



EDMONTON DESIGN COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Location: Google Meet
Tuesday, March 3, 2026**

MEMBERS:

C. Dorward, Chair
N. LaMontagne, Vice-Chair
J. Mills, Vice-Chair
D. Brown
G. Freer
J. Monfries
K. Dieterman
K. Oxley
M. Tindall
N. Pryce
R. Subramanian
S. Gibson

PRESENT:

C. Dorward, Chair
N. LaMontagne, Vice-Chair
J. Mills, Vice-Chair
D. Brown
G. Freer
J. Monfries

M. Tindall
N. Pryce

S. Gibson

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

E. Backstrom, Urban Planning and Economy, Lead Urban Designer (A)
A. Rowan, Urban Planning and Economy Department, EDC Administration
W. Sims, Urban Planning and Economy Department, Urban Designer
K. Bacon, Urban Planning and Economy Department, Planner

A. CALL TO ORDER AND RELATED BUSINESS

A.1. CALL TO ORDER

C. Dorward called the meeting to order at 4:02p.m.

A.2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

MOTION: C. Dorward

Motion to adopt the March 3, 2026 Agenda, with the following attachment:

- [Letter from citizen](#) regarding Item C.1

SECONDED: M. Tindall

The motion passed unanimously.

A.3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

MOTION: C. Dorward

Motion to adopt the February 17, 2026 Minutes

SECONDED: N. Pryce

A.4 REQUESTS TO SPEAK

None.

B. PROJECT SYNOPSES (Closed to the Public)

MOTION: C. Dorward

That the Edmonton Design Committee meet in private pursuant to Section 29 (advice from officials) of the Access to Information Act (ATIA) for the discussion of item B.1.

SECONDED: D. Brown

The motion passed unanimously.

Edmonton Design Committee met in private at 4:04p.m.

MOTION: C. Dorward

That the Edmonton Design Committee meet in public.

SECONDED: J. Mills

The motion passed unanimously.

The Edmonton Design Committee met in public at 4:29p.m

C. APPLICATIONS

FORMAL PRESENTATIONS (Open to the Public)

C.1 Downtown Student Housing (DP)

Andrea Van Niekerk- FAI

Motion of Non-support: J. Monfries

Seconded: N. Pryce

In the interest of ensuring a high standard of urban design, the Committee recommends the Applicant:

- Consider the design refinement of building materiality and facade treatment (e.g., suite window size, pilasters, cornice, etc.) in the upper floors to better reflect a residential and Warehouse District character. These same characteristics should also be reflected in the design of streetscape and courtyard spaces with respect to surface materials, site furnishings, and features (e.g., lighting type, fencing, etc.) selection and application.
- Consider the design approaches and differences between the various buildings (e.g., offset versus aligned windows, differing fibre cement colours and extents), and either lean into having the buildings be more different, or more similar.
- Consider the expanded use of brick on additional buildings and elevations within the development to relate to the warehouse district zoning and neighbourhood spirit, versus only utilizing brick on the existing heritage building. In particular, replacing the woodgrain fluted metal panel along 106 street could be considered to be replaced with brick.
- Consider commercial or public accessible uses at grade, especially along 104 Avenue. The emphasis on private courtyards and controlled spaces limits its contribution to the public realm and street life.

For the Motion: D. Brown, J. Monfries, S. Gibson, N. LaMontagne, N. Pryce, M. Tindall

Against the Motion: J. Mills, G. Freer, C. Dorward

CARRIED

R. Subramanian joined the meeting at 5:30p.m.

C.2 Nexus 80 (DP)

Don An- 345 Architecture

Motion of Non-support: G. Freer

Seconded: J. Mills

The application does not clearly demonstrate a universally accessible, barrier-free primary entrance from the public sidewalk, with access appearing to rely exclusively on stairs and grade changes rather than a continuous accessible route. In a single-family neighbourhood where most homes are ground-oriented and directly accessible at grade, this condition may be perceived as limiting inclusivity and inconsistent with expectations for equitable residential infill development.

- Front entry design refinement should be considered to enhance the transition and interface with the neighbourhood public realm, incorporating site/landscape components (hard surfacing, soft landscape, site furnishings, and features) that create a ‘front yard’ and opportunities for resident outdoor gathering.
- Consider relocating window wells off the primary 76 Avenue facade. Basement suites relying solely on recessed window wells will experience limited access to natural light. Care should be taken to ensure window wells are not obstructed by covers, fencing, or landscaping so that available daylight and ventilation are maximized.
- Reassess the rooftop outdoor amenity space form and function and consider design components and amenity space layout to better support year-round use and varied types of potential residential activities (i.e. wind screening, partial weather protection, integrated seating, seasonal lighting, flexible layouts, etc.).

The Committee notes that this project would have benefited from an informal presentation. While the proposal aligns with the applicable zoning, it introduces a built form and scale that differ from the established pattern in the surrounding area. As a result, it may help shape expectations for future neighbourhood renewal and infill, and thoughtful consideration of its broader contextual relationship is important.

For the Motion: G. Freer, S. Gibson, J. Mills, M. Tindall, D. Brown, C. Dorward, R. Subramanian

Against the Motion: N. Pryce, N. LaMontagne

CARRIED

D. OTHER BUSINESS

E. UPCOMING APPLICATIONS, CONFLICTS AND REGRETS, March 17, 2025

Regrets: N. Pryce (away until April 16)

F. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:48p.m.

G. NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, March 17, 2026 at 4:00p.m.