

What We Heard Report

Crestwood

LDA25-0243

Edmonton

Public Engagement Feedback Summary

Project Address: 14603 - 95 Avenue NW

Project Description: The City has received a rezoning application from Situate for 14603 - 95 Avenue NW. The current zone is the Small Scale Residential Zone (RS) and the proposed zone is the Small-Medium Scale Transition Residential Zone (RSM h12.0) which would allow for a range of small to medium scale housing, a maximum height of 12.0 meters, and a maximum site coverage of 60%.

Engagement Format: Online Engagement Webpage - Engaged Edmonton:
<https://engaged.edmonton.ca/Crestwood95AveRezoning>

Engagement Dates: July 28, 2025 - August 10, 2025

Number Of Visitors:

- Visited the page: 568
- Submitted a question or forum response: 66
- Contacted the planner directly: 106

About This Report

The information in this report includes summarized feedback received between July 28, 2025 - August 10, 2025 through online engagement via the Engaged Edmonton platform, and all emails submitted directly to the file planner (up to Aug 25, 2025).

The public feedback received will be considered during the planning analysis to ensure the review of the application takes local context into consideration and is as complete as possible. It will also be used to inform conversations with the applicant about potential revisions to the proposal to address concerns or opportunities raised.

This report is shared with all web page visitors who provided their email address for updates on this file, and to all residents that emailed the file planner directly. This summary will also be shared with the applicant and the Ward Councillor, and will be an appendix to the Council Report should the application proceed to a Public Hearing.

Engagement Format

The Engaged Edmonton webpage included an overview of the application, information on the development and rezoning process, and contact information for the file planner. Two participation tools were available for participants: one to ask questions and one to leave feedback.

Feedback Summary

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.

This section summarizes the main themes collected.

Number of Responses: 172

In Opposition: 166

In Support: 3

Mixed/Questions Only: 3

The most common **concerns** heard were:

Policy Context: Many respondents expressed that the current RS zone is sufficient for infill development, or is already too permissive. Many felt that there is an abundance of multi-unit infill in the area and additional density is not needed. Several others stated there is no clear justification, nor policy support, for the proposed rezoning. Many respondents indicated that the scale and scope of change occurring in the neighbourhood is too extreme.

Scale and Character: We heard that development allowed under the proposed zone is too large in scale (e.g., height, site coverage, density, reduced setbacks), and does not align with the existing character of Crestwood, which is predominantly low density single detached housing. Impacts to surrounding properties including: privacy, sun/shadow, and loss of mature trees were also noted. Others cited social and quality of life impacts.

Parking and Traffic: There was a common belief that the proposed rezoning will lead to an increase in on-street parking congestion as on-site parking is not required. We heard that 95 Avenue has seasonal parking restrictions and was not designed to handle increased traffic flow. Traffic congestion was a concern, especially during school drop-off/pick-up and during rush hour.

Neighbourhood and Community Infrastructure: Concern over infrastructure capacity and emergency service access, as well as, aesthetics and feasibility of waste collection were common concerns raised by respondents. Many stated that the parks and schools in the neighbourhood are at capacity and can not accommodate more residents.

Engagement: Feedback included that community consultation was inadequate. City Council and Administration not listening to resident input was another common sentiment while others believe that developers profits are being prioritized.

Safety Concerns: Residents noted that the proposed rezoning will bring visibility and safety concerns for active mode users like pedestrians, cyclists, and children. Others felt that adding density at this location undermines traffic calming efforts along 95 Avenue and Vision Zero.

The most recurring comments of **support** heard were:

Location: The site being a corner lot along two collector roads makes it a suitable location for densification.

Amenities: Residents noted the site's proximity to schools, playgrounds, commercial amenities, and transit make it a livable place for residents, including young families.

What We Heard

The following section includes a summary of collected comments. The number of times a comment was recorded is then presented in brackets (comments received once do not have a number).

Reasons For Opposition

Policy Context

- Current zoning is sufficient and/or already allows for too much (60).
- There is an abundance of multi-unit infill in the area (either approved, or under construction) and additional density is not needed (52).
- There is no clear justification for the proposed rezoning (44).
- RSM h12.0 zoning at this location is not aligned with the Jasper Place District Plan or District Policy (40).
- Change is too extreme or is happening too rapidly and the City should reassess (22).
- Reconsider where multi-unit development is permitted and/or what built forms are allowed (20).
- Site is not in proximity to LRT or bus stops where density should be located (6).
- Four residential units should be the maximum in the RS Zone (6).
- This rezoning would set a precedent (5).
- Density should be in new neighbourhoods (5).
- Consider obtaining objective expert reports, particularly with regard to potential safety and infrastructure issues, prior to a decision being made (4).
- 146 St and 95 Ave NW should not be considered collector roadways (4).
- The Mature Neighbourhood Overlay, which protected mature neighbourhoods and considered residents, should be restored (3).
- Applicants are not held to their intent (3).
- Site is not at the edge of the neighbourhood (3).
- Worried about commercial uses on-site (3).
- Site is not within a node, corridor, or priority growth area (2).

- Adjacent to single detached housing, not larger scale development (does not provide a transition) (2).
- A maximum density target should be established (2).
- Smaller forms of infill would be more appropriate and accepted (e.g., skinny homes, garage suites) (2).
- Density allowed is more extreme than other Canadian cities (2).
- Developers do not provide sufficient landscaping (2).

Scale and Character

- The proposed zone does not align with the character of Crestwood, which is predominantly low density single detached housing (85).
- The proposed zone is too large (e.g., height, site coverage, density, and reduced setbacks/private green space (30).
- Sun/shadow impacts (25).
- Privacy impacts (18).
- Removal of mature trees on private property (18).
- Social and quality of life impacts (10).
- New developments are poor quality and aesthetically unappealing (5).
- Dwellings will be too small.

Parking and Traffic

- Increased on-street parking congestion due to various factors (e.g. on-site parking challenges, on-site parking not required, additional density/additional drivers) (78).
- Increased traffic congestion, especially during rush-hour/school drop-off/pick-up, and during construction (59).
- The adjacent roads are not designed for increased traffic (e.g., too narrow, bus route, existing heavy traffic, and traffic calming) (24).
- 95 Avenue does not permit parking year-round (e.g., seasonal parking, snow removal/windrows, street maintenance and street sweeping) (10).
- Parking and traffic congestion will impact gatherings held at community spaces (e.g., schools, churches, rinks, courts, walking/biking access to ravines, Candy Cane Lane, and commercial businesses) due to parking and traffic congestion) in Crestwood (2).
- Vibrations and noise from trucks and trailers on speed bumps impact nearby homes.

Neighbourhood and Community Infrastructure

- Utilities are at capacity (e.g., sewer, drainage, water, electrical) (72).
- Parks and schools are at capacity (53).
- Emergency service capacity and access (47).
- Concern about waste collection (e.g., aesthetics of carts, feasibility for garbage truck maneuvering) (37).
- Concern that taxpayers/abutting neighbours will fund upgrades required by infill development (7).
- Concern about infill reducing the quality of life and livability in Crestwood (6).
- Not enough daycares nearby.

Engagement

- Inadequate community consultation was done (46).
- City Council and City Administration are not listening to resident input and there is growing discontent (e.g., District Plans, Zoning Bylaw Renewal/City-wide Rezoning, Priority Growth Areas, Rezoning applications) (25).
- Developer profits are being prioritized over community opposition or interests (13).
- Rezoning applications should be paused until a community impact assessment is conducted (4).
- Residents can not influence development permit applications, which are allowed as of right (4).
- Rezoning applications are not transparent (i.e., city's verbatim review comments are not shared with the public).

Safety Concerns

- Visibility and safety concerns for active mode users (e.g., pedestrians, cyclists, children) (34).
- Density undermines traffic calming efforts (e.g., on 95 Avenue) and Vision Zero (16).
- Located on a busy street/intersection with many conflict points (15).
- Increased local traffic due to shortcutting (2).
- The City should consider additional traffic control as development occurs.

Affordability and Land Value

- Excessive infill development in the area is reducing property values (22).
- Infill benefits developers who only care about profit (19).
- New infill units are not affordable, regardless of whether they are owned or rented (17).
- Reduce taxes for the neighbourhood if neighbourhood characteristics are being taken away (4).
- Developers are not locals (3).
- A percentage of new dwellings should be below market housing, or subsidized, to help address the affordability crisis (3).

Restrictive Covenant

- Residents are resorting to a restrictive covenant to prevent multi-unit development in Crestwood and other areas of Edmonton (7).

Other

- Construction disruptions (e.g., noise, dust, road closures) (4).
- Reduced quiet and overcrowding (3).
- Residents impacted by infill will move to surrounding municipalities (3).
- Increased crime (2).
- Concern over maintenance of infill properties (e.g., weeds) (2).
- Poor environmental standards/not environmentally sustainable (2).
- Development is not suitable for seniors or individuals with mobility issues.
- Heat island/heat dome impacts.

Reasons For Support

Location

- Site is a corner lot (2).
- Close to commercial amenities (e.g., L'oca, FreshCo, Jasper Gates Shopping Centre).
- Proximity to schools and playgrounds.
- Located near other multi-unit housing.
- Site is along collector roads.

Questions & Answers

Why is the applicant proposing this rezoning, and what makes the current zoning inadequate?

- Important note: the applicant is not held to their intent. If the rezoning is approved by City Council, the full rights of the zone would be possible on site.
- The applicant has shared the following statement about their intent, and a diagram:
 - “We are rezoning to RSM in order to allow additional height that will enable us to provide drive-under parking for each unit. The plan is for the homes to be sold as condominium units rather than rented. The development plan includes a 7-metre-wide drive aisle along the south side of the property, which will serve as a meaningful buffer between the new building and the lot to the south. This space not only helps preserve privacy and openness, but also allows for dedicated, on-site parking for each unit—addressing common concerns about street parking. Importantly, the site is located on the north corner of the block, which significantly limits shadow impacts on adjacent properties. The design approach respects neighbouring homes by maintaining generous setbacks and minimizing perceived massing.”



How has the developer engaged the immediate neighbours to understand their thoughts around this proposed application?

- Important note: there is not a requirement for applicant/developer-led engagement with surrounding residents when a rezoning application is proposed.
- In this case, the applicant shared that they installed site signage with contact information, in addition to the City's signage.

- They also sent a postcard to neighbours within 60 metres of the site with their contact information and a link to their project website:
<https://sites.google.com/situateinc.ca/crestwood95avenue>

If the rezoning is approved, can the developer change their design plans after the fact?

- If the proposed RSM h12.0 rezoning is approved, the applicant/developer is not held to a specific design, and the full rights of the RSM h12.0 Zone would be possible on the site. Design plans can change, or the site could be sold in the future. Zoning is attached to a property, not tied to ownership or one specific design.

How did the City engage with surrounding residents?

- A broadened engagement approach was used for this application due to the broad community interest.
- The notification area was doubled for all mailed notices (from a 60 metre radius to a 120 metre radius).
- The initial mailed notices for this application were sent to the community league and surrounding residents on June 3, 2025.
- The Engaged Edmonton web page was live from July 28, 2025 - August 10, 2025.
- Residents with feedback and/or questions can still reach out to the file planner directly, despite the conclusion of the Engaged Edmonton period on August 10.

When will City Council consider neighbours and community character prior to approving large structures (e.g. 10016 - 147 Street NW and 10006 - 147 Street NW)?

- For development permit applications:
 - Development Planners are the delegated decision makers for development permit applications. Development Planners are obligated to approve development permits for a Permitted Development (as per section 7.100 of the Zoning Bylaw).
 - A Permitted Development is a development for a permitted use in the applicable zone that follows the regulations of the Zoning Bylaw. The development permits for the properties located at 10016 - 147 Street NW and 10006 - 147 Street NW both fully complied with Zoning Bylaw regulations.
- For rezoning applications:
 - City Council are the decision makers on rezoning applications.
 - All feedback received will be summarized in the planning report for this application and made available to the public and to City Council prior to a Public Hearing where a decision will be made.
 - Once a Public Hearing date is scheduled and the agenda is posted online, there is the option to send verbatim feedback to the Office of the City Clerk, and/or you can register to speak to the item at the Public Hearing. There are virtual and in-person options, and each speaker is given 5 minutes to speak.

Next Steps

The planning analysis, and how feedback informed that analysis, will be summarized in Administration's report to City Council if the proposed rezoning goes to a future City Council Public Hearing for a decision.

The administration report and finalized version of the applicant's proposal will be posted for public viewing on the [City's public hearing agenda](#) website approximately three (3) weeks prior to a scheduled public hearing for the file.

When the applicant is ready to take the application to Council:

- Notice of Public Hearing date will be sent to surrounding property owners and residents and applicable nearby Community Leagues and Business Associations.
- Once the Council Public Hearing Agenda is posted online, members of the public may register to speak at Council by completing the form at edmonton.ca/meetings or calling the Office of the City Clerk at 780-496-8178.
- Members of the public may listen to the Public Hearing on-line via edmonton.ca/meetings.
- Members of the public can submit written comments to the City Clerk (city.clerk@edmonton.ca).

If you have questions about this application please contact:

Saffron Newton, Planner
780-423-3224
saffron.newton@edmonton.ca