



Inglewood Area Redevelopment Plan

Draft ARP Review

What We Heard, What We Did

March 13, 2018

The City of Calgary



Contents

Project Overview3
Engagement Overview3
 Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee.....3
 Online Public Survey4
What We Asked4
Next steps4
What We Heard, What We Did5
Detailed Responses6
 Land Use Concept Feedback6
 Open Space Feedback19
 Mobility Feedback.....23
 Infrastructure and Environment Feedback29
 Other Feedback.....34



Inglewood ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 8, 2018

Project Overview

In 2016 The City of Calgary started work on new Area Redevelopment Plans (ARPs) for the communities of Ramsay, Inglewood, and Millican-Ogden, as well as a Station Area Plan (SAP) for the South Hill area. These communities will be home to Green Line LRT stations, and because of that, it is expected that these areas will see increased development in the future. New ARPs and a SAP were developed to provide rules and guidance for future development in these communities; things like how to complement the local character, what level of density makes sense, and how to transition from high to low density or from residential to commercial within a community.

The Area Redevelopment Plan for Inglewood started with the vision and design concept developed as part of a 2015 Transit Oriented Development study and community design charrette. This initial vision was refined and expanded upon through subsequent public engagement in 2016 and additional planning work by The City of Calgary. In the spring of 2017, The City of Calgary produced a draft Area Redevelopment Plan for the community of Inglewood that looks to reflect community priorities, while also aligning with overarching policies such as the Municipal Development Plan and the Calgary Transportation Plan.

Engagement Overview

The City of Calgary conducted an additional round of public engagement in October and November of 2017 in order to collect feedback on the draft ARP for Inglewood. The results of this round of engagement are collected in this report-back.

Engagement to collect feedback on the draft ARP was collected through two related processes: the Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee, and a broad public survey.

Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee

The Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee (ARC) was comprised of residents and volunteers from the communities of Inglewood, Ramsay, Millican-Ogden and South Hill/Riverbend who met to review and discuss the draft area redevelopment or station area plan in their community. This group was tasked with providing additional local context to the document and identifying areas of the document where they felt that additional focus was required. For most of the Green Line communities, this volunteer opportunity was advertised throughout the community and on-line, and interested participants were asked to submit an application to The City. After initial conversations with the Inglewood Community Association and in an effort to minimize stakeholder fatigue a similar, but slightly different process, was followed in Inglewood. In Inglewood, The City of Calgary's Engagement Resource Unit worked with the Community Association and ward Councillor's Office to reach out directly to a group of individuals who could provide a wide variety of local perspectives. As a result, this group included resident home-owners, people who worked in the area, business owners, local developers or real-estate professionals, and community association members.

The Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee for Inglewood met two times over the course of October & November of 2017.



Inglewood ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 8, 2018

1. The first meeting for the group included a detailed walk-through of the draft plan by the community planner who had developed it and then transitioned into the process of collecting feedback from participants on the draft ARP. Committee members discussed different sections and recorded their specific thoughts. A session facilitator also recorded high-level themes raised by the group and helped to ensure that discussion moved through all of the sections of the document.
2. The second meeting for this group provided participants a chance to add additional comments or clarify issues that had been raised earlier. At this meeting, participants also reviewed feedback that had been collected during the public, online, survey (described below) and helped to ensure that it was captured within the correct overarching theme.

Online Public Survey

From October 30 to November 14, 2017, an online survey was hosted on The City of Calgary's Engage Portal. This survey provided the general public with an opportunity to share their thoughts on the draft ARP. Participants were asked to review a PDF copy of the draft plan, and then, for each section of the ARP, asked to identify any areas within that section that could be updated to better fit the community context or meet community need.

What We Asked

Both the Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee and the open public survey asked the same questions of participants. For each of the four primary sections of the ARP document (Land Use Concept, Open Space and Parks, Mobility, and Infrastructure and Environment) as well as for the document as a whole, participants were asked to:

- Identify any areas within this section that could be changed to better fit the community context or meet community need.

Next steps

In the spring of 2018, there will be opportunities to discuss the themes that were raised and ask questions about the responses that were provided. The updated and merged draft plan will also be shared and there will be additional opportunities to review the plan and provide input on specific topics, through a public session in the community and on The City's online Engage site. The new plan is expected to be brought forward to Council in December of this year.



Inglewood ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 8, 2018

What We Heard, What We Did

All of the feedback collected from the Inglewood Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee participants as well as all feedback collected through the online survey has been combined into a single feedback data set. Similar responses have been grouped together into themes and a summary statement describing the central idea or community concern have been drafted for each theme.

The City’s Technical Advisory Committee for the ARP – which includes representatives from Community Planning, Heritage Planning, Calgary Parks, and Transportation Planning – have reviewed all of the collected feedback, themes, and summary statements and have determined how the community feedback can best be addressed within the ARP.

The City’s responses to the community feedback generally falls into one of five categories below:

- Suggested ideas or changes that can be incorporated directly into the ARP.

- Suggested ideas or changes that could be incorporated into the ARP with some additional community feedback and engagement.

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be addressed within the ARP, but could be addressed through other City projects or initiatives.

- Suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft ARP. In this case, The City may need to provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.

- Suggested ideas or changes that may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. In this case, The City would need to explain why.

The following pages outline The City’s responses to all of the suggested ideas or changes. For a complete list of all verbatim comments, please see the What He Heard report back, published earlier here:

https://calgary.ca/engage/Documents/Green%20Line/ARP/Inglewood_draft_Area_Redevelopment_Plan_-_What_we_heard_FINAL.pdf



Detailed Responses

Land Use Concept Feedback

1 - Building Heights

What We Heard

Suggestions that allowable heights are generally too tall throughout the plan, with the concern that higher buildings will shade adjacent structures and open spaces as well as overwhelm the surrounding community.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes could be incorporated into the ARP with some additional community feedback and engagement

The City is open to further discussion on heights, however we will need more specific feedback on which sites are a concern and what people want to see.

If more people are going to live, work, learn and play in a community, that community is going to require more space within buildings for that to happen. A lot can be done to increase the activity within spaces. Residential examples are basement suites and backyard suites. These sorts of developments can double the number of units in an area quickly. To achieve higher densities, at some point uses and units need to be stacked within buildings, meaning an increase in building height.

The plan has tried to allow for meaningful intensification while minimizing impacts.

Doing that will affect views, sunlight/shading and produce a sense of enclosure where there used to be openness.

The remainder of this response will discuss:

- The public purpose of community intensification.
- The impacts of higher buildings.
- The rationale for heights and densities across the community.

Apart from the impact that intensification has on the character of the community (discussed in another response), it results in taller buildings at some point.

Taller buildings:

- May obstruct views
- Create conditions of overlooking (backyards lose privacy)
- Create a greater sense of enclosure (visible walls instead of sky)



Inglewood ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 8, 2018

- Shadow adjacent lands (this site is useful for understanding impacts:
<https://www.suncalc.org/#/51.0412,-114.0347,17/2018.03.21/07:59/14/0>)

The allocation of new growth across Inglewood and Ramsay follows a principle that was established early on in the process, during the 2015 charrette. For the area overall, the idea was that 20% of the land should accommodate 80% of new development and that 80% of the land should accommodate 20% of new development (80/20 principle). This means that intensification is limited to specific sites within the community, helping to minimize potential impacts on the surrounding neighbourhood.

Based on this, the majority of new development is being shown around the future 26th Avenue Station and larger underdeveloped sites within the two communities. The Brewery and Truck Stop sites are the major underdeveloped sites within Inglewood. Within the rest of Inglewood, 9th Avenue is the key corridor, with 12th Street also being important. The development on the larger sites (which currently have an industrial character) is intended to step down in height as it nears existing residential areas. This helps minimize the impacts of tall buildings on existing residential communities and public open space.

Finally, there are some misconceptions about taller buildings:

- *They lower property values.* In fact, they tend to raise nearby property values.
- *They're associated with crime.* Community activity is important. When public spaces are encouraged to include activities by residents, visitors and other legitimate users, criminal acts are discouraged. Per capita crime rates do not increase with density.



2 - Densification / Intensification

What We Heard

Feedback ranged from comments in support of encouraging intensification in order to ensure neighbourhood vibrancy, to those concerned that intensification would adversely limit residents' quality of life.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes could be incorporated into the ARP with some additional community feedback and engagement

The City is open to further discussion on density/intensity, however we will need more specific feedback on which sites are a concern and what people want to see.

There are many public benefits to intensification. City infrastructure becomes more efficient with intensification. Within the public right-of-way are the water, sewer and drainage pipes under the streets and sidewalks. The cost of these is proportional to the length of right-of-way. The more development that locates along a given length of right-of-way, the more property taxes there are to cover the costs of that infrastructure. Fire and emergency response stations have a response radius and experience similar economies of scale as more people and jobs locate within the coverage area. Other city services like police, social services and waste disposal have costs proportional to population. Stormwater management facilities and parks have costs proportional to their area. Intensification improves the balance of cost to revenue for The City and by extension, taxpayers.

Given the planned Green Line LRT, the positive relationship between transit and intensification is also important to recognize. Ideally, transit would be a viable alternative to the private automobile for most trips within the city. To achieve this, it needs to be safe, reliable, comfortable and fast. Transit is fast when service is frequent and separated from the regular flow of traffic. To provide frequent service (without large subsidies) there needs to be enough people around the transit line to fill the busses or trains. It's convenient to walk to a station or stop if it's five to ten minutes away (about 600 metres). The more people that live or work within that catchment area, the more people there are who are likely to take transit. This can start an upward spiral where because more people take transit, higher levels of service can be provided, encouraging more people to take transit. This is the rationale for transit oriented development.

But community intensification doesn't just benefit The City. Local business, facilities and schools also benefit from a greater population base to provide with services and goods. Many businesses in Inglewood benefit from being along 9 Ave, given its connections to the wider city.

Finally, intensification plays an important role in improving sustainability. Sustainability is about the number of people on the planet and their per capita impact. Urban structure plays a significant role in helping reduce greenhouse gas emissions, agricultural land conversion and impacts to natural areas. Generally speaking, when cities grow up, not out, the impacts on these goes down. Visit calgary.ca/sustainability for more information.



Inglewood ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 8, 2018

3 – Community Character

What We Heard

Interest in maintaining a ‘village’ feel to the community, along with the suggestion that while heritage is part of the neighbourhood character, Inglewood is best thought of as an eclectic neighbourhood, rather than simply a historic one.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes are already embodied in the draft ARP. The City will provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.

Community character is one of the most difficult aspects of planning to address, because regulations tend to stifle character more than nurture it.

Currently there is a misconception about the policy. The policy calls for the existing character to be respected, however that doesn’t mean emulating it. What it means for new development to fit into existing character is difficult to describe in policy terms. What fits depends on the site in question and what’s around it. What the policy (in Section 3.1.4) does is signal to prospective developers and their architects that The City will be looking at various aspects related to how new development responds to context during the review process.

Part of community character is building height and scale. There were comments about how new development will change this. That’s true: new development will alter the character of the community. But part of what makes Inglewood so interesting is that you see the development character of various periods reflected in the architecture of buildings. This will continue with new development.



4 – Tension between traffic flow and public realm

What We Heard

Strong feeling that 9th Avenue cannot be both a regional traffic route to access the downtown core, and a walkable, pedestrian friendly main street.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes could be addressed through work happening in parallel to the ARP.
- There will be additional opportunities for community feedback and engagement on these issues as transportation initiatives are funded and planned.

The comments identify a real contradiction: there is a basic conflict between the idea that 9 Ave is a pedestrian-oriented main street and a traffic thoroughfare for the downtown. Right now, the Streetscape Master Plan process is working through this exact issue (see: <http://www.calgary.ca/PDA/pd/Pages/Main-Streets/yc-Main-Streets/V-ninth-ave-se.aspx> for more information). That process will look at the level of detail necessary to resolve the issue. The ARP will just show the street as a Neighbourhood Boulevard. ARPs are not a good place to have detailed street cross section designs because it means that all of Council would have to approve any changes. The Streetscape Master Plan will likely be adjustable based on local engagement, rather than through a political process.



5 – Concern over Land Use Changes

What We Heard

Concern that changes made in land use designations in the plan will have negative impacts to local residents.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes could be addressed through work happening outside of the ARP. Additional opportunities for community feedback and engagement on these sites would be take place as part of future development processes.

The comments in this section identified some areas of concern. Specific comments within this theme were not included in error, as some suggested. The idea was to identify potential development areas and seek feedback (this process is the one whereby The City receives feedback on these). The sites that are going to change are the City-owned lands that are shown as open space (22 Ave & 16 St SE and 7 Ave & 20 St SE). The development potential of these sites is going to receive further attention.

Many of the comments The City received referenced rezoning. One point that should be clarified is the difference between Area Redevelopment Plan building blocks and Land Use Bylaw districts. Area Redevelopment Plans guide land use redesignations and development permits. Changing the land use map of an Area Redevelopment Plan will not affect the regulations that apply to a property. Regulations are established by the Land Use Bylaw. Area Redevelopment Plans do outline what land use districts are acceptable, but landowners must still apply for a land use redesignation if they want one. Council ultimately decides what gets approved.



Land Use Concept Feedback

6 – Brewery Site & Blackfoot Redevelopment

What We Heard

Interest in seeing greater discussion of Blackfoot and Brewery redevelopment areas, but suggestion that this may require a stand-alone process or plan.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes could be addressed through work happening outside of the ARP. Additional opportunities for community feedback and engagement on these sites would be take place as part of future development processes.

Proposed policy around the Brewery and Blackfoot Truck Stop sites attempts to provide guidance on future land uses and development intensity, relying on a future planning process to provide all of the necessary details to support site development. Each of those sites is going to require further planning at a more detailed level. There are ideas about what should happen on the sites, but the arrangement and layout of uses hasn't been determined. The ARP outlines some parameters for site development with a requirement for further planning.

In response to specific comments:

- New development will have to mitigate impacts of rail (risks associated with derailment, noise and vibration). Cities grew around rail lines and Federal legislation protects them well. Since liability for impacts to new development 9as a result of adjacent rail0 falls on the Municipality that approved it, The City will be doing due diligence prior to approving development to ensure that rail is not likely to interfere with the reasonable use and enjoyment of those adjacent properties.
- What happens in the area of the ball diamonds near Blackfoot Trail at the east end of the community will be up to a future Parks site planning process to determine. The area not impacted by the BRT line is still planned to be future open space.



7 – Rowhouses

What We Heard

Generally supportive of allowing rowhouses in the community; however, there are a number of suggestions around potential limits or restrictions on their approval.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes could be incorporated into the ARP with some additional community feedback and engagement

Feedback on rowhouses vary from those who feel the policies are too prohibitive and others who feel they are too permissive. This topic will remain open for discussion and some minor changes may be made.

In response to specific comments:

- The requirement for rowhouses to have a lane is to ensure that the front of the buildings are not dominated by garages.
- There is a policy that speaks to the Airport Vicinity Protection Act (AVPA) for all development. It's not necessary to repeat that in every section.
- The policy currently allows for end-of-block rowhouses to face a different direction because it allows those sites to develop easier.
- Council approves land uses. They cannot sub-delegate this authority to neighbours of a development, but they are elected and do take concerns of adjacent residents seriously.
- The 'should' language of the policy seems appropriate. Being inflexible can result in unintended consequences.



8 – Secondary Suites

What We Heard

Some suggestion for additional areas where secondary suites could be allowed, but also some suggestions for additional limitations.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes could be incorporated into the ARP with some additional community feedback and engagement

Section 3.6.2 was one of the ideas that came out of the Main Streets program. Upon further reflection, the policy seems unnecessary (relaxations may still be granted on a case-by-case basis pursuant to the Land Use Bylaw). The policy will be deleted.

There are currently proposed amendments to the Land Use Bylaw which would include secondary suites as discretionary uses within R-1, R-C1 and RC1. Visit Calgary.ca/suitereform for more info.



Land Use Concept Feedback

9 – Heritage Conservation Approach

What We Heard

Concern that the heritage conservation approach outlined will not actually have the effect of preserving heritage buildings in the community. Some comments note that the outlined approach does not do enough for protection, while others fear that it does not do enough to incentivize development that preserves heritage.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes could be incorporated into the ARP with some additional community feedback and engagement

The City will be facilitating additional engagement on the draft plan where there will be opportunity to further consider the contents of this section.

Increased density in our communities is a Municipal Development Plan objective but so is heritage conservation, with objectives needing to work together and not supersede each another.

The heritage conservation measured in this ARP will be stronger than anywhere else in the City – we have included a robust bonus system to exclusively benefit heritage conservation. The bonus system allows us to increase density in the community while leveraging development to help protect the character which makes the community special.

Thus, additional density in the plan area must be earned and the methods to earn it will exclusively incentivize heritage conservation.

Requiring community benefit for increased density is standard best practice across North America. In this case community benefit equates to heritage conservation measures and incentives. In fact, bonusing is currently used elsewhere in Calgary to obtain community benefit, which has included heritage conservation in communities such as the Beltline, East Village and Downtown. The City has engaged a land economics and development consultant with expertise in the Calgary environment. His findings are that what is being proposed is fair to developers and enables them to redevelop the community while providing community benefit in the form of conservation incentives.

If additional density is sought for a development over the densities that currently exist, the development would be required to obtain it two ways which both benefit heritage conservation: to pay into a community improvement fund which will benefit protected (designated) heritage properties; and/or to acquire (purchase) unused development rights from protected heritage buildings.



Inglewood ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 8, 2018

The use of the fund will benefit heritage by creating a community-specific restoration grant program for protected properties. The fund benefits restoration specifically, otherwise allowing it to be used for too many things could water down the benefit to heritage conservation. Thus, heritage properties will be the beneficiary of the benefits allowed by new development.

A protected heritage building will have unused development rights to transfer (or sell) equivalent to the difference between the maximum proposed density for its site and the actual area the heritage building takes up.

By offering these two heritage conservation incentives it will make retention of heritage properties more economically viable, and not put heritage properties at an economic disadvantage by forgoing redevelopment of them. It is expected that these incentives will lead the owners of heritage properties to seek protection (designation) to take advantage of them. In some situations, one of the two incentives may be more viable for the heritage property owner, while in other instances a heritage property owner may seek to use both incentives.

In terms of ensuring that the design of new development fits well into the community, and particularly when adjacent to heritage resources, the [Developed Areas Guidebook](#) (DAG) which will jointly apply with the ARP, directs that new development be compatible and respectful of the existing context without creating a false sense of heritage character.




10 – Service Stations / Auto Lots

What We Heard

Suggestion that service stations or auto lots may be appropriate or beneficial within the right context.

City Response

-  Suggested ideas or changes may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. The City will explain why.

The policies in sections 3.1.7 & 3.4.3.b restrict the expansion of current auto-service uses and prohibit new ones. One of the objectives for the community is for it to become more pedestrian and transit oriented. Having auto oriented uses is in conflict with this.



Inglewood ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 8, 2018

11 – Building Accessibility

What We Heard

Suggestion for specific policy language around accessibility

City Response



Suggested ideas or changes may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. The City will explain why.

Section 4.6 of the Developed Areas Guidebook (Volume 2, Part 3 of the Municipal Development Plan) speaks to universal design. The policies of that document are to be applied in conjunction with the policies of the Area Redevelopment Plan. Accessibility is covered to the extent that it can be in a land use planning document. To a large extent accessibility is an Alberta Building Code issue and as such is addressed as part of the application review and building permit processes



Open Space Feedback

12 – Trees / Heritage Trees

What We Heard

Interest in seeing greater protection for trees in the community, with special mention of heritage and fruit bearing trees.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes can be incorporated directly into the ARP

In accordance with the Tree Protection Bylaw (23M20002), all public trees and shrubs should be protected, wherever possible, upon redevelopment of adjacent sites and redevelopment of the public realm. The 9 AV SE boulevard between 21 ST SE and 22 ST SE carries historic significance and protection of trees and shrubs in this location should be given the highest consideration. The draft ARP will be revised to reflect this information.

- Suggested ideas or changes may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. The City will explain why.

The ARP does not impact public trees. Protecting public trees is a process separate from the ARP. Its very difficult to protect private trees unless an owner wants to. We can protect private trees if they are deemed to have heritage value and are listed on the City's heritage Inventory (www.calgary.ca/heritageinventory), and, like a building, if the owner requests it/ is agreeable to it.




13 – Preservation of Open Spaces

What We Heard

Interest in preserving areas that are currently not officially-designated open space, but may be used by the community.

City Response

-  Suggested ideas or changes may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. The City will explain why.

Parks is investigating the mapping to decide if these areas should be included as open space but does not have an answer at this point.



14 – Park Amenities

What We Heard

Feedback ranged from an interest in seeing greater recreational opportunities, to preservation of natural space, to a feeling that some parks are over-developed.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. The City will explain why.

While the ARP provides direction for public spaces, including parks, these design elements are components of other projects and are too specific to mention in ARP policy.

- Suggested ideas or changes can be incorporated directly into the ARP

The City is looking at including a general policy in 4.1 stating:

“Upon redevelopment, Park spaces should be designed to accommodate a variety of uses and age groups.”



15 – River Access

What We Heard

Interest in allowing for river access while minimizing environmental impacts.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes can be incorporated directly into the ARP

The City completed the Calgary River Access Strategy in 2017 which includes direction related to river access locations and strategies for mitigating environmental impacts.

The strategy identifies a potential River Access location associated with the McDonald Bridge, 12 Street Bridge, and Harvie Passage. Parks will confirm the feasibility of these location and amend the ARP accordingly.



Mobility Feedback

16 – Pedestrian Safety

What We Heard

Suggestions for increased and specific focus on pedestrian crossings and sidewalks.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes could be addressed through work happening in parallel to the ARP.
- There will be additional opportunities for community feedback and engagement on these issues as transportation initiatives are funded and planned.

Current policies in the ARPs align with the Municipal Development Plan and Calgary Transportation Plan and are appropriate for the communities. The ongoing work that Transportation is doing will align with the policies in the documents. Citizens will have further opportunity for engagement as initiatives are funded and planned.



17 – Pedestrian Accessibility

What We Heard

Specific suggestions concerning pedestrian accessibility for individuals with disabilities; curb-cuts and ramps, light timing, etc.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes could be addressed through work happening in parallel to the ARP.
- There will be additional opportunities for community feedback and engagement on these issues as transportation initiatives are funded and planned.

Current policies in the ARPs align with the Municipal Development Plan and Calgary Transportation Plan and are appropriate for the communities. The ongoing work that Transportation is doing will align with the policies in the documents. Citizens will have further opportunity for engagement as initiatives are funded and planned.



Inglewood ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 8, 2018

18 – Pedestrian & Cycle Network

What We Heard

General agreement on importance of pedestrian and cycle network within the community and connecting to adjacent communities, with some debate over the use of 8th Avenue as a cycle route.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes could be addressed through work happening in parallel to the ARP.
- There will be additional opportunities for community feedback and engagement on these issues as transportation initiatives are funded and planned.

Current policies in the ARPs align with the Municipal Development Plan and Calgary Transportation Plan and are appropriate for the communities. The ongoing work that Transportation is doing will align with the policies in the documents. Citizens will have further opportunity for engagement as initiatives are funded and planned.



Inglewood ARP

What We Heard, What We Did

March 8, 2018

19 – Transit Network

What We Heard

Interest in ensuring community is effectively served by transit.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes could be addressed through work happening in parallel to the ARP.
- There will be additional opportunities for community feedback and engagement on these issues as transportation initiatives are funded and planned.

Current policies in the ARPs align with the Municipal Development Plan and Calgary Transportation Plan and are appropriate for the communities. The ongoing work that Transportation is doing will align with the policies in the documents. Citizens will have further opportunity for engagement as initiatives are funded and planned.



20 – Traffic Flow

What We Heard

Suggestions to enhance traffic flow through the community.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes could be addressed through work happening in parallel to the ARP.
- There will be additional opportunities for community feedback and engagement on these issues as transportation initiatives are funded and planned.

Current policies in the ARPs align with the Municipal Development Plan and Calgary Transportation Plan and are appropriate for the communities. The ongoing work that Transportation is doing will align with the policies in the documents. Citizens will have further opportunity for engagement as initiatives are funded and planned.



21 – Parking Concerns

What We Heard

General concern that intensification and development will create parking challenges for existing residents. Some specific debate over the impacts of parking relaxation for heritage buildings.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes could be addressed through work happening in parallel to the ARP.
- There will be additional opportunities for community feedback and engagement on these issues as transportation initiatives are funded and planned.

Current policies in the ARPs align with the Municipal Development Plan and Calgary Transportation Plan and are appropriate for the communities. The ongoing work that Transportation is doing will align with the policies in the documents. Citizens will have further opportunity for engagement as initiatives are funded and planned.




Infrastructure and Environment Feedback

22 – Infrastructure Upgrades

What We Heard

Interest in seeing more detail around how infrastructure maintenance and upgrades would be conducted in order to meet demands of intensification in neighbourhood.

City Response

-  Suggested ideas or changes may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. The City will explain why.

This theme concerns a several issues related to City infrastructure and one related to electricity.

Adequacy of infrastructure capacity for future development: The capacity of infrastructure to support future development is confirmed as a part of the planning process. The City models the demands for transportation, potable water, sewer and storm drainage that will result from new development (in addition to what currently exists) and plans expansion to meet the demand. That information is not included in the plan, except in general terms. The land use plan is incorporated into capital plans.

Infrastructure age and maintenance: There are periodic inspections of infrastructure, but the pipes in the community are old and sometimes things break. This issue is wider than the scope of the ARP as it relates more to the City budget process (see: <http://www.calgary.ca/CFOD/Finance/Pages/Action-Plan/Default.aspx>).

Electricity (and telephone, cable and internet): these are not elements that are typically regulated by municipal plans. They have different regulatory bodies and they operate within the public right-of-way (see: <http://www.auc.ab.ca/about-the-auc/who-we-regulate/Pages/default.aspx>). Regulating these elements through an ARP is outside the authority of The City.




23 – Contamination

What We Heard

Concern about environmental contamination requirements being met prior to allowing any residential development.

City Response

-  Suggested ideas or changes may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. The City will explain why.

Site contamination is regulated by Provincial standards and enforced locally (see: <http://www.calgary.ca/UEP/ESM/Pages/Environmental-assessment-and-liabilities/Environmental-Assessment-and-Liabilities.aspx>). Basically, if contamination is possible on a site, The City requires due diligence as part of an application process.




24 – Flood Mitigation

What We Heard

Concern that more could be done to ensure flood resiliency in the community, as well as suggesting limits on development in areas that have substantial flood risk.

City Response

-  Suggested ideas or changes may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. The City will explain why.

The City of Calgary is actively involved in a number of flood resiliency initiatives and projects that provide benefit to communities throughout Calgary, including work specific to Inglewood. The Inglewood Flood Barrier is an integral and functioning component of flood protection for the Inglewood Community and it remains capable of protecting against a 2013 magnitude flood event. Flood protection will be greatly enhanced through implementation of the Province's Springbank Off-Stream Storage Project that has been committed by the Government of Alberta and is currently in the environmental assessment phase (<http://www.transportation.alberta.ca/sr1.htm>). In addition to this, the City is investigating construction of a new barrier through Pearce Estate Park to protect Inglewood east of Blackfoot Trail SE from flooding. Following the 2013 flood, the City assessed the stability of riverbanks throughout the City and added new bioengineering and riprap revetments; two of which are located in Inglewood (See MacDonald Bridge to 9th Avenue SE and Inglewood Protection: (<http://www.calgary.ca/UEP/Water/Pages/construction-projects/Riverbank-Stabilization.aspx>)).

City-wide policy specifically includes limits on development in areas that face flood risks, in alignment with Provincial regulations, and covers all communities in Calgary where flood risks exist. Since the 2013 flood, The City of Calgary has committed over \$150 million for various flood mitigation and resilience projects throughout Calgary. For a full list of projects, please visit: <http://www.calgary.ca/UEP/Water/Pages/Flood-Info/Recovery/Flood-Mitigation-Recovery-Projects.aspx>.

Also refer to The City's Council-endorsed Flood Mitigation Strategy, which explains The City's vision for increasing flood resiliency across the city, including a new reservoir upstream on the Bow River as well as Springbank Reservoir on the Elbow: <http://www.calgary.ca/UEP/Water/Pages/Flood-Info/Recovery/Flood-projects.aspx>

There is also a multi-departmental group at The City that is exploring appropriate policy for the floodplain Calgary Growth Strategies.

In summary, there is a lot of work beyond the ARP that is being undertaken to better protect communities potentially impacted by flooding.




25 – Alternative & District Energy

What We Heard

Feedback ranged from support for a district and alternative energy system to concerns about the public cost of the plan.

City Response

-  Suggested ideas or changes may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. The City will explain why.

A district energy system would require, at a minimum, a catalyst development. That's why a district energy system study is required as part of the development process for the larger sites within the community. If a developer is potentially interested in developing a district energy system on a specific site, they would likely complete a study to determine financial viability of developing, basing their decision on those results. That is why implementation of a district energy system on specific sites is possible, but cannot be required by The City as part of the ARP.



Inglewood ARP


What We Heard, What We Did
March 8, 2018

26 – Sound Concerns

What We Heard

Interest in seeing more done to address noise concerns from traffic and rail.

City Response

-  Suggested ideas or changes may not be able to be incorporated into the ARP. The City will explain why.

Concerns about noise from CP rail operations are noted, but cannot be addressed in the ARP the CP rail is a Federal jurisdiction / authority issue. Rail is regulated by Transport Canada (see: <https://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/rail-menu.htm>).



Other Feedback

27 – Relationship to other plans

What We Heard

Interest in seeing specific references within this plan to other related City plans and documents.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes are already embodied in the draft ARP. The City will provide clarification to where or how the document addresses the community concern.

The plans adopted by a municipality should be consistent with one another. There were comments about linking the ARP to other planning documents. The plan that the ARP is essentially linked to is the Developed Areas Guidebook (Municipal Development Plan: Volume 2, Part 3). The policies of the Developed Areas Guidebook form a part of the ARP and are applied in conjunction with it. With respect to the other suggestions:

- The ARP supersedes the Infill Development Guidelines. Those were developed for areas with no ARP or where the ARP was silent on infill development.
- The Streetscape Master Plan is a more detailed plan for 9th Avenue. The ARP will provide general support, but that level of detail is not appropriate for an ARP. See response to #4.
- The Bend in the Bow plan is generally referenced by Section 4.1.1 of the ARP.



28 - 28. Figures & Maps

What We Heard

Suggestions for changes to include maps or figures.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes can be incorporated directly into the ARP

There were a number of comments about map accuracy and what the photos show. The City is looking at the specific sites and will update anything in error. We will also try to update the document with more illustrative images, but some are going to show what the community is like now. Additional information will be provided with the next iteration of the plan that will highlight what changes were made.



29 – Definitions & Clarity

What We Heard

Requests for additional clarity or definitions within the document.

City Response

- Suggested ideas or changes can be incorporated directly into the ARP

There were some requests for clarification.

- 4.1.4.b: activating a frontage means having entrances, windows and public-facing architecture.
- 5.4.2.c: This is an error.
- 3.2.1/2: This is an error.
- 3.1.8: Will be clarified to include LRT and BRT stations.

These changes will be made in the final version fo the ARP.



Inglewood ARP

What We Heard, What We Did
March 8, 2018

30 – Engagement Process

What We Heard

Suggestions around the engagement process.

City Response

Engagement activities are promoted through varied methods and media channels. For the Inglewood ARP survey posters The City used social media ads and email distribution to spread the word, as well as neighbourhood bold-signs, and posters throughout the community. We are always open to hearing suggestions on different or specific ways to share information and hear back from the community.