



*A historical community in the heart of Calgary*

1136 - 8<sup>th</sup> Street S.E. Calgary AB T2G 2Z7

January 29, 2009

Mayor Bronconnier  
Members of Calgary City Council  
David Watson, GM of Land Use Planning, Development and Assessment

City of Calgary

**Re: Council Public Hearing February 9 for LOC2007-0080 Ramsay Exchange Land Use Redesignation (proposed Bylaw 22D 2009) and Amendment to Ramsay ARP (proposed Bylaw 5P2009).**

**The Ramsay Community Association respectfully recommends that LOC2007-0080 and ARP Amendment be referred back to Administration for further review and amendments.**

After two years of meetings with stakeholders, extensive research and approximately 800 hours of volunteer time, the Board of the Ramsay Community Association (RCA) and the Civic Affairs Committee (CAC), cannot support without further amendment, the above-noted land use re-designation that will be on the Agenda for February 9 Public Hearing, for the following reasons:

1. **Page 6, Land Use Amendment (LUA) under “Subdivision and Development Regulation”** there is no mention of relevant policy from LUB 1P2007 regarding: 220 “Kennel.” Kennels are an existing permitted use adjacent to the site on CES property, owned by the City. As covered in the MGA, and in the interest of public health and use and enjoyment for existing and future residents, the setback policy associated with this permitted use should be applied to the re-designation of industrial I-2 land to mixed use and especially residential land uses.
2. **Page 7, LUA under “Road Layout”** states in last paragraph *“Pedestrian connectivity within and through the site is provided by the roadways and sidewalks which connect to the boundary roads adjacent to the site, and the regional pathway system (RPS) along the Elbow River corridor to the west”*. We submit that the Stantec Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) of August 2007 does not explain how the Ramsay Exchange site will connect to the RPS since the plan reveals that the RPS is only accessible by crossing two slip lanes (one existing and one proposed) and two lanes of traffic at the intersection of Spiller Road SE and 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE or by walking north, crossing 3 lanes and then walking south 2 blocks as indicated in the Stantec report. We suggest that the proposed intersection buildout for increased vehicular traffic to and from the site via Exchange Road and Spiller Road SE is entirely antagonistic to pedestrian and cyclist connectivity to the regional pathway system.
3. **Page 8, LUA under “Density”** the CAC cannot accept the proposed density of the Ramsay Exchange land use districts because the four factors stated: *“shadow impact analysis, visual impact analysis, transportation impact analysis and compatibility impact analysis”* were derived without community consultation. We challenge the proposed density for the site (between 700 and 1500 residential units / 2550 persons maximum (p.11)). We submit that the community road network adjacent the site west and north, cannot accommodate the vehicular traffic without changing road designations that are protected in policy in the Ramsay ARP. Section 4.3.1., (page 50). The CAC has requested since January 2008 for review of shadow studies, building heights and placement,

TIA review and community interface analysis. These reviews were not provided to us, nor opportunity to engage the applicant or the City in meaningful dialogue towards solving these contentious issues.

4. **Page 9, LUA under “Interface Conditions”**, existing conditions with the CES to the west (Barn ‘G’) must be recognized for application of mandatory setbacks from kennel operations, as per issue #1 above. LUB1P2007; p.195; 220 “Kennel” c) states: **“must be a minimum distance of 150.0 metres from a residential district...”** In “forms of words” 1P2007; p.5; 8 **“ ‘must’ is...a compulsory obligation.”** To this point, we are in possession of two letters from Alberta Health Services, Calgary Health Region, dated April 22, 2008 (Jason Feltham author) and December 4, 2008 (Dennis Stefani author). Both letters were solicited by City Planning and both state clearly that residential land use districts adjacent industrial land use districts with agricultural permitted uses including kennels, would be problematic. Neither letter was attached to the LUA presented at Calgary Planning Commission on December 11, 2008. The CAC notes that on page 3 of the LUA document, in the table Summary of Circulation Replies, the Calgary Health Region (CHR) is listed as *“No objection.”* The two letters are attached.
5. **Page 14, LUA under “Environmental Review”** the CAC requests that a new Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) be undertaken by the applicant and the City to determine the public health risks associated with proximity by future community residents to existing and proposed permitted agricultural operations on lands adjacent to the proposed development to the south and to the west, and to existing industrial operations to the east (Lilydale). This HHRA should form part of the Master Environmental Management Plan, under the same terms and conditions for Council approval before second and third reading.
6. **Page 15, LUA under “Transportation Network”, Road Capacity**, the CAC cannot support the statement *“The TIA has been accepted by Transportation Planning”*. The TIA was not written in consultation with the community of Ramsay, which according to Mr. Richard Parker, consultant to LUPP, (introduction to ARP Amendment version 1, July 18, 2008) is a mandatory condition of the TIA approval process. The CAC has written several letters to Transportation Planning challenging the assumptions and data contained in the Stantec TIA. Furthermore, paragraph 2 states *“...the majority of intersections within the study area are expected to operate at an acceptable capacity during the AM and PM peak hours.”* The CAC challenges this statement as contrary to road designations protected in policy in the Ramsay ARP (Section 4.3.1., page 50). The basic assumption of the TIA is that all intersections and roads connected to the Ramsay Exchange site can be built larger and redesignated to increase their capacities. Please refer to letter of September 5, 2008 to Transportation Development, attached.
7. **Page 16, LUA under “Bus Transit Service”**, the CAC had previously supported the inclusion of supplementary transit service for the development. Version #2 draft ARP Amendment made this a policy priority. That policy statement no longer exists in the final version. We therefore cannot support the statement *“Existing public transit routes along Spiller Road will provide bus service to residents in the Ramsay Exchange project”*. We find it unacceptable that the proposed development will not provide its’ own bus shuttle service to existing and future stations. The TIA document claims a daily trip generation decrease because of the development’s Transportation Demand Management system, but to date there is no policy in either the Concept Plan or the ARP Amendment to support the claim that vehicular traffic to and from the site (residential and commercial) will be mitigated in any fashion, by multi-modal transportation choices. Easy use of sustainable choices is not apparent within the concept plan and ARP draft amendment.
8. **3.3.11 ARP Amendment “...Landfill Setbacks”**. The Stantec HHRA notes that Calgary Waste & Recycling **will not support a variance for schools, daycares or hospitals**, i.e. vulnerable populations, within the 300 m setback of the Manchester landfill. This area comprises approximately two thirds of the site and a majority of site density. We respectfully submit that existing and future residents of Ramsay have a **“right to know”** regarding human health risks attendant with the land use re-designation of industrial lands to mixed use and residential within the

300 m setback and from adjacent industrial and agricultural land uses. Therefore we believe that this should be written into the ARP Policy statements.

9. **Appendix VIII, page 1 design drawing of building 01.01 (#4)**, clearly states in the legend *"Terrace w/ outdoor dining"* along the western and southwestern face of building. The CAC wishes to point out that immediately south of this building and terrace location, with a distance of approximately 10m, is the tunnel on the CES Back of House property, used for industrial transport of animals, manure and soiled bedding materials from their western operations. Furthermore the location of this outdoor terrace is directly in the path of the prevailing westerly winds blowing across the existing barns on the CES lands. This is an example of the potential for conflict between land uses on adjacent properties.
10. **Amendment to Ramsay ARP (proposed Bylaw 5P2009)**. For reasons similar to the above objections to the Land Use Concept Plan, the CAC cannot fully support the policy language contained in the Amendment document. Previous correspondence dated November 28, 2008, attached to the CPC file, indicates those areas where we consider the policies to be weak, inaccurate and misleading in its efforts to support the proposed redevelopment project. Please find the November 28 letter attached. Also note I-E land use change northeast of site is not listed in the ARP Amendment.
11. **Community Consultation**. The RCA wishes to state that the final version of the ARP Amendment was only available for review by the CAC on November 24, 2008. The LOC application document authored by Mr. Doug MacDonald was only available for review on December 5, when it was posted on the CPC Agenda for December 11. The last community Open House was on September 23, 2008, where LUPP and the applicant had display boards referencing land use districts and policies associated with the first draft ARP Amendment of July 2008. Since then there have been two revisions of the ARP Amendment, neither of which was presented to the Ramsay community-at-large in an Open House. The RCA respectfully suggests that consultation with the community has been perfunctory at best, given the complexity, size and impact of the proposed redevelopment. At the same time, the RCA wishes to commend Alderman Ceci and LUPP administration for their efforts in trying to keep the CAC up to date on important matters as they were evolving between the City and the applicant between January 2008 and November 2008.

**Recommendation: Based on the above-noted issues, the Board of the Ramsay Community Association respectfully requests that City Council refer the Land Use Amendment and ARP Amendment back to City Administration for further review before second reading, in the interest of creating a truly sustainable development that will benefit the community and the City.**

Sincerely,  
The Board of Directors of the Ramsay Community Association



Judy Hellevang, President

Attachments:

- Letter from Calgary Health Region, dated April 22, 2008. Author Jason Feltham.
- Letter from Calgary Health Region, dated December 4, 2008. Author Dennis Stefani.
- Letter to Transportation Planning, dated September 5, 2008. Author CAC.
- Letter to LUPP, dated November 28, 2008. Author CAC.



## calgary health region

April 22, 2008

Mr. Daryl Schwarz  
Development and Building Approvals  
The City of Calgary  
P.O.Box 2100, Postal Station "M"  
Calgary AB T2P 2M5

**Via E-mail: [daryl.schwarz@calgary.ca](mailto:daryl.schwarz@calgary.ca)**

Dear Mr. Schwarz:

**Re: LOC2007-0080/10C 723, 803, 813, & 813R 24 Avenue SE (Ramsay Exchange)**

Further to our letter dated July 25, 2007, we have received and reviewed the following documents:

- 1) Limited Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Ramsay Crossing, 723, 803, and 813 – 24<sup>th</sup> Ave SE, Calgary AB (AMEC Earth & Environmental, May 31, 2005)
- 2) Letter Report Re: Report Review, Ramsay Crossing, 723, 803 and 813 – 24 Avenue SE (Clifton Associates Ltd, March 3, 2006)
- 3) Torode Commercial Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment – Ramsay Crossing, 803 – 24 Ave SE, Calgary, AB (Stantec Consulting Ltd., July 2006)
- 4) Human Health Risk Assessment, Manchester Yards and Ramsay Exchange (Stantec Consulting Ltd., November 2007)
- 5) Human Health Risk Assessment, Manchester Yards and Ramsay Exchange (Stantec Consulting Ltd., February 15 2008)
- 6) Ramsay Exchange Remedial Action Plan (Stantec Consulting Ltd., March 20, 2008)

Based on our review of the information provided to date, the Calgary Health Region (CHR) would like to forward the following comments for your consideration:

### 1. **Industrial Interface**

The CHR does not support new residential developments adjacent to existing industrially zoned land and existing industrial operations, due to the potential for future land-use conflict and for adverse impact to future residential receptors. In addition to adjoining the industrially zoned land to the south and east, the proposed development will be ~ 200 meters from the existing Lilydale operation which has historically been a source of odor complaints from area residents.

We wish to note it is the CHR's position that industrial-residential interfaces be minimized wherever possible to mitigate the potential for future land use conflicts. The CHR has been providing this advice to prevent any future resident health impacts and resident complaints. These health impacts are associated with both chronic and acute exposure to chemicals, particulate matter, noise and physical hazards such as from traffic and diesel truck emissions, facility operations and industrial accidents.

## **2. Application for variance to the 300 m setback from abandoned Manchester Yards landfill**

The CHR does not object to the conclusions reported in "Human Health Risk Assessment, Manchester Yards and Ramsay Exchange" (Stantec Consulting Ltd., February 15 2008). However, we concur with the information needs outlined in Alberta Environment's correspondence to the City of Calgary (April 15, 2008, re: Ramsay Exchange Development LOC2007-0080/10C 803, 813 & 813R – 24 Ave SE, Calgary, Alberta), for adequate City vapour and groundwater monitoring locations along the north perimeter of the Manchester Yards, and for a contingency plan for the Ramsey Exchange site for vapour migration.

## **3. Phased Development and Remediation**

The Remedial Action Plan (RAP) indicates that the site is proposed to undergo phased remediation and development, and that a phasing plan is not yet finalized.

We wish to note it is CHR's position that the initial remediation / development phases should address the worst-impacted areas (Worst First Concept). This serves to mitigate potential public health risks by removing sources of high contamination as a priority, before other areas have been developed, thereby reducing the potential of contaminant exposure of future onsite receptors.

The CHR concurs with the recommendation put forth in the RAP for a work plan to be prepared for each phase of the development, providing information on proposed remediation activities. The CHR recommends that each work plan also outline what preventative measures will be taken to prevent re-contamination of completed phases, and to protect both onsite and offsite receptors from exposure to contaminated materials, including ambient air quality monitoring and dust mitigation plan.

The CHR also recommends that the developer / applicant develop a communications process to inform onsite and offsite receptors of the proposed development, including a complaint response protocol to address environmental and public health concerns that may arise as development proceeds.

The CHR recommends that the developer / applicant develop a contingency plan to provide an exit strategy in the event that environmental management of the site is discontinued (i.e. future phases do not proceed).

The CHR would like an opportunity to review and comment on Phase work plans, communication plan, and contingency plan as this information becomes available.

#### **4. Soil Sampling and Environmental Verification**

The CHR notes that environmental investigations completed to date, and delineation of contamination and identification of COPCs in soil and groundwater is largely limited to the southern half of the site.

The RAP indicates that stockpiles of excavated material will be screened for COPCs and those that meet the remediation targets may be retained for suitable land use in the development. The CHR would like clarification on what suitable land uses are proposed for the excavated material.

Due to the sensitive nature of the proposed land use, the CHR does not support the reuse of material excavated from areas where soil and groundwater investigation is incomplete (i.e. the northernmost portions of the site, under paved surfaces, beneath buildings to remain onsite), until further delineation of contamination and confirmation of COPCs in these areas is undertaken.

The CHR also wishes to note its position on residential development on contaminated sites, with respect to surficial soil contamination, that the top 1.5 meters of soil on the completed development should meet the applicable residential soil criteria, with one foot of clean soil on the surface. This applies to landscaped areas above sub-grade structures that are proposed for the site.

The CHR understands that the proposed development will include the installation of 2-3 levels of underground parking over much of the footprint, with the exception of the existing Dominion Bridge and Blue Whale buildings. The RAP anticipates that impacted soils will be removed from the site as a result of the excavation for the underground parking.

The RAP describes Environmental Verification to confirm that soils impacted by COPCs have been removed during surface stripping over the entire site, and during excavation of the Southeast portion of the site where subsoil impacts have been identified. The CHR would like clarification on what Environmental Verification (i.e. confirmatory soil sampling) is proposed for excavations to accommodate sub-grade structures, especially in those areas described above where soil and groundwater information is limited or unavailable.

#### **5. Water Management**

The RAP indicates that water samples from depressions and excavations will be collected and analyzed for applicable COPCs, to determine what appropriate measures and approvals are needed for the release of such water from the site. Due to the sensitive nature of the proposed land use, the CHR recommends that the analysis of water collected

from those areas where limited or no soil and groundwater information is available, should include, at a minimum, BTEX, hydrocarbon F1-F2, PAHs and VOCs.

## 6. Risk Management

The CHR would like an opportunity to review and provide comment on any risk management plans submitted for the subject site, as that information becomes available.

The RAP indicates that risk management measures, if required, will be developed in the event that impacted soil cannot be removed from beneath existing buildings that are to be retained. The CHR would like clarification on what investigation is proposed to investigate soil and groundwater quality underneath the existing buildings, for the purpose of identifying impacts and possible mitigation.

## 7. Reporting

The RAP indicates that reports will be submitted to the City of Calgary, outlining remediation activities and environmental verification completed during each phase of the development. The CHR wishes to receive a copy of these reports, for our review and records.

## 8. Health Approval of Public Facilities

The CHR would like an opportunity to review and comment on building permit applications to construct public facilities on the subject site (e.g. food establishments, swimming facilities, daycares, personal service establishments). Please note that Health Approval of some public facilities is required after final construction, but before operation of the facility begins. For more information regarding health approval and plan examination, applicants can contact Nick Suen at (403) 943-8047.

Please call (403) 943-8039 or e-mail [jason.feltham@calgaryhealthregion.ca](mailto:jason.feltham@calgaryhealthregion.ca) if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Jason Feltham, CPHI(C)  
Environmental Health Advisor, Land Development and Reclamation  
Risk Assessment and Management  
Calgary Health Region

c: Dennis Stefani, Calgary Health Region ; Kim Kirillo, Alberta Environment

December 4, 2008

**Ms. Judy Lupton**  
**Manager, Development and Business Licensing**  
Planning and Development  
The City of Calgary  
Box 2100, Stn M  
Calgary, AB

DEC 05 2008

Via email: [judy.lupton@calgary.ca](mailto:judy.lupton@calgary.ca)

Dear Ms. Lupton:

**Re: LOC2007-0080/10C; 723, 803, 813, & 813R 24 Avenue SE (Ramsay  
Exchange)  
Residential – Industrial Interface Concern**

Alberta Health Services – Calgary Health Region (AHS) expressed concern in a previous letter dated April 22 2008 to The City of Calgary (the City), about a land **use incompatibility issue pertaining to the proposed Ramsay Exchange**, that includes a residential component. Lands to the north of the Exchange are zoned industrial.

In discussion with the City, it has become apparent that the Calgary Stampede organization may have plans to construct an animal facility immediately adjacent to the Ramsay Exchange in the next 10-15 years. The animal facility presents a potential residential-interface concern, with the high probability of public complaints to the City and AHS from odour emissions that are significant part of any animal operation. Also of concern, are emissions of aerosols (including bioaerosols), vapours, and gases from the facility.

However, AHS understands from The City that the barn will not have continuous animal occupancy throughout the year, which is a factor mitigating the land use conflict concern - *Clarity of the expected total days of animal occupancy over the course of the year, and if that occupancy will be primarily in the summer, would be helpful.*

Summer is the season of greatest concern in terms of maximum odour emissions from an animal facility, and has the potential to generate the maximum number of complaints from the public regarding offensive odours due to open windows and outdoor activities, including from outdoor restaurant patios.

Odours and other emissions of concern can be mitigated both at the barn and at the Ramsay Exchange building. Although the focus would of necessity have to be on the barn.

In terms of the animal facility, the following is a list of means for mitigating and abating emissions of odours, aerosols, gases and vapours. AHS would not, as a first step, recommend a risk assessment to assess this issue. Rather, AHS recommends incorporating a well considered and developed building design, operating practices and the implementation of emission control BATs (Best Available Technologies), as opposed to BAEFTs (Best Available Economical Feasible Technologies).

The Stampede Organization should be held to a very high standard to guarantee that emissions will not adversely affect residents or building occupants, either indoors or outdoors, through the creation of public health nuisance under the Public Health Act. A nuisance under the Act is defined as a condition that is or might become injurious to the public health, and, includes aesthetic nuisance odours or exposures with the potential to be infectious, allergic or toxic – all of which can affect well being.

- All animals will be offloaded from and uploaded into transport trucks, housed, and fed inside a fully enclosed and engineered building(s).
- All animals will not have access to or be allowed to enter into an open air corral of any kind regardless of the length of time.
- Manure and other waste will be stored, handled and managed at all times using a fully engineered system and contaminant and within a fully enclosed and engineered structure(s), with absolutely no open air storage of wastes of any kind for any duration of time. Storage facilities will be engineered to condition, treat and process the wastes to minimize as much as technically possible the generation and emission of odours, including other harmful emissions.
- Animal feed will be stored in a fully enclosed building(s).
- Barn operating practices will minimize the generation and emission of odours and other toxic emissions.
- Any and all air exhausting from or exiting from any building(s) with animals in it, or any building(s) associated with or used for manure storage, handling, transfer, including passive vents or openings, including those associated with the treatment or storage of wastes of any kind, will pass through emission control technologies to reduce emissions to an acceptable level such as not to cause odour or aerosol, chemical, gas, or vapour emissions that may impact the well being of adjoining residents and commercial tenants, whether inside or outside.
- Engineered emission control technologies will include, but not be limited to, acid gas / gas / organic vapour filters, aerosol filters, biofilters, thermal oxidizers. BAT rather than BAEFT will be applied to selection of emission control technologies.
- Trucks for the transport of any and all waste products will be fully enclosed and airtight. Waste transport trucks will not be permitted to temporarily line up and wait for entry into the building. The building must be designed to handle the size of trucks that are anticipated.

In terms of the Ramsay Exchange, the following is a list of the means for mitigating and abating the entry of odours, aerosols, gases and vapours emissions from the barn into the Ramsay Exchange building(s):

- Outdoor air, fresh air, make-up air, and combustion air used for heating, cooling, exhaust ventilation, general or local ventilation will be located on the opposite side of the building from the side the barn is located on.
- The building ventilation system will be designed and engineered to incorporate air cleaning filters for the removal of aerosols, gases, acid gases, reduced nitrogen and sulphur compounds, odours and other substances of concern emanating from the adjacent barn.
- In addition, the HVAC system will be designed and engineered to be able to operate in 100% recirculation mode, and capable of providing any required cooling or heating, with the complete exclusion of outdoor air.
- Exterior windows, doors, etc, will be engineered to a high degree of airtightness to reduce as much as possible the infiltration of outdoor air into the building.

Prospective tenants into the building are to be advised that Calgary Stampede organization may be constructing, in 10 or 15 years, an animal facility adjacent to the Ramsay Exchange, and that the City will be applying design, emission and operational controls to mitigate, abate and manage the airborne emissions of concern from the facility, including odours. And, that the facility will only house animals on a temporary basis and the season when the facility will be used.

I hope this provides assistance to the City on this issue. Please contact me if you have any questions at 943-8049 or email [dennis.stefani@albertahealthservices.ca](mailto:dennis.stefani@albertahealthservices.ca)

Yours truly,



Dennis Stefani, B.Sc., CIPHI (C)  
Coordinator, Risk Assessment and Management  
Environmental Health

c. David Lee. Manager, Risk Assessment and Management



A historical community in the heart of Calgary

1136 - 8<sup>th</sup> Street S.E. Calgary AB T2G 2Z7

Mr. David Patman, City of Calgary Transportation Planning  
Mr. David Thatcher, Stantec Consulting

September 5, 2008

By Email Only

### **Review of Ramsay Exchange Traffic Impact Assessment, Stantec Aug. 20, 2007**

The following list summarizes our review of the Stantec TIA and supports previous correspondence on this subject from the community of Ramsay in 2008, as follows: letter dated April 10 (David Patman); emails dated May 27 and July 30 (Malcolm Brown); and letter dated August 17 (LUPP – G.Lopushinsky, C.Khandl); all requesting a review of the existing TIA. Our previous correspondence received no official response from the City, so we are submitting a more specific list at this time (note this list does not supersede our previous correspondence which had a more general community-context focus and contained issues of a more general nature). This review references page numbers in the existing TIA for ease of discussion and correction.

#### **Page E.2 2015 Transportation Planning Horizon**

Request that the Transportation Planning Horizon be extended to 2020, to accurately reflect full occupancy build-out from beginning of construction (estimated to be 10 years).

#### **Page E.3 Classification of Dartmouth Road**

Request that the overlapping in suggested reclassification of Dartmouth Road between 24<sup>th</sup> Ave. and 26<sup>th</sup> Ave. SE be corrected. The report overlaps “industrial street” and “local major road”.

#### **Pages E.3/5.1 Walking Time to Erlton LRT Station**

Request that the suggested walking time of “*less than 6.5 minutes to the Erlton Light Rail Transit station...*” be corrected to a minimum of 15 minutes. The approximate walking distance from Ramsay Exchange by road and regional pathway is in the order of 900m, not the straight line distance of 730m. Anecdotal information suggests that it takes a minimum of 15 minutes for an able-bodied person to walk from Spiller Road and 25<sup>th</sup> Ave. to the Erlton Station via the regional pathway.

#### **Pages 2.1/4.12 2.1 Existing Road Network / 4.4 Daily Traffic Volumes**

Request that the classification of Spiller Road be corrected to “collector road” throughout the document. The report indicates that “*Spiller Road is designated as a primary collector road according to the City’s Transportation Bylaw.*” This statement contradicts the City’s Transportation Bylaw map and the Ramsay ARP which designate Spiller Road SE as a collector road with a design traffic flow of 1,500 – 5,000 vpd. Spiller Road in the community does not have a central median characteristic of primary collectors, nor is it four lanes wide beyond 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE.

We note that Table 4.5 on page 4.15 indicates that the 2015 post-development daily traffic volumes for Spiller Road north of 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue are projected at 14,250 vpd, which is nearly 3 times its designated

capacity. Page 4.12 indicates *“Spiller Road north of 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE is currently classified as a primary collector. The daily traffic volumes on Spiller Road...are projected to be approximately 14,250 vpd, which is “...within 14% of the guideline for a primary collector.”* Request that this statement be revised to reflect the correct roadway designation.

Request that the classification of 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE be corrected in Table 4.5 to “local residential road” (Ramsay ARP 4.3.1 Policy), with a maximum design traffic flow of 1,500 vpd, from the proposed “high street” designation with a proposed design traffic flow of 7,000 vpd.

**Page 3.7      3.2 Proposed Road Network**

Paragraph 2 states *“Appropriate handling of traffic capacities through road and intersection design, as well as the introduction of traffic calming measures ensures that most traffic entering the development will not need to pass through the existing community of Ramsay. The road hierarchy is planned to ensure that the primary access point to Ramsay Exchange will be from the south.”* We request that the scope of the TIA include both the community of Ramsay road network and the surrounding perimeter road network including 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE, between Spiller Road and Macleod Trail, and the effect of new development on 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE (District 1 Police HQ) and Manchester Operations Centre. We also request that this study reference the Calgary Exhibition and Stampede expansion plans and its road network capacity projections.

**Page 3.9      3.3 Trip Generation**

Tables 3.2 and 3.3 indicate that the trip rates for a certain portion of the multi-family residential units and office floor space were reduced (...*“reviewed and approved by Transportation Development Services staff”*...) because the applicable land use was within 600m of the LRT station. Within the 2015 time horizon used throughout the study, the closest LRT station is straight-line 730m and walking distance 900m to Erlton Station. This reduction in trip rates amounts to approximately 2500 vpd. We request that the data in these tables be reviewed and corrected upwards to reflect the elimination of the lower trip generation rate. Should the study review adopt the requested 2020 Transportation Planning Horizon, this data should reflect the reality of the proposed future S.E. LRT station at Crossroads which would be within 600m of the development, though difficult to access across the CPR tracks.

**Page 3.9      3.4 Trip Distribution and Assignment**

Request that Figure 3.11 be corrected to reflect City of Calgary 2015 Select Link Analysis (Appendix D) which indicates that vehicle trips oriented to and from the north, via Spiller Road and 11<sup>th</sup> Street at AM and PM peaks, ranges from 30-40%. The TIA report only has 6-11% of the AM and PM peak site oriented trips travelling on Spiller Road north of the site. It would appear that the TIA report underestimates the potential traffic impact on the Ramsay community, and provides further argument for increasing the scope of the study to include the community road network.

**Page 4.1      4.1 2015 Traffic Volumes**

Request that Transportation Planning Horizon be increased to 2020 to reflect the proposed development build-out as mentioned previously. Request that the scope of the TIA be increased to include data for 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Macleod Trail and downstream intersections in the Ramsay community (Spiller Road and 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue) and on the perimeter road network (26<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 11<sup>th</sup> Street SE). Also missing is data on the future proposed 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue Blackfoot to Macleod Connector and the ramp linkage to Dartmouth Road.

**Pages 4.7- 4.10    4.2.3 Post-Development Operating Conditions (Recommended Road Improvements)**

The TIA report recommends a number of localized road improvements that will have an impact on the existing community. There are no plans indicating the extent of these recommended intersection improvements so that local residents and businesspersons can identify the impact on their properties.

Two examples include the proposed intersection improvements at Spiller Road, 6<sup>th</sup> Street and Exchange Road, and at Spiller Road, Constance Avenue and 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Such proposed improvements will have a pronounced effect on on-street parking to create the necessary four traffic lanes required, which as already noted, also requires a road designation change. Again we are requesting that the scope of the TIA be increased to fully clarify the proposed impact on the community road network and that plans be included for local road and intersection improvements.

**Page 4.15      4.0 Transportation Assessment - Table 4.5 Daily Traffic Volumes**

We request that changes be made to the Environmental Design Guideline (vpd) column in Table 4.5 to reflect the previously requested road designation corrections for Spiller Road (max. 5,000vpd) and 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue (max. 1,500 vpd). Furthermore the 2015 Post-Development Daily Traffic Volumes in Table 4.5 indicate that the TIA study should have included 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Macleod Trail intersection, given that the vpd volumes are projected to be 12,800 above the 30,000 vpd capacity on 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue west of Spiller Road towards Macleod Trail.

We welcome the opportunity to discuss these requests for corrections and increasing the scope of the study to include the community's road network and perimeter road network. Other community concerns with regard to multi-modal transportation issues include poor connectivity to the regional pathway system from the proposed development and the antagonistic intersection improvements at Spiller Road SE and 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE, which will serve to make pedestrian connections to the pathway more challenging.

Respectfully,

Michael Benoit  
VP External/Chair Civic Affairs  
Ramsay Community Association

Taras Semeniuk  
Chair, Traffic Committee  
Ramsay Community Association

cc.      Alderman Joe Ceci  
         Richard Parker  
         Malcolm Brown



*A historical community in the heart of Calgary*

1136 - 8<sup>th</sup> Street S.E. Calgary AB T2G 2Z7

November 28, 2008

Ms. Grace Lopushinsky  
Mr. Doug MacDonald  
Land Use Planning and Policy  
Alderman Joe Ceci  
City of Calgary

By Email Only

**Re: ARP Amendment of November 24 and Land Use Application LOC2007-0080**

The Civic Affairs Committee (the Committee) of the Ramsay Community Association (RCA) wishes to express the community's enthusiasm and support in principle for the concept of the development of the Ramsay Exchange site and the desire for increased communication, collaboration, and dialogue between all stakeholders; the applicant, the Calgary Exhibition and Stampede, the City, and the residents of the community of Ramsay.

The Committee acknowledges receipt of the November 24 third draft of the Ramsay ARP Amendment, with a request for comment by December 2. While we understand the urgency of a fixed CPC hearing date of December 11, we must emphasize that such urgency does not allow for proper community consultation on the finalized amendment document. Therefore our comments are general in nature and not exhaustive.

Aspects of the development proposal that we can support include the adaptive re-use of the Riverside Iron Works building, higher density mixed uses in appropriate land use districts, affordable multi-family housing, townhouses along the site perimeter that are contextual with adjacent low-rise residential, and potential community amenities including a community-scaled grocery store to support a sustainable inner city community.

As documented in previous correspondence with City Planning, it is the opinion of the Committee that several issues remain unresolved. These include: a comprehensive revised Concept Plan; environmental concerns; Interface with Calgary Stampede Back of House Support Functions; and a revised Traffic Study (TIA).

In reference to the November 24 draft Amendment, the specific policy sections that we cannot support at this time include:

- 3.3.2.8 Inter-connectivity with Ramsay Community
- 3.3.4 Land Use
- 3.3.8 Interface with Calgary Stampede "Back of House" Support Functions
- 3.3.9 Heritage
- 3.3.10 Transportation and Parking
- 3.3.11 Environmental Remediation and Landfill Setbacks

The Committee and the community of Ramsay look forward to continuing dialogue with the applicant and other stakeholders to resolve these important quality of life and human health issues in the spirit of collaboration towards building a healthy, vibrant and diverse mixed use development.

The Community of Ramsay welcomes sustainable development that respects the history and emerging character of the neighborhood, complies with the Area Redevelopment Plan and bylaws, and will be a benefit to the people who live here.

Respectfully,

Michael Benoit  
VP External / Chair Civic Affairs  
Ramsay Community Association

Judy Hellevang  
President  
Ramsay Community Association

Attachments: Letter to Transportation Planning, Sept. 5, 2008.