

TWIN BROOKS FIRST PLACE PROGRAM

Transcription of raw comments and question from Public Open House December 3, 2016 at George P Nicholson School

Chart 1

- This program started in 2006 but economy has changed, has there been a reassessment of the need for housing? For next few years market is going down so why are we still building if there is no need? Slow down development.
- Damage our environment, school already overcrowded
- Where will kids go to school?
- New building materials will not fit with existing look that is 20-30 years old

Chart 2

- Traffic already very dense on 12th Ave!!
- Sight lines a problem at curves
- 44 new homes = many more cars turning left & right into “new homes”
- Dangerous for our school children - ^traffic & turning traffic
- Parking on 12th St. will be very limited for remaining soccer/play fields
- Not enough visitors parking on site
 - Too many cars parked on roadway near school
- Size of stalls large enough for trucks & larger vehicles
- Bridge on 119 St to 23 Ave.
- Better Limit parking to 2 hrs on 12 Ave or that development will park all night!! GRR!
- Not safe for children!!!
- Not enough space for parking in morning
- House value down
 - Concern
- Under utilized park “Twinbrook Community Park” by course
- Feeling of being blindsided - Mandel - MGA.
- Thinks the 6-8 community members is only superficial aspects.
 - Don't think
 - Us about colour
- Likes Landmark homes - he currently lives in one

Chart 3

7-8 4:45 - 6:00P<

Wants more frequent Bus Service in PM peak.

5:20 switches to 30m should be 15 min

- Blind Corner
- Densification on 111 St due to park & ride
- Safety of children on sidewalk crossing access
- School doubled in size - they essentially put both sites in one
- Open space label misleading - has fields, rink, parking lot, etc.
- Study out-of-date - school is bigger
- Parking - on a soccer night - onsite (garages full of stuff)
- Q. - crosswalk light to trail in park??
- Sightlines - parking ban/speed reduction?
- Infill is a good thing - makes a more beautiful city
- Want bridge on 119 St to 23 Ave - another way out, less speeding past school
- 1-2hr on-street parking limit so sports fields can be used
- Left turn @ 9 Ave
- 111St phase too long
- Noise level is high overall in the NBHD
- Extend EB left turn, shorten NB/SB traffic @ 111 St/12 Avv.
- lengthen school zone speed limits?
- Parking bans @ certain hours or 2 hrs.
- Xwalk lights, reflective poles - a lot of dog walkers
- Opportunity to turn left into site at peak times
- Congested during AM peak (7:45) (N of 9 Ave/113 St)
- 119 St connection to AHD (like to see a connection)
- Cross creek bridge be constructed to connect to 23 ave ((5+)
- Against bridge to 23 Ave cuz environmental impact
- shared parking for AM drop off w/mechanical centre?
- expand parking area for Community League to accommodate requirement for on-street parking?
- Ped flasher @ site access
- LRT Stop btw 12 Ave & 9 Ave

Chart 4

- Was the District Park considered for this development.
- Is the F.P. program still required
 - Has a recent market analysis been done.
 - Needs justification.
- People do not utilize the south soccer & ball diamonds. This space could be better utilized/programmed.

Chart 5

- Who will save our public commons?
- Justice miscarried by First Place Program
- An election issue for all Edmonton
- Vote to keep public green spaces for all to enjoy outdoors
- Why is the City not looking or considering other open spaces/empty lots for this program?
- Community Parkland Quantitative analysis - provide to community
- Too much park space is expensive to maintain
- Develop offers opted opportunities

Chart 6

- Concerns for Recess Times for Students
- Concerns of the Amount of Time the Soccer Fields will be closed
 - Phase in new fields before closing.
- New Soccer fields face East and West = players running into the sun = dangerous!
- Public Consultation needed for Park use prior to building construction and finalization of Location/Project
- Need to consider temporary fields the Community puts in
- Concern with access and blind spots to development
- Concern of open space availability with future population increase

Chart 7

- Lacks Universal access for mobility
- Put something interesting in the front of the homes - or landscaping
- Don't like colours. Do Neutral colors.
 - Stucco to match
- 18 feet isn't enough space for 2 cars - we have 20 units too
- What is the Unit Cost? \$300k w/land
- How does the mortgage work? **See City program**
- Unit-turnover don't want empty units managed - **Condo Board manages**
- Pictures of the proposed aerial view needed
- Too many cars on the street creates ugly curb appeal
- Entrance to site will cause parking issues
- Is 18 feet a double garage? **Yes**
- The architectural design integrity is compromised - **not necessary - depends on community design**

Solutions:

- Larger parking for residents of First Place
- Traffic site-lines might be a problem
- Traffic site-lines = unsafe for kids - **Transportation**
- Cost too high for many young & old buyers
- Final design isnt set out - **to be completed per Design Engagement**
- **Cost:**
- Under/App \$300,00 including land

Chart 8

Assessment and Taxation

- Concern re increased traffic (morning) due to this development - traffic is already an issue
- Was not aware of Site Development when he purchase his home 2 yrs ago - believes there should be mkt value decrease
- Concern with Site becoming a rental complex - what precautions are being made to stop this?
- Orientation of Soccer Fields - should be north/south not east/west - sun affecting play
- Current green space is being utilized - we should not lose green space to development
- This is not the right site for development - encloses green space - we lose visibility of children playing from 112 Ave.
- Have you considered the possibility of additional children in the NBHD when LRT expands to this area? We may need another school at that time.
- when will construction begin?
- Concern: Community Bldg being used for Square Dancing/Tai Chi also use Green space - area could be better utilized as a Library or Spray Park
- It is a good development - it should not affect the traffic or we will still have a lot of greenspace

2H per 1000

12H per 6000

15H

Chart 9

- Greenspace - Can COE + Developer work together to get quality design for green spaceflow?
- We need spaces/places to do outdoor activities.
- We need quality over quantity
 - Consider the need desire + strong place
- 12th Ave Traffic will be an issue
- This doesn't fit

- Character of the neighbourhood
- Redirecting speed was a good thing
- Only green space in community for activities
- Stopped sports play (unhappy)
- Majority of community is against it
- Green space
- Lack of green space
- Traffic concern
- We don't need development
- 90% is vacant South
- Dumpster site - worried about location
- It is important to connect children w/nature. Volunteer nature walks, root - for tree planting incentives
- Consider that school + YMCA uses green space as part of programming
- Wants soft integration w/green space/neighbours in the back
- Character Neighbourhood
- Supports the program - everyone should have a right to a home
- Like the idea of the program
- good use of taxpayers \$\$
- Traffic
- Taking away green space
- Council would not revisit past 2014
- Land is transferred with no cost!
- Somebody needs to look at the finances of this
- Concerns about look
- Concerns about traffic'
- Not fair that this program is only in parts
- Concerns about soccer field
- Infractions of MGA Act
- Staff doesn't know about policy C513, A1448
- Was told not to email/contact them
- No one has come out (except Mr. Anderson)
- Q. Who is financing this?
- Question about financial study on program success
- PP/s (?) keeps talking about how it never was a soccer field
- Worried about land values.
- Wants to know about reselling unit
 - Affordable.
- A lot of people will be driving a long way for Soccer for their kids!

- follow proper process C513-PE C513
- The developer don't pay for the land - Market Place for land(?)
- When did the City make it its mandate to provide housing?
- concern with conditions of subdiv approval for public purposes
 - Got land for fee + now making \$ on

Chart 10

Open Space & Sportsfield

- Was the District Park Considered for this Development.?
- Is the F.P. Program still required?
 - Has a recent Market Analysis Been Done.
 - Need Justification
- People do not utilize the South Soccer & Ball Diamonds. This Space could be better utilized/programed.
- Would like info on the type of activities committee does
- Good architecture in Bearspaw.

Chart 11

- Who finances this.
- When did the city make its mandate to provide housing?
- Don't like the look of the townhome (Bearspaw) outside looks tacky - like the stucco ones on 9th Ave.
- Does the committee do Interior & Exterior design - wants to know more about the committee.

Chart 12

- Are any of the units designed for people with disabilities?
- Is it the same developer building all the lands?
- The City did not own the land
- Someone switched the original plans on the land. The City should not be owned by the City on public school board lands
- Is there a concern for people buying it & flipping it for profit later on?

Chart 13

- What is the criteria you use to select if more than 89 people sign up to volunteer on the design committee?
- Would like more than 6-8 people for a community of this size.
- Want more information on timeline.

- Signs should be more accurate/reflect truth with council approval as part of the process (200 approvals).
- Individual supports this development
 - Too much NIMBY
 - We have lots of green space.
 - Look at the bigger picture (population trends)
- Opposite view
 - Land deficit per capita.
- Health Centre Development equivalent to school space
 - Ratio for green space
 - We have deficit
- Business model is wrong
- Seems like lots happened behind closed doors.
- 6-8 ppls committee is hypocritical.
- Moral dimension to this.
- Why interested in program for my kids (young Adults).
- The problem is the City is the developer and Funder. This needed to be looked at before it started.
- 12th Ave parking isn't large enough for 2 lanes of parking
- Too many units for size of neighborhood
- Loves Bearspaw - kids can walk to school.

Chart 14

- Losing up to 8 soccer fields for little children
- Why was site plan changed - school wasn't originally to be on that site.
 - What is the history of the change?
- Haven't been communicated with enough + consulted with
 - It's too late to change decision
 - How this was communicated was unclear - concept of homes
 - Communities frustration is not about not wanting this - losing green space that's used by kids to play safely + can see them
- This land is the public commons + green space is vital to livability, walkability, vibrant community + should be claimed as open space for outdoor enjoyment by the public

Half First Place program - taking valuable open public space out of the urban footprint + will make Edmonton less desirable, less liveable, western Canadian City. This is my City. Robbery of public land trust - all over the city.

Chart 15

- Design engagement is City's way to say they've consulted the Community but it's not real engagement
- Has building location changed?
- are previous first place site plans available?
- Loss of green space means more travel to access soccer fields
 - No way to replace soccer fields
- We lose our big soccer field
- Design engagement is opportunity is open & transparent, I like it, I think I'm going to go sign up
- My questions have been answered today
- Replacement fields are too small!!
- Taking away green space & broke law to do it, expect us to be law abiding, makes us angry that we're paying your salary.
- We don't want this here

Chart 16

- Skating rink right next
- Not safe for our kids - traffic, next to school
- Do not agree with site
- Build where no schools
- Need land for our children and community for soccer + school kids to play
- Traffic increase - 12 Ave too small
- Property values
- School uses the space for Fun + Fit day and will lose this + used at recess
- Noise
- Live across site - I'm going to lose my view
- Against building - use for more recreational opportunities - build basketball court or other
- Kids will lose freedom of playing b/c have to watch for traffic + ^stress on Supervisors

Chart 17

- Proximity to school + their potential complaints about noisy kids
- Concern with ^ trend of infill + density in areas where arterial roads
 - This location going to further increase 111 St --- ^ need for repairs + use
- Contradictory - need to build in core where there's better access
- Kids play there all time
- Info presented is misrepresentation of actual green space because rink + community league not marked on them so looks like we have more green space than we actually do
- Green space will be hidden + secluded + dangerous + won't have trees
- Very important to capture comments + documented in a transcript

Chart 18

- Traditionally City uses historical demographic + movement data to id trends + need for development. Does the City also do future forecasting to determine need for housing? Concern of overbuilding.
- Rather than spreading the City out , if we can utilize our space properly do it
- I live 3 blocks away. I have some concerns (eg. property value) and I can also see need to accommodate more variety of citizens, not everyone wants to shovel sidewalks
- We all have to start somewhere (re first homes)
- Concern City asked for exemption from MGA w/out getting input from citizens
MGA was developed to avoid this from happening

Chart 19

- Would like to address this fact they've circumvented this process (MGA) How can we know what our municipality will do if laws don't suit their needs, they just change the law?
- Why did City feel need to expedite process + rush this building?
- Follow MGA process - citizens want input on whether building happens in first place
- I'd like the building stopped
- The use of surplus school lands
 - Seems there are other sites that are better
- When we bought into this land was because it had fewer residential dwellings now you're increasing density - that's not what we bought into
- My view is City is expecting us to overlook these issues and thats not going to happen

Chart 20

- Green space in TB is already smaller compared to other communities
- Concern children accessing Soccer fields. Parking on street might hinder children safety.
- Cover off frontage to watch children, rather than person looking out of the FP development
- Will not be readily accessible space because park will be enclosed behind the building
- Hadow was done well
- My solution - have Landmark trade open space downtown, save on transportation & infrastructure by building where people work
- Need information on the land used for this space - address idea that City is giving away the land.

Chart 21

- Want follow up info + regular and know what decisions have/are being made + what's being done.
- What will be done to ensure kids safety?
- Kids safety during construction might aggravate already existing traffic issues - esp morning drop-off @ school
- Aerial plan view of alternative site locations would have been appreciated
- What were the other options for this piece of Land?
- What about other sport options, tennis, Urban Park?

Chart 22

- This is the only park in the community, walking Place?
- Removal of green space is a huge loss. How does this compare with other Canadian cities?
- Issues about communication - not reflecting actual views of this community.
- This is losing consumer choice to invest in lower density and quiet residential. Need strategic infill - smart, not just economics driven - designated hubs for higher density, respect for existing mature neighbourhoods + their character. We're losing heritage housing + buildings + heritage footprint of urban planning - lose aesthetics, social env. + green space.

Chart 23

- This is the only park in the community, walking place. Removal of greenspace is a huge loss. How does this compare with other Canadian Cities?
- Issues about Communication -
Not reflecting actual views of the community
- This is losing consumer choice to invest in lower density and quiet residential. Need strategic infill (smart, not just economics driven) - designated hubs for higher density, respect for existing mature neighbourhoods and their character. We're losing heritage housing and buildings and heritage footprint of urban planning - lose aesthetics, social env. and greenspace.

Chart 24

- Planners + politicians need to recognize organic growth + change - infill wave is imposing on communities with minimal involvement of community
- Need good data about communities, monitor changes happening + each community should have area redevelopment plan
- Community Leagues should be empowered to be co-planners + EFCC.
- Loss of space
- Better buildings?

- Buildings built on props (health/children)
- Payment taxes
- Heritage site:
 - How big is this?
 - How is it avoided for in planning?
- Why is there a shortfall of planned population?
- Access to park when buildings are built?

Chart 25

- Concern program will not attract/retain young people because house price same
- Capacity is being used as planned
- Council's density goal cannot be reached in older communities
- Adding new homes to existing community is too aggressive, because of large lots

Chart 26

- TWIN BROOKS NASP 1989
 - Original concept plan
 - Population goal was 6,100 residents
 - By your figures, we are approx 150 over the plan
- As rezonings occur the plan's projected "planned" population should have decreased
- Go back to each amendment and see if the data tables changed w/each amendment
- Check original plan vs current plan

Chart 27

- Loss of Sportsfield for 3 years due to build. Where will kids play soccer? This is important for the community.
- Space is already tight in the Community, why can't the City use a different vacant spot?
- Two mini Soccer fields are not good enough to play the normal soccer of ages - 10 yrs. Please rethink about no space for a full soccer field?
- Graphs are "scientifically" fraudulent Not criminally fraudulent.

Chart 28

- Where will the garbage facilities be?
 - Community League has one right out front and it is ugly and how to avoid more of that.
- will the building site be expanded?
- In support of project - City needs it and we have good green space.
- what is the F.P. approval process
- Who decides on the price?

Lot and building?

- In support of project, can we have more.
- Why was the engagement plan for 1027 moved to 2016?
- What are the qualifications for the First Time homebuyers?
- Parking on the roads is my concern
- How does the mortgage work on the First Place program?
- People are upset at the process

Avonmore

- Why was the MGA changed to go ahead with this development?
- Provincial exemptions on the MGA - to go ahead?
- That eliminates the effectiveness of the MGA - that is against the democratic process.
The City should be allowed to do this because it is against the law. This was in 2006.
- Are the units going to be rental units?
- Have there been any problems in paying their mortgages so far?
- This development will create a transient neighbourhood.
- We are concerned with the essence of the neighbourhood
- Our taxes will go up
- I am in favour of the project and I support it
- How can I apply for the program?
 - To buy a house
- We have a lot of safety & traffic issues
- I want a car free community (LRT)
- We cannot have a safe community with all this new development
- Trees, don't take out the trees

Chart 29

- Is this Affordable Housing?
- Why not pick another space?
- The built school was made bigger than originally planned.
- Kids play soccer here, seniors also have programs on this space in summer
 - Will be more difficult to carry equipment further
- Could be used for other uses than Housing e.g. - waterpark, programmable space (Seniors)
- Other parks are too far away for seniors to walk.

Chart 30

- Safety concern with in/out of condo development
- Extend 30km/hr speed limit past this development, or not build it at all
- What kind of people are buying these? e.g.. Families w/children?

- How many units, what kind?
- Who can qualify
- explanation of land deferral process?

Chart 31

- Concern w/ownership and turnover of units - how to ensure no vacant units
- What about selling in the first 5 years?
- Where are the councillors that initially voted for it - not only the ward councillors
- Not just replacing one building w/another - a condo (24/7) is very different than a school (school hours, speed limit, traffic)

Chart 32

- 119 St development - future LRT parking? Bridge development will be reopened??
- already so many condos for sale in Edmonton at this price - is there a demand?
- I dont want this development
- Issue w/access - safety (traffic)
- LRT Park & Ride impacts - buses, traffic on 111 St.

Chart 33

- Everybody in Twin Brooks doesn't want this
- Continued to be pushed
- Why should we be law abiding citizens when the City is not following the law?
- Not affordable housing (was first brought as affordable)
- Who benefits - Builder? City?
- The population calculations for the neighbourhood are wrong.
- The available green space is lower than what is depicted in the map.
- The design of the buildings should be congruent with the existing community (built form)
- The landscaping should be done with the neighbouring greenspace in mind.
- Not enough parking spaces on the development.
- How many people have shown up who are potential buyers?
- Do these buyers have any Children?
- Which was the last one that was constructed?
- Which was the first one which was built?
- I have heard the units were not selling.
- Was the community targeted? There are so many sites concentrated here?
- Is it only 2ac?
- How many homes/ houses are planned?
- We dont want the program in this area.

- Who benefits from the developments?
- Ramming this through our throats.
- Why Council is not listening to our concerns?
- What other locations are available?
- Enquiry on the Haddow Site - How many site are there on the Haddow Site?
- How does the community feel about developments in the First Place sites?
- The design is too crowded, too many units, but the appearance is acceptable.
- How many sites have been completed so far?
- I am concerned about the density compared to other sites in the City

Chart 34

- Where will the parking be?
- What kind?
 - Concern with safety in parking design - don't like underground
- Studies for servicing / drainage
- How do we access them (traffic/ drainage)?
- How many have been developed already? How close to existing school?
- Leaving little green / flat space
- Map misrepresenting areas.

Chart 35

- What benefits is the City giving to these residents?
- Did initial resident pay extra for this space?
- Parking on-site, traffic due to school - where can they park
- Why can't we say where we want the site.
- What is the price per unit?

Chart 36

- How can we stop this
- Follow the City Policy for engagement
- Why was original site on east passed to this site?
- Can we take the City to court.
- Loss of green space playing fields