



South Hill SAP

Draft SAP Review - What We Heard

February 10, 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 Station Area Plan for South Hill started with a design concept developed as part of a 2015 Transit Oriented Development study and community design charrette. This initial concept was refined and translated into a draft policy plan through subsequent public engagement in 2016 and additional planning work by The City of Calgary. In the spring of 2017, The City of Calgary shared a draft Station Area Plan for South Hill that looks to reflect community priorities, while also aligning with overarching policies in the Municipal Development Plan and the Calgary Transportation Plan.

Engagement overview

In August of 2017, The City of Calgary conducted an additional round of public engagement in order to collect feedback on the draft SAP for South Hill. The results of this round of engagement are collected in this report-back.

Engagement to collect feedback on the draft SAP 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 identify areas of the document where they felt that additional focus was required. This volunteer opportunity was advertised throughout the community and online, and interested participants were asked to submit an application to The City. Members were selected for this committee by The City of Calgary's Engagement Resource Unit and were purposefully chosen to try to provide a wide variety of local perspectives. As a result, this group included resident home-owners and renters, 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 South Hill met four times over the course of October and November of 2017.



South Hill SAP

Draft SAP Review - What We Heard

February 10, 2018

1. The first meeting for this group brought together ARC members for Ramsay, Millican-Ogden, and South Hill/Riverbend to see a background presentation on the Community Planning process in The City of Calgary and to discuss the purpose and limitations of an Area Redevelopment Plan.
2. The second meeting for the group included only the South Hill community members and included a detailed walk-through of the draft plan by the community planner who had developed it.
3. The third meeting began the process of collecting feedback from participants on the draft SAP. 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.
4. The fourth 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 the public feedback that had been collected through the 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 SAP. Participants were asked to review a PDF copy of the draft plan, and then, for each section of the SAP, 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 SAP 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.

What we heard

Feedback collected from South Hill Green Line Area Redevelopment Committee participants and through the online survey were combined. Similar responses were grouped together into themes and a summary statement describing the central idea or community concern were drafted for each theme. All of the themes and corresponding summary statements that emerged are listed below. For a complete listing of all verbatim input provided, please see the [Verbatim Responses](#) section at the end of this document.



South Hill SAP

Draft SAP Review - What We Heard

February 10, 2018

Land Use Concept Feedback

1. Residential areas within land use concept
 - Both concerns and opportunities about building heights for residential mid-rise area.
2. Employment - Industrial & Employment- Intensive uses within land use concept
 - Seeking clarity on policy 3.2.21 and some confusion between Employment - Industrial and Employment – Intensive
3. South Hill Mobile Home Park
 - Interest in seeing a proactive approach to dealing with the mobile home park in the long-term.
4. Community amenities and services
 - Uncertainty around older-adult housing but interest in public safety facility (police/fire), day care, and Community Association space.

Open Space Feedback

5. Open Space
 - Interest in ensuring adequate open space in plan area.
6. Trees
 - Interest in preserving existing trees, and planting trees now so they are more mature when the area develops.

Mobility Feedback

7. Traffic Flow / Mobility Network
 - Interest in ensuring adjacent communities are not impacted by excessive traffic increase, while still maintaining connectivity for the station area.
8. Pedestrian / Cycling Links
 - Lots of interest in increasing pedestrian and cycling links within the plan, including connection with WID Canal, as well as back into Riverbend and Quarry park.
9. Future Transit Planning
 - Concern over potential future transit routes servicing the station and surrounding community.
10. Station Location / Integration with Adjacent community
 - Concern that the present station location will limit integration into the communities of Riverbend and Quarry Park.



South Hill SAP

Draft SAP Review - What We Heard

February 10, 2018

11. Parking

- Discussion of managing parking impacts for residential areas and adjacent communities; suggestions for neighbourhood parking structures.

Infrastructure and Other Feedback

12. District & Alternative Energy

- Additional district energy and alternative energy planning opportunities.

13. Plan Boundaries

- Questions surrounding the plan area boundaries, specifically the Glenmore Inn lands being located in the South Hill SAP.

14. Plan Updates

- Specific instances where information needs to be updated or more detail is requested.

15. Nothing Noted

Next steps

All feedback (verbatim and the summarized concern or idea themes) has been provided to the Community Planning team working on the draft plan. The City of Calgary will share how they plan to address issues and ideas raised by the public feedback in February 2018. This will include identifying:

- Clarification for which of the suggested ideas or changes that are already embodied in the draft SAP,
- Which of the suggested ideas or changes may be incorporated directly into the SAP,
- Which suggested ideas or changes may not be able to be incorporated into the SAP, and why.



Verbatim Comments

Land Use Concept Feedback

1. Residential areas within land use concept
 - Both concerns and opportunities about building heights for residential mid-rise area.

Page #	Section #	Comments
		I do not believe residential should be in this area unless it is in an apartment building with a max 6 stories with the main level being commercial, the 2nd level being offices. Levels 3- 6 could be Soho style.
		I do not believe using Bridgeland or Mckenzie High street as examples serves any purpose.
		I support having taller than 6 story residential building in the mid-rise area.
	3.5	There is a big slope/hill there. This should be considerate of the slope. Slope-adaptive. Concern for height at the top of 24th. How big will this be from the bottom?
		I think keeping residential buildings less than 6 storeys is good because it will provide for gradual building height increase from riverbend in the community mid-rise area.

2. Employment - Industrial & Employment- Intensive uses within land use concept
 - Seeking clarity on policy 3.2.21 and some confusion between Employment - Industrial and Employment – Intensive

Page #	Section #	Comments
		Proximity to rail is attractive. To be next to this community for mid-rise and employment industry,
		How will this attract developers? Could highlight location, access to industrial park, proximity to transit.
21	3.2.21	What does this clause mean? More clarity please. [Existing Industrial Uses - Buildings demolished as part of the Green Line right-of-way and station construction are permitted to be rebuilt with similar dimensions and for a similar purpose].
	3.7	Industrial seems to close to prime real-estate and residential here - why? Is this because of landfill setback?
	3.7	Business Campus changed to business high-street intensive. Could rename this in the D.A.G. If Amazon needs space, let them come here and do whatever they like.
		Development affected by CP Rail and Industrial [industrial surroundings may not be attractive for development]
		Developers should be able to build food courts in second floors even with landfill setbacks.

3. South Hill Mobile Home Park
 - Interest in seeing a proactive approach to dealing with the mobile home park in the long-term.



Page #	Section #	Comments
		Trailer court should be expanded to accommodate an extra 50 plus mobile homes as an incentive or in lieu of area. The boundary of the trailer court should have 20 year old + trees.
		Transition for mobile home park
		Need to have a better plan in place for the mobile home park and transition
	3.9	Define short-medium term? Would like another parking structure.
		Important for The City to have a plan for the mobile home park.
		Need to avoid conflicts like Mayfield Heights. A plan consulted with the people who live there will help avoid this.
	4.	Community amenities and services
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncertainty around older-adult housing but interest in public safety facility (police/fire), day care, and Community Association space.

Page #	Section #	Comments
	3.1.7	3.1.7 - Older-adult housing
		I am wondering why this plan calls for adult only housing when housing that does not allow children was just in the news as being phased out. There have been some interesting new « seniors » housing developments in Europe and elsewhere that aim to integrate seniors and students or daycares etc. I'd love to see this in South Hill.
	3.1.7	What is older adult housing? Is this senior's housing? Need clarity around this as the provincial government will be phasing out age-restricted living (i.e. 50+ condos)
		I also did not see a single mention of daycare facilities in South Hill. If this is intended to be a high density work/live neighborhood, daycare is essential! The plans should require some!
		is there a plan for a Community Centre? Current SAP does not call for one?
		Fire Station and or Police station should be added in here.
	3.2.6	Community Association Space - encouraged by this. If it is private, will it be publicly available?

Open Space Feedback

- 5. Open Space
 - Interest in ensuring adequate open space in plan area.

Page #	Section #	Comments
	1	The document is light on details for use of the escarpment shown in Fig 18. It will be interesting to see what becomes of it. Hopefully a balanced mixture of natural and other uses along with better pedestrian access.
		Green spaces should be adjacent to Glenmore Trail area. No housing should be within a 1 block distance.



The amount of space dedicated to green space/parks seems very small. In a high density area green spaces are very important.

4 Open-space, would like it dog friendly (have this mentioned or encouraged).

The landfill area south is a great open space resource (in the future). The Station Area Plan should make reference to this area and make plans to intensify the recreation uses, because there is a shortage of green space within the current plan and due to industrial background.

6. Trees

- Interest in preserving existing trees, and planting trees now so they are more mature when the area develops.

Page #	Section #	Comments
		Integrate mature trees that are currently on the west side of the SAP
		Plant trees now for future development.
		Implementation - Laying the groundwork for trees. Planting now so they will be mature when built-out.
map 13		It would be preferable to have the park space (Map 13) and other developments proposed for the former CPR residential, between of 84 Avenue/Glenmore trail and as well as 24 St./Ogden Road, be designed and built and built to preserve as many of the hundreds of majestic older trees and shrubbery currently remaining in the area. Some of these may be as old as the original development c 1910.

Mobility Feedback

7. Traffic Flow / Mobility Network

- Interest in ensuring adjacent communities are not impacted by excessive traffic increase, while still maintaining connectivity for the station area.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		East-West connections shown in the plan are entirely lacking. How are residents supposed to cross the WID canal south of Glenmore Trail?
		what will the impact on traffic in Riverbend, particularly along 18th Street, and what is the City prepared to do to make sure it does not get worse
		Concern for opening up Riverstone road and the affect this would have.
	5.5.3	Should be removed, transit access only.
	5.5	South side of Riverstone. No garages here, so there is lots of on-street parking. Lots of children play here too. Higher traffic would be unsafe. These are narrow streets that cannot sustain 2-way traffic (riverstone blvd) additional traffic would disturb the area around Riverstone Rd.



Map 5 90th Ave wouldn't align with the current intersection. Not clear on this map why this doesn't line up with 91st. Too many lights in a row.

Concerned that 90th ave is built on a pipeline corridor. Move to 91st.

8. Pedestrian / Cycling Links

- Lots of interest in increasing pedestrian and cycling links within the plan, including connection with WID Canal, as well as back into Riverbend and Quarry park.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		The plan seems commendable - although finding appropriate pedestrian, bicycle and transit links between the north side of Glenmore Trail and the south side of Glenmore Trail in the subject lands will be a very serious challenge. It might be better to incorporate those northernmost lands in the Ogden Millican plan instead.
		Bicycle lanes if any should only be connecting street to Ogden road. Shepard Road should be maintained for industrial traffic/ non biking 2 lanes each way.
map 13		The plan needs to include a proper E-W bike/ped connection in the vicinity of Glenmore Trail that connects with WID Canal and lands further east. This connection was lost with the construction of the Ogden interchange. The new one built as part of the new interchange is insufficient. How are residents supposed to cross the WID Canal/Green Line south of Glenmore Trail on foot? Map 13 doesn't even show the new path along Glenmore Trail.
		The Calgary Transportation Plan, Primary Cycling Network Map shows a main pathway connection running through Riverbend and South Hill that connects the regional pathways on the Bow and irrigation canal. This connection should be incorporated into the SAP.
		There needs to be clear and open access for bicycle traffic between South Hill and the Western Irrigation District canal on the south side of Glenmore Trail. Recent construction on Glenmore has resulted in removal (not sure if this is permanent or temporary) of the bike path leading to the canal on the south side of Glenmore. This needs to be reinstalled or replaced by another access point without forcing cyclists to cross under Glenmore road twice in order to access the canal to the south.
		I'm not convinced that a pedestrian overpass would be needed over 24 Street. If the goal is to create a pedestrian-friendly neighbourhood, it seems like reducing speed limits on 24 Street, and creating a high quality grade-level crossing would be preferable
		The need for appropriate pedestrian, bicycle and transit links between the east and west sides of the subject lands (both north and south of Glenmore Trail), over the WID canal, the CPR and LRT lines will be a challenge that needs to be planned for sooner, rather than later. This is on top of the challenges between the north and south portions of the subject lands bisected by Glenmore Trail. This will be the most important challenge that needs to be met, in order for this area to prosper in the medium and long term, and not just continue it's legacy uses as low intensity industrial and commercial uses, accessible only by car or truck.



South Hill SAP

Draft SAP Review - What We Heard

February 10, 2018

map 13	<p>Map 13 does not include the bike path south of Glenmore east of the canal - currently exists and goes to the Big Rock brewery.</p> <p>there needs to be a pathway/bikeway map added to this section, like the Millican-Ogden ARP.</p> <p>Likely to have significant bicycle usage along Riverstone Road, needs separated bike path or multi-use pathway.</p> <p>How does the greenway/regional pathway connect to the western irrigation canal pathway? This connection makes sense as these two main bikeways have connections. Is there access near Glenmore trail?</p> <p>Bike sharing program? Then people do not have to worry about bike theft. Could help to connect Riverbend, Quarry Park, and South Hill.</p> <p>On maps, connections don't seem to exist between Green Line pathway and Canal pathway. If they don't exist they need to, if they do, please indicate on the map.</p> <p>Easy connection from Green Line pathway to Canal pathway and also to Glenmore East path via bike.</p> <p>Extend Riverstone Park bike path toward the SAP and connect the SAP pathways. Right now there is no path along the border of the park or connecting the park to 24 street.</p> <p>Need further access to Riverbend via cycling/multi-use by connecting Riverstone Park to South Hill Ana a map on the SAP showing it.</p> <p>Mixed use pathway should connect 90th MUP to 86th MUP on Shepard to complete the loop. Should not be an issue as that section is transit only.</p> <p>Pedestrian crossing 24st immediately south of the roundabout are difficult for vehicles traveling south from the roundabout to see, partially due to the hill.</p>
5.3	<p>Bike pathway plan needs to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Riverstone RD west connecting to Holy Angels school pathway (across from Riverstone Close). - 24st connecting to Riverstone Park Pathways. - Connect Green Line regional pathway to Glenmore Pathway reading east. - Connection to western irrigation district canal pathway.

9. Future Transit Planning

- Concern over potential future transit routes servicing the station and surrounding community.

Page #	Section #	Comment
	3.4	<p>Volume expectations and coverage area plans from transit. What are the #s and the plans for service? (the feeder bus routes). Transit Hub could handle 500 buses. What are those #s, and what is the justification for the plaza.</p> <p>Need reliable bus plan to service Riverbend going through Riverstone Road.</p> <p>Routes should change to center around South Hill rather than Chinook.</p> <p>Will route 56, 41, 136 be redirected to service the new transit plaza?</p> <p>Will the current transit routes be re-jigged with the new transit plaza.</p>



10. Station Location / Integration with Adjacent community

- Concern that the present station location will limit integration into the communities of Riverbend and Quarry Park.

Page #	Section #	Comment
23		LRT Station Location (PG.23): This is so far out of the way from the local community right next to it (Riverbend). If the location was more south from the proposed location, closer to Ogden Road, more people in the community would have the opportunity to use it. Only people in the north of Riverbend will be able to use it, and moving it south could allow for at least the east side of Riverbend (houses east of 18th st) to have easier access. At the moment, for myself, it's a 25 minute walk to the station and I live near the border of Riverbend/Quarry Park
		I know that there was a push to have the industrial portion of the area included for use at this station, but it is a missed opportunity to leave out so much of the Riverbend area in this plan. Move the station more southward along the proposed line.
		As much connection as possible to surrounding communities
		As south Hill develops, it will have all the greatest and latest. This includes the latest technologies as well as newer buildings. If this happens, what is going to be done as far as the possible exodus of businesses in Riverbend to the new area. The idea is that in this case, South Hill is the new shiny toy that everyone will want to play with, leaving Riverbend where?
		Multi-use pathway connective from the river pathway to the transit plaza.
		Bike racks must be functional and prioritized ahead of visual appeal. Cyclist have commented other bike racks are not secure or functional and act as an art piece, instead of being useful.
		Missing integration into quarry park and riverbend. Try to view the 3 as one integrated community.
		Is "well-connected" enough? Can we be more specific in this definition?

11. Parking

- Discussion of managing parking impacts for residential areas and adjacent communities; suggestions for neighbourhood parking structures.

Page #	Section #	Comment
		no surface parking! why are we wasting precious space on this.
	3.6	The park/green space north of the Glenmore Inn should belong in South Hill. This could be a 6 story parking structure with sports facilities on top.
		It is our understanding that the South Hill station will be a no-parking LRT. The problem is that people will still drive to it and will end up parking somewhere, whether the City allows for it or not. Our concern is that it will end up being streets of Riverbend. Residents should have PRIORITY to park in front of their own homes. So, either add South Hill Parking or ensure you look after how you control that residents are still able to park by their houses (i.e. maybe parking passes).



South Hill SAP

Draft SAP Review - What We Heard

February 10, 2018

Second, there is a related concern – access.

Historically, Riverbend was a CLOSED community. In the past, the ONLY way to get in or out was via the Glenmore Trail/18th Street Overpass.

Years later – a second access point was added into Quarry Park. This was both a curse and a blessing. As far as the curse, it greatly increased traffic along 18th Street. As far as the blessing, it allowed a second access point, and easy access to locations like South Centre. As part of this, the idea that the City could shift the bulk of the traffic now using our community as a cut-through by forcing it over to 24th Street has not materialized.

Not only that, but, we have also been told by the City that given traffic in the community, we now qualify for a sound wall along 18th street

If the plans go through for South Hill, that would add a THIRD access point to Riverbend on our eastern border. The problem we have is that this may well complicate frustrate concerns we have with such things as parking and traffic unless there is plan to deal with it.

The point – things can only continue to get worse instead of better unless the City has identified a plan to deal with it now wanted to broach our eastern borders with access to the LRT Station as no parking will be provided at this station – or at least that appears to be the plan.

3.1.9	Opposed to this ever being a park. Would like this to be a parking structure with a green space on top of it.
5.6	parking! Dream bigger!
	The minimum number of bike stalls per the land use bylaw should be doubled in South Hill because the parking requirements are reduced.
	Will need to ensure efficient transit service to prevent excessive parking in residential areas such as Riverstone Road, where residents don't have garages.
	Put parking on less valuable land next to landfill.
	People living in South Hill could use a neighbourhood parking structure located in the landfill setback. Why? Higher density in the core. Cars will be used occasionally, rather than daily.
5.6	TOD Areas. Parking requirements reduced. Go the opposite way. A maximum of 35% can be provide on-site. Remainder serviced by neighbourhood parking structures, funded 40% by the developers for the exclusive use of the residents of the complex so that the 75% target is met..
	Parking is important, but a reliable bus route can help to alleviate parking pressure. A route circling Riverbed with high frequency can reduce the urge to drive closer. There will be limited parking at the station, so need to ensure residential areas do not become defacto parking lots.
5.6	Ensuring there is sufficient parking for transit and not in the residential areas, particularly on Riverstone RD were there are no garages. Concern for spill-over effect of parking and an increase in residential parking permits.



Infrastructure and Other Feedback

12. District & Alternative Energy

- Additional district energy and alternative energy planning opportunities.

Page #	Section #	Comments
		District Energy systems here will be hampered by the difficulty of interconnection north to south under Glenmore Trail, and east to west by the WID Canal and CPR line. It would be best to anticipate these needs prior to LRT construction, and perhaps create underground "corridors" for the appropriate connections at the same time as LRT construction. Thereafter, any future development should be required to connect to the systems. Perhaps it might be possible to enter an agreement with the WID to use their water allocation for such a system, and ensuring that all water used within the district energy system is returned into the WID canal?
		As well, creating a blanket approval for all new development with regard to solar energy and even greenhouses on rooftops, could provide additional design concepts that make excellent use of the district energy system.

13. Plan Boundaries

- Questions surrounding the plan area boundaries, specifically the Glenmore Inn lands being located in the South Hill SAP.

Page #	Section #	Comments
		Why is the portion NORTH of Glenmore Trail and west of the CPR/WID not included in Millican-Ogden ARP? This has been part of Millican-Ogden since at least Glenmore Trail was built. It makes little planning sense to exclude this from the Millican-Ogden ARP. Glenmore Trail is the an obvious physical border on the south side of the community. There is and likely will be very little interaction between the two communities due to Glenmore Trail. The Glenmore Inn lands need to be included in the Millican-Ogden ARP, not part of an SAP south of Glenmore Trail.
		Why are the APR and SAP boundaries not reflecting community boundaries? They are in the Inglewood ARP and Ramsay ARP. Does the planners writing the Millican-Ogden ARP understand the community. The APR at present excludes not only the Glenmore Inn lands but also Beaverdam Flats and Old Refinery Park?
3.8		Area N of Glenmore Trail. Does this really need to be part of the plan? Nothing will be done here? Does this belong to Millican-Ogden.

14. Plan Updates

- Specific instances where information needs to be updated or more detail is requested.

Page #	Section #	Comments
--------	-----------	----------



South Hill SAP

Draft SAP Review - What We Heard

February 10, 2018

3.1.6	Please define, what does "new auto-oriented" uses mean?
6.1	Does this use the canal? Seems to be lacking info.
7.1	Glenmore trail reflects current condition it is built. [Map shows older configuration of Glenmore Trail]
	Is South Hill going to be its own community or neighbourhood with a population of 7000? It appears likely. Therefore, The City should provide clarity to the neighbouring communities
8.3.4	Update "post-closure" care status to reflect current status - date it could be incorporated.

15. Nothing Noted

Page #	Section #	Comments
		Good.
		No comment.

16. Other

Page #	Section #	Comments
		With the population of potential LRT users in south Calgary and the number of potential users from communities south of the City, I feel that this leg of the LRT should have a higher priority than the north leg since there are already two legs that are operational in the north. Completing the south leg first would greatly reduce the current traffic overload on the major south to north roads, especially Deerfoot Trail.