

WHAT WE HEARD REPORT

Rezoning Public Engagement Session Feedback Summary LDA19-0389 - Keheewin

PROJECT ADDRESS: 2008 - 105 Street NW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A proposed rezoning from **Urban Services Zone (US)** to **Site Specific Development Control Provision (DC2)**, intended to allow for the provision for affordable housing, on a former school site declared surplus 2009, in the form of row housing and low rise apartment housing.

PROJECT WEBSITE: edmonton.ca/keheewin > Planning Applications

TYPE OF ENGAGEMENT	DATE	RESPONSES/ # OF ATTENDEES
Advance Notice from the City	October 23, 2019	No. of written comments: 5
Public Engagement City-hosted Event (drop-in format)	November 7, 2019	No. of attendees: 164 including Ward 10 Councillor Walters No. of written comments: 89 No. of online comments: 42

ABOUT THIS REPORT

Information in this report includes responses to the advanced notice and feedback gathered during and after the November 7, 2019 public engagement event. This report will be shared with those who emailed the file planner, and/or provided an email address at the event, as well as with the Applicant and the Ward Councillor. If/when the proposed rezoning and plan amendments advance to Public Hearing, it will be included in the information provided to City Council.

ENGAGEMENT SESSION FORMAT

Planning Coordination
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES



The meeting format was a drop-in open house where attendees were able to view display boards with project information and ask questions of City Staff and the Applicant. Participants were invited to share their feedback on a “Graffiti wall” by offering general feedback and questions via sticky notes. 171 sticky notes were received addressing the following questions:

- What do you like about the proposal?
- What are your concerns about the proposal?
- What do you want the City Council to know?

Additional written feedback forms were also made available for attendees to provide more comprehensive feedback relating to the application. We received 89 feedback forms with written comments and 42 online submissions of the feedback form through an online survey option provided. The comments & questions we received are summarized by the main themes below and the number beside each comment indicates how many times it was heard.

WHAT WE HEARD

Feedback Forms

Parking, Traffic, and Transit:

- Traffic concerns (x68)
- Parking concerns (x29)
- Loss of street parking / drop-off and pick-up space for parents of students (x16)
- Public transit is insufficient (x5)
- Concerned about uncontrolled crosswalks (x4)
- Loss of site lines for parents of students when picking up / dropping off (x3)
- Would like to see a more recent transportation study done as the most recent available is 2016 (x3)
- Would like to see infrastructure to regulate traffic speeds and improve safety - i.e. speed bumps, traffic lights, crossing lights (x2)
- Concerned about U-turns occurring at the lights from people trying to avoid the 23 Ave overpass (x2)
- Cost of underground parking will be 5x higher than if a larger site, which could accommodate surface parking, was chosen
- The traffic assessment does not include extra activities at Keheewin park in the summer (soccer/baseball)
- Would increase the number of potholes in the area

- Would like more information on the proposed area for the school drop off zone
- Would like to see improvements to transit and bike paths in the area to facilitate this proposal
- Appreciates underground parking and on site parking to reduce street parking

Location:

- There are more suitable locations in the neighbourhood for this development - i.e. the site next to the YMCA or on the west side of this open space (x22)
- Proximity to existing crosswalk(s) (x4)
- Other uses for this site
- Development is proposed too close to the roadway
- 180 units could be achievable on a different site
- Would like to see the City do a land-swap and use a different park
- This proposal should be moved to a site that isn't beside a school
- There are other surplus sites which are closer to the LRT and shopping centres
- There are many other areas in South Edmonton that would make more sense
- Concerned that this site is being treated differently than other surplus sites
- Would like to know why Keheewin has been chosen for this development instead of the 8 other surplus sites that would have less controversy
- The other 8 surplus sites do not have a school within 100 m

Built Form:

- Concerned about density / number of units (x71)
- Would support this development with lower density / decreased building footprint (x16)
- Concerned about height of proposed buildings (x12)
- Would prefer only the townhouses / rowhouses (x10)
- Proposed development does not follow city rules for the building envelope - i.e. City Policy C583 (x6)
- Residential building envelope should be the same as was permitted when there was supposed to be a school in this place (x4)
- Concerned about existing infrastructure capacity (x4)
- Proposal and design looks great (x4)
- Sun/shadow impacts (x3)
- Doesn't believe that this is a family oriented development (x2)
- Remove the building that's closest to the school from the proposal or make it smaller (x2)
- No other elementary schools have such an unsafely situated proximate building (x2)
- The proposal encroaches on the AS land between the two school properties
- Would like to see the size and shape of the parcel reduced
- Density of project has increased with every meeting held

- Would like to see more family designated homes
- Would prefer two small houses on one lot
- Would like to know why the percentage of density is so high in the development when the original Affordable Housing spread it across 9 communities
- Would like to know if there is a bylaw that would regulate appropriate setback for schools
- There are no low rise apartments built on other surplus school sites
- Would like to see design improvements made on environmental / carbon emission impacts
- Appreciate hearing that the tall buildings in front and away from the school will make green space adjacent to the school
- Appreciates that the number of units is decreasing
- Appreciates access through the development, ensuring that the field is still accessible from 104 Street
- Push back is partly a result of the community not being used to densification

Keheewin School:

- Proximity to school (x80)
- Safety / privacy concerns for school and students (x55)
- Less room for play area / access for kids (x21)
- Concerned about school capacity/overcrowding (x12)
- Supervision sight lines broken from apartment building (x10)
- Concerned about second hand smoke from residents of the proposal (x6)
- Residents could have dogs which will defecate / contaminate the field/schoolyard (x4)
- Would like to see clarification on the school drop off zone as addressed by the transportation team as a means to solves the problem (x4)
- There were previously portables in this area and now there will be nowhere to put them if needed again (x3)
- There are no other developments like this in proximity to a school/school entrance (x2)
- Concerned about fire truck access to the school (x2)
- Would like to know where future kids of the proposal would go to school (x2)
- Noise impacts on school and impacts on children's learning as a result
- Would like to know why the concerns of school administrators / teachers not being gathered for consideration
- Residents of this proposal will complain about noise from the school
- This is the reason there is oversized classes
- Concerned this area will have a need for more schools in this area in the future
- Concerned about the ongoing construction that will occur next to the school
- Would like to see the developer build a fence around the school grounds as well as the housing development
- Historically schools are not built this close to other buildings

- Would like to know what would happen if the proposed apartment building caught on fire
- Concerned about things falling off balconies of apartment and onto the kids
- Neither the School Board trustee nor the Keheewin School principal are in favour of this
- Love the idea but concerned about the school/kids

Consultation Process:

- The City is not listening to its citizens and the ongoing meetings are not answering communities questions (x32)
- General dissatisfaction with the Councillors rhetoric towards the community and lack of representation (x18)
- Negative experience with Capital Region Housing projects - maintenance of property and criminal elements (x5)
- Consultation process has been frustrating, disingenuous and lacking honesty / transparency (x3)
- Capital Region Housing is not listening and is not transparent (x2)
- Feels as though the decision has already been made and is being forced on community (x2)
- Would like to know why the community input was disregarded following the January 2019 meeting and the density only decreased to 135 units (x2)
- Previous meetings were not advertised (x2)
- Would like to know why this meeting did not reference/display C583 (x2)
- Community is not against the project they just want it scaled back (x2)
- Community does not want this development
- The City is favouring Capital Region Housing over its citizens
- Feels as though the concerns are being portrayed as not wanting low income residents in general, but the concern is the location and proximity to the school
- Lack of consistency and transparency with projects city wide
- Open house meeting format is not helpful - would prefer a town hall format
- Community will come in large numbers to the Public Hearing (Council Meeting)
- The City needs to be better with rezoning
- Seems like some aspects of development include a lot of bylaws but there aren't any standards being met
- If the impact studies on all impacted stakeholders is not all positive and supportive then this project should not be pushed forward
- Would like to see comments recorded in report
- Would like to see better quality control in regards to these kinds of projects
- Would like to see all feedback considered in the decision making
- The meeting was another example of sharing non-information
- Does not believe the impact studies for this project by the City/Stantec

- Would like to know why there is a discrepancy between the facts about the project and what representatives are sharing tonight (eg. Student enrolment at Keheewin, distance between schools in Edmonton and other multiple family dwellings)
- Decision was already made prior to the first meeting
- Is upset about the community members being characterized as hysterical
- There needs to be a time to formally voice concerns rather than just surveys
- Would like to see alternative locations for this proposal
- Would like to see focus groups with published findings
- Would like to know how many people are against the project and how many just have concerns about size and proximity
- Is happy with the amount of consultation that has been provided
- Would like to see Councillors engaging their constituents early on to help them understand the need for affordable housing and to understand the planning process in general

Housing:

- Likes that the City is trying to provide affordable and diverse housing options to people / families in need (x11)
- Community has its share of condos / townhouses / apartments / rentals / subsidized / low-income housing (x6)
- Appreciates the general goal / need of providing low incoming housing (x3)
- Steinhauer United Church is also planning low income housing, leaving no space left for children (x2)
- Affordable / mixed-income housing is good for the community and the City (x2)
- Affordable housing in proximity to a school will be great for families (x2)
- We need to target the next generation of families (x2)
- Would support supporting low incoming housing and the potential for cultural diversity but feels as though this project is concerned more with business and money over the actual needs of families and the neighbourhood
- Affordable housing should not be at the cost of the safety of children
- Subsidizing housing is a good idea but the implementation is terrible
- Appreciates affordable housing as a means of reducing medical costs / improving health equity
- Does not agree with the negative connotations that “low-income” brings and would like people to understand that it means single income, laid off/injured worker, seniors, families with children, and struggling university students
- There is enough low income / first buyer housing in the community
- Solving homelessness should be a fair share between older neighbourhoods
- Concerned that downtown towers do not have to follow the same 5% low income housing rule

Green Space:

- Loss of green space (x14)
- Would like to know what happened to the green belt past 20 Ave and when this area was rezoned (x2)
- Loss of mature trees
- Would like to see a landscaped buffer around the property to increase privacy and mute noise
- It is unethical to reduce the park space which is jointly owned by the community
- The hypocrisy of a city that would allow for parking instead of transit use and mature tree removal during a time of climate change activism is alarming
- This development would cut off the community from the remaining green space
- Does not want public greenspace to be rezoned as private property
- Is happy that they have adjusted the entrance to allow the trees to remain between Chimerson Chase and the new development

Crime:

- Increased crime in area (x3)
- Concerned about perverts living beside the school (x2)
- Concerned about drugs in the area
- Increased safety issues for proximity to potential sexual offenders overlooking the school entrance / playground
- Concerned how to prevent bad people from living at the proposal and preying on the children

Zoning / DC2:

- Concerned that the draft DC2 is still subject to change with uses being removed or added
- Concerned about the list of potential uses included within the draft DC2 document, specifically group homes, lodging houses, home based businesses, and religious assembly
- The draft DC2 provided calls to question the credibility of the City government
- Would like to know what will be proposed for Area A or B in light of the listed uses
- Would like to know why the US zoned property was added to the surplus school site to enlarge the property from the beginning
- Property should not be rezoned to anything above an RF5
- Current zoning should not be changed
- Using up all zones arranged for future development isn't necessary
- Would like to know why they are proposing apartments prior to the rezoning going through

Other:

- Decreased property values (x8)
- Privacy concerns to existing homes / community (x4)
- This site should not be considered surplus / should not have been given back to the City (x3)
- Concerned about impacts on existing infrastructure (x2)
- Increased noise (x2)
- Would like to see this application cancelled (x2)
- Edmonton / Alberta has too much space to crowd people into existing communities (x2)
- The Councillors / Mayor should be thrown out if this goes through (x2)
- Would like to be able to fire Councillors
- This has not been properly planned and considered
- This site should be used for a senior housing complex
- Would like to see a community vote on whether or not this goes through
- Edmonton pays the highest property tax in Alberta and has to live with unwanted developments
- Project is not appreciated or welcomed
- The City is spending money it does not have
- Proposal would negatively impact the area
- Most current residents had to work hard to purchase their homes
- No space for necessary community amenities
- Proposal could heavily impact the quality of life for people living in the community
- We hope City Council knows that we cannot rely on the money which comes from the land sale
- It's not too late for City Council to reconsider the application before damage is made to the community
- The social economic situation of this community will decrease with rental property
- The school land given up for this will be needed in the future
- This project is an example of what the City should be doing and should continue to do so
- The City should continue to follow their overall strategic goals
- Lack of any neighbourhood support
- This land should not be developed
- Concerned with the nimby-ism of neighbours
- We need these projects to make our city more viable and equitable
- Likes that community space is being include in the proposed buildings
- Will bring new families into the neighbourhood
- In favour of bringing new development and new neighbours to the area

Graffiti Wall Comments

What do you like about the proposal?

- Nothing (x26)
- Provides / General support for affordable housing (x8)
- Provides diversity for the community (x2)
- Brings in younger families / more families in area needed (x2)
- General support for proposal (x2)
- Accessible pathways through the development (x1)
- Like the layout and the look of the development (x1)
- Like the mix of town/row housing and condos (x1)
- Like the mix of affordability options (x1)
- Like the on site parking (x1)
- General support for provision of housing
- It brought the neighbourhood together in protest (x1)

Administration Note: many comments received utilized the 'What do you like about the proposal?' section to voice concerns over the proposal. These concerns were included in the 'What are your concerns about the proposal?' section that follows.

What are your concerns about the proposal?

Parking, Traffic & Transit:

- Current / Potential traffic is an issue (x21)
- Issues around school drop-off / parking (x13)
- General area parking as a concern (x5)
- Street parking is an issue (x5)
- Traffic along 23 ave as an issue (x3)
- Traffic study missing / inaccurate (x2)
- Existing road infrastructure insufficient (x2)
 - will need to upgrade roads to include traffic lights (x1)
- Not enough parking provided for the proposal (x1)
- More cars causing pollution (x1)
- Issues with bus service (x1)
- Will create more potholes (x1)

- Add access to 108 Street (x1)
- Parking needs to be strictly monitored (x1)
- Will a parent parking lot for the school be built? (x1)

Location:

- General concern over proximity to school / proximity to school as a safety concern (x28)
 - no other elementary school with 20m separation as a precedent (x1)
- Takes greenspace/park/play area away (x14)
 - fields are used regularly (x7)
 - will lead to more obesity, increasing traffic (x1)
- Other locations more appropriate (x5); use YMCA grounds (x2)
- Build in a different neighbourhood (x2)
- Community was never designed for it (x1)
- Need to save mature trees (x1)
- Reduces area for school events (x1)
- Land is better saved for future development, such as more schools (x1)
- Should stay zoned for schools (x1)

Built Form:

- Too large /not at this scale / too many units / too big / too high (x33)
 - Other area buildings have less units on a larger footprint (x3)
 - Building footprint should only cover proposed school building boundaries (x2)
 - Large increase from initial meetings (x1)
 - Should only be 70 units (x1)
 - Should only be max 60 units (x3)
 - Should only be 50 Units (x2)
- Blocks sunlight from children / the school (x2)
- Silly design (x1)
- Should provide for more families (x1)
- Should be more connected with the community area (x1)
- Reorient to move deeper into field over running along road (x1)
- Businesses need to be better outlined as essential services (e.g. daycares) (x1)
- Concern over the size of the fence (x1)

Safety:

- Undefined danger/safety concerns (x19)
 - for children (x15)
 - in general (x5)
 - for nearby residents (x1)

- Traffic / pedestrian crossings as a safety issue (x8)
- Concerns over potential tenants / tenancy effects (x6)
 - Smoking/ Marijuana too close to school area (x3)
 - Prefer private ownership to renters (x1)
 - Dog owners who will let their dogs urinate and defecate in the play space (x1)
 - Easy access from units to playground - not safe (x1)
- Children having access to and wandering into the complex during recess (x1)
- Creates sightline issues (x1)
- Drop-off/ parking unsafe around the school (x1)
- Design creates a channel for students to move through (unsafe for fires) (x1)
- Construction proximity posing danger to children (x1)
- Poses safety issues moving children around at recess (x1)
- More adults in the school yard a safety issue (x1)
- Existing mixed income housing interfering with children at the school (x1)

Broader Area Context:

- More children to the area, affecting school enrolment numbers/ class sizes (x9)
 - will lead to more busing out of neighbourhood (x1)
- General community congestion / overcrowding (x3)
- Issues with lack of community programs (x3)
 - after school care (x1)
 - youth activities (x1)
 - daycares (x1)
 - single parent programming (x1)
 - general community programming (x1)
 - lack of programming burdens non-profits in the area (x1)
- Loss of area feel/aesthetics (x2)
- Community has already accepted a housing project a few years ago (x2)
- Too many apartments in the neighbourhood (x1)
- Community is stressed (x1)
- Community league fronting costs for increased amenity maintenance (x1)
- Creating a 'Ghetto' (x1)
- Losing our neighbourhood to people (x1)
- Concern water infrastructure cannot handle proposal (x1)
- Will devalue surrounding properties (x1)

Consultation Process:

- Not enough neighbourhood consultation / consideration (x4)
- Community concerns ignored / are not being listened to (x3)

- Is being forced upon the community (x2)
- Decision was already made and sessions are to save face / process is disingenuous (x2)
- Proposal scope changing between various meetings (x1)
- Lack of data from the city (x1)

Other:

- CRHC has bad online reviews / a bad track record (x4)
- Concern over maintenance / upkeep of the proposal (x2)
- Lack of responsible planning / a ridiculous plan (x2)
- Concern around garbage disposal (x1)
- I pay more in property tax to avoid congestion (x1)
- Unfair to children (x1)
- If I quit my job or work part-time, can I live there? (x1)
- Having to keep children away from the area reduces recreational time and may reduce instructional time as they walk further to designated exits (x1)
- What are the processes to mitigate issues? (x1)

What do you want City Council to know?

Parking, Traffic & Transit:

- Too much traffic / congestion (x6), especially in the winter (x1)
- Issues with student drop-off / pickup (x2)
- Poor area bus service (x2)
- On street parking is/will be an issue (x1)
- Issues w/ 105st & 23 Ave intersection (x1)
- Issues with the crossing at 20th Avenue (x1)
 - improve safety here for kids (x1)
- When was the traffic study done? (x1)
- Cars idling in front of the school (x1)

Location:

- Too close to the school / setbacks need to be larger (x13)
- Larger / more appropriate sites elsewhere (x9)
 - take land in other neighbourhoods (x2)
 - consider moving to the west side of the field (x1)
 - use land by the YMCA (x1)
- Green space is being destroyed/ taken away / needs to be maintained (x6) - is counter to Council's narrative (x1)

Built Form:

- Too dense / too high / too many units / too large a scale (x13)
- Build a greenhouse for educational purposes instead (x1)

Safety:

- Undefined safety issues (x7)
- Affects sightlines looking to/from the school grounds (x1)
- Takes away privacy of children and teachers (x1)

Broader Area Context:

- Threatens the integrity of the neighbourhood (x1)
- Decreases property values (x1)
- Too many apartments in the area already (x1)
- Community needs to remain sustainable for current and new inhabitants (x1)
- Other area amenities needed to support families (x1)

Consultation Process:

- See/hear our voices / Listen to the long-term area residents (x3)
- Sentiment concerns are being ignored/dismissed (x2)
- Didn't ask the community if this was needed (x1)
- Maps displayed do not accurately show location of the school by the complex (x1)

Other:

- Otherwise supportive of affordable housing, but issues with this proposal (x8)
- Issues with Councillor comments (x2)
 - received in correspondence (x1)
 - about neighbourhood reaction in the media (x1)
- Natural light is needed for the kids (x1)
- CRHC has too many negative reviews on Google that need to be addressed first (x1)
- Project should be shelved (x1)
- No benefit to the community (x1)
- Potential Councillor conflict between infill housing agenda and ward representation (x1)
- Affordable housing projects are not well maintained (x1)

If you have questions about this application please contact:

Vivian Gamache

vivian.gamache@edmonton.ca

780-944-0122

Planning Coordination
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

