

Date: 3 July 2018 LDA **File No.:** LDA18-0184

To: Brian Murray, B&A Planning

From: Sean Lee, Planning Coordination - City Planning

Application Type: Rezoning

Address:

- 1 - Bonnie Doon Shopping Centre NW
- 8420 - 85 Street NW
- 8715 - 85 Street NW

Neighbourhood: Bonnie Doon

#	ADMINISTRATION COMMENTS	APPLICANT RESPONSE	STATUS
	REZONING APPLICATION		
1.	Figure 9: Proposed Plan Area Districts: Are distinct parameters/regulations to be used to define/discern these districts?	Yes, Figure 9 depicts the districts at a conceptual level. The (DC2) Site Specific Development Control regulates the height of each sub-area in regulation and differs slightly from Figure 9.	Complete
1.	Figure 11: Mobility Network: As discussed in the Working Group, please provide fully protected configuration options for on-site bicycle lanes. Preferred would be to stack Travel Lane> Parking Lane> Barrier> Bicycle Lane> Sidewalk, to follow hierarchy of decreasing speed/increasing vulnerability of mobility.	See Conceptual Master Site Plan contained within Submission #3. The Conceptual Master Site Plan contains separated bike lanes along 85 Street, Secondary Road Type 2, Secondary Road Type3, and the north portion of the Main Street, establishing a shared use path link to Dermott Park.	Complete
1.	Figure 12: Proposed Street Cross-Sections 1. Page 42 identifies the use of a 1:1 ratio for podium height:street section width. This is preferred and should be reflected in the Cross-Sections.	The (DC2) Site Specific Development Control indicates a varying height to a maximum of 22.0 metres. Through a series of internal design exercises including angular planes, sun-shadow, wind and snow analysis, and 3D massing, the project team feels comfortable that the ratio submitted balances an appropriate human-scale environment, access to sunlight, and reduces wind tunnel effects.	Complete
1.	Proposed Public Realm Details on hierarchy of spaces, typology of spaces, and subsequent appropriate improvements/development of spaces according to function should be provided.	Please see Figure 15: Conceptual Landscape Plan which highlights the potential amenities that may be provided within the Plan Area. The Urban Design section of the (DC2) Site Specific Development Control defines each space and describes the overall intent.	Complete
	Proposed DC2 Provision shell: General		
1.	Site staging: a Staging Plan is required as part of the DC2 Provision.	The (DC2) Site Specific Development Control includes a regulation stating that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A master phasing schedule will be submitted with each development permit and shall indicate the anticipated FAR and dwelling density of each phase of development. 	Complete

	<p>a. This is necessary to ensure orderly development of the site which takes advantage of significant City infrastructure which services the site, namely the Bonnie Doon LRT stop on the Valley Line LRT.</p> <p>b. The first stage should be adjacent or proximate to the Bonnie Doon LRT stop. Subsequent stages should advance from the area of the LRT stop outwards towards the north and west of the site.</p> <p>c. Details for interim connectivity in and through the site should be addressed, ensuring that pedestrian, cyclist, and vehicular access can be safely provided as development commences at various stages.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Included in the regulations is a requirement to illustrate interim connectivity in and through the site. <p>A conceptual phasing plan has been included in the application with a priority to target the first phase of development as close as possible to the Bonnie Doon Station.</p>	
2.	<p>Heights: a Height strategy/regulation must be provided, indicating appropriate maximum Heights at different areas across the site.</p>	<p>The Conceptual Master Site Plan identifies tower locations and heights, while the DC2 regulates maximum height between 28.0 m and 126.0 m and a maximum site FAR of 3.5. Varying regulations accommodate lower maximum heights along 85 Street while providing a higher intensity of development in close proximity to LRT.</p>	Complete
3.	<p>Sub-Areas: break down the site in to sub-areas, which could align with Staging; need to be able to assign manageable sets of regulations per heights, FAR, etc. across the site.</p>	<p>The Conceptual Master Site Plan identifies tower locations and heights, while the DC2 regulates maximum height between 28.0 m and 126.0 m and a maximum site FAR of 3.5. Varying regulations accommodate lower maximum heights along 85 Street while providing a higher intensity of development in close proximity to LRT.</p> <p>See DC2 Appendix 1 for a breakdown of Sub-Areas.</p>	Complete
	<p>Proposed DC2 Provision shell Section 3: Uses</p>		
1.	<p>The following Uses are not supportive of Transit-Oriented Development and will not be supported by City Planning on this site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drive-in Food Service Gas Bars 	<p>Agree that auto oriented uses are counter to TOD and pedestrian oriented activities.</p>	Complete

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapid Drive-through Vehicle Services • Warehouse Sales <p>Per the MGA, existing Uses may continue as legal non-conforming after the passage of a bylaw for a new zone on the site which does not include those Uses, so long as they do not lapse for a period of 6 months or longer.</p>	Warehouse Sales has been retained so as not to preclude a hardware store with a warehouse component from being permitted on the site. Public engagement has identified a community need within this use class.	
2.	Given the proximity to existing residential areas, Major Digital Signs will not be supported on the site.	This use has been retained in the DC2. We have included a regulation stating: “Illuminated signs shall be designed, located or screened so as to reduce visual and light impacts on adjacent off-site residential units,” while requiring a “Comprehensive Sign Design Plan” at the Development Permit Stage.	Complete
	Proposed DC2 Provision shell Section 5: Regulations		
	b. Building Heights, FAR and Setback		
1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • i. The minimum Floor Area Ratio for the site shall be 1.0. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Specify that sub-areas/stages shall each have a minimum FAR of 1.0. ○ Specify minimum Heights (for example, “in general accordance with Appendices...) 	DC2 regulates maximum height between 28.0 m and 126.0 m and a maximum and minimum site FAR of 3.5 and 1.0 respectively. See DC2 Appendix 1 for a breakdown of Sub-Areas.	Complete
2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ii. The maximum Height for the portion of the site east of 85 Street NW shall not exceed 162 m. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A general assessment of the site against the Residential Infill Guidelines suggests that 162 m on the east site (main mall site) is excessive. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the low-density neighbourhood to the west, to the approximate locations of proposed maximum heights near 83 Street is about 135 m; on a 35-degree plane, this suggests a max height of 95 m. • From the mid-rise property lines to the east along 83 Street to the east site property line is approximately 50 m; drawn from east site boundary in to the low density residential to the east, is around 125 	The Conceptual Master Site Plan conceptually identifies tower locations and heights, while the DC2 regulates maximum height between 28.0 m and 126.0 m and a maximum site FAR of 3.5. Varying regulations accommodate lower maximum heights along 85 Street while providing a higher intensity of development in close proximity to LRT. See DC2 Appendix 1 for a breakdown of Sub-Areas.	Complete

	<p>m. The 45-degree plane would apply here, providing a 125 m maximum height.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Height maximum of 125 m will provide for approximately 40 storeys (assuming ~3m/storey), which would be more appropriate in this context than the proposed 162 m which provides for up to 54 storeys. 		
3.	<p>iii. The maximum Height for the portion of site west of 85 Street NW shall not exceed 24 m.</p> <p>This would be acceptable, but requires detail to provide for transition/stepbacks towards adjacent low-rise residential area.</p>	<p>The Conceptual Master Site Plan identifies tower locations and heights, while the DC2 regulates maximum height of 28.0 m for this location. To support a more gradual transition to the neighbouring community, architectural detailing, tower stepbacks, and separation distances will be utilized.</p>	Complete
b. Amenity Areas			
1.	<p>ii. Amenity Areas may be provided...</p> <p>Amenity Areas are required for the residents of this development. Regulations which meet the intent of providing for resident's needs can be proposed, or remain silent and the Zoning Bylaw rates will apply.</p>	<p>A minimum amenity requirement has been included in the DC2 provision.</p>	Complete
d. Vehicular Circulation, Parking and Servicing			
2.	<p>ii. Notwithstanding Section 53 of the Zoning Bylaw, vehicle access or egress from parking areas shall be off of a Public Roadway, Private Roadway, or a Publicly Accessible Private Open Space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need detail to ensure there is no conflict from vehicles moving through plaza space, for example. 	<p>Please see Figure 14: Conceptual Master Site Plan, within Submission #3, for all access/egress points.</p>	Complete
3.	<p>iii. Vehicular parking shall be provided as per Section 54.2 of the Zoning Bylaw, except that reduced vehicular parking requirements of the Zoning Bylaw that relate to Transit Oriented Development adjacent to an LRT stop shall apply throughout the entire Site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instead, simply specify that Parking for the site is to be provided per Section 54.2, Schedule 1(C). 	<p>The (DC2) Site Specific Development Control includes a regulation stating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicular parking shall be in accordance with Section 54.2, Schedule 1(c). Parking may be further reduced or increased with the submission of a parking study, to the satisfaction of the Development Officer. 	Complete

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specify that required parking may be further reduced with submission of a parking study, to the satisfaction of the Development Officer. Parking allowances shall not exceed Schedule 1(C); for Uses with maximums not specified in that schedule, parking provision shall not exceed the minimums provided in Schedule 1(A). 		
4.	<p>iv. Parking may be developed below grade, at grade, or above grade within parking structures wrapped with Active Uses at ground level where abutting any private or public roadway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking at grade will not be permitted unless developed behind/within a building that provides wrapped, active frontages on all sides, with allowance for the driveway access. More detail on appropriate wrapping of above grade should be provided to ensure high standard design and integration/disguising of the parking structure. Above grade parking structures without wrapped active frontages shall not be developed adjacent to a Public road. Above grade parking structures should be accompanied by regulations to ensure future-proofing/retrofit for occupiable space: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum clearance of 3 m; Level floors; Ramps positioned so as to allow for removal without interfering with developable space; Ramps designed to be removed. 	<p>These comments have been addressed within the (DC2) Site Specific Development Control which includes regulations stating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking may be developed below ground level, at ground level, or above ground level. Where above ground level, parking shall be located within Parking Structures wrapped with uses at ground level where abutting any private or public roadway or Publicly Accessible Private Park; Where parking is provided at ground level, except on street parking, the parking area shall not be adjacent to a public roadway and shall be screened, landscaped, and hard surfaced. Where parking structures are provided, the structure may be designed to be adapted to a future use, and may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum floor to ceiling clearance of 3.0 m; Have level floors; Position drive ramps to allow for removal without interfering with developable space; Drive ramps designed to be removable. 	Complete
5.	<p>vii. Bicycle parking shall be as per Section 54.3 of the Zoning Bylaw.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given observed demand for bicycle parking in comparative situations in Edmonton, a ratio of at least 50% should be used- suggest even more. 	<p>The (DC2) Site Specific Development Control Draft DC2 Shell includes a regulation stating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bicycle parking shall be as per Section 54.3 of the Zoning Bylaw. 	Complete

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulations for the location of resident/employee/visitor bicycle parking should be included, or you may have Zoning Bylaw regulations apply. 		
	d. Vehicular Circulation, Parking and Servicing		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a Wind Study ... Use 23 m as the trigger height. b Sun/Shadow Study Use 23 m as the trigger height. 	Noted – the Wind and Sun/Shadow Study, and associated regulations within DC2, have been updated to reflect a 23.0 metre trigger height	Complete
6.	Community Amenity Contributions in Direct Control Provisions - Policy C599, and Developer Sponsored Affordable Housing, Policy C582, are not substitutes. C599 is explicitly to operate in addition to C582.	Noted.	Complete
	ADVISEMENTS:		
1.	Community Amenity Contributions in Direct Control Provisions Policy C599 is scheduled for consideration at Urban Planning Committee for July 3, 2018. It is Administration’s direction that all Direct Control regulations under consideration at this time subscribe to the Policy as currently proposed. C599 is separate from affordable housing requirements under C582, and from Municipal Reserves which may be owing.	Noted. Policy C599 has been included in the DC2 but will be determined from stakeholder input as part of the engagement program that will take place in October 2018.	Complete
	<p>For this application, a simple calculation of the amount owing would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Current FAR per DC2.485 : 1.0; RA7 site: 1.4 ii. Proposed FAR: Mall site - 4.5; RA7 site - 4.5 iii. Increase in FAR: Mall site - 3.5; RA7 site - 3.1 iv. Site areas: Mall site - 120,456 m² ; RA7 site - 3,755 m² v. CAC amounts owing: Mall site - \$15,809,850; RA7 site - \$436,538 vi. CAC amount owing - Total: \$16,246,388 	<p>Noted. Policy C599 has been included in the DC2 but will be determined from stakeholder input as part of the engagement program that will take place in October 2018.</p> <p>Based on the revised FAR to 3.5. the new calculation is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Current FAR per DC2.485 : 1.0; RA7 site: 1.4 ii. Proposed FAR: Mall site - 3.5; RA7 site - 3.5 iii. Increase in FAR: Mall site - 2.5; RA7 site - 2.1 iv. Site areas: Mall site - 120,456 m² ; RA7 site - 3,755 m² v. CAC amounts owing: Mall site - \$11,292,750; RA7 site - \$295,707 vi. CAC amount owing - Total: \$11,588,457 	Complete

	<p>Current proposals from the applicant for fulfilling this requirements are understood to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Funding additional requirements above the City baseline currently budgeted for 85 Street Collector Renewal, to build to the Ultimate standard under a Complete Streets reconfiguration, expected in the year 2020; ii. Publicly-accessible open space provided on-site; iii. Family-oriented housing provided on-site. 	<p>Noted. Policy C599 has been included in the DC2 but will be determined from stakeholder input as part of the engagement program that will take place in October 2018.</p>	Complete
2.	<p>Developer Sponsored Affordable Housing Policy C582 applies to this proposal, and is not supplanted by the proposed Policy 599 above.</p>	<p>The (DC2) Site Specific Development Control Draft DC2 Shell includes a regulation stating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At each stage of the development and prior to issuance of a Development Permit, the Development Officer shall ensure that a signed agreement has been executed between the City of Edmonton and the owner, requiring the owner to provide the City of Edmonton, at the time of Development Permit approval, the option to purchase 5% of the proposed number of residential units (rounded to the nearest unit) at 85 percent of market value, or the equivalent value as cash-in-lieu (at the discretion of the Owner) to The City of Edmonton. 	Complete
3.	<p>Municipal Reserves owe as described below on part of the site. The MGA provides for the possibility of a municipality requiring additional MR at time of subdivision for increased residential density, beyond the standard 10%. This could be exercised on this site in the future.</p>	<p>The applicant does not anticipate subdivision within the Plan Area. As such, the no MR lands are contemplated within the Plan Area.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the applicant expects that approximately 17% of the Plan Area will exist in the form of Privately-Owned Publicly Accessible Spaces (POPS).</p>	Complete
4.	<p>Municipal Reserves owing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Titled parcel Plan 3849NY - including both Block 3, Lot H and Block 9, Lot 5 – on this plan there was a dedication of municipal reserve as Block 9, Lot 6R. The area of the reserve parcel is .14 ha which does not appear to be 10% of the title area. b. Titled parcel Plan 2224KS, Block 3, Lots A,B,C - the creation of these titled parcels area included land that was previously 	<p>The applicant does not anticipate subdivision within the Plan Area. As such, the no MR lands are contemplated within the Plan Area</p> <p>Nonetheless, the applicant expects that approximately 17% of the Plan Area will exist in the form of Privately-Owned Publicly Accessible Spaces (POPS).</p>	Complete

	subdivided from 1907 to 1954. A review of these plans did not find any historical dedication of municipal reserve on any of the plans. Plan 2224KS was created in 1956 and there does not appear to have been dedication of any municipal reserve, either as land, or otherwise noted in the plan endorsement, on the registered plan. It appears that municipal reserve dedication is outstanding from Plan 2224KS, Block 3, Lots A,B,C.		
5.	85 Street Collector Renewal and Improvement City Planning supports the concept for 85 Street to be reconfigured/rebuilt to a Complete Streets, ideally in the year 2020, to a standard which better reflects the neighbourhood and future site context. Certain matters of implementation will need to be resolved for inclusion in the DC2 regulation to provide certainty, including balancing Community Amenity Contribution costs.	Noted. Policy C599 has been included in the DC2 but will be determined from stakeholder input as part of the engagement program that will take place in October 2018.	Complete
	DEVELOPMENT SERVICES ● To be sent under separate cover when received.		
	PARKS		
1.	Open Space Programming:		
	a. DC2 should include two components: a concept illustrating the open space functionality/programming, and text to describe the intent of open space components.	Noted. Please see the Urban Design Regulations section of the DC2 and the Conceptual Master Landscape Plan found in DC2 Appendix 2.	Complete
	b. We strongly recommend the inclusion of an off-leash area to minimize impacts to other open spaces by dogs. These problems exist in other park locations, where there is higher density residential, such as Railtown Park and Michael Phair Park. A suitable example is Alex Decoteau Park.	Please see the Conceptual Master Landscape Plan found in DC2 Appendix 2, which contemplates a “dog park” in the east portion of the plan area.	Complete

	c. The design of the special streets should allow for closure for special events to relieve pressure on other dedicated open spaces.	This has been considered in the design of all the Special Street and Main Street.	Complete
	d. Limited-use programming, such as gardening plots, should be predominantly located on podiums. If located at-grade, it needs to be integrated with broader community and year-round uses.	Please see the Conceptual Master Landscape Plan found in DC2 Appendix 2, which contemplates a “Community Garden” in the west portion of the Plan Area. The DC2 regulation accommodates limited-use programming on podiums and roof tops.	Complete
	e. DC2 text must include the requirement for servicing, including water and power, to support open space uses.	This will be addressed at the Development Permit stage.	Complete
	f. Open space must be timed in such a way to support each phase of development, at the discretion of the development officer.	See DC2 Appendix 1 for a breakdown of Sub-Areas which can be used as a basis for phasing/staging of development.	Complete
	g. A bookable indoor community gathering space should be provided to serve residents. This should be included in the programming concept.	Agreed. This will be discussed in more detail at the Development Permit stage.	Complete
	h. Programming should follow Winter City Guidelines.	See page 140 of Submission #3 that highlights a design response to the Winter City Guidelines. The guidelines played a crucial role in the design of the Plan Area, Street Cross Sections, and Master Landscape Plan.	Complete
2.	General Landscaping Comments		
	a. DC2 should also include text for landscaping on podiums.	The (DC2) Site Specific Development Control Draft DC2 Shell includes a regulation stating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Podium and Roof Top Green Space Throughout the Site there may be a variety of podium and roof top green spaces established through best-practices in intensive and extensive green roof construction to enhance sustainability, biodiversity and energy efficiency and to offer opportunities for additional amenity space development. 	Complete
	b. DC2 landscaping concept plan should include podium and offsite landscaping. The plan should show how proposed plantings	Noted.	Complete

	complement and tie in to the adjacent context, such as Dermott Park and street trees in the adjacent neighbourhoods.	Please see the Urban Design Regulations section of the DC2 and the Conceptual Master Landscape Plan found in DC2 Appendix 2.	
	c. Streets need to be designed to support long-term survival of boulevard landscaping and to avoid conflicts between utilities and landscaping (i.e. soil cells, common trenching for utilities, appropriate soil depths, etc.)	Noted. This will be considered in detailed Landscape Plan at each phase of development.	Complete
3.	Connections		
	a. A protected bicycle link should be established between Dermott Park and on-site destinations.	See Conceptual Master Site Plan contained within Submission #3. The Conceptual Master Site Plan contains protected bike lanes along 85 Street, Secondary Road Type 2, Secondary Road Type3, and the north portion of the Main Street, establishing a separated cycle link to Dermott Park.	Complete
	b. Paths through open spaces should not dead-end at the edge of the site.	Noted – the applicant will work with the City to ensure this does not occur.	Complete
	c. Vehicle-pedestrian conflicts around the library should be addressed.	Noted.	Complete
	d. Wayfinding should be provided indicating connections to both on- and off-site destinations (i.e. Dermott Park, library, Mill Creek Ravine, Cite Francophone)	The (DC2) Site Specific Development Control Draft DC2 Shell includes a regulation stating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gateway signage shall be located at key entry points to the site to strengthen the character and identity of the site and provide wayfinding. 	Complete
4.	Adjacent Buildings and Uses:		
	a. DC2 to include minimum standards for glazing and active units fronting open spaces and streets.	See DC2	Complete
	b. The area of patios and other exclusive commercial activity in open space should be limited to ensure primary functions of the space are maintained.	Noted.	Complete
	c. Publicly accessible washrooms should be provided to support central park uses.	Noted.	Complete
5.	A public access easement must be registered for all open space. The easement will allow for access during standard parks hours, except for paths, streets and other connections, which will have twenty-four accesses.	See DC2	Complete

	DRAINAGE Planning Coordination (Drainage) has reviewed the Bonnie Doon Mall Redevelopment rezoning application and provides the following comments:		
1.	Bonnie Doon Shopping Centre Redevelopment Design Brief (1st submission) It is understood that all the sewers will be private. It should be mentioned in the report that in case of future subdivision strata easements (Easements, Covenants, and Restrictions agreement) for pipes (as mechanical servicing may be proposed for this project) and drainage easements for roadway drainage would be required.	Aplin & Martin- This will be mentioned in the updated design report	Complete
2.	The report can be considered as the NDR for the whole development and should state that each phase of the development will be submitted with a separate drainage servicing report.	Aplin & Martin – Yes, understood.	Complete
3.	Capacity analysis for the full development and the impact on the existing combined /storm sewers should be conducted. Analysis should include the amount of total design flow as a ratio of the total pipe capacity and upstream analysis to determine available capacity if feasible. Please summarize tie-in points and flow generations for sanitary and storm to assist with hydraulic modeling and analysis.	Aplin & Martin – We have expanded our modeling to include additional offsite information.	Complete
4.	Please revise the Figure 2.0 showing all the existing storm and combined sewers within and outside of the project boundary (along all roads shown on the plan).	Aplin & Martin – Will be shown on the updated design report.	Complete
1.	Sanitary/ Combined System Comments: Please comment on any upstream flow from east of 83 street and west of 85 street and also at the downstream location where the flow from the proposed development is contributing to the existing system.	Aplin & Martin – Included in the updated design report.	Complete
2.	Calculations should include everything from the top end of the system to the final discharge point (i.e. should include as-built pipes, even if 'design flows' cannot be fully included).	Aplin & Martin – Included in the updated design report	Complete
3.	Provide an interim sanitary plan similar to the interim storm plan.	Aplin & Martin – Included in the updated design report	Complete
4.	Ultimate sanitary plan should include manhole numbers, stubs, basins.	Aplin & Martin – Included in the updated design report	Complete

1.	Storm System Comments Proposed overland drainage scheme should be explained in more detail and also check if there should be major drainage basin boundary. It should consider the impact to the roadway network outside of the project site and include the potential sag locations along the private roads within the project site.	Aplin & Martin – We have completed a more detailed grading plan to show on site basins and sag locations.	Complete
2.	It is mentioned that roof top storage, underground storage and storage tank will be the elements to capture the major storm event. Connection and flow route among all of these elements as well as the operational strategy (controlled discharge of 3 or 5L/S/ha) during a critical event should be explained more precisely.	Aplin & Martin – we will elaborate on this in more detail, but a lot of this detail will be dependant on the detailed design for each phase. Our current philosophy is that storage will be accomplished by a mix of roof top, underground storage, and roadway ponding and that each will be restricted to ensure the minor basin release rate matches requirements. We will provide a total storage required for each basin and estimated roof top, ponding, and underground storage within each basin.	Complete
3.	Existing site topography figure 3.0 should have flow arrows, rough catchments areas, storm/ combined sewer release, etc.	Aplin & Martin – included in the updated design report	Complete
4.	Please have a discussion on possible storm sewer complete separation where the CB along 85 Street (find the attached) is connected to the 600 mm combined sewer.	Aplin & Martin – We have included the rerouting of these catch basins into our system. We will not be providing storage capacity for these basins, just pipe capacity.	Complete
5.	Calculations should include everything from the top end of the system to the final discharge point (i.e. should include as-built pipes, even if ‘design flows’ cannot be fully included).	Aplin & Martin – Included on the updated design report	Complete
6.	Please explain the ideology to consider the open space as a part of major system. Section 3.1 or 3.2.3 should include the breakdown of all storage elements those are accumulating the total amount of required storage.	Aplin & Martin- See storm system Requirements #2.	Complete
7.	As the project shows lots of green space please explore LID options like bio swales, green roof & box planters as a potential alternate to Oil and Grit Separators.	Aplin & Martin- This will be addressed in the updated design report.	Complete
8.	Please provide additional details and result from your hydraulic modeling.	Aplin & Martin – updated modeling will be provided.	Complete
9.	Please provide storage volume calculations.	Aplin & Martin – We will provide storage for each sub basin.	Complete
10.	There are some storm sewers flowing with velocity lower than standard. Please include a discussion if any potential concerns.	Aplin & Martin – this has been addressed and these sections have been eliminated.	Complete

11.	Ultimate storm plan should include manhole numbers, stubs, basins.	Aplin & Martin- this will be addressed on the updated design report	Complete
12.	Interim storm plan should show the basin boundaries.	Aplin & Martin – this will be addressed on the updated design report	Complete
13.	Please provide the rationale to use the Time of concentration of 10 minutes for the design of minor system. Please contact Shamim Begum, Development Engineer, at 780-496-4463 for any questions or concerns.	Aplin & Martin – This has been corrected and the updated design will reflect current CoE tc standards.	Complete
TRANSIT			
1.	Revise the statement regarding the ETS Bus Network Redesign to: While details regarding revisions to the bus transit network are currently being contemplated by City Administration, the completion of the Valley Line and the adoption of the transit strategy allow for additional improvements to the provision of bus transit in and throughout southeast Edmonton that builds on the LRT investment committed to date.	Updated in Submission #3.	Complete
2.	Discussion with ETS should occur to determine whether routing will enter the property after full build out. With ongoing public consultation for the Bus Network Redesign, there hasn't been firm direction from ETS. This could impact requirements for the cross sections of the streets; however, ETS won't be able to give direction until the Bus Network Redesign is complete in 2020.	Noted - discussions are ongoing.	Complete
3.	Bus stops along 83 Street have been reviewed, consolidated and updated as part of the SE LRT work. The westbound stop on 82 Ave/Whyte Ave, adjacent to the property will be required for full upgrade at the Development Permit stage. If you require more information, please contact Lori Armstrong-Mathieu at 780-496-8913.	Noted.	Complete
TRANSPORTATION			
1.	Figure 4 (Page 19) - the Centre line LRT shown along 82 Avenue should be	Please see a revised version of Figure 4 in Submission #3.	Complete

	depicted differently that the Valley Line LRT and should be labelled in the legend as "Potential LRT line"		
2.	Figure 7 (page 25) - the Centre line LRT shown along 82 Avenue should be depicted differently that the Valley Line LRT and should be labelled in the legend as "Potential LRT line". The identified station along 82 Avenue should be removed from the figure.	Please see a revised version of Figure 4 in Submission #3.	Complete
3.	Figure 7 (Page 25) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The intersection of Connors Road/83 Street/85 Street/90 Avenue should\ be updated to more accurately reflect the future intersection configuration that is to be developed (Connors Road to tie in with 90 Avenue, 83 Street to tie into 85 Avenue to the north, and 85 Avenue south to only connect with Connors Road and 83 Street). Use the attached plan for guidance to update the intersection depiction. There should be a distinction between existing and future new accesses. The north access on 83 Street is a new future access. 	This is an existing site context figure and is not trying to convey future improvements.	Complete
4.	Page 31 Engagement Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is this engagement or the provision of information? There is a lack of information on what will be done with the engagement feedback. The section should include some information about how feedback will be considered. 	Noted. Please see a revised version in Submission #3	Complete
ADDITIONAL NEW COMMENTS ON SUBMISSION #2			
1.	Figure 2 (Page 15) The Centre Line LRT should be depicted differently than the Valley line LRT and the legend should specifically state "Future Potential LRT"	Noted. Please see a revised version in Submission #3	Complete
2.	Figure 7 (Page 25) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no sidewalks on either side of 85 Street between 84/85 Avenue and 88 Avenue. Not the entire stretch of 85 Street should be depicted as having a 	Noted. Please see a revised version in Submission #3	Complete

	<p>pedestrian connector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The double headed arrows should be defined in the legend. 		
3.	<p>Figure 11 (Page 45)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A review of the parkade access east of 85 Street along the 86 Avenue alignment needs to be reviewed to ensure there is adequate separation distance from 85 Street ● There is a mid-block crossing along 85 Street for the proposed pedestrian path that extends through the east-west park in the middle of the plan area. The crossing should be reviewed as part of the TIA to ensure adequate sightlines and to review and advise on the protection for the anticipated pedestrian volumes. 	<p>See Conceptual Master Site Plan contained within Submission #3.</p> <p>Access points are subject to detailed design and are only conceptually identified at this stage.</p>	Complete
4.	<p>Page 46 Opportunity - 1st Paragraph</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● “As the new Valley Line West and ...” - It is supposed to refer to Valley Line Southeast rather than Valley Line West. ● “As well, 85th Street will shift from a high volume arterial to a more neighbourhood focused collector...” - 85 Street is currently designated as a collector road (between 82 Avenue and 90 Avenue) 	<p>Noted. Please see a revised version in Submission #3</p>	Complete
5.	<p>Cross-section Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● City of Edmonton Road Design and Construction Standard (Complete Street Design and Construction Standards) is being updated and should be published in June/July 2018. With the new design standards, some of the proposed Travel Lanes are over designed. We encourage narrower travel lanes . (i.e. the new Design Standard suggests 3.0m for inner travel lane, 3.2m for travel lane with transit, or 3.25m for curb travel lane with transit) 	<p>The cross sections have been revised to reflect the new design standards. Sections for existing public streets have been removed.</p> <p>Cross Section G is based on a prior DP approval for the reconfiguration of the north east entranced based on a new road alignment with Dermott Park.</p>	Complete

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Remove the the cross-sections of City roads (83 Street, 82 Avenue and 85 Street) from the document. These could be added as an appendix (if you wish) and labelled “For information only” ● The entire width of road right-of-way for each cross-section should be illustrated on the figures (i.e. Section G, H, I, and J). ● The dimensions of the individual units (lane widths, furnishing zones, etc.) within the cross-sections are to be removed from the document being forwarded for council approval. The overall cross-section dimension could be included. Similar to what the report currently includes on page 58 for Section K. The detailed cross-sections with dimensions could be included as part of the TIA. ● Consideration should be given to simplifying the number of cross-sections on-site and the need to make every road unique vs. the confusion of drivers traveling in the area with different operating conditions on every street (bike lane location, parking, etc.) ● Section G - Main Street (Page 50) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed 4.5m and 4.7m travel lanes are over designed. ○ The Curb Zone(Furnishing Zone) on both sides appears narrow and should be widened to more than 1.7m to ensure the boulevard trees are not negatively impacted. ● Section H - Main Street (Page 51) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The +/- 7.4m is too wide for two travel lanes and should be narrowed ○ The Curb Zone(Furnishing Zone) should be more than 1.7m. ● Although we require the removal of the city road cross-sections from the body of the report, we provide the following comments on the cross-sections included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Section J - 83rd Street (Page 57) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ According to the Valley Line LRT Concept Design, there will be one parking lane on the east side of 83 Street and three northbound travel lanes. The area for street lights between 		
--	---	--	--

	<p>the LRT platform and southbound travel lane is not a designated “Sidewalk”. The cross-section of 83 Street should be updated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section L/M/N - 85th Street (Page 59 - Page 61) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposed 85 Street is not designed as a complete street (i.e. no parking lane, bike lane, and sidewalk). ○ The proposed cross-section shows the Bike Lane will be within private property. Should this be constructed, an easement would be required to permit public use of the bike lane. ○ City plans to rehabilitate 85 Street in 2020.. The City and applicant should work collaboratively to explore opportunities to improve 85 Street. 		
6.	<p>Page 113, section 2.2.9 B, includes the need for covered bicycle racks and storage - these requirements should be included in the DC2 regulations</p> <p>Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is subdivision planned to occur on-site? ○ How will the roads be developed? Will Morguard retain ownership of the roads? ○ How will the roads be maintained? ○ 	Bicycle parking shall be as per Section 54.3 of the Zoning Bylaw. Additional bike storage will be considered at the time of development permit.	Complete
7.	<p>Small changes / Typos</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Page 14, first bullet in the right column - remove “stop”. It should say potential Centre Line LRT ○ Page 18, middle column, end of the last paragraph includes “85 Avenue in Strathern” this should be “95 Avenue in Strathern” ○ Page 56 “...82nd Avenue and 83rd Street operating has transit corridors” . Suppose to be “as” . ○ There are a number of statements in Appendix referring to “Potential Centre Line LRT station” such as Page 76 - 3.3.1.1. and 3.3.1.4. 	Noted. Please see a revised version in Submission #3	Complete
	DC2 Shell_Comments		

1.	As the plan area has been programmed to incorporate five distinct districts to better describe the intended built-form, public realm and uses, it is suggested that the site be split into sub-areas. This approach will provide opportunity to develop area-customized regulations.	The Conceptual Master Site Plan identifies tower locations and heights, while the DC2 regulates maximum height between 28.0 m and 126.0 m and a maximum site FAR of 3.5. Varying regulations accommodate lower maximum heights along 85 Street while providing a higher intensity of development in close proximity to LRT. See DC2 Appendix 1 for a breakdown of Sub-Areas.	Complete
2.	The proposed DC2 should include the followings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed regulations regarding non-accessory parking, such as location and the maximum number. • Bicycle parking provision; • Opportunity for further parking reductions with the provision of a parking study • Easement requirements to permit the public and emergency services access to the site; • The requirement for TIA updates at logical intervals as development proceeds and/or time passes; • Off-site improvements on City road right-of-way, such as potential improvement on 85 Street, if there is the opportunity. 	The DC2 includes provisions/regulations that address each of these items.	Complete
TIA Assumption Sections_ Comments			
1.	Although the route and station location of Center LRT line has not been determined, the TIA should discuss the possibility of having Centre LRT running on Whyte Avenue, and the associated impact on trip distribution, mode split and site access.	Discussion included in updated TIA.	Complete
2.	The report should discuss how the background traffic to be established. Specifically, how the traffic generated by major projects in the adjacent neighbourhoods (such as Strathearn Heights and the underway Holyrood) would be taken into account.	Discussion included in updated TIA.	Complete
3.	The TIA should advise when the technical reports for parking and traffic need to be updated and the criteria triggering the need of updates.	Included in updated TIA.	Complete

4.	The report should identify the study intersections to be included in the study and should provide background traffic volumes and the basis for the estimation of their volumes.	Included in updated TIA.	Complete
5.	Figure 2-4 needs to be updated to reflect the changes to the roadway network as a result of the Valley Line LRT. The traffic control at several intersections along route needs to be updated.	Included in updated TIA.	Complete
6.	Section 2.2.5 Transit (Page 16) The report states that no specific revisions to the bus transit service around Bonnie Doon Shopping Centre are being proposed. However, this is inaccurate as there will be a significant reduction in routes serving that area. As well, the on-site routes through the site are still under review with current conditions and will be removed prior to full build-out of the site.	Updated as per discussions with Transit & Transportation.	Complete
7.	Parking Calculation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report should include information/assumptions of the unit mix to support the estimation of residential parking requirement. • Table 3-2 Zoning Bylaw Parking Rate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For non-residential parking assessment, it is proposed to use the rate of 1 stall per 100 sqm in the TIA, which may result in underestimating the non-residential uses parking demand. Some of the parking demand should be estimated at a rate of 1 per 30 sq m 	Included in updated TIA.	Complete
8.	Please use City of Edmonton's 2022 Origin-destination Car Driver Trip spreadsheet for the 2047 horizon.	Resolved through meeting with Transportation.	Complete
9.	Mode split comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mode splits listed in the bulleted list on Page 29 should be mode splits to alternate modes rather than to transit only • The residential, office, and medical / dental uses should not all have the same mode split to auto percentages. The office and medical/dental uses would have higher mode split to auto 	Resolved through meeting with Transportation. Included in updated TIA.	Complete

	<p>percentages. People may pick where they live based on available transportation options but fewer would select their employment based on that or their medical professional. This should be reviewed based on the use and adjusted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed overall mode split to alternate modes seems high based on the existing census data. This represents a significant increase in alternate mode use between 2016 and 2047 and although desirable, is it achievable by 2047? • By 2047, the light rail system in Edmonton should be more developed. Although there is no firm timeline for West Valley Line LRT, it ranks on the top of the list for LRT lines to be constructed in the future. The construction of the West Valley Line LRT will encourage a higher mode split to transit for people traveling between the subject site and west portion of the City. • We suggest having an overall discussion about mode splits 		
10.	Table 4-5 - Please breakdown the types of trips generated rather than just having a "gross trips" row.	Trip generation details included in Appendix B.	Complete
11.	<p>With the next submission of the planning documents (submission #3), a complete TIA is required.</p> <p>Prior to the detailed analysis required for a full TIA, Planning Coordination (Transportation) would like to review an updated TIA front end submission based on the comments provided above (basically an update to the TIA document attached to submission #2).</p>	Complete TIA included.	Complete