



WHAT WE HEARD REPORT

Online Public Engagement Feedback Summary LDA19-0103 - The Hive

PROJECT ADDRESS: 8630 to 8650 - 108A Street NW & 8715 - 109 Street NW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed rezoning is for two sites. The first, on 109 Street NW, is from a Site Specific Development Control Provision ([DC2.528-Area A](#)) to the ([CB1](#)) [Low Intensity Business Zone](#) with the [Main Streets Overlay](#). The purpose of the CB1 Zone with the Main Streets Overlay is to provide for low intensity commercial, office and service uses that encourage and strengthen the pedestrian-oriented character of Edmonton's main street commercial areas. These sites are typically located in proximity to residential and transit-oriented areas and provide visual interest, transparent storefront displays, and amenities for pedestrians.

The second site, on 108A Street NW, is proposed to change from two Site Specific Development Control Provisions ([DC2.128](#) & [DC2.528-Area B](#)) and the [Low-Rise Apartment Zone \(RA7\)](#) to a new Site-Specific Development Control Provision (DC2). The proposed DC2 Provision would allow for a residential high-rise building with the following characteristics:

- A maximum height of 70 - 75 metres (approximately 22 - 25 storeys)
- A maximum floor area ratio of 10.0
- Up to 271 dwellings (including at least 11 with three bedrooms)
- A tower floor plate of 855 square metres
- Townhouse style dwellings at the ground level facing 108A Street NW and the lane to the north

- Underground and enclosed surface parking accessed from the lane to the west

Plan Amendment

There is an associated application to amend the [Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan \(ARP\)](#) to revise policies and maps that effectively limit development on the 108A Street NW site to 4 storeys. Policy 2.2a currently directs high rise development to the north of the rail right-of-way along Saskatchewan Drive only. The [proposed amendment](#) would allow a tower to be built on the 108A Street site.

PROJECT WEBSITE: https://www.edmonton.ca/residential_neighbourhoods/neighbourhoods/the-hive-mixed-use-tower.aspx

ENGAGEMENT FORMAT: Online Engagement Webpage - Engaged Edmonton: <https://engaged.edmonton.ca/garneauthehive>

ENGAGEMENT DATES: August 5 - 26, 2020

NUMBER OF VISITORS:

- Engaged: 112
- Informed: 214
- Aware: 677

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

ABOUT THIS REPORT

The information in this report includes feedback gathered through the Online Engagement web page on the Engaged Edmonton platform from August 5 - 26, 2020. Because of public health issues related to COVID-19, the City wasn't able to host an in-person public engagement event to share information and collect feedback, as we normally would have done.

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 when the proposed rezoning goes to a future City Council Public Hearing for a decision.

This report is shared with all web page visitors who provided their email address. This summary will also be shared with the applicant and the Ward Councillor.

ENGAGEMENT FORMAT

The Engaged Edmonton webpage included a video, written text and documents available for download. Two tools were available for participants: one to ask questions and one to leave feedback.

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: 13

Opposed: 99

Comments

General/Other

- Will increase crime (x11)
- 100% against this tower (x10)
- The only winner here is the developer/greed (x7)
- Really/fully supportive of this plan (x6)
- Opposed (x2)
- Strongly disagree with this project (x2)
- Beljan has shown they usually do positive things (x2)
- It's great
- There is absolutely nothing to like about this application
- Don't see how this is connected to the overall City vision
- All 22 units in nearby co-op oppose this application

Impacts on Strathcona House

- Shadow/loss of sunlight (x27)
- Devalue condos (x22)
- Loss of views (x15)
- Privacy intrusion (x9)
- Construction impacts (x8)
 - Especially with more people working from home (x3)

- Long timeline for construction due to geotechnical studies, environmental assessments, potential archeological finds
- Laydown area
- Increase short-cutting through Strathcona House parking lot (x3)
- Temporary utility shut-offs
- 4-6 storeys would be more appropriate - no shadow impacts on highrise tower to the north
- Residents should take legal action against the City if this is approved
- Compromise integrity

Transportation

- Increased traffic congestion - already so much (x45)
- Parking impacts on quiet streets/not enough parking (x32)
- Safety issues for school/kids/seniors nearby (x17)
- Lane very narrow for this level of traffic (x12)
- Already hard to access Strathcona House, adding another tower will make it harder (x7)
 - Waste collection, loading/moving trucks, emergency access (x5)
- Open Option parking won't work here (x6)
- Not good for emergency access (x5)
- Loss of commercial parking for nearby businesses (x3)
- Not enough transit service nearby for people to not drive or for such high densities (x3)
- No access to an arterial road so traffic going through the neighbourhood
- Proposal will probably have very little impact on roadways
 - Only 20% of tenants own vehicles

Massing and Scale

- A small walk up would be more appropriate (x9)
- 108A Street site not appropriate for a high rise tower (x9)
- Too close to other tower (x7)
- Too tall/big (x6)
- 4 - 6 storeys max (x4)
- No transition to the south and east (x4)
- 7 - 10 storeys max (x3)
- Anything above 4 storeys blocks sunlight access which is needed here (x2)
- Should be stepped up from townhouses to the south
- I support density, but this is too much on too small a site (height should be at least half)
- Height out of character with area
- Height, FAR and density reasonable here
- Transition is a bit dramatic, but good design and architecture makes up for it

Building Design

- Not enough units for families (x3)
- Renderings are misleading because they make the area around here look spacious but streets are narrow (x2)
- If the tower actually looks like the renderings, it would be a good addition to the neighbourhood.
- Poor aesthetics
- Looks great
- Good to have 3 bedroom units and townhouse style units at ground level (x4)
- Design does not fit with historic character of the community
- Too many small units, convert area to an extension of U of A campus
- Want to see small scale affordable housing on these lots
- Attractive

Microclimate

- Increase noise (x14)
- Loss of sunlight (x10)
 - Bad for mental health, especially with people working from home (x2)
- Wind tunnel in the area already, this will make it worse (x9)
- Greenhouse emissions and pollution from towers concerning (x3)
- Concerned about geotechnical aspects, sinkholes, seismic waves (x3)
- Snow drifting
- Loss of nearby trees/wildlife

Utilities and Infrastructure

- Already a taxed area, this would make it worse (x2)
- Will overload sewage infrastructure
- Will overload power infrastructure

Garneau Area Redevelopment Plan

- This doesn't follow the plan (x8)
- Plan should be followed, ie. 4 storeys on 108A Street site (x8)
- Don't amend plan (x3)
- Keep ARP as is (x2)
- No good reasons to not follow plan

Broader Neighbourhood Impacts

- A high rise here is a threat to the whole community/negatively impact character (x10)
- Will make area less welcoming for families (x6)
- Area already dense enough (x5)
- Added density will help activate 109 Street (x5)
- Already so many vacancies in the area, don't need more (x3)

- City needs density, but not more here. Should be in suburbs/other areas (x3)
- Changes the neighbourhood for the worse/no benefit (x2)
- Towers should be on main roads, not quiet streets (x2)
- Would definitely consider moving here - more housing choice to the area (x2)
- 4-6 storey building would connect with neighbourhood better
- As a rental building, this goes against the grain of the Garneau neighbourhood
- Like the potential and revitalization of the area
- Perfect example of infill for this people-oriented area
- Need to start putting density around these major central corridors
- Increased density will support schools, tax base
- Will raise property values and rents for students which isn't good
- Negatively impact skyline view from downtown
- This proposal is counter to community connection

Consultation

- The people responding positively online probably don't live anywhere near the site (x4)
- City shouldn't accept feedback from people not in the area
- Good we can voice our concerns but unsure if we will be listened to.
- My comment was deleted when I tried to submit it.
- Since my earlier submission has not been posted, I can only assume that the planning department is suppressing certain submissions.
- Developer did not seem to listen to consultation done at their pre-application open house

Questions & Answers

1. How can adjacent property owners hold the developer accountable for any structural damage caused by construction?
 - The Alberta Building Code requires the owner of a construction site to ensure that work undertaken does not damage or create a hazard to adjacent properties. If City Council approves the zoning change, Council is simply stating that the proposed land use at this location is appropriate. They are not removing the owner from their responsibility to follow the Alberta Building Code during construction. If their construction does cause damage or create a hazard, the owner is the one who would likely be liable if it is found that they have made an offence with respect to the Alberta Building Code. This would mostly be an issue between adjacent landowners without the City's involvement, though initial complaints can be made through [311](#). Concerned landowners should document the current state of their properties prior to nearby construction commencing to assist with any complaints of damage caused by construction.

2. Why would the City invite a surplus of real estate in a depressed market? Will this not further depreciate existing properties due to saturation? Why are other areas of the City not being considered for this type of density?
 - The City does not control where landowners and developers choose to invest and has not historically been involved in trying to influence market forces such as this. There are other areas where plans and guidelines approved by Council would support this kind of density. The [Draft City Plan](#) identifies the need to do more to encourage development in priority growth areas through means such as expanding infrastructure capacity.
3. Besides the zoning change, is there any proposed structural change to the site on 109 street?
 - The rezoning would just change the development rules for the site. It would not mean there is any approval of structural changes which are handled through Development Permits and Building Permits. The applicant advises that there are currently no plans to make any physical changes to the building on 109 Street NW.
4. Has a Parking Impact Assessment (PIA) been completed for this proposed development, and if so, where can I view this? Where will people park?
 - On June 23, 2020, City Council approved changes to the Edmonton Zoning Bylaw that provide a flexible market- based approach where business, landowners or developers decide 'the right amount' of parking. This is known as [Open Option Parking](#). As such, vehicle parking supply analysis (as it pertains to a site/development) typically will not be required for a rezoning application. Access to parking (e.g. from an alley, to a parkade, etc.) will still be reviewed.
 - Discussions on proposed onsite parking supply, the existing on-street parking characteristics and the demographics of the Garneau neighbourhood are included in the Transportation Impact Assessment. This document is now available for download on the [rezoning project webpage](#).
5. The proposal includes at least eleven 3 bedroom units which the intention to make them family friendly by offering more storage. What other design elements are there with regards to this? The Hendrix downtown has all of their 3 bedroom units as main level townhouses which are not very family friendly not popular with families. What checks and balances does the City have in place to ensure the 3 bedroom units will be reserved for families?
 - Yes, there is the intention to make these eleven 3-bedroom units desirable

for families. In addition to more storage, the zoning also requires access to more bicycle parking and the building will have a shared children's play space of 180 m² of which a minimum of 80 m² will be indoor space and minimum of 100 m² will be outdoor space. These units are intended to be located at ground level, with individual front entrances, similar to the look of a townhouse. Having these types of units in the lower portions of towers helps ensure affordability compared to 3-bedroom units in the upper storeys of towers (penthouses). While these units contain some characteristics that may be appealing to some types of families, there is no guarantee they would be occupied by families and there is no perfect "recipe" for this, as families come in different sizes and have varying preferences and needs.

6. How are these comments being vetted for authenticity and conflict of interest? What is stopping the developer, their employees or other involved parties from flooding the comments with support for this project?

- There is no vetting happening. Anyone is able to make comments and ask questions and the City is trusting that the developer would not attempt to undermine the City's engagement efforts. Considering the majority of the comments received so far express concerns about the application, there does not appear to be any indication that this is happening.

7. How would this development impact the proposed Rail Trail with the Garneau Renewal Project?

- The proposed development is intending to respect and interface with the Rail Trail and potentially provide funding to enhance it further based on a Community Amenity Contribution located within the [proposed DC2 Provision](#).

8. Beljan Developments purchased these properties prior to the COVID 19 pandemic. Post COVID, there are many more people working from home and out of work which has shifted our daily patterns and the way we interact with our neighbourhoods. For densely populated and high traffic areas such as the 109 street corridor, noise pollution is a health and safety hazard many residents find themselves increasingly coping with as they work from home. Virtual meetings are regularly interrupted with sounds of sirens, traffic and distant construction. With the new realities COVID brings to the ways Edmontonians live and work, how will the City mitigate noise pollution from active construction projects above and beyond the current decibel restrictions? The proposed rezoning site is tightly surrounded by residences who will be greatly impacted all hours of the day by construction noise. The City should review the construction noise bylaw and make additional provisions for concealing and reduction of noise pollution given that residences are now largely

occupied during day times with professionals and students working virtually from home.

- This is a good observation and not something that has come yet with regards to the City's response to COVID-19. Thank you for your suggestion. The topic has been added to the Infill Compliance Team Steering Committee's agenda in September for discussion.
9. Have planners from the City physically been on site to experience how crowded the alley ways are with delivery, service vehicles, and traffic from adjacent businesses and residents? Have City planners physically observed the constraints for access of emergency vehicles, particularly when there is concurrent drainage work being done in the area? Google maps, photos and videos do not suffice. Please view the site in person to see how outrageously unsuitable this site is for what is being proposed.
- Yes, City planners and engineers have physically visited the site and are familiar with it. The [Parking and Transportation Impact Assessment](#) was informed by site visits that were completed during the morning and afternoon peak hours to assess existing traffic patterns and circulation around the site.
10. Are impacts on view corridors for existing high rise buildings something that the City considers when analyzing proposed new towers nearby?
- There is no City Policy or Council direction specifically regarding protecting views from existing high rise towers. Compatibility between existing and proposed towers is generally evaluated in three main ways:
 - Tower Separation - Ensuring that towers are at least 20 metres apart, preferably 25 to 30 metres. The further a new tower is away from an existing one, the less impact it has on the view in the direction towards it. This space also helps reduce cumulative wind impacts and reduce loss of privacy. This tower proposal maintains a separation distance from the Strathcona House tower to the north of at least 20 metres. Due to the shapes and orientations of both the existing and proposed towers, there are many instances of the separation distance being between 25 and 30 metres, depending on which parts of the buildings are compared and from which direction the measurement is taken.
 - Tower Floor Plate - Ensuring towers are slim in design with the floor area of each storey approximately 850 m² or less. The narrower a tower is, the less impact it has on the view in the direction towards it. It also reduces the shadow impacts with shadows passing more quickly. The proposed tower has a floor plate of 855 m².
 - Location of windows, balconies and amenity areas - Ensuring windows, balconies and amenity areas do not directly face each other and are offset or angled away from each other, especially when Tower Separation is more limited. This helps still give people a sense of

privacy in these spaces, even with another tower nearby. The proposed tower has a “sawtooth” design to the facades creating variation in the direction windows face.

11. Why is the Administration even bringing this proposal in its present form to council?

- Administration’s role is to process any application received, regardless of the characteristics of it. Anyone can make an application and they have the right to have their application considered by their elected representatives on City Council.
- While Administration's recommendation to Council will be based on their analysis of the application, the applicant is 100% in control of what product they bring in front of Council for consideration. Administration always makes suggestions for revisions, often based on feedback received through public consultation, but the applicant can decide if they want to follow those suggestions or not.

12. Is the City going to be able to view the comments from residents that were given to the developer at the meetings they held in Garneau last year or the year before? And if so have those comments been filtered if given to the City?

- With their submission, the applicant did include a summary of the feedback they received through their consultation efforts prior to making their application to the City. With it, they indicated how they have addressed the feedback they received in their application, or if not, why not.
- The City has no way of knowing how the applicant may have filtered this feedback.
- The City conducts its own engagement activities when an application is received to allow people to provide feedback directly to the City.

13. Have engineered wind and snow studies been conducted on the impact of the proposed hi-rise on the surrounding structures?

- With this rezoning application, a Wind Impact Statement was submitted. It is available for review on the [rezoning project webpage](#). This is only a “desktop assessment” and not based on 3D modelling or wind tunnel tests.
- The proposed DC2 Provision contains a requirement for a more detailed Wind Impact Study to be done at the Development Permit stage with a requirement to incorporate design features to minimize adverse microclimatic effects such as wind tunneling, snow drifting, rain sheeting both on and off Site, consistent with the recommendations of the Wind Impact Study.

- The Wind Impact Study is required to be prepared by a qualified, registered Professional Engineer, and be based on a scale model simulation analysis, prepared to professional standards.

14. What is the emergency plan for the city fire Marshall?

- Fire Rescue Services reviews all Development Permit applications and will ensure that a proper Fire Access Plan is in place.

15. What measures are in place to ensure that the majority of the 271 units would not be bringing cars along with people?

- The City does not control who lives where or how many cars people choose to have. City Council has recently approved an [Open Option Parking](#) strategy that allows developers and landowners to choose how many parking spaces they provide. This is based on the assumption that the market/developers are better suited to determine their parking needs to be able to lease or sell their units. If they choose to not provide parking spaces for all units, they are taking the risk that they will be able to attract people to some units who do not own vehicles.
- This increases the responsibility on the City to properly manage on street parking which is understood and being worked on.

16. How will pedestrians be able to circulate safely when we already have issues with pedestrians walking through a busy alley, especially children walking to school?

- The [Building Great Neighbourhoods - Garneau Project](#) includes measures to significantly improve the pedestrian and bicycling experience in Garneau, manage traffic speed, and enhance connections to and through the open spaces. One such feature is the proposed Rail Trail which will follow the tracks to the east of this site and connect to 109 Street NW through the lane north of this site.

17. Has a study been done regarding the impact to the existing business if this parking is further reduced or if the residents in the area decide to enter into the Residential Parking Program?

- No specific study has been done. However, the applicant has indicated they intend to continue to provide some surface parking for nearby businesses enclosed within the main floor of the proposed tower.
- Residential Parking Program Permits are only available to residents of single family homes and multi-family buildings up to and including 3 storeys in

height within the program area.

18. How are residents of "The Hive " going to drive to their building? Will they have to rely on the Strathcona House main entrance driveway ? Or cross 109st to enter 86 avenue causing more delays on 109st.

- The [Parking and Transportation Impact Assessment](#) includes details of anticipated traffic circulation in the area.
-

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 clicked 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.

If you have questions about this application please contact:

Andrew McLellan, Principal Planner
780-496-2939
andrew.mclellan@edmonton.ca