

WHAT WE HEARD REPORT

Online Public Engagement Feedback Summary

LDA20-0026 - Oliver

PROJECT ADDRESS: 10231 - 120 Street NW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The application proposes to rezone the property from [Urban Services Zone \(US\)](#) to [Medium-Rise Apartment Zone \(RA8\)](#).

The proposed Medium-Rise Apartment Zone (RA8) would allow for a 23-metre high (approximately 6-storey) residential building with limited commercial opportunities, such as Child Care Services, General Retail Stores and Specialty Food Services, at ground level.

The application includes an amendment to the [Oliver Area Redevelopment Plan \(ARP\)](#) to enable the rezoning.

PROJECT WEBSITE: https://www.edmonton.ca/residential_neighbourhoods/neighbourhoods/oliver-planning-applications.aspx

ENGAGEMENT FORMAT: Online Engagement Webpage - Engaged Edmonton: <https://engaged.edmonton.ca/stjohnsrezoning>

ENGAGEMENT DATES: June 5 - 26, 2020

NUMBER OF VISITORS:

- Engaged: 36
- Informed: 84
- Aware: 536

See "Webpage Visitor Definitions" at the end of this report for explanations of the above categories.

ABOUT THIS REPORT

The information in this report includes feedback gathered through the Online Engagement Webpage on the Engaged Edmonton platform from June 5 - 26, 2020. Because of public health issues related to COVID-19, the City wasn't able to host an in-person public engagement event to share information and collect feedback, as we normally would have.

Input from Edmontonians will be used to inform conversations with the applicant about potential revisions to the proposal to address concerns or opportunities raised. Feedback will also be summarized in the report to City Council when the proposed rezoning goes to a future City Council Public Hearing for a decision.

This report is shared with all webpage visitors who provided their email address. This summary will also be shared with the applicant and the Ward Councillor.

ENGAGEMENT FORMAT

The Engaged Edmonton Webpage included a video, written text and documents available for download. Two "tools" were available for participants: one to ask questions and one to leave feedback.

The comments are summarized by the main themes below with the number of times a similar comment was made by participants recorded in brackets following that comment. The questions asked and their answers are also included in this report.

WHAT WE HEARD

Support: 5

Support with conditions: 6

Opposed: 20

No Position: 5

Comments

General

- This should be a DC2 Provision to address site specific concerns. It can be modelled after RA8 but with adjustments to address site specific issues (x5).
- I oppose this development (x6).
- I support this (x5)
- Please do not okay this development (x3).

- Please make this happen!
- I'm looking forward to seeing it built!
- Good missing middle infill proposal.

Transportation

- Increased traffic could result in more accidents and impacts on pedestrians, including seniors home nearby. (x6)
- Street parking is already limited, this would make it worse. (x5)
- Private on site parking nearby will be taken up by visitors and people going to the potential commercial uses.
- Great location for removal of parking minimums with proximity to downtown, bike lanes and future transit.
- A full traffic study should be done
- Anything above 4 storeys would mean too much congestion/parking/traffic.
- Lots of development sites in Oliver right now and concerned about the cumulative impact on traffic increases from them all.
- Not concerned about parking if the goal is to encourage transit/bikes.
- Parking will probably continue to be an issue but is to be expected living so close to downtown.

Previous Applications

- It is disingenuous to say that the previous zoning application would have resulted in expanding the park, as this was not in the rezoning application (x3).
- Disappointing that Council voted down the previous application, but this is an acceptable alternative.
- Applaud developer's earlier attempts to address community concerns through a land swap, but not supportive of this alternative.
- The developer here seems to be caught between a rock and a hard place, given the recent history around previous attempts to develop or swap this land.
- It seems that the application rejected by City Council in 2019, or something like it, might want to be reconsidered, given that it solved or mitigated at least some of the problems related to the amount of open space in the area.
- This RA8 rezoning application is preferable to the two previous applications by this developer.
- The previous DC2 zoning would have allowed margins for a more nuanced and artful development.

Peace Garden Park

- Sun shadow would negatively impact the garden to the north. This is the only garden in Oliver and needs to be protected (x8)
- This will ruin the little park next to it (x3).
- There is an impact on the park but it is acceptable (x2)

- Peace Garden Park is an exclusive use area for gardeners, should not be catered to.
- Sun/shadow impacts on the garden are manageable with limited impact on the garden.
- Sun access to the park has to be considered year round, not just in summer.

Parks/Open Space

- We need a park/garden on the St. John's School Site. (x8)
- Oliver already has a very high population density, with not enough parkland (x3).
- COVID-19 has shown we need more parks/open space, not less (x2)
- Balance has to be maintained between high density buildings and park space (x2).
- Undeveloped paved strip between the park and school site needs clarity on ownership and intent. If left undeveloped, it is not good for anyone.

Carnaby Lane Condos ("Bubble Houses" to the south of the site)

- Setbacks not sufficient from townhouses to the south (x5).
- Building too close to townhouses - risk of falling debris (x2).
- Setbacks in the RA8 zone are prejudiced to large sites and single detached houses where they are expected to be larger than on smaller sites and next to other small scale types of development like row houses (x2).
- Design of building at the development permit stage should consider the interaction with the townhouses to the south and the garden to the north (x2).
- Landscaping between new building and townhouses would eventually disrupt sidewalk on townhouse site.
- Nowhere to put snow clearing from townhouses if built.

Building Design

- Setbacks too minimal (x5)
- RA8 is a contextually inappropriate tool for this site and the RA8 zone's setback and stepback parameters have generally been calibrated assuming a greenfield development situation, where both the site and adjacent sites are assumed to be abiding by the same setbacks as regulated in the contemporary zoning bylaw. This is not this context (x4).
- Overlook and privacy concerns on surrounding properties (x3)
- Size of the building doesn't fit the neighbourhood (x3).
- Design should have more articulation (x2).
- 6 Storeys fits well with existing condo developments in the area.
- Size and scale is extremely reasonable for the interior of Oliver.
- The standard RA8 zone leaves a lot of unanswered questions about design specifics and site layout.

- This is the exact kind of height reduction the community was asking for from the original application.
- 6 Storeys would create sightline issues for surrounding buildings and the park.
- Need more “green” buildings. Green rooftop space would benefit the residents of the building and bring more beauty to the area.
- Building should be carbon neutral because it is right by a garden.
- There needs to not be any variances to setbacks.

Policy Context

- 6 storeys/RA8 does not conform with Oliver ARP. The interior of the neighbourhood should stay 4 storeys as per the plan (x3).
- Aligns well with plans to increase density in core neighbourhoods like Oliver (x2).
- RA8 does not require height and massing transitions as recommended by the Transit Oriented Development Guidelines (x2).

Broader Neighbourhood Impacts

- Add terrific density and vibrancy to a highly desirable part of the core (x2).
- More noise from more people (x2).
- Lower buildings (4 storeys) should be in interior with taller buildings on the edges (x2)
- Council should look at what is happening in the neighbourhood overall before allowing this development to go forward.
- Oliver and downtown in general is in no need of yet another condo building
- Focus of Council should be on quality of life of the community
- Lack of regulations of RA8 doesn't ensure a design that will benefit the community.
- Would not benefit Oliver in any way
- Too many developments happening nearby here already.
- Will bring more living options to the area that are currently missing
- Construction impacts very disruptive

Questions & Answers

1. The massing and shadow in video appear to be developer-provided. Can you confirm? If so, has the City built and tested its own model of the RA8 massing envelope to validate these? Can you please provide views from other sides?
 - One of the models (the u-shaped one) was provided by the developer's architect to show an idea of how they see a building being designed for a site of this shape and size. The block model was built by the City to show the full

height and Floor Area Ratio of the [RA8 Zone](#). Shadows were created using Trimble Sketchup by the City, geolocated for Edmonton's latitude and are accurate. The models are in a three dimensional computer environment, so any angle, date or time can be created. Please contact the file planner, Andrew McLellan, at andrew.mclellan@edmonton.ca or 780-496-2939 to request a specific view.

2. What plans do the developers have in place to make this building as carbon neutral as possible? Will the city be changing its development requirements so that new builds must be net-zero in carbon emissions? Things like solar panels, rooftop green spaces, geothermal energy sources, or anything that makes a building zero emission should be mandatory.
 - Sustainable building practices, such as net-zero emissions, are not normally regulated by the Zoning Bylaw or through zoning. These practices are regulated under the Provincial Alberta Building Code and the National Energy Code at the building permit stage, after rezoning.
 - The applicant has advised they have not yet made specific design decisions around what types of sustainable features might be incorporated into this development. However, the building would be required to be built under the 2017 National Energy Code, which came into effect in December last year. The mandated energy efficiency under the 2017 Code is a level above the previous code, and is far greater than the standards older buildings were required to meet.
 - On August 27, 2019 City Council voted to update the City's [Community Energy Transition Strategy \(CETS\)](#) to work to limit the release of greenhouse gas emissions from now until 2050. Through this strategy, Edmonton is transitioning to a low-carbon future and is working to have all new buildings be net zero carbon before 2030, and all existing buildings be net zero carbon by 2050.
3. Parking along 120 Street is already very crowded due to resident parking and those that use the street as free park and ride (park and walk to Jasper Ave/104 Ave to catch a bus). What will the developer be doing to account for extra parking for residents of a multi-story building & guests?
 - On June 23, 2020 Edmonton City Council voted to remove minimum vehicle parking requirements from the Zoning Bylaw ([item 3.22](#)). Eliminating parking minimums represents a significant move towards achieving the vibrant, walkable and compact city that we have heard Edmontonians want through engagement for [ConnectEdmonton](#) and the [draft City Plan](#).

- This change means that effective July 2, 2020 developers, homeowners and businesses will be able to decide how much parking to provide based on their particular operations, activities or lifestyle. Under the new rules, on-site barrier-free/accessible parking will continue to be provided at rates comparable to today and bicycle parking requirements have increased.
 - Developers, businesses and homeowners know their parking needs best and have an interest in ensuring they are met, making this approach more likely to result in the “right amount” of parking. The developer for this particular project has indicated his intention to provide approximately one parking stall per unit.
 - For more information on the removal of parking minimums, please visit edmonton.ca/makingspace.
4. Can you please show the location of the south property line and illustrate the minimum building setback from it?
- The precise location of the south property line has not been verified by a survey at this stage. Rezoning deals with changes based on legal descriptions of titled parcels (lot, block, plan). Following zoning, at the Development Permit stage, a proper survey will be required to verify the precise location of all lot lines and required setbacks of new buildings from them, based on the zoning regulations. You can visit maps.edmonton.ca and turn on layers for “parcels” and use the provided measuring tools to estimate the approximate location of building setbacks. This will generally have an accuracy of +/- 1 metre. Below is an image that shows an estimation of:
 - The location of the south property line (red)
 - The location of the 1.2 m side setback required by the proposed [RA8 Zone](#) (blue).
 - The location of the 3.0 m side setback required by the [RA8 Zone](#) for a new building above a height of 10.0 m (yellow).



5. The sidewalks in the area are in varying states of disrepair with water & ice issues in winter/spring. Would the city/developer be willing to fix the sidewalks during the construction of a new building?
 - The developer is only required to repair damage to sidewalks, roads and lanes around the site that are the result of construction activities.
 - If there are any portions of the public sidewalk that you believe are particularly unsafe, please make a complaint to [311](#).

 6. The former St. John's location is two blocks away from Oliver School. It seems that this is a great opportunity for the City to encourage families to live walking distance from a school. Will this development have apartments / condos that can truly accommodate families, or will it be yet another one of many around here that consists of only 1 and 2 bedroom places?
 - The proposed [RA8 Zone](#) will not require a certain number of units to have a certain number of bedrooms or be family oriented in any specific way. That would be left entirely up to the Developer.
 - The Developer has advised that consideration is still being given to incorporating three bedroom units, however this will be determined at a later date when market studies are completed and the building design is prepared for development permit.
-

Webpage Visitor Definitions

Aware

An aware visitor, or a visitor that we consider to be 'aware', has made one single visit to the page, but not clicked any further than the main page.

Informed

An informed visitor has taken the 'next step' from being aware and clicked on something. We now consider the visitor to be informed about the project. This is done because a click suggests interest in the project.

Engaged

Every visitor that contributes on the page, either by asking questions or leaving a comment, is considered to be 'engaged'.

Engaged and informed are subsets of aware. That means that every engaged visitor is also always informed AND aware. In other words, a visitor cannot be engaged without also being informed AND aware. At the same time, an informed visitor is also always aware.

If you have questions about this application please contact:

Andrew McLellan, Principal Planner
780-496-2939
andrew.mclellan@edmonton.ca