



Chinook Station Area Redevelopment Plan

Stakeholder Report Back: Phase Three Engagement
What We Heard Report – Spring 2018

Project overview

The City is looking to create a redevelopment plan for the Chinook-Manchester area, surrounding the Chinook Light Rail Transit (LRT) Station.

The existing Chinook Station Area Plan (SAP) is a non-statutory document that Council adopted by resolution in 2008. The new Chinook Station Area Redevelopment Plan (SARP) will incorporate content from the previous SAP as well as the Manchester Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) and will align with the Developed Areas Guidebook, which is found in the Municipal Development Plan

The SARP will provide the framework for redevelopment through policies that guide land use, built form and the public realm focused around the Chinook LRT.

Engagement overview

The Engage Spectrum level for the third phase of engagement on the Chinook SARP project, was 'Listen & Learn' which is defined as "We will listen to stakeholders and learn about their plans, views, issues, concerns, expectations and ideas."

Based on feedback received and participation in the previous phases of engagement for this project it was decided to develop an online engagement program with a targeted and comprehensive communications effort for landowners, businesses and residents in the Manchester and Chinook area.

In our final phase of engagement, feedback collected through the City-led engagement program will be used to help refine the final Station Area Redevelopment Plan before it is presented to Calgary Planning Commission and Council.

Online engagement

An online survey was made available from April 16 – May 6, 2018 on the project website, calgary.ca/chinookSARP. Citizens were provided with the draft of the policy plan and summary information and asked to provide feedback on the draft document through 5 targeted questions.

We received 50 comments through our online engagement.

How did people hear about engagement?

A communications plan was developed to inform the community about the project and our engagement opportunity. Ongoing tactics employed throughout the life of the project have included:

- Project specific website (calgary.ca/chinook) that shares information about the project and engagement opportunities.
- Project specific engage portal page (engage.calgary.ca/chinook/sarp)
- A project email newsletter, where interested parties can subscribe for project updates. An email is sent out about key project milestones, timelines and upcoming engagement activities. There are currently 129 subscribers.

The following communications tactics were employed to promote participation in our engagement opportunity:

- Communication with the local area Councillors
- Facebook advertisement to area residents
- Letters mailed to surrounding area residents, businesses and landowners
- Road signs located at high-traffic intersections sharing engagement details
- Targeted communications and posters distributed in nearby residential buildings in Manchester (including the Calgary Housing Complex)

What did we ask?

We asked citizens to answer the following questions to help refine the draft plan.

1. Does the proposed land use concept and policy help achieve the vision for the Chinook Station Area? If yes, please tell us why. If no, please tell us why not. Is there anything missing? Tell us what.
2. Do the proposed mobility policies help achieve the vision proposed for the Chinook Station Area? If yes, please tell us why. If no, please tell us why not. Is there anything missing? Tell us what.
3. Do the proposed open space and parks policies help achieve the vision proposed for the Chinook Station Area? If yes, please tell us why. If no, please tell us why not. Is there anything missing? Tell us what.
4. Is there anything else the project team should be made aware of or you feel is missing from the proposed Station Area Redevelopment Plan?
5. Are there any policies or maps in the draft plan you found difficult to understand? Tells us which one(s).

The Developed Areas Guidebook is currently undertaking engagement and as such this project team added a question to our survey due to some project synergies. The question was:

1. Does the Employment- Industrial Flex building block support the land use concept and vision for the Chinook SARP? Please tell us why/ why not.

The engagement results will be reported as part of their What We Heard Reporting. More information can be found here: engage.calgary.ca/developedareasguidebook

Summary of input and verbatim comments

Below is a summary of the comments received for each topic area and the verbatim comments provided for each question. Verbatim content is captured as it was provided by citizens. No edits have been made unless there was personal information or offensive language which is removed with an indication that this has happened.

Land Use
<i>Does the proposed land use concept and policy help achieve the vision for the Chinook Station Area?</i>
Summary of input
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion for a new LRT station at 50th Avenue • Suggestion for a new plaza location • Concern that the plan doesn't reflect the current land use designations and may not be achievable • Concern regarding the proposed density on the Chinook Centre site • Suggestion to change the boundary to include the Fairview area • Concern with the impact of additional density on transportation infrastructure and traffic congestion • Concern regarding the current safety issues within the area and desire for these to be addressed through the plan • Concern that the plan is not flexible enough and that it may impede development and/or not be feasible to implement • Desire for clarity in the information being presented • General supportive of the proposed plan
Verbatim comments
Better uses for the Manchester West could be achieved through a new LRT Station at 50th Ave and a new High Street along 50th Ave that could tie into the 50th Ave Main Street. Higher density mixed use retail, commercial, small scale industrial and residential could be achieved. A plaza area could also be developed to service this northern area of the plan.
Concerned about too much community density on the current site of Chinook Centre.
Concerned with having the balance of the CF Chinook Centre site identified as Employment Intensive as it does not reflect the current land use designation.
it helps, however i have concern that the Fairview industrial area at Center and Glenmore up to Flint road needs to be included. The bottle necks at this location and on down towards 58th on Center is often congested. As well the narrow or missing sidewalks for pedestrians are also problematic particularly with its link to Chinook station
No, the area already has massive traffic issues and the proposal includes "high-density" along an already congested area. I live and work in the area and this makes me want to leave the area.
no. the land use map does not include the pedestrian/cyclist corridor along the LRT right of way.

<p>The proposed land use concept and policy will partially achieve this but there are two major constraints that need to be addressed. The first is that the area currently is not safe and pleasant and this needs to be addressed before new development will find it attractive. Secondly the LRT station itself is a significant source of this undesirable neighborhood activity. What is missing is a plan to address this reality. In addition the land use. Generally supportive of the direction plan is overly prescriptive and will slow interest in redevelopment opportunities.</p>
<p>The vision is only good if there is demand for the development that the proposed land use concept will impose on property owners. Change of use for businesses that suit the existing buildings will be restricted and result in potential long term vacancies and loss of income for property owners while at the same time increasing property taxes. Imposing such intense developments will not result in increased development...in fact it will impede development and freeze property owners into simply keeping the old buildings going until the market demand lines up with the imposed, high intensity development requirements. No regard for market demand is considered in the proposed land use plan. The Plan should be optional not imposed.</p>
<p>What proposed land use concept? Your entire page for feedback is a labyrinth of links. The relevant information should be here to review and a link for additknal information. Instead, there is page of paragraphs to disregard while trying to find visuals and summary information. If you want genuine, inclusive, and high volume engagement and feedback don't set-up your feedback to be a chore or an academic undertaking.</p>
<p>Without a comprehensive plan for the lands adjacent to the station, it is hard to tell if this ARP will achieve the desired result.</p>
<p>Yes, the Citys concept and vision is achievable assuming that the public and the private landowners are in synergy.</p>
<p>Mobility</p> <p><i>Do the proposed mobility policies help achieve the vision proposed for the Chinook Station Area?</i></p>
<p>Summary of input</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that there has not been enough consideration of private automobile use in the proposed plan • Suggestion for a new LRT station at 50th Avenue • Generally supportive of the proposed plan • Specific suggestions made for improvements to pedestrian and cycling connectivity • Concern that the plan is too focused on private automobile use • Desire for clarification on specific policies and proposed infrastructure • Concern regarding pedestrian and cyclist safety
<p>Verbatim comments</p> <p>No, "private vehicular access" is minimized and barely mentioned in the "mobility plan" anywhere. Private vehicles are the primary mode of transportation in Calgary and in the Chinook Station area. It should not be discounted. I like and work in the area and the recent changes have make access difficult and did not consider the majority of users.</p> <p>*See previous comment.</p> <p>Better mobility can be achieved through the implementation of a new LRT station at 50th Ave. This will provide greater coverage to the area.</p>

<p>Generally supportive of the mobility plan so long as bicycle travel enhancements do not compromise current vehicular traffic capacity or lead to more congestion. Loading and garbage pickup need more attention in the plan particularly if grocery and other retail establishments are being promoted. References to potential deliveries by bicycle have no real credibility in this plan.</p>
<p>No. The cyclist connectivity is poor and forces cyclists to conflict with vehicles. The mobility map should include the LRT right of way that can easily be converted to more useful use from 25th Avenue to 61st Avenue, and further south.</p> <p>Most importantly, myself and my staff walk to/from the Chinook LRT station. We continually risk life and limb because there are some roads in the area that do not have sidewalks!! This is absolutely unreasonable from a safety perspective not to mention that The City is the owner of the affordable housing towers in the Area.</p>
<p>No. The present plan is far too aligned with vehicular traffic, and doesn't provide any comprehensive alternatives or overview for creating new pedestrian or bicycle friendly "corridors" aside from the existing street grid.</p>
<p>The Plan identifies an additional pedestrian overpass to cross Glenmore Trail from 5th Street. Also, Transit Network section indicates a Transit Priority intersection at the intersection of 58th Ave and Macleod Trail (NE corner of the CF Chinook Centre). These items require clarification and discussion with the City.</p>
<p>The suggested improvements to mobility are very good and an important first step as it will over time motivate residents and businesses to be located in the area which will then lead to demand for more intense developments.</p>
<p>there is often a conflict with pedestrians and traffic at the Center and Glenmore area. Bike traffic is difficult at best as well. On the East side Fairview community is impacted by much traffic congestion at times, primarily due to its proximity to CP rail and Chinook station</p>
<p>Yes. In theory it works. Both pedestrians and cyclists must not impact traffic flow and be restricted to the designated areas. There is a large segregation of opinion on value of pedestrian vs cyclist infrastructure. Pedestrians in this city have "the right of way" when sharing the roads with automobiles. (Absolutely ridiculous due to our weather and intense sun during summer drive home time). Keeping pedestrians in close proximity to cyclists may very well have the reverse impact, as cyclists have implied "right of way".</p> <p>The word "Safe" warrants a breakdown in definition.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Guardrails to protect pedestrians and or cyclists 2. Lighting 3. Fines for cyclists abusing walkways and roadways as motorist currently have.
<p>Open Space</p> <p><i>Do the proposed open space and parks policies help achieve the vision proposed for the Chinook Station Area?</i></p>
<p>Summary of input</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific suggestions for the location of a new plaza • Specific suggestions for open space and park placement • Desire for an increase in open space within the plan area • Concern regarding the safety of park spaces • Concern regarding general safety in the plan area
<p>Verbatim comments:</p> <p>*See previous comment.</p>

A plaza at the northern end associated with a new LRT station could enhance the area.
I think open spaces and parks (with proper lighting) is great, but needs to be placed strategically. I'm not sure if I understand the plan correctly -- but what I got from reading this section is you want to put a park on 1A Street SE beside an auto body shop, warehouses and big box stores?
Increased open spaces will make the area more desirable and attract more intense developments over time.
No - the space presently contemplated is woefully inadequate. With a more detailed plan - there should also be a requirement for publicly accessible spaces, which could go hand in hand with the idea of new pedestrian or bicycle friendly corridors, outside of the existing street grid.
park space on the south east corner of the existing chinook site would be more beneficial to existing community members in meadowlark park than high density community area.
Seems like the amount of green space is woefully lacking for the density of the population. I know this is tough as green space does not generate tax dollars, but I think there should be more green space and/or park like features to make the streetscape more pedestrian and cyclist friendly.
We think a park would only enhance the bad things that happen now in the area and would not likely change as redevelopment occurs. We would not promote the idea . It would be better for each individual land owner to enhance his own property with amenity space that they can control.
what i see proposed is workable provided there are barriers between traffic and the public spaces
Yes, however the policy speaks to health and wellbeing and not safety. A few of the high density area green spaces are a hotbed for homelessness, drug abuse and loitering. Taxpayers will be responsible to provide safe environment. It is also imperative that the public and private landowners are in synergy.
General feedback
<i>Is there anything else the project team should be made aware of or you feel is missing from the proposed Station Area Redevelopment Plan?</i>
Summary of input:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that there has not been enough consideration of private automobile use in the proposed plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire for more pedestrian safety measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments were received that were out of scope and not related to the specific plan or station area
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire for clarification on a number of specific policies or information provided in the plan. These could include and are not limited to; timeline of implementation, specific maps, setbacks, current direct control districts, transit priority, pedestrian infrastructure etc.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern regarding general safety in the plan area and suggestions for safety measures
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern regarding the plans proposed for the Chinook Centre site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern regarding the feasibility of implementation of the plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific policy revisions and suggestions were made

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire for more flexibility to exist within the plan
Verbatim comments:
Vehicles should not be an after-thought. The changes completed to 61st did not consider traffic volumes. They have made it problematic for users and dangerous in some cases. I have seen several instances of pedestrians almost getting hit. This is not always the fault of the driver. The area is not designed for all users. Vehicles are the many form of transportation in the area and that is not going to change overnight in an industrial area. I would encourage the City to actual go to the area and not try to force their preferences on everyone. There are reasons that people still use vehicles.
Why are you working on the Chinook station when you have not fixed the Westbrook station yet? The Westbrook station is surrounded by 10 acres of mud and weeds and filled with meth addicted homeless people. The station is a blight on the community and no matter how many people complain no one at the city will help.
The plan mentions the 300 m setback but does not deal with it in the plan. The setback area faces expensive complications if one was to consider developing to the proposed land use and policy guidelines. This will likely result in no development in the setback area, increased vacancies and loss of income to property owners. The setback area should have the opportunity to develop to the proposed densities but not the obligation. Current land uses and development guidelines should continue to be in effect until a property owner chooses to opt in on the new area plan and policies. How much more empty office space does Calgary need? What developer will build the density and type of space proposed when the market does not demand it.
Again on the East side The Fairview community at the south west end is impacted. due to increased traffic by those avoiding Macloed trail. Greater emphasis on bikes and pedestrian separation are needed between vehicular traffic
There is a disjoint in the maps with respect to the POTENTIAL REGIONAL PATHWAY. This element should appear on all maps.
Details on timeline? Not sure if this info is something that is generally included in, or appropriate for, this type of plan/document but just wondering when we might see these changes start to take effect and estimate on how long it would take for this vision to become realized.
A High Street concept along 61st ave is an admirable goal but you need both sides of the street and that does not exist on the south side of the ave at the transit hub. Therefore a little flexibility in the plan is warranted to avoid negating possible future options for more densification/diversification. it was confusing if April 30th or May 6th was the final day to provide comments to this important planning document but either date is too short a time frame for thoughtful responses. A minimum of 30 days would have been appreciated.
No
Take all the money you are spending on this project and use it to provide some security in the Westbrook station. Its like a Mad Max movie around the Westbrook station. A crime hub and an eyesore. Fix Westbrook before you do anything else,
*See previous comment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The vision for the area is much more employment focussed which differs from the desire to accommodate residential on the Cadillac Fairview sites; • Must ensure that all the policies recognize that existing DCs take precedent over the proposed policy. • The Plan identifies an additional pedestrian overpass to cross Glenmore Trail from 5th St. This item requires clarification/discussion with the City; • Transit Network section indicates a Transit Priority intersection at the intersection of 58th

Ave and Macleod Trail (NE corner of the CF Chinook Centre). Clarity is needed.

- Clarity around the new Energy Section and implications is required.
- Appendix now applies to entire CF Chinook site. Clarity is required from City.

concern about high rises on Chinook Centre block.

General comments

- Did the planning team consider a transitional land use block typology between the LRT/ freight rail line and Centre Street to support High Street east of the tracks, and create an appropriate transition of mixed-use/ commercial and higher-intensity use along this corridor?
- All lands east of the LRT/ Freight Corridor have been identified as Employment Intensive or Industrial. Perhaps a more fine-grained approach to land use would have been beneficial since this much of this area is outside of the landfill setback and within the 600m catchment of the Chinook LRT station. Was any consideration given to mixed use development in this area?
- The intent to create a more active street frontage along 61 Avenue and Centre Street S will be challenged under the typical built form and use typologies that would occur under 'pure' employment-intensive redevelopment.
- Please clarify why the 600m Station Area catchment is referenced as a "buffer" on the mapping. To be consistent with other Planning documents, this should state 'TOD Planning Area' or radius. Buffer sounds restrictive, or reads as a constraint.

2.2 Land Use Concept

Page 9, Policy 5: Please confirm if residential/ mixed use development is excluded east of the LRT at Centre Street, and further east. The language in this section and later in the draft document suggests this might be the case, but is not clear.

3.6 Manchester Employment Area

Page 18, Introduction:

- Broader discussion of longer term creative redevelopment opportunities for this area would be welcome.
- Could potential longer-term options for lands within the landfill setback be explored? There may be more flexibility and opportunities to address land use constraints creatively, particularly if the City gains control over the landfill setbacks through a City Charter.

Page 18, Policy 2:

- Confirm if residential/ mixed use excluded east of the LRT/ Centre Street/ south of 58th Avenue.
- Over time, and given proximity to Chinook LRT station, non-"industrial" uses should be anticipated as redevelopment occurs.
- What is "industrially-based" office meant to convey? Is this support office for industrial uses?

Page 18, Policy 4:

- Please clarify what is meant by "vertically stacked" industrial development? We note it is typically very challenging to develop industrial functions vertically, so we are wondering if this statement is meant to suggest vertically mixing other uses with industrial through redevelopment.

Page 18, Policy 5:

- Consider deferring to the Land Use Bylaw for ancillary commercial use areas rather than specifying a percentage at the ARP level.

- Why is residential development not considered within the Manchester Employment Area more generally?

Page 18, Policy 8:

- Please confirm why is freestanding retail prohibited. Some retail uses can provide support for industrial and office uses but may not be developed inside a non-retail structure.

6.2 Energy

Page 36, Policy 2:

- Please revise "...should consider solar energy equipment." This statement is currently too restrictive, but a modified version would convey the intent that renewable energy sources are encouraged/ preferred.

8.3 Station Area Plan Redevelopment Plan Implementation

Page 40, Policies 17 - 18:

- As commented above, this policy takes a very restrictive approach to the Landfill setback area. More flexibility could be built into the policy.

Appendix A

- Again, we feel that there the approach to the landfill setback is too restrictive. If the appendices are non-statutory consider adding a more future-focused discussion of the landfill setback and SDR here, in which possible scenarios could be outlined.

General Feedback

Are there any policies or maps in the draft plan you found difficult to understand? Tells us which one(s).

Summary of input

- Desire for more clarification on transit orientated development parking guidelines
- Desire for clarification on the regional pathway
- Desire for increased clarity in the information provided and the use of plain language in the policy document

Verbatim comments

No details were given on the TOD parking guidelines. This is an area that should be dealt with in more detail as the parking restrictions we assume will be invoked will again take away from a property owners desire to develop as the plan and policy dictates because the plan and policy do not consider what the market demand is.....over time demand for parking will change and if a property owner ends up with empty parking lots in fully leased buildings they will then want to develop the parking lot to accommodate market demand.

The survey should be savable or printable for the us as it would be helpful to have a record of the feedback we are providing.

Just the inconsistency in the POTENTIAL REGIONAL PATHWAY described above.

Document in general needs to be presented in plain language and needs proofreading/copy editing. Hard to be excited about, and engage with, a 47-page document when the language is too technical. Too much jargon and acronyms. The summary version isn't a real summary - it's just a shortened version of the draft plan. Please make this more relatable and easily digestible. Not written for a public audience.

No

*See previous comment.
No comment.

What are the next steps?

The feedback received through the third and final phase of engagement will be used by The City to refine the final draft Station Area Redevelopment Plan before it is presented to Calgary Planning Commission (CPC) and Council.

All feedback received through the entire engagement program will be summarized and used in the report to CPC and Council when the proposed document is presented.

To stay up to date on future project details, please ensure you sign-up to receive email updates at calgary.ca/chinook