

## WHAT WE HEARD REPORT

### Online Public Engagement Feedback Summary

### LDA19-0297 - Garneau

---

**PROJECT ADDRESS:** 11023 - 11045 86 Avenue NW

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The proposed rezoning is from the Medium Density Multiple Family Zone (RF6) to a Site Specific Development Control Provision (DC2). The proposed DC2 Provision would allow for a short mid-rise building with the following characteristics:

- A maximum height of 22 metres (approximately 6 storeys);
- A maximum floor area ratio of 3.9;
- Up to 159 dwellings (including at least ten with 3 bedrooms and no less than 50% with 2 bedrooms);
- Townhouse style dwellings at the ground level facing 86 Avenue NW; and
- Underground parking accessed from the lane

#### Plan Amendment

There is an associated application to amend the [Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan \(ARP\)](#) to revise current policy that does not support development of this intensity at this location.

Policy Number 1.6a currently directs for this block of Garneau to be developed as multiple family structures, preferably stacked row housing and row housing, to provide a transition between high density development west of 111 Street NW and the low density area south of 85 Avenue NW. This policy is proposed to be amended to allow mid-rise buildings on the

north side of the lane between 85 and 86 Avenues for this block.

**PROJECT WEBSITE:** [https://www.edmonton.ca/residential\\_neighbourhoods/neighbourhoods/11023-11045-86-avenue-nw-revised.aspx](https://www.edmonton.ca/residential_neighbourhoods/neighbourhoods/11023-11045-86-avenue-nw-revised.aspx)

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

**ENGAGEMENT DATES:** July 13 - August 3, 2020

**NUMBER OF VISITORS:**

- Engaged: 45
- Informed: 76
- Aware: 521

See “Web Page 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 Web page on the Engaged Edmonton platform from July 13 - August 3, 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 web page 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: 4

Support with conditions: 4

Opposed: 36

No Position: 1

## Comments

### General/Other

- Sunset clause height still too tall
- Developer driven, only benefit is to maximize their profits (x4)
- Rezoning makes no sense
- Construction impacts including potential temporary lane closure a concern
- Much needed housing to boost the economy

### Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan

- Respect the community plan, it was developed by Garneau residents and has already been carefully and collaboratively developed (x17)
- Too much of a deviation from the Garneau ARP (x5)
- Plan has to be followed to retain the existing older houses in the area, this would set a precedent to take down more houses (x3)
- Garneau ARP should be followed entirely, not just pieces of it (x2)
- Amendment rationale from applicant weak (x3)
- Density OK, but should abide by Garneau ARP (x2)
- Why have a plan if it is not followed?
- This proposal is not so remarkable that it deserves to have the Garneau ARP tossed aside in favour of this

### Massing and Scale

- Too large/too tall/poor transitions (x12)
- Should not exceed 4 storeys (x8)
- Too many units/increase in density too much (x6)
- Setbacks too small, not in line with rest of block (x6)
- Shadow impacts concerning (x2)
- Great density for the area (x2)
- Height should be regulated by number of storeys, not just metres

### Building Design

- There should be no option to remove and replace the trees. Existing trees should remain (x4)
- Design is monolithic/boring/ugly/tacky (x3)
- Design is ok (x2)
- Support except for design (x2)
- Should incorporate more neighbourhood character into it (x2)
- Building should be lowered so parkade doesn't extend out of the ground (x2)
- Attractive building
- Ground level units should have direct access to the sidewalk
- Amenity area requirements should be individually per unit, not satisfied only through combined spaces
- Not enough family housing
- For family housing, ten 3-bedroom plus ten 2-bedroom units, located within the first 3 storeys, with 15 sq.m. of private outdoor amenity space each, would satisfy the need better
- Only 5 m<sup>2</sup> of private amenity area for ground level units is not enough.
- Should provide proper utility and bike storage
- Invest into net-zero design to make up for taking away sunlight from nearby properties that might have been considering solar panels
- Lack of greenspace

### Transportation

- Will create traffic/safety problems (x9)
- Create on street parking problems (x3)
- Traffic in lane will be problematic (x3)
- Needs more and better accessibility for bike parking (x2)
- Needs less car parking, should have a 0.5 spaces per unit max (x2)
- Do not agree with observations of traffic that are in the Transportation Impact Study

### Broader Neighbourhood Impacts

- This will not enhance the neighbourhood (x2)
- This scale of development should be along 109 Street and the periphery of the neighbourhood instead of the interior (x2)
- Excellent addition to the neighbourhood (x2)
- Detrimental impact on heritage/character of Garneau (x2)
- This will hurt the neighbourhood and force current residents away
- Will help provide more apartments on quiet roads and not just busy ones
- Neighbourhood utility infrastructure can't handle this

### Previous Applications

- The initial tower design for this site was a strategy to make the revised proposal look like a good compromise (x5)

- Appreciate efforts by developer to address concerns, but still not sensitive infill (x2)
- Mid-rise better than high-rise
- Revised version responds well to previous community feedback on tower

### Consultation

- People shouldn't be allowed to comment anonymously (x2)
  - The opinions of persons living near the proposed development should carry more weight as they are the people more seriously affected
  - Incomplete consultation, especially with regards to ARP amendment
  - People with positive comments are probably not from the area
- 

### Questions & Answers

1. Why is your transition diagram wrong? The 6 storey building is right across the alley from two storey single family dwellings. Again this is a poorly thought out development that should be scrapped for 109 ST development. on 109 ST, you dig down, and send the soil to a remediation site and then put in parking garages and high rises. Why is this not the plan being taken as we saw to begin with? You cannot use increased density as an excuse! Put up the 4 - 28 storey buildings on 109 ST - you could put up three there!!! 28 x 6 dwellings / floor x 3 = 168 dwellings for 1000-2000 more people. Instead you are ruining a neighbourhood for an extra 40 dwellings for maybe 100 more people.
  - The transition diagram is not wrong. The Purple colour is showing the existing *zoning* for this area, which is different from the existing buildings (shown in blue). While the block south of the lane currently contains houses, the zoning is the [\(RF6\) Medium Density Multiple Family Zone](#), which allows buildings up to a height of approximately 4 storeys, as shown in the diagram and as directed by the [Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan](#).
  - The City would very much like to see redevelopment of the 109th Street corridor in some of the ways you have described. Please see the Council approved [109 Street Corridor Area Redevelopment Plan](#) for details. However, while the City can work on plans and Council can approve them, it is mostly up to private landowners to implement them. To date, not many of the landowners along 109th Street have decided to redevelop their land as per the plan and the City cannot force them. Moreover, the City is not involved as an approving authority for any private real estate transactions that determine who owns land or how much land is owned by one company or developer. The applicant/developer for this application has indicated that they are also looking for other land in the University area, including on 109th Street.
  - The City also cannot stop a landowner in the interior of a neighbourhood

(like this site) from pursuing a rezoning of their land. Anyone has the right, under the *Municipal Government Act*, to ask their elected officials to change zoning regulations or amend a Council approved statutory plan such as the [Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan](#). The City Administration's role is to process such requests and provide City Council with a planning recommendation for their consideration. Administration also carries out engagement activities so that Council is aware of the opinions of Edmontonians and can factor those into their decisions as they see fit.

2. Why is the developer seeking a zoning change to DC2? If the current proposal fits an R8, then shouldn't the application should seek a change from R6 to R8? (There is currently such an application for the LDA20-0123 proposal at 85 Avenue and 106A Street.) What specific protections are there on this site in the future if DC2 status has been granted? In 40+ years time, won't a developer say it is a precedent and try to build another tower on this site? Won't the original RA6 status be long forgotten by then?
  - The current proposal does not fit the [\(RA8\) Medium Rise Apartment Zone](#), primarily with regards to setbacks. For example, the RA8 Zone would require a 7.5 m south setback and the proposed DC2 is proposing a 3.0 m south setback.
  - A (DC2) Site Specific Development Control Provision is far more restrictive than a standard zone like the RA8 Zone. If Council approves this DC2 Provision, then the future building will have to be exactly as described in the DC2 Provision text and appendices. If the proposal was for the RA8 Zone, we would not know at the zoning stage what the building would look like, how many units there would be or what uses are proposed (such as commercial uses which the RA8 Zone allows but this proposed DC2 Provision does not).
  - As for the future, it should be recognized that cities evolve over time. The draft [City Plan](#) outlines a vision for the City growing from 1 million people to 2 million people over the next approximately 40 years. There is also the [Zoning Bylaw Renewal Initiative](#) which will result in a completely new set of zones to reflect the goals and objectives of The City Plan.
3. For bike parking, could single-unit storage rooms be considered? I have lived in several apartment buildings in this area, and the ones with communal bike rooms often had issues with theft. The best bike parking I've experienced was in a mid-rise apartment building in Strathcona that did not have explicit bike parking. However, each unit had a small storage room in the parkade that fit about 2 bikes. It was secure, because only the unit's dwellers could access it, and also super easy to take the bicycle out since I could just use the remote to leave the parkade. For people who don't own bikes, the small storage room could just be used for other things. This style of bike parking seems to be what they use in the Netherlands, the bike

capital of the world, as per the below links. 😊 I'm curious about whether or not Edmonton's bylaws allow this type of bike parking. The proposed building is in a great location for cycling and good, secure bike parking would really serve the demand in the area as well as potentially reduce traffic impacts.

<https://bicycledutch.wordpress.com/2013/07/11/parking-your-bike-at-home/>

<http://www.aviewfromthecyclepath.com/2008/09/cycle-parking-at-home.html>

- Generally, zoning does not regulate details of a building quite to this level of specificity. The [proposed DC2 Provision](#) does require bicycle parking to be in a safe and secure location in the underground parkade or in other secure locations within the building that are easily accessible to cyclists via a route through the building which facilitates easy and efficient transportation of bicycles. The type of storage you are referring to is possible within these regulations, but it is not guaranteed. The developer would decide on these details at the Development Permit stage, if the zoning is approved, and will be made aware of your suggestion for their consideration.
4. Why does the City of Edmonton consider this a "modified" design and not a new application? It is a completely new design so why is it not a new application, and re-start engagement from the start of the process?
- The City used the same application reference number for both the original and revised applications. However, both the technical review and public consultation essentially started over with the revised application. When the application was revised, the same notification and engagement steps were taken as if it was a new application. If the public health situation had allowed, there would have been a second in-person engagement event, just like there was with the original application. Due to current restrictions, this webpage has had to serve this engagement function as best as possible for the revised application.
5. The City indicates that proponents can apply for rezoning, and the City will consider it. What specific criteria and associated triggers does the City consider in such decisions? It seems ad hoc at best so keen to know specific triggers for yes/no. The process seems to ask citizens to "stop" changes to established ARPs and zoning rather than the City requiring the proponent to clearly provide benefits from the proposed rezoning / development.
- Anyone can apply to rezone land or amend a statutory plan, such as the [Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan](#). These applications are indeed "ad hoc" and generally only apply to one proposed development site. The City is mandated by the *Municipal Government Act* to process such applications and take them to City Council for a decision. When doing so, we provide a recommendation to City Council based on our technical review and planning analysis. Another component we facilitate is engaging the public on the

details of the application and collecting feedback. This feedback is used in three main ways:

- To inform our analysis with local knowledge and make sure that it is comprehensive;
  - To engage the applicant on potential revisions to address concerns raised; and
  - To inform City Council of the perspectives of the public so that they can consider these prior to making their decision.
- In making their application, the applicant does put forward their perspectives on the merits/benefits of the proposal. In doing our technical review and planning analysis, we consider their perspective and compare the application to other Council approved policies and guidelines such as the [Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan](#), the [Residential Infill Guidelines](#) and/or the [Transit Oriented Development Guidelines](#). We also factor in our own professional opinions and accepted best practices, as well as technical studies for items like drainage servicing and transportation.
6. The water / wastewater / drainage study does not provide details re cost accounting. Can you specify the costs to the City for any development or maintenance of lines and systems associated with the proposed development?
- The applicant/developer is responsible for all costs associated with building any required infrastructure upgrades. Future maintenance will be the responsibility of the City or specific utility company, no different than the maintenance responsibilities for the existing infrastructure. The City does not do fiscal assessments for maintenance of specific infrastructure replaced/upgraded as the result of a more intense development. However, maintenance costs for new infrastructure is typically less than for older infrastructure. By a developer replacing/upgrading infrastructure at their expense, there is a diminished need to do the same maintenance or upgrades at the City's expense in the foreseeable future.
7. Has a final traffic impact report been provided? The draft report indicates that parking on 86 Avenue was "observed to have capacity available during peak hours". The report also indicates that traffic volumes in the alley "are relatively low." Can the City provide the raw data provided by the developer including the dates and times these observations were made as they are not aligned with common observations made by residents, nor comments made by the City wrt neighbourhood renewal. The report indicates that the developer halved the estimated road traffic impact based on the location assuming that students would be residents of the building. Was that 50% of standard impact acceptable to the City, and if so, based on what assumptions (and how are they applied in the design and requirements of the proposed building - are they required to rent to students)? Based on those 50% factors, the draft traffic impact assessment estimated between 40-110 vpd

additional volume in peak hours to 110 Street, 110-120 vpd additional to 111 Street, and 150-230 vpd in the alleyway. According to the draft report, this represents 4-12% of maximum traffic which is generally considered acceptable to the City on residential streets (or 8-24% if the reduction factor had not been applied by the developer based on their assumption or attracting pedestrian owners/renters to the building). What factors did the City consider specifically regarding the estimated increased traffic, when the streets already exceed 1000 vpd and when the neighborhood redevelopment plan is focussed on reducing traffic and calming measures (what cumulative impact does the City consider acceptable)? Also, why would the City accept that an alleyway can or should accommodate the same traffic as a road - and why would the City approve that alleyways could accommodate about 3 times the amount of current traffic (or about 5 times without any discounting)? Can the City please confirm details regarding if and how this is aligned with the neighbourhood renewal plan? Regarding parking, the table in the draft traffic impact report indicates the City requires minimum parking for the building. Is that accurate, or has the City waived the requirement for minimum parking in DC2 developments? To reduce traffic and support the 50% reduction applied in the draft report, would the City at least halve the proposed parking by the developer (82 stalls or fewer) to meet the traffic impact discount assumed in the report? Will the City confirm that no on street parking permits will be provided to building residents - nor any visitor passes? Can the City provide the estimated costs to meet the proposed changes in the draft traffic impact report (e.g., signage, crosswalks, etc.) as well ongoing maintenance costs re transport infrastructure?

- The Transportation Study is available on [the City's planning website](#). The study has been updated numerous times, most recently to account for the revised application. The final report will be the same as the draft report (March 2020) currently posted.
- The study collected traffic data in December 2018 during the morning and afternoon peak periods. The study also cited past traffic counts collected in the area. Traffic volumes on the alley were found to be relatively low, while local roadways in the area have higher volumes. The higher local roadway volumes in this area of Garneau are in part a reflection of the nearby higher density residential and major institutional and employment areas.
- The study did not find any operational concerns in the immediate area, including the alley. Both the alley and the local, predominantly one-way roadways are able to accommodate the additional traffic. While the traffic volumes for local roadways exceed Transportation Association of Canada (TAC) thresholds, these are more representative of a traditional suburban and smaller city context, and are accordingly used as a starting point. The volumes are in line with thresholds used by other jurisdictions such as Calgary and Toronto, and existing volumes on other local roadways in Edmonton. Edmonton does not currently have its own thresholds and uses

TAC and other jurisdictions for guidance.

- The study used census data to assist in mode split projections - that is, which mode of transportation people use to get to and from the site - which is a standard approach for these types of studies. Garneau has [among the highest mode splits in the City](#), with approximately 60 percent of trips to work by an alternative mode (not driving a vehicle). To account for this, the projected vehicle trips for the development, which are based on City data derived from primarily suburban areas, required a relatively significant reduction. Note that the City does not consider tenancy (renting vs. ownership) in its review of applications.
  - Neighbourhood [renewal planning](#) for Garneau is ongoing, with construction planned to commence in 2021. The plans include measures to significantly improve the pedestrian and bicycling experience in Garneau, manage traffic volumes and speed, and connect to open spaces. While the proposed development will add vehicular traffic to the neighbourhood, it is also well positioned to take advantage of the multi-modal infrastructure existing or planned for the neighbourhood. Initiatives such as the recently approved [reduction to residential speed limits](#) are also anticipated to improve the livability of the neighbourhood.
  - City Council recently approved [Open Option Parking](#), which provides developers' flexibility to choose the amount of parking that they feel is appropriate for their projects. The parking supply for this project will accordingly be determined at the development permit stage. Parking maximums remain in place to avoid an oversupply of parking. Under [current regulations](#), the proposed development would not qualify for parking permits due to its heights being over three storeys.
-

## **Web Page 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