



Feedback – Open House

Christine Meikle School

June 19, 2014

Feedback Collected June 19-June 25, 2014

Question 1 What are your thoughts about the concept designs you have seen?

- I am in support of this school. We like Option B because it has good traffic layout, good screening for neighbours and park connections. Option A is not good.
- I want to express my unconditional and unapologetic support for this school and the site on which it is proposed to be developed. The location is great, it is close to the hospital, which serves the kids with special needs; the park will be a great place for the kids to explore the outdoors. I'm excited for this development and I wish you the very best.
- Prefer Option B; smaller footprint. I support and encourage development of the site for the Christine Meikle School.
- I like the design with the traffic flow on 50th Street only. The designs both look great, but I favour the 2 storey, because it's a smaller footprint. (Option B).
- Shut off access to 32 Avenue for 50th Street, open up the road from 50th to 49th. Allow traffic to turn right for 49th onto 32nd with a stop sign at intersection.
- The plans look good; love that buses will be off the street and large g....
- The design (2-storey) looks very adequate for meeting the needs of these students. The need for a suitable school is a priority. The site is the questionable part.
- I choose the two-store plan because it does not impact the community like the one-storey. It gives the staff a place to relax on a different level than the kids when they need a break. There is space for a baseball diamond.
- Have a presentation as well as free talk; I couldn't get close to pictures at all to see them. Presentation means we all get the information.
- Everything looks wonderful and I am very happy to see the amount of work that has gone into this. I only came tonight to show my support for the school coming to the area. It is a fantastic idea, a good area for the school and I welcome the school, staff, kids, families. I hope everything goes well in the building.
- Seems that the major reason for ever going ahead with this project is CBE's access to the land, next to Varna Crescent. In my opinion, nothing else makes much sense; parking, traffic, etc., etc.
- I was only able to see one and wasn't able to get near anything else. My concerns remain the traffic, the geological concerns and whether this is really the best location for the school. This open house was totally unsatisfactory. You couldn't get near anything and there was no one to ask questions of.
- I prefer the two-storey with driving from north going out south.
- Option A is too intrusive to the neighborhood. Option B is acceptable, if the barrier on 50th Street is not removed.
- Before seeing the plans, both architectural and traffic, I was against the build. Now, I'm not.
- Overall I think the proposed A-Option (1-storey option) looks most appropriate. It still manages to leave a large portion of the green-space intact without limiting field of view over the natural area.
- Prefer the one-storey. This makes sense for limited mobility of many students and reduces visual / views for residents.
- Parking access would be better coming off 32nd Avenue. I.e. West on 32nd onto

49th Street then west on 34th Avenue up a block and north on 50th.

- No problems except in both conceptual drawings let's prevent use of school roads as a through-route for 50th Street. Either no through route or bus trap.
- The 2-storey plan is more desirable. It takes up less green space. I'm concerned that the passage way (through the building) will be used as a short cut during non-school hours, thus increasing traffic and making the 2 cul-de-sacs on 50th ineffective.
- Public use of roadways is a concern. Perhaps installing a bus-trap to prevent regular vehicle access. 50th Street is currently blocked to through access. Plan B, 50th Street could be circumnavigated.
- Option B, but keep the overall height as low as possible.
- Prefer Option B.
- I much prefer Option B, partial 2-storey. It accommodates a natural pathway from the Varna path access, does not promote additional traffic on Varna, and significantly enhances the traffic restriction on 50th.
- Looks great.
- I personally liked both concept designs as they allow much open space without ruining the park. As for traffic, I personally feel that this won't be a major issue as there is a small number of staff and kids. I feel as though building the school will allow for more integration between the kids and the community.
- We really liked plan #2 (plan with second level). Our kids (at Christine Meikle) will really benefit from a new facility developed for the wide spectrum of needs that our kids have.
- I believe the concept design options have taken into accounts the concerns the residents have regarding increased traffic. I believe the second option with a partial 2-storey building still leaves a big green space for the residents to continue using it as a park while meeting the school needs at the same time.
- I like the look and planning that has gone in to it so far. The site location is great as far as convenience of getting our children to and from appointments at the Children's Hospital in a timely manner. Being a parent I have a different perspective than those living in the community and I really want them to be on board and feel like their concerns are being heard.
- First, I note that we only saw two concept designs, Alternatives A and B. it is clear from the CBE's actions that it does not want to consider alternative locations for the school and as concerned citizens we find this to be unacceptable. The open house did not provide an opportunity for people to ask questions or receive direct representations from the CBE executives. It was clear from the CBE actions that it had made up its mind and did not want to hear about other alternatives.

Given the limited alternatives indicated by the CBE we favor Alternative B. this alternative appears to result in the least amount of intrusion of the project into the surrounding residences. The only other alternative, Alternative A, results in an unacceptable intrusion into the peace and quiet of a great many citizens which have been living in peace for the last forty some years. The thought of such an invasion of their privacy and peace is totally unacceptable.

I suspect that the major concern of the community will be the impact of the project on the flow of traffic relating to the construction and operation of the school. Every effort should be taken to minimize the number of residences that will be affected by the additional traffic that the school will undoubtedly bring. A good example of the problem can be seen by examining Alternative A. Under this alternative the project will include the construction of a road for the entire length of the site (east to west) so that cars and buses dropping off students will travel the full length of the back of the houses on Varna Crescent and then return on part of Varanger Place and the existing Varna Crescent. We feel that such an alternative is far too

intrusive and should be rejected by the CBE.

- I live across the street at Varna Crescent. I am very glad to see an under-utilized site be developed if it's done well. I love Concept B and dislike Concept A. I think it's very insensitive to the adjacent neighbours. I also prefer not to have bus traffic directed that way.
- I think the site selection was poorly planned since there are much better sites available. West Campus - Much easier with respect to traffic concerns, close proximity to Children's. Close to Adult Recover site. This is unused land, etc. Recover Partnership - Possible help of funding. Untouched land, adjacent to the over 21 year Adult site, means that we have greater possibilities for synergy of services. Another unused site with or without an existing structure. I.e. such as R.B. Bennett, unused structure (could be developed) and retain park space.
I understand that this will cost more; however, the city is not expanding outwards and inner city park space is at an even high premium. This has less impact on the community and the surrounding residents and various clubs to still use the existing site.
- They do not make sense. You are taking away valuable green space to convert it into a parking lot and bus drop-off area? Where are the baseball diamond and the people who use them going to go?
- It's terrible what the CBE has put forward. This park needs to be left alone. Anything you put on this site is an eyesore. There is no room for traffic in this area. The shortcut to 16th Avenue from Market Mall using Home Road already causes so much noise and traffic. What you are proposing is unfair to the residents of this community and I am absolutely floored at how inconsiderate the CBE has been towards the people who live in the area.
- I see no apparent benefits to the Varsity Community. This school could be built anywhere, as there are students being bused in from all over the city. There must be better sites to build the proposed school on.
- I would prefer to see an on-site pull through for the buses accessed from either the north or south; thereby impacting one side or the other. Berms to retain a green view for the houses backing onto the park. I like the green spaces you are retaining and the diagonal walkway which is well used.
- Consideration given to north access for traffic, private CBE driveway entrance via access 40th Avenue and 49th curve, school drop / pick up, 50th Street exit going north to avoid worsening traffic congestion at 50th Street and 34th Avenue and 50th Street and 32nd Avenue.
- Totally concerned about the traffic access in all directions which is already a considerable concern along with all the parking problems in the neighborhood as it is.
- It is unfortunate yet again we are repeating mistake of past 60 years building a facility used only 10 months of the year, Monday to Friday, 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m., plus maybe cub scouts meeting one night a week. Need to demand multi-use combination facilities. Example, busy Varsity Community Association thinks they need a gym; does this school fit there? Example, Vecova has strategic plan and building goals, could this C. Meikle project be combined with them?
- I couldn't get anywhere near them. What a ridiculous setup / venue. Couldn't get near a human to ask questions. This was a waste of time and nothing but a show by the CBE of its supposed interest in engaging Varsity residents.
- I believe that the site in Varsity selected for the Christine Meikle School is not appropriate for the district. Have all assessments concerning land use and traffic patterns been done? Why have the residents of Varsity not been consulted about this project earlier in the process? Has CBE considered already developed and not fully used school sites in Bowness? These would be much more accessible to

families coming from many parts of the city.

- I am extremely concerned about the increase in traffic. All streets around Market Mall are congested between 3:00 and 5:00. The condos at Crowchild Square will add to the problem. Am also not in favor of taking away green space in the area. Are there not any unused schools that can be rebuilt instead?
- I am very concerned about the parking lot on the north side. Buses will be coming in on 50th Street, an already busy street with cars parked along both sides. This school will not have regular hours as it is a long term facility, traffic will be continuous.
- No one would quarrel with the need for Christine Meikle to have new facilities. Removing a green space and putting the school in a residential area is short sighted and also is poor utilization of tax dollars. Using existing and under-used school facilities in the N.W. requires further review. (R.B. Bennett) in Bowness is an example. Also Montgomery School).
- Am very concerned about the traffic that will increase in our neighborhood. Staff, kids, janitors and buses. Not very happy as I have young children learning to ride bikes, etc. Who will want to buy my house when we have lost our peaceful, quiet streets? I am not pleased.
- The issue is not the designs. It shouldn't get that far. The location is a poor choice. Traffic has always been an issue in the area, there simply isn't enough room for more. I hear there are 70 more cars in the morning and 70 more in the afternoon. The green space is also important to the residents. 100% against this project location.
- If forced to support one design concept, we would vote for 2-storey design as it has smaller building footprint and does not have additional traffic coming through neighborhood on residential streets i.e. Varna Crescent. Very unhappy about lack of early communication and consultation from CBE to residents. We're learning different story from alderman / MLA.
- I think the designs do not adequately address traffic concerns or congestion. Home Road and 50th Avenue will both likely see a heavy increase in traffic volume (they are both already very busy). I have also not heard from anyone or seen how construction traffic and noise will be addressed during the build.
- I truly feel the design is inappropriate in that space. The green space is for the apartments / condos / homes. Why can't you use an existing school site? Parkdale should not be given to a charter school. That school could be razed and a new one built there.
- Whatever plans you would put forward, plain and simply it's a bad place for a school. Traffic and space and surrounding residents will not be compatible.
- I still have concerns about traffic along 50th Street. The information provided does not mention anything about after-hours usage of the swimming pool, which would also contribute to traffic problems in the area. The streets in the area are already lined with vehicles, and this school will add to the problem.
- I did not like either design. I still believe there is a better site either at Vecova's, U of C West campus or Jerry Potts school. If forced, I do think Option B is better due to a smaller building footprint and looks like it would have less traffic coming through neighborhoods.
- We are struggling to understand why only one of the parcels that comprise the park is being considered as part of the development planning. The proposed site plan would have a disproportionate negative impact on the residences at the south end of the park. The concept that shows a bus lane directly behind those residences is particularly offensive. It seems unjust to affect the enjoyment of those homeowners' use of their property to such a significant degree, and leave a vacant tract of land undisturbed on the other side of the park. If only one of the

parcels is going to be developed, I would suggest that the concept diagram showing the bus lane behind the residences should be eliminated from consideration. It is absurd to destroy property value of a few homes to such a great degree, particularly when there are alternatives that would not cause any significant hardship to any of the stakeholders.

- The concept of a school at this location is sickening all by itself.
- A study needs to be done for the impact on the river bank stability from this big construction. This is a big concern because it's a safety issue.
- I believe that traffic will increase in the area. Traffic is always increased when new facilities are built. People will want to use them after hours. The green space the neighbors used for a variety of years will be lost.
- My house is greatly impacted by both concept designs presented. I would like to see the school in the middle of the park to limit the visual / noise impact to the houses on Varna Crescent, specifically our house where additional traffic flow is proposed in both drawings. I'm not sure what the reasoning behind the decision to negatively impact the property value of the houses on the south side of the park.
- Use the site in Montgomery on McKay Road. Already a school there with room to add extra facilities, like a pool.
- The designs don't have a solution to resolve the traffic issue, no analysis about the impacts on traffic. Option A is even making the traffic situation terrible in a big area. Q4: Why is Vecova site not suitable for this school?
- Still do not address concerns i.e. vehicular access. Residents park on both sides of 50th. Essentially limits to 1 lane. Any decrease in on-street parking will adversely impact residents significantly. Intersection between 50th Street and 43 Avenue is a very dangerous intersection. Given the short distance from proposed site to this intersection affect these children, even if not very mobile. May be able to get to this intersection in a short period.
- I am very upset that the concept has not evaluated the use and options to ensure tax payers dollars are used most efficiently. The fact that no consultation with the community was mad. A private company or organization would need to have performed a better level of care / communication to community. Emergency access i.e. five seems very challenged for current congestion.
- The facility is designed to increase the dangers to our children. They will be faced with extra traffic from buses and facility employees, then have to cross Shaganappi to access recreational facilities. Would you want your child to do this?
- I'm worried about traffic flow, neither option seems great. I'm also concerned about sewage and stability; I hope experts ensure this works. Other than that, I am not opposed to the school, and the architects seem competent.
- Not impressed, as the residents of the Varsity area we were not informed in the beginning stages of the process. I am an owner of a condo directly across from the site. My main worry is traffic. How do you get 13 school buses plus teachers' cars and support staff cars and parent's cars down 50th Street that barely supports the traffic it has now? As of now you can't find parking nor can two vehicles drive by each other at the same time.
- Comments and Questions from some of the approximately 200 concerned residents who have signed our petition/consent form for the CBE regarding the proposed construction of a new short/long term care facility to be named "Christine Meikle" facility (CMF) in the Varsity Park off 50th Street N.W., Calgary (Varsity Park)
 1. The Varsity Park zoning S-SPR requires that the curriculum of Alberta Education to be taught for a facility to be a "school". In this regard we ask about the clientele of CMF:

1. Why is the number of clientele changing from 75 to 350 depending on the circumstance?
 2. What number of clientele are ambulatory?
 3. How much time is spent as respite care per day?
 4. What is the range of the IQ's of clientele and what is the required IQ at which the clientele are capable of learning the curriculum?
 5. How much time is spent on "teaching" the curriculum per day and what methods are used to "teach the curriculum?"
2. Is the CMF run as a joint venture; is Alberta Health Services a partner; how much of the budget for the CMF is funded by AHS; who else contributes to the budget of CMF?
 3. It is understood that much if not most of the Special Education Program which is offered via the Christine Meikle facility is actually medical and other services. The CMF is not a school but only has small components which are a school.
 4. The CMF is a "short/long term care facility" as described by the Calgary Board of Education (the "CBE") and as such is not a permitted usage as described under the current zoning.
 5. The current zoning of S-SPR was assigned to the Varsity Park in 1979 prior to the British North America Act being repatriated and the Charter of Rights & Freedoms being proclaimed. In the 1990's the issue of "Special Education Programs" gained prominence when the Alberta Department of Child Welfare took the position that the request of parents of children with autism for special programming was a school matter. The Court of Queen's Bench has considered this issue on many occasions and has concluded that there are at least two distinct components to the provision of services to children with Autism; medical and educational.
 6. Please advise of all properties owned by the CBE within Area 1 which either have a vacant building/school or vacant land (including Bowness and Parkdale communities) or other parcels in the process of being declared surplus <http://www.calgary.ca/PDA/DBA/Pages/Planning-policy-information/Online-information/Land-Use-Maps-Bylaw-1P2007.aspx>
 7. The property on 53rd Street is zoned S-SPR and is approximately 6 acres. A 4000 sq. metre building would take up 1 acre of space. Parking for 100 cars would consume approximately 1 acre. This site could have been chosen instead of the Varsity Park. Why was the Varsity Park chosen?
 8. The CBE is desperately trying to control a process which has been badly managed and frankly is horribly flawed legally, physically, geologically and from a transportation perspective. The CBE has to date refused to follow their IAP2 Policy and have not attempted to collaborate with the concerned owners. The CBE is acting like a runaway locomotive and not abiding by their own guidelines for site selection. It is clear that the proposed facility is not consistent with CBE policy.
 9. The 50th Street N.W. road provides insufficient room for the required 6 buses of 18m in length (Varanger Place also lacks sufficient space). There are fire hydrants which also limit this. The roadways surrounding this site are residential and narrow and on Varna and Varanger there are no sidewalks. There is insufficient room to have buses travel this road or on 50th Street N.W. (this is closed off for travel though to stop additional traffic).

10. The amount of noise which the proposed facility will generate must be contemplated; I can only imagine the constant beeping of reversing buses and the clanging of the mechanical contraptions which are used to move the clientele to and from the CMG. There will be no parking due to garbage trucks, problems with parking of buses and fire hydrants, no sidewalks, residential roads if two cars park on either side then 2 cars cannot safely pass, during the day and heightened at the end of the day residents and visitors park on Varna Crescent and on 50th Street N.W. Size of two buses passing side by side with cars parked on each side.
11. The Varsity Park is not the only answer. One need only look at the F.E. Osbourne parcel off 53rd Street which has a collector road on one side of it which is also zoned S-SPR. At the time the CBE made the so called emergent request to the City of Calgary to transfer back the parcel off 50th Street N.W. the land by F.E. Osbourne had the same characteristics as the Varsity Park. The proposed 4000 sq. metre building and 100 car parking lot would take up 2 acres and fit neatly on the south side of this S-SPR. Why was this site not requested to be transferred back to CBE? What is so special about the beautiful park which the CBE is proposing to destroy? The two sites were equal in 2012 and the City could have just as easily transferred the F.E. Osbourne site.
12. To propose to build a short/long term care facility in breach of the zoning bylaws in such wonderful park land defies comprehension when the F.E. Osbourne site exists and even better Vecova is prepared to work with the CBE. In this regard I have been advised by Vecova that they are prepared to consider any offer which the CBE is prepared to make in respect of partnering with them. What I understand is that the CBE has expressed no interest to Vecova and not the other way around as you have suggested. A director of Vecova has verbally advised that they would entertain any proposal the CBE puts forward but CBE is not interested in partnering with Vecova as the CBE insists that the CMF is an educational facility.
13. The "school" is not being built to educate students in Varsity. The utilization rate in Area I - Sector 1 is 78.59%.
14. When will you be applying for a Development Permit? Will you be giving notice to the concerned residents?
15. What is the minimum size for a school; is 10 acres a minimum size?
16. \$24 million being made available by the current Government which may not be re-elected; the money is urgently being spent not to lose it. The CBE has indicated that the lack of \$14 million dollars is prevented many schools from being built. This \$24 million could be used to ensure many students are given the new schools that their parents deserve.

Some other concerned owners have advised us that:

- Area: this school site is below the required 10 acres parcel
- Accessibility:
 - The school site has only one street fronting the school (50 street) which is a residential type road (neighbourhood street)
 - school site is located within a community setting
 - there is a barricade in 50 street that has been there since the 70s to calm traffic and keep the quietness and peace within the community
 - Right turn in 34 Avenue is not allowed (this measure was put in place as a

request by the community to avoid heavy traffic coming onto the community

- The street section (residential street) will not support the heavy traffic of drop-off and pick-up times. Neither it will support buses from coming in and out as the turning radio is too small
- There are a few bus stops along 49 Street. Users, who come by bus, will have to cross private property to get to school which increases public traffic onto a private area.
- Arranger Place (south of the site) is cul-d-sac classified as residential street also, section will not support heavy traffic
- Parking and transportation (we can request a copy of their traffic and transportation impact assessment, that they are supposed to do when a school site is for development)
- On-street parking is common on 50 Street. Residents from the multi-family complex use the street as an extra parking area. The streets are heavily used (we can include pictures)
- There are a couple of fire hydrants in front of the school site which will take away 10 meters of parking spaces
- Green space and nature:
 - As per the south Shaganappi Community Area Plan, this vacant school site is to remain as important open space/local park
 - This is an area is heavily used evenings and weekend (Spring, summer, fall) by the community and other people who come from all over the city including area residents to play baseball, Frisbee, soccer, and other sports. Where are they going to go?
 - During winter time people use the park for cross country skiing and tobogganing (in the small central hill)
 - There are many trees along the edges of the site. The CBE will have to cut most of them and change the site's grading to accommodate the building and possible a parking lot. Cutting trees compromises air quality in the area and contradicts sustainable practices
 - There is an off-lease park behind the school. This is not safe for school children
 - There is a natural park with big escarpments that are unsafe for school children

The site does not seem to be the best choice for a school development base on location, accessibility, area, and surroundings.

School sites in the area (<http://www.cbe.ab.ca/Schools/areas/area1.asp>)

All of which is submitted and asked by the concerned owners who wish to save the Varsity Park and can be communicated with at varsity.openspace@gmail.com

- None of the designs significantly improve the density of the community as they are focussed on a single use, a school, which is only used a few hours per day. However, the special nature of the school may not be suitable to such integration into other community needs. Also, it is too late to start such a big idea planning.
- We expected a school in the 70's that we did not get. Now the land is being used for what it was intended in a very suitable location.
- Although Option B is more expensive than A, it does fit into the surroundings best with minimal impact on nearby residents. The additional open space is nice, but hardly needed in an area with so much open space such as Bowmont Park.
- The removal of the baseball diamonds will reduce evening traffic on 50 St. and

make the street safer for vehicles such as bicycles in the evening.

- Pathways will enhance the ability of the community residents to use the space for improved access between Bowmont Park and the Market Mall. You may want to work with Livable Streets in the Transportation and Planning Department to make them bicycle friendly.
- Why has there not been more contact with Vecova about this? They do similar things for adults; the site is close to the University so there would be advantages to studying at the University and opening time at the school. Please take a close look at Vecova – it will be better for the disabled students.

Question 2 What do we need to pay attention to as we move forward?

- Let us know what's happening. Not happy with lack of consultation. Varsity residents deserve to know.
- All I ask is that the urban planners at the City of Calgary ensure the site has the infrastructure to support the school. Also, please stay strong. You have many opponents. These kids need our support and I am prepared to embrace and support them.
- I do not foresee traffic as a concern, given the low enrolment and hours of school operation.
- Keep the community informed. False rumors spread very quickly.
- Traffic – In this area where there is already limited (maybe awkward) access, there will be increased traffic (buses, staff – 70 cars) and times when children are ill or need to be picked up for other reasons. Other sites – In this era of throw-away former school sites could be used. There is definitely a cost to demolishing old buildings, but this has happened to other buildings in Calgary, e.g. the General Hospital. There are schools in Bowness and Montgomery (where I live) which are empty and could be done away with; where there is room for parking and increased traffic. Vecova has apparently offered to talk to CBE. Could this be part of the West Campus which is adjacent to the Children's Hospital? P.S. It has been my experience that any change, or new idea is accepted more easily when both sides, those informed and those who are informed, are engaged early in the process. I hope that future considerations will be presented earlier than later.
- Thank you for the opportunity. Great project for the kids. Key concerns raised by parents: Notice and information – provide more notice to local community – Is this the most efficient use of tax payer resources? Supportive of the new school. If this is the best site for the kids and most cost effective to enable more money for programming, please proceed.
- Hours to build, if it happens, strict 8 – 5 building hours, no earlier or later. Construction companies often push boundaries. Also not increasing students past an agreed upon level, if needed look at the other options. Talk to Vecova, change rules work with government on more partnership like N.E. School.
- The only thing I can say is that you should be hyper aware of terms and phrases as the concerns seem to come down to semantics. The fact is a good solution and a good school.
- We feel as you go forward that you are very careful not to damage a very quiet and productive neighborhood.
- Everything. Why aren't we given the chance to ask our questions in an appropriate forum?
- Sewer – we are having issues with the sewer system right now just to the north of the site.
- Will you replace all trees you are cutting down with new ones? The format of an

open house is terrible, too crowded, no one to answer questions. You are doing this deliberately to avoid being asked.

- Community Engagement and education.
- Already large volume of traffic on 53rd Street, routes to Market Mall. This seems to be a major concern.
- Traffic concerns come with all schools. The community could use some information about the expected impact of buses, vans, etc. Celebrate the need for these students to have a great school. I hear muffled NIMBY [not in my back yard] from neighbors.
- Parking on 50th Street and on residential street i.e. Varna Crescent. Parking on north 50th Street.
- As above - Non-school. Traffic. No problems except in both conceptual drawings let's prevent use of school roads as a through-route for 50th Street. Either no through route or bus trap.
- Not increasing car traffic, the 10 – 15 buses I don't mind, but it's the other people taking advantage of being able to cut through the parking lot that's worrisome.
- Non-school traffic. Using school as shortcut through the quiet residential community.
- Traffic volume. Retention of green space / park.
- Traffic. Noise.
- In the short term, personal communication of construction planning (construction hours, equipment access, contractor parking, etc.) to immediately adjacent residents.
- Consult with teachers and aids to ensure the needs of the kids are addressed before construction.
- A public debate needs to be arranged so everyone's concerns are met and addressed.
- Traffic concerns of residents – will results of traffic study be available for the public?
- The thing I heard from most people is the traffic on 50 Street and it being too narrow for buses to come down the street and cars coming the other direction would not be able to pass each other. The concern of increased traffic from the school itself I believe is very minimal but there are traffic issues already that they feel will be exasperated. One resident suggested they open up the cu-de-sac at 50 Street but place a barrier along 50 Street and 32 Avenue (Home Road?) so that people can't turn left at that 4 way stop. Would this help with all their traffic problems?
- What you need to pay attention to as you move forward is working with the affected citizens and re-examining the possibility of moving the development to the new West Campus at U of C. The U of C campus is already home to many activities related to the school and a development at that location could be accomplished without any impact on a residential community.

If this is not possible then I urge you to be aware that your intrusion into the community at this time will not be well received by the community and you should go out of your way to ensure them that you are doing everything possible to avoid inconveniencing them or imposing on their peace and comfort.

As traffic is such an important factor you should be aware that several years ago traffic flows were restricted on 49 Street and 32 and 34 Avenues because it was felt that these streets should share in the impact of high traffic volumes. What is now being proposed simply exacerbates the traffic problem on those streets and this should be avoided.

- Love concept B's attention to pedestrian movement towards the river valley.

Concept A would cut off my easiest walking access. Also please provide information about construction management plan for those of us who will be directly affected.

- Traffic.
- Identify all vacant sites around the area and conduct a site assessment to identify the most suitable location include vacant school in Montgomery, in Bowness, south portion of F.E. Osbourne School playfield (this area does not get used at all). Traffic impact assessment – flows, parking, accessibility. Why did you declare the site surplus to CBE needs in 2007 and then requested it back in 2012? In the meanwhile the site was identified as an important open space by the South Shaganappi Regional context study. Which level of the IAP2 spectrum are you using? 1 open house is not enough to fully engage the community.
- Find a new site that is already suited to handle the traffic. Use the land beside Jerry Potts. Explain the benefits of having this school at all in our area. A park is infinitely better than this school. How will you have 100s of cars in this community without impacting it? Every parent driving their kids and staff and constant buses and ambulances... Would you put this school in a park by your home? Don't put it here. Start over on a new site.
- Many groups use the park; little league, Ultimate, families, dog walkers, condo owners who rely on public green space. Due to mall and condos, there is little parking and heavy traffic already. Not feasible to add to that.
- Traffic. Have you exhausted alternatives; Vecova partnership, old Children's Hospital (more central and arguably faster / easier access to the new Children's Hospital. There are numerous under-used existing schools in the area. Could any of these be retrofitted?
- Assurance / response to concern regarding expansion plans for school. E.g. from 18 year old – 20 year old would up school population by 20 – 25%. Would state of art facility, once completed, invite expanding the spectrum of special needs kids served thereby up enrolment and numbers of staff / students above and beyond the various numbers in the proposal presented?
- The one suggestion that leaves the cul-de-sac on fiftieth will probably have it removed almost immediately after the building has been built. Turn offs from 40th Avenue on to 50th Street will be a problem also.
- I am not against 1971 school designation or building on this site; working openly but in focused manner with the city planners and community on valid dimensions i.e. landscaping, parking, traffic flow, community use of the facility, not on invalid issues like height and yes / no build here. Allowing issues to be focused on NIMBY [not in my back yard] is poor project management by CBE and city planners.
- Everything you have been told by the hundreds of Varsity residents who have and who continue to contact you.
- Primarily we should be paying attention to the wise selection of a site that would meet the needs of the proposed school and the chosen community.
- The people in the neighborhood that have concerns about traffic and falling property values.
- The present plan puts greatly increased traffic on 50th Street south of the 40th Avenue many small children are in the area and are placed at risk.
- What will they do to us next without letting us know that is going on?
- Picking a new location.
- Parking is going to be a major problem even with the planned parking on site. There will be even more displacement of the condo on-street parkers onto adjacent residential neighborhood streets and it will be an unmitigated disaster

during construction unless all construction workers / trades are forced to park on site.

- How about paying attention to anyone who lives in the community of Varsity. I get the feeling that had some passing by neighbors not stopped to ask the surveyors or architects what they were doing, that no one in Varsity would have even known that the school was planned for the site. Seems like CBE was trying to get this pushed through without consulting the neighborhood.
- Parking. Impact on residents.
- Please listen to the residents of a wonderfully quiet district that you are completely ruining. I am completely against this project. Don't take down the concrete barrier on 50th at 32nd.
- Traffic issues. Giving Residents a better opportunity to express their concerns, because this meeting / open house was poorly organized.
- Certainly traffic concerns. I think CBE just has that money burning a hole in their pocket. It is a rushed decision which I think they will regret later on. There was never any initial contact with community so this has left bad feelings that will take many years to overcome. Even our alderman and MLA were caught unawares.
- You need to pay attention to the concerns being raised by the neighborhood. If the issues with traffic, parking, access, drainage, property value / enjoyment, etc. are not adequately addressed it will not be in any of the stakeholders' best interest.
- You need to find a different location for the facility. The traffic, parking sewer and crime problems that this school will bring cannot be allowed in our community.
- The concerns of the neighbors whose property values that will decrease.
- Involve and inform your stakeholders on your plans; be transparent. I'm very disappointed with the CBE's public consultation process. The CBE has initiated this school project on a very sour note to someone who is a new addition to Varsity (July, 2013), I can only imagine the stress / concern this imposed change is causing residents that have lived on our street since 1971.
- Traffic management in the wider area. Including access from 40th Avenue, 32nd Avenue, 49th Street. How will residential parking be impacted? Water management and sewer line.
- Why no communications at all with public before? Concerns need to be seriously considered, not just a show of open house.
- Local traffic and parking.
- Capital efficiency, work with Vecova. Consult community. Emergency access seems inadequate for site chosen.
- Stop the lies. The CBE lies constantly. You are liars. Our children matter too. Don't they? Go ahead and tell another lie.
- I am still unclear as to why a partnership with Vecova was not considered. Could something still be worked out / negotiated.
- Possibly move it to another location. I understand these kids need to be near a children's hospital but I don't think building in a high traffic, residential area is the place to do it. There has to be another location that is close to the Children's Hospital that would be more suitable for these kids in the community and perhaps not stretch the true (i.e. Feb. 14/14 on the fact sheet).
- Please look carefully into the option of building this school at or near Vecova. There is land there, there is already a swimming pool, and intern students from the university are close at hand. This site is as close to the Children's Hospital as the proposed site, and is easier to reach from Crowchild Trail. My guess is that your government grant will get you more at Vecova.
- You will have to be able to ignore those that object for the sake of objecting in a

manner that makes them feel that they are being heard.

- As you progress to getting a development permit the community needs to be involved in meaningful ways. The involvement has to involve both the community association and members of the community that may feel they are not represented by the community association.
- Get the community working on options as they come up so that they feel they are building something?
- Have meetings in suitable spaces. You did very well with space on the Wednesday open house but must have thought that no one would show up on Thursday.
- Good luck dealing with my neighbours that defaced your signs and swore at your receptionist.