

What We Heard Report

Belgravia

LDA25-0002 & LDA25-0003

Edmonton

Public Engagement Feedback Summary

Project Address:	11607 - 76 Avenue NW (LDA25-0002) 11618 - 76 Avenue NW (LDA25-0003)
Project Description:	The current zone on both lots is the Small Scale Residential Zone (RS) and the proposed zone for both is the Small-Medium Scale Transition Residential Zone (RSM h12.0). Initially, the RM h16.0 Zone was proposed for both lots and most feedback was given with this lot in mind. After initial feedback from the City, the applicant chose to change to the RSM h12.0 Zone. The RSM h12.0 Zone would allow for a range of small to medium scale housing with a maximum height of 12.0 m (approximately 3 storeys) and a maximum site coverage of 60%.
Engagement Format:	Online Engagement Webpage - Engaged Edmonton: https://engaged.edmonton.ca/belgravia76Avenue Mailed notices leading to email and phone correspondence
Engagement Dates:	Online Engagement Webpage: March 10 - 23, 2025
Number Of Visitors:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Visited Engaged Edmonton page: 591• Submitted a question or forum response online: 23• Contacted the planner directly:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ LDA25-0002: 97○ LDA25-0003: 89

About This Report

The information in this report includes summarized feedback received from January 25, 2025 onward, including through online engagement and by directly contacting the file planner by phone or email.

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 everyone who emailed the file planner and 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.

Engagement Format

The Engaged Edmonton webpage included an overview of the application, information on the development and rezoning process and contact information for the file planner. Two participation tools were available for participants: one to ask questions and one to leave feedback. The engagement opportunity was communicated to the public through mailed notices and as part of the City's weekly public service announcements (PSA).

The comments collected on Engaged Edmonton and through phone calls and emails 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:

In Support: 9

In Opposition: 110

The most common **concerns** heard were:

Traffic Congestion: There was a lot of consensus from respondents that the neighbourhood currently experiences very significant traffic congestion, especially during peak times. Reasons for this were varied but it was noted that there are few access points, delays caused by surface running LRT and short cutting through the neighbourhood. Connections were made between congestion and pedestrian safety, emergency response times and air pollution. Many believed a full traffic study should be conducted before more rezoning applications are approved.

Neighbourhood Character: Many respondents referenced that this part of Belgravia should be made up of smaller scale buildings and that a mid-block larger building is not in keeping with the

character of the interior of the neighbourhood. There was worry that the development may be short-term rentals or small units that are not usable by families.

RS Zoning Sufficient: There was a high level of understanding that the new Zoning Bylaw, through the Small Scale Residential Zone (RS), already allows for infill opportunities in the neighbourhood beyond single detached houses. Many believe that increasing infill opportunities beyond the RS Zone is not necessary and that the RS Zone should be allowed to play out before there are changes from it.

Parking: Residents noted that street parking in the area is already quite congested. People have observed illegal street parking contributing to this in an area with a Residential Parking Program. Without the requirement for on site parking, it is concerning to many that new developments will make street parking availability more sparse.

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

Location: Some felt this is a good place for more housing close to transit, the river valley, bike lanes and amenities.

Housing crisis: Many of those in support saw this as providing more housing to help address 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

Built Form/Site Layout/Neighbourhood Character

- New RS Zoning will already have an impact on the character of the neighbourhood with all the infill it allows. Don't need to go beyond that (x42).
- Scale and type of development is out of character with the neighbourhood/not appropriate at this location (x42).
- Increases in intensity should not happen mid-block as there is no transition. At least restrict to corner sites (x17).
- With increased height and site coverage there will be privacy impacts on neighbours (x10).
- This type of development works against community cohesiveness (x7).
- Could be too many units. Number of units not known (x6).
- Need more housing for families. This is not housing for families (x6).
- Housing should focus on quality over quantity.
- Rezoning high quality neighbourhoods is wrong.
- Quality of infill projects has gone down over the years and this doesn't look like it will be a high quality one.

Traffic/Parking/Safety

- Existing traffic congestion is very significant, especially during peak times. Anything that might increase this should not happen (x67).
- Will increase demand for on-street parking, which is already congested (x32).
- Should be a proper traffic study before any more decisions are made (x12).
- Congestion is leading to dangerous driving in alleys and small local roads. Pedestrians, including kids, are at risk (x12).
- Concerned emergency vehicles are being delayed due to congestion (x9).
- Increases in delivery vehicles but they will have nowhere to park on the street (x9).
- Concerned there won't be enough on site parking, especially if there are commercial uses (x8).
- Lots of illegal street parking with little enforcement from the City (x6).
- Worried about access for waste collection if the number of units is increased (x6).
- Congestion is leading to more air pollution in the neighbourhood and health impacts (x3).
- Congestion would prevent safe evacuation if the community had to evacuate due to wildfires (x2).

Greenspace/Mature Trees

- Loss of sunlight on gardens and trees will lead to dying vegetation and people not using their yards (x17).
- Several mature trees will be lost on the properties (x14).
- Worried about impact on boulevard trees (x7).
- Too much building on sites will not allow enough moisture retention in ground (x4).
- Increased urban heat island effect (x4).

Policy

- Sites are outside of the Secondary Corridors so should not be increased in zoning (x9).
- While the sites are close to 400 m from the LRT station, this only makes sense much closer (x6).
- The city has already achieved 97% of its infill targets, there doesn't have to be more (x2).
- Rezoning goes against the proper process of getting variances that includes the appeal process.

Engagement/Politics

- Developers being prioritized over existing residents (x8).
- Existing residents and the Community League not being listened to about these kinds of applications (x7).
- Breaking trust with a fairly progressive neighbourhood during an election year (x3).
- No engagement from the developer (x2).
- There should be a proper community meeting to figure out what the neighbourhood thinks (x2).

- New zoning bylaw and district plans that are allowing this were rushed through too quickly without enough consultation.
- Governments should be taking charge of building affordable housing and taking action to protect tenants from "renovictions" and displacement.

Other

- Don't want to see anymore infill until impacts of two major projects under construction is known (x17).
- Water, electricity and drainage infrastructure is old and can't handle more units (x15).
- Will reduce sunlight access to solar panels (x13).
- Do not want to see micro-suites and/or short term rental businesses displacing housing for residents and families (x10).
- Speculative rezonings are driving housing prices up and displacing marginalized people from the neighbourhood (x10).
- Do not want these rezonings to set a precedent for more happening in the area (x9).
- Site preparation on these properties has been disruptive and maybe not following rules. Concerned construction will be worse (x7).
- Do not want commercial uses at these locations (x7).
- Worried about construction impacts, e.g., sidewalk blocking, tree health, damage to other properties. (x5)
- Will decrease property values (x3).
- BM Homes Ltd. has a limited online presence and may not be a legitimate company. Previous developments have not been good (x3).
- Will lead to more crime, nuisance, noise and littering (x3).
- Local schools nearing capacity. Can't handle more students from more housing (x2).
- Loss of sunlight could lead to mental health issues for neighbours (x2).
- Increased noise pollution (x2).
- Rezonings like this do not help with the housing crisis (x2)
- Concerned about non-Canadian developers doing this only for business reasons.
- Wasteful tear downs of perfectly good houses work against climate resilient objectives.
- These rezonings are leading to too many rental properties.
- Developers are deconstructing neighbourhoods against the interests of the people, and replacing them with undesirable development.
- Worried rezoning happens but not development leading to vacant lots.

Reasons For Support

- Good location close to transit, the river valley, bike lanes and amenities (x7).
- Will help address the housing crisis (x5).
- This will help with housing affordability in the area. (x2)
- More people will benefit from additional housing. Should be more housing in Belgravia (x2).
- There is a vocal minority wishing to fight these types of rezonings but actual opinion in the neighbourhood is more mixed
- Proposals like these serve what the community needs.

- Most younger renters currently have no choice but to leave the neighbourhood when they get older to own their own home or start a family. This will help people stay.
 - Developments like this contribute to environmental and social progress.
-

Questions & Answers

- 1. I looked at the proposed models for both applications and I could not see any fair provision for the future residents to park their vehicles on their property, if they so require. What accommodations have been made for new residents' vehicle parking that will not lead to overflow into residential streets, longer commute times and also pose safety risks for pedestrians, cyclists, and school children?**

The City has an [Open Option Parking strategy](#). Open Option Parking means that minimum on-site parking requirements have been removed from Edmonton's Zoning Bylaw. This allows developers, homeowners and businesses to decide how much on-site parking to provide on their properties based on their particular operations, activities or lifestyle. Removing parking minimums doesn't necessarily mean that no parking will be provided. Businesses and homeowners know their parking needs best and have an interest in ensuring they are met, making this approach more likely to result in the "right amount" of parking.

The sites are within the Belgravia [Residential Parking Program](#) area. On-street parking permits are available to residents of single family homes and multi-family buildings up to and including 3 storeys in height within the program area.

You may also be interested in the City's [Curbside Management Strategy](#) which addresses things like street parking.

- 2. Both of these applications are on what is currently new, renovated and in a couple of instances, original building. Understood this is a transition zone, so why is 4 storey transition for one and 3 storey transition for the other.**

Relative to the policy direction (see "How Does Applicable Planning Policy Apply to these LDA's" in the Learn More tab), the site on the south side of 76 Avenue is within 400 metres of the LRT station and the one on the north side is not. Generally, land within 400 metres of an LRT station is considered more suitable for more intense forms of redevelopment.

- 3. Can you provide a tally of how many rental units are currently proposed or under construction in Belgravia?**

There are approximately 300 new dwellings currently under construction or with issued building permits in Belgravia and McKernan (west of 114 Street NW).

Please note that the zoning bylaw does not regulate tenure, so we do not know how many of these new residential dwellings are rental units compared to condos or other forms of ownership.

4. Has an infrastructure impact assessment been conducted to evaluate whether the area can sustain this level of development?

City engineers and utility companies have reviewed the proposed rezoning and either assessed that existing infrastructure can handle this level of development or outlined upgrades that the developer will need to pay for in order to ensure utility standards are met.

5. Has the city assessed whether there is adequate space for proper waste storage and collection with this zoning change?

How will garbage collection work on lots like this if they are up-zoned? Is there room to fit 16 or more garbage bins in the alley for collection? Will there need to be room for a large dumpster?

All development permits are reviewed by Waste Management to ensure the site is designed in a manner that will allow for the functional and safe collection of waste. Depending on exactly what is proposed (site layout, number of units, etc.) the City will either mandate individual bins per unit or larger communal bins.

6. When will something be done about infill developments being used for Airbnbs, specifically when will Airbnb's be banned?

Zoning does not regulate tenure and does not distinguish between whether a residence is owner occupied or being rented for short or long term. [Here](#) is more information about how the City deals with these kinds of business.

Next Steps

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

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

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

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

If you have questions about this application please contact:

Andrew McLellan, Planner
780-496-2939
andrew.mclellan@edmonton.ca