Hello,

I'm writing in regards to the change in zoning bylaw to DC2.

We are not in favor of this change for the following reasons:

This will lead to homes being built that are higher than ours - blocking natural light.
Multi unit housing also lead to parking issues with cars being parked on the street constantly.
Having multi unit housing across our property will also lead to a decease in the value of our house.

Thanks,
Sadaf

Sent from my iPhone
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I'm writing in regards to the change in zoning bylaw to DC2.

We are not in favor of this change for the following reasons:

This will lead to homes being built that are higher than ours - blocking natural light. Multi unit housing also lead to parking issues with cars being parked on the street constantly. Having multi unit housing across our property will also lead to a decease in the value of our house.
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Sadaf

Sent from my iPhone
Your form has a new entry. Here are all the answers.

| **What are your first and last names?** | Shauna Faragini |
| **Are you speaking on behalf of a group?** | No |
| **What is your phone number?** | [Redacted] |
| **What is your email address?** | [Redacted] |
| **What type of meeting would you like to speak at?** | City Council Public Hearing |
| **What is the date of the meeting you would like to speak at?** | May 04, 2021 |
| **What are the agenda number and title of the item(s) you wish to speak about?** | Proposed bylaws 19685, 19686 and charter bylaw 19687. Zoning change request-11233, 11231, 11227, 11219 – 79 Street NW & 11232, 11226, 11224, 11220 – 78 Street NW |
| **What is your position on the issue?** | In opposition |
| **Would you like to be available to answer questions only?** | No |
| **Do you plan on providing a presentation or any other materials to Council?** | Yes |
| **Please provide any additional contact information or comments we should be aware of.** | I will provide written summary of position against this change. I am supportive of redevelopment but this change goes against the Cromdale ARP most recently updated in 2018, and seems contrary to efforts to establish community support for plans, including extensive work around the Exhibition Grounds redevelopment plans. |
Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Items 3.19 - 3.22 DRAPAKA

1 message

OCM OCC Internet Mail <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>  
Tue, Apr 27, 2021 at 8:32 AM

To: [city.clerk@edmonton.ca]

---------- Forwarded message ----------

From: Anthony Oliver
Date: Mon, Apr 26, 2021 at 6:56 PM
Subject: May 4 Public Hearing RSVP
To: city.clerk@edmonton.ca

Hello,

Eugene Drapaka would like to speak at this meeting re 3.19-3.22 via telephone. He also wishes to pass along the attached images to council. Please confirm at your earliest convenience. His direct # is [REDACTED]

Regards,

Anthony Oliver
Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.21 WRATHALL
1 message

IFM Meetings Internet Mail <requesttospeak@edmonton.ca> Wed, Apr 28, 2021 at 10:52 AM
To: [Redacted]

Please see comments below.

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Request to Speak - Office of the City Clerk <requesttospeak@edmonton.ca>
Date: Wed, Apr 28, 2021 at 10:15 AM
Subject: New form response notification
To: <requesttospeak@edmonton.ca>

Your form has a new entry. Here are all the answers.

- **What are your first and last names?** Cal Wrathall
- **Are you speaking on behalf of a group?** No
- **What is your phone number?** [Redacted]
- **What is your email address?** [Redacted]
- **What type of meeting would you like to speak at?** City Council Public Hearing
- **What is the date of the meeting you would like to speak at?** May 04, 2021
- **What are the agenda number and title of the item(s) you wish to speak about?** Charter Bylaw 19687
- **What is your position on the issue?** In opposition
- **Would you like to be available to answer questions only?** No
- **Do you plan on providing a presentation or any other?** No
Please provide any additional contact information or comments we should be aware of.

I live at [redacted] South N.W. Edmonton, which is directly impacted by the proposed bylaw change. I am a member of the community group which opposes the application, and wish to express the objections of myself and my wife to the application.
Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.24 AGRIOS
1 message

OCM OCC Internet Mail <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>  
Mon, May 3, 2021 at 12:22 PM
To: city.clerk@edmonton.ca <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Janice Agrios <janice.agrios@cityofedmonton.ca>
Date: Sun, May 2, 2021 at 11:31 PM
Subject: May 4, 2021 Public Hearing, Item 3.24 - Charter Bylaw 19645 re: Rezoning of 18825 - 137 Ave. from AG to IM
To: city.clerk@edmonton.ca <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Please see attached letter for distribution to Council at the May 4, 2021 public hearing.

Thank you for your assistance.

Janice Agrios

May 1 2021 Letter to City Council.pdf
536K
May 1, 2021

The Mayor and Council of the
City of Edmonton
2nd Floor, City Hall
1 Sir Winston Churchill Square
Edmonton, AB T5J 2R7

Your Worship and Members of Council:

RE: Charter Bylaw 19645
Rezoning from (AG) Agricultural Zone to (IM) Medium Industrial Zone 18825 137 Avenue NW, Anthony Henday Big Lake

We are solicitors for Legacy Edmonton Landco Inc., the owners of Lot B, Plan 7620483 located at 13316 - 184 Street NW. Our clients' lands border the subject property to the south and to the east. On behalf of our clients, we confirm that there is no objection to the proponents' proposed re-zoning from AG to IM, and the proposal has our clients' full support.

There is, in our respectful view, no cogent land use planning reason to deny the proposed re-zoning request and the re-zoning of this small parcel will coordinate well with our clients' larger, industrial/commercial development on its borders. Neither is the application premature because, as the Report from Administration makes clear, the subject lands will be rolled into the South Riel Industrial Park if and when annexation occurs and the Edmonton-based IM zoning will doubtless dovetail with the presumed requirements of that industrial park.

We trust you find the foregoing to be of assistance in addressing this matter, and we remain,

Yours truly,

Ogilvie LLP

Per:

JAMES W. MURPHY, Q.C.

cc: Clients
Subject: Item 3.24, Bylaw 19645 located at 18825 -137 Avenue NW

In reference to the noted bylaw, I have a few comments to make in regard to the council report and the position of the Administration.

But First, the City of Edmonton and 12 local partners including St Albert addressed the principle of economic development as a whole and signed the Memorandum of Agreement last month. One of the 6 principles in this agreement states "All focus is on attraction and expansion of net new non-residential growth."

Given that Edmonton also signed the agreement it would be fitting to appreciate that economic development in the form of all business is good for the City and thus the region.

Moreover, the Mayor of St. Albert released an announcement that states "simplified and faster path for business investment in targeted areas by making the regulatory environment easier to navigate. This will include work to reduce red tape, and document available tools and strengths that we can leverage to increase investment opportunities."

However, your report from your administration says St. Albert is opposed to the application.

Bylaw 19645 will rezone a single site on 137 Avenue to medium industrial to allow for the development of a new business involved in the construction sector.

The owner has purchased the property understanding that the larger area to the immediate east allows for medium industrial development. His business fits this type of zoning.

So as far as good land use planning goes, he expected support for his proposal. He did his due diligence and found the site to be shovel ready for development of a business such as his. The site offers all services at the property line excluding sanitary. He also understands that additional hydrants will be required, notwithstanding the fact that a hydrant exists across the street. This is a typical requirement for all development and zoning in this area. Remember that the larger site to the immediate east that has been fully approved for medium industrial development.

Yet, your administration reports question the ability to service the area knowing that all services are available for his site.
This leads into my questioning the position of your Administration who recommends nonsupport, not based on planning principles, but on the basis that St. Albert is opposed.

This is a rezoning in Edmonton, not St. Albert.

Now St. Albert has started the process to annex this area this year; the owner purchased the property last year.

The road to annexation this area of Edmonton into St. Albert is long and may not be decided for some time.

It could take years. The position of St. Albert should not be used as a reason to delay, postpone or stop the development of his business in Edmonton.

However, the Administration recommends to City Council, a position of non-support, simply because St. Albert has started the process to annex this area.

The owner will be paying industrial taxes and business licence to operate in Edmonton. This is not something that the city can afford to prevent. If the zoning is not approved, it remains a vacant agricultural parcel paying the appropriate taxes.

Furthermore, in your agenda, St. Albert indicates that the proposed zoning is not out of line with the zoning that St. Albert would apply if it was in St. Albert.

I request that although St. Albert has started the annexation, there is no need to delay this zoning and development.

Given the direction of the memorandum of agreement signed by the 11 other partners, delaying or stopping this rezoning will not hold to its intent.

Hold true to the word of the agreement.
Approve Bylaw 19645.
Welcome this new business to the City of Edmonton.
It will show the partners, "you mean business!"

Sincerely yours,

N:,£
RE/MAX Professionals
Residential/Land/Commercial

[Redacted]
Dear City Clerk and Councilmember Henderson,

This message is with regards to the City Council Public Hearing May 4, 2021, 3.16 and 3.17, Bylaw 19592 / Charter Bylaw 19593, address 8715-110 Street and 10957-88 Ave.

I would hereby like to note my concerns about the proposal.

The application is incomplete. The proposal is for student housing, with over 10 students at any one time living in a small accommodation. The proposal is not for young families with children, and working professionals. The developer is targeting student housing. We are concerned about the proposal because it will reduce (and not increase) density in Garneau. There is student housing west of the proposed building. This proposal will reduce population density in Garneau, because students that would live in the University of Alberta, may choose to live in the proposed building. The development reduces the land available for developing permanent housing for young professionals, couples with children, and working families.

As far as I know, the University of Alberta has not issued a call for more student housing to be developed off-campus in the past five years. If anything, the institution has developed several housing options for students on campus. One of the larger housing structures is available immediately west of the proposed building.

Lastly, from a process perspective, this particular process has been especially time-consuming, unclear and onerous for private citizens. As a full-time employee, I am unable to commit the many hours you request to participate in the Zoom call.

Respectfully,

Tomas Nilsson, Garneau resident (you already have my address on file)

--

Tomas Nilsson, PhD
Alberta, Canada
Public Hearing 4 May

1 message

David Buchanan <
To: city.clerk@edmonton.ca

Fri, Apr 30, 2021 at 2:11 PM
3 26 3 27

Please find attached a letter Re: City Council Public Hearing May 4, 2021, 3.26 and 3.27, Bylaw 19592 / Charter Bylaw 19593

I am writing in opposition.

Best regards,

David Buchanan

 attachment 1: Buchanan_Public Hearing_4 May_NH.pdf
76K
Friday, April 30, 2021

City of Edmonton
Office of the City Clerk
1 Sir Winston Churchill Square
Edmonton, AB
T5J 2R7

Sent via email: city.clerk@edmonton.ca

Re: City Council Public Hearing May 4, 2021, 3.16 and 3.17, Bylaw 19592 / Charter Bylaw 19593

Dear Mayor Iveson and City Councillors,

I live south of 87th Avenue in middle Garneau. My children attend Garneau Elementary, my wife works at the U of A, and my family frequently walks and bikes in the area of the proposed development. In opposition to the proposal for ground-oriented multi-unit housing in north Garneau, I would like to address several aspects of the report by administration.

In my view, city planners are doing City Councillors and residents a great disservice by using the city plan to misrepresent and dismiss the negative impacts of development applications in Garneau. The initial summary of the rationale for approval offered by administration is at once vague, incorrect, and short-sighted.

Administration describes the proposed building as a “moderate” increase, with “sensitive transitions and setbacks to adjacent properties,” and as “largely” conforming to the GARP.

My first response is that the proposal does not conform to the GARP, does not exhibit sensitivity to adjacent property owners, and cannot within reason be described as moderate given either the size of the adjacent property or the character of the neighbourhood.

Nancy Hunt, who lives next door to the proposed building, will provide further details regarding the negative impacts of the setbacks, height, and volume of the proposed building. I would like to focus on what I think is the faulty basis for administration’s approval.

Administration would like us to believe that they keep the GARP and local voices in mind when making decisions about applications. However, the evidence suggests otherwise. Over and over, applications that do not meet the GARP and are openly opposed by residents are approved. The reason is simple: Administration bases the decision to approve on the city plan alone.
Administration is using the lack of district plans and the vagueness of the city-wide plan to further administrative aims that do not foster the livability of local neighbourhoods.

There seems to be a great hurry to prepare for two million people and to fit as many as possible into Garneau. Why not focus on getting the planning correct first? Assuming that administration will continue to only mention the GARP when convenient, this would require attention to district planning before rubber stamping piecemeal development applications in the meantime.

My understanding is the purpose of city planning is to ensure predictable, consistent development that enables a high quality of life for all residents. Taking the time to ensure site-specific, community-based solutions is necessary to make this happen.

To conclude, please do not take administration’s approval at face value. The reasoning is weak and the justification essentially non-existent. I respectfully ask that city council reject this proposal. Nancy Hunt and the people of Garneau deserve better.

Sincerely,

David Buchanan
To Whom It May Concern;

To The Councillors;

RE: Tuesday May 4th City Council Public Hearing Agenda Item 3.26 & 3.29, Bylaw 19592 & 19480, Amendment to the Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan.

I've recently heard of the application to build a High Rise in East Garneau on 108a Street. I am concerned about the shadow it will cast.

Garneau After School Centre uses the outside area that would be affected by the shadow of the High Rise and this will take away the sunlight and warmth where the children play. We use this area in the mornings during Spring and Summer. A giant shadow would take away not only the sunlight but the warmth it provides when they are playing outside.

Please consider this before making an important decision to put a high rise in East Garneau.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Mary Carey
Dear Councillors

RE: Tuesday May 4th City Council Public Hearing Agenda Item 3.26 & 3.29, Bylaw 19592 & 19480, Amendment to the Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan.

"A Day in the Life in the Shadows"

Reference document:"Revised Sun Shadow Study" The Hive Residential Tower

The year is 2025, and it is springtime. We are a family living in an affordable housing unit in the on . It's time to go to school. We put on our light winter jackets because we know we won't be out of the shade and wind for hours. We walk through a very windy and narrow alley between two very tall buildings. We are passed by a tow truck and have to wait for a garbage truck. A car drives past us pretty quickly. We make our way through the parking lot on 109 st, and cross the road into the school yard. It's still cold because of the shadow from the Hive. There are other families to say hello to, but people are hunched and don't linger because there is no morning sun.

In the afternoon, the kids in the housing cooperative have a playground and play space, but it gets cold early because there is a shadow on the playground from 3pm. Younger children prefer to play somewhere warmer, like inside. Parents hate to hang around outside to supervise, it's chilly! There are large planters, but where there used to be tomato plants grown, now is just soil and shade plants. No one picnics on their front yard unless its very hot in summer, because there is no sun to provide evening light and warmth on days that are not hot.

How did this happen?

By allowing a very tall residential tower to be built, there are shadows all over the neighbourhood. Everyday life has become very dark for residents. If they want sun, they need to seek it somewhere else.
I have attached photos of our everyday life, that, if taken with the Hive in place, would all be in shadow.
Please do not approve the rezoning for a residential tower on 108a St.

Thea Moss
Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Items 3.28 & 3.29 VANZANTEN

1 message

OCM OCC Internet Mail <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>  Mon, May 3, 2021 at 12:36 PM
To: CRS Council Correspondence <ocmcouncilcorrespondence@edmonton.ca>

Please see attached.

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Sander Veldhuyzen Van Zanten >
Date: Sun, May 2, 2021 at 11:51 PM
Subject: Letter to city council
To: CRS Council Correspondence <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Please see attached my letter to city council expressing my concerns for Feedback to LDA19-0103 – Revisions to the Hive

Sander Veldhuyzen van Zanten, MD, FRCPC, MSc, MPH, PhD
Professor of Medicine
Division of Gastroenterology
e-mail: 

Medical Director
Digestive Health, Strategic Clinical Network
www.ahs.ca/dhscn

Leah Dufault
Medical Secretary
tel: (780) 492-9864

Edmonton, AB T6G 2X8

Thomas Prince
Administrative Assistant

Yelena S. Cena
Assistant to:

Sander Veldhuyzen van Zanten, MD, FRCPC, MSc, MPH, PhD
AHS Senior Medical Director
March 8, 2021

Andrew McLellan, RPP, MCIP
PLANNER II
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES | PLANNING COORDINATION

City of Edmonton
Edmonton Tower
6th Floor, 10111-104 Avenue NW
Edmonton AB T5J 0J4
andrew.mclellan@edmonton.ca

Dear Mr. McLellan,

Re: Feedback to Proposal LDA19-0103 – Revisions to the Hive

I am writing as a disappointed community member regarding the above listed development proposal.

I live in the , a building that on the directly will be impacted by the development.

I participated in and had prepared to speak at the November 17 Hearing.

I am surprised and concerned that City Planning in the revised DC2 application has not taken into consideration any of the important concerns, which were communicated in written submissions in preparation of the November 17 Hearing.

Therefore, I am remain strongly opposed to the revised DC2 application as proposed.

I am bringing forward several of the same concerns that have been brought forward by others. Concerns that for reasons I do not understand have not been addressed by City Planning or the developer.

They are:

1. The building design and massing are an extreme departure from the existing neighborhood, existing zoning, and even the densest standard apartment zoning in Edmonton (RA9) - in density, height, and FAR.
2. The proposal is a radical departure from Garneau ARP Policy G3, which does not consider this site to be appropriate for high density residential development. The particular location the site is zoned for 4 story development consistent with the Garneau ARP, not potentially for a high rise of a 24 to 27 story building.
3. The proposal does not align with “The Way We Grow” Policy and Garneau ARP Policy G4 regarding fitting with existing neighborhood context, and respecting scale, form and massing that create a transition between the new development and the existing neighborhood. The proposal is a radical, dramatic departure from this policy in any measurable metric, including the expectation to transition in height down from structures on the river valley edge, such as Strathcona House. The proposal would literally ‘tower’ over Garneau Estates with limited setback between the properties.

4. Serious traffic density concerns. There is limited traffic access around the Hive: the alleys and 108A Street surrounding the site are narrow and not ‘through traffic’ lanes. They are not suitable for a building of the scale and density being proposed. The corner of 109 Street and Saskatchewan Drive is extremely busy with traffic from cars, pedestrians, cyclists and joggers. 108A Street will not be able to safely accommodate traffic in a neighborhood where many small children also live. Service trucks, such as a garbage collection or delivery vehicles will cause serious disruption of traffic on 108A Street and when 109 Street is accessed through the alleys.

5. Extreme setbacks (at ground level): in particular, the south setback of 1.4m is much too close than the adjacent neighbor (Garneau Estates) should be expected to live with, and the east setback (facing 108A Street) of 1.7m is unacceptable for a residential neighborhood.

6. Lack of family dwellings: the previous very small commitment of 11 dwellings to accommodate families (only 4% of the total number of dwellings) is further reduced to only 7 dwellings in the revision. This lack of commitment to family accommodation is in complete contradiction to Garneau ARP Policy G1.

7. Engineering studies are too preliminary for the scale and scope of the DC2: the TIA site conclusions are based on a total of 3 hours of observation by one person on one day. The Wind Impact Statement has no engineering content. High wind gusts in the east-west alley have been previously documented and communicated to City Administration. The addition of the Hive and the potential for exacerbated wind effects in the east-west alley must be studied prior to the approval of the proposed re-zoning, as it is a potential safety issue for the many pedestrians and cyclists using this lane. Potential snow loading on Garneau Estates roofs due to wind effects from the Hive has not been studied and must be addressed prior to consideration of the proposed rezoning – another potential safety issue. These roofs have not been designed and constructed to resist snow drifting.

8. Poor Access for Construction: similar to point 4, the lane configuration and resulting lack of ingress/egress presents a serious challenge for construction on the scale of what is proposed. A preliminary construction feasibility study should be conducted prior to re-zoning approval that considers the safety and daily living needs of the many residents and businesses adjacent to the site on all 4 sides (commuting to work, reliable access for delivery services, access for waste collection, emergency services access).

9. Lack of protection for mature trees on 108A Street: the developer would be allowed to remove the large, mature boulevard trees on 108A Street and not replace them, as Garneau ARP now requires. Some would consider these trees irreplaceable. Section 9, Article 5(a) of the DC2 Schedule says if a boulevard tree cannot survive the...
construction, it must be removed. It is likely the scale and setbacks of the proposed Hi-
Rise would result in this, and I am concerned they may not be replaced, with no input by
the surrounding Garneau community.

10. **Inadequate Loading Space(s):** only one loading space is proposed for 245 units. A single
loading space does not meet the Edmonton Zoning Bylaw 12800 minimum requirement
of 2 loading spaces, and would result in unnecessary neighborhood traffic congestion.

11. **Lack of commitment to ensure the surrounding alleys are functional:** 10.4(a) of the Draft
DC2 Schedule makes a commitment to only “remove/relocate existing utilities to
facilitate access to parking and waste collection”. The north-south alley currently
measures only 4.2m clear and is unsuitable for two-way traffic. As a condition of
rezoning approval, the developer should be assigned the responsibility to bring the alley
up to a commercial standard width for the full length, from 86 Avenue to the east-west
alley at the north end of the site.

12. **Parking concerns:** it is not realistic to assume that a low number of tenants in the new
building will not own cars. In the revised proposal surface parking has been reduced
from 23 spaces has been reduced by 10 to only 13 spaces. This demonstrates a general
lack of concern for neighborhood parking and traffic needs.

13. **Dramatic change in the look of the historic corner of 109 Street and Saskatchewan
Drive and the High Level Bridge.** There is complete disregard for the esthetics of this
important historic landmark location of the city.

In conclusion, given all the above mentioned points I strongly oppose the proposed
development. I also want to express my deep felt concerns about the lack of responsiveness of
City Planning in taken the reasonable objections raised by the local community into
consideration.

Sincerely,

Sander Veldhuyzen van Zanten

Address: [Redacted]

Phone: [Redacted]
CRS Council Correspondence <ocmcouncilcorrespondence@edmonton.ca>
May 2, 2021

City of Edmonton
Office of the City Clerk
1 Sir Winston Churchill Square
Edmonton, AB
T5J 2R7

Sent via email: city.clerk@edmonton.ca

Re: City Council Public Hearing May 4, 2021, Agenda Items 3.28 and 3.29, Bylaw 19480 and Charter Bylaw 19481

Dear Mayor Don Iveson and City Councillors,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on behalf of the owners of Manhattan Lofts. Our 30-unit residential building is located on 10855 Saskatchewan Drive just east of Strathcona House.

We would like to express the following concerns regarding the proposed bylaw amendments to allow a high-rise development, specifically related to traffic impact.

We note the following from the Parking and Transportation Impact Assessment

- An intersection traffic analysis was intentionally excluded from the assessment.
- Site observations were made by a single person during 3 hours on a single day (Monday April 8, 2019).
- The turning counts used in the assessment were collected previously on October 22 and 23, 2015
- The number of trips was calculated using the lower daily Trip Rate of 2.07 trips per dwelling unit for Multifamily Housing, rather than 5.81 for Apartment Housing.

We would suggest that the Parking and Transportation Impact Assessment is based on flawed assumptions and outdated information, and that the traffic impact will be much more significant than indicated.

We would question the assumption that a minority of residents in a new high-rise building will have vehicles, due to availability of alternative transportation modes. At Manhattan Lofts, all of our units have one or two vehicles; in fact, there is chronic shortage of parking space within our building. We believe that the number of vehicles and trips has been severely underestimated.

The report has not considered the increase in traffic volume since the counts were collected in 2015. As you are aware, the population of Edmonton has grown by 10% between 2014 and 2019 (https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/facts_figures/municipal-census-results.aspx). A significant area of increasing congestion is 109 Street. During morning peak
hours, it is already difficult for our residents to make a right turn onto 109 Street northbound due traffic volume; it is sometimes necessary to drive south to 82nd Avenue in order to access 109 Street northbound. It is especially difficult for those of us trying to access the turn lane onto 87th Avenue westbound, in order to reach the University area. Then, during evening peak hours, congestion on 109 Street results in a lineup of cars along 87th Avenue eastbound, extending to 112th Street. We anticipate that the congestion will be exacerbated by the increased number of vehicles associated with a new high-rise residential building.

It is not realistic that 108A Street will be able to accommodate the large expected increase in traffic. 108A Street is narrow and any delivery, service (e.g., garbage) or construction vehicle would block the street, if it cannot easily park on the site, which under normal existing conditions is not possible. Prior to the COVID 19 pandemic, online shopping with home deliveries was already increasing significantly. With the pandemic the number of home deliveries has risen exponentially and is likely to stay.

We note that Edmonton Bylaw #12800 requires 2 loading spaces for buildings with 200 dwellings or greater. This DC2 application, based on 245 dwellings, has requested a variance from two loading spaces to only one loading space. This will result in unnecessary traffic congestion in the neighborhood. There is no redundancy if, for example, a vehicle breaks down in a single loading space.

The issue of traffic impact is not only a matter of convenience, but also of safety for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. We take particular note of the many small children living in this area, especially on 108A Street. With the elementary school located across 109 Street, safety will be compromised with the increase in traffic density. The existing congestion on 109 Street leads to vehicles speeding through intersections to avoid a red light. We have the impression that accidents are a frequent occurrence at the intersections of 109 Street with 86th and 87th Avenues and Saskatchewan Drive. Solid data on this issue is of paramount importance.

At a minimum, we would strongly advocate for a more rigorous transportation impact study, based on current data, before a decision is made on the proposal.

Sincerely,

Sharon Watanabe
Edmonton AB  T6E 6T6
Hi

My name is Garnet Ostercamp. I reside in [redacted]. I am very much opposed to this 27 story high rise that is proposed. This is way out of line with the Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan for the area. The streets in the area are already unable to handle the present traffic. Increasing more traffic will only make it worse. This is already a very high dense area.

Across the street from the proposal is a co-op housing living area. Many small children reside there. Often they play out front. Sometimes I see them run out on the road. I very much worry that the added traffic will be of increased danger for them, especially during the construction phase with heavy trucks and machinery working.

I strongly feel that the developer should come up with a much more community friendly proposal.

Thank you

Garnet.O
Thursday 29 April 2021

City of Edmonton
Office of the City Clerk
1 Sir Winston Churchill Square
Edmonton, AB
TSJ 2R7

RE: Public Hearing- May 4th, 2021-Agenda Nos.: 3.28 & 3.29 - Bylaw 19480 & Charter Bylaw 19481

Dear Mayor Don Iveson and City Councillors:

Please note that I have been a resident of East Garneau since 1998; and I live.

I wish to convey in writing my strong opposition to the captioned proposed re-zoning application, which contemplates the construction of up to a 27-storey high-rise apartment tower... to be quite literally squeezed onto the above subject small parking situated directly across the said small laneway that abuts Strathcona House.

I believe that it is quite important to keep in mind that at present the site in question is zoned - as per DC2.128 and DC2.528-Area B - to structure(s) that cannot exceed 4 storeys in height. Moreover, this proposed re-zoned 25-storey apartment development would clearly be offside, and certainly would not conform in any way, shape, or form, with the "Overall Plan Objective" as outlined in the 2017 Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan (GARP)... which commits "to maintain the existing character of the Garneau Area" and which also states in the "Overall Development Concept" the following: "The development concept for Garneau complements the existing pattern of development by providing for gradients in height and density. In general, the height and density of land uses in Garneau will decrease from north to south and from west to east".

Hence, it is quite apparent that the developer in question - Beljan - is not just requesting a few minor variances to the current zoning regulations... but in essence... is seeking a very fundamental, so dramatic, and quite material change to the current, proper, and time-tested zoning criteria.

Furthermore, when you consider this proposed re-zoning application in isolation and upon its own merits... in other words asking yourself how "reasonable or desirable" is indeed this specific re-zoning application... I feel that one cannot fail but to come to the conclusion that it is a very bad idea and holds no merit whatsoever.
To begin ... such a contemplated 27-storey high-rise apartment tower ... would most assuredly have an overall negative visual impact upon the surrounding landscape and streetscape. Is it "reasonable" to block the view of almost all of the 100 south-facing owned residences of Strathcona House? And what about a number of the south-facing residences of Manhattan Lofts? Moreover, what about the 10 townhomes of Garneau Estates ... in that this behemoth of a structure would be looming over - and peering down - upon our west-facing back decks? Again ... is this "reasonable or desirable"?

Now with regard to the almost non-existent on-street parking that currently exists in the surrounding neighbourhood ... this proposed structure containing up to 245 dwellings ... would undoubtedly greatly exacerbate this ever-increasing and quite serious problem. When the developer - Beljan - first started to "sell" their proposed project back in November of 2018 ... at that time they had committed to provide parking stalls for only 50% of these units. But now with the City Council of Edmonton having, in June of this year, removed the minimum on-site parking requirements from the municipal zoning bylaw - commonly known as "Open Option Parking" - I am of the opinion that it can be reasonably assumed that Beljan will most likely reduce this number of planned parking stalls even more ... so as to maximize, as much as possible, the return on their investment. Once again ... is this "reasonable or desirable"?

This leads to another important consideration ... that of the speculative activity on the part of certain property developers in the Garneau neighbourhood. At this moment - within a 2-block radius of Garneau Estates - there already exists two large open-air excavations (one being the old Knox-Met site on 109 Street - the other situated just west of the Granite Curling Club on 86 Avenue) - that for at least two years are awaiting some form of development. They remind one of forsaken and quite large desolate bomb craters. There is another smaller site located just east of the Mucho Burrito Mexican Grill restaurant located on 109 street ... although unexcavated ... nevertheless has been barren and undeveloped for again around 2 years. It certainly appears that the quite significant downturn in the oil and gas industry has negatively impacted such developments from going ahead. But in the meantime ... the Garneau neighbourhood ... has to live with such open and gaping sores, and the resulting negative impact upon the fabric and sense of community.

Now with regard to staging this quite lengthy 2 to 3-year construction project ... there is great concern on my part due to the so limited and very restricted access to the site in question. It is bound on three sides by a narrow laneway to the west, another narrow laneway to the north, and by 108A Street to the east. It is important to note that 108A Street is effectively a dead-end at its northern periphery. So ... where and how ... would the lumbering and quite noisy dump trucks, cement trucks, delivery trucks, excavators, bulldozers, cranes, labourers, etc. - safely and without having a negative impact upon the quality of life of surrounding residents/businesses - gain daily and constant access to this very small and restricted site? Please take note that the narrow laneway to the west is used by the five small businesses/restaurants that front onto 109 Street for their regular supply deliveries - while the narrow laneway to the north is used non-stop by the numerous residents of Strathcona House
in order to access their underground parkade. It would also surely prove to be a constant hindrance (for sure a lot of noise, dust, and dirt), and certainly an undisputed disruption, to those residents that live on 108A Street - and in particular - an undoubted safety concern for the parents of the numerous young children who regularly play in the front yards and sidewalks of the Strathcona Housing Co-operative (located at the northern end and eastern side of 108A Street). In light of the above outlined very legitimate concern of not being really able to effectively stage this proposed huge construction project... is it then at all "reasonable or desirable" to seriously consider the approval of the subject File LDA19-0103/Garneau - "The Hive" Re-Zoning Application? I do not think that it is.

In closing... I believe that East Garneau is already one of the more densely populated neighbourhoods in our great city. I also wholeheartedly welcome and fully support considered and measured renewal and rejuvenation of this our treasured community. However, for the various quite legitimate concerns raised herein... I am very much opposed to the Beljan - File LDA19-0103/Garneau - "The Hive" Re-Zoning Application... it is most assuredly not "reasonable or desirable" and quite simply "beyond the pale".

Yours truly,

Andre Giasson

via email to 'city.clerk@edmonton.ca'
Dear Office of the City Clerk,

Please see my following comments regarding the upcoming May 4, 2021 Public Hearing, Item 3.28 (Bylaw 19480 - Amendment to the Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan Item) and item 3.29 (Charter Bylaw 19481 - To allow for a high rise residential tower, Garneau).

I am writing to express my strong concern and opposition to the rezoning of the 8630 to 8642 – 108A Street NW site, which would allow for the development of a high rise residential tower. I am an owner of a south-facing suite in Strathcona House, a high rise located directly north of the proposed development. Since the announcement of this proposal, myself and others in the community have been voicing our concerns about the damaging effect that a high rise development would have on our neighbourhood. These concerns have not been adequately addressed by the developer and I am asking that you please reject the proposed rezoning. This rezoning and development would create an unjustifiable amount of strain on the existing community members and, if approved, would result in both monetary and quality of life costs to 108A street residents in the following ways:

- Sun shading and loss of views on the south side of Strathcona House would significantly reduce the enjoyment of our properties. All owners in Strathcona House have purchased their properties based on the current 4 storey zoning of the proposed site, which ensures that our access to sunlight and our views are protected.
  - Sun Shading - I purchased my property specifically for the access to sunlight and the view. Reviewing the latest Sun Shadow Study from the applicant and daylight data from the National Research Council Canada, it appears that the proposed development would reduce the amount of sunlight that reaches the south facing Strathcona House suites on December 21st from approx. 7.5 hours to approx. 3.25 hours. This is a significant reduction during the winter months when sunlight has a major impact on mental health. In their report, City Administration states that “Very few dwellings in Edmonton, from houses to towers, receive unobstructed sunlight throughout the entire day, so it should be noted that the existing condition for Strathcona House is an exception, not the standard.” In this case, the impact on our sun access should receive exceptional consideration.
  - Loss of Views – Due to the concave shape of Strathcona House, every south-facing property faces the proposed development site. At its closest point, the proposed tower is located 24 meters from our tower. At such a close distance and a height much taller than our building, there is no question that the proposed development would have a major impact on our views. The proposed development does not even meet the Planning and Design Guidelines for Mature Neighbourhoods, which outlines that towers should be separated by a minimum of 30m if they are offset and 35m if they face each other.

- As a result of the sun shading and loss of views, owners on the south side of Strathcona House would experience decreased property resale values. This would ultimately decrease property resale values throughout our 220 unit building. While the developer would profit, myself and my neighbours would take a financial hit.

- All residents close to the site would be subject to years of noise and dust pollution during construction. With many of us working from home full time, we would be subject to the noise and dust during all day working hours.
hours. Construction of a smaller development would have a much shorter timeline, which would be less disruptive to the lives of community members.

- The mature boulevard trees that border the proposed site add great value to our neighbourhood by creating a healthier and more sustainable environment through carbon dioxide removal and stormwater filtering. The proposed development could result in the removal of these mature trees with no requirement for replacement, especially with trees of similar ecological value (which increases with tree age).

- Competitive parking in the neighbourhood would become drastically worse as the proposed development will not provide adequate parking for the tenants and visitors of that building.

- The flow of traffic on the narrow roads and alleys that surround the site would be heavily impacted by any construction equipment or vehicles. A single delivery truck or moving van is enough to currently block both the north/south and east/west alleys that border the site. Over the years, I've seen countless traffic jams surrounding the site.

- There would be increased traffic and safety concerns for the many pedestrians and bicyclists that use the narrow alleys/roads that border the site. Of specific concern is the east/west alley that is used daily by young children walking to the Garneau elementary school.

- The technical studies completed by the applicant are not adequate. Specifically, the Parking and Traffic Impact Assessment has a very limited data collection window and the Wind Impact Statement was completed without ever visiting the site. With a proposed development of this size, all technical studies should be completed with accurate data prior to any decisions being made.

- This application does not follow the Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan (GAR) which outlines that the height and density of land uses in Garneau will decrease from north to south. The massing and height of the proposed development does not align with the existing character of the neighbourhood. The GAR should not be amended to fit the needs of a developer.

In their report, City Administration states that “due to a well thought-out and customized site layout and building design, this proposal adequately mitigates negative off-site impacts, and while there are intrusions on existing sunlight access and views, this is to be expected in major nodes and areas of more intense urban development”. Contrary to this statement, the proposal certainly does not adequately mitigate negative off-site impacts and our community certainly does not expect intrusion on existing sunlight access and views. What we do expect is that developers work within existing zoning and that existing area redevelopment plans be adhered to.

The proposed development is inappropriately large and too tall for the site. It will negatively impact the quality of life of hundreds of owners and residents adjacent to the property. I ask that you please deny this application and that the applicant works with the community to create a plan that adequately addresses our concerns and more closely aligns with the existing neighbourhood.

Thank you for taking the time to hear my concerns.

Sincerely,

Angela Seehagen
Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Items 3.28 & 3.29 STRATHCONA HOUSING COOP

1 message

OCM OCC Internet Mail <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>  Mon, May 3, 2021 at 9:46 AM

To: 

Please see attached.

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Board of Directors Strathcona Housing Co-op <shcboardofdirectors@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Apr 30, 2021 at 6:30 PM
Subject: Proposed Development on 108a Street and May 4 Public Hearing
To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>, Ben Henderson <ben.henderson@edmonton.ca>, A Benitez 

Please see the attached letter regarding City Council Public Hearing May 4, 2021, Agenda Items 3.28 and 3.29.

Thank you,
Susan
Board President

--
Strathcona Housing Co-op
Board of Directors
Strathcona Housing Co-op
Edmonton, AB
T6E 4M7

3 attachments

Letter regarding Beljan Development 2021.pdf  88K
CL_Nov17_PublicHearing_Beljan.pdf  86K
Letter for Beljan Development 2018.pdf  172K
Re: City Council Public Hearing May 4, 2021, Agenda Items 3.28 and 3.29, Bylaw 19480 and Charter Bylaw 19481

Dear Mayor Don Iveson and City Councillors:

On behalf of Strathcona Housing Co-operative members, I would like to express our continued concern over the Beljan high-rise development proposal on 8632/34/38/48/50 -108a Street in Garneau. As our building is located directly across the street from this proposed development, we feel we will be negatively impacted by this massive high-rise and respectfully ask that this information be reviewed prior to the Hearing, as time permits.

To date, our concerns have been expressed by:

- attending and commenting on the proposal at Beljan’s first open house;
- December 2018 letter to Chris Dulaba of Beljan Development, bcc’d to Ben Henderson; and,
- City of Edmonton public engagement meetings, in person and online.
- attending the Nov 17 City Council Public Hearing, where a number of our members were prepared to speak, but was referred by Beljan.

Over time we have consistently expressed our opposition and concerns regarding a project of this scale on the lot in consideration as outlined in our letter to Beljan (see attachment).

Currently, what is most concerning is that amendments to the project did not take into consideration any of our concerns or those shared by the rest of the community. The proposed changes mean that the high-rise is expected to take up more space and be even taller. We would are even more concerned about how this over development will affect the neighbourhood with regards to:

- safety of our children and other pedestrians;
- flow of traffic;
- lack of parking will exacerbate a persistent issue of outsiders using our private parking spots;
- lose of valuable sunshine; and
- how an already windy corridor will get windier.
We feel the construction of such a large building will only exacerbate these existing problems and so far Beljan has not adequately addressed these issues.

It should be noted that we are not opposed to development. On the contrary, we welcome any family-friendly, affordable housing project that respects the history, community atmosphere, and character of this street and neighbourhood. A new development should add value to the community not negatively impact residents’ quality of life.

We implore that the city reject the current application for rezoning of this area and force Beljan to amend its plans according to the current zoning and the Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan. We also ask that Beljan consult with community members to create a proposal that will maintain all the things we love about living in our community.

Sincerely,

Susan Satterthwaite  
Strathcona Housing Co-operative,  
Board President  
shc.boardofdirectors@gmail.com

cc: Ben Henderson

Attachment: Letter to Chris Dulaba of Beljan Development
Re: City Council Public Hearing November 17, 2020, Agenda Items 3.14 and 3.15, Bylaw 19480 and Charter Bylaw 19481

Dear Mayor Don Iveson and City Councillors:

On behalf of Strathcona Housing Co-operative members, I would like to express our continued concern over the Beljan high-rise development proposal on 8632/34/38/48/50 -108a Street in Garneau. As our building is located directly across the street from this proposed development, we feel we will be negatively impacted by this massive high-rise and respectfully ask that this information be reviewed prior to the Hearing, as time permits.

To date, our concerns have been expressed by:

- attending and commenting on the proposal at Beljan’s first open house;
- December 2018 letter to Chris Dulaba of Beljan Development, bcc’d to Ben Henderson; and,
- City of Edmonton public engagement meetings, in person and online.

Over time we have consistently expressed our opposition and concerns regarding a project of this scale on the lot in consideration as outlined in our letter to Beljan (see attachment).

Currently, what is most concerning is that amendments to the project did not take into consideration any of our concerns or those shared by the rest of the community. The proposed changes mean that the high-rise is expected to take up more space and be even taller. We would be even more concerned about how this over development will affect the neighbourhood with regards to:

- safety of our children and other pedestrians;
- flow of traffic;
- lack of parking will exacerbate a persistent issue of outsiders using our private parking spots;
- lose of valuable sunshine; and
- how an already windy corridor will get windier.

We feel the construction of such a large building will only exacerbate these existing problems and so far Beljan has not adequately addressed these issues.
It should be noted that we are not opposed to development. On the contrary, we welcome any family-friendly, affordable housing project that respects the history, community atmosphere, and character of this street and neighbourhood. A new development should add value to the community not negatively impact residents’ quality of life.

We implore that the city reject the current application for rezoning of this area and force Beljan to amend its plans according to the current zoning and the Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan. We also ask that Beljan consult with community members to create a proposal that will maintain all the things we love about living in our community.

Sincerely,

Susan Satterthwaite
Strathcona Housing Co-operative,
Board President
shc.boardofdirectors@gmail.com

cc: Ben Henderson

Attachment: Letter to Chris Dulaba of Beljan Development
Dear Chris Dulaba:

I am writing on behalf of the Strathcona Housing Co-operative. We are extremely concerned about the proposed high-rise development on 8632/34/38/48/50 - 108A Street in Garneau because our building is located directly across the street. While we understand the interest to develop in prime, central locations, the lot in consideration is not an appropriate choice to do so, due to the following concerns:

Traffic
There is already heavy traffic through 108A Street and the alley connecting 108A Street to 109 Street and the proposed high-rise will increase congestion on a street with existing limited space. We are also worried that higher traffic will increase safety concerns, especially for our children playing and walking to school because this alley is a pedestrian corridor. Traffic in this area is already dangerous, but adding an extra 225 unit-building will definitely make this area more dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. Many of our residents are also concerned that any changes to the alley, which were discussed at the proposal meeting, will reduce access to our building. This reduced access means increased risk if emergency vehicles need to get through but aren’t able to. There are also concerns about garbage or recycling trucks having access, especially in the winter when the adjacent alleys haven’t been cleared of snow. At almost any time of the day, all parking on the street is taken. 108A Street is quite narrow and in our winter conditions, it is already risky road to drive down.

Unwanted garbage
We have continuing problems with residents of other buildings using our garbage containers to get rid of unwanted items such as mattresses or furniture. Our building is left to pay the cost of the disposal of these items. This issue tends to get worse at the end of the university semester. Your building is being targeted to students / millennials who will likely use our garbage containers to dump their unwanted things.

Safety
Your proposed building is targeted to a more transient population, which will eventually decrease stability in the neighbourhood. Transient populations don’t generally connect to the community or any kind of community building. This community is unique because we are community focused. In addition, this area is already densely populated but having more residents attracts more unwanted people to the area. Theft is already common in the area. This type of development will encourage more theft and as a result of the transient nature of your housing development, there won’t be many neighbours watching out for each other.

Parking
Lack of parking has been an ongoing issue for our building, other apartment buildings and businesses in this entire area for years. Our residents’ private parking stalls are
constantly occupied by people who are visiting the area, want to avoid paying for parking or just need somewhere to park. Your proposed high-rise would only offer around 40% of what is required under current zoning rules and so this proposal will exacerbate an already serious problem. Guests to the proposed high-rise will also cause problems because your proposal lacks such a large quantity of parking stalls. You also need to consider that access to alleys or parking stalls are regularly blocked by service or delivery vehicles. When large numbers of people are moving in or out of your building, where are moving vans or trucks going to park? Are large moving trucks going to block the whole alley just south of Strathcona House?

Shade
We rely on the sun’s light and heat that we get in the late afternoon and evening from the west. This neighbourhood is already shaded by other buildings and tall trees and more shade will mean higher utility costs to heat and light our homes.

Construction
The developer mentioned that this project could take 28 months to complete. This means that we will have 28 months of noise, dust, and likely reduced access to the street and our own homes. The reduced access can lead to a number of problems, which were mentioned above. Currently, this proposed development has the potential to greatly reduce the quality of life in this neighbourhood. We hope that Beljan Development will take into consideration all of our concerns.

Denver Poburan
Strathcona Housing Co-operative,
Board President