



114 University II
LDA20-0111



WHAT WE HEARD REPORT

Online Public Engagement Feedback Summary LDA20-0111: 114 University II

PROJECT ADDRESS: 11323, 11325, 11329, 11333 and 11335 University Avenue NW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This proposal is for a (DC2) Site Specific Development Control Provision that would allow for a mid-rise residential building with the following characteristics:

- A maximum height of 23.0 m (approximately 6 storeys);
- A maximum floor area ratio of 3.4; and
- A maximum of 132 residential units.

ENGAGEMENT FORMAT: Online engagement webpage - Engaged Edmonton: <https://engaged.edmonton.ca/114University2>

ENGAGEMENT DATES: January 18 - February 5, 2021

NUMBER OF VISITORS:

- Engaged: 15
- Informed: 43
- Aware: 285

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 January 18 - February 5, 2021. 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 and written text overview of the proposed rezoning as well as supplementary related documents 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: 5

Neutral/Mixed: 7

Opposed: 3

Comments

Massing, Density, Building & Site Design

- Height and size are better than before (x2)
- Original proposal at 30 m should have been approved
- Would like to see more height increase to stagger up 3 to 6 storeys from south to north, instead of a “cube”.
- Shouldn't be any higher than 4 storeys.
- These kind of towering infills don't fit in the neighbourhood
- Loss of sunlight and privacy for nearby properties
- Need more density to support local business and make housing more affordable.
- Should have as dense of housing developments as possible close to LRT.
- Reduction in density from original proposal unfortunate.
- Square rectangles and uninteresting rooflines are not attractive.
- Rooftop amenity area needs to limit noise and ensure privacy of abutting houses.

Transportation

- Proximity to LRT means this is what we should build here (x3).
- Would increase shortcutting through the neighbourhood. Should have more direct connections to major roads to mitigate this (x2).
- 76 Ave/114 Street intersection is already problematic, this would make it worse (x2).
- Not enough on site parking (x2).
- Encourage the developer to include as little parking as possible so that traffic through the neighbourhood isn't increased too much.
- East-west alley needs to be upgraded to accommodate this development and others.
- Like the commitment to bicycle parking

General/Other

- Happy the revised proposal is in line with McKernan-Belgravia Station Area Redevelopment Plan (x2).
- This is exactly the type of place where more intense development should go.
- Great idea. Area needs more accommodations.
- Exciting, sensible project.
- Excited about this new project along University Avenue.
- Neighbourhood is losing its charm/reasons why people like it.
- Veiled motions of public consultation - not genuine.

Questions & Answers

1. In light of the new open parking policy, how much underground parking is the developer planning on building for 114 University II and Mckernan Gates?
 - From the applicant: The Open Option Parking strategy gives us the ability to adjust the exact number of parking spaces we want to build at the development permit stage in response to market conditions. Currently, we are contemplating 130 - 135 underground vehicle parking spaces in a shared 1-level parkade spanning underneath both buildings.
2. Can the developer provide any details on the amenity they will build? roof top, or other?
 - From the applicant: To meet the amenity area requirements of the proposed zone, we are currently planning to build an approximately 92 m² indoor amenity room with direct access to the rear landscaped courtyard. While the proposed DC2 Provision leaves open the option for a rooftop amenity area, that is not something currently being contemplated in our design, but this could change going forward.
3. Will residents have underground or off street parking? If not all do so, where will on street parking occur?

Will on-site parking be increased?

- In line with the City's [Open Option Parking strategy](#), the zoning for this site will not regulate a minimum amount of parking for this development. This provides flexibility to developers to choose the amount of on-site parking that they feel is appropriate for their projects, including visitor parking.
- The developer has indicated that they are currently planning 130 - 135 underground vehicle parking spaces in a shared 1-level parkade spanning underneath this proposed building and the one already approved and under construction to the west of this site.
- The buildings combined could have up to 287 units, which means there may be units that do not have assigned parking spaces.

- In this scenario, residents of these buildings also wouldn't qualify for the Residential Parking Permit program in place in the area leaving their options for on-street parking nearby quite limited. As such, it is likely that the people that choose to live in this building without a designated parking space won't have a car.
4. Since the City wishes to emphasize pedestrian/transit use in this area, would the developer consider reducing the amount of underground parking (currently at around 135 units) in order to reduce auto traffic in the neighbourhood?
 - From the applicant: The current plan is for approximately 135 parking stalls between the two developments. The number of parking stalls proposed is already only about half of the maximum number of dwellings proposed (287). We believe this will help promote pedestrianisation and uptake of public transit among residents, while reducing the automobile traffic through the neighbourhood.
 5. What factors influence citizens' beliefs about infill and how can changes in attitude be achieved?
 - The City has taken a number of steps over the last several years through its [Infill Initiative](#) to try to raise awareness of the benefits of infill development and to help encourage good construction practices and better communication between builders and neighbours of infill. The City provided an update on the status of the current infill roadmap and enforcement efforts at the [January 19, 2021 Urban Planning Committee Meeting \(items 6.1-6.4\)](#).
 6. Will there be eco-friendly initiatives matching other builds in the area? In particular structures like solar panelling or rainwater collection?
 - The Zoning Bylaw does not regulate these kinds of eco-friendly initiatives. The future building would have to abide by any energy efficiency requirements of the Alberta Building Code or The National Energy Code of Canada.
-

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