

# Argyll Park Preliminary Master Plan Feedback Comments

## 60-Stall Parking Lot

- If there is a parking lot to be built at the south end, it helps a lot to solve the parking problem around this area on the weekend, especially Sunday morning.
- Support 60 parking lot on the south end of the park.
- But have a problem with a parking lot at the end of the baseball fields.
- Generally good but I object to size of 66 Avenue parking lot. The proposed lot is too close to the ravine.
- I definitely support the parking lot at southwest end of park. More parking is needed even with the extra Velodrome parking.
- The southwest parking is much needed.
- Love the idea of additional parking, it's a must both lots are required.
- Partially. I believe that the new parking lot should be added to the Velodrome parking lot instead of making little parking lots all over.
- You must include the parking area at 66 Avenue as indicated.
- Yes to parking lot off 66 Avenue & 88 Street with ONLY resident parking on ALL streets. Park users must use parking lots or bus or bicycle or hike.
- Need to provide parking for users off of 88 Street.
- I'm quite troubled to learn that the southern most parking lot has been all but "scrapped" due to opposition in favor of a "phasing approach - if required". While I do understand the reasoning and agree that it is a good idea to only build it if required, it was one of two hopes residents had of slowing down and managing the traffic in and out of the facility. I've seen my fair share of high speed passages through the neighborhood and will attest to the fact that it is those with ball gloves, soccer balls AND those with bicycles.....If you are not going to put in the south parking lot you better consider traffic controls like the mini rotundas and stop signs.
- If the proposed 60 parking stalls are not what the residents want, why not relocate the 60 or more parking stalls to the grassland immediately south of 66 Avenue (west of the Chinese Church) which serves both baseball diamond users as well as the soccer field (between 65 and 66 Avenues) users. The soccer field users have no public space to park. They are forced to park their vehicles in the parking lot of the Chinese Church which is really trespassing a private property. I suggest the City contact the Chinese Church to see if they have any concerns of putting up some parking spaces west of their property south of 66 Avenue.
- If the 66 parking stalls are not what the residents want, the stalls should be relocated to the grassland immediately south of 66 Avenue to the west of the Chinese Church. The new parking spaces, if built, will serve both

the baseball diamond users as well as the soccer field (between 65 Avenue and 66 Avenue) users. The soccer field users have no public space to park when they come to use this soccer field. They are forced to park their vehicles in the parking lot of the Chinese Church which is private property. They are essentially trespassing private property.

- I am strongly opposed to the parking lot off of 66th Avenue.
- Relocate the proposed 60 or more parking spaces to the grassland immediately south of 66 Avenue and west of the Chinese Church.
- I would like to highly support the 60 stall parking lot by the south-west area by the baseball field. As there is no parking for the 2 soccer fields and only street parking for the baseball fields, parking becomes very limited. It also becomes a safety issue when we have church functions and there are games at the same time. Athletes and families end up parking at our church's parking and the safety of the children is a huge concern. This 60 stall parking will also help decrease the parking issues on the street on weekends.
- Please ensure to build the 60 stall parking end in the south side of the park. Thanks.
- The idea to hold off on the parking lot at 66th Avenue for now is appropriate, but if it is deemed necessary, it should be constructed.
- To build the 60 proposed parking stalls, on the southwest corner of the park by the bus stop of the baseball diamonds, at the same time with the entire project. This will address the concerns of lack of parking space for the two soccer fields adjacent to the Edmonton Chinese Christian Church.
- I support this plan with the exception of the Southwest Parking Future Option. The southwest parking future option is an unsafe site due to the traffic flow traveling west from 66 Avenue and 88 Street corner. Speeding is a common factor and collision potential will increase.
- Omit the 60 stall southwest parking area.
- Recommend the new proposed parking lot (60 stalls) automatically and immediately be incorporated into the plan to alleviate/share/disperse the traffic volume into the primary parking lot.
- Don't like the new parking lot on 66 street, can we move a ball diamond to another park?
- Except not the parking lot off 66 Avenue.
- Reduce the size of the new parking lot bordering 66 Avenue / Mill Creek Ravine.
- The 66 Avenue / 88 Street parking should be considered as it is a reasonable use of park area.
- It seems reasonable. Do put in a parking lot at 66 Avenue and 88 Street. That "green" space is wasted space and will not be missed. Otherwise parking will very soon be a problem again, even with proposed ban.
- Hold off on the west parking lot to evaluate need.
- If additional parking is needed, have southwest corner parking done with

open paving stones, so grass can grow through it. Open parking only for tournaments.

- The lack of an option for additional parking is disappointing. To eliminate green space for a 4-5 month baseball season is an extreme waste and a detriment to the community at large. If the parking lot is made I will not support this plan.
- I like the idea of phasing in the second 60 space parking lot if demand requires it.
- The plan does not change much except for the parking, which hopefully takes vehicles from parking on the street. I would suggest the parking lot have CTV cameras just to ensure the park maintains a safe and healthy environment for the users.
- I think that the parking area which is only a suggestion needs to be a reality.
- This south parking area is necessary to make the roadways safer.
- The parking lot expansion would be an added benefit.
- The southwest parking (60 stalls) should go ahead ASAP. You can't even park on 67 Avenue east of 88 Street during ball times at all.
- No parking lot on south end of park. Suggest: permit parking and angle parking. No parkland to parking lot.
- Both of the new parking lots required! See a few parking in alleys and back drives.
- Southwest parking future options: I suggest that these 60 stalls be build as part of the expansion and not a future option. Users of the soccer field, baseball field, and special BMX weekends often use our parking lot. Also due to safety concerns, people drive by our parking lot very fast. We are thinking of closing the gates to block traffic flow. Having this parking lot will help a lot for users of both the 2 soccer fields and baseball players. Does the city have any plans for parking space for these users? Having this parking lot will address our concerns.
- I have issues with the parking for baseball. The south parking lot needs to be rethought.
- The parking lot off of 66 Avenue must be built. It is required to keep the traffic down on 88 Street and 86 Street. It is required so the people can park close to the fields.
- Remove or reduce the number of 60 parking stalls down to 40 - 45 the very max.
- I would suggest the parking off 66 Avenue be included as part of the plan immediately with construction right away. This will relieve some traffic flow through the community.
- Build the 60 stall lot on the southwest corner.
- Avoid developing 60 spot parking lot on southwest side.
- That the parking lot off 66 Ave is incorporated. The baseball players will not park by the Velodrome. If necessary post signs for no parking area

similar to that used by Northlands and the Coliseum, You'd need a residential sticker to be able to park there.

- I feel the extra parking on 66 Avenue will be necessary.
- The only part of the plan that my husband I have issues with, is that as a resident (one who lives directly across from the park) we will have the same issues with traffic and the inability to park in front of our own home. Without a resident issued parking pass this will still be a major frustration. Park users will still feel justified parking, leaving garbage, tailgating, and other objectionable behavior...they will just do it on the residents' side of the street. An extra parking lot will alleviate this only to a degree. It will only be courteous park users who will use the lot.
- I applaud the initiative of other Hazeldean residents to cordon off the proposed parking lot on the southwest corner. This clearly and accurately demonstrates the disruption that this site would cause. Since I walk this route daily, I am aware of many other activities that this space is used for. X-country skiing, snow shoeing, kite flying, radio controlled flying, model rocket launches, and parachute kiting to name a few. This park is immediately inviting when you enter from the southwest corner, and it would be a violation to locate a parking lot where so much year round activity takes place. My other objection to the proposed parking lot is that it would need to be maintained in both the summer and winter months regardless of its limited use in the winter. Surely the cost of plowing a vacant lot would be yet another drain on the City's snow removal budget. To summarize, the Argyll Park preliminary master plan needs to reconsider the use of parkland for parking. This would be parking that would only be used by non-residents and, even then, during the months of May through August. The balance of the year would see little or no use, and be required to be maintained regardless.
- Any inclusion in the plan (phase 2 or not) of a parking lot off 66th Avenue is completely unacceptable. I completely support Hazeldean Community League's position. We should NOT be paving parkland for a parking lot for ball diamond users. We should also not be paving parkland to create a parking lot to stop cars parking on 88 Street. The people along that street bought their houses knowing the ball diamonds were there. Does the City relocate bus routes just because people complain about the noise and traffic causes by buses along their street? No, because people buy their homes knowing where they are located. Calling the parking lot "phase 2" and "only if necessary" is not satisfactory. Consultation, flawed as it may be, is taking place now. It is unacceptable to place the parking lot in the plan even as phase 2 which could result in some city employee later deciding, without consultation, that the parking lot is now necessary.
- I strongly object to additional parking being added at the southwest corner of the park.
- The proposed parking lot off 66 Avenue ruins a choice piece of real estate.

- I do not want a 60 stall parking lot at the end of the park. There will be accidents and decrease access for those who live here.
- The parking lot bordering 66 Ave is an abomination. Ball players will still park along 88 Street and when I have company in the summer they will be the ones having to use the parking lot.
- No parking lot off 66th Avenue.
- I fully support the parking lot for the 60 parking space.
- I strongly recommend relocating the proposed 66 parking stalls to south of 66 Avenue immediately west of the Chinese Church.
- I strongly recommend relocating the 66 parking stalls to south of 66 Avenue to the west of the Chinese Church.
- 60 stall parking in the south is really good proposal.
- Proposed south parking area is a great idea.
- Hopefully the additional parking lot will be unnecessary.
- I fully support the "staged" parking lot development (great plan). Just a word of caution - you must ensure the parking lot is used. All of the residents along 88 Street already have a tough time - this will worsen it.
- The 60 stall parking lot will cause a loss of green space and will increase garbage in the creek. It may also cause accidents as people turn off of 66 Avenue.
- The proposed parking lot on the south end of ball fields I believe will help if not solve the parking problems for the area.
- Both of the new parking lots are required. Don't relent.
- I believe the relief parking at the southwest end may be a great alternative to the street parking.
- Oppose the parking lot off 66 Avenue.
- Parking lot off of 66 Avenue & 88 Street should go in.
- The auxiliary parking lot off of 66 Avenue near Chinese church is a good idea.
- I support the idea of the parking at the entrance to the baseball diamonds.
- I support additional ballpark parking on 66 Avenue.
- I am in favour of this plan, including the extra parking just off 66th Avenue by the bus stop.
- I support the parking lot at the lower end of the ball fields as needed.
- I support the parking off of 66th Avenue. It keeps the traffic off the smaller roads.
- Make sure you address the residents concern about traffic - it appears to be related to parking needs (so the parking lot on the far end of the ball fields may be essential).
- I believe the parking at the west end of the park area is a must.
- I do not support the paving a parking lot over green space! Many people use this space and taking away already limited park space is unreasonable. Already a very congested area - bus stop, busy street,

cars/vehicles driving fast around the curve - dangerous.

- I am opposed to the prospective parking lot (60 stalls) along 66 Avenue and 90 Street. Tear down parkland to put up a parking lot! This lot is contraindicated along several lines: Aesthetics – it's adjacent to city's major bike / pedway right adjacent to creek. Sure would spoil my vista. Safety - the entrance / exit is proximate to the bike / pedway trail, bus stop, crosswalk to access park from the neighbourhood, speeders rounding corner going west. Rationale - This small lot will not alleviate parking problems; lot would be way underutilized and be a waste of tax dollars, amount of general leisure / passive park space greatly reduced. How do I access park to have family leisure, or walk to grandmas - either take my kids through a parking lot or dodge baseballs. Really a parking lot for baseball players - get real.
- I am pro the 60 car parking lot.
- No to parking lot at 66 Avenue.
- Without the parking lot off 66 Avenue the traffic going down 88 and 86 Street will be too much during the summer when baseball gets underway.
- Increasing density with parking lot around a blind corner is not safe. Please reconsider this issue. The bus stop has been hit twice in three years. We don't need any more problems.
- I really liked the idea of the phased southwest parking lot build if needed. Good idea.
- Provide additional parking north of 66 Avenue west of 88 Street.
- The parking lot off 66 Avenue takes up the only active use space at the south end of the park.

### *88<sup>th</sup> Street Parking*

- To allow parking on one side of the street at least as it has been for many years. Allows baseball players direct access to fields.
- Particularly the parking ban on 88th Street.
- No parking for all the potential users unless a very strict parking program is enforced. Too many vehicles will be on 88 Street and it is not fair to the residents.
- As you work to get the ball users to park at the Velodrome with parking only on one side of the street on 88 Street, I think the residents may need parking passes or some way to prevent the users from parking on the side streets.
- The lack of an option for additional parking is disappointing. I was looking for the options of angle parking along 88 Street.
- Continue to allow parking on both sides of 88 Street.
- Parking at southeast. Ball players will continue to park on 88 Street rather than using the expanded Velodrome.

- Parking along 88th Street - why not put parking restrictions on both sides of the street rather than just the park side because we know what the users are going to park along the other side.
- Though I do understand why certain 88th Street residents are against this re-development, I have to also consider that while traffic increases during summer events (mainly softball) residents would have to expect that traffic would be an issue when considering the living in this location. Furthermore, many of these residents themselves park on the street while most have double garages with back alley access. This is obvious by the number of vehicles parked on 88th street during the fall and winter months. In short, they themselves contribute to the problem of both traffic and parking on 88th Street. My family made a conscious choice to buy a home that has an ETS bus stop in front. This by no means entitles me to demand that the city move this stop because it may be an occasional nuisance.

I would again suggest that the park space along 88th Street be altered to allow for angle parking between existing trees. Additionally, parking along the east side of 88th Street should be limited for residents only. This will accomplish 4 things. 1. Increase parking during busy summer activities, 2. Residents would have unimpeded use of the parking in front of their homes, 3. The use of this space would have limited impact on the park as a whole by utilizing the perimeter, and not the center parkland. Lastly, this space would be more easily maintained during regular road plowing when not in use.

To summarize, the use of the perimeter directly bordering 88th Street would have the least impact on year-round park activities.

- I strongly recommend street parking to be allowed on 88 Street on weekends.
- I fully support the single sided parking during summer/weekends.
- The street congestion would definitely be reduced if parking was limited to only the residential side however, this may hinder those residences wishing to access the parking in front of their own homes.
- Ban parking on 88 Street or local parking only.
- I would like a parking ban along 88 Street with seasonal restrictions.
- Placing a ban on parking on 88 Street will only enable users to drive faster.
- If one-way parking will be proposed on 88 Street, then it should be one way along the park. People can drive in from the north east and face the south west. NO one way parking should be along the residences.
- Consideration to move the blvd trees inward on 88 Street and 69 Avenue in order to widen these streets - would increase parking for both residents and park users in summer time / weekends.
- I'm concerned about the proposed parking ban.

- Because I live on the corner of 88 Street and 67 Avenue, I have experienced the increasing traffic over the last 21 years. Ball diamond users often block our driveway and park unsafely and/or illegally. Residents who live on the south side of 66 Avenue or closer to Argyll Rd. are not affected so much at this point.

### *Parking - General*

- Encourage more parking space as it is short on Sunday morning when there is a ball game.
- Have more parking spaces.
- Well thought out and a great facility. Like all the extra parking off street.
- Adding the additional parking is critical.
- Concerns regarding parking.
- Particularly increased site parking.
- Ensure that additional parking for Velodrome is not too close to the ravine edge.
- As it is what was heard at consultation meetings, new parking lots are required.
- Additional parking in addition to Velodrome parking proposed.
- Two lane is on 87 Street and 67 Avenue. Suggest parking on one side of the road only.
- Love the plan, encouraged to know off-street parking is hopefully planned.
- I support this plan fully. Sufficient parking / access.
- Great work! Needs more parking.
- That it ensure that there is adequate parking or bus routes - 60 spaces seems limited for both staff and public use.
- The major issue to be resolved is on street parking.
- Parking is ok.
- Parking must be addressed first. This is the number one issue with neighbourhood residents. Parking passes / tickets to encourage users to use parking stalls currently sitting empty.
- Maximizing use of space. Suggest maximize current parking spots.
- School parking lot to be maintained and a sign indicating ok to park.
- I'm concerned about putting increased parking lots on city green space.
- Too much parking is destroying the park.
- No parking lots near neighbourhoods.
- Too much parking close to edge of ravine.
- I disagree with converting any green space into parking stalls. This is the part of a slippery slope.
- Please consider removing the surplus school and increasing parking there.
- Parking bans in all of Argyll during major events should be inclusive of 87 Street cul-de-sac as well.



- Please do not replace Parklands with Parking.
- Parking? I assume this will be adequate.
- Please keep all parking spaces on the street.
- If all these plans come to fruition, we will need a lot more parking stalls. I support the extra parking where the dirt bike track is now but that is still not enough when there will be events at the hall, soccer, biking events, etc. all at the same time.
- Only local home owners and guests should be allowed to park on the house side of the roads along the park. Athletes and exercisers should get out of their vehicles before entering Argyll.
- I would like a parking ban on 87 Street and 67 Avenue with seasonal restrictions.
- Why not do what they do around Northlands park and have residential parking only and have any violators ticketed. Both parking lots are required.
- Extend the parking ban / institute residential parking permits along 69 Avenue / 84 Street in front of the toboggan hill and ensure adequate parking is supplied at the school site for all user groups of the building (old school).
- What happens when 600 - 800 people come to watch a cycling event? Where will people park? Is the neighbourhood going to be subjected to parking limits such as exist around Commonwealth Stadium?

### *Traffic*

- We are lacking traffic control, solving traffic in residential street with services - hard of hearing, poor eye sight, children crossing - not a chance with massive traffic. We need stop signs at 66 Avenue and 86 Street going north, also 86 Street and 69 Avenue, plus speed bumps which can be removed in winter (Leduc County does this)
- Concerns regarding traffic. Pave 86 Street T-Intersections at 66 Avenue and 86 Street.
- The master plan as presented did not include all info on the Argyll/City Transportation Committee recommendations to help deal with traffic issues (round-about at the north end of 86 Street, signage, speed controls, etc.). It did mention that parking would not be permitted on the park side of 66 Avenue. It would have been useful to have the full set of recommendations available and may have helped alleviate some of the concerns, unless of course there is no plan to implement those recommendations. I would be very concerned if that were the case. Transportation studies (whether they be Velodrome/city funded/ or whatever) and other information should be made publicly available - this would help build confidence in the public consultation process and

proposed development of the Velodrome. The failure to share information in an open and transparent manner places what should be positive development in jeopardy - I heard the drums beating folks!

- The traffic in this area is definitely a concern. I think the current access to the facility is a much better location than moving it to the corner.
- Traffic concerns on 87 Street when most facilities are being used.
- Traffic lights and lanes turning north off of Argyll and 86th and turning left east from 86th and Argyll is causing a problem now. Increased traffic (not only due to Velodrome projects) but population increase.
- Speed bumps on 86 Street - people speed down our street coming to and from the park area. It will only get worse with more traffic.
- Also the addition of speed bumps along this same road (ie. 88 Street).
- City to investigate the possibility of re-routing traffic through neighbourhood (eg: one ways, etc.).
- Perhaps the proposal should look at ways to reduce traffic flow and numbers of vehicles.
- There is a plan to deal with increased traffic to the area, ensuring children, animals, and seniors are safe on the road.
- You need to address traffic speed on 86 Street.
- Traffic calming bumps on 86 Street would be an inexpensive way to reduce traffic speed so that residents are kept happy.
- Traffic flow of 86 and 88 Street. Speed bumps put in place?
- Concerned about increased traffic. T intersection at 66 Avenue a good idea.
- I would also suggest speed bumps be inserted along 86 Street to reduce traffic speed.
- Traffic lights at 86 Street and 63 Avenue need to be considered.
- To keep the existing drive way location for the Velodrome - a corner location is more direct and would increase speeds of the vehicles = more dangerous.
- If you take it in measured steps. Give full thought to the transportation problem.
- The traffic issued has not been resolved. By not allowing the parking lot off of 66 Avenue the traffic will continue to flow thru 86 Street and 88 Street. The lot on 66 Avenue would have some of the baseball traffic out of our neighborhood. This would have helped a lot. We will still get the traffic for soccer and the Velodrome, and now still the baseball diamonds. So, nothing has really changed to help the traffic issue. Also 1400 cars sounds like a very high number considering the width of 86th Street with parking on both sides.
- Our community is too small to facilitate it. We already see a very large traffic volume through the spring and summer due to baseball and BMX. Traffic and speeding down 86 Street is a huge concern for those of us with children. I don't think we have proper access (direct) to the facility

without impacting our small community. Traffic is loud and bothersome and disruptive and dangerous for our children.

- Too much traffic in a residential area.
- There is already way too much traffic in the neighbourhood.
- It includes the new Velodrome which increases traffic thus aggravating a situation which is already unacceptable.
- Traffic.
- Too much traffic.
- I do not support the plan because of the traffic involved.
- It does not adequately address the traffic issues already being experienced along 86 Street and 88 Street. A multi-purpose park and facility should have better access that does not affect local residents to this degree. As a resident on 86 Street I am continually exposed to speeding along this street from users of these facilities.
- Of the extra traffic speeding through 66 Avenue. The area is used by many cyclists and children. The speed signs are not obeyed or enforced now and this will just make the area more dangerous to children who are leaving the area to attend school. If we could find a way to control traffic I would be in favour of the plan.
- Addition of a NO-U-TURN Sign at 86 Street and 64 Avenue is necessary. Lights at Argyll Road and 86 Street will require a left turn phase light for exiting traffic traveling south bound to accommodate exiting traffic increase from development of Argyll. Speeding is common on 66 Avenue. What measures can be instigated to reduce traffic speed? Speed bumps do not work for ETS.
- Transportation - no roundabout at 69 Avenue and 86 Street.
- Speed bumps and stop signs to slow traffic.
- How would it impact traffic flow? For example: with parking for 165 cars it contravenes your own bylaw that major recreational areas are not to come off residential streets.
- RE traffic - I would like to see a traffic circle at 69 Avenue and 86 Street to make the incoming traffic slow down and give pedestrians the right of way.
- When you start construction I would suggest you move the bus shelter about 20-30 feet closer to 66 & 88 corner to save it from getting run over by speeders coming along 66 avenue from the south - it is particularly dangerous in winter when road gets icy.
- Many of us are concerned about traffic - it is inevitable.
- Better pavement markings, signage and no parking within 2-' of crosswalks is essential. A 30KM/hour speed limit is required on the entire corridor. Implementation of roundabouts or reconfiguration of intersections cannot take place without further public input.
- I am not sure if this is included, but the lights at 83 Street and Argyll Park need to be adjusted to allow more flow of traffic out of the community.

Would like the major thoroughfare to be along 85 Street from the east instead of on 86 Street.

- Only concern is the traffic proposal. Do not take out the triangle. Do not put in a traffic circle near the Argyll School. Evolve the traffic plan rather than trying to predict it.
- As a long time resident (51 years), I can only see a great increase in traffic if all these plans come to fruition.
- There is an opportunity to suggest two lanes south across Argyle (traffic lights) left turn flashing. Turning right from 86 onto Argyll - two lanes okay but need to stop traffic from the north.
- The feeder road from Argyll needs more traffic signs. Have a turning lane on Argyll Road.
- People coming into the community assume they have the right of way if there is no traffic sign. A yield sign is needed on 86 Street at 69 Avenue now.
- We support all the proposed changes with the addition of parking obstacles (for lack of better word) to reduce the speed of traffic on 86 Street going around the corner.
- The proposed "T" section on 66 Avenue and 86 Street should not happen. Also people slipping in traffic will drive directly into my home. Also the vehicle lights directly at my home at all hours.
- Make sure you address the residents concern about traffic - it appears to be related to parking needs and speeding vehicles (install speed bumps or mini traffic circles).
- The vehicle per day numbers seem rather high and perhaps these are peak numbers. Winter vehicle numbers would be lower due to no use of the baseball or soccer facilities.
- Biggest concern heard from locals - parking / traffic. Suggest taking another look at routes in / out.
- Given the current building climate and the city's other needs, I wonder if this project is too grand in scope at this time. The Hazeldean / Argyll Communities have been concerned with traffic issues for a number of years and I see nothing in the current plan that addresses anything other than parking.
- I would like to see more traffic calming efforts in Argyll, especially on 86 Street. Traffic speed too much on 86 Street.
- Traffic calming measures to deter speeding are needed especially along 86 Street. I am a strong proponent for a "T" intersection at 86 Street and 68 Avenue. As well I would like to see at least 2 speed bumps to slow traffic down.
- I would like to see speed controls for traffic so that residents also are happy. Everybody can win, speed bumps are cheap.
- The issue of traffic continues to be a concern. I fully support the park plan and the Velodrome but the city of Edmonton should continue to support

the solutions the community has proposed regarding traffic.

- I do not feel that my concerns for traffic on 86 Street is necessarily being addressed. I am concerned about the proposed increase in traffic at peak times and the existing number of speeders and irresponsible driving.
- More traffic control at the end of 86th near the old Argyll School. Slow traffic down along 66 Avenue.
- As a resident who lives along 66 Avenue I can vouch for the serious speeding issues we have.
- What about ETS Service to the facility? Will 88 Street and 86 Street become bus routes?
- Transportation is our main concern, there are only two ways out of the Argyll neighborhood (66 Ave or 86 Street) Something would most definitely need to be done about the traffic light situation at 63 Ave (Argyll Rd) and 86 Street - it is already ridiculous at rush hour (ie: turning left or right heading south on 86 St to turn onto 63 Avenue is difficult with heavy traffic).

### *Velodrome*

- I believe that the upgrade/redevelopment of the area will increase the participation of cycling on a community level as well provide opportunity to host international level events which aid in the financial stimulation of Edmonton. This applies to not only cycling, but the participation of sport in general (soccer, baseball, etc.).
- The Velodrome will be great for Edmonton, and will be the envy from the rest of Canada. The whole recreation idea is important for our residents and society.
- Fantastic - the city will benefit from a multi-use facility. Great for athletes.
- It will give more options to training indoors and accommodate more users of the facility.
- An indoor cycling facility would be a tremendous boost for future development of world-class athletes.
- This is a good idea because cycling will be a larger sport in Edmonton.
- The Velodrome will be a great asset.
- This plan will allow many more athletes to train better. It will allow better winter training for cyclists and will likely attract top athletes from around the area!
- It would be fantastic to have a place to cycle in the winter.
- The Plan addresses the issues identified by the community at the previous meetings. One of the shortcomings is the uncertainty of the impact on the community by the Velodrome redevelopment.
- Re: new development of Velodrome - Argyll and Hazeldean residents should be offered facilitated access to Velodrome facilities (reduced

rates/passes/etc.) and Argyll Community League should have first right of refusal to operate any concession facilities in the Velodrome - incentives are a useful tool and build awareness of this development as an opportunity rather than a negative impact.

- I do not support the revised Velodrome at this time.
- In addition to bikes and tracks for running, it would be a good idea to rent out to others such as soccer teams (adult only) - we do not have many sports.
- To increase the usage of the area for cyclists and other sports minded people. May use schools to increase numbers at track and other aspects of facility.
- Excellent use of space and promotion of environmental use and exercise. I encourage an aggressive fundraising effort by the cycling clubs to ensure minimal tax impact (city funding) or dramatically increased public use of facility.
- To summarize, while I am in favor of the Velodrome re-development, the Argyll Park preliminary master plan needs to reconsider the use of parkland for parking. This would be parking that would only be used by non-residents and, even then, during the months of May through August. The balance of the year would see little or no use, and be required to be maintained regardless.
- The Velodrome should be moved out of Argyll to a better location elsewhere in the city. Edmonton is growing, and with only one access road in or out of this still quiet community (66th Avenue turning into 86th Street) the traffic here is already increasing dramatically.
- There is no reason to develop the ravine edge more than it is already. Why not put the concrete bunker in an industrial area? The only benefits I've heard are for association members - not for Argyll or city residents. This development could turn into condos in 10 years time. Who is paying for this development? Quite possible that the association will use city taxes to pay for a facility that benefits only the association.
- I would rather have tax dollars spent on fixing our neighbourhood roads and sidewalks than on expanding the Velodrome for a few avid cyclists.
- \$20 million for a few professionals sucks.
- Locating the Velodrome within a residential area never made sense. The desire to enclose the track and expand services to attract more and varied users, while noble, is to the detriment of the community.
- The entire plan looks well thought out and I fully endorse the proposed Velodrome project. This would be an asset to the community, the city, the sports community, for the entire nation.
- I think that this plan to build multi-sport facility is an excellent plan to grow various sports in Edmonton. Cycling in Canada has grown to the level where we need indoor facilities, especially in our climate. In addition to cycling facility will and can be used for various other sports that need

indoor room in our climate. Thank you for doing this for our population.

- I think a city doesn't get many chances for a new Velodrome as proposed here. It would be a shame to pass on the opportunity. A year round building would be a great boon to the city to develop world class athletes and promote health and fitness to the general public.
- I like the idea of using the floor of the Velodrome for tennis, volleyball etc because it would be year round.
- More parking inside by the Velodrome is a good idea, less congestion.
- I encourage the facility being open to the public, offering memberships to the gym etc. Great looking, I think its a great addition to Edmonton facility.
- Keep the open integrity of Argyll Park. No closed in (Velodrome) facilities.

### *Argyll School*

- The school will be used for a nonprofit group.
- The Plan addresses the issues identified by the community at the previous meetings. One of the shortcomings is the ultimate use of the public school site.
- Re: Argyll School - it was indicated to me that the school board has decided not to remove the portables. I strongly urge removal of these unsightly structures. Removal would allow additional parking to be developed on the existing portable footprint and remove the necessity for the parking lot (and proposed expansion of that lot) adjacent to the east side of the school.  
I do not support expansion of this parking lot to a 30 site parking lot unless the parking lot is placed at the north side of the school (ie where the portables are currently located). Given that little detailed information was provided regarding future tenants of the school site, the Argyll Community League is depending on the City following through with its promises to bring forward a short-listed set of suitable candidates for review and endorsement by Argyll Community League.
- Nonprofit groups in old school site is good use of existing facilities.
- Put a good tenant in the empty school. Someone who will complement and enhance what is happening here. Or use it as another related facility operated by the city.
- With the parking ban on 88th Street and additional parking facilities I would want assurances that the school facility is tagged for non profit "recreational groups / youth groups" and be mandated the school area revert for a recreational use once the facility is too onerous to maintain.
- School kept for non-profit or community groups or changed to parkland.
- Argyll school parking should be increased to accommodate increased

- parking for occupants of school.
- Make use of the Argyll School grounds with possibly more parking there to ease the parking problems on the street.
  - Ensure that the Argyll School is purchased by the city and at the end of the schools useful life that the land reverts to non-special use green space. No sports fields.
  - If the old school has to be torn down - how about a paved passive area for wheel chairs and baby buggies - friendly to them at least.
  - Non profit groups in old school are an excellent use of existing facilities.
  - Not knowing how Argyll school will be used is a major concern.
- This plan is not inclusive of all Argyll Park as it did not address the former school building and site.
- Not quite sure on the future uses for the "school".
  - I'm pleased city bought school property to add to overall sports region and nonprofit groups in the old Argyll Park.
  - The Argyll School use seems to be an open ended question as to long term use. A commitment from the city to have it earmarked for recreation space once the maintenance of the facility becomes too onerous and can no longer be used for non profit organizations.
  - Keeping the Argyll School is good; it could be retrofitted for solar heat sometime in the future.
  - I appreciate the fact that the city listened to the concerns about the surplus school and purchased it so nonprofit groups can make use of it.
  - Any future use of Argyll school (or a replacement building) should be parks and recreation related, not office space or commercial use.
  - I like the idea that non profit groups are going to be using the old Argyll school site.
  - More information on potential uses of surplus school and long term plan for incorporation in recreational activities.
  - At the last meeting we wanted the extra school site to accommodate parking for use by baseball fields, Velodrome and fitness. It is an old building with big structural issues. Get rid of it and use the space.
  - Leave the Argyll School as is (park for amateur sports).
  - Interested in more information on the future use of the school for non profit groups. I believe the community should have a voice on which groups use the schools so that there is no adverse impact on the community.
  - There was very little information about the future use of the school.



## *Public Toilets*

- It will be nice to see new bathrooms.
- Don't have privies all over the place – consolidate.
- Outdoor toilet - a must.
- Washrooms with exterior lighting - prevents vandalism.
- Bathrooms added to back of hall would be great.
- I am concerned regarding porta potties. I would rather see washrooms like the ones at Hawrelak Park.
- Needs washrooms for sport fields.
- Don't put toilets in the middle of the field.
- Outdoor toilets available are a must. (Saw a 5 year old from Avonmore with no where to go.)
- NO Baseball Excessive drinkers; they use the parks as toilets.
- Keep an option for privies.
- I understand you were thinking of adding toilets to the back of the Argyll Community League, a good idea.
- I like the idea of the outhouses being available for the field users.
- Adding outside toilets is exceptional given there are so many people using the space - our kids have to run home to go to the bathroom when they're at the park playing so toilets outside would be great.
- The additional washrooms are a great idea.
- Do not put out porta potties, bathroom facilities should be available at Argyll School, Argyll Community Hall and building adjacent to Velodrome.
- I am pro privies.
- Outdoor toilets are needed.
- Privies are a good idea, however I would be interested in viewing design styles.

## *Trails*

- Generally good but I object to the paving of all the paths.
- Clear path - no west/southwest access to Mill Creek Ravine from community hall when all four diamonds in use. This is currently possible and should be with proposed development.
- Do not pave the outer perimeter.
- Amber flashing pedestrian lights to cross 66 Avenue beside the ravine to ensure safety of trail users.
- Have a gravel trail instead of paved trail along west side.
- Excellent that bike trails lead to the facility. I plan on using them,

- therefore they should be lit. Would expect a lot of people will ride.
- I feel this proposal incorporates excellent use of the existing green space provided that the trail system is preserved.
  - Extra paved trails are good.
  - I don't mind developing the trails.
  - I DO NOT support the Ravine Top trail being converted to asphalt and suggest only the interior trails (good as proposed) and the trail along 88 Street around behind community league building be paved.
  - WE do not think one has to walk between the playing fields to gain access to the valley trails.
  - Do not pave the outer perimeter. If you asphalt the west side of the park this will encourage bikes etc to the detriment of people walking their dogs. Keep as much green belt open for the enjoyment of the people.
  - The paving of the existing bike paths through the area is a great improvement and we look forward to having the existing paved paths connected.
  - The continuation of the bike / walking path around a parking lot seems strange.
  - Continuing the trail off 88 Street to go between diamonds 2 and 3 would be better than having it turn up and go between diamonds 3 & 5.
  - Do not pave any more paths in the sports fields. Keep it natural (perimeter).

### *Tree & Shrub Planting*

- It will be nice to see new shrubs.
- I like the trees in the model around the fields etc.
- Area behind Velodrome now designated as ad hoc soccer field should follow Bio Diversity proposal and be replanted with wild berry (chokecherry, Saskatoon, as well as poplars and a few spruces.
- Area immediately east of School parking to be developed into a quiet area with low shrubs or flowers and EVEN a fountain or other water feature. Plan shows tree line angling across section of school Yard. The park currently has view of CITY SKY LINE which is a very nice feature therefore any trees there should maybe be lower shrubs to preserve Sky Line feature. Thank you.
- Adjacent to the east side of the school - there is also no plan to provide suitable landscaping for the existing lot to hide its unsightly appearance from the residents who live across the street from the school. If this lot has to remain, such site improvements are necessary.
- I'm concerned that the proposed plantings might obscure clear lines of sight in a park that I currently feel completely comfortable in at night.
- Ensure tree plantings are shade trees that will ensure visibility.

- No planting around baseball fields.
- Sitting / quiet flower, low shrub gardens east of school by school parking lot. Fountain would be very nice. Open area north and east of school shows tree line - keep tree plan low so as to retain distant view of city.
- With the trees planted along the perimeter of this new parking area, you would not see this from 66 Avenue or 88 Street anyway.
- Do not put bushes and trees around all the baseball diamonds.
- Ensure new planting does not obstruct spectators' view of baseball fields or limit putting in stands.
- The proposed parking lot on the south end of ball fields - if trees are planted around it will also enhance the beauty of the entire park.
- Maximize trees in sports areas.

## *Fields*

- I hope we can get Home Base for both 300' fields for baseball soon.
- Maybe have fewer slowpitch parks - do we need that many?
- I'm not keen on the ball diamonds, but can live with them.
- No other nearby sports facility for residential use. Five softball diamonds might be a bit heavy density.
- Too many baseball pitches. Add more soccer pitches or fewer baseball.
- Additional outdoor soccer and baseball diamonds are needed.
- Less softball fields to increase the multi use of the area.
- I find that ball diamonds tend to sit empty quite often where as it can be difficult to find proper sized soccer fields for games. Perhaps a larger ratio of soccer fields?
- Reduce the number of softball fields from 5 to 4.
- I do not see the need for that many ball diamonds. Will they be used? So far as I see there is not to many times that the ball diamonds are fully used. Even with the new proposed regulation sized fields will it be used?
- Move the rugby grounds east to west. Move the soccer east.
- Maybe I don't like the density of five ball diamonds. They create a lot of traffic issues for little usage.
- The sports field proposals look good.
- Too many ball diamonds squashed in.
- There appears to be an inordinate amount of space dedicated to ball fields in comparison to other community based activities. The ball fields used primarily by outside adults that have no connection to the community, thereby increasing the ratio of cars vs people (ie: one person per car) The rationale that the ball field users would not walk to a parking lot is not valid as they park on out streets and avenues and walk 2-3 blocks to the fields.
- Leave the field view open as it is even if you must put 4 diamonds

squeezed in there.

- Consideration should be given to not having all the diamonds in use at the same time. This would cut down on the parking problem.

### *Fences & Benches*

- No fences around baseball fields. Define open grass/passive use in a different way than above (maybe shorter plantings). This creates areas that are too secluded.
- It is good that no fences be put up on the diamonds.
- With additional benches along 68 Avenue to sit near soccer and rugby fields.
- Around all the baseball diamonds - bench areas - maybe?
- Provide benches in open areas.

### *Process/Format*

- The Velodrome and City must provide written and available information to the community in advance in order to obtain realistic and informed consultation. I.e. the business plan, the traffic study, the parking study, the alternate site study, the environmental impact assessment, etc. Apparently some traffic measures are being considered between the City and Argyll Community League... Yet you had NOTHING at the open house about that.
- I am very impressed with the planning that has gone into this project to ensure that many user groups benefit and that there is sufficient parking to accommodate the increased volume.
- The open house format is not appropriate; we need a public meeting to address transportation concerns.
- I really like the fact that the community was involved in the master planning process.
- I must say that the information is quite vague and open to interpretation and speculation. The city should endeavor to be more concise in planning details and projections of impact to the community. The information provided was appreciated, but changes to the neighbourhood should be met with clarity rather than the appearance of a dreaded "hidden agenda". We should be building trust in the system (regardless of final decision). I don't see evidence of that. Thanks.
- While the city planners claim to be unbiased, they also state that they are in "partnership" with the AVA - this is a conflict of interest which favours the developer.

- Thank you for the opportunity to talk with city officials, etc about this plan. The information is helpful in understanding what is actually happening in this area. This is a good project and will inject some new life into this area.
- I like the information that has been shared and appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback.
- More communication and transparency is required from planning to the community. Community wants to know information and when asked planning makes excuses and charges outrageous fees instead of cooperating. Waive the \$2800 fee and work with the community. The residents want to be heard and they know the community best. If they indicate that drivers drive fast through 66 Avenue, they do! FOIP is one thing but isn't FOIP supposed to provide information to those who request it; who will be most impacted. I live in the community and so want to know what is going on in the community.
- Introductory information (when you first come into the gym) was weak aesthetically. Didn't make you want to read it yet it was vital information to understand the context of what came after. This is your most important piece when trying to gain support for your plan.
- It looks like a tremendous amount of work / planning has gone into this already. The planning committee has done a great job.

### *Miscellaneous*

- Good bike parking facilities will be useful.
- It will provide more sport activities and facilities to this community. It is a good plan.
- It will help the development of this community since our city is growing. It is a very good idea to have sport recreation facility locates in a good traffic area.
- It looks great. A multipurpose site is sorely needed here.
- I support this plan, it looks great! We need more of this type of facilities. Well done.
- One of a kind sport and natural park facility.
- One of Edmonton's strong points is the sport facilities and green space development of these is required for continued enjoyment
- I think this is a great plan, the multi use seems like it was well thought out.
- Always need new facilities for families and individuals to go to for recreation.
- Having a facility inside the city a nice touch as opposed to having to travel to the edges of the city.

- A facility such as this in central Edmonton is a wonderful asset.
- Recreational facilities are important to our quality of life, and they must be adapted and upgraded as necessary to keep them relevant to the needs of our citizens.
- Make good use of the empty park space. Provide more usage to the residents of Edmonton.
- Well thought out plan with benefits for many diverse user groups.
- I think it is great. It supports a healthy life style. Very good plan!
- Good use of space and support of current users.
- It is well thought out, inclusive of the users, and has merit.
- Good use of space - moderate yet necessary redevelopment.
- As it appears to be well thought out and an excellent use of space.
- The plan seems to balance green space with structures.
- As it utilizes existing grounds to a maximum.
- Will make for a beautiful park space.
- Layout addresses communities concerns.
- I support this plan completely. The process taken and thought put into it have been exceptional.
- There has been an effort to listen and reassess.
- Jim Black (City of Edmonton, Landscape Architect) has done an excellent job in design. Some minor tweaking may be required.
- This is a fantastic, well planned and considered development.
- Great ideas and important for a growing city.
- Although I don't live close to the neighbourhood. I look forward to seeing this project proceed.
- It's a great addition to our city.
- Nothing's perfect. It will be nice to see new development.
- A positive plan for the community and city.
- The city would benefit hugely from this project.
- I think it is an excellent plan.
- I support this plan 100%.
- I think the proposed changes look good and will work well.
- Good plan - well thought through.
- I don't see any downfalls for the proposed park plan.
- Fantastic looking plan.
- Looks like a reasonable plan.
- As it is currently presented at this meeting.
- Yes. It is well thought out. It is really needed.
- As designed.
- Let's stop talking and get it done!
- Whole heartedly.
- 100%
- As described in writing
- The plan is heading in the right direction. However, continued feedback is

- required with the residents of Argyll.
- More communication between the planning committees and the community. More available information should be shared with the community. Want more transparency from planning to help community. Waive \$2800 fee as it is a community concern.
  - Input and support of the community leagues.
  - Keep the BMX track.
  - My main concern at the moment is the booking of too many major events all at the same weekend. Recently there was a Provincial BMX event plus a ball tournament on the same weekend. I expect there were also other events happening at the soccer fields etc. No residential area should have to deal with that. In other words who ever does the bookings needs to check all events happening.
  - Green space is scarce and I moved here because of the open spaces. I am concerned regarding the security. Security of site would be important to me.
  - Include the Velodrome facility (or convert the Argyll school) to be used as a starting point for cross country ski activities in winter.
  - That it be affordable to use to those in the community. That it incorporate health and education initiatives.
  - Yes, I support this plan as it is needed in the community. My concern is not to damage or destroy present nature.
  - From 12 years of experience, of living across the street from the ball diamonds, users do not care about being courteous. In addition, we strongly believe that residents who live outside Argyll area and who are not directly affected by living so near the park should have less weight given to their responses regarding the survey. As they do not have the same point of view as those of us who deal with the park users and problems directly associated.
  - Overall, an acceptable plan.
  - I support this plan as being excellent!
  - Great plan! Good use of this land.
  - It's a no brainer, just get it done. The use would be utilized year round.
  - Excellent idea. A credible management team is in place.
  - Great work!
  - There have been no allowances for one of the major users of this area - BMX - a much larger user than the Velodrome.
  - Too much congestion and development in a neighbourhood.
  - Too much development.
  - No passive space is allowed for non sports users. Too large a concentration of use for other city residents at expense of local residents.
  - I no longer support the plan. It's going way overboard with change to the area. Keep the areas inclusively sports fields, park and green spaces.
  - I saw absolutely NO details on how the City proposes phase 2 to be

considered, the mechanics of how it would be done, when it would be considered, etc. I was very disappointed in the lack of take away information at the public meeting. No handouts. No informational brochures. Just posters. And very little information on the posters. Verbal assurances from employees at an open house is not sufficient. I also object to the lack of adequate information provided by the City in its advertising of the public meeting. People only found out what was truly being considered as a result of the hard work of community volunteers handing out flyers pointing out what was being considered and staking out the 60 car parking lot. I am also dismayed that the City only informed the community moments before the open house of changes to their proposed park plan (for example the phase 2 aspect of the parking lot) even though that would have surely been known earlier within the City. Such information should have been communicated much sooner through channels known to the City.

- The failure of the city and the Velodrome association to share all the documentation to the Hazeldean community league reps.
- I was unable to examine all aspects of the plan due to time restrictions. There needs to be more opportunity for Argyll residents to do this. Our community league president supports this plan, but he is not representative of the majority of residents.
- It is very important that the BMX track is incorporated into this area!!
- Ensure the BMX track has a new site, they are a delight to see.
- Keep the BMX track for the pleasure of families and spectators out walking.
- This will be great for the neighbourhood and surrounding neighbourhoods to have this kind of complex so close to us. It would be great if seniors would be able to use the complex. Get this done it will be great for all.
- Must ensure passive park users are not over powered by excessive bike and sport activity.
- RE "Master Plan" - the off-leash area below (in the ravine) is one of the few truly dog friendly areas in the city. Some other "off-leash" areas are not designed with dogs and owners in mind. Please be sure to keep all the entry points, especially east of the school (west of the toboggan hill).
- Upgrading of park for present facilities ok as long as passive space left basically unchanged. If extra facilities needed develop them closer to access without recreational facilities or consider building some on linear park west of 93 Street and east of 99 Street north of 67 Ave.
- I am pro passive areas.
- The potential to attract high level athletes to Edmonton as well as increase participation in cycling and other sports at the grass roots level is very exciting. I look forward to seeing the Argyll Park become an Edmonton Centre for such a broad range of sports and activities.
- Remember only amateurs should benefit from this.



- We should not forget amateur sports.
  - I believe this is a great idea and is moving in the right direction to promote physical activities and sports which will help all that use it to become healthier. Listening to many of the people objecting to this plan and wanting to convert the field back to just a field are people who reject any and all changes as bad and if it were up to them we would still be riding horse and cart.
  - Approval of this plan would reflect support for the policy of promoting wellness and physical activity among all population cohorts.
  - The facility would greatly enhance the neighbourhood with the services available. The community would be safer with the presence of more users, as the parking lot is attracting crime.
  - This would be an excellent addition to the city of champions with an all ages target for community at large.
  - It does not destroy existing river valley, ravine, green spaces. It has bike trails that access the Velodrome. I think fewer people will use Velodrome and I'd like to see sponsors pay for upkeep.
  - The area has needed improvement for quite a while and I'm glad to see the City has taken this approach. A very nice blend of utilizing existing facilities and being proactive to the upcoming needs of the community and city citizens.
  - I think it would be a wonderful addition to our city. The park is due for an update and the proposal has been well planned and thought out.
  - It is exciting to see the city recreating an old community to be a young active community.
  - The city must address this issue as many young families with young children are moving into this community.
  - I like the idea, and feel it would benefit a lot of people.
  - The neighbourhood is changing from seniors to families with young kids/children. Let's see the city put into practice and enrich Edmonton green park area, not reduce it.
  - Create more family friendly areas beside the ball diamonds such as quiet areas with benches, work out loops for all to use (such as in other parks - like 112 Ave and 82 Ave park).
  - The food facility should be one of a healthy menu. Athletes do not need junk food being sold. I strongly stress this. We need to promote healthy foods at sport venues everywhere in the city. Don't forget to put in outdoor bike racks. I love everything offered in the plan. Thanks for all the hard work on this.
  - This site (parks, Velodrome, baseball, soccer, rugby and natural ravine) could be an international model for civic promotion of parks, recreation and environmentalism.
- I hope the city is looking hard at finding a long term solution to the pollution in the ravine and that it is incorporated in the recreation

- development.
- We appreciate all the work done to create this master plan.
  - This is great plan.
  - Strongly support the plan, definitely a good model for other areas.
  - It should proceed as soon as possible.
  - Great job so far on this project.
  - Overall, a well thought out master plan.
  - We all have to do our share in supporting a growing Edmonton.
  - I support the master plan as is.
  - A wonderful project that hopefully comes to be.
  - Good luck. Thanks.
  - Some great opportunities.
  - Please support this worthwhile project.