

Shaganappi Trail Corridor Study

Community Conversation Highlights

Nov. 26 and 28, 2013

On Nov. 26 and 28, 2013, about 45 and 42 people attended each of the Shaganappi Trail Corridor Study community conversations. The purpose of the sessions was to present and gather feedback on three new concept plans for the section between Crowchild Trail and 40 Avenue NW. These potential concepts are posted on the project website at www.calgary.ca/shaganappicorridor. The feedback gathered from these community conversations, along with previous meetings with external stakeholders, will be used to help identify the recommended option for the Shaganappi Trail Corridor Study. The sessions included a presentation, followed by small group discussions to identify strengths, weaknesses, and key considerations for each of the design concepts. Feedback received via discussions and comment forms represents a wide cross-section of stakeholders, including adjacent homeowners, residents of Varsity and (to a lesser extent) other surrounding communities, business owners, and commuters by various modes of transportation (cycling, transit, automobiles, etc.).

Highlights from the discussion sessions and comment forms received include the following:

- General theme that improvements to Shaganappi Trail should not impact or should minimize impacts to homes adjacent to Shaganappi Trail. Examples of how to reduce property impacts included: retaining Voyageur Drive, retaining on-street parking, not adding a third lane on Shaganappi Trail, narrower medians, and adding a multi-use pathway or cycle track with sidewalk on only one side of the roadway.
- No broad consensus in favor of one particular concept. Of the input provided, Concept A was slightly preferred by more people, followed by Concept B. Concept C was the least preferred, primarily due to potential loss of parking.
- General support for separation of pedestrians and cycling, but there were concerns about the impacts, due to space requirements, that pathways and cycle tracks could have on adjacent properties.
- Mixed feedback regarding whether cycling facility improvements should be focused adjacent to Shaganappi Trail, on nearby residential streets, or other dedicated cycling routes.
- Mixed reaction to the long term transportation improvements anticipated for Shaganappi Trail in regards to the benefit or need for an HOV lane (e.g. transit or carpools). There were also questions as to which lane should be designated as the HOV lane, and whether it would be for used by transit only or for other high occupancy vehicles (e.g. taxis, carpools) as well.
- Mixed reaction for removing Voyageur Drive between Crowchild Trail and 32 Avenue due to potential property impacts, creating a high traffic/speed corridor, increased noise and pedestrian/driver/cyclist safety impacts.
- Some support was received for the previous idea of widening Shaganappi Trail to the west, rather than proceeding with one of the three concepts presented at the sessions.
- Some interest to keep the pedestrian overpass at Valiant Drive, rather than replacing it with the at-grade signalized crossing. Some respondents indicated that the overpass should be improved or moved to Varsity Drive.
- Some concern that an additional traffic signal at Valiant Drive would further exacerbate the existing traffic and congestion issues on Shaganappi Trail.

The verbatim comments collected from attendees at the November community conversations via the discussions and comment forms are available below.

Shaganappi Trail Corridor Study

Community Conversation Workshop Notes

Nov. 26 and 28, 2013

Concept A - Strengths

Home/Property

- No residential impacts
- Homeowners/properties are not impacted
- Keeps Voyageur Drive, residents are not having to live on Shaganappi. Still feel part of community
- Low impact to residential
- Least residential impact
- Like this concept the most of the three
 - Not disruptive to current use of the area
 - People living on the roads won't be too disrupted
- Prefer to keep Voyageur Drive
- Minimal impact to residents
- Front access to homes
- Parking lane in front of house
- Parking is important. Like on-street parking
- Keep parking "inside" Voyageur Drive
- Curbside parking remains

Walking/Cycling/Transit

- Path on east – good connection to mall and park. Combined pedestrian and cycling infrastructure
- Pathways
- Bike path, walkway
- Advantage for bus
- Pathways set back from Shaganappi Trail
- Bike lanes on east side allows better access to U of C
- Multi-use path is better than cycle-track on both sides

Traffic/Roadway

- Congestion - traffic in strip mall would be reduced because overpass is removed, better access to and from strip mall
- Reduced speed limit (60 km/h)
- Better traffic flow
- Improved vehicle flow (north and south)
- Barrier is still there
- Preserves the parking in the area
- Limiting types of vehicles using Shaganappi Trail - only high occupancy (i.e. carpools or buses) have large trucks using a ring road

Safety

- Buffer space good for family safety
- Wall/fence to protect children from traffic
- Improvement for accident prevention

Other

- Consensus is this is the favoured/best concept
- Tries to accommodate all users
- Potential for buffer space (sound barrier)
- Seems to be best of A/B/C but need to refine presentation to show comparison of “as-is” and “to be” within right-of-way. Show solution for existing messy near-miss prone intersection at Varsity Drive. Show refined vehicle circulation for homes now subject to one-way change in front of their house adjacent to Shaganappi Trail.

Concept A - Weaknesses

Home/Property

- Feels closed in (houses on Voyageur Drive)
- More infringement than buying out the property
- Nobody is considering the people at the bottom of the road
- Less space on Voyageur Drive
- Pave back road and not raise taxes? Possible?
- Impacted Petro/7-Eleven and Shell - not a lot of impact to residents but to businesses
- Even though impact still feel that they have to move
- Takes business away – something we agreed should not happen at last meeting

Walking/Cycling/Transit

- Paths too narrow
- Valiant Drive can't take any additional vehicle traffic
- Cycling and walking do not mix
- Pedestrians between on [path]way - logic
- No continuation of pathways into community
- Mixing pedestrians and cyclists
- Crosswalks impede cycling traffic
- Cycling only on one side
- Pedestrian overpass should remain and be upgraded (safety and convenience)
- Pedestrian crossing at-grade on Shaganappi Trail impedes traffic flow excessively
- No separate cycle lane
- Shared path
- Cycling on residential streets not Shaganappi Trail
- Would like no bikes
- Only one side has bike paths – should be one on each side
- Shared path is a weakness – should be separate
 - One per side on separate paths
 - Where will snow go in winter?
- Along east side of Shaganappi Trail there are no issues for cyclists
- Bridge is safer than light
- On Valiant Drive instead of traffic light place a bridge
- Pathways cannot be multi-use, it's dangerous for both cyclists and pedestrians.
- One person would prefer the signals [*at Crowchild to replace the free flow merge*] to make it safer for pedestrians who are going to Northland Mall

- Unsafe to share path
- Pathway can be dangerous at intersections in traffic merging right will pose serious issues

Traffic/Roadway

- 40 Street NW to 40 Avenue NW handles large volume of traffic from Varsity Drive and Varsity Drive is a larger width roadway
- Open Valiant Drive West of Shaganappi Trail
- Concern that Valiant Drive will have more traffic, to make the left turn to go on Shaganappi Trail
- Already have speed bumps to slow traffic, we don't need more coming through on Valiant Drive
- Reducing speed will not increase volumes of traffic
- Don't want HOV lanes
- Keep 3 lanes for cars
- One-way frontage is not a good idea
- Don't believe that you can have a two-way street
- Closing access at Valiant Drive from the frontage road means diverting local traffic
- Frontage road access to Valiant Drive at Shaganappi Trail is dangerous – Concept A is better
- Terrible idea to place a traffic light at Valiant Drive
- Winter - poor access to houses (snow removal only once last year)
- Putting a signal at Crowchild *[for eastbound Crowchild Trail to southbound Shaganappi Trail dual right]* to replace the free-flow merge would not be well received
- Concerned that lanes now are going to be super busy
- Concern with 3 lanes flowing into one lane

Other

- Noise
- No trees
- Too noisy
- Too much concrete
- May want the fence to stay – ask people who live there
- Buffer space is a wasted space. Would rather have boulevard instead.
- Minor changes

Concept A - Key Considerations

Home/Property

- Less impact on homeowners

Walking/Cycling/Transit

- Advertising and promoting carpool and biking
- Make sure “turning arrows” are on the light standard

Roadway/Traffic

- Like lower speed
- Speed limit must be 50 km/h
- A widening of the road on the west would be better than Concept A

Other

- Remove noise wall and add more green space
- Community gardens on new green space along Shaganappi Trail - give space to community to use and maintain.
- Keep the physical barrier (visual and sound) – important
- 3 residents prefer A
- Concept A preferred by – 2
- 2 people prefer A
- Do not like homeowners losing street access to homes and having traffic outside their homes with no buffer.
- Plan A Ok

Concept A - Questions

- Voyageur Drive preserved?
- Talk to people directly impacted – buy out- and build road full width (too immediate to houses)?

Concept B - Strengths

Home/Property

- Commercial closures off Valiant Drive
- Closing back lane is a good idea. 7-11 on corner can be redeveloped

Walking/Cycling/Transit

- Hybrid of cyclists and pedestrians in pathways
- Wide pedestrian/cycle
- Combined cycle and foot paths on both sides
- Like path on both sides of road
- Like path separation from road
- Like the idea of placing single road with enhanced pedestrian/bike facilities (but wants some screening)

Traffic/Roadway

- Reduced speed (50 km/h)
- Parking is incorporated
- Parking where it is liked (with the green space boulevard)
- Voyager road isn't used much in some areas along Shaganappi Trail
- Upgrade back lanes (pave)
- Wider lanes than Concept A – good thing
- Like the parking on Shaganappi Trail

Other

- More green space
- Green space in front of houses facing Shaganappi Trail
- Green space
- Like the idea of adding green space

Concept B Weaknesses

Home/Property

- Too many properties affected
- Property value impacts to those now facing Shaganappi Trail
- Too much impact on residential properties
- Loss of property value
- Pay me and bulldoze my house
- Loss of access to garage, cross path to get into the house, loss of property value – same as Concept C
- Like Concept A as well – Concept B impacts homes too much
- Homeowners – back lane access – no driveways
- Infringing on too many citizens property
- Too many driveways to be relocated. Not suitable for our level of intelligence.

Walking/Cycling/Transit

- Mixing pedestrians and cyclists
- Dangerous - children
- At-grade pedestrian crossings impede traffic flow – need overpasses and pedestrian barriers
- Get rid of HOV
- Path should not be shared
- Want pedestrians and bikes separate
- Cycling on residential streets not Shaganappi
- Don't like walking over pathway
- Keep the overpass (improve)
- HOV lane sort of exists
- Cycling lane already exists, so there isn't a large impact
- Snow removal concerns about bike/path route
- HOV lane might cause problems when they need to turn left (opportunity for an overpass)
- Cycling works now - we don't need to change it
- Cyclist issues and on-street parking
- No need for multi-use path - people already use Voyageur Drive for that
- Path - too small for both pedestrian and bike
- Pedestrians, cyclists, etc. being considered above property owners and tax payers!
- Paths on both sides, nice boulevard approach, but is it suitable for high volume?

Traffic/Roadway

- Snow routes - how would parking for residents be impacted
- No street parking in front of house
- Slows down traffic between Varsity Drive and Crowchild Trail with on-street parking
- Don't like on-street parking on Shaganappi Trail
- Parking narrow
- Forget on-street parking on a high volume arterial – not a good plan
- Parking issues because many are multi-tenant homes
- Enforcing speed limits and parking
- Poor comparison to Memorial Drive
- If this becomes snow route, there is no street parking
- Lanes are not wide enough for emergency response by Vandyke Road
- Gives no parking - what about garbage/recycle pick up if you're parked in the back.

- Don't like parking on the street
- Concern that parking in front of homes is limited – look at having it dedicated
- Not acceptable!! Parking is a problem. No safety fence

Safety

- Safety concern for those with children who live in houses now fronting onto Shaganappi Trail
- On Shaganappi Trail, parking could be dangerous with passing traffic
- Safety issue being right on Shaganappi Trail
- Safety of parking - Safety not good
- Safety of parallel parking for kids
- Safety for bikes
- Parking on Shaganappi Trail is too dangerous to consider, not feasible, not sustainable
- Potential for accidents as parked vehicles negotiate the bus lane into traffic
- Shaganappi Trail south from Crowchild Trail is already a dangerous place to merge

Other

- No sound guard
- Not enough green space
- Loss of play space
- No sound barrier option
- Noise issues without barrier
- Concern that traffic generates lots of dust/car exhaust
- Still concerned about looking at traffic instead of having physical barrier

Concept B - Key Considerations

- Green continuous hedges
- No HOV
- Pathways would be safer if the intersection was a full turn, not a merge
- An intersection at Valiant Drive and 40 Avenue (lights are there, it'll be slower)
- Residents would like sound barriers
- Concern about all the development in the north – traffic coming south through the area
- Majority of homes have access to garage through back lanes
- Mixed review between this and Concept A
- Don't change anything
- Is ideal since it provides boulevard, path, and parking.
- Like Concept B as I feel it provides for HOV, paths on both sides and parking for residence. I also like the added green on both sides.
- No way
- Concept B is most liked – 5
- 0/4 prefer B
- No Not acceptable- No No!
- Not Acceptable
- No!

Concept B - Key Questions

- What about paving the lanes to improve access?
- A lot of discussion – questions to understand the concept
- Sidewalk cleared by City?
- How do you get from a traffic lane to the parking lane if there is only one person in the vehicle?
- Is parking limited to area residents with a parking pass?

Concept C - Strengths

Home/Property

- Access closures at Petro Canada
- Potential in long term to redevelop affected homes into higher density
- Most appealing option for non-residents
- Great opportunity for redevelopment interim funding

Walking/Cycling/Transit

- Cycle track is good commuters will use (x3)
- Cycle track here would have less grade (x3)
- Liked that cyclists and walkers are separated
- Cycle tracks
- Separate pathways
- Sidewalks/bike lanes on both sides
- Likes bike lanes on Varsity Drive, 40 Avenue - show on other concepts
- Cycling and paths on both sides
- Best to keep cyclists/pedestrians separated
- One person is a cyclist and he would like dedicated bike paths
- No risk of accident with cycle lane so close to traffic
- The best is flow, best for both cyclists and pedestrian. Keep them separate and safe
- Bike lanes are great!

Traffic/Roadway

- Reduced speed limit (50 or 60 km/h)
- T-ramp at Crowchild - do same on other concepts
- Rear access only is a strength (improves flow)
- Overall good for traffic flow
- Best for flow
- Slower but moving traffic

Other

- Wider buffer
- Separation between motorists and bikes
- Better separation from road
- Like this concept best because of the extra green space (fruit trees, garden for community, etc.)
- Open wide look with green space, trees, etc.
- When space available, provide more
- Green space for impacted residents
- Snow removal

Concept C - Weaknesses

Home/Property

- Buy out Voyager Drive frontages - west side to create space or all (east and west)
- High property impact
- If plan is for higher density, move out to suburbs (which is the root cause of issue)
- Impacts on people living there
- No front access – driveways
- Cannot agree with concept that would have such negative effect on property owners.
- Quality of life is gone with taking Voyager Drive west and leaving the houses if you currently live on Voyager Drive

Walking/Cycling/Transit

- Do not like cycle tracks. Prefer to combine cycling and pedestrian infrastructure.
- Sidewalks too narrow
- Boulevard seems to be wasted space (could widen foot/cycle path)
- Cycling off Shaganappi Trail and on residential streets
- Maintenance of cycle track in winter will be tough (3-)
- No room for cycle track (3-)
- No cycling currently on Shaganappi Trail (3-)
- Families won't use track on main road for cycling (3-)
- Use cycle track south of 40 Avenue, divert to 53 Street (3-)
- Improve pedestrian overpass
- Gets dangerous for cyclists and parking
- Do not like parking on the street from a cyclist's perspective
- No need for separate bike lanes on both sides
- Impacts the neighborhood just as much as Concept B but adds the impact of no parking for many residents

Traffic/Roadway

- Loss of parking not acceptable
- Access to impacted houses reduced to alleys, which could become more congested
- Rear lane access
- No visitor parking
- Alley way for Vandergrift Crescent is already tight
- Rear access for homes would make worse
- Rear access parking limited, not feasible
- Only is a weakness
- No HOV lanes
- Bad traffic flow by Market Mall (turning left)
- Traffic light would not work because it is too short
- Back alley are not able to accommodate traffic
- Visitors, company people with more than one car
- No parking (company have nowhere to park side streets or alley)
- More traffic lights and lower speed limits is a deterrent for greater traffic
- Leave 40 Avenue as is
- It takes all the parking away for residents

Safety

- Safety concern for homeowners who would now face Shaganappi Trail - small children
- Access for emergency services as a concern
- No Parking on Voyageur Drive is not good - not acceptable!
- Voyageur Drive would be gone. Not good - no safety fence. This is a safety issue. Need fence

Other

- Poor snow removal
- No sound barrier
- Noise issues if there is no barrier
- Snow removal would be horrible
- Removes sound barrier
- Prefer more trees
- Doing a 30 year plan with today's restraints

Concept C - Key Considerations

- Would need sound barrier before cycle track
- Cycle track paths – really need to keep speed limit low to ensure safety especially right hand turns
- Residents north of Varsity Drive would like a sound barrier if City goes with Concept C
- But a sound barrier would limit access of emergency vehicles
- Most do not like this concept
- Most of the table dislike this plan the most
- Group does not like this plan at all
- Concept C is best of the concepts
- Concept C is least preferred
- Not acceptable
- NO!
- The longer you wait, if houses are needed, the more it will cost.

Concept C - Questions

- Will the cycle track be dangerous next to the HOV?
- Placement of barriers - are the cyclists protected?
- Where to place the sound barriers?
- What about snow removal on cycle track?
- Study of cyclists and pedestrians along Voyageur Drive? Answer - No
- Where would people park?

Concept Proposed by Session Attendees

- Buy out west side because least affected number of properties
- Provides lots of open space
- Bike path
- Walking path
- On-street parking
- Sound barrier
- Lots of green space
- Wide buffer between the road (like Memorial Drive) and other paths (walking/biking) road-trees-path-sidewalk-house
- East side remains as-is
- Pedestrian overpasses to provide alternative to avoid high traffic intersection with bike lanes

Questions for Consideration for all Concepts

Home/Property

- Is there any way you could get an anticipated impact on property value?
- The people who are affected are not represented
- Why not expropriate the entire area along Varsity Drive to 40 Avenue?

Walking/Cycling/Transit

- Why not strictly transit?
- HOV – how well used are they?
- Why HOV on Shaganappi Trail?
- Why not HOV on Crowchild Trail?
- HOV's really need to be defined how?
- What defines rapid transit?
- HOV vs. rapid transit?
- Overpass removal on Valiant Drive – what is the motivation?
- Does HOV provide a benefit in a short space?
- Shaganappi Trail – HOV – merging to 16 Avenue – is that being considered?
- Why are HOV's on outside?
- Cycle/pedestrian shared path 3 metres wide?
- Valiant Drive overpass is great for pedestrians. Why?

Traffic/Roadway

- Are all concepts (A, B and C) the same width?
- What types of vehicles will be allowed? Big trucks?
- How is traffic speed going to be brought down?

Other

- Need a comparison on the maps (present situation vs. concepts)
- Why did the “do nothing” option get taken off?
- Q: Hammers
 - West Campus
 - Market Mall
 - Crowchild
 - Northland Shopping Centre
- A: Corridor is being planned to accommodate future growth. City does not know specific growth plans of the “hammers” but needs to plan for general growth nonetheless
- Why do anything?
- What will happen to the sound barriers or fences? Are these necessary?
- Why not use median?
- Would like a session just for [landowners]
- Sound barriers? These are necessary all the way along.

Key features to consider in recommended plan

Home/Property

- Good idea to close driveways at Shaganappi Trail and Valiant Drive and Varsity Drive corners
- If people/residents do not like the preferred plan they want option to have home purchased
- None of the concepts are appealing perhaps the City should widen right-of-way and buy homes now
- If I can only access my house via alley, then take my house and residence on Voyageur Drive for 45 yrs.
- The people on Voyageur Drive should have the strongest say
- Property values will go south with any of these plans
- Buy out homes on either side
- Buy off the frontage of the houses to make room
- If homes on Voyageur Drive are bought out, it can be repurposed as higher density/retail
- Might be better to buy homes on Voyageur Drive so City has less impact on residents when Shaganappi corridor is developed
- Concept A/B/C comment: Need to NOT get trapped into perpetual small increment design. Need to be bolder with what is supposed to happen, 50 year vision and 50 year capacity. Land use re-designation to high quality walk-up condo style density as first residential layer facing Shaganappi Trail should occur in any concept.

Cycling/Walking/Transit

- HOV/bus lane might lead to land switches, potentially hazardous?
- No HOV = 3 lanes traffic
- Cyclers in community not on Shaganappi Trail
- Cycling on Shaganappi Trail – direct route – include a 3 foot physical barrier
- If going to have cyclist then separate them from pedestrians
- Build barriers to prevent pedestrian crossing, but not a chain link fence at median
- New accessible pedestrian overpass is preferred to additional traffic lights
- If make Valiant Drive a pedestrian crossing, someone will get killed unless full crossing lights
- More people use Varsity Drive to cross Shaganappi Trail
- Would like to narrow the boulevard to have lesser impact on Voyageur Drive
- A pedestrian flashing light is badly needed on 40 Avenue across from Market Mall
- All plans include separate pedestrian structure over Crowchild Trail – is good
- HOV needs to be car and bus (key)
- At-grade pedestrian crossings slow down traffic (light changes)

- Should build multi-grade pedestrian crossings (that people will use)
- Love to keep the overpass
- Walkway – overpass - put on proper pedestrian overpass crossing on Varsity Drive rather than on Valiant Drive
- Pathway can be dangerous at the intersections (all 3)
- Use HOV (transit) to allow cyclists to bring bikes on transit
- Put HOV in the centre (switch am/pm)
- Use HOV for bicycles
- Crosswalks dangerous – prefer overpass but re-generate for bike up/down and wheel chair
- The crosswalks are far more dangerous than a pedestrian overpass
- Separate bike from pedestrian path – any plan should include a pedestrian overpass between Valiant Drive and Varsity Drive

Traffic/Roadway

- No traffic circles
- Need longer turning lane and advanced turning green going from Shaganappi Trail to 40 Avenue due to stacking in AM (hospital traffic) or find another solution
- 40 Avenue between Shaganappi Trail and 49 Street is backed up for a good portion on the day due to slow dual left turns onto Shaganappi Trail. This is due to traffic back up on Shaganappi Trail since John Laurie Boulevard construction was finished – poor traffic light management.
- Traffic light at Valiant Drive causing backups especially with left turning traffic from 40 Avenue to northbound Shaganappi Trail.
- Roundabout at Shaganappi Trail and Crowchild Trail
- Currently, north turn from 40 Avenue onto Shaganappi a major problem
- 50 km/h may not be feasible as people drive so fast
- Concern about traffic volumes and backups with 50 km/h speed
- All 3 concepts – lower speed from 70 to 50 or 60 km/h
- Like 50 km/h speed better
- Connect Valiant Drive all the way east/west (key)
- Problem for traffic flow (too many lights) (weak)
- Slow speed limits on Shaganappi Trail will affect Crowchild Trail
- More access to Shaganappi Trail improves traffic flow on Varsity Lane (private lane, many trespassers)
- Include traffic demand sensitive lights (and at 32 Avenue)
- Widen ramp from Shaganappi Trail southbound to Crowchild Trail westbound to two lanes so as to avoid “squeeze” at access to Dalhousie LRT station shopping centre (remove big sign)
- A traffic light to regulate traffic at 16 Avenue (get out eastbound)
- On street parking
- Lane congestion – if you do not have garage or parking pad will park in lane and increase congestion
- Want parking but parking on an arterial seems dangerous, not as convenient. Need parking in front for family, friends, and visitors
- Signalization at Valiant Drive is a very good idea on all plans but some people still want the overpass too (safety concerns cars not slowing fast enough) therefore reduce speed limit too
- Don't reduce lanes south of 40 Avenue (not just HOV +1 lane of traffic)
- Too many lights will create bottleneck (don't add on Valiant Drive)
- Facilitating traffic through community not to the benefit of community = bad for community
- Others in area already don't have front parking (e.g. 40 Avenue) and have to access from rear
- Roundabouts would work well
- Like removing free-flow merge of Crowchild Trail and putting in lights

- Too many lights on Shaganappi Trail - slows traffic
- Extra lights at Valiant Drive will slow north-south traffic in AM and PM - reduces traffic through the mall between Varsity Drive and Valiant Drive. Frequent signal should smooth flow
- Provide safe access to and from Valiant Drive
- Gets rid of useless overpass at Valiant Drive
- Only one left turn out of Shaganappi Village
- Connect Valiant east-west for bicycles and pedestrians
- Left turn at Valiant Drive is a good idea
- Should have third lane from Crowchild Trail south to Varsity Drive for safety

Other

- Public education
- Prefer concepts with green
- Noise barriers/fence/natural berm
- 40 Avenue and Shaganappi Trail - noise wall on northwest corner should be shortened due to poor vision for drivers on Shaganappi Trail going south turning right. Cannot see pedestrians approaching crosswalk
- Privacy/screening
- Leave it alone – the trail
- Very concerned whether or not garbage pickup in the lane can be operational with increased usage for all concepts (conflicts?)
- Noise is very important to residents
- There is a desire to replace and improve the existing sound wall – new designs more attractive
- City didn't listen to us in the spring
- Feeling that feedback in spring was ignored
- Disappointed in creation of concepts, it doesn't reflect past feedback
- [Not interested in] mirroring Memorial Drive
- A, B, and C are all basically the same thing with no significant differences = no real choice
- In the wrap-up, the first suggestion from the speaker where the table came up with their own suggestion is the only one that is practical and would work to optimize everything needed and is the best. Great for them!
- Concept 'A B C' comments- Comments about presentation
 - Plan view map in bottom left hand corner should have shown comparable cross section of existing as-is. Otherwise it is hard to envision from our intimate knowledge of existing
 - Hard to envision net impacts on flow continuity and road capacity (multi-modal) various concepts using different speed for cars, extra controlled intersections, different width for vehicles, bikes etc.

Safety

- Safety of Varsity Drive and Shaganappi is a concern on all concepts – put in traffic circle

Summary of key points from small group discussions:

Note: the notes below summarize the key points raised by session attendees above.

Group A

- Concept C is best of all the options but A, B, and C are basically the same thing with no significant difference = no real choice
- No HOV lanes
- Cycle on residential roads
- Cycle on Shaganappi Trail not residential roads with 3 foot physical separators
- If going to have cyclists then separate them from pedestrians
- Public education needed

- Prefer concepts with green
- Build barriers in median to prevent pedestrian crossing – no chain link fences

Group B

- Concern with traffic light at Valiant Drive
- Like Concept C
- Concerns with traffic backup, volumes with low speed
- Like pedestrian, cyclist separation
- Green space for community gardens

Group C

- 7 People
 - Concept A – 2
 - Concept B – 5
 - Concept C – 0
- There was concern about loss of access to front driveways for residents
- Like greenery/trees
- Prefer on street parking for visitors and extra vehicles
- Concept B - like the bike/pedestrian pathway on the east side of Shaganappi

Group D

- Preferred concept is A (75% of people, three of four)
- Because of lower residential impact
- Ability to have sound barrier
- Overall all concepts:
 - HOV needs to be carpool AND transit
 - At-grade pedestrian crossings slow down traffic, should be multi-level and increase in lights will also contribute to reduced flow

Group E

- We came up with our own concept
 - Buy out the west side and the east side remains as-is
 - It includes lots of open space with separate bike and walking paths
 - It includes a sound barrier
 - It has a wide buffer between the road and other paths (bike/walking)
 - Pedestrian overpasses at high traffic intersections with separate bike lanes
 - It includes on street parking
 - Road – trees – bike path – walk path – house

Group F

- Like:
 - Bike and pedestrian separation
 - City is planning now!
 - City is building relationship
- Don't like:
 - The removal of Voyageur Drive

Group G

- Concern that light at Valiant Drive will create more of a bottleneck
- Concern that cycle track beside traffic is actually not safe
- Like pathway on both sides
- Feel that need (with growth) 6 lanes to accommodate traffic – no HOV
- Perhaps relocate bikes to give more space

- Concern about parking on Shaganappi Trail – especially with future growth
- Concerned that trying to put too many services/uses in too small right-of-way

Group H

- Overall, not happy with any of the plans.
 - Need a safe pedestrian overpass somewhere along road.
 - If that much needs to be fit in, just buy out the properties
 - Use multi-use pathways rather than a cycle track
 - Have a HOV lane in center that switches am/pm
 - Ultimately those home owners on Voyageur Drive should have strongest say

Group I

- Street parking is essential for family, friends and visitors - just the lane parking is not enough
- Signalization on Valiant Drive is a great idea
- Want new attractive sound wall
- Want option to sell home to City now. Too much uncertainty!
- Reluctant to make upgrades
- Want sound barrier
- Visual screening from the road and sound attenuation are very important elements to consider

Group J

- Directly impacted residents would like to meet with team - buy them out and build the road you want
- Increase safety for kids and ability to have all needs met

Group K

- 3 out of 4 prefer Concept A because of minimal impact on residents
- 2 residents at the table have lived on Voyageur Drive for 45 years. Would not live there if front access was removed

Group L

- Concept A is liked the best (hated the least)
- Big concerns with Concept C
- Cycling route and HOV already somewhat exist
- Concern with people losing access to front of houses
- Concept A no light, instead make a rounded type at bridge or an accessible route
- Take into account that this is a stable community with not a lot of turnover

Group M

- Concept A the pathways are scary when shared by pedestrians and cyclists
- Concept C is the best for flow, keeps cyclists and pedestrians safe (separated – two separate paths)
- Problem is that it takes the parking away from residents and back lanes are unfit and too tight
- Need to accommodate garbage/recycling as well
- On Shaganappi Trail, parking is not feasible for safety

Group N

- Combine cycling and pedestrian infrastructure on one side of Shaganappi Trail
- Concern about property value impact.
- Safety concerns for homeowners facing Shaganappi Trail – children-traffic
- Reduced speed limits 50 km/h preferred
- Do not want to lose parking

Shaganappi Trail Corridor Study Community Conversation Comment Form Summary Nov. 26 and 28, 2013

About the Session

1. How did you hear about tonight's session? (Check all that apply.)

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| x11 Letter in the mail | x14 Community bold signs | x2 Word of mouth |
| x3 From other member of my household | x3 Community newsletter | x11 Road signs along Shaganappi Trail |
| x3 City news blog or social media | x17 Email | |
| x2 Other (please specify) | | |
| • Varsity Acres Presbyterian Church | | |

2. To what extent are you satisfied with the following aspects of tonight's session?

	Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Not Applicable
• Clarity of information provided	x26	x12	x3	x5	x0
• Project team's response to my questions	x26	x13	x5	x2	x1
• Opportunity to provide my input	x32	x10	x3	x1	x0
• Session location	x43	x2	x1	x1	x0
• Session time	x37	x8	x2	x0	x0

3. What did you like about the session format and activities tonight? What did you dislike? What can we do differently to make it better?

- Liked time for detailed discussion – maps and cross sections very clear
- I think the format was good, session was good but new concepts problematic
- Presented (3) options. Clearly layout advantage and disadvantages of each option group discussion.
- Concept A effectively eliminates access into my attached garage entrance/exit off and onto Voyageur Drive. Alley access not feasible.
- Like - facilitator to facilitate the discussion
- I really think there needs to be a separate session for home owners that front on Voyageur Drive. Their issues are different from the rest of the community's traffic issues. The concerns about buy-out or compensation are valid but separate from traffic flow.
- I liked that we were able to express our concerns and thoughts. I dislike the proposed ideas - it doesn't suit what we currently have although option A is better than B or C.
- None
- Session was ok but could not hear other people in the room (questions) and comments.
- I liked talking with my neighbors. I feel quite patronized not that there is any way around it. It's uncomfortable to be suggesting some of these changes.
- It's ok
- It's fine
- Options from April were not considered – i.e. not touching it - scrapping the plan. Reverse traffic flow at time of day like Memorial Drive.
- Adequate presentation, knowledgeable
- Liked the opportunity for discussion. It allowed some of the emotion to be dissipated.
- 1. I disliked the elementary approach it was like going back to group session skills read in the early 1980's. 2. I would like one on one session with the homeowners directly affected with the Shaganappi Trail Corridor Study and Councillor and Mayor Nenshi.
- Like small table group. Each table group received same information. Person for each table to write down ideas and concerns. Facilitator that answered question in clear-concise language.
- A larger facility (community center) the room was too small (people/tables) are too close together. It's too noisy and difficult to hear others speaking.

- The attendees appeared to have been selected from a previous session and it was not, in this sense, an open forum. The options presented appeared to ignore the input given at an earlier session. I think “minutes” should be kept of these meetings so that they can be referenced in subsequent meetings. The minutes should be agreed to by the participants or their representative.
- Didn't like small groups very little feeling for group consensus. No assurance that comments would be passed on to correct department
- Clear message
- Interesting – good
- Had all of my questions addressed
- Very good development plans but not easy to grasp right away (not here in April). Well presented by the first speaker however was hoping to hear more about plan for south of 40 Avenue.
- At one table 8, there were four homeowners on Shaganappi Trail. So focus of discussion was entirely on these people who resisted most.
- Zarina maintained friendly, happy disposition with “rounding-up the group” and kept it moving. Not as knowledgeable as she could have been (not her fault though).
- Too much noise! Difficulty hearing. Patience and good manners in allowing each person around table to speak.
- We had maps to look at to make things clear. We had a representative of the City. We all had chances to give our opinions.
- Worked fine
- Like: small group discussion with facilitator. Dislike: noise level made communication difficult.
- It is good to be able to have input
- Refer to #2
- All was well
- Good discussion but sometimes hard to hear, maybe set up noise panels
- Clarity “somewhat satisfied” because comparable streets (37 Street, 14 Street, Memorial Drive) great concept but too fast and need poster board for review and absorption. Project team response “somewhat satisfied” because few City staff had answers, just Chris Delanoy and 1-2 others have content knowledge.
- I did not care for any of the concepts and the information out there devalues properties and keeps everyone in limbo. To accommodate and do this properly you should do as was supposed to be done 30+ years ago which takes Voyageur Drive west houses. It is important to accommodate walker, bikers and buses.
- Start at 6:30 pm. Zarina did a great job of keeping us under control while ensuring we all got our input.
- I like the format as one gets an understanding of how people think about the problems. Perhaps a wrap-up at the end with open questions.
- The presentation did not clarify the situation. I did like the idea of breaking up into groups. This is where I began to understand each concept. Thank you for letting us have a chance to give our input. The group concept allowed for an exchange of ideas.

About the Project

1. **Please indicate the strengths and weaknesses of the concepts presented. Space is provided below for you to provide comments about the concepts. If you do not have any comments about a particular concept please leave the space blank.**

Concept A – One-way frontage roads in “constrained” section

- The best thing about this version is it minimizes intrusion on Voyageur Drive residences.
- I am a Voyageur Drive homeowner with a six year old son. I don't want a busy thoroughfare so close to my front yard. I realize this concept preserves Voyageur Drive in a reduced way but I think the City should just buy out Voyageur Drive homeowners to the west instead of making constrained changes that will lower our property values.
- You can buy me out and Concept “A” for *[the following]* reason above in 3 *[Concept A effectively eliminates access into my attached garage entrance/exit off and onto Voyageur Drive alley access not feasible]*
- Should be all documented in the discussion
- Continuous wide concrete very poor aesthetic
- Only option that allows us to keep what we currently have or something similar. Would still like to see a barrier wall or something that keeps pollution, dust, and dirt down.
- I like the parking and access to home on this concept. The least amount of change to property. The least effect on garbage and recycling pick-up.

- This one appealed to us
- Best one. Most important - must not see traffic from Voyageur Drive. Really want sound barrier wall.
- Best out of the three ideas, but not fabulous.
- It's ok. Mostly worried about Shaganappi Trail being closer to the house. More noise. Impact on property value. If chain link is converted to a sound barrier then will feel closed in. This concept is preferred.
- Problem: 1) property value decrease - will you pay for this?
- Second choice. Best of three poor choices. Forget access at Valiant Drive. Pedestrian overpass more important.
- Would prefer a pedestrian overpass on Varsity Drive on all options. Would prefer the lighted dual right turn off Crowchild Trail on all options to assist safe pedestrian/bike crossing. Less impact to residents. The property would still have some value.
- If you are not buying homeowners out, then the only people who should be answering this question are those people who live on those streets. Go door to door or call them and find out if they are okay with one-way streets.
- For all the concepts it was explained that Shaganappi Trail is to become a more "local" or neighbourhood" road even while increasing its size by 50%. This is not logically consistent. 1) I like "frontage" roads 2) I dislike meridians with plants or planters because of summer lane shut downs to water and weed. 3) I would like to see a dual turning lane in the center lane rather than plants as it gets traffic out of the other lanes when people want to turn. Memorial Drive is a complete mess for this reason.
- All weaknesses – absolutely no strengths for my property on Voyageur Drive NW.
- Needs to have a lower speed limit - pathways on each side are good.
- As a resident on Voyageur Drive this is the only option that is acceptable as long as the ½ meter buffer space is used to construct a noise abutment wall. I can't imagine the other residents of Calgary being happy with a speed reduction on Shaganappi Trail.
- I don't like concept A, the buffer space is a wasted space. I am against allowing space for a sound wall. Like the open concept. It is a safer concept as well.
- Path is jammed between two roads – people would get double noise level. Also no boulevard an issue.
- No
- No boulevard – not good
- Should have separation of cyclist and pedestrians. Do not like. Very crowded, a lot of hard surfaces. Little landscaping provided. Sound barrier needed. What type of vehicles will use Shaganappi Trail? Property values along Shaganappi Trail affected? Another alternative – buy homes on west side and widen to the west.
- Ok
- Feel there are other means to cut down on congestion on Shaganappi Trail – congestion fees (drivers to register and pay fee for traveling route)
- The concept would have the least impact for people living on Voyageur Drive. Zarina did a good job of handling the meeting and getting our ideas.
- Yes – best of the three, least impact on neighborhoods
- Sound barrier required. Concept A is preferred due to least amount of residential impact.
- Ok. But "C" looks at the long term future. Our table (3 vs. 1) preferred "A" which is short sighted and too "personal" not a "city wide" view.
- This is the one we liked best. Traffic flows best and has the least impact on residential property.
- Like path on east side only – most amenities accessed by pedestrians/cyclists are on east side – exception Market Mall however will be serviced by additional crosswalks at Valiant Drive. Dislike lack of aesthetics i.e. trees, green space etc.
- Best of all proposals. I do not support HOV lanes – main stream and traffic restricted to two lanes - why not allow total stream of traffic in use three lanes.
- Like that impact on homes minimal
- Strengths: minimal impact to residents along Voyageur Drive. Weaknesses: Little allowance for green space; need for a snow route; lack of bike/pedestrian pathway on both east and west sides (the division means that pedestrians or cyclists would have to cross to use respective allowed paths).
- Don't like; narrow street 3.3 vs. 3.5
- Not suitable for the needs. To take businesses away is bad. Too many lights on Shaganappi Trail.
- No too much devoted to roads
- This to me was the best one. It is difficult to please everyone I realize. This plan seemed to impact the businesses and homeowners the least. The ideas and minimal landscaping appeals to me. Why should the poor trees be subjected to heavy traffic? There was a place for people to walk and cycle.

Concept B – No frontage roads, provide on-street parking

- Not acceptable x2
- None
- Nope
- Shared cyclist/pedestrian paths are a safety concern
- I think you should have a session with Voyageur Drive homeowners only. I think you would discover that we would actually rather be bought out. The people who said in April NOT to buy us out (but to “preserve people’s homes”) were Varsity residents who do not live on Voyageur Drive.
- Buy out only option for Virginia Drive NW
- On-street parking does not seem compatible with six lanes of traffic. Mixed use pathway is okay but could be dangerous/conflicts due to “high” speed downhill moving cyclists going south. As part of a regional system it is likely to cater to commuter cyclists at least on weekdays.
- Although we would still have parking it seems that it will be dangerous to park in front with small children.
- 2nd favourite option but dislike main artery parking and results in rear laneway congestion
- Do not like parking on main artery (safety)
- Losing Voyageur Drive is major in terms of access/property value. Worried about safety of on-street parking. Worried about being plowed in the winter. Safety concerns with the loss of fencing.
- Problem: 1. Property value decrease- will you pay for this? 2. No access for emergency vehicles. 3. No parking if it snows, limited in back alley (it’s one lane)! 4. How do I parallel park or access my garage from a 70 km/h roadway? 5. I lose my garage on the front of my house!
- Third choice. Plenty to dislike about this flow. Too many neighbours have their driveways at the front.
- Better than Concept C in that it allows some parking
- All weakness - absolutely no strengths for my property
- This I think is the best of the 3 concepts, however it still has negative properties. The reduced speed is positive (50km/h) – place to park on both sides of Voyageur Drive. Walking path on east side is great.
- There should be no parking on Shaganappi Trail
- 1) A six-lane high speed road with on-street parking – nice 2) A bike lane within four blocks of a bike path. Face it; the three people who will use it will feel more secure on the path. And what is with all these bike lanes? When everyone at City Hall including our mayor commits themselves to bike transportation, then and only then will you have the moral secession to foist this nonsense on the rest of us.
- Again as a resident on Voyageur Drive this option is completely unacceptable. Parking and front door access off Shaganappi Trail is not an option! Our driveway (and our neighbours) are not identified on the maps provided i.e. total driveways to be relocated are at least 11 not 9.
- Ideal option. It connects all Varsity neighborhoods with a pathway, adds parking and provides more green (boulevard). I also like the 50 km/h vs. the 60 km/h in the other two options.
- Parking next to boulevard is poor and then in pathway – more quiet. It is better and safer to have lane for parking next to boulevard and away from bus (blue).
- I think this option answers concerns – I like this as it has paths, HOV on both sides and has green boulevards on both sides.
- Preferable but what do current residents think? Like the boulevard and parking options.
- Like better than concept A. Better for residents on Voyageur Drive. Traffic sound a concern. Like landscaping. Extend driveway from home to parking lane.
- No need to change. Emotional input because my house is located on frontage road.
- If you live on Voyageur Drive and are the only one in your vehicle, how do you get from the middle lane to get to the parking lane in front of your home?
- Good balance between “A” and “C”. Like that it will slow speed from 70 km/h to 60 or 50 km/h.
- Could use bike traffic on one side and pedestrian traffic on the other?
- Weaknesses: need for snow route, parking on Shaganappi Trail means safety concerns
- Parking is dangerous with HOV next to it
- Not acceptable for only taking Voyageur Drive. It’s best to do it right and take homes because quality of life will diminish tremendously. Safety of people living currently along Voyageur Drive is in question with congestion. HOV, pedestrian and bikes are a great idea.
- I did not like the idea of parking on Shaganappi Trail. To me it is too dangerous for such a busy corridor. Lots of business and home owners seemed to be impacted by this plan. Pedestrians and cyclists are accommodated in this plan which is a good point. This was my least favorite plan.

Concept C – No frontage roads, provide cycle tracks

- Not acceptable x2
- Did not like
- Nope
- Like the separation of cycle and pedestrian paths - a safety issue. HOV lane an asset, particularly for future bus use in corridor.
- You have to admit that Memorial Drive paving scenario is not ideal. We don't want that.
- Buy out only option for Virginia Drive NW
- Best one because more pathways/sidewalk
- Prefer a cycle track over parking. Better visibility, quieter, promotes cycle community. I like the separate cycle track but it doesn't necessarily need to be on both sides.
- Problem: 1. Property value decrease – will you pay for this? 2. No access for emergency vehicles. 3. No parking. 4. I own a garage I could no longer use, will you pay for this cost? 5. No one will buy my house now.
- Dislike this option - feel as though we would be living in some faraway place - we can't have friends and family over without making it difficult to find parking.
- Fourth choice. Forget the bike lanes! This is really poor.
- Worst option, nightmare for rear laneway and garage access to property due to all parking moving to rear laneway and limited access for garbage pick-up.
- No Parking for residents, makes alleys very busy - not good.
- No parking for houses facing Shaganappi Trail. This concept is not preferred.
- Not acceptable. Need to keep parking.
- Won't be liveable without parking for residents and guests
- All weakness - absolutely no strengths for my property
- The houses have a busy roadway out their front door - children and pets at risk to be safe. Rear lane not wide enough to be easy access. No parking for visitors' vehicles.
- No cycle tracks. No bike paths on major roads.
- See above [1) A 6 lane high speed road with on street parking – nice 2) A bike lane within 4 blocks of a bike path. Face it; the 3 people who will use it will feel more secure on the path. And what is with all these bike lanes? When everyone at city hall including our mayor commits themselves to bike transportation then and only then will you have the moral secession to foist this nonsense on the rest of us]. No HOV lanes. There are no buses on Shaganappi Trail so where is the need for HOV?
- As Concept B above except that lane parking and access is not an option! No lighting, recycling and garbage bins everywhere! Don't think there is anywhere in the city that a resident is required to access their house from a lane only. Is it not against City bylaws to park in a lane? What if we are on vacation for a few weeks and don't move our car?
- Option C is ok, but with option B, cyclists can use the pathway instead
- No parking for residents
- No cycle tracks – best of worst
- Poor as no one can access for residents and guests
- Like the best. More landscaping – “softer”. Accommodates all users – cyclists and pedestrians and separates cyclists and pedestrians. Like wider buffer.
- Best option
- Same as above [No need to change. Emotional input because my house is located on frontage road.]
- This is a major impact as there is no parking in the front of Voyageur Drive
- Dislike impact to homeowners – loss of frontage access and parking
- Like bike and walk traffic separate
- Strengths: more green spaces, good delineation of all vehicle uses. Weaknesses: no parking in driveways, front of residences
- Best choice but for residents along Shaganappi Trail it is difficult; City should ensure they will get financial assistance for relocating parking.
- Not acceptable – too congested
- Like this concept but perhaps others like paths
- This one is my second choice. It does provide safe pedestrian walks and a separate road for cyclists. It will impact homeowners on Voyageur Drive which is a draw back. Too many trees which restrict view and even block views. There is also the disadvantage of people losing their street parking. Again here are businesses and homeowners which are impacted.

2. Please share any other comments you may have about the Shaganappi Trail Corridor Study.

- None x3
- With 50 km/h speed limit, sound barriers not needed.
- I thank The City for coming up with new concepts based on feedback, but the new concepts are not good for Voyageur Drive homeowners and their families (original concept better than the one that expands to the west). Also be honest and transparent with us about the timeline. We deserve to know ASAP about any and all eventualities! Thank you very much, City of Calgary!
- Good session
- I don't live in the impacted area. If you were put in their shoes, there are limited options.
- For all options am in favour of 1. Dual lane merge onto southbound Shaganappi Trail - improves safety for pedestrians vs. current free-flow merge. 2. Traffic lights at Valiant Drive 3. Would really like pedestrian overpass at Varsity Drive safer for kids crossing to Varsity Acres elementary school and community center and ice rink 4. Support for lower speed limit at 50 km/h.
- Although I had huge concerns about them buying out my house and making me have to relocate, the options don't make any of the uncertainties go away or make me feel comfortable putting much investment into my home (i.e. renovation etc.) a buyout still doesn't resolve things either because I can't buy back into Varsity easily with market value of homes on Voyageur Drive.
- First choice – leave alone.
- Option D - get rid of this why do we need a road to nowhere? A bottleneck at 2-lane Memorial Drive. Option E: Why not lane reversal?
- Some photo realistic visuals would really help with visualization. Build a tunnel under the constrained area from Varsity Drive to Crowchild Trail. This allow for an open green space between east and west Voyageur Drive.
- Should City just buy out properties and do it right rather than do a constrained situation. The City did it on Glenmore Trail.
- Shaganappi dead ends at the river - what will happen to that intersection?
- 1. Would you be so kind to clarify what is the eventual expected outcome of the study? 2. I would be pleased to have a one-on-one meeting, including a representative from your Department, Ward Sutherland, Ward 1 Councillor, Varsity Acres and Mayor Naheed Nenshi or his representative to present my case. As well, I believe it would be in the best interest of all residents who are directly effected on both the east and west sides of Shaganappi to meet with your department, Ward Sutherland, Ward 1 Councillor, Varsity Acres and Mayor Naheed Nenshi or his representative to present their case and eventually, perhaps a committee could be struck to with the study at all times if the study is to continue. Would you be kind enough to advise if this could be arranged? 3. Is/has the Varsity Community Association been totally informed and involved in the Shaganappi Trail Corridor Study from the onset? 4. Would you be so kind to identify all stakeholders? 5. What became of the Crowchild Trail Study? 6. Has it been realized that Shaganappi Trail finishes at Bowness Road N.W.? 7. Before proceeding further with the Shaganappi Trail Corridor Study, perhaps consideration should be given to the redesign of the interchange at 16th Avenue; the proposed West Campus Development; and currently under construction The Groves of Varsity? All will have major impact, including traffic on the community of Varsity Acres.
- I believe the only way to handle the problem is to buy out homes on a whole side of Voyageur Drive be it west or east side to really make a positive impact. Not convinced that Valiant Drive option – traffic light and removal of overpass will make a positive difference for our area. The eliminations of multiple entrances/exits from gas stations and corner store is a great idea! Thank you for your work. I would like to attend the spring session.
- The employees of The City appear to want us to bike or walk but reality must be faced. We don't live in New York, Vancouver, or L.A. We live in a cold climate and we are going to drive cars. Eliminating roads will not force us not to. Riding a bike, walking, or taking transit does not work when you have two kids in tow and ten bags of groceries, and -20°C. We should not be working to make Calgary an unfriendly city for families which seems to be what we are now doing. How many at City Hall who have families, bike or walk, or use transit (even though City Hall has a stop outside the door)? We see they have kept the nice big parking behind their building where most others (parking lots) downtown have disappeared.
- Concept D - Leave it alone. I am very well aware that these “community” sessions exist only so that you can say they have occurred and with diverse responses you can do whatever it is you want to do. A reasonable if somewhat transparent strategy but it would be nice if you stuck to a few of your promises. I.e. Where is the grade separated interchange at 32 Avenue/Shaganappi Trail that was to be built before the Market Mall expansion?
- A lot of work for a road that goes nowhere. Because of the severe impact on the residents of Voyageur Drive, this should logically be a discussion between the City and them only. If either B or C were considered, buy out of property by the City would be mandatory. If concept A was adopted, there would need to be some financial compensation.

- I like downgrading Shaganappi Trail and introducing a traffic light at Valiant Drive. (It discourages heavy traffic on Shaganappi Trail).
- Bicycle and pedestrian path issue. On one side of trail should be cyclists and the other side pedestrians. Together divided by line is unsafe. Again: left side of trail for cyclists, right side of trail for pedestrians. I prefer plan B.
- No bike lanes, no HOV, DISLIKE concept A, B, & C – would prefer a “real” other choice. A, B, & C are basically same thing.
- I think there should still be pedestrian overpasses – pedestrians avoid high traffic intersections. Is there any way to restrict traffic to prevent shortcutting e.g. residents can turn on to Shaganappi Trail from Valiant Drive/Varsity Drive/40 Avenue and shortcutting is minimized e.g. cannot turn left onto 40 Avenue from Shaganappi Trail.
- Concept D – buy out all west Shaganappi homes
- I feel changes can be made by reducing congestion by “fees” for road usage or use by alternate license plate numbers on certain days
- The number of intersections presents a dangerous crossing for bikes and pedestrians
- I do not support HOV lanes – are there any in Calgary? How do they work? Is there a net benefit?
- HOV lane could be used by all and not a special lane
- 1. Hard to judge concept A, B, & C without summative perspective of road capacity because widths/lane types/speed limit/additional signalled intersections all variable. And capacity alone not only end result of interest, need to understand variation in free flow of the traffic multimode vehicle/bike/pedestrian. 2. City needs to get past concern about expropriation cost and emotion and show budget around land matters as affects support for alternatives. 3. Land use re-designation to higher density along adjacent lots should be considered on all options since measured land value helps assuage other concerns and is appropriate along an arterial road.
- Need to be fair to residents of Voyageur Drive west side. Option should be to re-designate and buy people out. Already with the low income housing going in at the old Turbo site will impact properties (some – re: traffic and parking). Quality of life is diminishing at the current state continually. Some decisions need to be addressed now! None of tonight’s concepts are acceptable. Compensation for people living along Voyageur Drive is needed. Bike and pedestrian lanes – fantastic! Re-designate Voyageur Drive west condos along the part between Varsity Drive and Crowchild Trail would be attractive and add more tax money and beauty to the area!
- We seem to be doing a 30-year plan with today’s restrictions
- If you do this it must be re-zoned for mixed use on each side
- Thank you for providing us a chance to give our input. I felt the company genuinely wanted to hear our feedback. I did not feel The City was that interested in our feedback. I would like to suggest a tunnel for pedestrian crossing across Shaganappi Trail. Every day I go through this intersection. Each day I see near misses, and pedestrians risk their lives crossing as drivers do not wait for them to safely reach safety of a median or the sidewalk. It is dangerous for drivers too as a pedestrian may cross just as they are about to turn. A less expensive alternative is to provide arrows on Varsity Drive to turn to Shaganappi Trail. If drivers were allowed to turn only on the arrow, pedestrians could cross when they see the walk signal after the arrows have turned off and only straight through traffic flows. Also I wonder if HOV lanes could be placed in the center so they do not interfere with drivers who want to turn.