

WHAT WE HEARD REPORT

Rezoning Engage Edmonton Feedback Summary

LDA18-0690 - King Edward Park/Mill Creek Ravine South

PROJECT ADDRESS: 8120 - 93 Avenue NW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The application proposes to rezone a portion of the property from the [\(A\) Metropolitan Recreation Zone](#) to the [\(PU\) Public Utility Zone](#) to accommodate the existing drainage facility, and to rezone a separate portion of the property from [\(A\) Metropolitan Recreation Zone](#) to [\(RA7\) Low Rise Apartment Zone](#) to enable the development of a low-rise apartment building. If approved, the proposed RA7 rezoning would allow for the opportunity for a 16-metre high (approximately 4-storey) apartment building with limited commercial opportunities, such as child care services, general retail stores and specialty food services, at ground level. Although the RA7 zone allows for a range of uses, this particular project will be limited to residential uses only (apartment housing) within the RA7 portion. It is the applicant's intent is to develop a 4-storey residential building with 30 dwellings for supportive housing.

An associated application has been made to amend the North Saskatchewan River Valley Area Redevelopment Plan to remove the subject areas from the plan boundary.

PROJECT WEBSITE: www.edmonton.ca/residential_neighbourhoods/neighbourhoods/king-edward-park-planning-applications.aspx

ENGAGEMENT FORMAT: Online Engagement Webpage - Engagement Edmonton
<https://engaged.edmonton.ca/lda18-0690kingedpkrezoning>

ENGAGEMENT DATES: August 26 - September 22, 2020

NUMBER OF VISITORS:

- Aware: 50
- Informed: 19
- Engaged: 13

*See "Web Page Visitor Definitions" at the end of this report for explanations of the above categories.

Planning Coordination
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES



TYPE OF ENGAGEMENT	DATE	RESPONSES/ RECIPIENTS
Initial Advance Notice from the City (Rezoning)	January 16, 2019	Recipients: 380 Responses with concerns: 2
King Edward Park Planning Applications Webpage	January 3, 2019	N/A
Sign Posted on Site	February 7, 2019	N/A
Second Advance Notice from the City (Rezoning)	July 28, 2020	Recipients: 382 Responses with concerns: 5 Responses for information only: 2
Advance Notice from the City (Online Engage Edmonton)	August 26, 2020	Recipients: 701
Public Engagement, City Hosted Event (online format)	August 26, 2020 - September 22, 2020	Responses in support: 5 Responses with concerns: 10 Responses in neutral position: 1

ABOUT THIS REPORT

Information in this report includes responses to the advanced notices and feedback gathered through the Engaged Edmonton platform between August 26, 2020 - September 22, 2020. This report will be shared with those who emailed the file planner, and/or provided an email address on the Engaged Edmonton website, as well as with the applicant and the Ward Councillor.

Input from Edmontonians will be used to inform conversations with the applicant about potential revisions to the proposal to address concerns or opportunities raised. Feedback will also be summarized in the report to City Council if/when the proposed rezoning advances to a future City Council Public Hearing for a decision.

ENGAGEMENT FORMAT

The engagement session was an online format where attendees were able to view a website with project, planning process, and contact information. Participants were encouraged to ask questions of City Staff and the applicant - in an online "Share Your Thoughts" & "Ask Your Questions" - format.

The comments are summarized by the main themes below with the number of times a similar comment was made by participants recorded in brackets following that comment. The questions asked and their answers are also included in this report.

WHAT WE HEARD

Support: 5

Opposed: 17

Neutral: 1

COMMENTS

Impacts to parkland

- Parkland should be protected and stay (A) zoning (x4)
- The loss of parkland cannot be offset by any benefits gained from the proposed rezoning (x2)
- The site, a non-naturalized, vacant, and underutilized parcel was never a park to begin with; the proposed rezoning and plan amendment are supported (x2)

Site/building Design

- 4 Storeys is too much for this neighbourhood (x3).
- The proposed building should not be taller than the buildings across the Avenue (2-6 storeys).
- Consideration should be given to incorporate some of the intentions of the new City Plan:
 - allowing a pedestrian path to access the Mill Creek pathways
 - bikeways,
 - Local businesses such as a daycare or cafe
 - outdoor urban space,
 - winter shelter, bus stop, rest spot, to engage neighbors and commuters.

Parking

- Parking impact concerns due to businesses across 93 Street such as overflow parking towards the areas of the site. Additional parking needs will heighten this issue. (x3)
- Surrounding parking issues could be alleviated if additional parking is provided on site.
- Parking supply should be minimized but not so much as to overly impact adjacent neighbours.
- Parking should be accessed through the rear alley to encourage transit use.

Use:

- I support supportive housing in the form of multi-unit housing and this project. (x6)
- The project should have some form of retail/commercial use on the main floor facing Whyte Avenue (x2)

- This site should contain a building for use by ALL community members such as a library or community league, community garden for all to enjoy the ravine views and access. (x3)

Location:

- This is a great location for supportive housing (x2)
- Poor location being beside Mill Creek Ravine
- Poor location across 82 Avenue from Youth Empowerment & Support Services (YESS) (x3).

Operations:

- There are various supportive housing models, and communities should be informed of what the specific housing model entails.

Construction:

- Concerned that King Edward Park has to take on another city project with associated construction impacts.

Process, Notification, Transparency:

- It seems like this has been pre-determined by the city and community feedback is just a formality. (x4)
- The notification also came after the sale of the land had been approved, thereby reaffirming the belief a decision has already been made by the city to move forward with this project.
- This process has been flawed and there has been no transparency with neighbourhood residents.
- Found it deplorable that for a project of this magnitude and profile that there wasn't greater effort in contacting a larger portion of those in the affected area instead of limiting postcard notification to those within 60 metres of the development.
- Disappointed in the lack of due process by city management prior to the approaching city council, and in particular, with community engagement.

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

Rezoning/Statutory Plan Questions & Answers

Note: Zoning regulates what types of buildings are allowed on a site (eg. residential or commercial) and the basic size and shape of those buildings. It does not control who can live or work in the buildings or whether the property is rented or owned. The City's Development Services Branch reviews the rezoning application based on:

- *Approved policies, plans and guidelines;*
- *Planning analysis (how the proposed zone fits into the neighbourhood);*
- *Technical information (traffic impacts, water and sewer capacity, etc.); and*
- *Public input (feedback from the public will be summarized in the final report to Council).*

The City of Edmonton's Affordable Housing and Homelessness section accepted feedback separately on the building design and a good neighbour agreement. For more information, please visit edmonton.ca/kingedwardparksupportivehousing

1. Why are letters only submitted to houses within 200 metres of the project? Why not letters to the whole community if the whole community will be impacted? In the case of Capilano and King Edward Park locations, this barely goes out to anyone considering the surrounding parks, the businesses and Mill Creek Ravine?
 - Letters were sent to homeowners and renters within 60 metres from the titled property and 200 metres from the site itself; more than three times what is required under the Edmonton Zoning Bylaw for land development applications notices. In King Edward Park and Terrace Heights, 701 and 806 notifications were sent, respectively. Information about the proposed development was shared beyond adjacent residents through site signage, social media ads, the City's weekly engagement public service announcement, outreach to Community Leagues and local media coverage.
2. What about the fact that this plan proposes that the land needs to be rezoned and removed from the ARP (Bylaw 7188)? Isn't this Bylaw meant to protect valuable and vulnerable river and ravine land and why isn't this being talked about?
 - The project site in King Edward Park is proposed to be a low-rise apartment zone on a vacant unnaturalized portion and the adjacent area (between the development site and the Mill Creek Ravine) is proposed to be a public utility lot for the existing drainage facility. The Plan will otherwise remain in effect and the amendment will not alter how it applies to the river valley and ravine system that it covers.
3. In a previous question, from JTD, he asked, "What are the thresholds in regards to community approval? a simple majority for or against deciding if the project goes through? It sounds like from the FAQ's section that the development is set in stone. The community engagement portion of the conditions is more or less just to help the service provider give guidance on how they develop plans. is this correct and if not could you clarify? JTD asked 16 days ago. Twice I've asked the same question for clarification and three times, once to JTD and twice to me, I feel you have evaded the question with a vague answer. Please don't tell me about the process. I understand the process. So I will ask again in a different

way... Is this a case of the City nodding its head saying community engagement is important, but in reality, it isn't... the project will go ahead anyway, even if there's a majority- 50%, 75%, even 100% opposition from the community at the stage of "the completion of this engagement process and rezoning approvals." What is the reality of the community possibly "killing" the project?

- Ultimately, City Council is responsible for making the final decision on the proposed rezoning and plan amendment. Community feedback will be summarized in a What We Heard Report and shared with City Council to ensure it is aware of the views of surrounding residents before making a decision.
- While all feedback will be considered, there are no thresholds for community support deciding the outcome of a proposed rezoning or plan amendment. If Council approves the rezoning and plan amendment, the input collected during the public engagement process will be shared with Homeward Trust to consider as they finalize building designs and with the operator to help them create a final Good Neighbour Plan.

4. Why was the sign advertising the project hidden/placed behind the construction equipment so it wasn't visible to the public? What communities do those advocating (specifically the panelists) reside in? Why would a facility like this be placed in by the ravine where there is already a huge issue with transients, crime and no security? Statistics show both in the US and Canada that community housing does put the community at a higher risk as well as will decrease of property values.

- The sign was placed on the corner of 82 Avenue and 93 Street. If someone has moved the sign from its original location, we will look into this and ensure it remains visible to the public.
- The live stream question and answer session was an opportunity to answer specific questions that residents submitted throughout the engagement process and wanted answers to; it was not an advocacy session.
- The location was selected because it is a vacant, City-owned parcel that is ready for development, well integrated with the surrounding land uses and built form, and close to amenities for residents, including transit. Rather than a walk-in, temporary shelter, the proposed supportive housing would operate more like an apartment building. We have confirmed the site's proximity to the ravine is not considered a barrier to the project's successful operation.
- We have no evidence to suggest that supportive housing increases crime. Inspector Dan Jones of the Edmonton Police Service addressed this issue in our September 1 info session. You can watch the discussion on this topic here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DRle8yigWf0&feature=youtu.be>

- There is no conclusive evidence to suggest non-market housing, including supportive housing, negatively affects surrounding property values. For more information, you can watch the discussion on this topic here:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NlkvH3QtX8U>
5. When is council scheduled to vote on the rezoning? Will this be made public? Will it be posted on any of these websites? Will I receive an email on the date if I have signed up for further communication on this project's website?
- The target date for City Council Public Hearing and decision by City Council is December 8, 2020.
 - The Administration Report including a summary of the engagement process and feedback received will be posted on the Council Public Hearing agenda
https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/council-committee-meetings.aspx
 - We also send out a notice of public hearing to interested residents through our mailing list. To add your name to the mailing list you can contact the file planner at marty.vasquez@edmonton.ca.
6. Will the "What We Heard" report that will be presented to council, be available to the public to read prior to the council's meeting on the rezoning?
- The target date for City Council Public Hearing and decision by City Council is December 8, 2020.
 - The Administration Report will include a summary of the engagement process and feedback received and will be posted a couple weeks before the hearing on the Council Public Hearing agenda
https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/council-committee-meetings.aspx
 - We also send out a notice of public hearing to interested residents through our mailing list. To add your name to the mailing list you can contact the file planner at marty.vasquez@edmonton.ca.
7. You did not answer my question about the amendments required to bypass bylaw 7188. You said there would be an amendment and that it only applies to public utilities. You didn't say what the amendment would be or why it is needed. Bylaw 7188 sets out specific protocols that need to be followed to do any changes to land near the ravine. It sounds like you are just trying to avoid the proper protocols (that are in place for a reason) to save time and money doing proper assessments. Why does it need to be amended? What are the amendments? What exactly is putting public utilities in going to do to the land. Are the bulldozing the trees that are already there?

- This rezoning application proposes to rezone a 0.32 ha portion of the Millcreek Ravine South from the existing (A) Metropolitan Recreation Zone to (PU) Public Utility Zone and (RA7) Low Rise Apartment Zone.
- There is an existing EPCOR Drainage facility located on a 0.09 ha portion between the proposed 0.23 ha (RA7) Low Rise Apartment Zone portion and the top of ravine bank. This 0.09 ha sub-portion is proposed to be redesignated to (PU) Public Utility Zone as the more appropriate zoning for the existing use on this piece of land. At this time, there are no plans to modify the existing public utilities portion including any impacts to the existing vegetation within this area.
- The associated amendment to the North Saskatchewan River Valley Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) (Bylaw 7188) is proposed to better align with the proposed rezoning to the (PU) and (RA7) designations. This is to allow for the continuation of the existing drainage facility and removes this area, and the developable 0.23 ha upland portions at the corner of 93 Street and 82 Avenue from the ARP boundaries. Overall, the boundary amendment extracts the subject 0.32 ha lands but allows for continued opportunity for the protection of the Mill Creek Ravine South and for active/and passive recreational space within the ravine area.

Supportive Housing Questions & Answers

***Note:** Answers to the following questions about the building design and site operations were provided by the City of Edmonton's Affordable Housing and Homelessness Section. For additional public feedback on the King Edward Park site, including the Good Neighbour Plan and building design, please access the King Edward Park Supportive Housing site and their What We Heard Report at: edmonton.ca/kingedwardparksupportivehousing*

1. As well, you state that Homeward Trust will select operators for each site through an open Request for Proposals (RFP) process. Shouldn't the RFP be prepared in conjunction with all the stakeholders including the community to ensure that the facility is operated with a delivery model and accredited staff that is acceptable to all stakeholders?
 - Homeward Trust will select an Operator through a rigorous, competitive process. Operators are required to follow standards that are common across all supportive housing developments to ensure they are run effectively, safely and securely using evidence-based approaches. This includes abiding by legislative requirements, Homeward Trust's policies and standards, and the description of how they provide support and services are approved as part of their contract.
 - The delivery model for supportive housing is grounded in the belief that everyone has a right to safe, stable housing. Supportive housing removes barriers to accessing housing and ensures residents have the necessary support in place for

them to remain housed. Supportive housing is also operated with the belief that people can grow, recover and evolve.

- Staff who operate and provide services through supportive housing are skilled and well-trained and may include medical professionals, social workers and support staff that help with tasks like grocery shopping and accessing transportation. Employees must have the required qualifications for their positions or are trained to the level of competency required, and they must actively demonstrate the necessary competencies on an ongoing basis.
- If a community member has a concern about the operations of a site, they will be able to access the community contact who will be outlined in the Good Neighbour Plan. The community contact will work with the individual to reach a resolution. If resolution is not possible through the Operator, the community member can access Homeward Trust's issue resolution process.

2. You state in your FAQs that, "there is no conclusive evidence to suggest non-market housing, including supportive housing, negatively affects surrounding property values". If that is the case, would the City of Edmonton be prepared to reimburse property owners if their property values were adversely affected?

- Thank you for your question. Studies have consistently found that if non-market housing is well-designed, fits in with the surrounding neighbourhood, and is well managed, property values of neighbouring homes are not negatively affected.

There are many other factors that influence residential real estate values. Assessments and sale values are primarily driven by local and global economic factors, rather than the introduction of new non-market housing in the community

Web Page Visitor Definitions

Aware

An aware visitor, or a visitor that we consider to be 'aware', has made one single visit to the page, but not clicked any further than the main page.

Informed

An informed visitor has taken the 'next step' from being aware and clicking on something. We now consider the visitor to be informed about the project. This is done because a click suggests interest in the project.

Engaged

Every visitor that contributes on the page, either by asking questions or leaving a comment, is considered to be 'engaged'.

Engaged and informed are subsets of aware. That means that every engaged visitor is also always informed AND aware. In other words, a visitor cannot be engaged without also being informed AND aware. At the same time, an informed visitor is also always aware.

FUTURE STEPS:

- When the applicant is ready to take the application to Council:
 - Notice of Public Hearing date will be sent to surrounding property owners
 - Once the Council Public Hearing Agenda is posted online, you may register to speak at Council by completing the form at edmonton.ca/meetings or calling the Office of the City Clerk at 780-496-8178.
 - You may listen to the Public hearing on-line via edmonton.ca/meetings.
 - You can submit written comments to the City Clerk (city.clerk@edmonton.ca) or contact the Ward Councillor, Mike Nickel directly (mike.nickel@edmonton.ca).
-

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS APPLICATION, PLEASE CONTACT:

Name: Marty Vasquez

Email: marty.vasquez@edmonton.ca

Phone: 780-495-1948