

What We Heard Report

Windsor Park

LDA25-0389

Edmonton

Application Overview

Location: 9222, 9230, 9240 and 9244 - 116 Street NW

Description: The City has received a rezoning application from Green Space Alliance. The current zone is the Small Scale Residential Zone (RS) and the proposed zone is the Medium Scale Residential Zone (RM h23.0) which would allow:

- A maximum height of 23 metres (or approximately 6 storeys).
- Commercial opportunities at ground level.
- Vehicle access from the alley.

Note: when notification postcards were originally sent out to surrounding residents and the community league in October 2025, the application also included the property at 9218 - 116 Street NW. This property has since been removed from the application.

Engagement Format: Engaged Edmonton (Online)
Open House (In-person)
Contacting the File Planner Directly (Email and Phone)

About This Report

This report summarizes feedback received online, in-person, and submitted directly to the File Planner up to July 28, 2026.

Feedback Usage

Your feedback:

- provides local knowledge which informs the City's planning analysis
 - helps inform conversations with the applicant about making potential revisions to the application
 - informs City Council so that they are aware of public opinions prior to making their decisions
-

Engagement Format

This section summarizes the engagement formats used for this application:

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

- Website: engaged.edmonton.ca/windsorpark92ave
- Engagement Dates: June 29, 2026 - July 12, 2026
- Number of Visitors:
 - Visited the page: 385
 - Submitted a question or forum response: 78

Open House (In-person): The Open House was drop-in format. It included information boards about the application and the review process. City staff were available to answer questions and feedback was provided through general feedback sheets and sticky notes.

- Engagement Date: July 2, 2026 from 6:00 PM to 9:00 PM
- Event Location: Students' Union Building (SUB), Cascade Room, 8900 114 Street NW
- Number of Attendees: 27

Contacted the File Planner Directly (Email or Phone): In addition to the formally scheduled online engagement and open house, residents reached out to the File Planner directly through email or a phone call.

- Date: Ongoing
- Number of Respondents: 58

Feedback Summary

This section includes the total number of respondents, the most common themes, and a summary of collected comments. The number of times a comment was recorded is presented in brackets (comments received once do not have a number).

Please note: when notification postcards were originally sent out to surrounding residents and the community league in October 2025, the application also included the property at 9218 - 116 Street NW. This property has since been removed from the application. The feedback received after the removal of 9218 - 116 Street NW continued to reflect consistent themes and concerns.

Total Number of Respondents: 136 (excluding open house attendees)

- In Opposition: 123
- In Support: 9
- Mixed: 2
- Questions Only or Neutral: 2

Open House: 27 attendees

- Comments in Opposition: 37
- Comments in Support: 6
- Mixed Comments: 5

Common Themes - Opposition:

Building Height and Transition: The most common reason for opposition was that the height of the proposed development is too tall, or that the building would be too big. Many also felt that the built form would not provide an appropriate transition to nearby single-family homes.

Ecology and Mature Trees: Many respondents expressed concern about the potential loss of vegetation, particularly mature trees. Some respondents mentioned they were worried about related negative impacts on the climate, loss of urban tree canopy, and the urban heat island effect. We also heard from respondents who were concerned about disruption to the Habitat Greenway on 116 Street NW.

Cumulative Impacts: We heard concerns that the Windsor Park neighbourhood has been experiencing negative effects from the cumulative impacts of recent projects, and that these impacts should be studied more before any more projects are approved. Some also felt that Windsor Park has already densified enough, or that the neighbourhood has been changing too quickly, while others were concerned about strain on utilities and infrastructure.

Common Themes - Support:

Appropriate scale and density: The most common reason for support that we heard from respondents was that the proposed scale is contextually appropriate for the area. Some respondents felt that this is an ideal location for increased density because there is

significant local demand, and expressed support for the potential to create more housing opportunities in the area.

Appropriate location: Respondents highlighted the site's proximity to the University of Alberta and other major institutions and employment opportunities, and felt that new residents would be well-positioned to use transit and active transportation modes. Respondents felt that the proposed development would allow more people to work, study, and meet their daily needs close to where they live.

Reasons for Opposition:

Massing, built form, transition, and character:

- The proposed size/height is too big (97)
- The scale of the proposed development does not provide a transition to nearby single family homes (80)
- The proposed development is not compatible with and is harmful to the character of the neighbourhood (69)
- Concern about loss of architectural and cultural heritage; historic buildings and neighbourhoods should be preserved (33)
- Densification should be in smaller-scale forms instead (e.g. 'missing middle' housing, duplexes, 4-plexes, backyard and basement suits, 8-plexes on corner lots, townhouses/rowhouses, lot-splitting) (16)
- The development would most likely be unattractive and have poor architectural design (e.g. boxy, cookie-cutter, eyesore) (11)
- The proposed development should be limited to 3 storeys (10)
- The proposed development should be limited to 4 storeys (4)
- The proposed development should have a maximum density

Open space, ecology and sustainability:

- Concern about loss of mature trees and vegetation, and impacts to climate, wildlife habitat, and the urban heat island effect (73)
- The proposed development would disrupt the Habitat Greenway on 116 St NW that connects to the river valley (46)
- Concern about loss of open space and green space; densification should require increased open/green space (15)
- Environmental concerns (e.g. cost of demolishing existing homes, the development would likely have poor environmental design standards) (3)

- The venting of furnaces, dryers, air conditioning units, etc., would have heat impacts on neighbouring houses and reduce their ability to open their windows to cool down

Densification and cumulative considerations:

- Windsor Park has already met densification targets, and has been undergoing more densification than the rest of the City; this development is not necessary because there are already many new and under-construction developments nearby (64)
- Windsor Park has been experiencing negative effects from the cumulative impacts of multiple recent redevelopment projects (63)
- There needs to be a study on the cumulative impacts of redevelopment before any more projects are approved in Windsor Park (63)
- The neighbourhood has been changing too quickly (51)
- Densification/redevelopment threatens and displaces existing residents, and negatively impacts the culture and community in mature neighbourhoods (43)
- The proposed development would strain utilities, infrastructure, and amenities, and nearby schools like Windsor Park Elementary (43)
- Opposed to any more lot consolidation to build large developments (35)
- Allowing this proposal would set a precedent for future applications (35)
- Discontent with Westrich Pacific Corp.'s activity in the neighbourhood (21)
- The proposed development would have too many units, and bring too many new residents to the neighbourhood (7)

Mobility:

- The proposed development would bring too many cars to the area, and existing congestion would worsen (this is also a concern for emergency access) (53)
- Parking at the back of the building would be too disruptive (e.g. for residents, garbage collection, wildlife) (45)
- The proposed development would strain parking on nearby streets; concern about a lack of on-site parking (44)
- It would not be feasible for residents of the proposed development to use transit and active transportation (e.g. particularly for families, especially in winter, too far from transit/LRT and bike networks) (44)
- Traffic from the development would reduce safety for pedestrians and cyclists, including in the university campus area and for children from the elementary school (15)
- Concern about conflict with the bike lane on 116 St NW (e.g. from vehicles accessing the site or stopping in the lane) (3)

- Bike infrastructure on 116 St NW does not meet City standards (2)
- The proposed development would bring too many pedestrians to the area, which would make congestion worse on 116 St NW when they use crosswalks

Policy and site location:

- The proposed development does not meet District Policy (e.g. 2.1.1.4, 2.5.2.4, 2.5.2.5, Habitat Greenway requirements, too big to be considered 'Small Scale') (50)
- The proposed development does not appropriately transition from the buildings across 116 St NW (the university buildings have large setbacks, it is a step up from Windsor Car Park and the open space north of the parkade, it is an 'inverse transition' from taller buildings in the Node to shorter ones in Urban Mix) (46)
- The proposed development does not meet the City Plan (e.g. not in a Node or Corridor or Priority Growth Area) (44)
- Density and student housing should go elsewhere, not in Windsor Park (e.g. South Campus/University farm area, downtown, four-block area between 116–118 St NW and 87–89 Ave NW) (41)
- The site has poor transit access (37)
- Windsor Park is not a '15-minute' neighbourhood; it is difficult to access services and amenities from this area (35)
- It would be more strategic to encourage density downtown, in Nodes and Corridors, or in Priority Growth Areas, (23)
- It does not make sense that "additional scale" in District Policy 2.5.2.5 could allow for a 6-storey building when even better locations are limited to 4 storeys in District Policy 2.5.2.4 (22)
- It is not on a corner lot (11)
- Discontent with the Zoning Bylaw (5)
- It is not on an arterial road (4)
- Zoning was established a certain way for a reason, and should not be changed (4)

Process and engagement:

- Agree with the need for densification and not opposed to infill, but it should preserve neighbourhood character, fit in with the community, not be excessive, protect trees and ecological assets, involve more dialogue with residents, and provide more housing options than just large rental apartments (47)
- Residents have expressed their opposition in the past for similar applications, but it has not had an impact on the outcomes; the City prioritizes the needs of developers over neighbourhood residents (34)

- These developments are only built to make profits for developers, who do not care about the neighbourhood or providing good-quality housing (15)
- Positive feedback about the proposed development is likely coming from Westrich Pacific Corp. employees and/or people who do not live in the neighbourhood and do not experience the impacts (4)
- Neighbourhoods across the city are adopting restrictive covenants, which shows that residents are opposed to how much densification and infill the City is approving (3)
- Required upgrades should be completed at the rezoning stage, not the development permit stage (e.g. drainage infrastructure, alley) (3)
- There should be more transparency that Westrich Pacific Corp. is the developer (2)
- The date and location of the July 2 open house at the UAlberta Students' Union Building prevented the neighbourhood from attending (2)
- City Council claims infill and densification is necessary to prevent urban sprawl, but the city has been sprawling anyways (2)
- The notification postcard for this application should have been sent to the whole neighborhood

Unit/resident composition, demographics, affordability:

- Preference for new housing that is better suited for families and community-building (e.g. townhouses, large units with 2–3 bedrooms, single family homes, split lots, duplexes, family ownership rather than rentals) (24)
- Neighbourhoods with attractive character and single family homes within walking distance of work are desirable to talented, highly educated professionals, doctors, and university faculty; they are important for Edmonton's competitiveness and should be protected (9)
- The units would not be affordable (e.g. for students, families) (8)
- Multiplexes are not in demand (5)
- This development is not needed because there is already enough student housing in the area (3)
- Commercial space would be unaffordable for small businesses; existing new commercial space is often empty (2)
- Windsor Park will likely never be affordable for first-time home buyers anyways (2)
- There should be considerations for accessibility needs

Technical studies:

- Sun shadow study is insufficient (should include descriptions, satellite & streetview, images for December, and table with hours of shadow on nearby private properties) (5)
- Concern about assumptions and mitigation measures in the Drainage Servicing Report; an updated report should be submitted since the application was revised
- The Mobility Assessment makes too many assumptions, and it should include new traffic data for the 116 St NW and Saskatchewan Dr NW intersection and 116 St NW intersection and 92 Ave NW intersection

Other:

- The proposed development would decrease property values (43)
- The proposed development would negatively impact quality of life for nearby residents (e.g. more noise, less privacy, less sunlight) (38)
- The proposed development would bring too much litter and garbage (7)
- Infill development often has poor quality of construction, and there is concern about risk of infill-related fire (6)
- The proposed development would bring safety and security concerns, and increase risk of crime (4)
- Current residents have already been paying and would continue to pay for the infrastructure that this development will use, which is unfair (2)
- Concern about construction in the neighbourhood (e.g. traffic, noise, debris, disruption/destruction to fences/trees/foundations of adjacent homes) (2)

Reasons for Support:

- The area is walkable, next to bike infrastructure, and has excellent transit access, and it will allow more people to work, study, and meet their daily needs close to where they live (10)
- The scale and built form is appropriate for the location, and there is a lot of demand for more density in this area (9)
- The proposed development would help create more affordable and equitable housing options in Windsor Park, and allow more families and people of different incomes and stages of life to enjoy the neighbourhood and central location (6)
- The site is very close to the University of Alberta, major institution and employment opportunities, and amenities (6)

- Potential loss of mature trees is unfortunate but the development would have net positive environmental impacts; the alternative is cutting down trees for greenfield development since housing has to go somewhere (5)
- This type of development prevents urban sprawl and helps preserve valuable agricultural and natural areas on the edge of the city (4)
- The proposal aligns with City policy goals (4)
- There is opportunity for commercial space on the ground floor (3)
- Adjacent landowners' concerns are understandable, but the proposed development would benefit many people with relatively little negative impact (3)
- The proposed development is close to existing high density development across 116 St NW (2)
- Support for holding an open house for residents
- The U-shaped building structure would reduce sun shadow impacts to nearby low-density homes, and morning shadows are already cast regardless by the buildings across 116 St NW
- There is sufficient on-street parking in Windsor Park
- The higher density would have public benefits like bringing the cost of housing down, reducing congestion and wear on roads, earning more tax dollars per unit area, and reducing the per-capita cost of infrastructure and services, which allows us to provide more amenities for everyone to share
- Support for new stop signs being installed at the 116 St/92 Ave and 116 St/Edinboro Rd intersections

Suggestions for Improvement:

- Protection of trees (e.g. preserve trees on site as much as possible, new planting requirements for any trees that are cut down, implement private tree bylaw) (26)
- A development that was fewer storeys and preserves mature trees would be more likely supported by the community and would still contribute to densification (22)
- The proposed development should include on-site parking requirements (e.g. for residents, visitors, delivery services) (5)
- Traffic and pedestrian safety improvements are needed (e.g. more enforcement on one-ways, full signal on 116 St NW and Saskatchewan Dr NW and Emily Murphy Park Rd NW, developer-funded traffic calming on 116 St NW, developer-City cost-shared upgrade to separated bike lane on 116 St NW) (5)
- The development should use sustainable design and building practices (e.g. re-use grey water, salvage building materials from demolished homes to use in new building) (3)

- There should be a public walkway on the north side of the site between 116 St NW and the alley, accommodated within a 6 metre setback from the property to the north; this would also provide a connection to Edinboro Park (2)
- The alley be upgraded as part of the proposed development (2)
- Reducing the density or adding some of the adjoining lots to the application would provide additional green space for residents and improve transition of the built form (2)
- There must be regulations to ensure that the proposed development does not become short-term stay hotels or AirBnB rentals (2)
- The developer should use good design and high-quality materials so that the new development doesn't reduce the charm of the area (2)
- To create more housing, instead, the City should work with developers to build large apartments with a mix of unit types and underground parking
- The heat island effect can be reduced by reclaiming space from wide roads to plant trees

Community League Feedback

The Windsor Park Community League expressed opposition to the proposal, primarily on the basis that it does not meet District Policy requirements. They also emphasized that they would welcome dialogue with the developer about a development that is fewer storeys in height and preserves the ecological functionality of the Habitat Greenway along 116 Street NW.

The Windsor Park Community League's position is that the proposed development does not meet the District Policy for Urban Mix areas that are outside of Nodes and Corridors. They stated that the proposal does not sufficiently meet the criteria for additional scale in Section 2.5.2.5. They also said that it is illogical for Section 2.5.2.5 to allow for a building that is 6 storeys in height, when Section 2.5.2.4 limits supporting development to 4 storeys for locations that are along arterial roads and on a corner lot or within 400 metres of a mass transit station.

The Windsor Park Community League also stated that the proposal goes against the District Policy's direction on Habitat Greenways. Their position is that the proposed development contradicts Section 2.6.3, because it would negatively impact the Habitat Greenway on 116 Street NW by removing vegetation and reducing connectivity for wildlife.

Question and Answer

Will there be family-oriented units, or is this seen as student housing? Will there be condos, purpose-built rentals, or low-income housing?

Zoning does not regulate or account for unit type, who can use a property, or tenure type (such as rental, condo, or owner-occupancy). These details are up to the applicant/developer.

Will mature trees be saved?

The City does not require the preservation of trees on private property. However, the Zoning Bylaw sets out landscaping requirements for new development that includes incentives for preserving existing trees and shrubs. If trees/shrubs are not retained, developers are required to plant new trees/shrubs.

Will there be visitor parking? Does the project include underground parking?

The City has an Open Option Parking policy, which means that there are no minimum on-site parking requirements required by the Zoning Bylaw. Developers/applicants decide how much parking to provide based on their operations. For this development, parking details would be finalized later at the Development Permit stage, if this rezoning application is approved by City Council.

Next Steps

This report will be shared with: the ward Councillor, the applicant, and individuals who shared their contact information on the Engaged Edmonton webpage, at the Open House, or with the planner directly.

After Administration's review, if the applicant decides to advance the application to a Public Hearing, this report will also be included as an attachment to the Planning Report.

Approximately three weeks before a scheduled Public Hearing:

- Notice of the Public Hearing will be sent via mail to nearby residents, property owners, and applicable community leagues and business associations.
- The Public Hearing agenda, Planning Report (including Administration's analysis), and applicable Bylaws will be posted on the [Council and Committee Meetings](#) website.

- Anyone may register to speak at the Public Hearing by completing the form at edmonton.ca/meetings or calling the Office of the City Clerk at 780-496-8178.
- Anyone may submit written comments to the City Clerk (city.clerk@edmonton.ca).

On the Day of the Public Hearing:

- Anyone that registered to speak may attend the Public Hearing online or in-person.
- Anyone may listen to the Public hearing online edmonton.ca/meetings.

If you have questions about this application, please contact:

Saffron Newton, Planner

780-423-3224

saffron.newton@edmonton.ca