



Evolving Infill

Building In. Let's Talk.

What Was Said Report

Draft Infill Action Plan Open Houses

June 11 and June 21, 2014



Evolving Infill Project Overview

Evolving Infill is a project led by the City, in collaboration with citizens and stakeholders, to advance residential infill. It is *both* a conversation and project designed to embrace and harness change.

This is a new approach that will build a shared understanding about infill in Edmonton and identify what we can do to collectively make choices that support the evolution of established neighbourhoods through infill development.

Over the next 30 years we expect over 500,000 new residents to call Edmonton home. Supporting new housing in established neighbourhoods is a key element of finding homes for a growing population. Infill is one of a number of strategies to support growth and change in our city.

The outcome of Evolving Infill will be an Action Plan that will serve as a roadmap for the City's work to advance infill. Actions identified will support and build on public conversation and Edmonton's long term vision, and could include changes to regulations, policies, processes and other activities related to infill.

Evolving Infill will run from November 15, 2013 until August 2014.



Evolving Infill: What Was Said Reports

This *What Was Said* report contains all the feedback we received at the two public draft Infill Action Open Houses held on June 11 and June 21, 2014.

Focus of the draft Infill Action Open Houses

The City of Edmonton crafted a draft Infill Action Plan based on what we heard and learned over the course of Evolving Infill. The draft Plan consists of 24 actions to support residential infill in our city.

Between June 2 and June 23, 2014 the Evolving Infill Team invited the public to review and provide comments and feedback on the draft Plan. Feedback will be used to help us finalize the Plan and move toward implementation.

On June 11 and June 21, 2014, the City held “Draft Infill Action Plan Open Houses” at City Hall and the Central Lions Recreation Facility. The Open Houses provided interested citizens with an opportunity to learn more about the actions in the draft Infill Action Plan, and to share their feedback. Those unable to attend the events were able to download the draft Infill Action Plan from the City’s website, and to provide their thoughts and ideas by email or on engagingedmonton.ca

The actions in the draft Infill Action Plan were organized into five groups:

- Communication
- Collaboration
- Knowledge
- Rules
- Process

Participants were asked to answer the following two key questions related to each group of strategies:

1. Considering your needs and the needs of others, what benefits and challenges do you see associated with this group of actions?
2. What are the most important or effective aspects of this group of actions that will create positive change for infill development in Edmonton?

Two additional questions were asked at the last two stations at the events:

3. What needs to be considered as we implement the Infill Action Plan?
4. Is there anything else you’d like to tell us?

Communication

The following comments respond to the actions relating to improving communication between residents, builders, and the City.

Considering your needs and the needs of others, what benefits and challenges do you see associated with this group of actions?

- Benefits of good communication between developer/city/neighbour is obvious – it will save time, anxiety on all
- Challenges: Guessing game about actual to be built vs. “approved plan” on paper, Neighbours should have access to good information on a specific infill early in the process – posted notice with contact info (development officer/developer/builder – not just 311)
- Far too much information to go through
- There is too much paper and even if an announcement is made on TV a better way to reach the people. Notice of this could have been included in TAX notice
- The Action Plan seems to be broad and a bit unrealistic/ambitious. To improve the communication aspect of the Action Plan, it could be suggested that a 24 point plan be replaced with a more succinct 5 or 8 point plan outlining the core goals which are ambitious, succinct, achievable, and having greatest impact. Professionals and experts may be consulted in the narrowing down to a 5 to 8 point plan. Trying to communicate a 24 point Action Plan is difficult.
- Good developers are willing to show info with neighbours because they have good reputations and proven track record bad developers avoid the neighbours so they should be strongly encouraged to show their plans.
- Giving owners/occupants of neighbouring properties notice of construction of a new infill should be common courtesy but should not give neighbours the chance to affect the design aesthetic of the new home. Respecting the ‘character’ of a street/ neighbourhood is more about scale of the new home versus a visual ‘look’
- 5. Good neighbour construction guide. I think it’s very important to spell out exactly what the rules are in a revised RF1 and RF3 zoning... How close to the road can the structure be? What are the specific situations where a garage / garden suite will not be allowed? What is the benefit of one style over another? If this information is readily available to “consumers” I think there would be more people willing to pursue infill beyond the first step... if they understand what can be done specifically, and why it would be advantageous, they are more likely to proceed to “how can I make this happen?” That’s where the number of people who are serious about infill can increase dramatically, instead of people who are stuck in the speculative “looking into it” phase.
- Community needs to find ownership in the proposed development. (Large lots) Don't lose sense of community
- People aren't interested in the info until it's timely/relevant to their situation. People don't know what they don't know. Might not even go looking for things that could help them if they don't know they exist.
- Communicate all development with the community league. Development of adversarial processes rather than cooperative

- A communications strategy should include opportunity for communities to be involved in determining what kind of density housing choices they want in their community and where it would be located
- There is a disconnect on what infill means. Is it tearing down a single family dwelling to rebuild another one or is it to rebuild a massive multifamily dwelling? City promotes this as densification but this isn't entirely true.
- My main concern with this process is the accountability of the builders to respect the guidelines set out for the neighbourhood. We need to know what we end up with. I feel it's too late once a project has to go to the appeal process. It is "fait de complet". This process can't only work for the builders - the current residents deserve the same respect. We moved there for a reason

What are the most important or effective aspects of this group of actions that will create positive change for infill development in Edmonton?

- The online tool sounds great. Ability to visualize the zoning bylaws will make things easier. Not every lot is the same so the differences can be seen.
- Most important aspects: better, earlier, direct communication posted notice early i.e. before demolition/ development permit even received with opportunities to review plans with developer before it gets too far.
- A 3D version or virtual version might be an idea for one or two settings of the action plan before construction starts on a particular project if this is possible. Or make changes in one community over a long period of time so everyone can see or envision the possibilities. As more change occurs over a period of time more possibility comes up. Don't rush through construction zones. Don't rush construction. Get feedback as circumstance move along. I live in the Britannia/ Youngstown area work (change) is needed) Feedback (on both parts) are needed. Pictures can be used for garage suites and garden suites (how about one 3D version if possible)
- Action 5: Should be a priority. Currently living a nightmare in Parkallen infill housing builders have all the advantage and current homeowners have none. After contacting 311 4 times have been told the city and the homebuilders have no obligation to inform neighbours if the building complies with all bylaws and zoning. However how about a code of conduct to ensure good receptions. i.e. Date existing structures to be demolished (the infill next to my house during the excavation dug two feet onto my property leading it to eventually sink (landslide). Date construction to be started and an idea of what type of structure is to be built (i.e. two-storey, square footage, and siting in relation to existing houses, lanes,, streets, sidewalks and boulevards). The infill builder said he provided the community league with his blue prints but they are not my neighbour or agent. I finally get a hold of the plans but they did not show location on the lot or in relation to my home. I now have a 27 ft x 20 ft chunk of house blocking what used to be blue sky and I do not get the sun in the morning ☹️. Instruct builders that boulevard trees should not be cut to serve their purpose. Our elm trees are cut in January by the city and not in May to suit construction. Work within the footprint and not the entire street and do not use neighbours property as the dumping ground for cement or any other construction material. I have spoken to the absent homebuilder on

numerous occasions and he always promises to fix, repair broken lights, broken fences, re-landscape etc. but not action to date. 311 again says that is a civil matter and the city cannot intervene. It is frustrating beyond belief. Knowing the siting would have also helped me to decide how to re-landscape. I have lived in my area for 21 years and both houses were bungalows. I now have 6 windows opening up directly in my backyard, I have no privacy. This is respecting my opening statement but, the bottom line is the infiller holds all the cards and existing home owners none. They know the schedule, the size, the materials, when and how. If we could have a guidebook for the builder and the neighbours would create more harmony. The final point is that when deliveries are made to ensure that some form of plywood or other material is placed on the boulevard and NOT to use the neighbour's property as a driveway. I have been ignored on two occasions by construction workers. It is my property and I feel like a hostage in my own neighbourhood.

- Communication is of utmost importance. Send information in as many forms as possible
- ALL GOOD. Communication is very important. Can't just find out after the fact that a development is going up b/c there is no chance for input
- A communications strategy is most important
- Action 1 - Simplify the process so that the information is available but also have staff that can address all questions even if they are out of the department
- A communications strategy should include more clear planning process, zoning, what could be allowed in surrounding properties, what setbacks are
- I like the idea of an online tool to help non-builders/ non-developers visualize what can possibly be built on a lot
- What buildings would look like - Generic duplex image online - what could be built
- Early notice is important.
- Very Good. People going by the site can see what is happening or going to be happening - and do not have to be "online" to get info

Other

- Infill housing has been in Calgary for years. What can be learned from their experience? Because it is more common there are housing prices affected there. Did they bounce back after a few years?
- I think infill housing is good for the city. Providing hopefully more affordable housing in stable neighbourhoods. I look forward to seeing progress
- No design guidelines/ no 'architectural controls'. A diverse streetscape helps to create beautiful streets, serial vies & interest. Edmonton already has too much homogeneity. Infill development provides the opportunity for individuality vs. conformity.
- "Class B" process redundant. Homeowner and city should notify neighbours just once.
- Please look into using community billboards to get messages out to the public so they are more informed about infill in their areas!! When it comes to knowledge as to what will happen in our areas i.e. Millwoods, Richfield + others – as we are one of the areas to be used for infill. One of the problems already happening in our areas is lack of parking for residents.

- Like to be notified if perhaps a new suite is put in, it must be inspected. We have reached a stage, not everyone is honest and in time an area could become a slum area. We were informed when we bought it was a single house area, now the rules are changed. We could be notified by mail delivery as not everyone takes Sun or Journal. We do have notice boards in Millwoods. How do we keep everything up front! If a lot of suites were put in a surprise the value of our homes go down even if we keep our homes up
- Community is not being listened to. City is not abiding by the plans that are currently in place: manipulating current bylaws for the benefit of the developer with no regard for directly affected residents. Seriously consider directly affected people in this plan.
- Good architectural controls provide beautiful urban space. It may take 20 years, but architectural controls work. The best example I know is Canmore. They used the theme of a mining aesthetic. Edmonton's architectural control is spotty – small areas of preservation and an out with the old- in with the "new" approach. It results in 20 years of flavour of the month. Why not provide elevation drawings that infill builders fit interior space to. Ten templates that fit neighbourhoods like Westmount + N. Glenora should be enough. Provide drawings & not just text to have a graphic of what is built. This needs to be what is sent to neighbours. Why not a 3D model of lot use.
- Duplexes are a big problem too. Builders are using a 1970s design template and this doesn't fit 1920s neighbourhoods. Here again the city can provide elevation templates that incorporate porches, vertical window, mullions, steeper roof pitches etc. 1924 style themes. The area that I see a problem is 127 street and 124 street. Please severely restrict flat-roof modernist houses. These do not belong in 1920s to 1940s neighbourhoods.
- In some inner city neighbourhoods infill is a scary thing. What you're told something is isn't what it's going to be. Need tools to ensure that slum landlords and bad developers are compliant, in a timely manner. City and communities need tools – people need to deal with things in a timely manner. City needs to follow its own rules has taken 2 months to get someone from compliance out to look at problems. Knowing who to contact is not the problem.
- Does the city have tools to refuse permits based on history of non-compliance and criminal or health issues?
- I live in beautiful community – Oliver next to Grandin LRT. From the meetings I heard that developers want to build a monster – something for store high rise condos. Oliver is mature community and build this monster (which will be not fit in this area) around 99 ave and I believe 112 street is wrong! I heard from my neighbours negative about this building but in the same time City Counsel already approved construction. Nobody Listen to Citizens. All about money!
- Infill appropriate to neighbourhood should be only ones even considered → parameters for specific neighbourhoods should be followed by developers
- Finding out about the meetings at the last minute doesn't allow residents to voice their concerns. I read the paper everyday and seem to hear about this at last minute. More meetings before the action plan is drawn up. (too late now) Meetings should be in the neighbourhoods that are affected. Notifications in my email aren't as important as a sign in my community.
- Have city department know and understand the entire process

- Important: meet people where they are (physically and metaphorically). Where do they go? What are their problems (pain point), Who do they already engage with? (contractors, architects, hardware stores, etc.)
- Something like a "liaison" person to communicate between both citizens and the city to interpret the language of both parties as they are not always understanding what is said due to differences in terms and language
- Was building a house by a park. Got an email about "too many windows" after getting the development permit. (Poorly timed communication). Parkland County has good guidelines
- Sad to see history lost when old houses get demolished
- Planning department needs to inform developers to present their plans to the community first
- Make plans available to neighbours before construction starts
- Community engagement inspectors should inspect infill as it is being built. Drainage is an important issue - landscape contouring.

Collaboration

The following comments respond to the actions relating to supporting better collaboration between stakeholders.

Considering your needs and the needs of others, what benefits and challenges do you see associated with this group of actions?

- The idea of collaboration is great, but is there a point where too much consultation and collaboration becomes counterproductive and just a time consuming process. More succinct action plan.
- Action 7: Should be reworded so that the tools and resources are developed collaboratively with city, industry and EFCL so it's collaborative so communities don't feel "done to"
- I would encourage innovation but would want citizens to build what they want (within reasonable city code). I wouldn't want anyone to dictate what could be built (collaboration point 8)
- If infill housing is seen as important, remember that the City of Edmonton does not build infill housing – private companies, seniors, - these are the people who need to have barriers and regulation removed. Keep it simple!
- Communication & collaboration are very important and also tremendously challenging... but please don't let uninformed public opinion entirely trump well researched facts, design expertise, industry best practices, success stories in large and growing cities across the Americas and Europe have much to teach us. Please don't let these be overwhelmed by the complaining uninformed masses
- Teamwork is important and I support this idea of having citizens' opinions and suggestions
Senior association have to give their input about the future (very near) as demographic is aging quite rapidly
Focus on accessibility on 55 St. to live downtown. Also, taking care that a lot of people do not rely on family as some people are single or in relationships with one person only which means access to grocery or medicine or social activities have to be easy to deal with.
STOP building \$\$\$\$ UNAFFORDABLE condos downtown
- Neighbourhoods (community leagues and broader community residents) want opportunity to be involved in discussions to identify areas in their neighbourhood that need redevelopment, infill, including where higher density should go.
- Collaboration is essential to benefit of the experience of each team mate
Hopefully all the City Departments will have the same goals and looking forward to leading to the same results
Hoping to have less paperwork and more actions done efficiently
- Wording: no such thing as "objective" in this context. I suspect "balanced" is more accurate. Tours are a great idea, fun and engaging.
- Infill Action Advisory group should not be just a one size fits all approach to advise across the city. There needs to be a process to involve communities (through community leagues?) to take into account their specific issues/needs/vision. Currently

developers are "advised" to consult with community leagues. This consultation should be required. Developers also need to be held to account in an enforceable manner for the commitments they make to a community

- The cost of conducting an advisory group where the members are remunerated. Who would pay? Front-loading costs to developer? I would make a strong recommendation that the advisory panel limit their focus to larger scale projects 1000-2000 square meters
- Members of the Advisory Group might not even be homeowners for all I know
- City should host a competition to showcase really bad infill that planning and development has allowed, so residents will understand what they really could be getting, instead of the sales pitch from planning and development
- For tours, collaborate with existing events and organizations such as Jane's walks and the Doors Open festival
- Planning academy course integrated into the post-secondary planning academy course as part of accredited program
- Cost recovery for education courses (planning academy). Community leagues could sponsor cost-recovery. Individual home owners could apply

What are the most important or effective aspects of this group of actions that will create positive change for infill development in Edmonton?

- Encouraging Competition creates interest. I would love to see a "top 5 infill designs of 2014" as the front page of both the Journal and the Sun... much like when the Art Gallery was in design stage. Get ordinary Edmontonians to vote for their favourite. Make it something people will talk about – not just developers.
- Action 11: Urban green cohousing society would love the opportunity to partner with the city on or journey to realize our dream. We are in the process of planning our project on land we have purchased in Old Strathcona
- As a developer I LOVE the idea of pilot projects which would allow us to learn as a group, develop better projects on a greater scale
- Action 8: Infill Design Awards: considering the city's past with some of our public art, I love the idea of extra consideration being given to local architects/ designers. Let's use our home-grown talent to create something unique.
- Interdepartmental collaboration would benefit all
- Strengthen relationships between developers + City + community members
- Public tools and resources should be a first priority. Communities need opportunities to be involved in determining what kind of higher density infill is needed in their community, e.g. seniors housing to accommodate seniors who want to stay in their community which would free up lots/homes for families and at where higher density infill should be located within the community
- An infill design award or competition is a great idea to get architects/developers thinking outside the box

- Design awards and competitions are really important. Look to city of Portland as an example. Permit ready designs to make the process easier and encourage people to do infill/decrease costs
- I think that the idea of "more unusual infill" is great like a garden house could accommodate a senior parent to "live" but "not live" with children supporting aging in place. Additionally, the idea of co-housing (multigenerational, intentional community) is appealing. Put the rules where they need to be and take the hoops to jump through away from where they are not required
- Really like initiative #11

Other

- Tiny housing
Split existing lots
CoE becoming more involved in creating "community/unity"
Lane housing
Look to Seattle, Oregon
- Do not have architectural controls
- If you want design, give some flexibility for protrusions into side yards (leads to flat facades); do not count in foot print (give 1% for decorative)
- Lot coverage
- Would like leeway (2 ½ % for thick walls (for enticing more efficient homes)
- Time is important
RF1 corner lots – discretionary too risky to propose duplex
Put suite in duplex (currently cannot do if Rf3, lost opportunity)
- Each community should have an infill advisory group that is part of a larger collaborative resource group. Each community is unique i.e. era, character, architecture, trees, size of houses, lanes vs. front garages etc etc so a local group would have a more intimate knowledge of what types of infill should be allowed (instead of a one size fits all infill development plan)
Mature neighbourhood overlay needs to be part of this collaborative approach, applies judiciously and specifically to infill
There must be a lot of experience gained by community groups, individuals that should be channelled to these advisory groups
- Would like to see more equitable rules applied everywhere - not just Ritchie but in Glenora too - Both rich and poor neighbourhoods
- Collaboration means input from all sides but residents aren't notified of collaboration meetings. I've found out at last minute. Use road signs (like the census signs) for awareness
- Design - all but 7 and 10
- Incorporate more green energy such as geothermal into the pilot projects and green energy in general into infill projects
- Creative infill - Ex. Corner lot 2x33'. Put up garden cottages where like minded could spend their senior years 80-100. Many single/divorced/widowed women own houses in

neighbourhoods and want to remain. Would like smaller as 2 bedroom semi with basement around a garden core where they could gather around fire pit in nice weather, could look after each other's dogs/cats when owners are away, check in when someone's not well. I am talking about relatively healthy people who want to remain independent in their own place. Not sure about requirements, garages how they would fit... do you need a garage vs. covered parking, How long will we be driving after 80-85. Presently good bus service.

- Cottage clusters, courtyard housing

Knowledge

The following comments respond to the actions relating to improving access to information.

Considering your needs and the needs of others, what benefits and challenges do you see associated with this group of actions?

- Challenge: people & homeowners afraid of changing times (arrow point to this with another comment saying “I agree”)
- #12 Involve communities in those assessments. Local knowledge is very important. EFCL
- #13 What about the impact of infill on neighbouring properties
- In many areas, the older homes were built when there was less knowledge about drainage & appropriate building practice for example, 50 plus year old homes don’t have weeping tile and sump pumps. Homes that are in areas with low water tables are subject to constant water/ moisture problems in basements. This is exasperated when development occurs next to, or around these homes. However, this is not and should not be the builder’s problem. It is incumbent on the residents keep their own homes up to spec.
- Address sewage gas build up that may come from new construction
- Concerns are crowding e.g. parking. Ottawa mandated all cars off of the road for all neighbourhoods with our winters having even more cars will make narrow streets even worse
- Send out surveys to the homes in the neighbourhood to find out if there are weeping tile on the property. For those homes that do not send the survey back have someone go to these homes and ask if there are any weeping tile plus any other pertinent questions. I live in the Britannia / Youngstown area (I lived in Canora for a long time as well). These areas are apt to have a mixed reaction as to whether or not weeping tile are included on the property because of how old these neighbourhoods are. Deal with tree concerns regarding drainage. Snow melt issues in spring time “Help”. Snow removal issues all winter long. Back alley / sidewalk (Oatmeal) snow removal clearing.
- Pedestrian /transit or automotive communities?
- Need density thresholds for greenspace requirements. Park dedication of surplus school redevelopment sites or TOD zones
- Benefit: get different agencies coordinated to save time, effort, and grief. Challenge: Getting them to use it
- More cooperation among utility providers to stop ripping up roads repeatedly
- Upgrading neighbourhoods is a pain while it is happening but boy does it improve things when completed!
- Landscaping and densities must be considered as areas grow
- I believe that we can't continue to expand outward, but I also understand that people want to see positive change in their neighbourhoods. If an audit is done of each neighbourhood, it gives a scientific basis to where and how infill will be done

- Audit identifies needs and opportunities over time 20 years. Opportunities are funding potential (i.e. surplus transportation corridor, Bus/LRT etc.)
- Online resource for drainage concerns move toward mediation rather than adversarial legal remedy

What are the most important or effective aspects of this group of actions that will create positive change for infill development in Edmonton?

- Infill specific info resource about drainage issues is a great idea. Draining inspectors / assessors could inform neighbours of what to expect and any mitigation that might need to be done as an adjacent infill progresses
- Drainage services can state how much development (both housing and other) the local neighbourhood sewers (storm and sanitary) can accept. Is the capacity of trunk lines not known. The information must be available – yet more study?
- Good transit can lead to fewer cars and fewer parking spots

Other

- Plan to make permeable surfaces (roads, sidewalks) to help with drainage
- When we make zoning more flexible in lower-density neighbourhoods, let's put in incentives for increasing density while matching "tone" of the street. On great incentive: Fast-track approval for targeted designs.
- How about eliminating the multiple reviews of plans when sewer have been deemed adequate
- Affordable housing vs. \$200, 000 housing no longer affordable.
- For neighbours that sump pumps are not allowed to drain into sewers. The drains should be directed to the alley not the front sidewalk
- Sidewalks downtown. Get those "bricks interlock" out. It is a real threat for walkers dangerous to trip. Some sidewalks are too narrow to allow terraces – restaurants. Widened sidewalks allow handicapped with scooters or walkers or wheelchairs to circulate more easily. Keep in mind population is ageing
- River valley banks should be shored up all the way to Dawson Park – just like they are at Louise McKinney Park. If necessary bulldoze current scrub trees & build new trail system on top of new berm
- A way to convey the need for infill: same scale maps, side by side, of Edmonton and Minneapolis, Paris, Davis CA, Toronto and cities of similar population. It makes it obvious that our sprawl means higher taxes while potholes & snow removal still are a huge problem
- To keep old residential neighbourhood streets calm and quiet (and suitable for street hockey) Let's allow reduced setbacks but require garages and driveway still to be in back where alleys are present
- I am in favour of building on part of the greenspace allotted to schools. Even for an active school, many sites have more than enough space for playgrounds and sports fields with plenty leftover for housing. I live in Spruce Avenue. Yes in my backyard!
- Matrix organization B/W various departments to implement audit #12

- Include local knowledge in developing the highlevel snapshot by involving community residents. Share the information widely with all stakeholders and the community to develop shared understanding
- Regardless of scale of project, city should have fiduciary duty to send inspectors to all sites to monitor violations. Drainage of particular concern - make sure down spouts are in right place - including street tree protection
- Big infill houses replacing war time houses 2 bedrooms with one bathroom now 5 bedrooms and bathrooms use the same drains... can old drains handle this?
- Do the different departments communicate with one another? ATCO, EPCOR, Planning, approval
- Infrastructure is more than just utilities. Greenspace, recreation, parks, parking, transportation, transit, shopping, healthcare, community services...
- Failing infrastructure, no public school, and added congestion due to increase density -> sounds like a place I no longer want to live. It should be prioritized that infrastructure is rebuilt first
- Infrastructure and community roads are handling only what we have. There is no place to accommodate more drainage and no place for more cars. New development should be structured for multifamily. People bought into neighbourhoods for reasons of their own and for what they saw at the time of purchase Taking away sunlight and privacy (because of new heights) isn't fair. Older houses do not have fire retardant materials that should be required for the decreased distance between structures.
- All infrastructure should be repaired first, then talk about infill. A denser neighbourhood will cause more disruption when the roads have to be torn up.

Rules

The following comments respond to the actions relating to changing the rules to support more and better infill.

Considering your needs and the needs of others, what benefits and challenges do you see associated with this group of actions?

- Tiny house/small house/container house movement; affordable housing for all
Change in rules will help seniors/single moms/low income families afford a home
Split lots for affordability
Slow down \$200k housing allow for affordability now
- #17 Major barriers to development in many RF3 areas exist. One major impediment is approval for building row homes. Particularly relaxation of rules is necessary to allow for these projects.
- 18. Mature neighbourhood Overlay. I can see where in some instances barriers could be reduced to accommodate more infill. On the other hand, it shouldn't be blanket revision. Some mature neighbourhoods need more stringent application of mature N.O to ensure character/ trees/ style/ size is maintained (esp. RF2). Some new infills are depleting sunlight and reducing privacy (re: 2 ½ storey c 4' basement) is 2 stories higher with larger footprint than existing housing. These aren't increasing density – they are still drawing single families with suburban expectations to the inner city and mature neighbourhoods.
- 16. Allowing infill in both RF1 and RF3 to be built closer to the front of the property (Another comment below “Agree! Go back to 3-6 m instead of average block face. With average block face you could end up with a large useless front yard. Would provide back yard space)
- Remove “character” from MNO
- Zoning bylaws can be hard to understand, make them easier to understand. Height restriction definition is so hard to comprehend. Definition for “grade” is subjective
- 18. Relax parking requirements for suites – especially on or near transit corridors (comment below: Agree most MNO locations have transit options. Not everyone owns a vehicle)
- Many great ideas but feel it could go further: laneway houses? Garage and garden suites on mid-block lots? Zero lot line single unit development? Secondary suites allowed on lots smaller than 360m²? how about 300m²? ~25' x 125' lot.
- #18 MNO provides a lot of protection to communities. It's not clear what would change. There's concern it would be weakened. Draft says it's adversarial. That's not the case. This item is a big concern to communities. It's too vague.
- Subdivide 50' RF1 lots to 2 25' lots – excellent
Allow secondary suites on lots smaller than 360 m² → how about 25' x 125' lots? ~290 m² → greater affordability and housing option
Full use of 2 ½ storey
Zero lot Line
Ensure 'style' is not part of any notification/consultation process
Encourage diversity/choice/individuality in design

- Small scale infill is not benign to a community than larger scale. The effect on the liveability and appeal of a block is always affected in one way or another. Have not seen any consideration or mention of: urban agriculture, urban mature trees, urban wildlife. There is significant potential for negative impact in these aspects. Currently, planning response is we can't do anything about that and yet it is their policies and recommendations that create issues.
- We live in Windsor Park. One area has schools that are not utilized by students who live in our area. We would like to split our 50'x150' lot into a duplex lot. Our house is old and does not add value to the area. If we could build a duplex, the city would benefit by taxes approx approx. 2-3 times the present and schools would benefit by being a little fuller. Hope this receives some attention as is a win-win for all involved including the City of Edmonton
- Aging in place - so seniors can stay in "hood" they have been in for 50-60 years. Multi-dwelling (single SR) on 1 large lot, if 8 units means lots (usually family homes) available to new infill families, tenants can stay in same area with same neighbours friends of last 50-60 years and take care of each other
- It's our understanding that the fire department has concerns about expanding our opportunity for garage and garden suites. We would like assurance from the fire department that more garage suites would be safe
- I think 25' lots will require builders to be creative to get the desires of homeowners into a smaller package will definitely increase supply
- 25' lots are too narrow and could result in boxes stacked up
- I like the opportunity to subdivide 50' lots - however I fail to understand how this is different than allowing a duplex to be built. The two houses are a less effective use of space with having to have the extra side yards - you still have the same density and parking issues.
- If this is done it must be communicated early that this is not the answer to affordability and that suites cannot be accommodated on their narrow lots. These things list for more than half a million
- Maintain MNO provisions -> force creativity

What are the most important or effective aspects of this group of actions that will create positive change for infill in Edmonton?

- Laneway housing
- Garage suites – mid-block
- Prioritize 17, 18
- Fully support relax
 1. Garage Suite
 2. Relax RF1 subdivision to small lot especially some good area RF1
- Yes to garage/garden/in-law suites infill over row housing
- 17. Reducing barriers to row housing will positively affect affordability as well as diversity in neighbourhoods

- 16. Allow subdivision of RF1 lots is a huge priority will increase affordability (Comments Below: “Huge Priority” and “YES!!!”)
- Smaller minimum lot sizes in RF1 areas is a great idea → 25’ minimum lot widths provides greater supply for infill development and puts less \$ upward pressure on land acquisition costs
- 1. Garage suites
2. Garden suites
3. Suites above commercial properties
These types of homes would do really well in the Britannia/ Youngstown, Canora and Stony Plain Road area. The more the mix type of housing the better. This will offer more variety of choice as what one might consider. Ability and disability alike there is a choice for everyone
- Encourage / Allow mid block garage suites
- 16. Allowing the subdivision of RF1 lots is the greatest idea in entire plan. The increased supply and therefore affordability will greatly enhance our mature neighbourhoods
- Allow secondary suites on smaller lots – increase affordability
Relax parking requirements on secondary suites close to public transit – this is why we are building LRT – Increase diversity of neighbourhoods
Allow larger footprints on homes with green features
- Our area, Windsor Park, has an old school that has approximately 25% of live in the area student population. We need more split lots in general, more families who could utilize the area facilities

Other

- Secondary suites → lots = 320m²
- Building height for garages
- 360m² site if 25’ wide needs to be 155’
- 320m² make the area reflective of now 25’ lots
- Bikers! Stay away from me when I walk on my reserved sidewalks. You “bikers” are pedestrians’ pest! ATB means ALL terrain!
- Allow legal basement suites in existing half duplexes
- Allow basement suites in duplexes relax rules (Another comment underneath “AGREED!”)
- Rules might be challenging sometimes. Ex: Café Restaurant in Downtown is a pain in the neck concerning the walking access. The owners are exaggerating by using more space than permitted. So pedestrians will use streets?
- Recycling is also a nightmare for those without using cars / bikes. We need accessible bins
- Allow back lane access to attached garage. If 1.2 m is allowed along one side yard setback then it should be allowed on each side yard.
- Give development officer power to grant variances
- What qualifies as small scale infill?
- No variance to be allowing to developers. Lot size and builders height
- Ease restriction on driveway permission for infill i.e. losing right to front drive when building infill

- Unless already in the same context: no front access drive, that's what rear lanes are for. Front access drive conflicts with streetscape (trees/boulevards) and pedestrian safety.
- Need to add the mechanical noise issue. Location of vents of the furnaces etc to the rear
- Are decks included in site coverage? Some compliance officers believe it is. If it is I am above grade but what exactly is grade! Is grade from the ground to deck floor or from the average grade level of the lot!
- Would like to see more flexibility for design options / development options. Increase max building height in MNO to 33' from 28'3". Allow full use of 2 ½ storey could be master suite or other use beyond "loft" or mechanical space. Look at defining a development envelope and fit the house within it (in the plan & street section) no matter what the roof type
- Garage suites – allow in RF3 anywhere
- There's a large empty lot in North Milbourne on the corner of 76th street and 40 ave (about 3 blocks south of the Whitemud overpass). The lot I assumed at some point was designated for a school but it's been empty for as long as I've been a resident of Millwoods (since 1993). Anyways, I think it's a perfect target for an infill it's about 2/3 blocks south of the Millgate transit centre just walking distance from the Whitemud overpass.
- Change the RF4 zone (allows duplexes) to RF3 so allowing more opportunities for threeplexes and fourplexes
- Parking concerns especially where illegal suites are
- Fire safety - please setback buildings and place windows to ensure fire station between windows
- Make sure that the decisions being made are for sustainability reasons not solely as a way for developers to make money
- Write in clauses to remove DO's ability to vary site coverage
- Bylaw 12800 stifles innovation and creativity in both design of structure and material used. Consider basic rules only to adhere to building code and then allow each project to be evaluated on its own merits. For example - bylaw restricts front driveways but front drives may be more appropriate for row housing or height of garage must not exceed height of building. Suggest height have a +/- factor e.g 1-2 feet higher isn't going to make a lot of difference overall
- Focus is on encouraging good infill - need to also address protecting form or preventing bad infill (infill with a negative/undesirable impact on the community)
- Zoning - we need to make it work. Individuals living in Ritchie sell their houses and move into cottages freeing up their houses for new owners now 6-8 people living on property which currently houses 1 - Me. Don't need a lot of space around level wheel chair accessible and complete living/eating/sleeping - no stairs. Semi-bungalow would allow extra room upstairs
- As with collaboration, this is important to make rules that make sense - be flexible where required and strict as necessary. Picture a development that will be viable in 200-500 years from now, not just for 30-40 years

- I don't see "stifling" of building a reasonably sized home by the city. The rules are to protect existing residents and the process is not too long. IF the developer knows the timeline then deal with it.
- As far as the rules go I think that they need to be the same for everyone and that they need to be clear and easy to understand. The other thing that needs to change is the timeframe to get permits - If everything fits the bill it should not take 3-4 months to get a permit to build a house!!
- Infill meeting talk like these mature neighbourhoods are idea. I see lots of diversification and all use groups and a great community with most lots occupied. Empty lots are being held by developers waiting to turn a profit, not interested in the community. New neighbourhoods aren't built with proper infill in mind (just cookie cutter homes). Lead with new construction
- Treatment of mature neighbourhoods is different than non-mature. This influences home-owners to purchase in new areas and expanded suburbs if they are looking for stable zoning and more stable home value. Poor infill significantly affect nearby property values. In many mature neighbourhoods, the family home is the primary asset of a senior. Reduction in home value has a large impact on their ability to support themselves. If Edmonton is considering eliminating or defining out of existence RF1 they will be encouraging people who are looking for RF1 areas to move to/create new subdivisions, acreages, bedroom communities where those areas are available
- Look at rules for size of lot to allow secondary suites. If we were to make 2 lots from (50x150/2 ~360 square meters) Why not reduce this so that there is an incentive to build 2 new detached homes with secondary suites versus semidetached
- Must change Bylaw to allow for front driveways - it makes no sense to restrict this. Allow garages with footprint of house within face of house to save garden and yard space in back.
- How many will we be driving. We need it in Edmonton at 85-100 age in place in our own neighbourhoods. Don't want conventional seniors lodges.
- A must to change the rules up for 2 suites in single housing basements not just a secondary suite - this would provide more small scale housing. Unfair rulings that within the bylaws that a 3 suite (single house) becomes an apartment. How is it possible that a single house now is subjected to "apartment rulings" If you are truly interested in "infill housing" - this must change! There is a piece of puzzle missing, yet you are looking for change expanding lots by dividing, 4 dwellings, garden suite or garage suite. But you cannot maintain the appearance of the "old community" by allowing 2 basement suites. Also allow young people to afford housing - help to pay for it and grow to a larger home in the future. Old areas are ruined by allowing 2 story large complexes, but no support for an existing home!!
- Think of splitting 60x150 lots (mine) lengthwise OR front and back. Taller house in the back and bungalow in front. Split title

- Community consultation process needs to be clarified so that City, developers, SDAB and communities have a common understanding. Overall - important for them to work together so that a mix of housing is achieved. Suggest a new age in place use to enable people to stay in their communities and speed up the availability of lots for redevelopment

Process

The following comments respond to the actions relating to changing our process in order to support more and better infill.

Considering your needs and the needs of others, what benefits and challenges do you see associated with this group of actions?

- Like the overall direction of actions 20-24. “Class B” approval process redundant homeowners and city can work together to notify affected neighbours once, not twice
- Would welcome experts of MNO from planning staff to be readily available to answer questions or provide clarifications on MNO bylaws
- 22. Involve affected community in their pilots
- #20 + #24: EFCL would like to be involved in developing the changes to the notification letters and infill related notification + consultation process
- #20 Be more detailed with the notification letters explaining in more detail what project is about...
- #22 Creative and innovative infill is welcome as long as it “fits” with character. There are some great examples of cool infill projects in Old Strathcona but there are also some horror stories and monster infill that technically meet infill standard
- #20 Notification: Neighbours should be notified before development permits are issued “good neighbour” process. Maybe through Community Advisory Group or Community League or Resource group?
- If infill is good fit, then it’s ok. If infill has problems, it is early in process + easily accommodate revisions
- Notification is great and should be a standard courtesy. Consultation is a slippery slope:
 - should only be required if application includes a variance
 - style/visual aesthetic should not be included in conversation
 - scale is more important than style W/R/T street/neighbourhood ‘character’
 - need to encourage new/unique housing to create & encourage diversity and interest
- Reducing the bureaucracy will be very helpful and make a huge improvement
- Clarify language in letters from the city. Not helpful/timely
- Make more changes to notification process so more clear and notify for development permits (not just rezoning). There was a complaint about the charge for an appeal at SDAB
- Not just infill. ALL applications
- #22 - Community planning. Community should be responsible for adjudicating proposals in context of framework and framework should be flexible while acknowledging requirements. National building code.
- Online resource for notification (community and developer buy in to process). =
Balanced need in streamlining process.

What are the most important or effective aspects of this group of actions that will create positive change for infill in Edmonton?

- Strategy 17 Nice to have a tour of sensitively built infill housing
- 22. Love the idea of helping to steward creativity in infill projects – will allow “good infill” to spread quicker
- Very Important Rule 21 & 22 (Comment below “AGREED!”)
- #21 Team of city staff dedicated to infill is great idea
- 21: Love the idea of a team of city staff who can expedite approval process. This will help us out greatly as developers
- #21 - A City Infill Team would be great. A fixer to help in a timely fashion to keep projects moving towards completion
- #21 - Absolutely concur 100%

Other

- Help builders get applications approved by working with them on their submissions. Submissions are expensive and a builder should know what to expect before applying and spending \$\$\$
- Pushing through NIMBY to increase density and a hold on Greenfield development will stop sprawl. Not Arenas.
- I find if add that surface drainage plans are not required before the building permit is approved. Once a house is build it would be too late to have proper surface drainage
- Remove setback requirements. Even narrower lots
- Have the information more concise. I found the material very well done but a bit heavy to read. Town halls are very instructive.
- I called 311 several times and I was not too satisfied about follow up
- Idea: make a hub of money: easy way to find out about all subsidies, grants, etc. available to homeowners in all infill areas
- Incorporate a calendar to make all projects visible and allow others to be scheduled more intelligently. Give it teeth? Make people upload to the calendar as part of permit process? Build a form that drives input of relevant details
- If I am already subsidizing development in the outskirts with my taxes then why am I getting "taxed" again by changing my neighbourhood into something more dense? That big house takes my sunshine, my parking, my privacy, and security
- Remove 12800 altogether and replace with a basic formula that provides for flexibility, innovation, and creative design. 12880 - one size does not fit all. Evaluate properties on a case by case basis
- Appeal board approves non-compliant infill. Better understanding of the board to follow through on City's policy related to infill
- The process for doing an infill is just way too long!! Just to get a building permit for a permitted use is 3-4 months. I build in surrounding areas as well (Parkland county, Strathcona county etc) and I can get a building permit in about a month. There needs to be a quicker process for applications where they fit all the rules!!

- We need more affordable housing. Young people can't buy a house anymore need to be able to earn additional income to afford mortgage thus secondary suites. Not enough rental units in city right now
- Infill redevelopment results in unaffordable housing. Not enough overall planning - my neighbourhood is a "dogs breakfast" now.

What's Next?

The following questions and comments from participants are related to the actions aimed at improving the infill process for everyone involved.

What needs to be considered as we implement the Infill Action Plan?

- What will the new parking regulations be when density is increased? Neighbourhood by neighbourhood basis?
- BIG OMISSION: City investment is missing:
 1. Incentives for young families to buy or build in a mature neighbourhood rather than a new neighbourhood
 2. Establishing a redevelopment agency to develop on City land or in areas that are not attractive to industry
 3. Upgrading public infrastructure to serve a denser, more diverse area e.g. parks, playgrounds, rec centres, streetscape. Public amenities must accompany/attract higher density infill and people
- Recycling: we need more facilities for downtown buildings for ALL TYPE of goods to be recycled. Not enough bins available. Many times a car is needed to access those premises because too far from my home. I do not have a car. I love living downtown “affordable” land surrounding parking lots should be used to put in place those bins. If city encourages recycling, city should provide more recycling places
- Why are commercial properties allowed to build out to the sidewalk but houses cannot. Hugely disappointed that the medical commercial building on 109 ST and 76 AVE took out all the mature trees

Anything else?

The following comments from participants include everything else they wished to tell us at the two events.

Is there anything else you'd like to tell us?

- Discussion on “aesthetic” should be explicitly excluded from conversation
- Have an option to fast track a development permit with an extra fee (example – Leduc has this option).
- Add % of extra for interesting architectural elements as part of the coverage. Allow some percentage for thicker walls for conservation, better energy use.
- All applications should be dealt with on a level playing field (in terms of regulations and DP review/approval – not consistent)
- Design, architecture with an eye to our winter conditions
- I strongly advocate to provide row houses:
 - It will save our valued land wastage
 - It will minimize the gangster operations and night time crimes
 - This type of accommodations make good neighbourhood relations
 - It is comparatively more affordable
 - Better public facilities and transportation system will also save the extra burden of constructing long roads and sidewalks. So → It will also reduce the extra pollution by private vehicles
- Main benefits of row housing:
 - Reduction in heating charges
 - Builders will have to construct small length sewer system and water supply lines
 - All these factors will help the medium families to have their own home at cheaper price. Our town is expanding at a very fast pace. Accommodation rent is sky rocketing.
- Look at St. Albert regulations for development envelope
- Excavation costs have gone up with 25' lots
- Food for thought: 1. We have tweaked the rules. That's good. 2. We need infill! 3. We have builders eager to build! 4. Where are the tools to supervise builder to build what they said they would build. Are there penalties if they don't? If there are, are they serious enough to deter? There are horror stories every corner of the city and the more common remedy is to impose a small fine!
- Like the multigenerational housing idea
- Can we claim we have too much urban sprawl and claim we have the most greenspace (compared to other cities) maybe we're not as spread out as we think.
- Challenge: social paradigm that families need big houses on big lots
- Be brave! Be a model for all other North American communities on how good infill should be done! Have faith in the average person to want to improve their neighbourhood with their infill choices. Be wary of developers/builders who will not be living in the neighbourhood - make sure that they follow the rules and get input from the community and stick to it.

- Not one word in the presentation about the potential negative impacts of these proposals. No pro/con presentation - more like a commission sales presentation than a professional consult such as legal or medical. NOTE audit report on consultation. Present alternatives so that residents can express preference vs instead of presenting the 'solution'. This helps the process become more collaborative than adversarial
- These forums seem to be a PR exercise more than anything. Communities have been talking about the sprawl issue for years, the apparent lack of good planning when it comes to sensible traffic and good road redevelopment issues etc. The city seems to be way behind the 8 ball and always scrambling to fix the affects of their previous decision making at tax payers expense. The central/downtown area suffers from neglect on many of its streets and roadways while newer areas are given most (if not all) the resources and attention. I don't live in central/downtown Edmonton, and wouldn't want to. Infill housing is another joke in so many ways. The process is already started to destroy old homes and add brand new without any real planning in place to avoid the architectural mess the city is creating, along with an ugliness for people to live. Stop jamming so many residences into such a small space or lot and not allowing green areas between structures. Stop encroaching onto sidewalk areas, where someone's balcony is almost on top of you etc. Edmonton is too much about cars and driving and not enough about walkable, healthy, safe communities.
- Link the infill initiative to councils direction to establish and include a neighbourhood redevelopment agency to advance appropriate infill