
Appendix A

Palliser Major Redevelopment Site Area Master Plan
First Public Open House


1.0 Public Open House Introduction

The purpose of this Public Open House was to provide information on the Palliser Major Redevelopment Site and obtain public input on the Conceptual Area Master Plan Vision of how the area may be developed.


There were more than 65 participants at the Public Open House which was held at Palliser Furniture (90 Lexington Park) on Thursday, August 30th. Of these 65 participants, 42 responded to the exit survey. 13 respondents lived adjacent north of the site (postal codes identified as R2G 3X9, R2G 3X5, R2G 3X6, R2G 3X8, R2G 2X7 and R2G 3Z4). 9 respondents lived adjacent east of the site (postal codes identified as R2G 3S2), 1 respondent lived adjacent west of the site (postal code identified as R2G 2Y9. 5 respondents lived nearby north of the site (postal codes identified as R2G 3Y8, R2G 2G8, R2E 0K3, R2G 0N5, R2G 2J8). 9 respondents lived nearby south of the site (postal codes identified as R2K 1R9, R2G 3E3, R2G 2J6, R2G 3B1 and R2G 3A2). 2 respondents lived nearby east of the site (postal codes identified as R2G 2Z7 and R2G 2Z6). 1 respondent lived nearby west of the site (postal code identified as R2G 1P2). 2 respondents did not respond to this question.



Of these participants, 15.00% of respondents are affiliated with (employed by, own, attend, etc.) the Church or a business within the Master Plan Area. 85.00% of respondents are not affiliated with (employed by, own, attend, etc.) the Church or a business within the Master Plan Area.



Of these participants, 10.00% of respondents are affiliated with (employed by or own) a property or business on Burnett south of the Master Plan Area. 90.00% of respondents are not affiliated with (employed by or own) a property or business on Burnett south of the Master Plan Area.



The Public Open House was advertised in the Herald and Mailers were delivered to all addresses immediately west of Raleigh Street, and all addresses in the area bounded by Gateway Avenue to the west, Molson Street to the east, McLeod Avenue to the south, and Chief Peguis Trail to the North.

The following summarizes the results of the Public Open House. These results represent only the views of those who chose to participate in the public open house and those who chose to submit a survey and cannot be generalized to represent the view of all property or business owners within the Palliser Major Redevelopment Site Area.

2.0 Summary of Open House Findings

The highlights of the Exit Survey findings are:

4. Please rate the Planning Issues (listed below) from 1 (most important) to 8 (least important) to you and your family, when considering the planning of the Palliser Major Redevelopment Site.

An average was calculated for each Planning Issue. Importance was as follows:

(1) Public green space (2.03)
(2) Road connections – proposed plus Gateway connection (2.86)
(3) Community Centre Lifestyle (3.34)
(4) Town Centre Concept (3.55)
(5) Public transportation enhancement and centre (4.05)
(6) Future industrial properties (5.00)
(7) Proximity to Chief Peguis Trail (5.43)
(8) School capacity (6.42)

5. Do you support the change from Major Industrial Uses to Town Centre with Multiple Family Residential Land Use?

40.00% of respondents indicated they either Strongly Agree or Agree, 35.00% were Neutral and 25.00% of respondents indicated they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree.

6. Do you feel the creation of the Town Centre will benefit you and the community?

40.00% of respondents indicated they either Strongly Agree or Agree, 32.50% were Neutral and 27.50% of respondents indicated they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree.

7. Do you feel a people/community centred development has merit in this location?


50.00% of respondents indicated they either Strongly Agree or Agree, 22.50% were Neutral and 27.50% of respondents indicated they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree.


8. Could you envision living in this type of development?


35.00% of respondents indicated they either Strongly Agree or Agree, 30.00% were Neutral and 35.00% of respondents indicated they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree.


9. Would you recommend living in this development to your family and friends?


41.02% of respondents indicated they either Strongly Agree or Agree, 17.95% were Neutral and 41.03% of respondents indicated they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree.


5. Do you support the change from Major Industrial Uses to Town Centre with Multiple Family Residential Land Use?
100.00%
90.00%
80.00%
70.00%
60.00%
50.00%
40.00%
30.00%
20.00%
10.00%
0.00%
22.50%
17.50%
35.00%
7.50%
17.50%
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Stongly Disagree


6. Do you feel the creation of the Town Centre will benefit you and the community?
100.00%
90.00%
80.00%
70.00%
60.00%
50.00%
40.00%
30.00%
20.00%
10.00%
0.00%
17.50%
22.50%
32.50%
12.50%
15.00%
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Stongly Disagree



7. Do you feel a people/community centred development has merit in this location?
100.00%
90.00%
80.00%
70.00%
60.00%
50.00%
40.00%
30.00%
20.00%
10.00%
0.00%
27.50%
22.50%
22.50%
10.00%
17.50%
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Stongly Disagree


8. Could you envision living in this type of development?
100.00%
90.00%
80.00%
70.00%
60.00%
50.00%
40.00%
30.00%
20.00%
10.00%
0.00%
15.00%
20.00%
30.00%
10.00%
25.00%
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Stongly Disagree


9. Would you recommend living in this development to your family and friends?
100.00%
90.00%
80.00%
70.00%
60.00%
50.00%
40.00%
30.00%
20.00%
10.00%
0.00%
20.51%
20.51%
17.95%
5.13%
35.90%
Strongly Agree
Agree
Neutral
Disagree
Stongly Disagree

10. Was this meeting helpful?

97.50% of respondents felt this meeting was helpful while 2.50% did not.



11. Please provide us with any additional comments you may have.

Additional Comments

The additional comments were split into categories as follows: 1) density, 2) types of development, 3) general comments on presentation and development, 4) noise, privacy and traffic congestion, 5) green space and walking paths, 6) amenities, 7) property value and 8) access. For complete list of comments, please see the attached.

Dot Matrix Summary

Where do participants live (as indicated by dots placed on map)?

Totals by Area

North of Springfield Road – 8
West of Raleigh/Gateway – 2
South of Burnett – 0
East of Hydro Corridor - 13

Planning Issues

1) Keep tall buildings away from existing single family and residential (20)
2) Traffic/extreme traffic considerations/traffic volume increase (17)
3) Density too high/too scary (11)
4) Traffic will be too busy or too noisy (hot rods/motorcycles/semi) (8)
4) More green space, preservation of existing forest, community gardens, edible green space (8)
5) Transit – Need better connection. Do RT route (6)
6) 15 storeys – too tall (5)
7) Privacy issues (4)
7) What kind of people coming here? More retiring vs. mobile (4)
7) Berming for privacy of existing homeowners (4)
8) Redevelop Palliser Building with high rise residential component (3)
8) People walking greenway are looking for destination – do corner as commercial (3)
8) Place for arts – gatherings, venues music (3)
9) Cluster tall buildings together (2)
9) MPI property removed (2)
9) 2 storey buildings maximum (2)
9) Market (2)
9) Walking/bike path (2)
9) Traffic – Deal with existing deficiency (2)
9) Value in creating centre? Is there enough room for commercial options (2)
9) Underground parking (2)
10) Single family housing preferred (1)
10) Connect to universities (1)
10) In Palliser – have church space (1)
10) Place to walk inside, go to KP now (1)

Where do participants live (dotmography)?

Map	Neighbourhood		Total Dots
#1	-	North of Springfield Road	3
	-	West of Raleigh/Gateway Corridor	0
	-	South of Burnett	0
	-	East of Hydro Corridor	3
#2	-	North of Springfield Road	0
	-	West of Raleigh/Gateway Corridor	1
	-	South of Burnett	0
	-	East of Hydro Corridor	5
#3	-	North of Springfield Road	5
	-	West of Raleigh/Gateway Corridor	1
	-	South of Burnett	0
	-	East of Hydro Corridor	5
Totals by Area			
	-	North of Springfield Road	8
	-	West of Raleigh/Gateway Corridor	2
	-	South of Burnett	0
	-	East of Hydro Corridor	13

Planning Issues as Listed by each Group

Group	Issues	
#1	-	Will development be too busy or too noisy?
	-	Most services already within 5 minute drive
	-	Extreme traffic concerns
	-	Single family housing preferred
	-	Preservation of existing forest
	-	Privacy issues
	-	Mixed use - No big box stores
	-	Keep tall buildings away from existing single family
	-	Redevelop Palliser Building with high rise residential component
	-	Cluster tall buildings together
	-	MPI Property removed
	-	Berming for privacy of existing homeowners
	-	15 storeys - too tall
	-	Traffic - noisy, by-law, hot rods/motorcycles/semi
	-	Like mixed use
	-	Congestion to Chief Peguis
	-	No high rises
	-	Want only big box stores
	-	2 storey buildings maximum
	-	No commercial
	-	Density too high
	-	Condos in factory building
#2	-	Traffic - Work with City to improve
	-	Traffic - Deal with existing deficiency
	-	Transit - Need better connection. Do RT route
	-	Density - High is scary
	-	Value in creating centre? Is there enough room for commercial options
	-	Want to keep University age people here
	-	No new areas to build houses
	-	Issue with only having limited house builders
	-	People walking greenway are looking for destination - do corner as commercial
	-	Existing Palliser building blocks sunset
	-	What kind of people coming here? More retiring vs mobile
	-	Keep tall buildings away from residential
	-	Underground parking
	-	Place for arts - gatherings
	-	Venues music
	-	Connect to universities
	-	In Palliser - have church space
	-	Place to walk inside, go to KP now
	-	Green space?
	-	Make sure to tie into existing walkways
	-	Basketball court
	-	Community Gardens
	-	Green roof

	-	Edible green space
	-	Provide sun corridors
	-	Need a strategy to attract young people (late-breaking idea)
#3	-	Market
	-	More green space, higher buildings
	-	Centralized daycare
	-	Walking/bike path
	-	Traffic
	-	Traffic volume increase (2,000 units)
	-	Traffic circles (Gateway may be widened)
	-	Encourage growth/development near Gateway
	-	Buildings as close to center as possible with outskirts being green space
	-	Cycling hub off Chief Peguis to Springfield
	-	Bus rapid transit station on Gateway (similar to confusion corner)
	-	Meandering pathway
	-	Smells coming from south
	-	Inhibiting deer habitat
	-	Crime/partying
	-	Blocking sun - high-rises
	-	Density issues (high rises vs. green space and range of heights)
	-	Traffic
	-	Traffic circle planned
	-	3rd access point
	-	Open another access
	-	Council decision to widen road
	-	Not Springfield. Turn impossible
	-	Incentives, partnership
	-	Invest to update Gateway
	-	Will widen
	-	Years to get started?
	-	Hope to get City to loop bus route
	-	Suggest more people would walk
	-	Height of buildings a concern
#4	-	Seniors block has been approved already
	-	We have to cover all the green space to make project viable
	-	Concerned about Manitoba Housing builds
	-	What types of businesses coming in?
	-	Can higher buildings in less residential areas be considered away from residential impact
	-	Consideration to make Gateway a one way traffic control
	-	What happens to wildlife? Could have been brought up when other developments were done.
	-	8 storey concerns of seeing their private backyards
	-	Would the apartment blocks be for seniors
	-	No more assisted living option near church
	-	This building convered to commercial project
	-	Project based on 2000 residential. Doesn't want to lose the birds
	-	Concerns about more apartment blocks being built later
	-	Concerns about parking space

	-	Concerns with apartment building near busy road can be extremely noisy
	-	Is there ability to plant trees to create privacy on both sides of Springfield Road
	-	What is important? Water, cycling, bus
	-	Top priority - trees to credate privacy, to block out the traffic noise
	-	Will the roads be widened?
	-	16 storeys is too high
	-	Taking sustainability into account
	-	Originally the development are was a park?
	-	Trees needed and green space
	-	Most important - 4 top (1) vision barrier = trees, 2) traffic, 3) distance between existing single family dwellings and new projects, 4) walking trail, green trail, cycle, 5) no low income

Planning Issues according to dots placed next to individual items

Group	Issues		Total Dots
#1	-	Will development be too busy or too noisy?	4
	-	Extreme traffic concerns	13
	-	Single family housing preferred	1
	-	Preservation of existing forest	4
	-	Privacy issues	4
	-	Keep tall buildings away from existing single family	11
	-	Redevelop Palliser Building with high rise residential component	3
	-	Cluster tall buildings together	2
	-	MPI Property removed	2
	-	Berming for privacy of existing homeowners	4
	-	15 storeys - too tall	5
	-	Traffic - noisy, by-law, hot rods/motorcycles/semi	4
	-	2 storey buildings maximum	2
	-	Density too high	6
#2	-	Market	2
	-	More green space, higher buildings	2
	-	Walking/bike path	2
	-	Traffic/Traffic volume increase (2,000 units)	4
#3	-	Traffic - Deal with existing deficiency	2
	-	Transit - Need better connection. Do RT route	6
	-	Density - High is scary	5
	-	Value in creating centre? Is there enough room for commercial options	2
	-	People walking greenway are looking for destination - do corner as commercial	3
	-	What kind of people coming here? More retiring vs mobile	4
	-	Keep tall buildings away from residential	9
	-	Underground parking	2
	-	Place for arts - gatherings	1
	-	Venues music	2
	-	Connect to universities	1
	-	In Palliser - have church space	1
	-	Place to walk inside, go to KP now	1
	-	Green space?	3
	-	Community Gardens	1
	-	Edible green space	1

Planning Issues according to total dots

Issues		Total Dots
-	Keep tall buildings away from existing single family and residential	20
-	Traffic/Extreme Traffic Considerations/Traffic volume increase (2,000 units)	17
-	Density too high/scary.	11
-	Traffic will be too busy or too noisy (hot rods/motorcycles/semi)	8
-	More green space, preservation of existing forest, community gardens, and edible green space	8
-	Transit - Need better connection. Do RT route.	6
-	15 storeys - too tall	5
-	Privacy issues	4
-	What kind of people coming here? More retiring vs mobile	4
-	Berming for privacy of existing homeowners	4
-	Redevelop Palliser Building with high rise residential component	3
-	People walking greenway are looking for destination - do corner as commercial	3
-	Place for arts - gatherings, venues music	3
-	Cluster tall buildings together	2
-	MPI Property removed	2
-	2 storey buildings maximum	2
-	Market	2
-	Walking/bike path	2
-	Traffic - Deal with existing deficiency	2
-	Value in creating centre? Is there enough room for commercial options	2
-	Underground parking	2
-	Single family housing preferred	1
-	Connect to universities	1
-	In Palliser - have church space	1
-	Place to walk inside, go to KP now	1
-	Community Gardens	1
-	Edible green space	1

Additional Comments

Density

- I do feel the target population density is a bit high. Density is too high. Too much density. The density of this property proposed is not in keeping with the nature of the existing neighbourhood. We feel that this will be negative to property values. We live in the existing area that was developed by Mr. Art DeFehr and his brother and I now strongly feel he is ruining our wonderful neighbourhood. Very, very sad. I would like to feel good about my neighbourhood and hope my concerns are not dismissed. I would like to be happy to say I live in a great area, but this looks really bleak to me. Keep buildings at a maximum of 2-3 storeys. Density is too high for residential area. 5
- Eight storey maximum less preferred. 1
- Height of buildings should be no higher than 3 storeys. 1
- I am concerned about the proposed density of this project. I am not entirely opposed to the condo/multi-family concept; and the idea of having a community centre/town centre is very appealing. It is the high rise/density that is worrisome on many levels: traffic congestion, property value, noise and 1
- Too many buildings for the amount of land. 2,000 units too many for area available. 2
- With our group, suggestions were made for buildings up to 16 storeys, but I feel that may be too high, especially right on Gateway, where that was proposed. I believe that area should be no more than 12 storeys. Anything higher should be further back (east of) Gateway Road. 1
- Our home (78 Mahonee Drive) backs onto this property that is going to be potentially developed. I do not want tall apartment buildings overlooking my backyard and also this brings too much density to our area. We have looked out our backyard for 24 years onto a green area and nature (many deer). Now we are faced with looking out at dozens of apartment buildings. 1
- If anyway could be seen around multiple high rises. Ie lower units near Mahonee resdiential. High rises to open area. 1
- Too many people jammed into too small area. This is a suburb, not inner city. 1

14


Types of Development

- If these blocks have to be built then I would prefer "seniors only". 1
- Higher buildings with less land being used. 1
- Love the idea of a town centre. The town centre sounds nice. 2
- Great retirement community. 18-30 demographic may be looking for more "action" in the community. 1
- Worried about it turning into low rental area. 1
- Think bigger on self contained to include Gateway, McCloud, Gateway, Springfield and Springfield Lagimodiere 1
- Ensure availability of affordable housing (I work with immigrants and new Canadians. I hope there will be apartments for $700-900 a month available too. Please ensure accessibility to lower income people as well as higher income living.) 2
- This will become simply a retirement community if there is not strong early support for making it attractive to the 20-30 year olds. 1
- Why will families want to move into condos? 1
- You should sell land so people can build their own houses not just condos and apartments. Not everyone wants to live in a box. 1
- Honestly it sounds like a seniors/baby boomer retirement community. Is there a nursing home planned too? 1
- Consider developing Palliser Building into condos/apartments. 1

14


General Comments on Presentation and Development

- Respondent is not in favor of development. We have to place our home for sale. This is ridiculous. I strongly feel that this development will be completed in the manner that will make the most money for the developer and owner. I do not feel that our input will change anything to the outcome. I think its a done deal and probably already all planned.
- General concept is good. Good concept overall.
- I do appreciate hearing what the development possibilities are.
- Creating a desirable destination is key.
- I'm very interested in the future land development as a Palliser employee and resident of this area.
- Communicate honestly and frequently.
- I could not hear presentation (p.s. use microphone). Need a mic or someone who can project better so everyone can hear.
- Have a meeting later than 5:30pm so those that work until 5:00pm stand a chance of getting here.
- This looks like quite a large project, so I assume it will probably take some time to get all the approvals and before anything is started. I'll be interested in watching the progress on this.



Noise, Privacy and Traffic Congestion

- Concern with traffic and privacy (tall apartment buildings). Taking away our privacy, noise level will go up, traffic down springfield.
- Living on Mahonee this is totally unacceptable. Traffic in this area Gateway, McLeod is already too congested. What about (oh what's the use) this will happen. Maybe we'll move but lose money.
- Traffic flow planning must be addressed to avoid the congestion on Gateway Road. More traffic lights are not the answer. During the construction phase care must be exercised to avoid damage to homes from vibration due to piling of foundations and damage to streets from construction vehicles.
- Traffic from the area should be aimed at Springfield Road as this area gets jammed up during weekday events.
- In that same 6,000 people would live here and many others visit to take advantage of the amenities, traffic flow can't be under prioritized.
- Worried about traffic congestion.



Green Space and Walking Paths

I would prefer the land be made into a park with walking paths.


Keep commitments to greenspace, etc. Need more greenspace. Look at Calgary who has huge blocks set aside that can't be developed. Concerned about the loss of green space. I will miss the green.

Emphasize green build/sustainable

Like the concept of having some destinations for people using the walking trail system


I am concerned that the existing single family dwellings in this suburban neighbourhood are not suddenly affected by walls of concrete, and the loss of open, unspoiled green space. I do understand the area could not be left as is forever.

A perimeter of green space protection of taller buildings "looking into backyard".




Amenities

- Not convinced that there will be enough amenities within walking distance.
- Keep out liquor stores, casions and wine stores.
- No pets.
- Young people want to live where there are shops and markets




- Don't need all this commercial area when we already have if available on Springfield/Raleigh, McLeod and Sun Valley. There is no need for the services when they are in the area already between Henderson Highway and Regent. You are considering taking a quiet residential area and changing it into a congested apartment block area with stores not needed.



6

Property Value


- Concerned about Property Value. Density negative to property value.
- Inquiry regarding if this will lower our property taxes since more taxes will be collected from these buildings and businesses.



3

Access

- Have exit from Springfield to the homes north of Springfield which face Dunits Drive




Palliser Major Redevelopment Site Area Master Plan
Second Public Open House


1.0 Public Open House Introduction

The purpose of this Public Open House was to provide further information on the Palliser Major Redevelopment Site and obtain public input and support on the Conceptual Area Master Plan Vision of how the area may be developed.


There were more than 100 participants at the Public Open House which was held at Palliser Furniture (90 Lexington Park) on Wednesday, October 3rd. Of these 100 participants, 51 responded to the exit survey. 16 respondents lived adjacent north of the site (postal codes identified as R2G 3Z4, R2G 3X8, R2G 3X9, R2G 3X5, R2G 3Z4 and R2G 1Z3). 11 respondents lived adjacent east of the site (postal codes identified as R2G 3S2), 9 respondents lived nearby north of the site (postal codes identified as R2G 2J8, R2G 0N5, R2G 0Z2, R2G 3L9, R2G 2V5, R2G 3Z6, R2G 1Z7 and R2G 0V2). 1 respondent lived nearby south of the site (postal code identified as R2G 3E3,). 2 respondents lived nearby east of the site (postal codes identified as R2G 4A4, R2G 2X2, 7 respondents lived nearby west of the site (postal codes identified as R2G 0M9, R2C 3S4, R2G 3K8, R2G 2K9, R2G 1W2 and R2G 0R4). 3 respondents lived in another part of the City not within the Master Plan Area (postal codes identified as R2V 0G8 and R3W 0B8). 1 respondent did not respond to this question. 1 respondent provided an invalid postal code.



Of these participants, 20.00% of respondents are affiliated with (employed by, own, attend, etc.) the Church or a business within the Master Plan Area. 78.00% of respondents are not affiliated with (employed by, own, attend, etc.) the Church or a business within the Master Plan Area. 2.00% of respondents did not respond to this question.



Of these participants, 7.84% of respondents are affiliated with (employed by or own) a property or business on Burnett south of the Master Plan Area. 90.20% of respondents are not affiliated with (employed by or own) a property or business on Burnett south of the Master Plan Area. 1.96% of respondents did not respond to this question.



The Public Open House was advertised in the Herald and Mailers were delivered to all addresses immediately west of Raleigh Street, immediately east of Raleigh Street and all addresses in the area bounded by Gateway Avenue to the west, Molson Street to the east, McLeod Avenue to the south, and Chief Peguis Trail to the North.

The following summarizes the results of the Public Open House. These results represent only the views of those who chose to participate in the public open house and those who chose to submit a survey and cannot be generalized to represent the view of all property or business owners within the Palliser Major Redevelopment Site Area.

2.0 Summary of Open House Findings

The highlights of the Exit Survey findings are:

4. Do you support the Area Master Plan Vision presented (Boards 5,6 and 7)?

52.18% of respondents indicated they either Strongly Agree or Agree, 26.09% were Neutral and 21.73% of respondents indicated they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree.

5. Do you support higher density residential with a high rise residential tower, for the Lexington Park and Gateway Site as a way of concentrating higher density away from the neighbouring residential community?

70.83% of respondents indicated they either Strongly Agree or Agree, 14.59% were Neutral and 14.58% of respondents indicated they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree.

6. Do you support medium density residential with an average height of 6 storeys plus parking for the balance of the planned area?

42.86% of respondents indicated they either Strongly Agree or Agree, 22.45% were Neutral and 34.69% of respondents indicated they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree.

7. Do you support the repurposing the existing Palliser Industrial Building to include office, commercial, retail and multi-family residential component?


72.92% of respondents indicated they either Strongly Agree or Agree, 16.66% were Neutral and 10.42% of respondents indicated they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree.


8. Do you support the creation of substantial landscape buffers of berms and trees along the Hydro Corridor and Springfield Road?


93.75% of respondents indicated they either Strongly Agree or Agree, 6.25% were Neutral and 0.00% of respondents indicated they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree.


9. Do you support the Green Space concept of a hierarchy of internal interconnected publically accessible private courtyards, squares, gardens, playgrounds and open space to create a 'green' corridor connected to the periphery trail systems and the central community market?


77.55% of respondents indicated they either Strongly Agree or Agree, 16.31% were Neutral and 6.12% of respondents indicated they either Disagree or Strongly Disagree.















10. An average was calculated for each 'Village' concept. Importance was as follows:

(1) The amenities – shops, grocery, drug store, restaurants, doctor's office, etc. (3.86)
(2) Public green spaces (3.91)
(3) Walking to everything you need (4.14)
(4) Bike paths/walking trails (4.40)
(5) Community market place on the weekends (5.02)
(6) Staying in North Kildonan when you are older (5.31)
(7) Easy access to future rapid transit corridor (6.19)
(8) Multi-generational community (6.51)
(9) Buying a condominium (7.61)
(10) Renting an apartment (7.88)

11. Please provide us with any additional comments or suggestions you may have. Is there anything missing from the Master Plan Vision that you would like to see incorporated?

The additional comments or suggestions were split into categories as follows: 1) form of development, 2) building height comments/suggestions, 3) traffic comments/suggestions, 4) public services, 5) construction noise comments/suggestions and 6) timelines.




12. Do you have any concerns which you feel have not been addressed in this survey?

29.42% of respondents had concerns that were not addressed in this survey (for complete list see attached).

11. Additional Comments and Suggestions


Form of Development

- Design that will make "Peppertree Corners" part of the same plan for continuety to avoid it becoming an isolated space. Discuss with church how their housing maybe incorporated and matched to the rest of the area. This may encourage less than 11 storeys.
- Love the focus on high-density integrated with a variety of transportation networks and easy access to services and amenities. Great work.
- In the event condos are to be sold, please consider my services as a Realtor - as I am very familiar in the area and could be of great service for this project.
- Go ahead, clean the area up.
- Looks good.
- First time seeing plans. Would like to take part in future plans.
- Not sure at this time.
- Provide quality construction. Concrete and steel buildings with underground or heated parking.
- I am interested in more seniors housing, assisted living, etc. 55 plus all inclusive.
- High end condos and apartments.
- More emphasis on 'aging in place'.
- Life lease units.
- Emphasize green/eco friendly community - ie shared transport, cool roofs, geo-thermal




Noise, Privacy and Traffic Comments/Suggestion

- Traffic remains a large concern. As long as the traffic issue is addressed I'm very happy to support this project.
- Everything looks pretty but concerned about traffic, noise and privacy.
- Privacy, privacy, privacy. None at all for residential along Springfield.
- Traffic is already a mess. This is going to be a disaster. Why does the developer pay for twimming Gateway?
- I have a major concern regarding need for redevelopment of the Springfield Road segment between Raleigh Street and Gateway area now does not work well at peak traffic times ie 06:30-08:30am/16:00-18:30pm. This sketch needs to be redesigned as well on Gateway Road.
- Why is the developer not responsible for widening Gateway Road and for being responsible for the traffic problems they are causing? There will have to be a large berm put in place before construction to help reduce the construction noise and dust.
- Too much traffic on Springfield. Developer should be paying the cost of road redesign, not tax dollars.
- Berms/trees should be in before construction starts to provide protection from construction noise.
- Don't want transit traffic on Springfield Road.




Building Height Comments/Suggestions

- Lower the height of the buildings close to Springfield Road.
- No building higher then 4 floors.
- Maximum 4 to 5 storey that face Hydro line and Springfield
- I have major concern about the height of the proposed apartment tower at the north east corner of the proposed development.
- I believe you should be placing the tallest buildings next to the "Community Centre" and along Gateway Road.
- Buildings no higher than 3 storeys facing Hydro corridor. Position buildings so no balconies face houses backing onto Hydro corridor. Build up berm with dense and tall trees.
- Tall buildings too invasive. 4 storey maximum.




Public Services

- More fire department, police, security.
- Library?
- Address the concerns of security/crime in the development and surrounding areas.
- Continue to upgrade the existing infrastructure feeder hoses run more frequently.



Timelines

- No timelines on project?
- Start Market idea in 2013 - low risk, bring in people via trail, walk, bike early - creates atmosphere - demonstrates need, capacity, etc.



12. Concerns not addressed in this survey

Building Height

- 6 storeys and buildings too high along Hydro Corridor. Keep buildings 3 storeys or less.	2	1 1
- The height of that one round tower apartment building	1	1
- Buildings on Springfield should be 4 storeys maximum	1	1
- Do not like the idea of larger building on Gateway - view too obstructive.	1	1
- Do not like the idea of larger building on Gateway - view too obstructive.	1	1
- Feel that the buildings are still too high?	1	1
	7	

Public Services

- Security, police protection, crime prevention.	2	1 1
- Snow clearing of public spaces (small children, seniors safety, etc. Do public dollars pay for clearing of drives/walkways in this new area?	2	1 1
	4	

Timelines

- No timeline provided, or order of construction. Timeline (ie, when do you expect the first resident to enter and how long until the area is fully developed?)	2	1 1
- Plant early	1	1
	3	


General Comments on Presentation and Development

- You are not addressing or considering the extended impact on the existing community.	1	1
- I think this is already planned and these meetings are all a farce. There is no regard for the present community. It's all about making money and being able to say that the community participated in the planning. What a job this is!	1	1
	2	

Traffic/Roads

- Traffic/Roads	1	1
- The developer should pay for any road construction to be done on Gateway and Springfield.	1	1
	2	

Area Master Plan Vision - Conceptual Plan



PALLISER MAJOR REDEVELOPMENT SITE