



WHAT WE HEARD REPORT

Online Public Engagement Feedback Summary LDA20-0385 - Station Flats/Station Park

PROJECT ADDRESS: 8101 - Gateway Boulevard NW & 10245 - 82 Avenue NW

- PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**
- Rezoning of 8101 - Gateway Boulevard NW from DC1 to DC1 to continue to protect the historic CP Train Station as a designated municipal and provincial historic resource, but also allow new development north and south of it.
 - Amendment to the Strathcona Area Redevelopment Plan to better reflect Open Option Parking, amend the height strategy, and designate the land proposed for a new residential development as being “Residential”.
 - Municipal Reserve Removal from the park site at 10245 - 82 Avenue NW to allow the expansion, on a temporary basis, of commercial development from the train station site northward.

ENGAGEMENT Online engagement webpage - Engaged Edmonton:

FORMAT: <https://engaged.edmonton.ca/stationflats>

ENGAGEMENT DATES: February 16 - March 5, 2021

- NUMBER OF VISITORS:**
- Engaged: 30
 - Informed: 55
 - Aware: 319

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 February 16 - March 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.

The feedback is summarized into two parts. The first for the rezoning and plan amendment component, and the second for the proposed Municipal Reserve removal component. While it is expected that all three components will be decided upon by City Council at the same Public Hearing. The proposed Municipal Reserve removal will be decided upon separately from the rezoning and plan amendment.

Input from Edmontonians on the rezoning and plan amendment components 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 if and when the proposed rezoning and plan amendment goes to a future City Council Public Hearing for a decision.

Input from Edmontonians on the proposed Municipal Reserve removal will be used to ensure the City's analysis of the application is as complete as possible. It will also inform City Administration's consideration for the removal of the Municipal Reserve designation from this site. Feedback will also be summarized in the report to City Council if and when the proposed Municipal Reserve removal 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 and included in the report to City Council if and when this application proceeds forward to a Public Hearing for their consideration.

ENGAGEMENT FORMAT

The Engaged Edmonton webpage included two videos, 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 - Rezoning & Plan Amendment

Support: 3

Neutral/Mixed: 4

Unclear/Questions Only: 10

Opposed: 13

WHAT WE HEARD - Municipal Reserve Removal

Support: 2

Neutral/Mixed: 2

Unclear/Questions Only: 12

Opposed: 14

Comments - Rezoning & Plan Amendment

General/Other

- Adding more commercial spaces in this area makes no sense with all the existing vacancies, especially in historic buildings which we want to see used and maintained (x3).
- Good project to improve the area/underutilized site (x2).
- Development should consider/incorporate the unused CP railway land (x2).
- Want railyard converted to parks and open space.
- Should make the entire area park with trees.

- Need more trees from 78 Avenue to Whyte Avenue.
- Will bring much needed vibrancy and density to an otherwise difficult location.
- Overall a good idea.
- Would cut off views of Old Strathcona from West Ritchie.
- Want other recently approved projects to go ahead first before this one.
- Need a good plan for drainage servicing and flood mitigation.
- Developer doesn't understand the community by going against the plan.
- Good to see plans to increase density.

Building Scale

- Existing, new height maximums in the ARP should be maintained and not changed so soon after approved (x5).
- Residential building too tall (x4).
- Historic train station is being crowded in. Giving the station more breathing room (more than 5 metres) with a surrounding greenspace would be preferred (x2).
- Supportive of a new building, but 4-6 storeys would be more appropriate for residential building (x2).
- 3-4 storeys more appropriate for the new residential building.
- Out of scale with historic train station - should be 3 storeys nearest station and 4-5 storeys further south.
- Building height should be the same as Strathcona Hotel.
- Height variances are minimal and reasonable.
- The buildings would overshadow the train station.
- Skyline would be disrupted by the height of this building.

Building Design

- Does not encourage foot traffic or retail at street level with surface parking/should have active retail frontages, not surface parking (x5).
- Design of the building does not match the historic character of the neighbourhood/don't like seeing a modern glass building next to a historic brick building (x4).
- Sea container style building is ugly/oppressive (x2).
- Use of sea containers as a re-use of existing materials is good.
- Don't make another long, ugly building like the one to the east of the tracks.
- Should be broken into two with heights of each meeting the existing height restrictions.
- Creative, attractive proposal.

- Concerned about safety of people in enclosed surface parking area.
- Existing concrete should be made into more green space.

Transportation

- Proposal should include a pedestrian/bike path across the tracks at 80th Avenue (x5).
- Want to see bicycle/pedestrian connections maintained/created through the current park and rezoning site from Whyte Avenue to 81 Avenue/in and around the site (x4).
- Long slab “wall” doesn’t reflect the potential extensions of the avenues into the railyard (x4).
- Need better north-south pedestrian and cycling connections down the west side of site along Gateway Boulevard (x3).
- Need better transit options so this new development doesn’t just lead to more vehicle congestion (x2).
- City should look into vehicle connection at 80th Avenue.
- Will add to traffic congestion.
- Not sure where developer will fit enough parking for the development.

Microclimate

- Not good to have residents right above a busy road in terms of air quality (x2).
- Adding tall buildings will decrease foot traffic with people not wanting to be in shadow and wind all the time.
- Long, tall building will create a shadow in the evening on West Ritchie.

Engagement/Process

- Engagement period should be longer (x2).
- Want to see more detailed plans.

Comments - Municipal Reserve Removal

General

- There is already little park space in the area (x2).
- Understand hesitation on the MR removal, but on balance, I support.
- Do not want the MR designation more tenuous.
- 5 years as “temporary” is too long.

- No decisions on the park space or MR removal should be made until the Old Strathcona Public Places Plan is done.
- Should be thought of more strategically about connecting to the north side of Whyte.

Future Use of MR Site

- Want site maintained as open green space, not a paved commercial extension (x5).
- Only green space on Whyte that would be a great community hub with some improvements to amenities and connections (x5).
- Need more green space, not less, especially with this intersection being a hub for street car/gondola in the future (x3).
- Removing open space for commercial use when there is so little open space in the area is not acceptable (x2).
- Want to see the existing open space retained as is as continued use for the homeless population. Ideal with close proximity to public washrooms (x2).
- Don't mind a couple of seacan's, but not the entire space.
- Use of park space as plaza/commercial is a better use than it has currently.
- Like the idea of another plaza in the area.

Open Space/Plaza Design

- Critical that the existing trees be retained (x2).
- Don't want more paved area/concrete (x2).

Design of Temporary Buildings

- Would block view of historic train station from Whyte Avenue (x2).
- Seacan design not in context of the historical area.
- Like the idea of using container as construction material.
- Should have more seating/observation area on the top.

Questions & Answers

1. My question is about the potential implications of this proposal on future pedestrian access to the east. There has been talk about at some point facilitating pedestrian access along 80th or 81 avenue across the old rail line to the shopping district to the west of Gateway. This would be a huge improvement for residents of Scona Gardens, as many don't have vehicles, and the walk up to Whyte Avenue and south

again is difficult with groceries and other goods in your arms. Would this development eliminate any possibility of pedestrian access being possible in the future and lead to further isolation of the neighbourhood to the east?

- The City recognizes the value in securing a pedestrian / cyclist connection at 80 Avenue, which was highlighted in PlanWhyte and now the Strathcona Area Redevelopment Plan.
 - The proposed DC1 Provision has a regulation requiring a minimum 3.0 m wide public access connection east to west through the rezoning site at approximately 80th Avenue in anticipation of a future connection across the tracks to 102nd Street. The more significant barrier to completing this connection to the east is the railyard, which is still in active use next to this site. Should the railyard ever become inactive or an arrangement for a crossing is made with the operator, this pedestrian and bicycle connection could then be completed.
2. How will bicycle traffic flow through the Station Park development on the current Municipal Reserve lands? Will Station Park allow for people to ride slowly through to access the crosswalk at 81 Ave? Or have a path that allows cyclists to bypass the pedestrian area?
- There are no planned infrastructure improvements specifically for bicycles being proposed as part of this project.
 - It is anticipated that the current lands with Municipal Reserve designation, if temporary development is allowed, will still have a large amount of plaza/open space as part of the temporary commercial development.
 - Edmontonians are reminded that cycling on the sidewalk is not permitted except for bikes with a 50 cm wheel diameter or less, such as kids' bikes ([more information](#)). At some locations, sidewalks may be designated as shared sidewalks and shared pathways, but that is not the case for any sidewalks currently in the vicinity of this land. If that changes in the future, look for these signs:



- The City is undertaking the [Gateway Boulevard Reconstruction and Rehabilitation project](#) immediately adjacent to the lands with Municipal Reserve designation south to 80 Avenue NW. As per the [Draft Concept Plan](#), there is an intent to build a pedestrian connection along the east side of Gateway Boulevard. It is yet to be determined if this connection will be designed to accommodate other modes of travel as well.
3. Where are the pedestrian / cycling / transit connections as part of Area B? With the heavy traffic zipping by, perhaps a multi-use path would be appropriate on the East side of the development. Or--if we'd like to have it on the west side of the development--the city could propose a road diet here and turn one of the traffic lanes into a sidewalk with a parallel bike lane and barrier of trees between the pedestrians and traffic. Truly pedestrian friendly connections all the way down to 76 Ave are sorely missing.
- The City is undertaking the [Gateway Boulevard Reconstruction and Rehabilitation project](#) immediately adjacent to this site. As per the [Draft Concept Plan](#), there is an intent to build a pedestrian connection along the east side of Gateway Boulevard. It is yet to be determined if this connection will be designed to accommodate other modes of travel as well.
 - South of 80 Avenue NW, the proposed DC1 Provision will require the owner/developer to continue this pedestrian connection to the southern limits of their site.
4. What are the plans for the unkept and under-utilized vacant space between the Station on Whyte building and the proposed project? I am referring to the vacant CP land and unused train tracks.

- Although the tracks currently end at approximately 81 Avenue NW, the entire rail right-of-way is still under the jurisdiction of the railway and/or the Province of Alberta.
 - The portion of the right-of-way that contains tracks, as well as the railyard further south, is still active and in use.
 - Due to the current ownership and nearby rail operations, the City does not have any plans for this space.
5. Why would you ever add a chunky glass mini-tower right between historic brick buildings?
- Though no decisions have yet been made by the City on whether to support this application or not, guidance in this regard is being taken from [The Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada](#).
 - As per these Standards and Guidelines new development adjacent to a historic place should be distinguishable as a product of its own time, so modern materials and design are often considered acceptable.
6. If I read it correctly, the distance between the station and the sea container structure is only 5 meters. Would it be possible to see some renderings of the west elevation?
- The proposed DC1 Provision requires a 5.6 m separation distance between the existing historic train station and the new sea container commercial building.
 - There is also a requirement for a 4.5 m west setback for the sea container commercial building, increasing to 8.0 m on the south end, with the intent of ensuring the view of the historic train station from Gateway Boulevard NW is maintained. The renderings below from the applicant generally show this intent.



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 the rezoning or plan amendment component of this application please contact:

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

If you have questions about this the Municipal Reserve removal component of this application please contact:

Corey Churchill, Senior Planner
780-496-4843
corey.churchill@edmonton.ca