

What We Heard Report

Alma NASP LDA25-0034

Edmonton

Public Engagement Feedback Summary

Project Address:	5510 - 122 Street NW
Project Description:	The City has received a proposal for a new Neighbourhood Area Structure Plan (NASP) within the University of Alberta Farm area. The boundaries for the proposed neighbourhood plan are 122 Street NW to the east, Whitemud Creek to the west, the Grandview Heights neighbourhood to the north, and the Lansdowne neighbourhood to the south.
Engagement Format:	Engaged Edmonton (online), in-person open house, and contacting the file planner directly.
Engagement Dates:	Phase one: April 7, 2025 - May 5, 2025 Phase two: March 30, 2026 - April 19, 2026 • Open house: April 9, 2026 6:00 pm - 9:00 pm

About This Report

This report summarizes feedback received online, in person, and submitted directly to the file planner. 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, attended the open house and provided their email on the sign-in sheet, and to all that contacted the file planner directly via email. 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

Online: engaged.edmonton.ca/West240

The Engaged Edmonton webpage included an overview of the application, information on the new plan process, and contact information for the file planner. Two participation tools were available for participants: one to ask questions and one to leave feedback. Phase one of online engagement was available from April 7, 2025 - May 5, 2025. Phase two of online engagement was available from March 30, 2026 - April 19, 2026.

In Person: Phase two engagement included an in person open house. The open house was drop-in format, and was held at the Alfred H. Savage Centre on April 9, 2026 from 6:00 pm - 9:00 pm. The open house included information boards about the application and the review process. City staff and the applicant team were available to answer questions and feedback was provided through general feedback sheets and sticky notes.

Direct Contact with File Planner: In addition to the formally scheduled online engagement opportunities and open house, residents reached out to the file planner directly through email or a phone call.

Feedback Summary

The following section summarizes the number of respondents and most common themes.

Online:

- Phase one:
 - Visited the Engaged Edmonton page: 735
 - Submitted a question or forum response: 45
 - Respondents In Support: 3
 - Respondents In Opposition: 29
 - Mixed Respondents: 9
 - Respondents with Questions Only: 4
- Phase two:
 - Visited the Engaged Edmonton page: 1,284
 - Submitted a question or forum response: 54
 - Respondents In Support: 1
 - Respondents In Opposition: 45
 - Mixed Respondents: 5
 - Respondents with Questions Only: 3

Contacted the File Planner Directly:

- Phase one:
 - Total number of respondents: 14
 - Respondents In Support: 0
 - Respondents In Opposition: 11
 - Mixed Respondents: 3
- Phase two:
 - Total number of respondents: 13

- Respondents In Support: 0
- Respondents In Opposition: 10
- Mixed Respondents: 3

In Person (Phase Two Only):

- Number of attendees: 78
 - Comments In Support: 3
 - Comments In Opposition: 48
 - Mixed Comments: 26

PHASE ONE

The most common **concerns** heard were:

Lack of Conservation: Many respondents expressed the desire to preserve the existing trees and vegetation and felt that the design of the new neighbourhood plan was not doing enough for environmental protection and conservation. Many of the respondents also cited concerns over the displacement of the numerous animal species that live within the tree stand in the southern portion of the new neighbourhood plan.

- Note: Lansdowne residents were concerned that the trees between the boundary of Alma and Lansdowne were not being retained in the first submission. In the second submission, the trees were retained using Municipal Reserve (MR).

Traffic and Mobility: We heard concerns about the new neighbourhood plan leading to an increase of traffic and congestion in the area. Many felt that there would be an increase in shortcutting through neighbourhoods like Grandview Heights and Lansdowne as a result of the increase of density proposed in the area. Others expressed concern over the shared alley along the boundary of the new neighbourhood and Lansdowne and felt this would be a safety concern, particularly for children in the area.

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

Neighbourhood Design: We heard support for the location of the Mixed Use Area proposed in the new neighbourhood plan. Respondents cited support for increased commercial development opportunities in the area, especially along 122 Street.

Transportation Opportunities: Those in support also frequently expressed appreciation for the integration of active and public transportation opportunities within the new neighbourhood plan.

PHASE TWO

The most common **concerns** heard were:

Municipal Reserve - School Site: A common concern among those we heard from was that a school site should be provided in Alma. Many felt that a school site is important because there

are a high number of residents projected to live in Alma. Another common concern regarding the school site being necessary is because other schools in the area are at capacity and aren't able to handle additional students from Alma.

Municipal Reserve - Parks and Open Space: Many respondents raised objections to the provision of parks and open spaces throughout the Alma NASP. Those with concerns believed there are not enough parks and open space being provided throughout the new neighbourhood plan or that the parks and open space provided felt very fragmented, small, and sloped making programming and sports fields difficult to achieve. Others felt that the proposed parks and open spaces are located too far away from Medium and High Density Residential areas within the NASP leading to residents leaving the neighbourhood to access parks and open spaces.

Active Transportation: There was a desire amongst respondents to retain and consider the multi purpose path and loop trail on 62 Avenue in the new neighbourhood plan. Some respondents also felt that additional infrastructure for active modes of transportation must be provided to surrounding neighborhoods to encourage and prioritize active forms of transportation. This included narrowing vehicle lanes, reducing or removing on-street parking, and providing trees and street furniture.

Compatible Housing Area: Feedback and opposition around the Compatible Housing Area included the desire to see a Low Density Residential buffer between the new neighborhood plan and Grandview Heights and Lansdowne which directly mirrors development in Grandview Heights and Lansdowne. Respondents felt it was important that development in these areas match the character and scale of the surrounding neighbourhoods.

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

Lack of Roadway/Transit Connection: The most common reason for support was that the proposed NASP does not feature a collector roadway connection between Grandview Heights and Alma, nor a transit connection via 129 Street. Many felt that there should be no vehicle access to Alma due to the increase in traffic and shortcutting it would cause. Safety concerns and conflicts with the multi purpose path along 62 Avenue were another reason why respondents believe there should not be access.

- *Note:* The current iteration of the NASP does not propose a roadway connection between Alma and Grandview Heights. The City has requested a roadway connection between Alma and Grandview Heights.

Additional Amenities: Another supported aspect of the new neighbourhood plan that we heard was the additional amenities, services and commercial uses that would be provided to the area. Respondents expressed the desire to have more services accessible nearby.

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).

PHASE ONE

Reasons For Opposition

Municipal Reserve, Ecology, and Open Space:

- Desire to protect and keep the natural row of trees and vegetation throughout the new neighbourhood plan especially along the south perimeter of the new neighbourhood plan and adjacent to the Whitemud Creek Ravine (27).
- Loss of wildlife in the area from the destruction and displacement of flora and fauna including protected species (e.g. pileated woodpeckers, peregrine falcons, barred owls) (26).
- Destruction of trees goes against the City of Edmonton's "Greener As We Go" Big City Move and other environmental policies (7).
- Lack of schools and services are provided in the new neighbourhood plan and surrounding area to support the growing population (5).
- The amount of park space provided between the development and the Top of Bank is insufficient from a natural area and slope stability perspective (5).
- There should be more green space within the new neighbourhood plan located near Medium or High Density housing (3).
- There should be more land with the Environmental Reserve (ER) designation within the new neighbourhood plan.
- Perceived fire risk due to housing backing onto Whitemud Creek Ravine.
- Surrounding developments should be analyzed in addition to the new neighbourhood plan when assessing the environmental impact.
- There should be larger parks and open spaces with programmable features and amenities (e.g. sports fields).
- Concern that community amenities and service are inadequate for new and existing residents.

Mobility:

- Increased traffic, congestion, and shortcutting in the surrounding neighbourhoods and roadways as a result of the new neighbourhood plan (23).
- Issues related to the shared alley between Lansdowne and the new neighbourhood plan (e.g. shortcutting, safety concerns) (12).
- The review of the NASP should consider surrounding projects when assessing transportation impacts (8).
- The mobility network must adequately plan for multi-modal transportation within and around Alma to reduce vehicle dependency and enable active modes (7).
- There should not be a vehicle connection between Grandview Heights, Lansdowne and the new neighbourhood plan (5).
- There should be no access to the new neighbourhood plan area from 62 Avenue NW (4).
- The surrounding road networks (e.g. 122 Street NW) should be upgraded as a result of the increased density from the new neighbourhood plan (3).
- Desire for improved mobility networks in the plan for pedestrians and cyclists (2).
- Concern regarding limited walkability within the new neighbourhood plan due to the high amount of front garages in the new neighbourhood plan (2).

- There should be additional access points to the new neighbourhood plan to improve accessibility, reduce isolation or allow emergency vehicle access (2).
- Trail connectivity concerns due to lack of connectivity of the shared use path.
- Difficulty achieving the transit hub goal in the NASP due to Edmonton Transit Service budget constraints.

Drainage and Servicing:

- Concern about increased flooding in the area particularly within the boundary between Lansdowne and the new neighbourhood plan (7).
- Concern about Storm Water Management policy that would allow the developer to relocate/reconfigure without a plan amendment (3).
- Belief that tree removal will negatively impact local drainage and ecosystem health.
- Servicing capacity concerns due to lack of electrical substation within the new neighbourhood plan.
- Surrounding projects should be considered in the review of the NASP and drainage and servicing capacity to assess cumulative impacts.

Density, Built Form, and Land Designation:

- The proposal should be a star example of urban planning, sustainable development and architecture and isn't (7).
- Single detached housing should be discouraged within Alma (5).
- There should be no High Density development within the new neighbourhood plan (2).
- The plan should enable commercial space fronting a park space (2).
- Concern about the feasibility of commercial/office space within the new neighbourhood plan.
- The number of units within the new neighbourhood plan should be reduced to match the number of units within the Grandview Heights and Lansdowne neighbourhoods.
- The amount of density proposed in the new neighbourhood plan is too high.
- Relocate the Mixed Use Area to the center of the new neighbourhood plan to ensure residents have equal and easy access to amenities.

Other:

- Loss of character in the Lansdowne and Grandview Heights neighbourhoods (e.g. reduced on-street parking, sunlight obstruction, removal of mature trees, more rental properties) (3).
- Construction impacts (e.g. noise, dust, debris, chemical compounds, poor air quality) and the desire for a construction schedule to minimize traffic disruptions (3).
- The proposed land lease idea for the new neighbourhood plan will lead to development stagnation (2).
- Increased demand in the area from development will lead to higher rent.
- Concern over maintenance of apartment buildings within the new neighbourhood plan (e.g. waste disposal).
- It should be more clear that written and mailed feedback is accepted during the engagement process.

Reasons For Support

- Support for the Mixed Use Area within the new neighbourhood plan and increased commercial amenities close by (6).
- There are good transit and active transportation opportunities within the new neighbourhood plan (6).
- Support for the development and the increase in density in the area (4).
- Support for the transit hub in the middle of the new neighbourhood plan (2).
- Support for playgrounds in the new neighbourhood plan (2).
- Support for treed boulevards within the new neighbourhood plan (2).
- Support for shared pathway connections (e.g. Whitemud Creek Ravine, Grandview Heights, Lansdowne) (2).
- Appreciation for how the new neighbourhood plan ties into nature.
- Support for no direct vehicle access into the Lansdowne neighbourhood.

Suggestions For Improvement

- Add bus lanes to improve traffic flow and connection to the South Campus LRT Station (2).
- Affordable housing should be provided.
- Student housing should be provided.
- Ensure that the transit hub is safe for all users.

PHASE TWO

Reasons For Opposition

Interface with Grandview Heights:

- The Medium Density Residential along 62 Avenue NW should be designated Low Density Residential to align with the purpose of the Compatible Housing Area (16).
- A buffer should be provided between Grandview Heights and the Alma Compatible Housing Area (e.g. green buffer, preserve trees, preserve safety) (8).
- Compared to Lansdowne, Grandview Heights is more negatively impacted by the NASP (e.g. distribution of greenspace, Medium Density Residential in the Compatible Housing Area, traffic congestion, and on-street parking impacts) (6).

Interface with Lansdowne:

- Vehicle access to Lansdowne should not be provided via the existing alley (10).
- The Medium Density Residential along the western edge of the Forestry Centre should be designated Low Density Residential to align with the purpose of the Compatible Housing Area (3).

Compatible Housing Area:

- Low density residential units should be provided as a buffer and transition between Grandview Heights and Lansdowne and the medium and high density residential development in the central portion of the Alma NASP (10).
- Ensure that development matches the character of Grandview Heights and Lansdowne (10).

- Alma, Grandview Heights, and Lansdowne should remain physically separate and distinct (6).
- Development must be limited to single detached housing (6).
- Development must face inward to Alma (i.e. away from Lansdowne and Grandview Heights) (6).
- Additional clarity on the Compatible Housing Area is required in the NASP (e.g. will houses face inwards or outwards from Alma, how will residents access their homes, how many storeys are permitted, what will the yards/landscaping look like, are garden suites permitted, etc.) (3).
- The maximum building height should be 9.5 meters (3).
- The maximum building height should be 10.5 metres (2).
- The Compatible Housing Area should be unique and differentiated from the remaining Low Density Residential housing (2).
- Garden Suites should not be permitted (2).
- Buildings should be limited to two storeys.
- All buildings should have alley access.
- Housing should face Grandview Heights and Lansdowne.

Mobility:

Transit:

- Maintain on-demand service in Grandview Heights, conventional transit service is excessive (16).
- Road connections must be provided to neighbouring communities to facilitate efficient transit service and support residents (4).
- Transit should extend further west in Alma (2).
- The mobility hub is not a good method for providing transit service (2).
- Alma must have efficient transit to reduce reliance on personal vehicles (2).

Active Modes:

- Must retain and consider the multi purpose path/loop trail on 62 Avenue NW (18).
- Additional active modes infrastructure must be provided within Alma and to surrounding neighbourhoods to prioritize active modes (e.g. narrow vehicle lanes, reduce/remove on-street parking, provide trees and street furniture, provide infrastructure for walking and rolling to decrease vehicle use and congestion, reduce parking concerns, and improve safety) (10).
- Must retain the Top of Bank pathway connecting Grandview Heights and Lansdowne and ensure that it is designed well, and does not become a dead end (4).
- A shared pathway should be provided along the pipeline corridor and should extend into Lansdowne (2).
- Retain and extend the shared pathway on 122 Street NW (2).
- Ensure shared pathways are wide enough and are safe (e.g. wide enough to provide greenspace and natural light, have raised crossings, be near traffic calming, don't allow vehicle movement that creates conflict points) (2).
- The Top of Bank pathway should remain gravel and should not be paved.
- Access to the Ravine already exists. The NASP should not claim that it is providing access.

- The number of terms used for paths, walkways, etc., is confusing and should be simplified.

Vehicle Parking, Traffic, and Congestion:

- Existing safety and traffic congestion challenges in Grandview Heights (e.g. windrows and narrowing of roadways in winter, most challenging during peak hours) (12).
- Sufficient on-street and on-site parking must be provided (e.g. minimum on-site parking requirements, roads designed with sufficient parking, minimize Alma residents parking in Grandview Heights, consider a communal parkade) (10).
- Existing mobility infrastructure does not have the capacity to support increased traffic from Alma and other current/proposed redevelopments in the surrounding area, the NASP and technical studies must address this (e.g. Michener Park, proposed Stollery Hospital, redevelopment on 51 Street NW) (10).
- More clarity is needed on how Alma will impact existing roadways (e.g. 122 Street NW, 51 Avenue NW, 114 Street NW, Belgravia Road NW, etc.) (8).
- Construction vehicles should only access Alma via 122 Street NW (6).

Road Design Elements:

- Treed boulevards should be provided on all streets to improve safety and the urban tree canopy (5).
- Front driveways should not be permitted. Alleys should be utilized (6).
- Non-transit collector routes should connect to surrounding neighbourhoods and should not dead end at any locations.
- Remove roundabouts as they are not pedestrian friendly.
- Provide additional roundabouts on 122 Street NW.

Municipal Reserve, Ecology, and Open Space:

- A school site is required in the neighbourhood (i.e. there are a large number of residents in Alma and the surrounding area, existing schools are at capacity, residents will have to drive to neighbouring communities which is costly and goes against active modes goals, schools help build a sense of community and connection, and children should not have to leave their neighbourhood to attend school) (71).
- The current provision of parks and open space is inadequate (e.g. fragmented, unprogrammable, sloped/unstable, limited quantity, poor distribution, too small, cannot accommodate sports fields, too far from Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential, requires residents to leave the neighbourhood) (31).
- Preserve the natural area and wetland at the northeast corner of Alma (14).
- Additional space should remain undeveloped and in its current state (i.e. farm, supports wildlife and the broader ecological network) (11).
- Existing trees and vegetation should be preserved (e.g. along the Ravine, along the border of Grandview Heights, along the border of Lansdowne, along 122 Street NW, along the Forestry Centre, and for the broader plan area) (9).
- The NASP does not adequately consider environmental, hydrological, or geotechnical impacts to the Ravine (6).

- Additional trees must be planted (e.g. between Alma and Grandview Heights, between Alma and Lansdowne, along the greenways, in parks, and more broadly in the neighbourhood) (5).
- Development should be further setback from the Ravine (5).
- Sufficient mitigation measures must be taken during construction to protect wildlife, the ravine, and the Top of Bank area (5).
- The entire site should remain undeveloped and in its current state (3).
- The Ravine is highly valued and ease of access must be preserved (3).
- The new neighbourhood draws on the city budget for infrastructure, but it does not contribute land or amenities for public use (e.g. school site, library, indoor/outdoor recreation, etc.) (2).
- The NASP identifies programming partnerships for wellness, recreation and education facilitated by UAPT, which is not desired (2).
- High quality soils should be preserved and moved if not utilized for the neighbourhood.
- Consideration should be given to the spacing and design of fencing between Lansdowne and Alma.
- Retain wetlands in eastern Alma to reduce flood risk.
- The dry pond should not be considered a park space for public use, there is no guarantee that it will remain dry and pathways should go around it so that they are still usable if it floods.
- Additional information on environmental/health hazards associated with the current agricultural uses should be explored and made available.
- The NASP must reflect existing biodiversity in the area.

Drainage and Servicing:

- Concern about drainage and flooding (e.g. in the alley between Lansdowne and Alma) (6).
- The excessive grading required is expensive and hard on the environment (2).
- To preserve the natural spring in Whitemud Creek Ravine, the water table must maintain stability, and be unaffected by storm and sewer drainage (2).
- Maintain the slough/depression in the southwest corner.
- Construct the dry and wet ponds before housing is built.

Density, Built Form, and Land Designation:

- The High Density Residential area in the NASP should be reduced or removed (10).
- The NASP should provide additional clarity on the type and scale of housing allowed in the Low, Medium, and High Density Residential land use designations (5).
- Low Density Residential should not be provided in Alma (2).
- Locate High density residential in the southeast portion of Alma (2).
- Additional Low Density Residential should be provided in Alma.
- High density residential should be located away from 122 Street NW and should be provided more interior to Alma.
- Medium and High Density Residential must be moved away from the Ravine to preserve views.
- If the natural area in the northeastern portion of the plan is preserved, the Medium Density Residential designation should be relocated and should replace Low Density Residential.

Process:

- The NASP does not reflect feedback provided, engagement is a tick box (8).
- The NASP must incorporate the needs of school boards and community agencies (5).
- It is challenging to identify changes between the different iterations of the NASP.
- Residents must be informed as the project progresses.

Services and Amenities:

- Additional amenities and services must be provided in Alma given the number of residents and the 15-minute city goal (e.g. sports field/facilities, playground, community garden, library, dog park, child care, religious assembly, grocery store, shops) (23).
- A centrally located community hub should be provided (e.g. community league and a primary neighbourhood recreation area) (3).
- Commercial uses should be located throughout the neighbourhood, not just along 122 Street NW (e.g. along the collector network exclusively, or on the main floor of residential buildings) (3).
- The Mixed Use Area in the NASP is vague. It should not be a strip mall with a big parking lot (e.g. like commercial development in Michener park) (2).

Policy:

- The NASP must align with The City Plan guiding values, and Designing New Neighbourhoods Guidelines (5).
- Ensure that the Scona District Plan reflects changes in the surrounding area (e.g. Michener Park) (2).

Other:

- Construction disrupts surrounding neighbourhoods (3).
- The site is a centrally located new neighbourhood which is rare. The proposal should be ambitious and less suburban (3).
- Concern about impacts on property values for surrounding residents (2).
- The LRT should connect to Alma and the future Stollery Hospital (2).
- UAPT is misusing the land use planning process to solidify control over the future development (2).
- Park and ride should be added to the South Campus LRT Station.
- Alma should be next to the South Campus LRT station and farming operations should remain at this site.
- Consider a Land Value Tax and no zoning regulation for Alma.
- The Stollery Hospital should be located near the South Campus LRT Station.
- Affordable and accessible housing should be provided (e.g. accessible design, single storey).
- Provide rationale for the 99-year leases in the NASP.
- Provide more clarity on development phasing in the NASP.
- The NASP should commit to more innovation and environmental responsibility given the land owner is connected to the University of Alberta (e.g. geothermal, solar, district energy).
- The NASP must align with UAPT's core values.

- It is difficult to understand how the NASP will look and function in real life once fully built out.

Reasons For Support

- The proposed NASP does not propose a collector roadway connection between Grandview Heights and Alma. A roadway connection would cause additional traffic, shortcutting, create conflicts with the shared use pathway, and decrease safety (61).
 - *Note:* The current iteration of the NASP does not propose a roadway connection between Alma and Grandview Heights. The City has requested a roadway connection between Alma and Grandview Heights.
- The proposed NASP does not propose a transit connection between Grandview Heights and Alma via 129 Street NW (22).
 - *Note:* The current iteration of the NASP does not propose a roadway connection between Alma and Grandview Heights. The City has requested a roadway connection between Alma and Grandview Heights.
- Generally supportive of additional amenities, services, and commercial uses (3).
- Generally supportive of a Compatible Housing Area (3).
- A school site is not required (2).
- The mobility hub and transit service will reduce traffic congestion (2).
- Supportive of an infill neighbourhood in proximity to the University of Alberta.

Suggestions For Improvement

- If access between Alma and Grandview Heights is provided it should be at 123 Street NW or 124 Street NW to minimize shortcutting (2).
- If access between Alma and Grandview Heights is provided it should be limited to transit to minimize shortcutting (2).
- Use the dry pond as a sportsfield (2).

Community League Feedback

Grandview Heights Community League (Phase 1)

A primary concern the Grandview Heights Community League expressed during Phase 1 of Engagement was the preservation of the character and streetscape of 62 Avenue. They requested that development on the south side be restricted to single family homes or Low Density Residential housing to align with the streetscape on the north side of 62 Avenue. They stated that vehicle and construction access to the new neighbourhood plan should be restricted to 122 Street, while limiting 62 Avenue to emergency access only.

The Grandview Heights Community League also expressed a strong desire to maintain the integrity of the multi purpose trail along 62 Avenue and provide a diversity of trail options such as single track unpaved trails and multi purpose trails within the neighbourhood plan.

A desire for a robust Construction Management plan was called for by the Community League as well as an expressed desire for continued collaboration with the UAPT and the City of Edmonton on the proposed NASP.

Grandview Heights Community League (Phase 2)

The Grandview Heights Community League reaffirmed its opposition to providing access to Alma via 62 Avenue and maintained that 62 Avenue should only be used for emergency access. They cited concerns with the width of 62 Avenue and the congestion it experiences due to the proximity to Grandview Heights School.

The Community League believes that the proposed Medium Density Residential between 122 Street and 124 Street contradicts the new neighbourhood plan's stated goal of sensitive transitions and affirm their request to designate this area as Low Density Residential.

In Phase 2 of engagement, the Grandview Heights Community League expressed that a school site should be included in the new neighbourhood plan and noted that existing local schools are already at capacity and will be unable to absorb the projected influx of students from Alma.

Questions & Answers

PHASE ONE

How will the collector roads be structured to support active mobility for transportation (not just recreation)? Will protected bike lanes be included along the collector roads as part of the design?

- Portions of the collector roadway network are identified as shared pathways which are intended to accommodate a variety of modes of transport, including cycling. The draft NASP makes reference to the physical separation of bike routes from vehicle traffic, but isn't directly committed to this through policy.
- Further information on the elements of this proposed plan that support active transportation modes can be found in Section 4.1 of the draft Plan.

Why would you allow the requirement of using an "existing alley" adjacent to an existing forest that is a wildlife corridor, trump all the City of Edmonton reports and Actions plans?

- The City has not yet reached a position on the matter of the existing trees along the south side of the proposed neighbourhood. There are a variety of factors that are being considered by the City, including Transportation, Ecology and Drainage. We are aware of the significance these trees hold for many residents, and assessing these trees and how they may be preserved within the plan is currently under review.

What is the trigger for city planners to request for the developer to keep existing forests and wetlands?

- In accordance with Policy C-531, the applicant has submitted an Ecological Network Report, the purpose of which is to assess the structure, function and integrity of the natural features within the Alma boundary. The report is currently under review and will help inform the City's analysis of the existing natural features and whether these need to be addressed in the proposed plan through the appropriate land use designation and reserve protection.

Is the City considering preserving the mature trees by Lansdowne, given their habitat value and alignment with Policy C-531 and sustainable growth?

- As part of their application, the applicant has submitted an Ecological Network Report, the purpose of which is to assess the structure, function and integrity of the natural features within the Alma boundary, in accordance with Policy C-531. This report is currently under review and will help inform the City's analysis of the existing natural features and whether this needs to be addressed in the proposed plan through the appropriate land use designation and reserve protection.

Currently, there is not a substation included in the design for Alma, can you reliably supply enough electricity to the proposed development?

- This draft plan is currently being reviewed by a variety of different utility agencies, including EPCOR. Should the need for a substation be identified, or any other upgrades, the applicant will be responsible for providing it.

How many residences (living units) will ultimately be built in Alma?

- The draft plan is estimating a total of 3198 units to be built.

Have you carefully considered the volume of traffic on 122 St?

- We are currently reviewing a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) that was submitted by the applicant. The TIA report investigated existing traffic volume and projected increase in volume due to both annual growth and the Alma development along 122 Street, extending north to 63 Avenue and south to 51 Avenue. The volume of traffic entering Saville's direction via 63 Avenue has been captured. The review of the TIA volume analysis and proposed measures is ongoing.

In the visual of the plan, it shows the Top of Bank line abutting the building limit line. Will the homes back directly onto the Top of Bank/ravine, thereby blocking views/access to the rest of the community?

- Currently, no residential development is proposed to be built below the building development line. The building development line is determined by the associated Geotechnical and Slope Stability and Setback reports.
- The Urban Development Line demarcates the transition from the non-developable land to developable land. Top of Bank roadways and Top of Bank parks and all other development must be developed above this line in alignment with Policy C542A Top of Bank policy and associated Geotechnical and Slope Stability reports.
- The Top of Bank policy states that a minimum of 30% of the development area abutting the Urban Development Line shall comprise either roadway or or municipal purposes (e.g. park space). Visual connectivity to the River Valley is one the the policy objectives that we are currently considering as part of our review.

Are there plans to remove current trees on the south side of Alma abutting the Lansdowne alley?

- The draft plan does not provide protection for these trees. The City has also not yet reached a position on the matter of the existing trees along the south side of the proposed neighbourhood.

- There are a variety of factors that are being considered by the City, including Transportation, Ecology and Drainage. However, we are aware of the significance these trees hold for many residents, and assessing these trees and how they may be preserved within the plan is currently under review.
- An Ecological Network Report (ENR) Phase II has been submitted and is being reviewed as a part of this application. The ENR includes a regulatory review, including the Migratory Bird Regulation. The ENR also includes information about wildlife species in the plan area.

There are many federally protected bird species in trees around Alma. Please confirm that the trees will not be disturbed?

- Thanks for your question. In response, we would refer you to our answer to your previous question, noting that an Ecological Network Report (ENR) Phase II has been submitted and is being reviewed as a part of this application. More details will be made available once this report is reviewed.

Are there examples of agreements between developers and school boards to determine school size? If the school is using public parks, how will use and access be negotiated between the school and public?

- The Joint Use Agreements are partnerships between the City of Edmonton, Edmonton Public Schools, Edmonton Catholic Schools, and Conseil scolaire Centre-Nord (Central North Francophone Schools). The Joint Use Agreement: Land guides the planning, assembly, design, development, and maintenance of Joint Use Sites for school and park purposes, and the Joint Use Agreement: Facilities guides access to school facilities for community groups after school hours, use of city recreational facilities by students during school hours, and shared use of sports fields by students and community sports groups.
- The City is not aware of other schools in Edmonton that use the leasing model stated in section 4.2.8 of the NASP. The standard process is for school sites to be dedicated as Municipal Reserve (MR).
- The proposed school site is being reviewed by open space and the school boards with respect to size and ownership, to ensure it will address the expected student generation of the neighbourhood.

PHASE TWO

Can you please provide your rationale for removing the proposed school site?

- The decision not to provide a school site is made by the applicant, not the City. Their justification for not providing a school is as follows:
 - *"A survey of current and projected capacities was conducted of schools in surrounding areas and there is sufficient space to accommodate students from Alma and to accommodate new and expanded school buildings if required for the entire district. The provision of schools in the neighbourhood would encourage non-resident traffic entering the community contradicts the overall vision of the community where most trips to, from, and within the neighbourhood are planned as non-personal vehicle."*
- Please note that the School Boards dispute the applicant's statement that surrounding schools have sufficient space to accommodate students from Alma.

Why build shared-use paths instead of protected bike lanes?

- Complete Street Design and Construction Standards suggest that separation is warranted at pathway locations where:
 - A high percentage of people walking (more than 20% of users) and total peak user volumes are greater than 33 persons/hr/m of path width; or
 - A low percentage of people walking (less than 20% of users) and total peak user volumes are greater than 50 persons/hr/m of path width; or
 - There are greater than 1500 combined users/day.
- Journey to work data from the 2021 Federal Census was reviewed and the average percentage of residents walking in 13 proxy neighborhoods was 10.4%.

What is the transportation plan for 122 Street thru to Belgravia Road and on to 114 Street and 72 Ave to downtown and 51 Avenue East bound?

- According to the transportation impact assessment, 122 Street (between 63 Avenue and 51 Avenue) and 51 Avenue (east of 122 Street) will remain as four-lane divided arterials. The total traffic volume estimated for these road segments upon the full development of the Alma neighborhood remains within the arterial road classification threshold for a four-lane divided roadway.
- Traffic signals will be added to the future intersections of 122 Street at 60 Avenue and 56 Avenue.

What is the definition of High Density?

- The plan does not currently give an exact definition of what High Density means, but based on the associated density of 90 units per hectare, it is anticipated that this will come in the form of 6-storey apartment buildings.

What is the intended use of the Mixed Use Area? Is it similar to what has already been built in Michener Park with Big Box chains or will there be opportunity for small local businesses? Will there be opportunities for a church or grocery store?

- The details of the Mixed Use Area can be found on page 22 of the draft plan (first document of the Document Library on the right-hand side of the page.)
- The section of the draft plan, including the applicable policies, currently provides a very broad and flexible vision for this area, describing it as an area that supports a broad mix of uses taking on “horizontal and vertical formats” and supported by private roadways.
- Without greater certainty from both policy and vision, the plan currently would support a commercial area similar to what is seen at Michener Park.
- At this stage in the development process, the neighborhood plan is not so prescriptive as to determine exact uses like a grocery store or church. Instead, the plan provides a vision for this area, which may include a grocery store and a church. Uses will then be determined by zoning (the next stage in the development process) and the landowner will determine which uses are ultimately built, based on the needs of the area. Both grocery stores and churches are common uses found within the Zoning Bylaw’s commercial and mixed use zones, so it’s anticipated that these will become opportunities once zoning is in place.

Why has there been no provision for saving the trees along 122 Street?

- In accordance with Policy C-531, the applicant has submitted an Ecological Network Report, the purpose of which is to assess the structure, function and integrity of the natural features within the Alma boundary. The report is currently under review and will help inform the City's analysis of the existing natural features and whether these need to be addressed in the proposed plan through the appropriate land use designation and reserve protection.

What is the proposed total number of new residents? Number of homes in the Low Density Residential designation? Number of units in the Medium Density and High Density Residential designation? Proposed total population?

- The approximate number of new residents is 6663 people. The number of approximate units within the Low Density Residential designation is 444, and within the medium and High Density is 2758.

I find it difficult and unfair to comment on the proposed neighbourhood plan given that the supporting documentation like the Scona District Plan and River Valley Area Redevelopment Plan are unavailable to view online. In my opinion, the process seems to be going in the wrong order. District plans should be guiding the neighbourhood plan not vice versa. It makes one feel that these bigger plans are being tinkered with by the authors of the Alma NASP, and written to suit the University first

- At present, this area is designated as a mix of "open space" and "institutional employment" in the Scona District Plan. The amendment to the Scona District Plan would change this designation to "urban mix" to reflect the proposed change of land use to a residential neighbourhood.
- The River Valley ARP will be amended to reflect the proposed Environmental Reserve designation for the area of this site that is located within the Whitemud Creek Ravine and below the top-of-bank.
- Both the Scona District Plan and the River Valley ARP are available on the Plans in Effect [webpage](#).
- The authorship of the amendments for each plan are the responsibility of the applicant. These amendments will be considered by City Council at a future public hearing at the same time as the proposed NASP.

Has the City considered reducing parking supply and limiting overly wide roadways to help reduce induced vehicle demand and discourage shortcut traffic, while also improving walkability for the new community?

- Roadways within the neighbourhood are required to meet the City's standards which are set by the Complete Streets Design and Construction Standards. These standards were recently updated to provide a greater emphasis on active transportation modes.
- The City no longer regulates parking supply. The City has adopted an Open Option approach to parking, meaning the landowner decides how much parking is needed to meet their needs.

Why does the Traffic Impact Assessment information include a roadway connection between Grandview Heights and Alma at 129 Street?

- Residents have raised concerns that providing roadway connection at 129 Street would result in congestion within Grandview Heights. The City requested that the applicant provide an assessment of a scenario where this connection is provided. The City's preference is that these neighbourhoods are connected at this location so that transit service be provided efficiently between both neighbourhoods which would also allow for a greater number of residents to have access to transit service within walking distance of where they live.
- The assessment provided by the applicant concludes that providing this connection is "not anticipated to generate significant traffic through the Grandview Heights neighbourhood".

How much parking is provided in the Alma development for the 6800 residents?

- An approximate figure for parking quantities is not known at this time. Parking quantities will be known at later stages in the process, once Development Permits for new building construction are ready for submission. At this time, we are concerned with understanding the traffic generated from the proposed neighbourhood and assessing the impact to the surrounding road network. The applicant's assessment is available on the right-hand side of the webpage (Transportation Impact Assessment). The TIA estimates a residential mode split of 35% to transit and active transportation using a combination of 2021 Federal Census Journey to Work data from surrounding neighbourhoods and the City's 2050 Origin-Destination data set.

Where are the community impact assessments - how do I get copies?

- A Community Impact Assessment, as you've described it, is not a requirement. The City assess impacts to the surrounding communities through a combination of policy considerations, technical considerations and community feedback. Through this combined assessment, the City will determine whether it supports or does not support the application and will make a recommendation to the City Council accordingly. City Council will make the ultimate decision to approve or not approve the plan at a Public Hearing in the future.

Why is the wooded area on the northeast corner of Alma at 122 Street NW and 62 Avenue NW not being preserved?

- The applicant is not proposing to preserve this wooded area. The Ecological Network Report prepared by the applicant reinforces the site's high ecological significance, classifying it specifically as a natural linkage vital for maintaining the broader ecological network on the north side.
- The report also states that the expected decrease in surface flows to this natural area was considered when making the decision about whether to retain the area within the neighbourhood. Given the reduction in water quantity and quality to this natural area post-development, this natural area was excluded from the development concept.

Need more clarity on the proposed mobility hub concept. Has ETS agreed to service it? How does this integrate with existing service? Will there be parking associated with it?

- The City has also requested more information on the mobility hub concept from the applicant, including more detail on the operations, functionality, and design.

- ETS will not provide a dedicated shuttle service for Alma.
- Bus service to the neighbourhood is likely to begin with a detour of existing local route 902 off of 122 Street into the neighbourhood.
- Bus frequency can be adjusted as demand increases.
- At this time, it is unknown whether parking will be associated with the mobility hub.

Will there be a Community League? If not, will the neighbourhood join Lansdowne or Grandview Heights and use their Community League facilities?

- As per Edmonton's Urban Parks Management Plan, a Community League facility footprint should be provided for every 10,000 people in a community. The development of a Community League facility is dependent on initiatives taken on by community members. Prior to the establishment of its own Community League facilities, there is the potential for residents to join the Community League of a surrounding community if agreements are made.

Will the existing shared pathway on 62 Avenue NW be retained?

- Yes, the existing shared pathway on 62 Avenue NW will be retained.

What is a wildlife crossing?

- A wildlife crossing is a location where animal species of the specified ecological design group (general type of animal, ie. small terrestrial mammals, amphibians, avian, etc.) can cross a road with enhanced safety relative to other locations. This is done by incorporating design features specific to the applicable ecological design groups that are anticipated to use the crossing, such as incorporating roll face curbs, curb extensions, enhanced boulevard plantings, signage, diversionary trees, etc.

Is the existing water and sewer infrastructure adequate?

- EPCOR has confirmed that existing water infrastructure and sanitary sewer infrastructure has adequate capacity to service the development.
- The development will include the construction of Stormwater Management Facilities (SWMFs) which will control stormwater runoff to acceptable pre-development rates.

What is the process for checking for historical Indigenous activity given the location near the River Valley?

- For matters related to historical indigenous activities within the site area, this is regulated by the Government of Alberta through the Historical Resources Act. When detailed plans become available, the landowner is required to submit these plans to the Government of Alberta, where further archaeological studies may be required before any excavation activity can occur.

How is the Compatible Housing Area different from the rest of the Low Density Residential? Are garden suites allowed? How many storeys will housing be? What will the landscaping look like? Will the houses use the existing adjacent alley or roadway? Which way will homes face?

- The City is seeking clarification on the Compatible Housing Area's implementation, suggesting the Small Scale Residential Zone (RS) as the clearest zone choice.

- The proposed NASP intends this area to permit a built form (height and scale) comparable to Grandview Heights and Lansdowne across the street/alley.
- Backyard Housing (Garden Suites) are allowed in most residential zones.
- Zoning regulates maximum height, not the number of storeys.
- The Zoning Bylaw requires permeable landscaping, trees, and shrubs.
- Road access and the direction housing will face (Lansdowne or Grandview Heights) are not specified in the NASP and would be determined at the Subdivision stage.
 - The existing Lansdowne alley will not be used because road connections cannot cross the Municipal Reserve dedication.

Which housing typologies are allowed in the High Density Residential land use designation?

- The plan does not currently give an exact definition of what High Density means, but based on the associated density of 90 units per hectare, it is anticipated that this will come in the form of 6-storey apartment buildings.

Next Steps

The planning analysis, and how feedback informed that analysis, will be summarized in Administration's report to City Council if the proposed neighbourhood plan 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 online via edmonton.ca/meetings.
- Members of the public can submit written comments to the City Clerk at city.clerk@edmonton.ca

If you have questions about this application please contact:

Stuart Carlyle, Planner
stuart.carlyle@edmonton.ca
 780-496-6068