

Strathcona Junction Project Advisory Committee Meeting #6 Summary

Date/Time:	Monday, January 17, 2011 / 2:00 p.m.	
Place:	EFCL Office - 7103 – 105 St. NW, Edmonton, AB	
Attendees:	Diane Dunn	Community Services, City of Edmonton
	Erik Backstrom	Senior Planner, City of Edmonton
	Graham Beck	Principal Planner, City of Edmonton
	Georgina Lawrence	Allendale Community League
	Henry Maisonneuve	Old Strathcona Foundation
	Micheal S. Guirguis	Queen Alexandra Community League
	Rob McDonald	Strathcona Community League
	Chad Griffiths	South Edmonton Business Association
	Don McFarlane	CESSCO
	Larry Dahl	Russel Metals
Absentees:	Shirley Lowe	Old Strathcona Business Association
	Wilf Brooks	United Cycle
	Berni Fuchs	Ritchie Community League
	Dan Lewis	AB Plywood Ltd.
	Jack Menduk	NAIT
	Jim Dallin	JDL Realty & Development Ltd
	Rick Poznikoff	CPR
Distribution:	Committee - ALL	

Introductions:

- New Advisory Committee member: Chad Griffiths is representing the South Edmonton Business Association and is replacing John Clarke
- Regrets: Rick Poznikoff was not able to make it due to the weather impacting air connections to Kamloops

Subject: Draft Strathcona Junction ARP – v17, January 10, 2011

- Erik Backstrom passed out copies of the Draft Strathcona Junction ARP, dated January 10, 2010
- Erik Backstrom provided an overview of the changes to the Plan since the last May 10, 2010 meeting.

Plan Area

- p. 2, boundary of the Plan has expanded to include area north of University Avenue, between the west side of 104 Street and Gateway Boulevard and north to 79 Avenue (and south of the existing Whyte Avenue Commercial Overlay)
- this area was previously included in the proposed Strathcona ARP amendment. Now proposed Strathcona ARP Amendment essentially leaves Strathcona ARP boundary intact.

- p. 16, Map 6 Development Concept. Within the Business Area, future extensions of the Avenues, to connect 104 Street with Gateway Boulevard, have been added.

Purpose of Plan:

- The plan is to facilitate change from the larger, industrial-sized lots, particularly along Gateway Boulevard, to smaller lots on smaller blocks, with a mix of more urban style compatible commercial, business, light industrial and mixed-use development.

- Rob McDonald: noted that the Southwest City Public Works Yard has been changed to “Business Area”.

Map 7: Transportation Concept

- Erik Backstrom p. 17, Map 7: Transportation Concept. Proposed pedestrian crossings have been added along 104 Street, Gateway Boulevard and 99 Street.

- Contra-Flow Lane, along 104 Street, north of University Avenue. Proposal is to review the function of the contra flow lane, which could include the possibility of two-way traffic north of University Avenue.

- Note is “Review Contra-Flow Lane.” This will include the option of introducing two-way traffic north of University Avenue. Transportation may be open to keeping this option open – we are awaiting confirmation.

- Future Passenger Rail: East side of Gateway Boulevard, noted as “Future Passenger Rail” to allow for future high speed rail link between Edmonton and Calgary in the future, within the CP right-of-way.

Map 5: Building Footprints (Possible Future)

- p. 12, Map 5: Possible Future Building Footprints. Possible future buildings, consistent with the proposed ARP, have been added within the Plan area. Such a concept was requested by the Edmonton Design Committee.

Residential Uses

- Micheal Guirguis: seems that residential uses are gone.

- Erik Backstrom: Direct Control Zone (Draft). There are residential uses between 104 Street and Gateway Boulevard only. However, these are mixed uses.
- Graham Beck: It includes Apartments Housing above commercial, only within Area 1. Other residential-related uses, including Apartment Hotels, Live Work and Motels are also allowed, only within Areas 1 and 2.
- Erik Backstrom: explained that initially, more housing was envisioned, as there was an option for the LRT line to go south down 104 Street corridor. However, this area is no longer a candidate for residential development. The focus of the transitional area, therefore is from industrial to commercial and not so much residential.
- Micheal Guirguis: Within the general area, there are not enough options for people to buy housing. What there is available, e.g. Allendale, is very expensive, for instance could be \$600K for 3 bedrooms, 2 bathrooms.
- Rob McDonald: Price differential for lots is so great that it encourages people to buy in the suburbs. It could be \$300K for a lot in mature areas, with a comparable lot in the suburbs going for \$100K.
- Micheal Guirguis: prefers to look at residential options for more than Area 1.
- Erik Backstrom: residential development could eventually come if the rail operation ceases, but priority in the meantime is to concentrate on urban form. Carving up the large, industrially-sized lots (into smaller commercial parcels) is the first challenge.
- Discussion: some of the members would prefer to have more residential opportunities within the Plan.
- Erik Backstrom: we need to be realistic about the market. Some areas do transition successfully from industrial to residential. For instance, Yale Town in Vancouver.
 - Portland, Oregon has a pedestrian district in an old industrial area.
 - However, there are a lot of areas already targeted for residential development in the central areas of the City, for instance the Quarters.
 - Have to rationalize where residential is encouraged.
- Rob McDonald: other areas include Fort Road.
 - Cheap land is the first pick for a realtor.

- Erik Backstrom: Whyte Avenue allows mixed residential and apartments above, i.e. in CB2 Zone. However, even within that area there is not that much residential.
- Rob McDonald: Cost is the main issue preventing more housing development (i.e. Whyte Avenue).
- Micheal Guirguis: why not put housing on the east side of the lane (DC1 allows housing only on the west side of the Lane)
- Erik Backstrom: there is the rail yard and more existing industrial development to the east,; it becomes an issue of risk assessment.
- Georgina Lawrence: in ARP, there is a photo of a lane with housing next to it – p. 20
- Discussion: would it be possible to at least emphasize more the residential opportunities within the Plan Area, i.e. Area 1?
- Erik Backstrom: will look at possible wording changes
 - *(Note: see additional clause, change in the ARP since the meeting, under 3.1.8 where Apartment Housing on upper floors is “encouraged” in Area 1).*

Map 7: Transportation Concept: avenue and lane extensions

- Micheal: Between 68 and 71 Avenues, how will the City prevent land from being developed within the future road right-of-ways.
- Erik Backstrom: p. 18 3.1.2 requirement for dedication of road right-of-way is a condition of subdivision
 - City will pursue opportunities to acquire areas designated as future roads where there is no subdivision.
 - However, Plan and the accompanying DC1 would allow private roadway extensions of the avenues (without the need for City to purchase them outright).
 - 3.1.4 policy calls for areas proposed for future roadways to be developed to resemble public roads when they are retained as private roadways, and utilities to support future intensification should be installed where possible.
 - Note: accompanying DC1 Provision prohibits the building of permanent structures within the areas designated as future avenues (as shown in Appendix 2 in DC1).

Large site development regulations

- Erik Backstrom: parcels along the west side of Gateway Boulevard, between 68-71 Avenue there is interest in this large site north of Home Depot as a big box retail site.
 - Regulations have been added to address large format retail, i.e. parking and connections, requirement to build to street, etc.
- Micheal Guirguis: in other cities there are two-storey big box developments.
 - parking lots – could be large lot parking lot next door
- Erik Backstrom: there will be redevelopment potential on any accessory parking lots that would service a future big box store that could be redeveloped with commercial built to the street (there would be some additional retail establishments developed to the street within the parking area block(s)).
- Micheal Guirguis: we could wait 60 years for such infill redevelopment

Transit

- Micheal Guirguis: What does the Plan do to encourage transit?
- Erik Backstrom: p. 22 addresses future transit improvements generally:
 - i.e. 3.1.36, transit service should be consisted for 104 Street and Gateway Blvd. as the area urbanizes and densifies.
 - p. 20, 3.1.30 – addition of pedestrian crossings.

99 Street – Sidewalks and pedestrian crossings

- Georgina Lawrence: Is there a sidewalk on the west side of 99 Street?
- Henry Maisonneuve: north of 76 Avenue there is a sidewalk on west side.
- Discussion: along parts of 99 Street, there are missing sidewalks
- Erik Backstrom: p. 24, sidewalks statements 3.2.11 Road designs should include: (a) sidewalks on both sides of roads.
- Rob McDonald: asked about sidewalk strategies.
 - Robert Wasnea in Transportation – should ask him about potential funds in the Sidewalks Strategy (fund for missing sidewalks) for 99 Street.
- Don McFarlane – Cessco: proposed pedestrian crossing on Map 7 Transportation Concept there is one shown at 74 Avenue and 99 Street.
 - 73 Avenue at 99 Street is preference.
 - 74 Avenue is used by large trucks and would present more pedestrian-vehicle conflict.
 - Bus stop location – going north bound is 1 block south at 73 Avenue

- *Note: Draft ASP has been changed in following draft after the meeting to show proposed crossing at 73 Avenue and 99 Street.*

Review of Plans

- Rob McDonald: plans never tend to get reviewed unless a developer wants a change.
 - should require 3-5 year review period
 - in the past it has been up to the community to manage it (review of plans).

CP Lands – change of use and remediation required

- Discussion: remediation of industrial land would likely only occur if CP moves its yard, and then incumbent on the next owner to pay costs of remediation.
 - remediation tends not to occur, simply due to clean-up costs.
- Don McFarlane: agrees that land tends never to sell because of remediation costs
 - cannot write an absolution of responsibility for clean-up of a property for sale in the sales agreement that would hold up in court.

Timing for the Strathcona Junction Area Redevelopment Plan

- Strathcona Junction Plan and accompanying DC1 goes to Edmonton Design Committee January 25th
- March 14, 2011 is target Public Hearing date
other plans: Strathcona ARP amendments also
- This is the last planned meeting with the Advisory Committee meeting prior to the Strathcona Junction ARP, amendments to the Strathcona ARP, DC1 Bylaws and amendments to the Calgary Trail Land Use Study are to be brought forward to Public Hearing.

Next steps:

→ We will forward updates of the DRAFT plans to the Committee

→ Committee would like to see EDC comments from the January 25, 2011 meeting as well.

Note: EDC accepted changes put in the current draft ARP at the January 25, 2011 meeting.