

## **First Place Liaison group meeting**

**Meeting Date and Time:** November 21, 2013; 7:15 PM to 8:15 PM

**Location:** Caernarvon community league building (14830 118 St NW)

### **Attendees:**

***Name and email addresses of attendees have been removed for privacy concerns from the liaison/s.***

## **AGENDA**

- 7:15            Introductions
- 7:20            Meeting objectives
  - Share information with Liaison Group
  - Listen and capture input from Group
  - Identify key take-aways and questions to be answered
  - Agree on next steps
- 7:25            Confirm topics to be discussed
  - Progress made in 2013
  - Shared lessons learnt
  - Discuss 2014 public engagement projects
  - Meeting with the public engagement consultant
  - Others to be added by the group
- 7:30            Group discussion
- 8:10            Next steps

**Introduction:** Meeting chaired by Tim McCargar

- Addition to the Agenda:
  - Exemptions - for discussion re:
    - Update on status of Provincial exemption and changes to Order in Council.
    - Group agrees to share personal email addresses among liaison members present

## **Agenda Items with meeting notes**

### **1. Progress made in 2013**

- Tawa & Caernarvon sites construction and new home sales are underway. Approximately 30 new homes sales are complete.
- Casselman site, shared finalized site design with liaison group. Site servicing is now complete and construction is beginning. New home sales shall start shortly.
- Kernohan - Have completed the design engagement with the community. Working through grading and tree relocation issues. Development permit is being reviewed. Site servicing should begin in spring 2014.
- Dechene- we have been investigating building site options to respond to community concerns that have arisen. Site soil testing has been completed and revealed unusual soil conditions. Builder has shared soils engineering reports for City to review before determining next steps.

### **Lesson Learnt**

Implementation and revisions to process/es

- As the Project has progressed over the past year, the City has reviewed the work in a number of areas and is revising the Public Engagement process as per a number of learnings.
  - Example – Casselman & Dechene soil issues demonstrated the need to conduct soil testing earlier in the overall process,
- Re-Siting – City Leadership Team has approved four principles to guide Administration in discussion of resiting requests that may arise on some building sites. Administration will consider possibility of building site resiting on sites where Council has yet to approve new use or, if new uses are approved, where city has not already revisited building site location. However, the approved building site is the default location where development will occur if an alternative site are not feasible or where there is not broad based community support to resite.
- Principles include:
  - Technical feasibility

- Financial feasibility
- Market Feasibility
- Broad based community support
  - Learning: City administration has prepared new engagement process to support resiting principles.
    - Process includes pilot project for re-siting.
      - A public involvement consultant is being hired to help review, finalize and implement a public engagement process on pilot sites and also determine how to evaluate process before it is implemented.
      - A number of members of the Group indicated a desire to meet with the consultant if it can be arranged before mid-December - Elmar of Brookview offered their facility as a meeting place.
- General Questions and Discussion – re: Re-Siting
  - Question – How many communities are asking for re-siting evaluation?
    - Answer – Not many, however not all communities are at the same stage in the implementation process, so the number of re-siting requests is difficult to estimate.
    - Supplementary Question – Is it up to the neighborhood to identify re-siting as an option?
      - Answer – Yes, but the City will first provide general information about the building site and surrounding City land to the community (*e.g. site diagram showing location of services on adjacent roadways and on larger site, as well as improvements on the adjacent City land such as sports fields, irrigation, drainage, grading, trees etc*) to help community better understand the site.
      - As well the City will explain the resiting principles and the updated engagement process prior to a community discussing if they wish to consider a resiting request.

## 2. Re-Siting – General Discussion and Questions

- Re-Siting Location – When talking about re-siting, are we talking about where on the building pocket, or on another completely different site? And if it's at another completely different location, isn't the City going to just say that that site doesn't have services i.e. "we can't move it because of what's 'not in the ground', so, it has to stay at the original site – are we just 'spinning our wheels'?"
  - Answer – all sites are considered on their overall merit, but information on readiness and availability of services

- will inform discussion.
- Comment – one of the EFCL’s concerns when commenting on the process was the need for the City to identify viable siting and re-siting options.
    - Response – City will first provide general information about the building site to the community, and will explain the resiting principles & the updated engagement process to help community better understand the site.
  - Comment – what’s the purpose of the work to identify service/s locations?
    - Response – site information (e.g. grading, servicing, drainage, soils, etc.) has an impact on the possibility of a re-siting occurring.
  - Comment – I understand the services are only to the curb. We take it on faith that the ‘limiting factors’ of services are located where the City says they are
    - Response – the City will provide diagrams of the services as part of the re-siting discussions that are appropriate for general public to review.
- o Would the City consider doing an on-site evaluation of property values?
- Answer – City will talk with the Property Assessment staff and Builder to determine how to address this property value concern.
  - Comment – in Blue Quill, all the houses facing the development are worth \$600k-800k , as opposed to \$250 thousand for the First Place townhomes.
    - Response - existing single family homes adjacent to the site are worth more as they have features townhomes do not. e.g. large yards, bigger garages and larger home square footage. The difference in price is based on these features rather than the quality of construction.

Comment – not so much about neighbourhood change, but what about the new building/s blocking views of the green space?

- Response – The community design engagement process allows community input into building orientation, massing and location on site, as well as landscaping and supports a discussion to address these concerns.
- Comment – some discussion of re-siting Seniors site to be adjacent to First Place site to make more effective land use.
  - Response – resiting process creates opportunity

for community to raise this issue for City/Builder consideration.

**3. Consultation Process** – general concern about who would be consulted and how the participants' recommendations would be incorporated into the decision-making process i.e. would the Community League executives be considered the sole representatives of the community?

- o Answer – No, all members of the neighbourhood and community would be engaged.
- o Comment – would the Community League executive be expected to conduct any public meetings?
  - Answer – No, public meetings would be arranged by City.
- o Question – what about sites scheduled for next year? What is the implementation process?
  - Answer – Process has changed and still a work in process, but building in more time for more engagement in the process will require adjustments to 2014 sites. The City will work to a fair and reasonable process, and will contact individual leagues where changes in implementation may occur.
- General Question – What about staff changes at the City and a potential disruption in the consistency of implementing the Program?
  - o Answer – staff changes are typical of any large organization and continuity is something that senior management addresses as part of their responsibilities.
- Traffic Flow - Question – Will the new developments disrupt and increase traffic flow to an unacceptable level?
  - o Answer – have discussed with Transportation and they indicate that the existing roads have capacity for planned schools, and that townhomes will generate less traffic than a school/s. Will have additional input from Transportation regarding crosswalks and bus stops through the subdivision circulation process. The information will be available to the entire community.

#### 2014 plans

- At our previous meeting we had hoped to begin community engagement on five sites in 2014.
- Time and resources required to complete community engagements is significant and City can only manage three community engagements each year.
- Also, several issues have arisen that were not foreseen
- This has resulted in a need to revise the planned community engagement for 2014, which must be aligned with the current market conditions in different parts of Edmonton.
- The City and Builders will be:
  - o approaching communities to discuss changes to the 2014

- community engagements and
- Will share these changes with the liaison group once these discussions have occurred.

### **Provincial Exemptions -**

- Comment – concerned the Provincial exemption allows homes to be constructed on adjacent city and school board land, etc.
  - Answer – Administration has consulted Provincial Ministry staff to discuss concern and determined if changes to the exemption may be possible. Discussion explored City approaching Province with ‘batches’ of sites to be removed from exemption every two to three years once developed complete.
  - Additional Comment – in a previous meeting, Walter said that the letter has already gone to the Province. Who do we believe?
    - Answer – The letter hasn’t been sent and Tim will talk to Law for clarification of protocol of the letter going from the Mayor to the Minister.
- Comment – concerned that re-zoning has been inconsistent, and therefore need park redevelopment and a park redevelopment plan.
  - Answer - Administration is developing new buildings on former school building sites and works to prevent or mitigate any impact on adjacent open space. All First Place sites were rezoned in 2006. Sites that were previously zoned AG & AGU have created some problems for leagues working to develop facilities. City has worked to resolve this by determining the First Place building site configuration/location and rezoned adjacent City land in some instances.
- Comment – why not return CS1 to AP?
  - Answer – City has previously agreed to re-apply reserve designations that existed previously and rezone adjacent City and school board land to appropriate land use zone after development complete. This has occurred on pilot sites and is occurring once development is complete on other sites.
- **Conclusion**
  - Meeting Schedule and Frequency – will schedule for an annual meeting next fall, however, will consult on as-needed-basis for twice/year.
  - City will schedule meeting of liaison group and new engagement consultant as soon as RFP concluded.

## Program Consultation Process

	Year 1	Pre- Consultation Phase	Consultation Phase: C/L Meeting, Public Meeting and Three Design Engagement Meeting			Construction/Sales Phase
		Soil Test and Resiting Discussion	Introduction to Community League	Public Meeting	Design Engagement process with residents (3 meetings)	Construction and sales
<b>Audience</b>		Community League	C/L executive	Community Meeting	Residents	
<b>Presenter/Leader</b>		City	City	City	City/Builder	Builder
<b>Meeting Objective</b>		To share soil test result and discuss interest in resiting	Year 2 Explain existing approvals, outline the opportunity for input, share implementation steps, share criteria to select residents to work with builders, respond to questions and discuss, Plan a date for wider public meeting before design consultation begins	explain approved program, implementation to public and determine 6-8 residents to work on design consultation	Engage community representative to obtain general agreement on a preferred site layout for new homes, review site layout option, input in home design, develop general agreement, and finalize design	Year 3 and Year 4 Development permit approved. New home construction starts followed by sales
<b>Agenda Items</b>		soil test result followed by discussion on resiting	Program approvals & overview, consultation process & objectives, selection of 6-8 residents to work with builders, implementation process	existing approvals, opportunity for input, implementation steps, resident selection in design process	Seek input on the layout, finalize layout, finalize design of new homes	
<b>Meeting length</b>		TBD	1 hour	1 hour	2- 3 hours	
<b>Meeting location</b>		C/L building or neighbourhood school	C/L building or neighbourhood school	TBD	TBD	N/A