look to include for the land use amendment application.</li> <li>6. As full build out timing and execution was raised as a concern, the design team began planning how phasing the project could be delineated to minimize the risk of over building.</li> </ol>
<b>3 &amp; 4</b>	Feb. 28, 2018 & May 22, 2018	<p><b>Public Open Houses</b> at Bridgeland-Riverside Community Hall.</p> <p>The comments received at both open house events were compiled and organized into recurring themes. The following summarizes our responses and what actions and/or changes that occurred because of what was heard:</p>

## Applicant Led Engagement Summary

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Assurance of Design Commitment</b> As described in the initial BRCA meeting, the CA and several open house attendees, voiced a concern for assurance that the design would be executed as proposed (quality of look and inclusion of mixed use commercial). The concurrent LOC and DP process was recommended by planning as the best way to provide this kind of assurance to the community.</li>   <li>2. <b>Unique Architecture and Presence</b> We were very pleased to hear so many positive comments about the look of the project. We are also very proud of the project and given that the success of project depends so much on fulfilling this look, the design team will do everything they can to execute the vision of the concept and make it a reality.</li>   <li>3. <b>Materiality and Style</b> Concerns around the use of glass as it relates to both the context of Bridgeland were raised. Some expressed contextual concerns they have about whether a building that has so much glass could be sensitive to what many consider a long established and historic community. We believe that even within the most historic of settings, unique and exciting things can and should be allowed to occur and still be sensitive to their surroundings. The proposed building will have a material palate consisting of glass, metal and masonry. Together they will combine to create an extraordinary sculptural presence that we hope will make this project as striking, memorable and "photo worthy" as other iconic landmarks in our city. At the same time the project stays true to fundamental urban design principals to ensure that the edges of the site are safe, pedestrian friendly and activated.</li>   <li>4. <b>Height</b> Concerns about height were raised by several residents with some understanding that some degree of height increase from the old DC zones was inevitable. Although, we feel that the height being proposed is appropriate for a transit-oriented site such as this, we can also appreciate that this may seem like a significant increase when compared to the 7 and 8 storey heights of the existing zones. Our message to the residents regarding this was: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) amendments to the Bridgeland-Riverside ARP will account for the potential of increased heights on sites within a TOD context.</li> <li>b) although the proposed height is increasing, the allowable density would effectively stay the same (5.3 FAR). The goal is to redistribute massing to allow for more diversity and uniqueness to the community.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
--	--	--



## Applicant Led Engagement Summary

		<p>c) this massing strategy also allows for height relief at the corner of 9<sup>th</sup> Street and McDougall with effectively only a 2 storey massing across from the 8 storeys of The Crossings development and a break up of an otherwise very long block into two slimmer towers.</p> <p>d) The site is not immediately adjacent to any low-rise properties that would be sensitive to this height increase and the towers will not cut-off views of the downtown skyline or mountains from Tom Campbell Hill given the grade differential.</p> <p>e) The north tower has been reduced in height by one floor.</p> <p><b>5. Shadowing</b> Related to the height were concerns about shadowing or shading of the adjacent spaces and buildings by the proposed development. In response to these concerns, we prepared and submitted several shadow studies of the proposed development and of alternate massing arrangements within the context of the surrounding neighbourhood. Each study shows how the difference in massing translates at different times of the day and year for each scenario. The studies also show that, even if the massing changes, as long as the volume (FAR) of the building remains consistent than the surface area of the shadowing also remains similar.</p> <p>The studies also confirm that the proposed development has minimal impact on the most sensitive areas to the west, Murdoch Park soccer field and playground structures. The Radius rooftop garden would only be in shade for approx. 4 hours during the spring and fall and not all during the summer months when it can expect the most use. The Radius roof top solar panels are on the north portion of the roof and will not be affected by the proposed building. To illustrate this further, shadow animations will be made available on the project website that show the exact path, extent of the shadowing and corresponding time lapse throughout the day.</p> <p>The reduction of one floor from the north tower will help in minimizing the impact of shadowing on the community hall and park beyond.</p> <p><b>6. Light Pollution</b> Any proposed exterior lighting for the development will be shrouded to ensure minimal spillage beyond the subject site. Fixtures such bollards and down lights will all be utilized to maintain safe yet comfortable lighting levels in and around the site.</p> <p><b>7. Parking</b> Both on-street public parking and private parking were raised as concerns at both open house events. Realizing most often</p>
--	--	---



## Applicant Led Engagement Summary

		<p>that this issue stems from lack or inconvenience of visitor and commercial parking, we have focused on providing all of the visitor and commercial parking on the first level P1 which is accessed immediately off of McDougall with no need for a trip down stairs or elevators. This will ensure not only the convenience to visitors and shoppers, but also the best chance for success of the future businesses that will inhabit the retail units. Close to 40 stalls on this level will be shared between shoppers in the day and then visitors in the evening to make the most efficient use of these stalls throughout the day. The parkade continues 2 storeys below this level to provide close to 229 stalls for 334 apartment suites translating to a ratio of approximately 0.68 stalls per unit.</p> <p>8. <b>Dedicated Car Sharing Stalls</b> Car2Go or other similar car sharing will be explored as part of a comprehensive TOD strategy for the development.</p> <p>9. <b>Traffic</b> Concerns about increased traffic along the two main adjacent roads (9<sup>th</sup> and McDougall) were raised. Specifically, how the increase in density and additional vehicles would affect the community. And in greater detail, how the entrance to parkade on McDougall Rd. would affect traffic on McDougall Road.</p> <p>As described earlier in this report, Watt Consulting Group was engaged to prepare both a parking demand study and a TIA for the development. This was submitted to planning administration in support of the land-use amendment. The details of these studies were thus made available to the public for their review. Any potential conflicts or traffic related challenges will hopefully be highlighted so that they can be addressed appropriately.</p> <p>The access to the parkade was specifically located to take full advantage of the slope of the site and allow vehicles and pedestrians to access the P1 level (visitor and commercial parking) with full convenience and barrier free accessibility. Vehicles leaving the parkade, do so without having to negotiate a ramp and thus limit their visibility of pedestrians and/or other vehicles on the road. Vehicles entering the parkade will have sufficient queuing length before the high speed roll up door to ensure that cars waiting to enter will not spill out onto the road or straddle the sidewalk.</p> <p>10. <b>Need for traffic light at 9<sup>th</sup> Street and McDougall Road</b> As noted above Watt Consulting Group (Transportation Engineers) prepared a traffic impact assessment (TIA) for this development. This report did not highlight a need for signaling of this intersection.</p>
--	--	--

## Applicant Led Engagement Summary

		<p><b>11. Bicycle Parking</b> The need to maximize and improve bicycle parking for this development was mentioned several times by the open house participants. It is for this reason, that both Class 1 and Class 2 parking stall quantities exceed the minimum bylaw amounts and are located in convenient areas (at or close to street level) to ensure they are utilized as much as possible.</p> <p><b>12. Commercial Uses</b> Although the vast majority of the open house attendees supported the introduction of commercial space along 9<sup>th</sup> Street, there were many that went further to ask for specific uses that were needed or desired and those that were seen as potentially problematic. As a result of this input, we worked carefully with Planning and the CA to include the exact uses that both the community and CA considered a potential benefit to the area.</p> <p><b>13. Construction Noise and Disruption</b> Disturbances during construction are unavoidable; however, we have made the commitment to the community that these will be minimized. Due to the site layout and road network, loading or hauling from the western side of the property (9<sup>th</sup> Street) cannot occur without appropriate permission from the City of Calgary. Almost all access will be from St. Matthews Square and 9A Street.</p> <p>Lane closures will also be required. The unique site conditions make this a challenging build but we have assured the CA that we will adhere to the City of Calgary street use and noise bylaws.</p> <p><b>14. Condo vs. Rental</b> The Calgary multi-family residential sales are not at level that can allow a project such as this to be economically viable as a market (condo) development. Currently, the only way this development can move forward is if it is conceived as a rental building and maximizes the density that is allowed with an efficient design. With the recent changes in mortgage rules (2% stress tests on loans applicants) and anticipated increases in mortgage rates, it remains unclear as to how long it will take for the condo market to return to favorable levels.</p> <p><b>15. Size of units and desire to attract families</b> The current proposed floor plans have been conceived with the idea that, if demand dictated, larger units could be developed by way of combining smaller units to create either a greater number of 2 bedroom units or, larger 3 bedroom units. Currently however, market studies continue show trends towards smaller, more price point driven units.</p>
--	--	--

## Applicant Led Engagement Summary

		<p><b>16. Affordable Housing</b> Dominion will provide competitive affordable rentals because it has been designed and conceived with efficiency in mind. Smaller units that work better allow buyers access to the lifestyle they desire but could not previously afford in an areas as great as Bridgeland-Riverside.</p> <p><b>17. Safety and Crime Prevention</b> Concerns about safety within and around the proposed development were raised. As with all of our projects, we make every effort within our design intentions to minimize potential undesired behavior and activity around the site. The best way to achieve this is of course to maximize visual surveillance of the street by utilizing as much clear glazing as possible. The grade-oriented units will provide much of this visual connection, while the commercial uses on 9<sup>th</sup> should provide more activation during typically quieter evening hours. Other CPTED measures will also be employed around and within the parkade, common areas and exits within the building. Visibility into exits and vestibules, high lighting levels, overall brightness, controlled access hardware and security systems /cameras will all contribute to a safer environment overall.</p> <p><b>18. Public seating around the site</b> Opportunities for the public to gather and just spend some time around the site are important to foster a sense of community. We have proposed several areas within the setback of the site for benches and landscaping. Further opportunities for seating can be allowed to evolve as the use of the retail units becomes clear. For example, if a business such as a café or ice cream shop occupies one of the CRU's then it would make sense for seating to be introduced immediately outside of that shop. These seating areas can also provide areas for older pedestrians to rest as they walk from through the community.</p> <p><b>19. Lower towers by transferring some their massing to podium level</b> Although it seems like a logical strategy to bring the height of the towers down, transferring massing from the towers would compromise the overall look of the two towers over a podium severely. In order to reduce the towers by even a few storeys each, the podium would most likely increase in height to about 5 storeys in height. The resulting look would be of a large block mass once again with two raised portions of that block on either end of the block. Currently, the sleek low profile podium enhances in contrast the slender nature of the towers.</p>
--	--	--

### Applicant Led Engagement Summary

5	July 18, 2018	<p>Meeting with <b>Bridgeland-Riverside</b> Community Association Board (BRCA)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The concerns raised here were from two future residents of the Radius Condo and were aimed at a need for more clarity on the shadowing impact and questioned the massing in relation to the shadowing specifically on the south face of Radius, and its roof top garden. In response to this, we worked with planning to update the shadow studies to show greater context and additional times of the day for each time of the year. Further to that, we have created animations of the shadow studies to better illustrate the shadow path as it sweeps across the surrounding sites.</li> <li>2. With respect to method of contact to be used to reach future Radius residents, Bucci has confirmed additional contact information and will ensure that these stakeholders receive appropriate notification of future engagement and information sessions.</li> </ol>
---	---------------	---

Troy Abromaitis  
Director of Development  
Bucci Developments

Tony Casola, Architect, AAA, SAA, MAA, AIBC  
LEED® AP, Principal  
Casola Koppe Architects Ltd.