



*Spring Creek*

M O U N T A I N V I L L A G E

**The Area Redevelopment Plan  
Public Consultation Report & Surveys**

November 2003

Compiled by  
Southwell Trapp & Associates Ltd.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.0 PURPOSE OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT PLAN</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3.0 RESIDENTS SURVEY DATA</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4.0 PUBLIC QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>5.0 RESTWELL AREA REDEVELOPMENT STUDY TEAM MEETING #1</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6.0 RESTWELL AREA REDEVELOPMENT STUDY TEAM MEETING #2</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>7.0 SPRING CREEK MOUNTAIN VILLAGE STUDY TEAM MEETING #3</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>8.0 SPRING CREEK MOUNTAIN VILLAGE STUDY TEAM MEETING #4</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>APPENDIX A</b>	<b>48</b>

## **1.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS**

Restwell has provided Canmore residents with an important source of entry level housing since the late 1950s for more than 1000 people, including permanent residents and seasonal residents.

These residents have been an important consideration in the redevelopment plans for Restwell and they have been provided with various opportunities to voice their opinions and give their feedback during the planning process.

A comprehensive consultation program was undertaken throughout the preparation of the Area Redevelopment Plan. The consultation program had four main components:

- 1.1 **Website:** An internet website "restwellarp.com" has been established to post an extensive list of materials including the Terms of Reference, open house summary information, supporting technical information, maps, pictures and contact information. A comment section solicits feedback from Restwell residents and the general public.
- 1.2 **Restwell Residents Surveys and Public Open Houses:** To gather demographic information and determine residents' opinion about the redevelopment, the owner of Restwell Trailer Park surveyed residents in May 2002. This was followed by a more extensive survey of residents conducted by The Praxis Group, as part of the Socio-economic Impact Assessment, in December 2002. Public consultation has been through open house discussion and presentations to Restwell residents and the general public.
- 1.3 **Study Team – Working Committee:** A Study Team committee consisting of representatives from the consulting team, Town of Canmore administration and Restwell residents was formed at the project outset. The committee met at strategic times to review the Terms of Reference, draft Development Principles and Concept Plans.
- 1.4 **Council Updates:** Council was updated on the progress of the study typically following each public open house.

**Key Dates:** The key consultation program dates are shown on Table 1 below.

DATE	ACTIVITY
April 14/02	Restwell Residents - Presentation
September 15/02	Public Open House - Terms of Reference
October 8/02	Council Update
October 15/02	Terms of Reference approved by Council
January Feb./03	Draft Development Principles prepared
February 3/03	Study Team Committee Meeting
February 25/03	Public Open House - Development Principles
June 19/03	Study Team Committee Meeting
June 23/03	Public Open House - Concept Plan Presentation
June 24/03	Council Update
October 20/03	Study Team Committee (review of draft ARP)
November 6/03	Public Open House
December ??/03	To Council (First Reading)

The following report is intended to provide an overview of the process undergone to maintain open communication, receive feedback and to provide the residents with an overall sense of community response to the redevelopment plans.

## ***2.0 PURPOSE OF THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT PLAN***

The purpose of the ARP for the Restwell area is to establish a pattern and phasing of land use redevelopment for the existing trailer park. In preparing the ARP, the following principles will serve to guide the establishment of the policies.

- To develop a plan that balances the existing needs of the Park while examining development opportunities on a staged basis.
- To ensure the ARP is consistent with the provisions of the Municipal Government Act (MGA), and the Town's Municipal Development Plan.
- To establish an ARP that takes into consideration the boundaries of the environmentally sensitive areas.
- To establish an ARP that takes into consideration the existing residents of the Restwell Trailer Park.
- To establish a planning process which ensures that the public are fully informed of and have opportunities for formal input as well as informally through information sessions and open houses during the ARP process, and its associated policies as they evolve.
- To establish a timeframe for the adoption of the ARP.

### **3.0 RESIDENTS SURVEY DATA**

The Survey was distributed to the Residents of the Restwell Trailer Park at the end of April 2002. The Survey was carried out to determine the demographics of the Trailer Park and to obtain initial input from the Residents with regard to what they see for the future of the Trailer Park. Other general information was also acquired during the Survey. The results are summarised below and a copy of the survey along with the responses displayed graphically can be found in Appendix A.

1. 99% of Residents own their trailer.
2. 50% of Residents have resided in the Park for a minimum of 5 years.
3. 44% of Residents plan on living in the Park long term. 30% have no definite plans on how long they will stay.
4. If having to move, only 3% would choose another mobile home. 38% have no preference and there is an even division between a preference to single family and multi-family dwellings.
5. There is a relatively even breakdown between the different demographic age group
6. 37% of homes do not have anyone currently working in Canmore.
7. 24% of homes have someone working outside of Canmore.
8. Out of 139 responses, 29% of homes have at least one retired resident.
9. 98% of respondent's live in their homes full time.
10. 31% of the respondent's homes are less than 13 years old. 59% of Residents homes are between 20 and 35 years of age.
11. Residents have a higher perceived value of their homes as indicated by the property taxes paid by Residents in the year 2001. 44% of Residents paid between \$151 - \$250 last year, which is at the low end of the tax scale.
12. 80% of respondents would prefer to see Option 'B' (see Appendix A) go forward with rental rates remaining at a lower than market rate with development being phased over several years.

## **4.0 PUBLIC QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS**

October 2002

**Comment:**

What would it be like to live out the rest of your life with construction traffic in front of your home? Our children will have to negotiate heavy equipment, and endless streams of associated construction vehicles. This would continue through their nursery, primary, and secondary school, past university and further still before it is all ended. Please do not let this project go on and on. Even two to five years is a long time to endure. Perhaps you should add an additional access just for construction traffic to reduce disruption with existing homeowners, downtown traffic flow and emergency access. One small mishap could block 7<sup>th</sup> Street and not allow emergency vehicles to respond to a call. I worry about my two-year-old daughter's safety with respect to the construction traffic that will be required to complete this project. It is very likely that it will never be safe enough for her to ride her bike on the sidewalk in front of our home.

**Response:**

We would not go forward with this project without a new access to Bow Valley Trail. Currently Restwell has 220 homes and over 250 RV sites which already generate too much traffic for just one exit. A new road to Bow Valley Trail would be the main construction road. I am not promising that volumes will go down on the road in front of your home, but they will not go up.

February 2003

**Question:**

I thought I heard you say that if you couldn't have the second access road where you have shown it, you would not develop at all, and you would sell. Was that correct?

**Response:**

I believe that a second access is needed if redevelopment is to proceed. I currently have a tentative agreement with a landowner for this second access and the Town's Engineering Dept. is supportive of it. If for some reason this did not go forward, and the only option was to take a second road to South Canmore or put more traffic Down Town, I would not proceed. What would I do then is a big question. I do not believe I would plan to own Restwell and operate it for the next 20 – 30 years the way it is. I am a developer and therefore I probably would put it back up for sale and move on. I am very confident this is not the case and the second access is attainable.

February 2003

**Comment:**

At the meeting it was mentioned that the proposed condos are only going to be 700 square feet. I really think that 700 square feet is too small, for a couple, let alone a family, and that they should be at least 1000 square feet. I know that this is very preliminary, however I do believe as I mentioned that 700s square feet is just too small, and even if these are the base models starting in the early \$100,000 then even if there are larger units available I am sure they would be much, much more expensive.

I hope that you would reconsider the size of these units prior to going ahead with any of these plans.

March 2003

**Comment:**

The only concern I have coming out of the meeting is about your comment that if we can't get approval for the second access road – you will sell off Restwell. This is understandable – but very scary. What do you see as the possibility of not getting approval? In your preliminary talks with those concerned (CPR, the Town, businesses) has there been any negative feedback?

I quite like the name 'Spring Creek Mountain Village' (much nicer than Restwell), but it is rather long. I think people will shorten it rather than say the whole thing – perhaps we should pick a name that won't be shortened? I kind of like 'The Village' – for what it is worth!

March 2003

**Comment:**

Great plan. I especially like the second connection to Bow Valley Trail, the plan to discourage short cutting, the proposed trail network, the emphasis on pedestrian connections to downtown, the separation of pedestrians and cyclists from vehicle traffic as much as possible, the new commercial at the north end, and accommodating existing resident's wishes. Great web site, simple to use and it's nice to see the aerial photo and other maps in readable size. As a part time resident of south Canmore, I'd like to see the existing pedestrian bridge over the creek upgraded and connected to the pathway on the west side of the creek and a second pedestrian bridge over the creek at the south end of the development. I would also like to see pedestrian and cyclist facilities connecting to bow Valley Trail. I look forward to more detailed plans in the future.

March 2003

**Comment:**

I would just like to compliment you on your presentation, and we are glad we attended. We have a couple questions that hopefully you may have the answers to, of course hinging on how the development goes. We definitely are interested in the Senior Housing units and if possible would like to get in on the initial stage. Like many seniors presently in the park we are on a fixed income.

Granted that everything runs smoothly in the development plans, at what stage would the seniors development be available (i.e. would it be one of the first or second or whatever phase)? By the time the units would be available we would be looking at down sizing to a one bedroom. Would it be possible sometime in the future for you to purchase this our present home, a model 1992 from us, and the funds would go towards a down payment on a senior's residence in the Park? At our age, we wonder if a financial institute will give us a mortgage. We realise that nothing is written in stone, and would just like to hear your thoughts. We wish you good luck in your ambitious and exciting development.

**Comment:**

As a member of an older couple that is worried that they might not have a home in the future, it's all fine and dandy to say that there is nothing to worry about but, when you are hitting 80 you have a totally different outlook. In my opinion there is pride before the fall, do you understand? Honestly? Do you really have sympathy for the residents of the trailer court and what happens to their future of relocating them?

**Comment:**

Something that concerned me greatly was a comment made by Mr. Baillie during your presentation to Council. He had stated that he expected you to keep the price of the units affordable on a continual basis. Now I may be wrong in interpreting this statement, but is he saying that the individuals that buy these units should not make a profit if they sell, or very little? I was very upset with this. By and far the majority of the individuals in Restwell are not well off at all, and if there is anyone in this whole wide world that deserves to make a profit (as others selling their property in this valley have done) it is them. I would be quite angry if there were restrictions made on these individuals as to the profit that they would deservedly be making on the sale of their property (if they so choose). I realise that the Town is no doubt trying to have the same restrictions as Banff housing Corporation had, however, I don't think that it is your obligation to do that. Maybe this is something that their own Housing Corporation should be doing, that is if they ever get any of their projects off the ground. Are there any even on the roster to be built? I have not seen any to date. This is a real sore spot for me.

**Comment:**

My wife and I spent a week in the Restwell Trailer Park last year. We enjoyed it very much and returned for another 5 nights last long weekend. We enjoy camping and the outdoors, and normally try to avoid highly developed campgrounds. However we find that this campground is unique and very pleasant to be at. The reasons we enjoy it are - that it is very close to the trail system within the Town of Canmore, it is within walking distance to the down town area, the view is fantastic, there are creeks on both sides, the service is very good and although the camping stalls are very tight they are good and well maintained. It appears to me that most of the older Town of Canmore is located within the Bow River flood plain. The campground is only few feet above the water level in the creeks. Therefore there is always a slight chance of flooding which makes permanent development more risky than those built up on the hillsides.

We would regret to see this site redevelop and have the campsites disappear.

**Comment:**

I was just reading through your web site and I have to compliment you on the terrific work you have done.

**Suggestion:**

I was wondering if you are going to consider allowing the future homeowners to do some sweat equity with their condo that they would be purchasing? I was thinking that it is a great way to decrease the purchase cost and it gives the homeowner an opportunity to do some hands on work with their condo (the extent to which as little or as much as they desire.)

**Comment:**

You should not continue with the development because it will create stress among the families already struggling to live in the Restwell area.



**Comment:**

My parents and I enjoyed the presentation last week. There were a couple of things that my parents asked me to ask you/comment on. The first is that you asked with regards to commercial development and what the potential homeowners desired. Both mom and dad commented that they would like to see less rather than more commercial development in this area. Also we talked to, and I believe it was, John the contractor with regards to this development. My parents are interested in the row townhouses with the attached garages. When talking to John, he mentioned they would be about 2000 square feet. Are you going to have any designs of the townhouses that would be about 1200 square feet? It would be much more affordable and of course two elderly people really don't need such large dwellings. Of note, I was really impressed with the 'arrangement' you have come up with with the Town. I think the perpetually affordable housing is good – and if the Town chooses not to manage it or deal with it then it is an open market (at least that is how I understood the arrangement to be). It puts the onus back on the Town and you have upheld your end of the deal. Very well done.

## **5.0 RESTWELL AREA REDEVELOPMENT STUDY TEAM MEETING #1**

January 29, 2003

ATTENDANTS: Thomas Debicki (Marshall Tittlemore Architects); Bill Marshall (Marshall Tittlemore Architects)  
Terry Riva (Town of Canmore); Carol Stefan (Golden and Associates)  
Richard Roberts (Axys); Ralf Southwell (Southwell Trapp and Associates)  
Oscar Regier (Town of Canmore); Ron Sadesky (Mountain Engineering)  
Marilyn Willox (Restwell Resident); Fran McTaggart (Restwell Resident)  
Cindy Cates (Eagle Terrace); Chris Laing (Town of Canmore)  
Brenda Caston (FCSS); Andrea Plastiras (Town of Canmore)  
Frank Kernick, Restwell Trailer Park

12:30 Frank: - gave overview of history and lands purchase  
- discussed location of lands; heart of town, creeks, downtown location and views  
- future and past servicing and infrastructure issues  
- obtaining residents input through open house and mail out questionnaires  
- asked all in attendance to write 2 paragraphs of what we think should be on the Restwell site in 20 year  
- introductions around the table were done

Brenda: Asked if all land to be developed?

Frank: No. Road accesses and by creek.

Fran Sell lots?

Frank open

RON

- everything for everybody; hotels, high and low end mixes
- restaurants, trails, shops
- pictured Bragg Creek with the shops and boardwalks

BRENDA

- hadn't really thought about it before
- work with FCSS and social environmental assessment and needs for housing for families with young, young adults and seniors
- neighbourhoods and communities be inclusive not exclusive
- inviting place for all to enjoy; bird watching, trees
- access make inviting
- affordable housing; multi family – inter generational
- environmentally self sustaining

ANDREA

- vibrant residential; not as much commercial
- possibly 2 accesses
- focus on residential uses; houses medium to high; townhouse/apartments (seniors housing)
- affordable housing
- location; opportunity to do traditional
- network of trails across freeway
- integration of creeks; environmental assets

OSCAR

- unique aspect, uses, retain through redevelopment
- mix of people in park
- refer to survey of residents and income
- low cost; not high end

RICHARD

Future of Restwell in 20 – 30 years

Prime focal point in Canmore

- a crossing point
- a “named place” own identity

A mix of uses – open space, residential and small commercial centre (local)

A gathering place for Canmorians – events and activities – summer and winter.

A unique identity – but focus on natural setting

A pedestrian focus – walk to work, school, town, shopping

An environmental conservation focus in the “Years of Water”  
“Decades of Kyoto”

MARILYN

Restwell should remain as the site of homes serving a variety of needs. In other words, the residents should be able to rent or own their home, they should have a number of choices of “housing styles – apt/condo, townhouse, row/house etc. They should also still be able to live in a mobile or manufactured home if they desire.

Various age groups should be accommodated e.g.: seniors housing or family housing. The overall site should be creatively yet naturally landscaped, with some park areas. It should have well planned infrastructure – i.e. roads, sidewalks, parking and access or entry roads. The site would and more importantly, the residents, would undoubtedly benefit from some type of community centre with a good variety of amenities.

Affordable – for Restwell \$10,000 to \$100,000

CAROL

- perspective more from the environmental side
- increase green space; formalise trail systems
- affordable – not big
- community centre

CHRIS

- reiterate what Brenda and Richard said
- social and ecological
- affordable
- combine with ecological guidelines using storm water, creeks, and building construction

BILL

- Transition from the highway; oasis island; Banff Ave.
- An exciting destination in community not an island
- A place of many experiences
- A master planned community that evolves, grows and achieves it full range of uses over time

Natural it is  
Assets Interpreted

- Phased to expand upon and embrace its natural green borders, water
- extension of Main Streets, pedestrian, commercial activities
- high emphasis on pedestrian, bicycle, movement pathways
- clever parking solution - circulation
- a central hub around and community asset; horse drawn trail rides

BILL (con't)

- a beautiful "Restwell Park"
- streets that are planned to embrace views embrace
- foot bridges – links
- more urban scaled housing 3-4
- seniors
- boutique hotels/restaurants
- family oriented
- central energy facility
- ground source heating/cooling
- deed restricted co-ops
- link "Boardwalk" to pedestrian boardwalk and site

Vision

FRAN

- multi residential; bungalow – low income seniors homes
- smaller one storey east and south side
- possibly condos or townhouses near the front of the park
- west side along Spring Creek could mirror the larger homes already in existence across the creek
- our secret park

TERI

- discussed access across creek; 4th street

THOMAS

- A blended community developed with clear respect for the land and for the
- Canmorians.
- well connected to downtown (part of town) location and beauty
- with excellent pedestrian and bike connections
- trails to schools/sport and rec. and shopping
- vehicle traffic – quick in-out – work with town
- varied density – averaging with medium
- varied building types and varied income groups and ages

Building: live/work studio?; co-op residences? ; retirement homes

Types: few single family; townhouses, duplexes and Stacked townhouses; few apartments

- land too large for single type
- friendly streetscapes, parkland, playgrounds
- safe, encouraging pedestrian traffic, encourage neighbour interactions
- created/preserved views; land- friendly development
- some commercial but no competition with downtown
- speciality hotels, intimate restaurants as a destination location
- convenience store, etc, day-care – local use

#### RALF

- mobile homes will go – too low density
- roads – creeks; huge room for improvement
- some commercial is important; shops with residents above
- flow of traffic in and out; don't want short cuts
- phasing; how over time to make it all work

#### AUTHOR

Restwell should be a unique residential neighbourhood integrated with the surrounding areas that reflect its history and current characteristics. A strong need and desire has been expressed by residents that housing be modest and affordable, yet with basic amenities to take advantage of the location and environmental attributes.

The space must be "open" to the rest the community. It is a spectacular piece of land for residents and visitors to be invited into to enjoy the scenery and close proximity to "downtown"

So a mix of housing for 1. Families 2. Young adult service industry workers and retired residents. The homes must be safe and adequate for the needs of these 3 populations.

Opportunities for leisure activities would be wonderful i.e. bird watching, parks/picnic areas, trail systems.

Environmentally sustainable and self-sustaining row houses, townhouses, "communal" living, four plexes etc. Less emphasis or no emphasis on single family dwellings.

Plant trees

Incorporate space for "neighbourhood interaction" meeting spaces (not necessarily "rec. rooms")

Green space w/bike and pedestrian paths

small parks w/benches

- mix of housing units: no big apartments but increased density, different costs
- a few luxury homes
- small businesses
- east side of Policeman Creek – formal path – benches – green space for bird watching
- recreation/community centre for local residents
- no big commercial that brings in lots of traffic
- community feel

FRANK

- personal perspective and potential of redevelopment
- front: some form of commercial; boutique hotel
- closer to other community amenities; restaurant overlooking creek
- experience community within the community
- stay close to town centre as a connection
- middle: mix of housing; seniors (ref. to Medican project) right project wrong location; a lot of seniors don't drive; access to downtown for seniors
- end: inside massing with lower density towards creek
- roads and creeks: perimeter trails owned by community
- meet the needs of existing community residents
- new condo = old trailer price not comparable
- not responsible for social housing needs of the Town
- goal: to take responsibility for the people that live there now
- access: referred to 1980 ASP

Questions:

Carol: Will you keep RV site?

Frank: They'll go with the phasing, they're not economical

Oscar: Lands are privately owned, turn over to public? Reference to infrastructure and costs

Frank: Not sure, reality to sub divide. ER and MR sites

- Putting GeoThermo heating in home in Invermere. It is about 1/4 of the cost.
- Ref. To Kyoto Accord
- Look at energy efficient designs.
- unique opportunity here; innovative in ability to plan development (65 acres with 50+ acres of developable/redevelopable land)

## **5.1 REVIEW OF STUDIES COMPLETED TO DATE**

Hard copies handed out and will also be posted on web site.

RON Gave overview of Engineering Status Report.

Ron: added that water elevations, temperatures are being tested weekly

Frank: study for contamination was a bank requirement

Andrea: Asked if.... existing entrance on 5th Ave to Restwell is classified as a collected roadway.....was a "Stub"

RICHARD Gave overview of draft Restwell Trailer Park Resident Questionnaire  
Approximately a 75% response

Marilyn: As a resident found questionnaire hard to fill out  
Depends on? Depends on Frank?

CAROL Gave overview of Preliminary Impact Statement prepared by Golden

Carol/Chris: - refers to area at end of Park which will require education of the people to ensure protected amount of silt in creek and the effect of fish spawning there is no storm management

Frank: - brought up the current location of road salt stock by creek and looking at having a new location on site away from the creek  
 - environmental management must be part of design and planning

Fran: - Policeman Creek has been dry, she didn't remember it ever  
 Being dry when growing up.

Frank: - remembers both creeks being dry around 30 years ago

Teri: Wolf Willow – rare? Town has abundance

Carol: Rare – Provincially Common in town- locally abundant but regionally not

Andrea: Is the Wolf Willow the area for the 2nd access?

Frank: No

Bill: Watercourse needs to be protected. Enhance them by deepening areas and redirecting? What is longevity? Is it waning?

Teri: Fish and Wildlife say it is intact and are reintroducing brown trout

Frank: Restwell currently cleans creek once per year; not good in the past; strong management needed in the future  
 Set backs, storm water management

Oscar: Referred to ground water data being collected and the changes affecting data depending on weather, glacier melts, etc.

## **5.2 DEVELOP DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPALS**

### **5.2.1 RELOCATION OF EXISTING RESIDENTS**

Bill: Why 15 years?

Frank: Minimum time to get stuff done.

Andrea: Freedom 55!

Brenda: Good time frame for people looking forward to a change with their families growing.

Ralf: If Frank doesn't own the land in the future will council abide by guidelines if passed?

Frank: If approved by council the new owner would have to abide.  
 Changes would have to go through the system.

Bill: Suggested incorporating the relocation section into the rental Agreement for Restwell residents.

Frank: Maybe. As an appendix. It would give the residents a sense of Security.

### **5.2.2 LAND USE AND DENSITY**

#### **5.2.2.1 MIXED USE**

Marilyn: What are % based on? % tax base

Frank: Numbers from Growth Management Plan are at  
 80% Residential 20% Commercial today

Oscar: Commercial development would require larger infrastructure  
40% commercial is on the high side  
As development phased maybe look back

Frank: We need to plan for infrastructure at the start  
Say 40% Maximum?  
Banff is the reverse with higher commercial lower residential. As Banff builds out its commercial the trend  
Will change and Canmore will see a higher commercial base

Thomas: Definitions of what commercial is: Is senior housing commercial? Etc.

Bill: Numbers are based on tax then.

Thomas: May not need to mention numbers – maybe note minimum 40%

### 5.2.2.2 DENSITY

#2 Andrea: Percentage seems high 22.4 units per acre  
Ralf: Call is net residential density  
Frank: After lengthy discussion removed Clause 2.2 (1)  
Marilyn: Is height tied into density?  
Frank: Height hasn't been talked about.  
Andrea: Rezoning of the lands will define heights.  
Ralf: Will need to have density in ARP  
Andrea: Normally set as a range  
Delete reference to original ASP  
Thomas: Should it mention abandoning ASP  
Bill/Andrea: Don't even mention it.  
Ralf: Legally council would have to rescind old ASP if new one is adopted  
It's a statutory document  
Frank: Town may need to look at the legal issue.  
Density will come from the overall project  
Range will be investigated

#3 Bill: Low density: farther away from town  
High density: concentrate towards Town

#4 ADD: control factor; open spaces and green spaces

#5 Andrea: Who determines what sensitivity is in the future?  
Frank: We recognise that there will be resistance to development  
Ralf: Sensitive to existing situation  
Thomas: It's only a principal  
Bill: People want to be able to visualise  
Illustrate, show set backs, green spaces along creek  
i.e.: Single Family The Boardwalk  
\*\*both are sensitive to creek edge  
Maybe word should not be sensitive but will "assess"  
Oscar: Referred to the "domed" effect of a building, tiered from the creek inward  
Carol: Trees along creek – like The Boardwalk  
Chris: Noted that #6 contradicts what is stated in #5  
Thomas: Suggested combining #5 and 6  
Frank/Bill: Suggest moving section for DENSITY to end of plan  
Bill: The success of the project will come from the residents



understanding of the plan and obtaining a comfort level through visual aids  
 People will come to understand density through education and meetings.

**5.2.2.3 RESIDENTIAL**

- #1 Take out word "components"  
 Take out words "at medium and higher densities"  
 ADD "single family and duplex"
  
- #3 Chris: linkage program  
 commercial development=jobs=housing needs  
 Frank Richard's analysis will help us that  
 Marilyn Define what a senior is?  
 Ralf Set a range  
 Brenda population of Canmore there will be less seniors  
 And more young families  
 The new seniors to town don't need affordable housing  
 Frank A demographic in Restwell is being recognised  
 Fran Stated that there are 400+ seniors in their local Group and over half of them don't come from Canmore

**5.2.2.4 COMMERCIAL**

- #2 REMOVE CLAUSE
  
- #3 Richard: You may get a reaction to "resort related commercial"  
 Suggest visual aids depicting what "resort related" is  
 Andrea Add word "small" to resort related  
 Ralf It'll be what's economical.  
 Bill Add recreational component  
 Brenda Include mixed small scale motel; office: lawyer  
 Thomas Live/Work - loft  
 Not currently in our bylaws  
 Bill Art studios?  
 Andrea These don't exist in zoning

**5.2.2.5 OPEN SPACE AND CREEK SETBACKS**

- #1, 2, 3 Frank Environment Reserve setback 10M  
 Building setback 20M  
 Currently in Restwell 0 M  
 Town can't tell us what the setbacks will be its  
 In MDP  
 Andrea It's a good guiding principal but the numbers conflict  
 With existing policy

	Frank	There are conflicts all over with policy Set backs restrict flexibility; assess on project basis The plan will show design with future ER, trails Rehabilitated areas, drainage sloping away from creek
#4	Andrea	The numbers on the edge may meet the requirements but you may over dedicate by having green spaces inside the park.
	Teri	Stay away from MR by tracks – kids safety
	Frank	If roadway goes through and fencing is a Requirement then consider MR
	Bill	Clarify requirements in principals for guidelines Add appendix to guidelines for items which Reference to MDP and remove them from summary
#6 and #9		CONSOLIDATE #9 reiterates what is in #6
#7, #8	Teri	elaborated on trail system; talked about making the Boardwalk handicap accessible and the cost; a trail along the railway; tying into existing trails

### 5.3 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

#2 a.		= no development CHANGE TO restricted development
#3, 4, 5		Duplicate statements; maybe combine or remove #3
#7		Remove
#8		Remove
#9e		Storm control should be Storm water control
#9f/g	Andrea	Bill has done a lot of work with Three Sisters so he would be good source of information
	Ron	Other energy sources will be explored
	Thomas	green design leads
	Richard	energy will be a very important issue
	Marilyn	Water table?
	Frank	Will take into consideration

Summary of suggestions at end of meeting;

- pull out regulations and references to MDP and insert as appendix
- Principles will be a great resource for discussion, will make it easier for the open house
- next meeting; how will process go – short PowerPoint use illustrations; have representatives from each study group to answer questions
- develop comfort, give definitions
- K.I.S.S.



Frank: Yes, storm water system is important  
Rear yard drainage, trail, not just the road, they are all important  
Still need sand and salt on the roads (referred to current storage location  
On Restwell property)  
Getting tentative agreement with land owner for access  
Any questions?

Ron: Agrees with everything Oscar says. Is getting in touch with CPR.  
Storm: idea of several drainage areas in Restwell instead of a large pond,  
Mini ponds, more friendly

Oscar: Feasibility? Alberta Environment  
Fisheries are important. Create system so as not to connect to creek and  
Impact streambeds.

Ralf: Referenced Tuscany area in Calgary.

Ron: Can you use infiltration?

Oscar: Yes.

Ron: Still have to have area to store?

Bill: Build that at crossing; a dry land pond

Frank: Sees many options: Look at grade of entire site, look at cost

Bill: Access road. Is that the only point that is viable?

Frank: Reviewed viability and summarised potential problems with alternative  
Access: Ash property to east; Old Canmore road; Montane Rd.; Fas Gas

Bill: Access from Main St. – Keep it in existing state?

Frank: Yes, thinks so. 2600 vehicle trips  
Doesn't want to load downtown will make focus Bow Valley Trail.  
BVT is main route.

Collector road standard: can handle up to 10,000 vehicle trips daily  
Has capacity for more  
Could improve current access but better  
to get BVT access

Bill: Viable/useable road. Any consideration for another; no emergency  
Bridging?

Oscar: Fire department concerned with only 1 access  
2nd access – they may want a 3rd  
-if tracks, Main St. access closed

Ralf: 2nd access would solve the problem

Fran: Doesn't make sense.

Frank: Oscar is being conservative.

Chris: It has been blocked more than a few times. It is on the table.

Frank: It's more of a concern for Cougar Creek. This access will help the Town.

Thomas: Allow crossing to Town to be dual use to handle emergency access.

Ralf: Explain type of bridge to handle emergency vehicles and pedestrians.

-----Round Table of comments from Open House-----

Ralf: Open house went well  
Principles seem to be well accepted; general idea is being accepted; seems to be an understanding of the process

Next step to develop a more detailed plan; and general policies for the Area Redevelopment Plan.  
You won't see fine details but a plan that the town will accept. An illustration of what might happen – perhaps more detail on first phase.

We are on the right track so far.

Existing tree stands must be considered. Park area at the back you may want to preserve. Old tree stands dotted all over, maybe plan around them  
Views: intimate by the creek

Richard: Few people had questions.  
Overall relatively low attendance at open house. Felt it was good.  
So why didn't they attend? Are they comfortable with information?

2/3 of residents filled out the survey  
1/3 of residents didn't fill out the survey  
- they may be at the bottom of the social economic group – are we painting a rosier picture because of this?  
Who didn't fill out the survey?

Bill: Could be the opposite of the spectrum.

Richard: Not a big deal – we may not have got the truest part of the picture.

Frank: Restwell did their own survey in April. May have been a higher response.

Richard: The questions asked were more of personal nature:  
Some heard Frank say, 2 or 3 times, that he'll walk away if he doesn't

Get the secondary access road.  
He may sell the land to another developer? The residents felt that they had something with Frank being the developer but what if he sells?

Suggest:           Get a draft guideline back to the residence with information  
                          And give assurances to residents.

Frank:            Comment was maybe too strong.

Fran:             Yes, until she heard that comment she had felt secure.

Marilyn:         Not a typical turnout. Residents disengaging from technical stuff.  
                      Feels that when the other stuff starts coming they will be more  
                      Interested.

Fran:             Feels residents are looking for something concrete.

Frank:            Yes, agrees that residents need that but that it is not part of this  
                      Process.  
                      Second meeting was very technical and let the residents know what  
                      was being done and is being done. Frank wants the residents to hear from  
                      himself what's going on, not through the rumour mill.  
                      Held off on a follow up with the residents until follow up with  
                      Study team.

Ralf:             Long term residents - care more  
                      Short term residents - may not care as much if they aren't staying

Bill:             Rough cut of densities. Have global vision; but will be flexible until details are known.

Thomas:         Maybe some illustrations will help.

Frank:            Social Economical: Can you put someone in a seniors apartment  
                      for \$120,000 to \$150,000 at current interest rates.  
                      Yes, today you can.  
                      However, There are outstanding factors that I can't control, such as interest rates

Bill:             Can do internally a workout of models on paper and put into plan.

Frank:            Need from Richard the social demographics, other stuff is market driven

Richard:         Look at National and Federal trends then look at Canmore

Frank:            Replace with equivalent type of housing  
                      Demographics to keep in community need those stats will help with  
                      Next step.

Ron:             Oscar touched on transportation and storm water.  
                      The walk through today I saw high levels of filtration.  
                      Access issues: started process with CPR and land purchase  
                      which is a key piece of the puzzle.  
                      Traffic circle at entrance; maybe one way roads

- Thomas: Advantage of 1 roadway then split you get an enhanced entry and a main focus  
Not an efficient use of road
- Frank: Think about everything on the table.  
Storm issue: Anything will be an improvement; 90% overland to Creek now
- Ron: Golder prepared the report
- Frank: 6 m strip will do a lot
- Ron: Use of garbarators to minimise take away. Can't compost. could help get to treatment plants.
- Commented on Frank's first presentation to Town council. Council asked hard questions. Franks last presentation to Town there were a lot of good comments.
- Sandy: This is a dream.  
Ideas: trees, enhance area, meandering trails  
Policeman's Creek (N) areas are quite natural – use as a base line  
To revegetate.  
8 m in one area nice distance for riparian zone.  
Elk poop tracking is being done and breeding birds in area.
- Bill: Open house went very well and well attended. Don't normally see this type of process. A mannered process. You can't just say at one meeting what needs to be said, it needs to be repeated. Shows movement of process, road networks and creeks are the primary questions from boards.
- Now that we know the process is going ahead they care about what is going to happen. But people are becoming comfortable now. They know things are going to change. They understand there isn't ownership of land but the home.
- Call it an "island of peace"; located against BVT or 1A it wouldn't  
Be "hidden" or fully protected. Don't want to promote traffic.
- Access off Main St. is magical not practical.
- "Edges" - two wonderful creeks converging  
Site walk around confirmed things he had heard at meeting  
"Views" - mountain edges – smooth, craggy  
There's a changing perspective because of the light  
The site runs parallel between ranges  
People are anxious to see what is next.  
People are comfortable with Frank.
- Frank: Seeing how things are controlled gives reassurances through policy and Bylaws.

Bill: Coverage and fall out good from meeting.  
Information is getting out. Very successful.

Ralf: Entrance to North end ; Make new entrance intimate like Main St. access  
Is there something we can do to make it intimate?

Thomas: Image issue.

Ralf: Not a traffic volume issue.  
We can improve on what's there. Important to promote.

Thomas: Repeat what Bill said with process going so thorough.  
Positive comments and trust  
Water – precious drinking water

Frank: Leave old hand pump in centre of town for feature

Thomas: Height concerns – three stories  
Process used to enhance value of homes to general public  
Greater density inside (6 story) island and leave more green  
Space on track side

Bill: Diagrams – most graphics are showing homes by the creek  
“The Edge”

Ralf: From walk about – trees would be on creek side of path  
Give points of access on trails to creek side  
to impede wild trails being made along the creek

Frank: Didn't get many comments at open house except from  
Al Bergie and 2 other residents  
Plans sound OK; thank god Devonian's not doing it  
Pleased with way things are going

Marilyn: As it is important to protect and enhance green areas – normally  
Landscaping happens at the end of a project – will it be at the  
End or start?

Frank: Move long term campers; bridge, park space and MR along  
Policeman's Creek  
Will depend on Phasing of project  
When homes are removed we lose revenues  
See amenity space sooner than later

Bill: Huge selling feature

Marilyn: How are sales going to happen? Waiting list? When?  
People are eager to find out  
Maintain sense of community  
Put access and flow between buildings; keep vehicles off the  
Road – underground parking.



Frank: Low water tables; grades and drainage

Chris: Nothing from public or council meeting  
At last council they were happy with two things:  
1) Process  
2) Appendix A – how the residents are being treated

Frank: Administration comments?

Chris: Treed strip along Policeman's Creek – issues to work out  
Transfer densities  
Sound alternatives with trees; mature spruce groves  
Ecological and environmental concern along tracks  
Trail connection across utility access behind A&W  
Good progress on "Edge"  
Key: creek beds and increase creek side  
Entry level: what does it mean? Apartments?

Frank: Towns feeling, scope and targets?

Chris: social, entry level, affordable – needs to come to a head with what it is?

Marilyn: Frank's approach addresses what the typical Restwell resident is.

## **6.1 DISCUSSION ON WAYS TO RESTRICT AND ACCESS AFFORDABILITY AND QUALIFY BUYERS**

Ralf: Town requested that we take comment out of guiding principles about providing low cost housing for town, however, responsibility needs to be shared.

Thomas: Other than entry level, low cost what other type would the Town consider viable?

Chris: Term: low cost. Is a problem, get rid of it.  
Phrase: resident housing doesn't have negative connotation like employee housing, geared towards younger family and workers

Ralf: Eagle Terrace is an example where it is geared towards people living and working in Canmore. It doesn't reflect a particular economic bracket.

Bill: Developer is giving principles for the team. It would be up to the Town Interpret into an agreement.

Ralf: In future the principles will be policies for consideration in the ARP

Frank: Received a couple of emails – not a lot  
Comments of emails:  
Create stress among families living there  
People won't have a home in the future  
South Canmore/Restwell residents:  
traffic and construction  
Great web site

Creek trails access to Town  
Seniors on fixed income getting into housing  
Liked name.

I'm happy with study process although a little late. Wanted to be where we're at now in Jan/Feb  
It takes longer than we think

Open house: Disappointed in numbers but a good open house.

Comment about emphasising the positive aspect of being  
A current owner in Restwell and getting a first in should  
Be emphasised more.

One gentleman upset that he couldn't sell his home and  
Wanted Frank to solve his problem.

Council presentation went well – gave a 20 minute version

Excited about where it's all going. Wants to put pen to paper.  
Enjoyed the walk about too, hasn't walked entire site in a long time.

Goal of principles to help give clearer direction to development.

## **6.2 DISCUSSION ON DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES**

Chris: Felt design solution instead of principle.

i.e. 1.6: - low density

Frank: Town wants to leave natural area alone; if we go there we go low density  
Tie area into Community Park where utilities are.  
Density transfer likely not a big issue

Ralf: Doesn't see dividing line between design and principles  
Principles should show developer's thoughts.

Frank: Comment not in there re. railway. Policy required

Chris: Is affordable entry level?  
Should have common terminology.

Frank: Appendix A – any feedback (query to resident's reps)

Marilyn: Nothing. Quite detailed. The residents can put themselves through process.

Richard: Has everyone got a copy of the principles?

Frank: Copies are available at front desk at Restwell and were available at the  
Open house.

Sandy: Is this a draft or WIP?

Frank: WIP

Sandy: Add clarity to density?

Thomas: Can't pinpoint numbers.

Sandy: Clarify – high sensitivity area  
Put in criteria  
? Maybe too detailed

Ralf: Point 2.3: it is in there, "consider it" the word is in there

Frank: Changed cover to "Developer's Development Principles"

Bill: The town doesn't normally see this type of document at this stage.

Frank: Golders will become more important when there is a plan; why, where,  
More specific

Thomas: The boards from the open house are available in PDF; could publish on  
Web.  
Emergency access came up today  
There is enough to start working

Ron: First draft. New offsite levy for Restwell

Frank: Town comment.

Ron: Not specific. BVT may not benefit Restwell

Frank: Not design principle  
Recognise offsite levies may be different from downtown core.

Ralf: Insert #7: principle of offsite levies  
A new district might be considered for offsite levy

Ron: 1.4 (1) "new main entrance"

Bill: Provide alternative route

Richard: Front Page: add WIP February 25, 2003 – updated with new dates  
As amendments are made.  
Under "Spring Creek Mountain Village" tell people what that is.  
i.e. formerly Restwell.....

Richards: Put in introduction and a mission statement..  
As presented at the open house February 25, 2003 used by the  
Study team to design development....  
  
"Restwell Area Redevelopment Plan"

Ralf: Web site has ARP. Do we keep using Restwell or use new name?

Frank: When ARP comes out use Spring Creek....

We'll use Restwell for now but plan on changing the name regardless.

Next open house – prominent name change to Spring Creek...

Where do we go now? Each area is working on their fields. Hopefully by May we'll have some concepts, even preliminary to bring to study Team.

Bill Access is major. Planning for development is we don't get access. Biggest hurdle is CPR and land owner (very positive so far) Town doesn't want Frank going to south Canmore. Frank has legal access through south Canmore.

Study team: need to assemble complete list of mailing/courier address; phone, fax and email addresses.

## **7.0 SPRING CREEK MOUNTAIN VILLAGE STUDY TEAM MEETING #3**

*June 19, 2003*

### ATTENDANCE:

Frank Kernick	Terry Riva
Ralf Southwell	Richard Roberts
Bill Marshall	Thomas Debicki
Marilyn Willox	Oscar Regier
Gary Buxton	Chris Laing
Cindy Sangster	Ron Sadesky
Sandra Marken	

### OVERVIEW OF MEETING TOWN PLANNING AND ENGINEERING ROADS

Frank went over the review of the development principles with the working concept and the various road options. What is being proposed is different from the traditional. Met with the town. Frank didn't want any short cutting through the development, showed access from Montane Rd. and through property and the hubs that are being created and the green strips separating the roads.

### BILL:

The overall site is like an island and buffered.

Gave an overview of Concept A roads and accesses. The "spine" with greenery between the roadways, putting in the water feature and that at every turn/bend in the road opens up to a view line.

Identified the central point access from Montane Rd., green spaces, bike/walking paths, boardwalk and creeks; central park with convergence. Noted that Alpine Land Surveys was sent out to do view lines

### FRANK:

This is opposite of the norm with the green space in centre. But may be able to tie the storm water into the green space. Like the concept once he had a chance to review it.

BILL:

Insulated/Isolated site. This concept takes advantage of existing road alignments and trees.

Creek Edge: softness, smaller residential area, rehabilitate and protect

Centre Site: relationship of building edge to views/greenery

Parking: piggy back building over parking garage; modify grade to build road up to allow parking underground; build walkout to grade

early studies showed movement, building grade and arrival point drove initial plans; out of the original plan came Concept A

RALF:

Concept A: Three Sisters view and then north vista; by offsetting allowed central space to be formed.

Create graduated density toward central site

FRANK:

Central park space important – to have a meeting place, create a sense of community and have small commercial centre with attraction features

Great park site and development

BILL:

Process is very vigorous. Services, open spaces, trail systems will bring in more users.

Users and uses (creek edge) more people will use and new population of people

FRANK:

Community association maybe needed to look after park area. ?Will the town want to maintain.

Concept is more detailed than what is needed for the area redevelopment plan. Need to work on parking, roads and buildings

THOMAS:

Gave summary overview of building concepts and designs:

Bring life into centre space of development.

Mixed use buildings; commercial space in front with living space behind or above;

Distance of one building to the next – spread out – look across 40 – 60 metres you'll be able to see the mountains

RICHARD:

Neat concept.

Concern with building concept and possible shadow lines.

FRANK:

Road is straight south, buildings are spread apart, some shadow may come across.

Sometimes there are areas in town where there is no sun.

The orientation is ideal, due south

RICHARD:

In winter, what do you do with snow build up?

BILL:

Build redepository areas in centre. Item has been discussed in house. A design issue. Canmore is not like Lake Louise with snow.

THOMAS:

Linear park is concept. As community grows it may change. It may start as just a landscaped mound; used as passage way. It's an important dimension

BILL:

Will comment on in next drawing with phasing.

Workable first stage development so it doesn't feel incomplete.

THOMAS:

Vibrant community: work, living, recreation, mixed ages, social economic considerations.

BILL:

Do that by staging building types that bring in a mix. This work presented internally to the Town and we have dealt with the issues from this meeting and how to enhance and improve roads

SANDRA:

Trying to visualise? 4-6 storey buildings, roads, greenspace

FRANK:

We still need pedestrian corridors and flexibility in buildings.

THOMAS:

They are not giant buildings.

Mews roads – pedestrian friendly; low impact

Townhouses would be 6 – 10 metre setbacks on one side

Variety of experiences as you go through the development

SANDRA:

Plants? Possibly obscure view shed.

THOMAS:

Types of plants/trees would be what you see outside now.

TERRY:

Stay away from pines – blow downs

High saline natural plants because of the salt use.

CHRIS:

Key to mixing income types – integrate into neighbourhood. As you walk down the street the building types are integrated and there is no difference as you go through the neighbourhood.

FRANK:

Agrees as to way he sees it happening.

One policy he sees – building designs.

BILL:

Through phasing.

Create diversity of users, increase population

THOMAS:

Gave overview of building types and possible scenarios: 1st floor commercial

2nd floor living quarters; maybe not great views

3rd floor maybe a 2 storey

apt.

Design gives flexibility and opportunity.

Plan ahead, create framework, mobility, road work

MARILYN:

Building type? How do you plan ahead for that?

THOMAS:

Review floor uses – flexibility in design

Frank:

Design to what the market wants at the time.

Flexibility in design; not demographics

BILL:

Plan for flexibility in the future and uses and incorporate into design.

RALF:

Bylaws and regulations change with the times.

RICHARD:

Scenario: Frank is the developer and develops land; Frank is the developer and sells the land. What happens?

FRANK:

Can you put controls into what another developer does. Put policy in place – range of housing.

RICHARD:

Development along the creek – diversify.

FRANK:

Hard to do – density and flexibility

THOMAS:

Create sites of variety/ units of variety

BILL:

In response to Richard: How to control and mandate elements. Look at all portions of the site. There are some areas that will be more challenging than others.

RICHARD:

Concern with shadow population – streets with no activity from Monday through Friday. This could be a problem.

FRANK:

Agrees, it is a reality in Canmore. It is harder to control in free market.

SANDRA:

Questioned road set backs and creek buffer.

THOMAS:

Set backs haven't changed; 20 m to building; 6 m to walkway

Show overlay of new layout to existing shows how large development is  
Concept with roads, uses and buildings: show purpose, views and options  
Control from public spaces  
Distance of buildings and heights  
Put blanket regulations over block and develop rules.

FRANK:

How do we bring into formal for ARD

RALF:

Reviewed requirements for the development:

- MR      2 ha plus deferred  
          2.4 ha on plan and excludes medians
  
- ER      6 – 10 m  
          10 on eastside Policemans Creek, boardwalk, wetlands
  
- BUILDING  
          20 m show on plan (normal)  
          on north side land narrows, may be one area that encroaches
  
- RESIDENTIAL  
          Townhouses 200  
          Seniors 190 – 225  
          Terraced 70 – 85  
          Other 450 – 500 (high density)  
                  4 ½ , 3 ½ storey and 21/2 on townhouses

Define replacement – equal housing of residents (put in policy of ARP)  
Suggest DC type bylaw; various zones in bylaw  
Mixture of resident types  
Density – decrease from the centre out  
Dwelling above commercial; don't want it too small that you compete with downtown commercial)  
Total number 950-1000 residential units of some form not including hotels.

RICHARD:

Concern for open house and the Restwell residents seeing huge density for first time.  
Possibly show some idea of phasing? Like where is my home under all this?  
Reassure that phasing plan in place.

BILL:

Good point. Very cognisant of phasing. Time is a component. It doesn't happen overnight. 5 – 10 years.

FRANK:

Thomas and Ralf to come up with phasing.  
Need to work with utilities. There are a lot of parts to consider.



Info may be available in September. It's premature at this stage.

RICHARD:

No calculations yet on implications. Are we close to thresholds – elementary schools?

GARY:

No thresholds.

TERRY:

No questions. Likes concept.

Concern with centre area

FRANK:

Maintenance, organise, irrigation – who looks after it?

Do you see the Town partaking? Or more the community?

Budget is a Town issue – sees this as a high level standard of maintenance

Maybe a community association along with the Town?

TERRY:

Probably see all public land

Offset costs; sees 1 crew of 3 to 4 people maintaining

Look at "Adopt A Park" scenario

MARILYN:

Can see residents wanting to look after green space.

OSCAR:

Road ways/utilities – operation and ownership?

Fee simple or condo plan?

Development should not create undue hardship on the Town budget

Unique designs – more maintenance – special equipment needs – other arrangements may need to be made (surcharge?)

Likes plan – access dealt with

? Ron on cul du sac – noise from train an issue

Utility storm water – spoke to Ron and Thomas on

Centre core – look at infiltration system

Look at separate drainage for roof and decks – doesn't have to be treated and you could use for irrigation

Idea: arctic utility put into utilicores, insulated case; minimal bury depth

TERRY:

Run it down through landscaping?

OSCAR:

Possibly, but keep in mind access to utilities and replacements

TERRY:

Storm septors.

OSCAR:

Storm septs minimal level of treatment

Look at proximity to creeks

CHRIS:

Single family – no position or comments

Small commercial along spine: innovate zone. Look into C2? District in Vancouver – similar idea – may need to refine

Townhouses create a long barrier – make more permeable (looks like a fortress)

THOMAS:

Townhouse units are comparable to one block.

Look at laneway?

CHRIS:

Put some sort of break in there (townhouses)

If DC bylaw would like to see that each phase has a minimum amount of affordable housing.

FRANK:

Once phasing developed it will be easier to figure out the numbers.

CHRIS:

Mix of uses through site so you don't know that you are going through different areas (employee housing to high end)

SANDRA:

Policeman's Creek and along tracks – studies are complete: amphibian/bird/rare plants

Noise date: would be quick and easy to collect

tracks to developments; frequency; noise level; appropriate buffers

FRANK:

Not sure if one has been done. D Brown has house right beside the tracks. We should look at that property.

SANDRA:

Control path and access with maintenance

Riparian functional

Likes the idea of putting caveats on properties along riparian area

Reclamation – species list

Public education system; signage, information boards

Central corridor – not an environmentally habitable area; doesn't detract from actual trail

Water quality: will review

TERRY:

Fish habitat.

FRANK:

Met with Brian on Monday to keep him apprised of where we are heading.

Brian was positive with the changes and plans in place so far as there was nothing before

Discussed what we could do to help? Maybe going in with a hoe to clean out silt down to the gravel.

Fisheries doesn't have the money, maybe Frank look into doing it.

SANDRA:

Rate of sediment? 1 to 25 years?

FRANK:

From the flood of 1974. 1 – 100 year event.

TERRY:

Fish viewing with interpretative signage along creek

MARILYN:

Questioned whether approval for crossing tracks is done.

FRANK:

No. Waiting for the concept plan so we can do traffic studies for CP and look at densities.

MARILYN:

Set backs from streets, creeks, ok – is there a height control?

RALF:

DC – we will be writing our own bylaw which will define areas

MARILYN:

4 – 5 storey were discussed previously. Is this high?

FRANK:

Yes.

MARILYN:

Useful for open house would be an overlay so people see through to their own homes  
Can the concept be made bigger?

CINDY:

Are the concepts going to be available as handouts at open house?  
Likes concept. Maybe house lines can be less defined – sketched out.

BILL:

Concept phasing? Where?

People will think that the road is going through their home. But their home won't be there when the road does go through.

Suggest doing diagrams to show options.

FRANK:

People will take phasing as gospel – won't commit at this time. May give possible insights.

MARILYN:

Keep the excitement going – give them (residents) a teaser to keep the interest up  
Show pricing from – to, concept of what residences will look like.

FRANK:

Won't have any pricing – lots to consider.

The interest rate will have more of an affect on affordability than costs.

MARILYN:

When will you be breaking ground?

FRANK:

Maybe next spring, more like 2005. So many little things to put together. The first phase can make or break the development.

BILL:

Components of infrastructure which may affect Town approvals

FRANK:

Lift station.

RON:

Looking at things more from the engineering side now.

Grading plan and the affect it may or may not have on phasing

More gravity than pressure sewer

A lot to look at: insulation, ground water

Concept 1) seems dense – gives that perception

2) a lot of straight lines – didn't expect that

FRANK:

If you put yourself in a car there is a lot more to it than straight lines.

RALF:

Site coverage – no detail yet.

GARY:

Traffic engineers: give the plan to someone who knows how to design pedestrian space

Calgary

Calgary commercial with city agreement – city pays certain level then fees are charged

6 or 7 singles? Thought 6; won't go there you know how he feels

Isolated site – look at parking issues/ratios. You can't move parking into south Canmore and make it there issue

Likes flexible use of space (commercial/residential)

Suggested checking out area in Calgary that has, he feels, the type of architecture you are after (Cirque du Soleil, near Curry Barracks)

GARY:

Entry level – replacement plus. Spread throughout the development

Busy – site coverage in centre – take the green off

Townhouses – break through the units

makes it uncomfortable for public to use; going from public to semi private lands

RALF:

6 or 7 units – build over gap like a archway/walkthrough

Phasing: issue displacement – where are they going

Intersection near circle more humane – public space with three roads around it?

Make it useful for pedestrians to access stores, etc.

TERRY

Water. Think of access.

FRANK:

Town maintenance.

GARY:

Micro design feature.

RALF:

Agrees: buses in to visitor/accomm. site  
larger more useful island

GARY:

Give buses 1 way through (water island), they don't need 2.  
Overall, quite nice  
Urban compliment to downtown

MARILYN:

Single family homes, is there an issue with those?

GARY:

Environmental; area is not developed; the proximity of area to railroad tracks  
ARP is not the place to do land use district – there to guide and direct  
Don't specify 3 storey, grade, or commercial with residential above  
Performance standards, not design criteria  
Leave flexibility, just enough but not too much detail

RALF:

Do we do comprehensive for the whole site?

GARY:

No. Referenced 198: it is falling apart – too much control from the start.

RICHARD:

Gave synopsis of living units to elementary school site access and the appeal then to only two groups –  
empty nesters and shadow population, but not to young families.

FRANK:

From here:      Open house Monday, June 23, 2003 7pm at Rec. Centre  
                         Council Tuesday, June 24, 2003  
                         September: more detailed plans

## **8.0 SPRING CREEK MOUNTAIN VILLAGE STUDY TEAM MEETING #4**

September 29, 2003

ATTENDANTS:	Frank Kernick	Oscar Regier
	Chris Laing	Gary Buxton
	Ron Sadesky	Ralf Southwell
	Sandy (Golder)	Richard Roberts
	Bill Marshall	Thomas Debicki
	Fran McTaggart	Marilyn Willox

TO SUMMARIZE ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION FROM THE DRAFT ARP OF SEPT 30, 2003

RALF:

Reviewed land designation summary, which was omitted from Draft of Spring Creek Mountain Village.

FRANK:

Reviewed progress with landowner Duncan Brown and the access, what was being done with the land and issues he had with access. Suggestion that access through south of property by buying land and then share access with Duncan Brown's property. This scenario could impact the environmental study and would change the ARP study boundary.

Decided to not include as part of draft ARP and to finalise studies based draft boundaries as is.

There were two (2) additional roads added to ARP boundary map:

- Restwell does not legally own those 2 roads, but all other roads in ARP Are Restwell owned
- potential future improvements to deal with the Town on

SANDY:

POINTS: aquatic habitat map on ARP boundary  
Environmental boundary  
Residential (R1) – medium sensitivity  
Reclamation plan

R1: for purpose of study what % of the lot to use as footprint? ½ size of lot 50%?

After discussion, determined that for the purpose of the study the footprint should be 20% to 30%, taking into account the 7.5 metre rear yard set back and the 20 metre creek set back.

CHRIS to SANDY:

Why is the ER boundary wider on one side of the creek than the other? Why not have same widths? Wider section has a more forested area and larger green space; other side of creek already has existing

homes with lawns to creek. Rehabilitation will still be required along both creeks.

FRANK:

Creek set backs minimum will be 6.0 metres. This may vary along the creek edge. We want to keep people on the trail, not have them create a trail closer to the creek edge so we don't want the trail to be 10 metres away. A minimum of 10 metres in moderate area.

THOMAS:

Landplan has been assigned the project of preparing a landscaping plan. Residents who will back onto the creek will have strict guidelines for landscaping their rear yards. Landscape guidelines for back of home will be defined at subdivision.

FRANK:

The first metre from the creek is the most important for the fish habitat and the tree and shrub coverage along with the storm water run off. Sandy agreed.

RALF:

It is difficult at the concept stage to do too many details so we have assigned a minimum because a maximum could be a concern.

How to show within the ARP:

Private, maintained/trail/riparian

Should be a minimum of 6.0 metres.

Average minimum discussed: can't have an average minimum

Could have a minimum of 6.0 metres to an average of 7.5 metres

Risk of the path being too far from the creek and people creating a secondary trail along the creek.

SANDY:

Reclamation plan will work with the landscape designer.

ER lands to note types and mixes of species

MR lands reference to types and mixes as in ER

FRAN:

POINTS: road access

Residents concerned with issue over access road.

If the access doesn't go forward, then what?

FRANK:

Working towards the access road. Amending the transportation report to get to the Town before it can be finalised.

RON:

POINTS: Engineer Drawings (follow up)

Sewer Master Plan/Timing

Following up with town on Sewer Master Plan – time line of reviewing?

UDG follow up with Town: road cross sections, location of streetlights in landscaped median,  
Fire hydrants, etc.

Shallow utilities and alignments need input

CHRIS:

Roads: access onto the mews. Can the public access the mews?

FRANK:

Mews are not gated, no problem giving access.

Mews to have different surface than other roads in subdivision.  
Who maintains? Private road with public easements.  
Road section state that – add to policy: Mews roads public access/public utility

THOMAS:  
They are a public road they just have a different character.

OSCAR:  
Private infrastructure with public access.

FRANK:  
Water master plan will look at well-head protection.

RON:  
Storm water, shallow wells raised a flag with consultants.

FRANK:  
Monitoring program for water during construction needs to be set up. The Town now monitors Restwell wells.  
Wants to change the wording of seniors housing to Adult or Mature housing, Independent living, Level 1 or 2 noted.

RICHARD:  
POINTS: Permanent – Non-Permanent Ratio  
Entry Level

Noted that the demographics show that if you are over 50 you can still have kids attached. Doesn't mean that there are no kids. Restwell has a high percentage of seniors.

GARY:  
Is demographics available as part of this report/

RICHARD:  
Used as technical support.

CHRIS:  
Doesn't think that section 4.6/4.7 of plan with tourist homes that those numbers can be met.

FRANK:  
Tourist home zoning should be considered. The Town wants to see this type of zoning in new areas so we put it out there.  
Breakdown for permanent summarised:  
25% entry level will be under 1000 sq. ft.  
SRS permanent residents – not weekenders  
STAFF for commercial based businesses  
450 units comprise seniors and entry level housing of the 1000 plus units

CHRIS:  
Ratio closer to 50 – 60 ratio, but what number to use.  
Reference to 25% permanent resident? How?

FRANK:  
Reference (25%) is a minimum in the ARP.



Condition that permanent residents must reside in home; maybe have caveat on title? Who holds caveat?

The caveat on title would create a two tiered market that will hopefully stand the test of time.

Permanent residences will be mixed throughout the community

Canmore Housing Authority would be good (caveat) if they were around long term.

MARILYN:

Is everything under 1000 sq. ft. going to be permanent?

FRANK:

No.

Phasing and timing will effect the percentage of affordable housing.

CHIRS:

What did the survey show as size?

FRANK/RICHARD:

80% of residences are under 1000 sq. ft.

The newer ones are around 1200 sq. ft; older ones can be 600 to 1000 sq. ft.

CHRIS:

The size needs to be revised. A 1000 sq. ft. home is hard to raise a family of 2 in.

THOMAS:

Yes, a larger range would help others gain access to the units.

FRANK:

What size do you think?

THOMAS:

1250 sq. ft.

Flexibility is good for everyone.

RICHARD:

What about the set back idea?

Ranges between \_\_\_\_\_  
But averages \_\_\_\_\_

FRANK:

The market will dictate too.

The square footage cost will affect affordability.

GARY:

Noted SilverTip: gross square footage; entry level square footage in by laws

It's open to be amended.

FRANK:

What percentage will it be at build out?

Still think it'll be 60:40

RALF:

Noted that policy is not part of the ARP but is referenced. (Section 4.1.1. in ARP)

GARY:

If were creating a policy about a policy then the policy should be included.  
ARP does not specify time frame for existing residents to buy. (45 days?)

Leave flexibility in policy for within a fair time frame for purchasing.

Insert as guidelines so there is no public hearing in the future required to change.

All units: Residents are not restricted to the type of units.

FRAN:

After 3 years I think that 45 days is enough time.

MARILYN:

Is 45 days enough for financing?

FRANK:

Entry level: policy/guidelines for residents first right of refusal  
Ratio: will use 60:40 unless other suggestions

CINDY:

Do renters in Restwell qualify?

FRANK:

Yes. Should note.

MARILYN:

Will there be a Rental/Owned ratio?

FRANK:

No. Do not want to segregate.

MARILYN:

POINT: Concept Map  
Would like to see a concept map with an overlay showing existing to phasing?

FRANK/RALF:

Could put together for next open house. But will not be part of ARP guidelines.

CHRIS:

POINTS: Section 1.3 historical use  
Section 1.3: Include reference information on study/survey mentioned in this section  
under historical use.

RICHARD:

Put the study in as a free-standing document now that the reference is made?

RALF:

Section purely social-economic or it can be built into other sections without duplicating information..  
Would you like to see a separate section? Reference section.

CHRIS:  
State clearly in Current Use Section. The key is section 1.3 current use.

RALF:  
Create a whole separate section and front section explains and then go into separate section.

OSCAR:  
POINTS: Servicing  
    Utilities  
    Ownership  
    Existing Water System: ground water impact  
    Phasing/all at once  
    Local street loops (public/private URW)  
    Site grading: raising and fill  
    Construction management plan: sediment into creeks  
    Grading/Fill: The increased traffic flow into site with fill.

FRANK:  
Underground parking will create a lot of fill that will be used on site.

OSCAR:  
Consider material that gets removed from Cougar Creek – it's close by and could be used on site.

FRANK:  
Believes offsite levy policy needs to be created for this area.

OSCAR:  
Sec 4.3.4.: notes new technology  
The town would like to know, if new technology, future costs of maintenance and operating.

RALF:  
Existing well protection policy. May need to tie in sooner if test show.

OSCAR:  
Shallow utilities; buried.  
Major overhead power lines, any plan to out under ground?

FRANK:  
Would consider.

BILL:  
POINTS           Urban Design Guidelines – Town input  
                    Community facilities (4.1.10)

FRANK:  
Build some community facilities around Phase 3, not like pools, more municipal.  
Community halls for social functions, space for day care.  
Individual buildings may have their own (hotel with conference space)

BILL:  
Community facilities: reference to building of facilities in section 4.1.10.  
Obligations undertaken by developer or is this giving space for Town to undertake?

FRANK:

Feels they are market driven.

It is developers intent; doesn't mind wording; gives some obligation on part of the developer.

OSCAR:

Local area skating rink. Is it feasible with Spring Creek or Policeman's Creek?

FRANK:

Thought process is there – at least considered.

FRANK:

POINTS: Parking (policy)

Creek set backs

Access Road = D. Brown property

Village Square

Building heights R1

Trail widths 1.5 – 2.0metres

Trail uses along creek.

Parking: During construction will be reduced, should be more beefed up. Developer to address during construction.

Creek setbacks: Try to meet 20 metre for Town.

Policy allows up to 10% relaxed. Set backs tightest at north entrance it is more difficult to meet 20 metre.

Right of Way is existing – not raw land with building

CHRIS:

Council is against that. They want 20 metres.

FRANK:

Consider that this is a unique setting.

BILL:

Allows for relaxation's on corners, maybe the occasional protrusion

FRANK:

Trying to meet the Town's new policy with relaxation.

CHRIS:

Is Golder involved for the entire project. If the set backs are relaxed from 20 metres then affect on environmental studies, etc..

FRANK:

No.

Access Road: Going forward with boundary as is now so can finish report.

Village Square: changed from previous draft.

Made more pedestrian friendly

R1 Heights: 1.5 in guidelines; should be noted as per bylaws

Height conforms to bylaws.

Trails: Width/Use along creek guidelines:

1.5 metres not wide enough  
Heavily used multi purpose trail  
Town is 2.5 metre width for multi purpose

RALF:  
Should it be variable?

OSCAR:  
No. Not if it is multi purpose.

FRANK:  
Change to 2.5 metres

GARY:  
POINTS            Visitor Accommodation  
                     Staff Accommodation  
                     Commercial uses  
                     R1

ENTRY LEVEL:    Replace plus 25% of units above existing

VISITOR: Some concerns: 550 resort rooms - MDP issue  
                 Area is residential not resort

STAFF: Why 25%? Should be of jobs created through commercial.

OTHER; Other Resort Developments

FRANK:  
Trying to replace existing trailer/camp sites with other forms of resort development

GARY:  
250 to 300 camp sites. Not near replacing when looking at 550 hotel rooms.

FRANK:  
What does the Town want?  
Commercial base would increase Town's tax base.

GARY:  
MDP says area not to have 500 hotel rooms.  
Local commercial: 40,000 square feet of retail. That's not local commercial

BILL:  
That number is including all types. Perhaps that it not explained enough (Section 4.1.8)  
Retail will not survive here. Small commercial that will tie into and compliment existing commercial.

FRANK:  
This is a maximum number.  
The market and land use will dictate square footage  
Are we way off base?  
Town wanted commercial?  
This is 20 years down the road.

GARY:

MDP: Yes, way off base with 40,000 sq. ft. commercial and 500 hotel rooms.

FRANK:

Can make entire property single family residential, doesn't have to go through this process. Are they ok?

GARY:

High end residential developments that address affordable

FRANK:

Ok, we'll change it.

We've committed to 25% - that's reasonable

Three Sisters is 25% of new

Won't look after affordable housing for the Town!

This has to be marketable and make economic sense.

GARY:

200 affordable homes on site – percentage is not replacement.

FRANK:

I can raise the rent and make Restwell no longer affordable.

GARY:

You are making the project 4X the density with no change in numbers for current existing.

FRANK:

Disagree.

FRANK:

Will Change to 220 from 200. He will meet his commitment to replace as a minimum

BILL:

Is 25% acceptable based on numbers.

May develop 800 to 1000 units.

GARY:

Won't commit to a number.

Other developers 25% of units brought to market are entry level

FRANK:

It's redevelopment – not new development.

It has to make economic sense

Land is undervalued. Initial offer to residents was to increase rents or redevelop

This is all I can accept.

Restwell was not contemplated in MDP. They're to be amended.

Summary:

Less commercial – More Residential

Try to create a balance supported by the Town

Development compliments downtown  
Can be too monoculture is all residential  
Residential is easy; who wants to finance a hotel? Hotels in the valley want more conference space.

GARY:  
Not what is in MDP.

FRANK:  
How do we bring this forward. Do we have your support?  
Change it now if way out in left field!

## ***APPENDIX A***