

# WHAT WE HEARD REPORT

## ICE District Phase II - Public Engagement (LDA19-0253)

---

**PROJECT ADDRESS:** Land north of Rogers Place bounded by 105 Avenue NW, 106 Avenue NW, 104 Street NW, and the lane east of 102 Street NW

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Rezoning from (DC1) Direct Development Control Provision to (DC2) Site Specific Development Control Provision Zone to allow for a high density, mixed use development with multiple residential towers, publicly accessible open space and pedestrian oriented streets.

**PROJECT WEBSITE:** [https://www.edmonton.ca/residential\\_neighbourhoods/neighbourhoods/ice-phase-2-rezoning.aspx](https://www.edmonton.ca/residential_neighbourhoods/neighbourhoods/ice-phase-2-rezoning.aspx)

**EVENT TYPE:** Public Engagement Session

**MEETING DATE:** Thursday, July 11, 2019

**NUMBER OF ATTENDEES:** 29

---

### ABOUT THIS REPORT

The information in this report includes responses to the application notification and feedback gathered during the July 11, 2019 Public Engagement Session. This report is shared with everyone who provided their email address during the event on July 11, 2019. This summary will also be shared with the applicant and the Ward Councillor. If/when the proposed rezoning advances to Public Hearing this report will be included in the information provided to City Council.

---

### MEETING FORMAT

The meeting format was an open house style event where attendees were able to view display boards with project information and ask questions of City Staff, the applicant, architect and developer. Participants were invited to share their feedback on “Graffiti walls” by offering general feedback by answering two questions;

- What do you like about this application?
- What do you not like about this application?

Planning Coordination  
CITY PLANNING



The City received 3 feedback forms with written comments and 24 sticky note responses on the “Graffiti walls”. The comments & questions received, including verbal comments noted at the event, are summarized by main themes below.

---

## FEEDBACK FORM COMMENTS

### Residential Units

- Concerned about the affordability of units.
- Would like to see family housing which would:
  - Support schools;
  - Increase incentive to stay in the neighborhood and;
  - Provide ownership within the neighborhood.

### Parking

- Concerned about adequate parking and preventing spill over into the surrounding neighborhood.

### Amenities

- Would like to see a grocery store included within the commercial space.
- Would like to see an emphasis on local businesses - restaurants, shops, artists, events, etc.
- Would like to see more of a focus on a gathering area.
- Would like to see the promenade resemble the highline in New York, for example.

### Other

- Concerned about safety.
- Concerned about the area adjacent to the MacEwan LRT Station and existing safety issues (noted the proposed development may provide improvements to the current situation).
- Concerned that the proposal is “too much”.
- Representatives of Central McDougal are not happy about the potential bus service change in this area and argue that the reduced service does not support the proposed TOD concept.
- Concerns about the range of building heights (i.e. 15 - 28 storeys):
  - Community members want more clarity on where the tall towers would be and hope that reasonable height transition can be controlled by the proposed DC2.

---

## GRAFFITI WALL FEEDBACK

### What do you Like?

- The mixed-uses and parks.
- Hill - great for all types of activities.
- Design that is show stopping and iconic! Maybe add some curves, no blocks.
- DC text should include family oriented units and pedestrian oriented crossings.
- Green roofs.
- Mixed housing - need more housing for families to support community and to build “ownership”.

- I like the green roof sloping over the community centre.
- Conceptualized design is very good. Having multiple rental properties in this area, this development will bring great benefits to the area. The only thing I would say are doing a more complex and accurate wind study and considering more thoughtful and diverse designs for the buildings.
- Love the promenade/mixed use spaces. We need even more of this!
- I like the Vancouver style architecture.
- “Hill” good idea - great for sledding in winter or just running up and rolling down all seasons.

#### What do you Dislike?

- Too much surface parking.
- More neighbourhood historical significance reflected in design and character.
- Encourage the applicant to have snacks. Proper engagement strategy.
- Leave old school buildings alone.
- The podiums don't look like they are connected.
- It would be great to have a massive elevated park.
- Not enough parking for residences - will spill over to the rest of the community.

## ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

- **Are the green roofs publicly accessible?**

At this time, that level of detail is not something that is known. There will be requirements for each building and unit to have a certain amount of Amenity Area allocated to it. This could take the form of indoor or outdoor space, including the green roof areas shown. On the south of the site, the intent is to have a publicly accessible park space, potentially on top of a 1 storey community focused building.

- **Wind study - what is considered low and high? Do I need a sweater/windbreaker for low? What does a wind scale of “sitting” to “uncomfortable” mean?**

Typically, there are 5 categories for comparing wind speed with comfort level. Whether someone wants to wear a sweater or windbreaker is a personal choice and also depends on the air temperature. The 5 categories are:

- Sitting ( $\leq 10$  km/h): Calm or light breezes desired for outdoor seating areas where one can read a paper without having it blown away.
- Standing ( $\leq 14$  km/h): Gentle breezes suitable for main building entrances and bus stops.
- Strolling ( $\leq 17$  km/h): Moderate winds that would be appropriate for window shopping and strolling along a downtown street, plaza or park.

- Walking ( $\leq 20$  km/h): Relatively high speeds that can be tolerated if one's objective is to walk, run or cycle without lingering.
- Uncomfortable: None of the comfort categories are met.

- **Where's the missing middle?**

Generally speaking, this application is not proposing what would be considered "missing middle", but instead opting for high-rise towers. However, some of the shorter towers on the north of the site, may be in the "missing middle" range. The City will work with the applicant to determine these exact heights during upcoming zoning negotiations.

- **Townhousing in podium; why all apartments?**

There are opportunities contemplated for ground oriented apartment units that would take on the appearance of townhousing along the street. The City will work with the applicant to address this level of detail during upcoming zoning negotiations.

---

If you have questions about this application please contact:

Andrew McLellan, Planner

780-496-2939

[andrew.mclellan@edmonton.ca](mailto:andrew.mclellan@edmonton.ca)

Planning Coordination  
CITY PLANNING

