

What We Heard Report

King Edward Park

LDA24-0341

Edmonton

Public Engagement Feedback Summary

Project Address: 7814 - 83 Street NW

Project Description: The City has received a rezoning and District Plan amendment application from Situate. The current zone is the Parks and Services Zone (PS) and the proposed zone is the Mixed Use Zone (MU h23.0 f3.0) which would allow:

- Medium scale mixed use development.
- A maximum height of 23.0 metres (approximately 6 storeys).
- A maximum floor area ratio of 3.0.

A proposed amendment to the Southeast District Plan is required to facilitate the proposed rezoning.

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

Engagement Dates: October 1, 2024 - October 14, 2024

Number Of Visitors to the Engaged Edmonton page: Visited the page: 551
Submitted a question or forum response: 57

About This Report

The information in this report includes summarized feedback received between October 1 - 14, 2024 through online engagement via the Engaged Edmonton platform. This report also summarizes all information submitted directly to the file planner via email or phone call.

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. 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.

The planning analysis, and how feedback informed that analysis, will be summarized in the City's report to City Council if the proposed rezoning goes to a future City Council Public Hearing for a decision. The City's report and finalized version of the applicant's proposal will be posted for public viewing on the City's public hearing agenda approximately three (3) weeks prior to a scheduled public hearing for the file.

Engagement Format

The Engaged Edmonton notice was sent to residents within 120.0 m of the rezoning site.

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.

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.

Feedback Summary

This section summarizes the main themes collected.

Number of Responses: 89

In Opposition: 78

In Support: 5

Mixed/Questions Only: 6

The most common **concerns** heard were:

Traffic/Parking: There are existing on-street parking and traffic congestion challenges in the area that will worsen if additional density is added to the area.

Safety: Existing safety challenges will become worse with the proposed development (emergency access concerns, conflicts between vehicles/pedestrians/cyclists including children, Vision Zero considerations, etc).

Open Space: Publicly accessible open space should be retained for the school children and the broader community.

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

Location/Amenities: The site is a good location in proximity to a variety of amenities and services (e.g. schools, commercial, current and future active modes, child care, open space, Bonnie Doon Mall, Mill Creek Ravine, Whyte Avenue, Downtown, etc).

Additional Housing: Opportunity to welcome additional residents to the neighbourhood during a housing crisis.

What We Heard

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

Reasons For Opposition

Scale and Character:

- The maximum height is too tall (23.0 m) (32).
- The proposed zone is for large scale initiatives and is not appropriate for this site (18).
- The proposed scale will change the charm and character of the neighbourhood (17).
- Sun/shadow impacts to adjacent properties due to scale (e.g. shading, health impacts) (13).
- Overlook/privacy impacts to adjacent properties due to scale (10).
- Too many dwellings/too dense (9).
- Noise and light pollution impacts to adjacent properties due to scale (7).
- The setbacks in the zone are too small to provide adequate separation (7).
- Large blank wall facing existing properties (3).
- The maximum floor area ratio (3.0) is too large (2).
- View impacts to adjacent properties due to scale (2).

Transportation, Access, and Parking:

- Existing traffic congestion (e.g. from nearby schools with choice programs, daycares, after school programs, religious assemblies, the community league, commercial spaces, other infill projects, LRT) in the area (83 Street, 85 Street, 82 Avenue, 76 Avenue, 78 Avenue, and surrounding alleys) will worsen especially at am/pm peak times and during events (54).
- The alleys are not adequate for emergency access (e.g. not wide enough) (24).
- Site access should be required from 83 Street NW, not the surrounding alleys which are inadequate for access and increased traffic volumes (20).
- Existing on-street parking congestion will worsen (16).
- Alleys are too narrow in the winter with snow piled on the sides and will require removal for proper access (15).
- The Transportation Association of Canada has a maximum of 500 trips per day in an alley, which the transportation study suggests that the development will exceed (12).
- The majority of students attending schools/child care in the area are dropped off by parents in a private vehicle, not using transit, active modes, or on a school bus (10).
- LRT has caused existing challenges that will worsen (e.g. accessing the neighbourhood is more difficult, delays at am/pm peak times, cross-cutting) (10).
- Insufficient on-site drop-off/pick-up stalls at the schools and daycares in the area which will worsen with the proposed development (10).
- LRT is not an appropriate form of transportation for many (e.g. stops are not near desirable destinations, stops are too far from the site, car ownership is still necessary to access activities around the city, and safety concerns) causing a majority of current and future residents to own private vehicles (7).
- Concern about on-site parking being optional due to Open Option Parking. The developer should provide sufficient on-site parking (6).
- The Traffic Study (draft V1) is not comprehensive and leaves questions unanswered (5).
- Should be planning transportation around am/pm peak traffic congestion, and irresponsible drivers.

Safety:

- Vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists (including children) are in conflict with one another in the area (alleys and surrounding streets/avenues) which is in contradiction with Vision Zero (30).
- Poor driver behaviour is an existing issue that will worsen (e.g. speeding, shortcutting, trespassing on private parking pads/properties to pick-up/drop-off children, damaging private property with vehicles, unsafe/distracted driving, not checking for pedestrians/cyclists, car accidents/near-misses, and illegal stopping in drive aisles) (24).

- Concern that emergency access to the site is not adequate, which could delay emergency response (19).
- Traffic calming/safety measures are difficult to implement in the alleys (e.g. traffic safety 'slow down' signs, photo radar, school zone signage) (14).
- The nearest fire hydrant on 83 Street and 85 Street is beyond the 45 metre maximum spacing from the site (12).
- Concern that increased density correlates with increased crime and social disorder (e.g. theft, kidnapping, vandalism) (6).
- Poor signage, obstructed signage, unmarked crosswalks, and blind spots exist in the area, and create unsafe conditions for drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists (4).
- Some school buses load/unload children in the alley which is unsafe (2).

Neighbourhood Services and Infrastructure:

- Infrastructure may not be able to handle additional residents (e.g. power, sewer, drainage, EVs) (15).
- Existing services in the area may not be able to serve additional residents (e.g. child care, schools, medical clinic, open space) (13).
- Increased use of infrastructure will result in premature aging (12).
- Insufficient lighting in the area (2).

Policy and Regulations:

- If the western portion of the site were to be redeveloped, the site would not meet the Government of Alberta Guidelines for new or replacement school projects (e.g. suitability of the site size to accommodate open space, segregation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic) (12).
- Does not align with The City Plan (removal of open space).
- The site is not within a Node or Corridor in The City Plan, or the Southeast District Plan.
- The site is not listed as a Local Node in The City Plan, and the examples provided are larger and along collector roads.
- The site should be considered a Secondary Corridor, not a Local Node.
- The site is not within a Priority Growth Area (PGA).
- Removing open space is contradictory to Breathe: Edmonton's Green Network Strategy.
- This application does not align with the Residential Infill Guidelines (RIGs).

Retain Open Space:

- Open space should be retained for children attending the school, and residents who use the space (e.g. important for the health of children, communities, and the city) (52).
- The loss of open space for children attending the school is unfair from an equity perspective (14).
- Exceptions to the requirement for proper outdoor space should not be granted for private schools (3).
- Removal of the open space will push out Al-Mustafa Academy (3).

Uses:

- There is no guarantee that residential uses (including affordable/housing for families) will be built as a wholly non-residential building is permitted in the proposed zone (19).
- The proposed zone has too many permitted uses (e.g. residential, commercial, Walmart) (9).
- If there is no frontage onto 83 Street, the development will not be attractive to commercial tenants (1).

Environmental:

- The proposed development is not environmentally sustainable (e.g. will result in increased carbon emissions, will exacerbate urban heat island impacts, will result in global warming) (6).

- Adjacent residents have installed solar panels to be more environmentally conscious, and the proposed development will impact them (3).
- Concern about increased traffic and population damaging the ravine/wildlife, disrupting the ecosystem, and risking structural integrity.

Aesthetics:

- Design lacks architectural appeal/is average/poor (3).

Property Value/Taxation:

- Proposed development will decrease adjacent property values and/or make properties more difficult to sell (8).
- Homeowners make significant financial investments in an area based on its characteristics, and large scale change is unreasonable (6).
- MU Zoning will make the land more valuable, driving up the cost of housing on the site if it is sold (2).
- Proposed development will increase surrounding property taxes.

Uncertainty:

- Standard zones are too permissive. If the rezoning is approved, the developer can change their design/intent, or the site could be sold and nothing in the zone prevents this from happening (14).
- There is no guarantee that the Al-Mustafa Academy will remain on site (6).
- Want to prevent future rezonings for additional height/density on the east side of the site.

Developer:

- Concern about the quality and/or character of the developer (10).
- Developers only care about profit (10).
- Concern about the developers connection to Al-Mustafa Academy (4).
- Concern about the developers connection to the United Conservative Party (2).

School:

- Residents have raised existing concerns with the school, which have not been addressed adequately (e.g. parents dropping off/picking up students in the alleys, trespassing on private property, property damage, speeding, etc) (4).
- The school is in a state of disrepair (2).

City Administration:

- Residents have submitted concerns about challenges in the area to 311 which have not been addressed (e.g. speeding, shortcutting, LRT, construction noise, and street light bulb replacement) (4).
- The review should consider the full impacts of what is possible in the zone (2).
- Distrust in the City's review process (2).
- City planning is contradictory and inconsistent in short timeframes.

City Council:

- Only care about making money (e.g. taxes) (10).
- Need to stand up for the residents that they represent and deny the rezoning (6).
- The rezoning would set a precedent in the area if approved (3).

Engagement:

- Asking for feedback, receiving strong opposition, and still approving a rezoning is not proper public consultation (3)

- The community held their own meeting on Oct 8, 2024 which was well attended, and volunteers door-knocked to ensure that residents knew about the application which they did because the City's notification is not sufficient (3).
- Communication from the City of Edmonton, Situate, developer, City Councillor, and Al-Mustafa Academy should have come sooner (3).
- 60 m notification radius for the mailed notices is not sufficient (3).
- The Engaged Edmonton page should not have ended on the Thanksgiving long-weekend (3).
- Residents deserve a meeting with the city, applicant, developer, school, and elected officials before a public hearing is scheduled.
- The rezoning sign was not placed in a prominent enough location.
- There is no opportunity for community consultation after a rezoning is approved.
- It seems like the proposed rezoning is being rushed through with urgency.

Other:

- The neighbourhood is not opposed to change/infill/densification/additional housing and has welcomed it, but this proposal is not appropriate (e.g. not safe, wrong location, not in the best interest of the community) (33).
- Other locations in the district/neighbourhood are more appropriate (properties that are already zoned for residential uses, Bonnie Doon Mall redevelopment, Beacon Apartments at East Junction, Strathern Apartments, vacant sites along the LRT, sites adjacent to Whyte Avenue, sites adjacent to a major node, large corner sited, and/or abutting a site that allows for more than 4 storeys) (23).
- Retain the current zoning (9).
- Construction brings chaos, noise, dust, debris, and damage to adjacent properties (e.g. infill development, neighbourhood renewal, LRT construction, 76 Avenue Renewal) (6).
- If this is approved, it will sour opinions about infill/densification in the neighbourhood (2).
- After EPSB, ECSD, Greater North Central Francophone and the City, private/charter schools should have a chance to buy a surplus school site prior to a private buyer.
- No examples of an apartment built in a school yard in Edmonton.
- The neighbourhood is part of a much bigger whole and concerns need to factor in local interests in light of municipal and regional considerations.

Suggestions For Improvement

- Explore other zones (10).
 - Explore the Medium Scale Residential Zone (4).
 - Explore the Small Scale Residential Zone (2).
 - Explore the Neighbourhood Mixed Use Zone (2).
 - Explore a Direct Control Zone to address the uniqueness of the site (2).
- Reduce the height, and increase setbacks to minimize impacts to adjacent properties (8).
- Redevelop the east side of the site, and retain the open space on the west side (4).
- Decrease the development footprint to accommodate more publicly accessible open space on the site (3).
- Optimize building placement to reduce shading impacts to adjacent properties (3).
- All parking should be underground to maximize open space on the site (2).
- Increase the width of the alleys to provide additional separation and safely accommodate vehicles (2).
- Require sidewalks with treed boulevards (2).
- Add additional lighting in the alleys (2).
- Explore missing middle housing for the site.
- Incorporate the commercial strip mall to the west for a larger site, and develop one slim high-rise tower instead.

- The proposed height could be taller so that more housing is available for people to live in the neighbourhood.

Reasons For Support

- Opportunity to welcome more residents during a housing crisis (including young families, residents without cars, etc.) (4).
 - Good location for additional housing near amenities and services (e.g. schools, commercial, current and future active modes/transit (including LRT), child care, open space, active modes, Bonnie Doon Mall, Mill Creek Ravine, Whyte Avenue, Downtown) (4).
 - Support for a variety of uses/mixed-use development (3).
 - Proposed height/scale/density is appropriate (3).
 - Aligns with The City Plan goal of 50% of trips made by transit/active modes (3).
 - Increased customer base for services and amenities in the area (2).
 - Suburban sprawl is unsustainable, and densifying in the core is the alternative.
 - Will provide additional housing types that are relatively affordable in the core.
 - Diversify uses/types of housing in neighbourhoods to be a financially sustainable city.
 - Other neighbourhoods (Strathcona, Garneau, Wîhkwêntôwin) are denser, but still provide a reasonable availability of on-street parking.
 - Different developments offer varying parking options so that prospective residents can choose whether the development meets their needs in terms of vehicle storage.
 - Concerns about on-street parking usage and irresponsible drivers should not prevent providing more housing in the neighbourhood.
 - Denser development/neighbourhoods do not have higher crime rates.
 - Confidence that the City will complete the appropriate reviews to ensure that development follows all regulations and codes (e.g. alley width, emergency access, etc.).
-

Questions & Answers

Would lanes be converted to one-way to accommodate increased traffic? Would the developer fund improvement of the lanes to accommodate increased traffic and flow?

Administration is reviewing the Transportation Impact Assessment for the site and requires updates to the report. The developer may be required to complete alley upgrades at their cost to facilitate their proposed development.

Are there provisions within the zoning or could some be added to make the alley ways safer?

The Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA) will provide recommendations based on the technical analysis of the alleys. The TIA is the report that will determine what improvements may be required. The zoning provides requirements on vehicular access being from the alley but alley improvements are context specific and not regulated within the Zoning Bylaw.

The proposed rezoning leaves too much in the hands of potential developers that due to limited restrictions might not create something that is suitable for the neighborhood. How can this be protected against?

Zones are designed to be flexible and focus on only regulating the things that the City and City Council have deemed necessary through the Zoning Bylaw. If the rezoning is approved, the full set of uses and regulations in the zone would be possible.

Detailed design (e.g. architectural drawings, site plans, etc) and review is required at the Development Permit stage, which comes after rezoning (if approved).

Can a residential building be constructed under the current Parks and Services Zone (PS)?

No, residential uses are not permitted in the Parks and Services Zone (PS). A residential building could not be constructed. Rezoning the site to a zone that permits residential uses is required to construct residential uses/housing on site.

Can a special provision be made to allow the school to continue to be functional until future development if rezoned to a zone that does not list Schools as a use (e.g. MUN Zone, or RM Zone)?

Yes, the existing school can continue operating under their existing development permit as a legal, non-conforming use if the zoning changed to a zone that doesn't allow for schools.

There are challenges associated with non-conforming uses/buildings that may make this option more challenging than choosing a zone that permits the 'School' use. For example: there are limitations to building alterations, additions, and exterior alterations that accompany a non-conforming use which can make maintenance/changes to the existing building more difficult in the long term.

Snow clearing: There is no snow clearing on the lanes/alleys. How would this affect access? Would the developer fund ongoing snow clearing of the lanes?

The developer would not be required to fund ongoing snow clearing in the abutting alleys. The City of Edmonton is responsible for snow clearing. The City of Edmonton has a priority system with associated service levels for snow clearing ranging from priority 1 to priority 4. Residential roadways and alleys/back lanes are included in priority 4. The [Roadways Snow Clearing Map](#) shows roadway priority and updates on snow clearing. The City of Edmonton's [Snow Clearing Service Level](#) website has additional information.

This site used to belong to the Edmonton Catholic School Board, so I am wondering if it has been formally sold?

The site was formerly owned by the Edmonton Catholic School Board (ECSD), but it has been formally sold. 7814 - 83 Street NW was owned by ECSD and was a non-reserve school site. ECSD declared the property surplus to their needs. In accordance with the Joint Use Agreement, the property was first offered to school board partners including Conseil Scolaire Centre-Nord and the Edmonton Public School Board. Neither Board expressed interest in acquiring the site at which point it was offered to the City of Edmonton. The City undertook a review to determine civic need/interest in acquiring the property. The City did not exercise its right of first refusal per the Joint Use Agreement. The City would have been required to purchase the property at market value. Therefore, the City communicated it was not interested in acquiring the property at which time ECSD sold the property privately.

Are there rules governing the amount of accessible park space per child for a school- public or private?

With respect to school sites, under the terms of the MGA and corresponding [Joint Use Agreements](#), The City works closely with the ECSB, EPSB, and Conseil scolaire Centre-Nord to determine appropriate school sites sizes. Note that it is only those boards, private schools are not covered within the legal agreements, and can choose sites that best suit their own needs or special interests.

Is there a requirement for reports from ATCO Gas and EPCOR on the impact of providing utilities for a project of such a large scope as part of, and prior to consideration of the rezoning application?

Rezoning applications are always shared with ATCO Gas and EPCOR for their feedback at the rezoning stage; however, there are no technical studies produced for EPCOR and ATCO.

If the new zoning bylaw that was passed, eliminating the mature neighbourhood overlays is a "living document", as touted by city planners, what is the process that changes can be made, and can they be made before this change can be voted on?

A text amendment is required to amend text in the zoning bylaw. Text amendments to the Zoning Bylaw can apply city-wide (for example, if a text amendment was made to amend one of the standard zones that applies to multiple properties across Edmonton). The process for a text amendment would not be

complete before this rezoning could potentially proceed to a public hearing. More information on text amendments is available on the [Zoning Bylaw Text Amendment](#) website.

Are there scenarios where during the analysis stage, the City concludes that the proposal is not viable, and does not follow through with a public hearing? Or do all proposals at this stage of submission go to a public hearing, regardless of analysis outcomes?

Regardless of whether the City administration says we support or do not support an application, the applicant can still take the application to public hearing to be considered by City Council. City Council are the ultimate decision makers on whether or not a rezoning is approved.

How much notice are residents given of the public hearing date?

Postcards will be sent out approximately 3 weeks before a scheduled public hearing date. This is also when the planning report and associated bylaws would be posted online, and when the administration's position of support or non-support becomes public.

Based on my experiences of dealing with rezoning applications and what is termed engagement, am I just going to get frustrated and am I wasting my time?

The Public Engagement Spectrum explains the 4 roles the public can have when they participate in City of Edmonton public engagement activities. As you move from left to right with the spectrum, there is an increasing level of public influence and commitment from the City and the public.

Rezoning applications are brought to the public at the 'Advise' level of the public engagement spectrum:



Feedback is sought to:

- To help inform conversations with the applicant about making revisions to address concerns raised.
- To collect local insight and help us make sure that our planning analysis is taking into consideration all the factors that it needs to.
- To inform Council about the nature of the feedback received so that they have a better understanding of the opinions of nearby residents prior to making their decision.

Are there any protections in place for current residents of a community in terms of A) minimum distance of high rise buildings from current single family home properties. Does this vary depending on the height of the building? B) blocking natural sunlight into adjacent properties?

A) The proposed MU h23.0 f3.0 Zone has a maximum height of 23.0 metres (approx. 6 storeys) which would allow for mid-rise mixed-use development. A minimum setback of 3.0 metres would be required for all portions of the development over 16.0 metres in height (from all the property lines on the site touching an alley). The width of the alley, and the minimum rear setback on the adjacent single family properties would also provide separation.

B) A Sun Shadow Study is required for all proposed rezonings to a zone with a maximum height of 20.0 metres or more. A Sun Shadow Study was submitted by the applicant and is included on the Engaged Edmonton website in the 'Documents' tab. At the rezoning stage, the sun shadow study takes into consideration the maximum possible shadow cast by the maximum build out of the proposed zone.

I noticed the developers would offer both surface and underground parking? Is there any mention of the number of resident, school and visitor parking stalls they will be offering relative to the number of proposed units?

In the applicant's Urban Design Brief (available in the 'Documents' section of the Engaged Edmonton page), they indicate that they intend to provide approximately 178 residential units, and approximately 212 new parking stalls on site.

It is important to note that City Council voted to enable Open Option Parking city-wide effective July 2, 2020. Open Option Parking means that minimum on-site parking requirements have been removed from [Edmonton's Zoning Bylaw](#), allowing developers, homeowners and businesses to decide how much on-site parking to provide on their properties based on their particular operations, activities or lifestyle. As such, while the applicant's Urban Design Brief shows their current intent, the zoning does not require them to follow through with this and it could change when development happens.

It appears that access is sole through back alleys. Is this permissible under current zoning bylaws?

Sole access from an alley is not prohibited in the proposed zone. On the contrary, the proposed Mixed Use Zone (MU h23.0 f3.0) requires vehicular access to be from an alley where an alley is present. It is common for standard residential zones and mixed use zones in the Zoning Bylaw to require vehicle access from an alley where one is present.

Why does the entire site need to be rezoned if only the west portion of the site is to be redeveloped and the intent is to have the school continue?

The City tries to avoid split zoning a site when possible, which requires drawing arbitrary zoning lines across a property, versus following the established property lines. Only one property is involved in the proposed rezoning which is why the entire site is proposed to be rezoned (7814 - 83 Street NW). In addition, rezoning the whole site would allow for the redevelopment of the entire site without needing to undertake a second rezoning. The proposed MU h23.0 f3.0 Zone permits schools, and will allow the school to continue operating on site.

Thank you for your response to my earlier question regarding the sun shadow study. Looking at the attached sun shadow study, several houses (4 houses) on the north side of the proposed development will indeed be in the shadow almost year round. Are there any hard rules that developers have to follow - ie proportion of daylight hours impacted for any single adjacent property?

No, the proportion of daylight hours impacted for adjacent properties is not regulated.

Adjacent properties to the north would experience more shadowing impact than other surrounding properties due to their location being north of the site. However, they still received sunlight in the morning and evening between the equinoxes and midday sun in the summer as well. The shadow impacts increase with the future development of the school location.

Seeing as this is a residential/neighbourhood area, wouldn't the Neighbourhood Mixed Use Zone (MUN) make more sense for this property?

There are often multiple zones that can generally meet policy direction and city objectives for a given site. We usually have informal conversations with the applicant before they formally submit a rezoning to discuss these options. Once they submit a formal rezoning application, we process that application based on the zone they submit.

I'm curious how this site will be serviced by emergency vehicles as there is no mention of this in the transportation study. As they exist today, the alleys surrounding the site do not accommodate emergency vehicles, specifically fire trucks. The Complete Streets Design and Construction Standards identify a passenger car as the design vehicle and a waste collection as the control vehicle, this seems consistent with what has been built. The standards further not a minimum 6.0m of clear space required for emergency vehicles which is not available in alleys measuring 4.0m wide. Given that this standard is not met, is the intention to widen the alleys to allow for this? I also noted a difference in the pavement structure for an residential alley (Dwg No. 2040) and a residential reverse housing alley (Dwg No. 2042) which presumably is related to the latter needing to accommodate a fire truck. The alleys were recently reconstructed, will additional work be required to bring these up to an appropriate standard?

The draft Transportation Memo dated August 2024 is being reviewed by City Administration including Fire Rescue Services and Transportation Engineers. Your comments will be shared with the consultant and further updates to the Transportation Memo are expected to address these concerns.

The transportation study/memo provides no details about the existing traffic volumes in these alleys. There is an estimate of the traffic generated by the school site, and estimate of the traffic which will be generated by the proposed development, but no mention of the traffic generated by the houses or commercial properties which border the alleys. The memo provides some description of how vehicles trips will travel to/from the site but provides no estimated breakdown of what the resulting traffic volumes are expected to be. The lack of an estimated future traffic volume for the alleys therefore makes the conclusion that "the availability of alleys along the north, south, and west sides of the site provides sufficient opportunities to access the site without concentrating volumes on any one alley segment" difficult to understand or verify. What is the total anticipated traffic volume? What is a traffic volume which would be inappropriate for alleys such as these which operate as a yield condition? These seem like very reasonable questions to which the study provides no answers.

The draft Transportation Memo dated August 2024 is being reviewed by City Administration. Your comments will be shared with the consultant and further updates to the Transportation Memo are expected to address these concerns.

My home is on the north side of 79th Avenue and we just installed solar panels. How will the proposed 6 story buildings impact the sunlight reaching them?

There is a Sun Shadow Study available under 'Documents' on this website. Properties on the north side of 79 Ave NW experience some shadowing during the winter solstice (Dec 21). The shadow impacts increase during the winter solstice (Dec 21) with the future development of the school location.

Considering that we had a Community Meeting last night to discuss the proposed rezoning and that a large number of our community were not aware of the proposed rezoning as well as the deadline is on ,Thanksgiving on the long weekend could we have a two week extension to the deadline. This would give the community and individuals an opportunity to truly engage as engagement was intended.

Feedback can be provided on Engaged Edmonton from October 1, 2024 - October 14, 2024. Feedback and questions can still be directed to the file planner via email at saffron.newton@edmonton.ca.

What is the plan for parking spaces and traffic, considering the site can't be accessed by the streets?

The Mixed Use Zone (MU) requires vehicle access to be from an alley, where an alley is present.

In the applicant's Urban Design Brief (available in the 'Documents' section of the Engaged Edmonton page), they indicate that they intend to provide approximately 178 residential units, and approximately 212 new parking stalls on site.

It is important to note that City Council voted to enable Open Option Parking city-wide effective July 2, 2020. Open Option Parking means that minimum on-site parking requirements have been removed from [Edmonton's Zoning Bylaw](#), allowing developers, homeowners and businesses to decide how much on-site parking to provide on their properties based on their particular operations, activities or lifestyle. As such, while the applicant's Urban Design Brief shows their current intent, the zoning does not require them to follow through with this and it could change when development happens.

Is this site classified as being on a node or corridor?

The application is still under review. The City is currently reviewing whether the site could be considered a local node.

In the [District Policy](#), local nodes are defined as a community focal point for business, services, gathering and housing with more development intensity. Local Nodes serve residential neighbourhoods through existing or new collections of commercial sites that are generally internal to neighbourhoods, sometimes nearby to civic spaces and centres, cultural facilities, places of worship and/or schools. Local Nodes are intended to be active and lively.

How are developers vetted or is the main focus the zone?

The review focuses on the proposed zone. Anyone has the right to submit a rezoning application. There is not a mechanism in place to vet developers/applicants, and who they are is not a land use consideration.

What criteria does the city review in order to assess which zone would be appropriate for a space? Do those criteria allow for circumstances not in the spirit of the rules and require a unique approach? (e.g. this plot of land that had 3 alley ways surrounding it)?

[Section 7.50 subsection 3.2](#) of the Zoning Bylaw outlines the review criteria to analyze the potential impacts of development under the proposed zone.

Each site has unique characteristics that are analyzed through the review process. For example, the access to this site, and alleys are being reviewed by Fire Rescue Services and Transportation Engineers.

Besides approving a rezone, does the city have that ability to apply certain provisions beyond the zoning rules to ensure appropriate design considerations and safety standards are considered?

If the rezoning is approved by City Council at a public hearing, the applicant will be required to get Development and Building permits. These permits ensure the detailed architectural and engineering drawings conform with the Zoning Bylaw and also any applicable [building codes and standards](#) that are provincially and federally regulated.

There are specific setbacks from alleys in the zoning rules, so is that what ensures appropriate emergency access or are there other guidelines that specify the need to allow adequate access (e.g. widening the alley).

The draft Transportation Memo dated August 2024 is being reviewed by City Administration including Fire Rescue Services and Transportation Engineers. Further updates to the transportation memo are expected to address these concerns.

Further review would also be required at the Development Permit stage, which would come after the rezoning stage (if approved). At the Development Permit stage, there are detailed architectural drawings and site plans that City Administration including Fire Rescue Services reviews to ensure the emergency access is adequate. Alley widening, and corner cuts are examples of how this can be achieved.

What considerations go into building height restrictions? With the alley being narrow and building potentially being tall. There is impact on surrounding neighbors regarding privacy, sunlight, and solar energy potential. Is this just a cost to densification or what design provisions can be instated to balance new build and current surrounding neighbors?

From a zoning regulation perspective, we review the maximum proposed height, and other regulations in the zone that impact the overall scale of the building (e.g. maximum floor area ratio, and minimum setbacks) when reviewing impacts. Sun shadow impacts are also reviewed.

Statutory Plans in effect also influence the review of whether a maximum height is appropriate at a certain location and there is an acceptance of more impactful development at these locations. For example, The City Plan and District Plans outline a network of nodes and corridors and the size of buildings that can be supported or considered within the network. Nodes and corridors in The City Plan vary in size and scale. The City is currently reviewing whether the site could be considered a local node, and the application is still under review.

In the [District Policy](#), local nodes are defined as a community focal point for business, services, gathering and housing with more development intensity. Local Nodes serve residential neighbourhoods through existing or new collections of commercial sites that are generally internal to neighbourhoods, sometimes nearby to civic spaces and centres, cultural facilities, places of worship and/or schools. Local Nodes are intended to be active and lively.

If this zone is approved, what cheques and balances exist for the city to review and approve future designs on what is to be built on the land, if any?

If the rezoning is approved by City Council at a public hearing, the applicant will be required to get Development and Building permits. These permits ensure the detailed architectural and engineering drawings conform with the Zoning Bylaw and also any applicable [building codes and standards](#) that are provincially and federally regulated.

What is the purpose of a sun shade study if it will not be used to restrict or dictate building design? It appears more as just for information for neighbors on how they will be impacted negatively rather than how they will be considered.

The purpose of the Sun Shadow Study is to illustrate the maximum impact at various times of day and year, based on the maximum build out of the proposed zone. It provides information about potential impacts to surrounding residents, City Administration and City Council to help form our collective opinions on the proposal.

Looking at a similar rezone (LDA19-0297 - 86 Avenue Mid-rise Rezoning (11023-11045 86 Avenue NW)), 11041 - 86 Avenue NW, 10119 - 85 Avenue NW, 11450 - 80 Avenue NW. They appear to have been either within or adjacent to a major node. In addition, these rezones were to a residential medium scale. They were also in close proximity to current 4 story buildings, towers, or on a big corner lot. For the following ones that were approved, and not developed on yet, 10504 - 128 Street NW, 13607 and 13611 - Stony Plain Road NW, 10240 - 136 Street NW, 13802 - 102 Avenue NW, 8502 - 92 Avenue NW, and 9206 - 85 Street NW. They were also Residential medium scale. Is there a reason this application was for Mixed use? Also, for the 6 story builds, since they were next to tall buildings they fit the feel. Wouldn't a more appropriate restriction for this lot be 4 story?

Answer from the City: There are often multiple zones that can generally meet policy direction and City objectives for a given site. We usually have informal conversations with the applicant before they formally submit a rezoning to discuss these options. Once they submit a formal rezoning application, we process that application based on the zone they submit.

Answer from the applicant [received after the Engaged Edmonton page concluded]: The Mixed Use (MU) zone is proposed for the site because it allows for both Residential and School uses. This means that new mid-rise residential buildings could be built on the west side of the site and the Al Mustafa Academy could continue operating on the east side of the site.

The City Plan and the District Plans establish the nodes and corridor system for the city. The District Plan Policy describes Local Nodes as “places in Urban Mix areas, separate from other Nodes and Corridors, that act as focal points for the neighbourhoods where they are located. They must include commercial uses and should also include another community use, such as a park, community hall, religious assembly or school. They are integrated within their neighbourhood and feature strong active transportation connections and transit service.”

The site and surrounding area align with the definition for a Local Node because it consists of local commercial businesses on 85 Street, Al Mustafa Academy on the subject site, Donnan School, King Edward Park field and playground, King Edward Park Community League's Large Hall, St. Jung Ha Sang Catholic Parish, St. David's Anglican Church, and nearby child care facilities on 83 Street. The site and surrounding area also have excellent access to active transportation routes and transit service. The Whyte Avenue, 76 Avenue, 79 Street and Mill Creek Ravine bike routes are nearby, and the Local Node is also located approximately 360 metres from the Avonmore LRT Station and 480 metres from the Bonnie Doon LRT station.

Within Local Nodes, the District Plan policy supports mixed use development, and supports mid-rise (5 to 8 storeys) development along arterial roads. The site fronts onto 83 Street which is an arterial road. This means that rezoning to the Mixed Use (MU) zone to allow for 6 storey buildings aligns with the policy direction in the District Plan.

Can you explain more about PS zone properties and their rezoning? It seems as though most surplus school sites retain this zoning and are used for similar purposes or sometimes rezoned as low income residential. Most properties are redeveloped through consultation with the community so how to best use this community zoned spaces. If this property was purchased as a PS zone wouldn't this zoning change drastically increase this property value for the owner and take away this public/community zoned space to private ownership? Are there other examples of school sites that have been bought privately and rezoned to multi use?

The purpose of the Parks and Service Zone (PS) is to allow for educational, recreational, and community needs at the city-wide, district and neighbourhood level. Common uses in this zone would be: schools, parks, libraries, recreation facilities, and a variety of active and passive recreation opportunities (e.g. picnic grounds, plazas, sports fields, outdoor rinks, spray parks, etc). Residential uses are not permitted in this zone.

It is important to note that the zone that applies to a property does not indicate whether it is privately or publicly owned. This site is privately owned. The current school (Al-mustafa Academy) on site is not a part of the Joint Use Agreements.

The [Joint Use Agreements](#) provide the framework for making decisions related to surplus school sites. Private schools and charter schools are not a part of the Joint Use Agreements. There are two scenarios the agreements contemplate: The City of Edmonton owns the land (surplus reserve site), or a school board owns the land (surplus non-reserve site):

Surplus reserve site (City owns the site): If a City owned school site is identified as surplus, it must be formally surplus through a bylaw by City Council. City-owned land is where you will see sites rezoned for affordable housing or other uses. More information is available on the [Surplus School Sites](#) website.

Surplus non-reserve site (school board owns the site): If the land is identified as surplus by the school board, it is offered to the other school boards. If other school boards do not purchase the land, it is offered to the City of Edmonton. If the City of Edmonton does not purchase the land (at market value), it can be sold on the open market to a private owner.

- 7814 - 83 Street NW was owned by Edmonton Catholic School Board (ECSD) and was a non-reserve site. ECSD declared the property surplus to their needs. In accordance with the Joint Use Agreement, the property was first offered to school board partners including Conseil Scolaire Centre-Nord and the Edmonton Public School Board. Neither Board expressed interest in acquiring the site at which point it was offered to the City of Edmonton. The City undertook a review to determine civic need/interest in acquiring the property. The City did not exercise its right of first refusal per the Joint Use Agreement. The City would have been required to purchase the property at market value. Therefore, the City communicated it was not interested in acquiring the property at which time ECSD sold the property privately.

Other examples of a former school site that have been bought privately and rezoned:

- There is an active rezoning (LDA24-0172) in the Strathcona neighbourhood for the former St. Anthony School site from PS to MU h30.0 f5.5 which would allow for a mixed use building up to 30.0 metres in height if approved.
- The former St. John's School site in the Wîhkwêntôwin (Oliver) neighbourhood was rezoned from the UF Zone to the RM h23.0 Zone, which allows for multi-unit residential and non-residential uses up to 23.0 metres (approx. 6 storeys) in height. This site has been developed as a 6 storey residential building.

Next Steps

The public feedback received will be considered during the planning analysis and will be included in the administration report for City Council. 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 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
