



WHAT WE HEARD REPORT

Online Public Engagement Feedback Summary LDA20-0066 - Metro 78

PROJECT ADDRESS: 11416, 11419, 11420, and 11423 78 Avenue NW.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Rezoning:

The City has received a proposal to rezone properties on the north and south sides of 78 Avenue NW between 114 Street Street and 115 Street NW. The application includes 11416, 11419, 11420, and 11423 78 Avenue. The developer's name for the project is Metro 78.

This application has been revised since it was first received by the City on February 21, 2020. The initial rezoning proposal was for two lots located at 11416 and 11419 78 Avenue NW to allow for two 4-storey low rise residential buildings. As a result of the City's review and public feedback, the applicant has decided to revise their proposal and include lots located at 11420 and 11423 78 Avenue NW.

The proposed zoning from the current [\(RF1\) Single Detached Residential Zone](#) to a [revised \(DC2\) Site-Specific Development Control Provision](#) would allow for the development of two mid-rise apartment buildings with the following characteristics:

- A maximum height of 23 .0 m per building or approximately 7 storeys (previously 14.5 metres or approximately 4 storeys)
- Up to 71 residential units per building for a total of 142 units (previously 55 residential units per building for a total of 110 units)
- A maximum floor area ratio of 4.0 (previously 2.45)
- Ground level commercial space fronting a public plaza

and the 114 Street shared use path. Opportunities for commercial uses include specialty food services, retail, and personal service shops.

- Vehicular surface parking that is accessed from the proposed north-south lanes west of the properties.
- [Community amenity contributions](#) in the form of a public plaza along 78 Avenue between the two buildings, cash contributions towards the Charles Simmonds Park redevelopment, provision for family oriented units, and the construction of two lanes abutting the site.

Road Closures

The application also includes a proposed closure of portions 78 Avenue, portions of 114 Street abutting the site, and the laneway south of 78 Avenue between the site and 114 Street. New 6-metre wide (previously 5-metre) north-south lanes are proposed along the western boundaries of the rezoning site to provide connections to the remaining lanes parallel to 78 Avenue and to provide access to the proposed development.

McKernan-Belgravia Station Area Redevelopment Plan

This application includes proposed changes to the McKernan-Belgravia Station Area Redevelopment Plan to amend current policies that do not support development of this intensity at this location and to allow for mid-rise buildings at this location.

PROJECT WEBSITE: <https://www.edmonton.ca/metro78>

ENGAGEMENT FORMAT: Online Engagement Webpage - Engaged Edmonton:
<https://engaged.edmonton.ca/metro78>

ENGAGEMENT DATES: August 16 - September 6, 2021

NUMBER OF VISITORS:

- Engaged: 120
- Informed: 178
- Aware: 418

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 summarized feedback received between August 16 to September 6, 2021 through online engagement via the Engaged Edmonton platform and emails submitted directly to the file planner.

The public feedback received will be considered during the planning analysis to ensure the review of the application takes local context into consideration and is as complete as possible. It will also be used to inform conversations with the applicant about potential revisions to the proposal to address concerns or opportunities raised.

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

The planning analysis, and how feedback informed that analysis, will be summarized in the City's report to City Council when the proposed rezoning goes to a future City Council Public Hearing for a decision. The City's report and finalized version of the applicant's proposal will be posted for public viewing on the [City's public hearing agenda](#) approximately three (3) weeks prior to a scheduled public hearing for the file.

ENGAGEMENT FORMAT

The Engaged Edmonton webpage included an overview of the proposed development, information on the development and rezoning process and contact information for the file planner. 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.

FEEDBACK SUMMARY

This section summarizes main themes collected.

Number of Responses:

In Support: 9

In Opposition: 108

Mixed: 10

The most common **concerns** heard were:

Deviance from the ARP: The community firmly believes that the guidelines established in the McKernan-Belgravia Station Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) should be adhered to. The neighbourhood invested a lot of effort in establishing this plan and indicated frustration that this proposal deviates from the guidelines.

Building Size: The buildings are out of scale with the neighbourhood and should be built in accordance with the guidelines of the Area Redevelopment Plan (up to 4 storeys). Specifically, the height of the structure will result in a loss of privacy and represents a significant transition from the abutting single detached homes.

Loss of Greenspace: There is a strong worry that selling a portion of the shared use path will set a precedent. Several comments identify that the Area Redevelopment Plan calls for the greenspace to be 12m wide. Reducing the width to 9m in this location will result in a “tunneling” effect and may lead to increased congestion and even crime.

Traffic/Parking: The area experiences heavy congestion around the intersections of 115 Street and 76 Avenue, and 115 Street and University Avenue. While the proposal caters to a car free lifestyle, there is apprehension that additional visitors to the site will increase this issue. These additional visitors may also increase demand for the limited on-street parking which is already in short supply. Lastly, the narrow lanes will result in large vehicles having to back into the proposed plaza, this is a safety concern for residents utilizing this space.

The most recurring comments of **support** heard were:

Location: The site’s proximity to public transit and large institutions (U of A) will allow additional people to easily access these resources.

Amenities: The commercial opportunities and public plaza will provide additional gathering spaces for the community while the additional residents will help support the existing businesses in the neighbourhood.

WHAT WE HEARD

The following section includes a summary of collected comments with the number of times a comment was recorded in brackets (comments received once do not have a number).

REASONS FOR OPPOSITION

Built Form/Site Layout/Neighbourhood Character

- The height of the building is too large, exceeds the Area Redevelopment Plan, and will not fit with the character of the neighbourhood (54)
- The additional storeys will result in a lack of privacy (21)
- The height of the building will cast a large shadow (10)
- The scale of the building is too large and the location is inappropriate at the end of a cul-de-sac/dead end street (8)
- Density/F.A.R is too great (8)
- Building will reduce sightlines along the shared use path/decrease safety (4)
- Building will be of poor quality (2)
- Setbacks are insufficient.
- Development is not a single family home.

Greenspace/Mature Trees

- The proposal will reduce the size of the shared use path and does not conform with the guiding principles depicted for the 114 Street Green Spine concept within the Area Redevelopment Plan (30)
- Insufficient landscaping and/or impacts to existing landscaping along the shared use pathway (3)
- Fire Truck turnaround within the plaza area will impede proper plaza programming.
- Does not provide additional greenspace

Traffic/Parking/Safety

- Will increase traffic congestion in the neighbourhood (65)
- Will increase demand for on-street parking (31)
- Emergency/services vehicles will be unable to maneuver and access the site, and alternative site design for maneuvering should be considered (11)

- Vehicles backing up into the public plaza will be a safety hazard (10)
- The rear lane will begin to experience traffic similar to a roadway (4)
- Poor condition of existing rear lanes

Other

- The proposal should follow the guidelines of the Area Redevelopment Plan (50)
- Concerns about the removal of Child Care Services from the proposal (13)
- Buffer between the new lane and existing houses is inadequate (10)
- The type of dwellings being offered will increase the amount of students/transient residents living in the neighbourhood and not enough diversity of housing options for families (10)
- Proposed plaza removes parking areas for LRT maintenance vehicles and snow clearance (2)
- Increased crime (2)
- Increased noise levels (3)
- The applicant's engagement 'summary and project revisions' document is not fully accurate
- Commercial uses not appropriate for context
- Impacts to existing drainage infrastructure
- Neighbourhood needs more single family homes

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

- Keep the height at 4 storeys (17)
- Provide additional pedestrian/cyclist connections (3)
- Add additional bicycle parking and support infrastructure (bike sharing, tune up stations) (2)
- Greater focus on climate impacts (2)
- Commercial opportunities to focus on food/grocery services
- Include community garden/composting
- No commercial business that will operate late at night
- Increase the number of 3 bedroom units.
- Cater to citizens with mobility challenges.

REASONS FOR SUPPORT

- Increased density/proximity along the LRT corridor (6)
- Opportunity for additional commercial amenities in the neighbourhood/greater support for existing businesses (3)

- Car free design (3)
 - Creates a gathering space for the community
 - Provides additional opportunities to live close to the University.
 - Allow more people to access existing amenities in the area.
 - Supports the 'missing middle'
-

Questions & Answers

1. Is there a density (3 or 4 storeys) which does not trigger EPCOR Water Infrastructure upgrades, or has a cost share been looked at?

EPCOR Water has provided comments for two scenarios under the initial proposal for two low rise apartment buildings (110 Dwellings) and the current proposal for two mid rise apartment buildings (142 Dwellings). Based on these reviews, both proposals require updated water infrastructure upgrades. No other review has been provided by EPCOR water based on the scope of the application.

Response from Applicant:

The project was submitted to the [EPCOR cost share program](#) under application ICSA-2021-020, but rejected based on the following:

- o This is a major infrastructure upgrade and that this project would take up the majority of the allocated \$1.2 million funding for the entire 2020-2021 program.
- o The criteria that the project needed to be at the development permit stage by way of a pre-application meeting submission which cannot occur unless the rezoning is approved.
- o 2022 EPCOR Water Cost Share Program has not been funded.

2. Can you clarify which day Metro 78 garbage and recycling pick up will be?

Each building with 71 Units would receive approximately 18 cubic yards of garbage service and 9 cubic yards of recycle services per week. According to the applicant, the waste storage room for each building would be adequately sized for approximately three 4-cubic yard wheeled bins and three 4-cubic yard wheeled recycling bins.

Based on this information, the anticipated frequency of pickup with these amounts of bins would be two times per week for garbage and one time per week for recycling. The specific days of collection shall be determined once the developer makes the request for service.

3. And is it correct to assume Metro 78 garbage pick-up will not be on the same as community garbage pick-up (Thursday)?

Separate garbage and recycling pick-up will be required for the Metro 78 buildings from the rest of the single detached homes in the community. This is due to different operational trucks needed to service the different dwelling types using either bins or the cart programs.

4. Has it been assessed whether the Metro 78 garbage trucks will be able to turn from the new north south lane into 78 avenue, when cars are parked on both sides of 78 avenue, and Metro 78 parking is full.

In consultation with Waste Services and review of the turning maneuvers, the intent is to have the bin collection vehicles enter from the abutting east/west lanes for each building. For the north building, the vehicle would continue east and exit north onto 79 Avenue. For the south building, the intent is to turn into the newly created north/south lane and exit after collection onto 78 Avenue. In all cases, turning maneuvers have been assessed and confirmed as satisfactory for the City's waste truck operators.

5. Is the garbage area in the building large enough to accommodate the garbage from any commercial units? And if not, does this mean another day of garbage pick-up?

The commercial units will be required to go with private waste removal companies and separate waste loading areas will need to be considered for the commercial component which is not mandated for City-provided service. This will also require additional bins to be sited in the waste storage area. If this is not possible, the commercial component will be required to use City-provided services at City-determined rates. According to the applicant, the garbage/recycling rooms shall be designed to accommodate the required number of bins to service both residential and commercial components.

6. With the garbage bins being kept inside Metro 78, will the garbage company have access to open the door, or will Metro 78 need to leave the garbage bins outside before they come?

Typically with wheeled bins that are stored indoors, the City's Waste Services staff would bring out the bins to the collection area if the distance is within the allowable guidelines (9 meters indoors plus 6 meters outdoors). It is ultimately the decision of the development on how they best see fit to provide access for Waste Services. Some ways of access could be a keypad with a code for the overhead door or access into the building to open the overhead door from the inside.

7. Will the document entitled 'applicant engagement and project revisions' be revised

for its omissions (including the following bullets below)

These developer-hosted engagement sessions were independent from and in addition to the City-hosted engagement on the application held from August 16 to September 6, 2021. These developer hosted sessions were held to receive feedback during the initial stages of a project and to help inform any refinements during the application review. It is the responsibility of the applicants to share the information received from these sessions with City Administration and to ensure they are complete and accurate.

While the City does take these developer-hosted engagement feedback summaries into account as part of its review of the application, they are considered in conjunction with a number of other factors. These factors include feedback collected from the City-hosted engagement, technical considerations (such as traffic and drainage impact assessments) and alignment to City land-use related plans and policies (eg the City Plan, the McKernan-Belgravia Area Redevelopment Plan, etc).

To provide some clarification on the 'applicant engagement and project revisions' document, the applicant has provided the following responses to the bullet points mentioned below:

- **Feb 7, 2021. The meeting was with representatives from BCL, BelMac and MCL, not just BelMac.**

Response from Applicant:

The meeting was recorded in Green Space Alliance (GSA) Consulting's What We Heard report according to the community group that requested or initiated the event, which in this case, was the BelMac group.

- **March 24, 2021. This is not included in the summary and was a meeting with representatives from BCL, BelMac, MCL, and the Charles Simmonds Park committee to discuss a contribution to Charles Simmonds Park.**

Response from Applicant:

The purpose of the meeting held on March 24, 2021, was to provide an opportunity to the Charles Simmonds Park committee representative to get clarification from City Administration as to how the Community Amenity Contribution policy applies to Direct Control rezoning applications. Green Space Alliance (GSA) Consulting does not consider this meeting an engagement activity

- **May 2021. This is not included in the summary. BelMac requested several times to have a follow-up meeting between representatives of BelMac, MCL, BCL and the developer, and the developer declined June 9, 2021.**

Response from Applicant:

Between September 2020 and December 2020, Green Space Alliance (GSA) Consulting held several meetings with the BelMac group and a professional consultant who indicated she was hired by this group to discuss the project with the developer. Subsequently, in 2021, additional meetings were held at the request of the BelMac group.

On June 7, 2021, GSA organized a meeting with the McKernan Community League Board. The meeting was open to the general public and the BelMac group.

- **The developer met with adjacent neighbours to discuss a fence. This is not included.**

Response from Applicant:

Green Space Alliance (GSA) Consulting's approach to drafting What We Heard reports is to not include either meetings held between property owners or ones not facilitated by GSA staff.

- **We requested a buffer not a fence (16)**

Response from Applicant:

The developer attended a meeting with the two adjacent neighbours to the west of the project site to discuss screening options. The meeting was productive. Both neighbours indicated that they favoured the approach of building new screening solutions to delineate their property. The developer and the two adjacent neighbours agreed that having the same screening material for both the north and south properties would be aesthetically the best solution. Follow-up steps/action items were for the developer to research screening styles and provide images to the two adjacent neighbours.

- **Summary of October and February meetings. Height and setbacks were also discussed, but these topics are missing.**

Response from Applicant:

Building height is a specific topic on page 2 of the report under Meeting #2 (October 2020).

Setbacks and stepbacks were also discussed and recorded under Building Design. The discussion about height at Meeting #7 (February 2021) revolved around the interface between single-detached houses and mid-rise buildings. This topic is in the report, and examples were provided as a follow-up to the meeting.

- **Project revision table is inaccurate. Appears may have removed all green spine landscaping to offset Charles Simmonds Park Contribution and this was not discussed (6)**

Response from Applicant:

As per the City Administration calculation, the community amenity contribution owed for this rezoning application is approximately \$181,000. This amount is offset by the number of family-oriented units provided. Any additional public amenity contributions that the developer has committed to are above and beyond the minimum required by the Community Amenity Contribution policy.

- **Childcare is no longer in the proposal (7),**

See applicant response under Question #12 below.

- **the community did not request west balconies (12),**

Response from Applicant:

A recurrent comment about building design was a contemporary versus traditional architecture style. Some residents indicated that balconies would make the design align better with a preferred traditional architecture style. Ultimately, we recorded a comment from a resident who remarked that balconies are how they meet our neighbours.

- **We requested once weekly garbage collection (13),**

Response from Applicant:

The number of bins calculated for the development is based on the City Waste Management guidelines. At the rezoning stage, the frequency of waste collection is estimated as the design of the waste storage rooms is within the scope of a future Development Permit application.

8. **Why is the 'plaza' called a 'plaza' and not a 'mid-block accessway'. Although the intent may be to function as a plaza, it clearly does not meet the definition of a plaza**

in the TOD guidelines, and shouldn't the terminology in the DC2 used be consistent with the City's definition?

'Urban Plazas' are defined in the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Guidelines as follows: Predominantly hardscaped plazas within an urban setting that primarily serves the local community.

For this application, the 'Urban Plaza' term is used to clarify its intended programming and implement the Mckernan-Belgravia Station Area Redevelopment Plan's desired conversion of the cul-de-sacs west of 114 Street to 'open-spaces'. The intended programming captures some of the TOD Guidelines for Urban Plazas, such as including guiding principles for these areas reflected as typical open space next to LRT stops with features such as predominantly paving material, seating areas, retail/active frontages dubbing the 'plaza' term appropriate for this context.

9. Why is the height of the building measured from the flat roof instead of from the top of the canopy?

Building height is measured according to the regulations on [Section 52 of the Zoning Bylaw](#). For flat roofs, the maximum building height shall be measured from the horizontal plane through grade to the midpoint of the highest parapet and shall not extend more than 1.7 metres above the maximum permitted building height of the zone. Section 52 also states that elements such as elevator housings, roof stairways, and entrances are excluded from the calculation of the maximum building height. According to the applicants, they anticipate revising the design to reduce the size of the canopies, thus, the perceived mass of the rooftop.

10. Has there been any assessment of whether current street parking will be able to accommodate the estimated additional 304 vehicles per day?

The estimated daily trips represent a combination of inbound and outbound trips expected to be made by the tenants, visitors, deliveries, ride shares and service vehicles, etc. which will be spread out over the course of a 24 hour period. The buildings are proposed to be constructed without on-site parking for the residents (as permitted by [Open Option Parking](#)) and will be marketed with this information; it is expected that potential residents of the development will choose to live in the building with this knowledge. Residents of the development will not be able to participate in the neighbourhood residential parking program (given the multi-family nature of these buildings). Given the proximity to the LRT

and the lack of parking, it is likely the majority of the residents will not have a car. The parking demand generated by visitors, deliveries, ride shares and service vehicles are expected to be short term and will be accommodated on-site through the supply of on-site parking for visitors, rideshare and loading. On-street parking in the area has some capacity to accommodate any spill-over short term parking demand generated by the development.

11. Has there been any assessment of the safety of children, cyclist crossing the new North-South lane to access the mid-block accessway, considering parked cars will need to back up to exit their parking stall, the increase in traffic, and the backing up of large vehicles when the loading zone/garbage zone/corner cut zone is occupied.

A separate detailed safety assessment for pedestrians and cyclists has not been completed as these reviews are generally completed for an area or section of roadway with high traffic volumes and frequent collision records. Based on the traffic impact assessment report, the development generated traffic volume is expected to be 26 trips in the busiest hour which translates into less than 1 trip every two minutes. Given there will be no parking provided for the residents of the building, the actual trip number could be lower than what is projected.

The scenario proposed with the development is not unique within Edmonton. There are examples in the city where midrise and highrise developments take access off the alley and generate significantly more traffic compared to Metro 78 generated traffic. In some of these cases, the intersecting roadway with the alley contains a bike route or major pedestrian corridor where no significant operational issues were reported.

Upon the completion of the development, traffic volume including pedestrians and cyclists are expected to continue to be low. Given these low volumes and that the interactions between modes will be in a low speed environment, no significant safety hazard is anticipated.

12. Why had childcare been removed as a possible use?

Response from Applicant:

- Child Care Services was never part of the original application; therefore, it was not removed.
- Through the engagement process, the developer received feedback from the community that Child Care Services would be something they would like to see in the building.
- The Zoning Bylaw deems Child Care Services a commercial use that is more intense than typical neighbourhood commercial uses. Child Care Services should comply with additional regulations in the Zoning Bylaw. These regulations create challenges for providing this service in residential buildings. The developer brought this issue to City Administration's attention. After extensive discussions with City Administration, the developer decided to create a specific space in the south building to have a day-home to accommodate the community's request. A day-home is a home-based business and is already allowed in the (RF1) Single Detached Residential Zone.

13. Why have setbacks been decreased by .5m on the west and east side compared to the previous DC2?

Response from Applicant:

We have not modified the setbacks since the building height increased from four to six storeys. In the previous concept (when there were only two lots), the west setback was 5.5 m, and the east setback was 2.0 m.

14. Will the platform structures on the east and the west of the building project an additional 1.5m, in addition to the reduction of the setback of 1m and 2m on the west and east side respectively up to 16.5m in height?

Response from Applicant:

- Section 44 of the Zoning Bylaw allows platform structures to project within required setbacks and separation spaces according to the standards provided in that section. The design fully complies with the regulations outlined in Section 44.
- There are two types of balconies designed for the buildings. The majority are Juliet balconies which are essentially false balconies or railings at the outer plane of a window opening connected to the building facade without a deck to walk on. On a limited number of units on each level, there are actual balconies designed with a minimum depth of 1.5 m to meet the Amenity Space regulations. Since they are recessed 0.5 m, they project 1.0 m into the setbacks.

15. There appears to be a 2m buffer between the Metro78 parking area and Metro78, but

the developer won't consider a buffer area between the directly adjacent neighbours and the new north-south lane. Why not?

Response from Applicant:

There is a 2 m sidewalk at the ground level between the parking area and the buildings. As requested by the community, we provided a range of examples of similar context in Edmonton and Calgary where mid-rise buildings are adjacent to single-detached houses separated by a rear lane. The proposed buffer seems not to be characteristic in this type of neighbourhood block configuration.

16. The developer previously supported their assertion that the development site is a gateway using the results of their survey. Is it correct to assume the developer will no longer use the survey results as support given they indicate in the engagement summary “this survey is not intended to be representative sample of the community”?

Response from Applicant:

Green Space Alliance (GSA) submitted an amendment to the Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) to reclassify the project location as a pedestrian gateway. The amendment is based on our professional opinion, not on the community responses to the survey.

17. The review of the survey was done by Avens Evaluation Group. According to Avens' website, one of the two consultants at Avens is Dorothy Pinto. Shouldn't an arm's length firm have reviewed the survey?

Response from Applicant:

The survey intended to gather information and perspectives from the residents on the project. Green Space Alliance (GSA) and the developer wanted to ensure that questions were unbiased. The developer hired an expert to review the survey question to ensure they were well worded. The developer's wife has a Ph.D. and is a professional and expert in the field thus qualifying her consultancy practice to conduct this type of work.

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.

Next Steps

The public feedback received will be considered during the planning analysis and will be included in the administration report for City Council. The administration report and finalized version of the applicant's proposal will be posted for public viewing on the [City's public hearing agenda](#) approximately three (3) weeks prior to a scheduled public hearing for the file.

When the applicant is ready to take the application to Council:

- Notice of Public Hearing date will be sent to surrounding property owners and applicable nearby Community Leagues and Business Associations.
- Once the Council Public Hearing Agenda is posted online, members of the public may register to speak at Council by completing the form at edmonton.ca/meetings or calling the Office of the City Clerk at 780-496-8178.
- Members of the public may listen to the Public hearing on-line via edmonton.ca/meetings.
- Members of the public can submit written comments to the City Clerk (city.clerk@edmonton.ca).

If you have questions about this application please contact:

Marty Vasquez, Planner

780-495-1948

marty.vasquez@edmonton.ca