



JASPER PLACE ARP PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS SUMMARY

The City of Edmonton is committed to engaging citizens in decisions that could affect them, as set out in Policy C513: Public Involvement. As such, the City organized a number of activities throughout the Jasper Place Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) process for community members to provide their input.

The input of the community has been essential in identifying the plan priorities and has directly informed the guiding principles and specific policies in the ARP.

The City gratefully acknowledges the time dedicated and commitment shown by community members in providing their input and feedback.

The following report highlights the key engagement tools used throughout the ARP process, a list of the consultation activities held, and a high level summary of the key consultation themes.

This is followed by the more detailed summaries of the feedback received at individual consultation events.

KEY ENGAGEMENT TOOLS

Website

The Jasper Place ARP website provided a key point of contact where community members could access information about the ARP process, opportunities for involvement, draft versions of the ARP, technical reports, online surveys, videos, interactive digital tools, surveys, and summaries of consultation feedback.

Email List

Interested community members signed up for the Jasper Place ARP email distribution list online, or in person at engagement events. The email list was used to provide updates regarding the plan process, engagement opportunities, and information resources. Over 350 individuals were signed up to the email list.

In Person

In person engagement events such as open houses, information sessions, booths at community events, and community league meetings provided opportunities for face-to-face conversations between community members and City staff.

Advertising and Notification

The open houses and information & feedback sessions were advertised using road signs, fliers to all residents and businesses, addressed mail to property owners living outside the plan area, the email distribution list, newspaper advertisements, and the project website.

Social Media

Project events and news were shared on Facebook and Twitter, and highlighted opportunities for community members to provide their input.

Consultation events

The following table details events and activities organized to collect community feedback.

| EVENT | SUMMARY |
|---|--|
| Open House #1 October 2012 | An opportunity for residents and stakeholders in all four Jasper Place neighbourhoods to learn about the ARP process, ask questions of City staff, and identify community priorities. |
| Learning Scenarios 2012-2013 | The Learning Scenarios explored the potential impacts and outcomes of different types of redevelopment in Jasper Place using a computer model that tracked changes to key community indicators in three hypothetical redevelopment scenarios. Findings were shared in a detailed report and summary video. The Learning Scenarios were undertaken with the input of a group of community volunteers from the Jasper Place neighbourhoods known as the Evidence Team. |
| Information and Feedback Sessions April-May 2013 | City staff visited each neighbourhood and met with the Stony Plain Road and Area Business Revitalization Zone. The purpose was to share preliminary information collected in the first phase of the ARP process, and to receive more detailed feedback about key issues identified by community members in Open House #1. An online survey was also available for community members to provide comments. Staff used this feedback, along with City-wide policy and technical knowledge, to write a series of draft principles for the ARP. |
| Open House #2 June 2013 | The City presented a series of draft guiding principles. Attendees had the opportunity to review and comment on the principles, and identify areas of future change they anticipated in their neighbourhoods. An online survey was also created to obtain feedback on the draft principles. |
| Community Event Booth Summer 2013 | Throughout summer 2013, the City attended a variety of community events to increase awareness of the ARP process, share information about the online survey, and provide opportunities for community members to provide their feedback directly on the draft principles for the ARP. |
| Open House #3 November 2013 | At Open House #3, community members shared their ideas about how to implement the guiding principles of the ARP in the Jasper Place neighbourhoods. Participants provided input through comment sheets, interactive displays, conversations with City staff, and workshop exercises about land use, parks and open space, and mobility. City staff used this feedback to inform the draft ARP. |
| Open House #4 June 2014 | Launch of the first complete draft of the ARP. Attendees had the opportunity to review display board materials, listen to a presentation by City staff that outlined the key policies and approaches of the ARP, and ask questions in large and small group formats. The first draft of the ARP was open for community input until October 31, 2014 through email, letters, and online surveys. |
| Stony Plain Road Market Booth August 2014 | City staff attended the Stony Plain Road Back Alley Market event to provide information, answer questions, and receive feedback from community members. Resources included information boards, copies of the first draft ARP, and comment boards where community members could read and post feedback. |
| Drop-in Session September 2014 | At the June 2014 Open House, participants were asked how they would like to provide their feedback on the first draft of the ARP. A number of respondents identified a desire to have one-on-one conversations with City staff. This drop-in session was subsequently organized to provide engaged stakeholders with an additional opportunity for to speak directly with City staff, ask questions, and provide feedback on the first draft ARP. |
| Open House #5 March 2015 | A second draft of the ARP was released in February 2015, along with a summary document that detailed how City staff had responded to the community feedback received on the first draft. Open House #5 was held to share information and discuss the second draft of the ARP. Information boards were provided, and City staff delivered a presentation outlining the second draft and next steps in the process. Community members had the opportunity to provide their input on comment sheets at the open house, through an online survey, and by email and phone calls until March 31, 2015. |
| Executive Committee Meeting May 2015 | Community members had the opportunity to attend an Executive Committee meeting on May 5, 2015 and share their perspectives on the second draft with members of Council. |

KEY ENGAGEMENT THEMES

A number of key themes emerged through the feedback received from residents, businesses and property owners in Jasper Place. The topics that relate directly to land use and civic infrastructure that could be considered in the ARP are highlighted below.

| THEME | OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Safety | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feeling safe in the neighbourhood was highlighted as a key priority, particularly in parks and along Stony Plain Road. |
| Housing Choices | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was general consensus that Jasper Place should provide housing opportunities for families, singles, and seniors. Some felt that single detached housing should be protected and that other types of housing detracted from neighbourhood character. Others highlighted opportunities for a variety of housing forms to attract families and support local schools. Many expressed a desire for the interior of the neighbourhoods to remain small scale with additional opportunities focused along arterial roads. |
| Design Quality and Sense of Place | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many expressed support for infill if it could be guaranteed to be of high design quality. Many valued the sense of space created by front yards and mature trees in their neighbourhoods. Rear garages were noted as a defining feature of the neighbourhoods. Some felt there were opportunities to redevelop older houses into more modern, higher quality buildings. |
| Transit Oriented Development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some felt transit oriented development guidelines were out of scale for the Jasper Place neighbourhoods and applied to too much of the area. Others felt TOD offered a good opportunity to provide activity and add to street life. |
| Stony Plain Road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Stony Plain Road commercial corridor was highlighted as a potential community asset that would be key to the success of the area. Concerns around the quality of buildings along Stony Plain Road were raised and a desire for more diversity of businesses was expressed. Mixed use development along the street was highlighted for its potential to revitalize the street. |
| Parks and Open Space | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parks and open space in Jasper Place are highly valued by community members. Some noted that existing parks would benefit from upgrading to improve the quality and safety of the spaces. The need for more parks and open spaces was highlighted by West Jasper Place residents. |
| Mobility | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The walkability of the neighbourhoods was highlighted as a valued asset. Limited pedestrian access to key commercial areas, including Mayfield Common and Stony Plain Road, was raised as an issue. The 100 Avenue shared-use path was noted as a valuable community asset. It was noted that biking infrastructure could be improved to link across the whole area. Increased pressures on on-street parking were highlighted as a key concern associated with infill development. Concerns about the impact of LRT on traffic and transit users parking in the neighbourhoods were also raised. |
| Infrastructure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many expressed the importance of ensuring adequate sewer and utility infrastructure to support the local community now and in the future. |

JASPER PLACE ARP: OPEN HOUSE REPORT

On October 16, 2012 the City hosted an Open House for the Jasper Place Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) process. The Open House was an opportunity for the public to clarify their priorities for the Jasper Place ARP and to ask questions of City Staff. The event was also a chance for City Staff to learn more about the interests and priorities of community members.

The Open House had a drop in period from 2:00 to 7:00 p.m., presentations at 7:00 p.m. and a breakout discussion session from 7:45 to 8:30 p.m. Feedback was gathered through comment sheets, a ranking of priorities, conversations between City Staff and community members, and six breakout table sessions where staff recorded participants' comments.

Approximately 130 people attended the Open House. The Open House was attended predominantly by residents of the four Jasper Place neighbourhoods of Britannia-Youngstown, Canora, Glenwood and West Jasper Place. Some individuals who own residential or commercial property in Jasper Place, or who work for businesses in the area, also attended the Open House. Open House attendees expressed a diverse range of perspectives and interests.

This report summarizes the feedback we received during the Open House and from comment forms filled out by attendees. The information we collected will help inform the next steps of the ARP process. For more information about the ARP process, please visit www.edmonton.ca/JasperPlaceARP.

WHAT WE HEARD

One exercise for gathering input at the Open House was a display board that listed ten priority issues. These priorities were based on key points identified in the Revitalization Strategy and pre-consultation discussions with community members. Individuals were given 8 stickers that they could place however they wished on the board, depending on which topics were most important to them. Just under 30 individuals ranked their land use priorities. The following table shows the results from most to least mentions. Additional priorities were added to the board, which are incorporated in table 2 on the following page.

Table 1 - Key Priorities

| MAIN TOPIC | FREQUENCY AS A PRIORITY |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Design and Community Character | 36 |
| Preserving single family homes | 34 |
| Property Values | 32 |
| Parks and Open Space | 28 |
| Housing | 27 |
| Walking and Cycling | 16 |
| Sustainability | 14 |
| Local Retail | 12 |
| Parking | 11 |
| Stabilize School Enrollment | 7 |

All other Open House feedback, from conversations, comment sheets and breakout sessions, is summarized in table 2 on the following page. The comments in the table are organized by main theme.

Phase 1
Learning About
Jasper Place
Autumn to winter 2012

Phase 2
Issues & options
Winter to spring 2013

Phase 3
Drafting the Plan
Summer 2013

Phase 4
Presentation to
Council
Autumn 2013

Phase 5
Adoption &
implementation
Winter 2013

Table 2 - Summary of feedback received

| MAIN THEME | WHAT WE HEARD |
|--|--|
| 1. Density and the Newman's Resolution | <p>Strong concerns around increased density in Jasper Place and the conversion of single family homes to duplexes and fourplexes were raised. It was felt that high density is not appropriate in all areas and that a commitment to the Newman's Resolution would spur investment in West Jasper Place. The Newman's Resolution was seen as protecting West Jasper Place from deteriorating as a neighbourhood. It was also stated that if density was needed it should be restricted to areas immediately along Stony Plain Road.</p> <p>Some respondents noted that they supported density in the area. It was felt that the Newman's Resolution is not relevant to the current conditions in Jasper Place. It was stressed that any increases in density must be accompanied by supporting infrastructure.</p> |
| 2. Traffic and Parking | <p>Increased density was described as leading to parking issues. For example, when owners and renters of duplexes or multifamily housing both own vehicles, street parking is over capacity. It was also suggested that stop signs should be put in at intersections to improve traffic flow and safety.</p> |
| 3. Current Planning Applications | <p>There was concern expressed about on-going development during the ARP process. It was felt that applications for rezoning or development should wait until the ARP process is complete.</p> |
| 4. Park Space | <p>Park space was noted as a priority by some and questions were raised regarding whether there was adequate green space in the Jasper Place neighbourhoods. Lighting along bike paths and walkways was suggested as a way to improve recreation access.</p> |
| 5. Housing Quality | <p>There was concern that multifamily and higher density redevelopment detracts from the quality of the neighbourhood. It was stressed that high density housing should be well designed and attractive to contribute to the neighbourhood. There were questions about what standards and guidelines exist for enforcing high quality multifamily developments. A need for stronger guidelines and enforceable standards was expressed.</p> |
| 6. Housing Affordability | <p>It was recognized that everyone wants a home and needs a place to live. There was concern with a lack of low income seniors housing and housing for individuals on fixed incomes. There was also a desire for more housing choice. It was suggested that modern duplexes or affordable condominiums could potentially provide more housing options.</p> |
| 7. Housing Tenure | <p>Some individuals noted concern at the high level of renting in the neighbourhood, feeling that a more transient population had a negative impact on the community.</p> |
| 8. Schools and Families | <p>It was stated that schools need upgrading and that Jasper Place neighbourhoods need to attract more families and young people to support the schools.</p> |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 9. Retail | There was a desire for more diversity in local retail options. In particular, individuals expressed frustration with the pawnshops and similar services along Stony Plain Road that they considered undesirable. It was stated that higher end businesses should be encouraged to come to Jasper Place neighbourhoods. Ideas included having a special BRZ rezoning similar to the Edmonton Downtown Arts District. The LRT was also suggested as a way to attract office development and other more desirable businesses. Some expressed concern that the LRT will negatively affect businesses in the area. |
| 10. Light Rail Transit (LRT) | There were many questions about how the planned LRT stations would affect Jasper Place neighbourhoods. Concern was expressed that LRT stations would negatively affect the housing stock. There was also a worry that the LRT would increase traffic, which was stated as already too intense coming from downtown. Some individuals expressed a desire that the LRT be underground rather than at grade. There were also those in favour of the LRT, who thought it would bring positive changes to the neighbourhoods. |
| 11. Neighbourhood Uniqueness | It was noted that each neighbourhood is distinct and the ARP should reflect the uniqueness of the communities in the Jasper Place area. |
| 12. Derelict Buildings | Derelict buildings were mentioned as dangerous to the community, aesthetically unpleasing and a cause of lower property values. |
| 13. Street Improvements | There was enthusiasm about the excellent street improvements taking place in some Jasper Place neighbourhoods. |

EVENT LOGISTICS

The City solicited input from the public about the organization of the Open House. In general, the Open House was well received by those who attended. Individuals highlighted the guest speaker as a positive aspect of the evening and noted that information was presented in a clear and accessible manner.

Participants also noted a number of challenges with the event organization, such as the size of the room and the parking availability. The lack of easily accessible elevators was also noted.

A number of participants noted that not everyone had easy access to the internet and that we should consider different ways of communicating our project information. There were also some who did not receive flyers about the event until very late.

City of Edmonton Staff will use this information to improve future public consultations and to develop a communication strategy for those without internet access.

FURTHER FEEDBACK

Did we miss something? Do have new questions or comments you would like to raise? We always want to hear from you, so please keep in touch.

Email: JasperPlaceARP@edmonton.ca
Phone: 780-496-6127

You can sign up to our mailing list and see project updates on our website.

Website: www.edmonton.ca/JasperPlaceARP



JASPER PLACE ARP SPRING 2013 INFORMATION AND FEEDBACK SESSIONS REPORT

The City of Edmonton is currently undertaking an Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) process in Jasper Place, which includes the four neighbourhoods of Britannia Youngstown, Canora, Glenwood and West Jasper Place, as well as portions of the Stony Plain Road Commercial Corridor. The ARP was launched in October 2012 and is **currently in Phase 2 of the process.**

Project Phases:

1. Learning about Jasper Place (fall 2012–winter 2013)
2. **Issues and Options (winter/spring 2013)**
3. Drafting the Plan (summer-fall 2013)
4. Presenting to Council (winter 2013/2014)
5. Implementation (winter 2013/2014)

This report highlights the feedback received at the Information and Feedback sessions held in spring 2013.

INFORMATION & FEEDBACK SESSIONS

Between April 29 and May 8, 2013, the City of Edmonton held a series of information and feedback sessions in each of the four Jasper Place neighbourhoods and presented at a Stony Plain Road and Area Business Association general meeting. The purpose of these sessions was to share information collected in the first phase of the ARP process and to receive further feedback on a number of key issues we heard from the community in our first phase of consultation.

The information and feedback sessions were held in the Community League Halls of each neighbourhood and were open for drop in attendance between 2:00-8:00pm. Display boards provided general information about the ARP process, the Learning Scenarios exercise undertaken in Phase 1 and key neighbourhood statistics. These display boards are available for viewing online. A series of questions were also posed to attendees to further explore issues that were raised by the community at the first Open House held in October 2012. Attendees also had the

opportunity to discuss questions and concerns directly with City Staff.

Approximately 60 people attended the Information & Feedback sessions. An additional 20 individuals completed an online survey that included the same questions asked at the sessions. The sessions were attended by residents of the four Jasper Place neighbourhoods, as well as individuals who own residential or commercial property in Jasper Place, or who work for businesses in the area.

A diverse range of views and perspectives were shared at these events. This report summarizes the feedback received during the Information & Feedback sessions and the online survey. The information that was collected will help inform the next steps of the ARP process by shaping the core principles that will guide the first draft of the ARP.

FEEDBACK RECEIVED

We asked a series of questions to better understand the community's perspective on key issues. There were three ways people could provide their input on these questions. For those that attended the events, comments could be written on stickie notes and placed on the question display board. Dots could also be added to existing stickies they agreed with. Attendees could also answer these questions by filling out a questionnaire booklet either at the event or by sending it in afterwards. Individuals who were unable to attend the events could also answer these questions online using a survey tool.

The feedback we received is summarized below under each of the questions. The range of comments we heard is reflected under each question, with similar feedback grouped into a single statement.

FURTHER FEEDBACK

Did we miss something? Do have new questions or comments you would like to raise? We always want to hear from you, so please keep in touch.

Email: JasperPlaceARP@edmonton.ca

Phone: 780-496-6127

Website: www.edmonton.ca/JasperPlaceARP



| QUESTION ASKED | WHAT WE HEARD |
|---|---|
| What features define the character of your neighbourhood? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Large lots, mature trees, quiet streets and lots of greenspace• Great neighbours, proud homeowners and long-term residents• Walkable neighbourhood with calm streets and minimal traffic• Well-maintained and older single detached homes with no front garages• Proximity to shopping and amenities with adequate parking• A diverse community - both in terms of residents and architecture• Good public transit and access to downtown• Access to schools• Buildings and yards that are not well maintained• Pawn and adult shops on Stony Plain Road |
| What details in building design are important in your neighbourhood? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Diverse housing design in a variety of styles - not “cookie-cutter” monster homes• High quality and diverse architecture that fits into the existing neighbourhood• Retention of older buildings that are well maintained• Maintaining spacious design with wide lots• Single detached homes and lower scale development• More well-designed retail opportunities on main streets and in the neighbourhoods• Clean and well maintained private and public property• Back alley ways and rear garages• Natural features, like trees and plants• Higher density development that takes advantage of the LRT line• A small town feel within in the city |
| What does housing choice mean to you? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wider range of age groups can be accommodated and attracted to the neighbourhoods, including seniors and families• Diversity in housing means diversity in residents• Finding different types of housing in different parts of the city - not all types need to be in all neighbourhoods• Housing diversity can take away from neighbourhood character• Fewer apartments or multifamily units and more single detached homes• Already have enough housing choice• Being able to choose how much social housing is allowed in the neighbourhood• Supporting vision for a compact city• Providing homes for people with special needs• Nice-looking affordable housing |
| What do you see as the benefits of providing housing choices in your neighbourhood? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A vibrant, livable and safer community• Accommodating all ages and incomes, including young families and seniors to support a balanced and diverse community• Attracting newcomers• Can help to keep the schools open• Encourages reinvestment in the area• No benefit - detracts from the character of the neighbourhood |



| | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Careful planning required to get a good balance and integrate the mix |
| What do single family homes mean to you and your neighbourhood? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">The backbone of every communityPride of ownership, and well-maintained propertiesQuality greenspace and landscape features, as well as opportunities for gardeningAttracts families with childrenSpacious, low density character of the areaStability of the neighbourhood and opportunities for ownershipEncourages interaction with neighbours and a village feelingMore privacy and quieterManaged parking and trafficBaseline of the community, but not the only thingNot paying fair share of tax burden compared to multi-family developmentIsolation with fewer people and children aroundDetracting from choice and opportunities to live in the neighbourhoodPart of the reason the neighbourhood lacks characterAspiration for the future |
| What do you think about opportunities to add secondary suites, garage suites and garden suites to existing or redeveloped single family homes? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Yes please!No way!Can work out well if carefully planned and supported by servicesCan provide more housing choice, particularly for seniorsThis is a preferred way to sensitively increase density in a way that maintains the character of the areaPreferable to other low density development, like duplexes or narrow lotsPreferred if owner is in the main unit and renting other suitesWill encourage more transient residentsThere are already enough and illegal units need to be controlledDecrease overlook and make the area less safeReduce the amount of greenspaceOften create parking problems with more cars on the streetCan help to prevent suburban sprawl - more housing in mature areasMakes good economic sense for homeowners - can help seniors afford to stay in their own homes longer |
| What activities do you currently use your local parks and open space for? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Biking and walking for people and petsRelaxing, enjoying nature and greenspacePicnics, community events and connecting with neighboursSporting activities and fitness opportunitiesPlaying with families and childrenConcern there is currently not enough park spaceParks are not well used due to perception of crime and low qualityUse private yard space or other parks outside of Jasper Place |
| What activities would you like to be able to use your local parks and open spaces for? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">Active play and exercise in all weatherEnjoying beautyRelaxing and a space for quiet timeCommunity gardensChildren's activities |



| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• BBQs and picnics• Community events• More opportunities for street cafés and patios |
| What would you like to be able to walk to in your neighbourhood? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shopping areas and community amenities (groceries, drug store, medical offices, cafes, patios, bakeries, butchers, farmer’s market, day care, theatres, live music, restaurants)• Unique one-of-a-kind shops• Buses and LRT stations• Parks, recreational areas, community centres• Area is already walkable but need more destinations to walk to• Walking needs to be and feel safe• Would like walking down Stony Plain Road to feel like walking down Whyte Avenue or 124 Street |
| What is your vision for the neighbourhood? | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A sense of belonging to the community is fostered - welcoming and stable• A beautiful community full of destinations• High quality shopping street on Stony Plain Road with lots of locally-owned businesses like 124th Street• Quiet, well-maintained and family friendly• A walkable environment on Stony Plain Rd and in residential areas, with houses connected to the street• Clean, fresh buildings and spaces that show pride of ownership• Well used schools and community gathering spaces• A community that attracts and supports young families with children• Nice landscaping, accessible tree-lined streets and greenspaces• Housing options for those who cannot afford a house• A safe neighbourhood, free from drugs and crime• High quality building and urban design• A place that is easy to get around |
| Other comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Better overview of development permit applications and bylaw enforcement• Density already too high and important to remember Newman’s Resolution• Density should increase to reduce urban sprawl• Concern with level of renting• Need to ensure affordable rent, particularly for seniors• Maintaining historic buildings and homes• Importance of well-maintained yards and city property (roads and lanes)• Concern around impact of LRT• Importance of getting community input in the process• Concerns with length of time for ARP process• Change is a good thing• Change will affect the makeup of our neighbourhood• Concerns and support for home-based businesses• Need to improve quality of schools• Better lighting and dead tree removal in parks• Concern with drug houses• Bus frequency should be increased |



JASPER PLACE ARP OPEN HOUSE #2 REPORT

On June 10, 2013 the City hosted the second Open House for the Jasper Place Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) process. A series of draft principles were presented at Open House #2, which were developed from community input provided at previous consultation events as well as a number of City-wide policies. The Open House was an opportunity for the public to ask questions about the process and provide feedback on the draft principles.

The Open House had a drop-in period from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. as well as a presentation and workshop session from 7:00pm until 9:00pm. About 60 individuals attended the event and provided feedback through comment sheets, interactive displays, conversations with City staff, and two workshop exercises.

This report summarizes the feedback we received during the Open House and from comment forms filled out by attendees. The information we collected will help inform the next steps of the ARP process.

EXERCISE ONE

In the first workshop exercise, community members provided feedback about the draft principles that will shape the ARP. Questions City staff asked included:

- What do these principles mean to you?
- What do you like about the principles?
- What don't you like about the principles?
- Did we miss anything critical?

In general, community members felt that the principles set out positive goals and a good direction for the ARP, but were unsure about how they might be realized. Participants emphasized the importance of linking the principles with clear, tangible actions, and that, while idealism is welcome, it is important that the plan be achievable. Participants also highlighted their perspective that a land use plan can't achieve positive neighbourhood change on its own; it needs to be accompanied by City investment in infrastructure, services and amenities.

In addition to these broad comments, workshop participants provided specific comments on the themes and goals of each of the principles. Community members expressed a diverse range of perspectives and interests.

Key Ideas

Each table was asked to pick out three key points to share with the wider group at the end of exercise one. The most consistent themes that emerged were:

- **Connectivity** - create a complete mobility network for walking, bicycling, and driving.
- **Transform Stony Plain Road** into a vibrant community asset.
- **Build on the potential of TOD** and create a town centre at 156th Street and Stony Plain Road.

The following table provides more detail on these points and others that were discussed.

| MAIN THEME | WHAT WE HEARD - EXERCISE ONE |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Safety | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood safety is a top priority for community members. • Public spaces should be safe and well lit. |
| 2. Transit Oriented Development (TOD) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial and higher-density residential development around transit hubs could add to street life. • Reduced TOD areas are preferred, with multifamily buildings limited to main roads and duplex or row house transition areas. • Concerns about how TOD will affect the neighbourhoods include impacts to parking, traffic and property values. • More information about Transit Oriented Development is needed. |
| 3. Housing Choice | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multifamily housing should be focused on main roads. • There should be no redevelopment in the interior of neighbourhoods and single detached dwellings should be preserved. • Encourage opportunities for infill such as duplexes and row houses. • Diversity should be limited. • Having a variety of housing choices brings singles, families and seniors together. • Market and non-market housing should be mixed, not concentrated in particular areas. • Consideration of parking needs is important when increasing housing options. • Increased opportunities for home ownership could contribute to community stability. • Concern that new development may displace existing residents. |
| 4. Green Space | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More park space is needed in some neighbourhoods, and all existing green space and mature trees should be preserved. • Parks are currently underused. Design improvements should ensure that parks are welcoming, safe, well-lit, and provide amenities such as playgrounds and seating areas. • Development surrounding parks could increase safety. • Green and public spaces should be incorporated in transit areas. |
| 5. Character and Quality | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single detached dwellings define neighbourhood character and must be preserved. • Good design, quality materials, and the provision of green space and amenities can ensure that redeveloped housing is safe and attractive. • Opportunities for older homes to be redeveloped into modern, high quality ground oriented housing such as duplexes and row houses. • Front garages are inconsistent with neighbourhood character. |
| 6. Mobility | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walkability is very important. • Cycling infrastructure could be improved to provide a network of routes to and through the neighbourhood. • Concerns about the LRT expansion include routing and possible negative impacts such as traffic congestion and accidents. • Traffic control or calming measures may be required to limit additional traffic on neighbourhood streets, and LRT parking must be restricted in the neighbourhoods. • Lessons learned from previous LRT expansions should be applied. |
| 7. Stony Plain Road | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stony Plain Road is a key community asset, and its success is essential to the broader success of the area. • Intensification and development should be focused on main roads, especially Stony Plain Road. • There is also potential for higher density residential development at Mayfield Common. • Increased population density could support a greater variety of businesses to serve local residents. • Stony Plain Road should be enhanced with infrastructure and streetscape improvements. • The impact of the LRT on Stony Plain Road businesses is uncertain. |
| 8. Other Comments | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools should be an important consideration in the ARP as existing local schools are important to the neighbourhoods. |

EXERCISE TWO

In the second workshop exercise, participants discussed where they saw change happening in their neighbourhoods over time, using maps and sticky notes to illustrate their points. Participants were also asked to share specific information about their neighbourhoods that they felt City staff need to know to come up with a good plan. Although there

were some different opinions amongst participants, a number of consistent themes emerged from the discussions that echoed comments from Exercise One. The following summarizes the vision of neighbourhood change described by community members in the workshop.

WHAT WE HEARD - EXERCISE TWO

- Workshop participants saw Stony Plain Road as a major focus of change, becoming a destination with a wide variety of commercial development and services. They described how new housing, attractive streetscaping and lighting could make the area safe, walkable and inviting.
- Community members envisioned commercial, multi-storey residential, and mixed use development at major intersections and on main roads, such as at the intersection of Stony Plain Road and 156th Street, and the Mayfield Common Area.
- Workshop participants saw row housing and duplexes in areas adjacent to main roads, commercial centres and parks. Preservation of existing neighbourhood character was important to area residents, and many preferred that changes within the interior of the neighbourhoods be limited.
- Community members commented that having a variety of housing types could accommodate residents of all ages and incomes.
- Workshop participants agreed that new development should require good design and quality materials, and provide sufficient green space, amenities and parking.
- Community members envisioned parks and green spaces of various sizes located throughout neighbourhoods, commercial areas and transit hubs. They described how green spaces should provide amenities such as playgrounds and seating areas, and be designed and lit to be safe, welcoming and attractive. Many emphasized that existing parks, green spaces and mature trees should be preserved.

Workshop Participants

We wanted to better understand which members of the community we are reaching. To this end, we asked participants at the Open House to tell us more about themselves.

Sixteen workshop participants completed this questionnaire. Community members that completed the form fell into age categories ranging from 20 to

79, with an even split between community members between the ages of 20 to 49, and 50 to 79.

Most of the survey respondents live in single detached dwellings and own their home. Over half have lived or owned a business or property in the neighbourhood for five years or more.

FEEDBACK FORMS

Feedback forms were provided so that all attendees could provide written comments about the ARP and the public participation process. This section summarizes comments from the feedback forms. The City of Edmonton staff will use this information to improve future public consultation.

| QUESTION ASKED | WHAT WE HEARD - FEEDBACK FORMS |
|---|--|
| 1. What do you think worked well or was successful about this Open House? | Participants generally felt that the workshop format using maps and sticky notes worked well, and that table facilitators were helpful in focusing and recording community feedback. The small table groups allowed everyone to express their point of view; this allowed productive discussion and the opportunity to achieve some consensus. Attendees appreciated that City planners were available to respond directly to questions and concerns. |
| 2. What do you think did not work well about this Open House? | <p>A number of participants commented that more concrete, detailed information was needed. They felt that data and conceptual drawings would allow community members to provide more meaningful input into the ARP process. Others commented that more information about Transit Oriented Development was necessary.</p> <p>Some attendees noted that although there were some new faces in the room, most were the same people who regularly attend community meetings. Some felt that more advertising about the Open House was needed in some neighbourhoods, while others felt that the process was moving too quickly, and that more community consultation was required.</p> |
| 3. How well do you feel your views were heard and understood? | Most workshop participants felt that their views were well heard and understood. Some participants commented that they felt that facilitators encouraged comments that supported the ARP principles and were reluctant to record critical comments. One attendee noted that hearing and understanding have limited value if the needs and desires expressed by the community are not incorporated into the plan. |
| 4. Do you have any additional comments? | Several workshop participants noted that the success of the ARP and of neighbourhood improvements in general will require involvement and coordination with various City departments. One attendee expressed concerns about home businesses operating in residential areas. |
| 5. How did you find out about tonight's Open House and workshop? | Community members learned about the Open House through email notifications, mail-outs, flyers at community events, and portable signs. Some felt that more advertising was needed, and noted that the address for the Open House was not displayed on some signs. |

FURTHER FEEDBACK

Did we miss something? Do have new questions or comments you would like to raise? We always want to hear from you, so please keep in touch.

Email: JasperPlaceARP@edmonton.ca

Phone: 780-496-6127

Website: www.edmonton.ca/JasperPlaceARP



JASPER PLACE ARP OPEN HOUSE #3 REPORT

On November 26 and 30, 2013 the City hosted the third Open House for the Jasper Place Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) process. The Open House included information boards that summarized what we've heard and learned so far, and a series of interactive workshops where community members could provide their feedback about important issues in Jasper Place relating to land use, parks and open space, and mobility.

Previous engagement events for the Jasper Place ARP focused on understanding community member's goals and vision for their neighbourhoods. Feedback from these events helped to inform the guiding principles for the ARP.

The purpose of the November Open House was to obtain more specific feedback about how community members would like to see the guiding principles implemented in their community. This feedback will help to inform the first draft of the ARP, along with City wide policies and the findings of technical studies for the ARP. Two Open House sessions were held, one from 6-9pm on Tuesday November 26, and the other

from 12-3pm on Saturday November 30. About 120 individuals attended the event and provided feedback through comment sheets, interactive displays, conversations with City staff, and workshop exercises where participants interacted with each other and City staff, and recorded their ideas on worksheets.

This report summarizes the feedback the City received during the Open House on worksheets and comment forms filled out by attendees. Participants expressed a wide variety of different opinions; comments have been grouped into frequently-mentioned themes to create the summaries. Staff have also transcribed all written feedback, and scanned all of the worksheets completed by participants. You can view all the written feedback the City received in full on the public involvement page of our website at www.edmonton.ca/JasperPlaceARP.

The information the City collected at the Open House will help inform the next steps of the ARP process. When the draft ARP is complete, there will be more opportunities for community members to provide their feedback.

WORKSHOP A: LAND USE

In the first workshop exercise, community members provided feedback about land use and building types. The worksheets asked participants what they thought about different proposed land use precincts, and to illustrate on a map where they thought these different uses were appropriate.

Participants expressed many different opinions, which are summarized below. The first table provides a summary of the comments made about each precinct and a description of what areas participants identified for these land uses. In total, 41 of worksheets were completed. For the written comments, some participants provided comments about all land use and housing types, while others only commented on certain types. For the map exercise, some participants coloured specific areas in detail; others completed the full map in a more conceptual way. The second table summarizes more general key themes that emerged as part of the exercise. You can find the original completed worksheets on our website's public involvement page at www.edmonton.ca/JasperPlaceARP.

| PRECINCT | WHAT WE HEARD - WORKSHOP A: LAND USE |
|-----------------------|---|
| Low Rise Housing | <p>Many community members expressed that the low scale nature of development in Jasper Place contributes positively to neighbourhood character. While some participants stated that new, high quality development in a range of low rise housing types could help to revitalize the area, many commented that forms other than single detached homes are not appropriate in neighbourhood interiors. Due to concerns about unauthorized secondary suites, some stated that they do not support semi-detached housing.</p> <p>Of participants that coloured in areas of Low Rise Housing on their map, some indicated it throughout neighbourhood interiors, while others showed a smaller proportion in combination with other housing types.</p> |
| Park Overlook Housing | <p>Some community members commented that semi-detached/duplex, town homes, and homes with secondary suites including garage or garden suites, are desirable surrounding parks and open spaces. One reason cited is the potential to enhance park security. Others do not indicate support for these housing types around parks. This position was reflected in the worksheet maps, where some did not identify any areas for park overlook housing.</p> <p>Of the workshop maps that did identify areas for park overlook housing, some indicated it in blocks surrounding existing parks and open spaces, while others suggested locations such as in linear strips connecting across neighbourhoods, or in large areas of neighbourhoods.</p> |
| Town Homes | <p>Some community members noted that the majority of dwellings in Jasper Place are single detached homes or apartments, and that housing diversity could be increased by including Town Homes. Good design quality and diversity in appearance were noted as important features. Some participants stated that Town Homes should only be located on neighbourhood exteriors.</p> <p>Many completed worksheets did not indicate any areas for Town Homes. Those that did showed it in locations such as along main roads, in larger areas around amenities such as parks, or in transition areas between Multi-Family and Low Rise Housing.</p> |
| Multi-Family Housing | <p>Many participants stated that higher-density housing types such as Multi-Family Housing are appropriate in close proximity to transit and amenities, however they also expressed concerns that adding higher-density housing types could lead to significant change in neighbourhood character, and increased on-street parking. While many expressed that Multi-Family Housing should only be located on main roads, others commented that living spaces should be located away from main roads and traffic noise. Some stated that Jasper Place has enough existing Multi-Family Housing.</p> <p>Maps that included Multi-Family housing generally showed it in areas with existing apartment buildings, such as Stony Plain Road, 149 Street, 156 Street, the area north of 100 Avenue in West Jasper Place, and in Canora south of 102 Avenue.</p> |
| Mixed Use | <p>Most participants stated that Mixed Use development is appropriate on Stony Plain Road; others also noted support for Mixed Use development on other main roads such as 149 Street and 156 Street.</p> <p>Some stated a preference for Mixed Use rather than Commercial-only development; one reason mentioned is to enhance safety by increasing the number of people overlooking streets. Others commented that they would not like to see Mixed Use development in neighbourhood interiors.</p> <p>Most participants illustrated Mixed Use development on Stony Plain Road; some showed it in a variety of other areas, such as 149 Street and 156 Street, on all arterial roads, or throughout the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) areas.</p> |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Commercial | <p>Most community members stated that Commercial development is appropriate on Stony Plain Road, and expressed interest in initiatives to make this area more vibrant and appealing. One perspective suggested that Jasper Place may have more Commercial zoning than local residents can support, and related this to a lower quality of Commercial uses perceived as detracting from neighbourhood character.</p> <p>Completed maps generally showed Mixed Use rather than the Commercial precinct, though some maps indicated areas of Commercial only along Stony Plain Road.</p> |
| Existing Opportunities | <p>Many participants stated that single detached homes should be preserved, and that other housing forms are not wanted in Jasper Place, especially in neighbourhood interiors.</p> <p>Most worksheet maps did not colour in any areas for Existing Opportunities. The ones that did showed Existing Opportunities throughout West Jasper Place south of 100 Avenue, except on 149 Street and 156 Street.</p> |

Frequently Mentioned Issues and Concerns

Participants provided many valuable comments about a variety of issues related to land use and housing types. There was general consensus about some issues, and widely varying opinions about others. These comments have been grouped into frequently-mentioned themes, and summarized below. Original worksheet comments can be seen on our website's public involvement page at www.edmonton.ca/JasperPlaceARP

| THEME | WHAT WE HEARD - WORKSHOP A: LAND USE |
|--|---|
| Infill and Density | <p>Many participants stated that neighbourhood interiors should consist mainly of single detached homes, with other housing types located along main roads and in close proximity to amenities such as transit and retail services. Excess on-street parking was identified as a concern related to higher-density housing types. Some indicated support for mixed use and high density, medium scale, and a variety of low scale housing types in a transition from main roads to neighbourhood interiors.</p> <p>Some participants noted that population density in Jasper Place is higher than many other Edmonton neighbourhoods, and stated that it should not increase. Others expressed that infill development and higher density housing forms could make more efficient use of land, and that the Jasper Place neighbourhoods are a good place for infill development because they are close to downtown.</p> |
| LRT and Transit Oriented Development (TOD) | <p>Some participants expressed concerns about the impact of LRT, such as excess parking and access problems into the neighbourhoods. Others suggested that transportation demands and new development may overstress existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Some stated that the impact of Transit Oriented Development (TOD) surrounding the future LRT stations may be excessive in West Jasper Place.</p> |
| Design Quality | <p>Many community members stated that good design quality is important to ensure that new development contributes positively to neighbourhood character. Some expressed support for infill development in a range of housing forms that demonstrate good design quality, especially if they replace single detached homes in poor condition.</p> |
| Assets and Amenities | <p>Community members described assets of Jasper Place such as good walkability, with easy access to housing, shopping and public transportation, and attractive public and private green space with mature trees. Some stated that the neighbourhoods do not have enough amenities to support increased density; some noted limited park space in West Jasper Place as a concern.</p> |

WORKSHOP B: PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

In this workshop exercise, community members shared their opinions about different types of parks and open spaces, and their ideas about how the City could meet parks and open space needs. The table below summarizes the feedback that participants provided.

| MAIN THEME | WHAT WE HEARD - WORKSHOP B: PARKS AND OPEN SPACE |
|---|---|
| Existing Parks and Open Space | <p>Many community members described parks and open spaces in Jasper Place as a community asset, but also noted that most require improved amenities such as landscaping, activity areas, play structures, community gardens, and lighting to enhance safety. Some commented that better maintenance is needed. Participants described the 100 Ave multi-use trail as particularly well-used for recreation and transportation, and mentioned that Canora Park at Holy Cross School would be better used if it had improved overlook. It was also noted that the maps did not highlight St. Anne Park in Canora.</p> <p>Some described Arthur Elliot Park in West Jasper Place as very well used. Others noted that West Jasper Place does not have sufficient parks and open space. Some stated that West Jasper Place has no park, because Arthur Elliot is co-located with Sherwood School and accommodates the community league building and skating rink, with limited open space for passive recreation.</p> |
| Park Types | <p>Participants described strengths and weaknesses of different park types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linear parks are good for walking, running, cycling and dog-walking, but less suitable for play areas. • Parkettes can make good use of vacant lots, and provide space for community gardens, but are too small for some activities. Maintenance and safety may be concerns. • Plazas are great for community activities and events, and should be located close to shops and restaurants, in areas with lots of pedestrian traffic. |
| Options to Improve or Increase Park Space | <p>Participants expressed preferences for various options to improve or increase parks and open space:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many participants felt that enhancing or reconfiguring existing parks and open spaces was a good option, noting that current features and amenities are limited and require improvement. • Some felt that additional park space in existing road right of way could add green space while providing an attractive way to control traffic. Others felt that this wouldn't create a significant addition of green space, and were concerned about traffic impacts. • Some community members stated that buying properties and removing the existing buildings was a good option to provide additional park space, particularly in West Jasper Place; others felt that this option would be too costly, or that the spaces created would be too small to be useful. • An alternative suggestion was to require new higher-density development to provide additional green space. |

WORKSHOP C: MOBILITY

In this workshop exercise, participants described existing mobility, traffic and parking features and patterns, and identified areas of concern.

| MAIN THEME | WHAT WE HEARD - WORKSHOP C: MOBILITY |
|---------------------------|---|
| LRT | Many participants expressed concerns about the impact of the LRT on vehicle and pedestrian traffic, such as safety issues, difficulty crossing the LRT tracks, and access in and out of neighbourhoods, particularly West Jasper Place. |
| Bike Lanes | The 95th Avenue bike lane and vehicle traffic changes were identified as problematic for both cyclists and vehicles. Cyclists and drivers expressed that cyclists would be safer, and vehicle traffic impacted less, if bike lanes were located on less busy streets or multi-use trails. Some commented that the bike lane was covered with snow and unusable in winter. Alternative suggestions included extending the 100 Avenue multi-use trail, or creating a trail on 107 Avenue. |
| Problematic Intersections | Some intersections were identified as problematic and in need of traffic lights, such as where heavily-used streets intersect with Stony Plain Road. Participants suggested that this could improve safety for vehicles and pedestrians. |
| Walkability | While participants stated that walkability in Jasper Place is generally very good, some noted that more crosswalks are required on Stony Plain Road, and that pedestrian access to Mayfield Common is poor. |
| Parking | Participants indicated few areas with parking problems, however some expressed concerns about parasitic parking from the LRT in the future, and increased on-street parking if infill development does not provide sufficient off-street parking. |
| Traffic Calming | Few community members expressed interest in neighbourhood traffic calming measures; some commented that those existing in Canora are an inconvenience to local residents, impeding local access to the Stony Plain Road commercial area, and have limited effectiveness in preventing short-cutting through the neighbourhood. Some participants felt that chicanes might slow traffic while allowing access, and could be attractive if landscaped. |

WORKSHOP D: JASPER PLACE TRANSIT AND LRT CENTRE

In the fourth workshop, participants described their preferences for the design of the future Jasper Place Transit and LRT Centre.

WHAT WE HEARD: JASPER PLACE TRANSIT AND LRT CENTRE

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Key facility features | Community members described priorities for the future transit and LRT centre as safety, accessibility, shelter from adverse weather, and proximity to the future LRT station. Many expressed a strong preference for a heated central shelter with washrooms and an overhang for outdoor waiting areas. Participants commented that locating the transit centre adjacent to shops and services would be convenient and improve safety by providing overlook. |
| Option analysis | Some stated that they prefer a design with buses clustered around a central island to reduce congestion on streets; others supported an on-street transit centre to increase proximity to shops and services and reduce wasted or underutilized space. |
| General comments | Community members expressed concerns about overflow parking into surrounding neighbourhoods, especially if parking space for Grant McEwan University were reduced. |

FEEDBACK FORMS

Feedback forms were provided so that all attendees could provide written comments about the ARP and the public participation process. This section summarizes comments from the feedback forms. City of Edmonton staff will use this information to improve future public consultation.

WHAT WE HEARD: FEEDBACK FORMS

- The Open House provided clear, accessible information.
- There was too much going on at the Open House; it was unclear what some of the different stations were for, and some information boards were confusing.
- Staff were helpful and open-minded, and the workshop activities promoted good discussion.
- Staff listened politely, but will just 'pass the buck' - nothing is ever done.
- The four neighbourhoods were not treated individually.
- The iPad quiz about families and housing types in Jasper Place was easy to use and surprising.
- Some community members did not receive the mailed notification, or received it very late.
- The large print road signs advertising the event, and the complimentary meal were appreciated.

Workshop Participants

City staff wanted to better understand which members of the community we are reaching through our outreach efforts. To this end, we asked participants at the Open House to tell us more about themselves.

A total of sixteen workshop participants completed this questionnaire. Of those that completed the feedback form, nine were between the ages of fifty to sixty-four, three were sixty-five or over, and three did not respond. Eleven live in single detached homes, one in a duplex/fourplex, and two did not respond. Fourteen own their home, and two rent. Ten have lived in Jasper Place for five years or more, one for one to two years, one for less than a year, and three did not respond.

Further Feedback

Did we miss something? Do have new questions or comments you would like to raise? We always want to hear from you, so please keep in touch.

Email: JasperPlaceARP@edmonton.ca

Phone: 780-496-6127

Website: www.edmonton.ca/JasperPlaceARP



JASPER PLACE ARP

WEST JASPER PLACE COMMUNITY MEETING REPORT

The West Jasper Place Community League organized a meeting on December 3, 2013 for neighbourhood residents to discuss the upcoming Jasper Place Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) and complete the worksheets provided at the November Open House. A City staff member attended this community event to answer questions about the ARP process and City-wide policy.

Participants were provided with an overview document that outlined information and perspectives on several City policies, the Jasper Place Community League position on various land use issues, and instructions for how to complete the worksheets.

Twenty-nine people attended this event. In addition to individual worksheets completed by participants, small groups worked together to provide shared comments. Twenty-five sets of completed worksheets were submitted to the City.

This report summarizes feedback recorded on the worksheets, as well as notes from group discussions that were provided to the City. Staff have also transcribed all written feedback, and scanned all of the worksheets and discussion notes completed by participants, as well as the instruction document. You can view these on the public involvement page of our website at www.edmonton.ca/JasperPlaceARP. Please note that all worksheets provided to the City have been scanned, including those with areas left blank.

All feedback provided to the City will be used to help inform the next steps of the ARP process. When the draft ARP is complete, there will be more opportunities for community members to provide their feedback.

WORKSHEETS A1 AND A2: LAND USE

Worksheets A1 and A2 related to land use and building types. The worksheets asked participants what they thought about different proposed land use precincts, and to illustrate on a map where they thought these different uses were appropriate.

The feedback provided to the City is summarized below. The first table provides a summary of the comments made about each precinct and a description of what areas were identified for these land uses. The second table summarizes more general themes that emerged in the comments. You can find the original completed worksheets on our website's public involvement page at www.edmonton.ca/JasperPlaceARP.

| PRECINCT | FEEDBACK RECIEVED - WORKSHOP A: LAND USE |
|------------------------|--|
| Low Rise Housing | Many comments in this section stated that residents of West Jasper Place do not accept semi-detached housing. One reason cited is that semi-detached units may include an unauthorized secondary suite. Some stated that only RF1 zoning is wanted in the interior of the neighbourhood, and that the Newman's Resolution should be upheld. Some would consider Low Rise Housing north of 100 Avenue, or along 95 Avenue and 100 Avenue. |
| Park Overlook Housing | Many comments in this section simply stated that Park Overlook Housing is not applicable in West Jasper Place. One reason cited was that apartment buildings are present in West Jasper Place more than one block from perimeter arterial roads, therefore the Residential Infill Guidelines support of more housing options around parks does not apply in the neighbourhood. Many comments in this section also stated a preference for no semi-detached housing. |
| Town Homes | Most comments in this section related to the preference for no semi-detached housing. Some stated that Town Homes could be acceptable in certain locations, such as along 149 Street, 156 Street, Stony Plain Road and north of 100 Avenue, if adequate parking is provided. |
| Multi-Family Housing | Some comments stated that Multi-Family Housing is most appropriate in the locations it currently exists, on 149 Street, 156 Street, and north of 100 Avenue. One comment suggested that existing Multi-Family Housing could be redeveloped at somewhat higher densities. |
| Mixed Use | Many comments suggested that Mixed Use development would be appropriate on Stony Plain Road. This was related to supporting local businesses, and the provision of adequate parking was noted as an important requirement. Some comments supported Mixed Use development in the area between Stony Plain Road and 100 Avenue. |
| Commercial | Stony Plain Road was described as an appropriate area for Commercial development with supporting pedestrian amenities. Major arteries including 100 Ave, 95 Ave, 149 Street and 156 Street were also noted as areas for commercial development. One comment suggested a commercial tower near the existing transit centre. Some comments stated that Mixed Use is preferable. |
| Existing Opportunities | Many comments stated that Existing Opportunities and the current RF1 zoning are preferred in the interior of the neighbourhood, and that the Newman's Resolution should be incorporated into the ARP. |

Frequently Mentioned Issues and Concerns

The following table summarizes frequently-mentioned themes.

| THEME | FEEDBACK RECIEVED - LAND USE WORKSHEETS |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Transit Oriented Development (TOD) | Some comments stated that the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Guidelines should not be applied to the area around the future LRT station at 95 Avenue and 156 Street, due to insufficient parks and open space in West Jasper Place. Others stated that the TOD areas at Stony Plain Road and 149 Street and 156 Street should not extend south beyond 100 Avenue. |
| Newman's Resolution | Many comments stated that the Newman's Resolution should be upheld and incorporated into the ARP to ensure that single detached homes are preserved in West Jasper Place. Some comments stated that because West Jasper Place has higher density than many other Edmonton neighbourhoods, and exceeds the minimum density targets in the Capital Region Plan, that density should not be allowed to increase further in the neighbourhood. |

WORKSHEETS B1 AND B2: PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

These worksheets provided the opportunity to express opinions about different types of parks and open spaces, and share ideas about how the City could meet parks and open space needs. The table below summarizes the feedback received.

| MAIN THEME | FEEDBACK RECIEVED -PARKS AND OPEN SPACE WORKSHEETS |
|---|---|
| Existing Parks and Open Space | Some comments stated that Arthur Elliot Park and the multi-use trail on 100 Ave are well-used and notable community assets. Many stated that park space in West Jasper Place is insufficient. There were also comments that the neighbourhood has no true park space as the Community League building, rink and tennis courts are located in Arthur Elliot Park, leaving minimal open space for passive recreation. It was also noted that additional facilities such as water zones or equipment would help increase use of these spaces. |
| Park Types | <p>Comments were provided about different park types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linear Parks: The multi-use trail on 100 Ave was described as well used, however many noted that it requires improved litter removal, weeding, snow-removal and lighting, in order to enhance its appearance, safety and usability. Other comments stated that a linear park is not a suitable/feasible option for West Jasper Place. • Parkettes: Comments stated that parkettes might be suitable along Stony Plain Road, or in the area of apartment buildings north of 100 Avenue. Some expressed that this was not a desirable option if it would result in the loss of single detached homes. • Plazas: Comments stated that plazas could be suitable along Stony Plain Road, or in the area of apartment buildings north of 100 Avenue. Amenities such as street furniture, and maintenance including litter and snow removal, were noted as being important. |
| Options to Improve or Increase Park Space | <p>Comments were provided regarding various options to improve or increase parks and open space:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many commented that enhancing or reconfiguring park space was a good option, and that Arthur Elliot Park could be enhanced by the provision of a flat area with gardens, benches and a walking path. One reason cited was to provide a passive recreation area suitable for seniors. • Most comments regarding adding park space in existing road right of way were not in support of this approach. One reason cited was possible impacts on traffic and parking. • Some community members stated that buying and removing properties was a good option to provide additional park space. Concerns relating to this option included the loss of single detached housing for a park space of limited size. • Alternative suggestions included the use of the Sherwood School site as park space if the school is declared surplus in the future, and encouraging businesses to provide open space. There was also a suggestion to have green roof space along Stony Plain Road. |

WORKSHEETS C1 AND C2: MOBILITY

The Mobility worksheets provided opportunities to describe existing mobility, traffic and parking features and patterns, and identify areas of concern.

| MAIN THEME | FEEDBACK RECIEVED - MOBILITY WORKSHEETS |
|------------|--|
| LRT | Many comments identified concerns about the impact of the future LRT, such as increased traffic congestion, shortcutting through neighbourhood interiors, limited access to and from West Jasper Place, parasitic parking, and the loss of existing parking on 156 Street and at Grant MacEwan University. |

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Bike Lanes | The 95 Avenue bike lane and vehicle traffic changes were identified as problematic, due to the loss of driving lanes, and safety concerns. Some commented that the lane markings are covered with snow and not visible in winter, resulting in confusion. Others felt that existing bike routes are sufficient. It was noted that an existing bike lane on 97 Ave was not identified on the worksheet map. |
| Parking | Some comments expressed concerns about overflow parking from apartment buildings, particularly those on 156 Street, and Grant MacEwan University, and felt that this could become more widespread and problematic if population density increases. The potential need for residential parking permits was noted. |
| Traffic management | A concern was noted that stop signs are treated more as yield signs. The importance of the cul de sacs along 100 Avenue was also highlighted for their role in improving road safety and decreasing parasitic parking. |
| Response to observations | Those that responded felt that the observations made by the consulting team matched their experience of mobility in the neighbourhood. |

WORKSHEET D: JASPER PLACE TRANSIT AND LRT CENTRE

This worksheet provided the opportunity to express preferences for the design of the future Jasper Place Transit and LRT Centre.

WHAT WE HEARD: JASPER PLACE TRANSIT AND LRT CENTRE

Some comments expressed a preference for a design with buses clustered around a central island, with the suggestion of keeping it in the same location. Others stated that this type of design can create isolated and unsafe spaces, does not use land efficiently, or could appear sparse and unattractive.

Some expressed a preference for an on-street transit centre to increase proximity to businesses, reduce wasted or underutilized space, and enhance safety by having more people around the area. Others were concerned that this option would cause traffic congestion, and make the street unappealing to pedestrians.

Security was described as a priority for the transit centre. A heated shelter was also noted as a desired amenity.

Some comments stated that there should be no buses at 95 Avenue and 155-156 Street, due to traffic congestion and the existing bike lanes.

Further Feedback

If you have any questions about the West Jasper Place Community League event, you can contact:

Irene Blain, Civics Director
Phone: 780-483-2815

City staff always want to hear from you, so if you have further comments or questions, please keep in touch.

Email: JasperPlaceARP@edmonton.ca

Phone: 780-496-6127

Website: www.edmonton.ca/JasperPlaceARP

JASPER PLACE ARP

FIRST DRAFT FEEDBACK REPORT

The first draft of the Jasper Place ARP was released in June 2014. Residents, as well as business and property owners in Jasper Place, had the opportunity to provide their comments on the Plan until October 31, 2014.

Community input is an important component of the ARP process. This document summarizes the feedback we received about the first draft, and shows how we've responded.

We heard positive feedback from community members about how the ARP could support more liveable neighbourhoods, with diverse housing choices, streets that are safe and appealing for pedestrians, and a more vibrant Stony Plain Road. Some people stated that introducing LRT into the area will support local businesses and high quality residential development.

We also heard questions and concerns about the ARP. Read on to explore common feedback themes that we heard in the process, and how we addressed them in preparing the second draft of the ARP.

PLAN FORMAT & LANGUAGE

The Plan subareas don't reflect existing neighbourhood boundaries and separate the Stony Plain Road corridor from the rest of the neighbourhoods.

We changed the Plan so each complete neighbourhood has its own section, with special policies for a Stony Plain Road focus area included in a separate section. This recognizes the unique features in each complete neighbourhood, while ensuring a consistent approach for Stony Plain Road throughout the Plan.

Separate maps of existing and proposed civic infrastructure for each neighbourhood are provided, but we've consolidated the civic infrastructure policy tables together, as most of the projects cross over neighbourhood boundaries and relate to assets shared by all of Jasper Place. Putting all the civic infrastructure policies in one table results in less repetition, and it makes it easier for Council and City staff to review and implement the policies.

The new format is explained in Section 3.2: Plan structure.

The land use maps are difficult to understand because the colours are too hard to tell apart.

We changed the colours of the land use maps so to make them easier to tell apart for printed or online versions of the Plan. We also created new civic infrastructure maps that are more clearly labeled.

Other Plans I've read have 'objectives and policies,' but the ARP just has 'land use concepts.' What does that mean?

We've changed the name 'land use concept' to 'objectives and policies' to make their purpose more clear.

Some text in the ARP has a picture beside it - what do these mean?

The icons are intended to show which guiding principles the policy responds to. We've added an explanation of what the icons are and what they mean in Section 3.2.

The Plan needs clear, enforceable language, not just suggestions or recommendations, so that the policies will be implemented.

Area Redevelopment Plans are policy documents that are to be interpreted as being primarily concerned with setting goals for the future. This is different than a regulatory document such as the Zoning Bylaw, which implements regulations in the present.

Different types of wording are needed to suit these different types of documents. Regulations can use mandatory language such as "will," "shall" or "must," or permissive language such as "may", because the Courts interpret regulations as detailed rules that are intended to be enforced exactly as they are written; sometimes making a

regulation permissive and sometimes making a regulation mandatory. Mandatory language in Plans, however, is not necessarily binding, because the Courts interpret Plans as setting high level goals about the future that may be implemented in different ways. This means that the Courts would not enforce a Plan policy exactly as written just because words like “shall” or “must” are used. Language such as “should” and “encourage” is the most appropriate language for a Plan, as these types of words reflects how Plan policies are actually implemented. This interpretation of “should” has been added to the second draft of the ARP.

LAND USE POLICIES

The Plan should specify Zones.

The draft Jasper Place ARP provides guidance on the type and scale of buildings in different areas, but it does not specify exact zones. This is because there may be a number of different zones that can be used to meet the objectives of the ARP, and because the Zoning Bylaw is a living document and may change over the time period of the ARP.

In the past, there have been instances where an ARP refers to a zone that has changed or is no longer in existence, making it difficult to understand the original intent of the ARP.

By providing clear guidance on the objectives of each land use area and the range of building types, instead of referring to zones, the ARP will provide robust and long-lasting direction for the area, even if the Zoning Bylaw changes over time. The City will use the guidance of the ARP when making decisions about rezonings and development approvals, to ensure they are consistent with the intent of the Plan.

The Plan should set clear density targets

The City of Edmonton is a member municipality of the Capital Region Board, which has a Growth Plan to manage urban development in Greater Edmonton. This Growth Plan includes density ranges for a variety of different areas, including Edmonton’s established neighbourhoods. Edmonton’s The Way We Grow Municipal Development Plan has policies to meet or exceed these density ranges throughout the City.

Density is only one aspect of the City’s approach to supporting vibrant and sustainable mature neighbourhoods. It is always looked at in concert with other considerations, such diversity in housing options to meet the needs of different household types, and design that enhances streets and public spaces. The ARP reflects the strategic goals of the City regarding increasing the number of houses in mature neighbourhoods and concentrating housing and commercial options around LRT.

It is unclear what ‘Active Edge Housing’ is, and the ARP calls for too much of it.

We clarified what opportunities are available in Active Edge Housing, and generally reduced the areas where it applies. One area where Active Edge Housing has been expanded is along 163 Street in Britannia Youngstown, north of 104 Ave. This change was made to bring the ARP into closer alignment with the Residential Infill Guidelines, which support a range of housing types along arterial roads.

One reason that Active Edge Housing was used in the first draft ARP was intended to provide opportunities for garage and garden suites in order to improve safety by having more residents overlooking parks and back alleys. In order to maintain these opportunities in the second draft ARP, we have highlighted some properties in the Small Scale housing areas as ‘garage and garden suite priority areas.’ This is meant to encourage garage and garden suites in these areas to help meet the objectives of the ARP.

I don’t want more commercial uses in my neighbourhood. I’m especially worried about body rub centres.

We removed commercial opportunities from Small Scale Housing, and now require commercial in other residential areas to have associated residential uses. This means that body rub centres will not be possible as they cannot be located on the same site as housing, while businesses to serve residents, like coffee shops and daycares, can be accommodated.



In the second draft of the ARP, we have also removed the opportunity for commercial uses in many Multi-unit Housing areas. This is because we found in the Learning Scenarios that there is a high amount of commercial space already in the area. Thanks to the feedback we received, we realized that providing opportunities for commercial space throughout these residential areas could take away from the vibrancy of Stony Plain Road. As such, we have removed the opportunity for commercial space in apartment buildings for most of Jasper Place, except for those along 156 Street where the future LRT will run.

The ARP should preserve historic character in the Jasper Place neighbourhoods.

We undertook an assessment to identify historic resources in Jasper Place, and added policies to highlight potential areas of historic character. The Plan also provides direction for further Heritage work to be undertaken in the area.

I don't support the extent of Transit Oriented Development areas in the neighbourhoods.

The Transit Oriented Development Guidelines, passed by Council in 2012, direct that the guidelines will be used to prepare ARPs for areas within 800m of LRT stations. The 800m catchment area extends to large portions of the Jasper Place neighbourhoods. Given what we heard and learned in the early phases of the ARP, the first draft of the Plan generally limited Transit Oriented Development areas to within approximately 400m around LRT stations rather than 800m, and concentrated redevelopment opportunities on main roads such as Stony Plain Road and 156 Street. The ARP also does not call for apartment housing on 95 Avenue, although this would be supported by the TOD Guidelines, due to the high proportion of apartment houses in the area already. The Plan instead seeks to provide opportunities for a variety of housing types around station areas.

The core of the neighbourhoods should be preserved for single detached homes. To ensure this in West Jasper Place, the Newman Resolution should be upheld.

The ARP must be consistent with City-wide policies in the Way We Grow Municipal Development Plan, Residential Infill Guidelines, and Transit Oriented Development Guidelines, which support opportunities for a variety of housing choices throughout all Edmonton neighbourhoods.

In the first draft of the ARP, we addressed concerns about introducing more varied housing types in neighbourhoods by concentrating row housing and apartment buildings on main roads, around parks, and in proximity to Stony Plain Road. As noted above, we also used a tighter radius for Transit Oriented Housing than is suggested in the TOD Guidelines.

In the first draft, we also provided policies to encourage front and side setbacks within the Small Scale and Active Edge housing types to reflect the setbacks of existing housing in order to maintain the existing sense of space that people highlighted as an important feature of the interior of the neighbourhoods.

Some multi-unit buildings are poorly designed and built with low quality materials, and do not contribute positively to neighbourhoods. The Plan should require that buildings be well designed and constructed.

The ARP provides policies to support high quality design, such as discouraging blank facades, and placing windows to maximize privacy for adjacent properties. City Planners will use these guidelines when considering rezonings, including Direct Control Zoning, and City Development Officers will use this design guidance to inform their decision on applications for 'Discretionary Uses' under the Zoning Bylaw.

To make implementation easier, we've added more explanation under the quality design policies, and ensured consistency across all the land use types.

CIVIC INFRASTRUCTURE POLICIES

Britannia Youngstown residents don't want a new vehicle access from Mayfield Common into the neighbourhood.

Based on this feedback, we have removed the proposal for a new vehicle access to Mayfield Common from Britannia Youngstown.



Some of the ideas for civic infrastructure in the ARP sound good, but I'm worried that they'll never really happen.

All civic infrastructure policies will depend on Council funding and prioritization. We have added further information to clarify which City Departments are responsible for the civic infrastructure policies, and different mechanisms that may be used to implement the projects highlighted in the ARP.

Can the area's existing infrastructure support increased density? Will residents have to pay for upgrades?

An Infrastructure Study was undertaken to evaluate how potential future redevelopment may impact the local drainage systems. This study found that a high level of redevelopment would likely result in relatively insignificant impacts on the existing storm and sanitary sewer systems. It also suggested that redevelopment could provide an opportunity for the City to implement low impact development features that reduce the peak flow of stormwater runoff.

EPCOR Power, Shaw Cable, Telus, and ATCO Gas did not identify any concerns related to potential future redevelopment.

In instances where additional upgrades may be needed to support redevelopment, the developer would be responsible for any costs.

There isn't enough park space in some neighbourhoods, especially West Jasper Place. This will get worse if the ARP adds more density and housing forms with little green space on site. Why doesn't the Plan make a clear commitment to add new park space?

The Plan provides policies to support the retention of existing park space, and to investigate options to add new park space. To make the importance of this issue more clear, we added a new policy for all neighbourhoods to prioritize acquiring school sites to use as park space.

Future Council decisions on budget resources, and the availability of sites for purchase, are unknown. Therefore, it is not possible for the Plan to guarantee that these sites will be acquired to add new park space. However, Council has approved a budget of \$5 million that will be used to acquire park space in mature neighbourhoods such as Jasper Place, as sites become available.

On-street parking is already a problem in some areas; redevelopment that adds more residents will make this worse.

A mobility study was completed to assess existing and potential future conditions. It found that there is sufficient on-street parking to meet projected needs, even with a high level of redevelopment. It also suggested options to discourage parking related to LRT within residential areas.

How is the City using community feedback about the future LRT station and Transit Centre?

We received a lot of different feedback about the design of the future LRT station and Transit Centre. We heard that important considerations include managing parking related to the LRT, minimizing sources of traffic congestion, and limiting negative impacts on surrounding residential areas. We also heard that pedestrian safety and pedestrian connections between LRT, buses, and surrounding shops and homes, are a priority.

These principles have been included in a number of policy recommendations that will guide further design work as the LRT project moves forward.

STONY PLAIN ROAD

I like the low scale of buildings in Jasper Place, and don't think tall towers fit in the neighbourhood context.

The ARP doesn't provide opportunities for increased height, except on Stony Plain Road. In the second draft, we have also limited the area where buildings up to a maximum of 8 storeys can be built, to within 100m of LRT stations on Stony Plain Road only.



To support more housing without increasing building heights, and to encourage underground parking instead of large rear surface parking lots, in the second draft of the ARP we have added policy to allow existing apartment sites to take up more space on their lot. The policy requires that these buildings remain 4 storeys in height. The rear setbacks of these buildings when backing onto single detached homes will also be maintained to ensure there is adequate space between these properties and the apartment buildings.

There are too many adult entertainment stores, pawn shops, and loan stores on Stony Plain Road. Why doesn't the ARP prevent these types of businesses?

The City has limited authority to restrict legitimate businesses. It would also be difficult to restrict these types of businesses without also restricting many other types of businesses. For example, pawn shops are defined in the Zoning Bylaw as second hand shops, so restrictions on them could also limit some of the antique stores that are popping up in Jasper Place.

The ARP has aimed to tackle this issue by providing opportunities for mixed use buildings on Stony Plain Road, which would add more people to shop at local businesses, encouraging a wider range of businesses that serve local residents. Having more people living on Stony Plain Road would also support improved safety by having more people around at all times of day and night.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The ARP only talks about the future; there should be a section to acknowledge each neighbourhood and its unique history.

We've added a supplementary document to the Plan that provides more history about Jasper Place as a whole, as well as each individual neighbourhood.

The Plan should provide estimations for population change and school enrolment.

As part of the ARP process, the City worked with a group of community members on a modelling exercise called the Learning Scenarios. The purpose was to consider different hypothetical development cases in the Jasper Place neighbourhoods, and track the possible impact of these scenarios on key community indicators like population, number of school-aged children, housing choice, and walkability. These scenarios provided a general sense of what the outcomes of redevelopment might be, and helped inform the land use policies in the ARP. The high case scenario was also used to test potential infrastructure needs in order to ensure there would be adequate capacity with redevelopment in the future. The Mobility and Transportation study made trip generation assumptions based on the proposed land uses in the first draft of the ARP that were used to model future traffic patterns.

In practice, it is very difficult to predict changes in population and school enrollment over time. This is because, unlike in new neighbourhoods that are developed all at one time, the amount, type and location of redevelopment in mature neighbourhoods depends on which property owners choose to redevelop their property. This may vary significantly based on unknown future conditions, such as economic trends or the number of children people decide to have. Due to these reasons, we have not included assumptions for population and school enrolment change.

THINGS WE CAN'T ADDRESS IN AN ARP

We heard a lot of feedback about important issues that are beyond the scope of an ARP. This section explains the limitations of the ARP in addressing some of these concerns, and where you can find more information about these issues.

I don't support the LRT route through Jasper Place or the number of LRT stations. The LRT station at 95 Ave and 156 Street should be removed.

The Valley Line LRT alignment was approved by Council in February 2012 and includes three LRT stations in the Jasper Place neighbourhoods. The ARP has no influence on the alignment of the planned LRT or location of stations.



I don't support Council's proposed changes to the Zoning Bylaw to allow lot splitting and more opportunities for garage and garden suites. The ARP should not allow these changes in Jasper Place.

The ARP has no influence over Council's decision regarding possible changes to the Zoning Bylaw. The Zoning Bylaw applies to the whole city, including the Jasper Place neighbourhoods.

Why doesn't the ARP address problematic street activity, loitering, public intoxication, or poorly maintained properties and back alleys?

Area Redevelopment Plans are land use plans that set out the types of buildings that property owners may build on their property. The Municipal Government Act defines the purpose of ARPs, and limits their scope to land use issues.

The ARP can promote safety using land use and design controls that support the presence of more residents overlooking areas where safety is a concern, such as providing policies for windows on street-facing buildings and encouraging garage suites that overlook back alleys.

Other ways to address safety issues, such as policing initiatives, bylaw enforcement for unsightly properties, and neighbourhood watch programs, are beyond the scope of ARPs.

For more information about safety programs in Jasper Place, you can contact Paul St. Arnault at 780-944-5417, or you can call 311 directly with any specific concerns you may have. In an emergency, call 911 to reach the police.

I'm concerned about the kinds of people who live in rental buildings, and feel that adding more multi-unit buildings will increase the number of renters and feeling of transience in the neighbourhood. We need more single detached housing to attract families with children.

The ARP has no influence over the tenure (owned or rented) of buildings, no matter what kind of building it is, from a single detached house to an apartment house.

Research for the Housing Assessment showed us that there is a nuanced relationship between the type of housing people live in and different neighbourhood demographics. For example, we found that 60% of families with children in Jasper Place rent their home, and about as many families with children live in apartments (39%) as single detached homes (43%).

The Way We Grow Municipal Development Plan states the goal to "Provide a broad and varied housing choice, incorporating housing for various demographic and income groups in all neighbourhoods." We learned that Jasper Place has apartments and single detached houses, but few other housing types. The ARP supports opportunities for more variety in housing options to meet the needs of all Edmontonians, including families with children.

NEXT STEPS

We encourage you to read through the second draft of the ARP where you can see the changes noted above, as well as other text changes made for clarity. These are highlighted in blue so that the changes are easy to identify.

We are accepting comments on the second draft of the ARP until March 31. This commenting period is intended to provide you with the opportunity to review the changes made to the first draft and share your thoughts on these changes. All comments we receive on the second draft will be reviewed and considered, however we do not anticipate major changes to this draft. We will share a summary of all comments received on the second draft with Council as part of the Public Hearing package presented, and you can also attend the Public Hearing to share your views with Council directly.

JASPER PLACE ARP

SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK ON DRAFT 2

On February 23, 2015, the City launched the second draft of the Jasper Place Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) and held Open House #5 to discuss the Plan on March 10, 2015. Community members had the opportunity to provide their feedback on the Plan at the Open House, through an online survey, or by writing or emailing, by March 31, 2015.

A variety of feedback has been received, including nineteen responses to the online survey, two telephone calls, two letters, and one email. The feedback is summarized below.

ONLINE SURVEY

The online survey asked a series of questions that asked about respondent impressions of the plan. Nineteen people responded, including four individuals each from both Britannia Youngstown and Canora, three each from Glenwood and West Jasper Place, and five who do not live, own a business in, or property in the area.

Respondents who had reviewed the first draft of the plan were asked to comment on key changes made in the second draft, including:

- the new neighbourhood chapter format of the Plan
- changes to the areas of application of Active Edge housing
- additional opportunities for garage and garden suites
- the removal small scale commercial uses from Small Scale Housing areas
- the addition of small scale commercial uses to the Active Edge and Transit Oriented Housing areas
- the findings and incorporation of the Historic Overview Study
- changes to the location of 8-storey buildings

There was general support for the changes made between the first and second drafts, with a majority of respondents supporting or feeling neutral towards the changes.

Survey respondents both new to and familiar with the plan process also had the opportunity to provide more detailed written comments. A number of generally supportive comments were made. In particular respondents noted the active transportation focus, links to the river valley, additional housing choice, and new opportunities for mixed use areas as positive aspects of the plan. Small scale commercial was seen as adding interest and vitality to the neighbourhoods. Respondents also noted that the land uses were consistent and well thought out. One respondent noted the importance of reflecting the unique elements of each neighbourhood, as well as the things that connect them.

Two respondents expressed dislike for the 8 storey buildings provided in the plan. Another respondent felt that overall there was too much infill opportunity and did not support the development incentives being provided. One respondent expressed concern that the plan would not accommodate families as it removed opportunities for single detached housing, and that this could negatively impact schools. It was also noted that garage and garden suites could impact neighbouring properties, and that the plan created too many opportunities for illegal suites. One respondent hoped that Active Edge housing could be extended to their street, while another did not support Active Edge for the northern portion of 163 Street. Additional opportunities for multi-family housing in the Stony Plain Road focus area was also suggested by one respondent. Comments regarding the Historic Overview Study expressed that the character of the areas had been lost and that applying the findings may reduce opportunities for infill.

The need for a complete sidewalk network was noted as something that needed to be ensured, as well as ensuring the communities weren't used for LRT parking. One respondent did not support the additional bicycle network. Another respondent highlighted concerns about increased traffic congestion in the area that would impact commute times



through Jasper Place. It was also stressed by one respondent that there is current insufficient on-street parking, contrary to what the mobility study indicated. The need for more trees and recreational facilities, as well as a new library in the area, were also noted as suggestions.

It was also noted by one respondent that the plan could have been written more clearly with less academic language.

OTHER FEEDBACK

In addition to the online survey, feedback was received through two phone calls, two letters, and one email. The comments covered a range of topics that are summarized below. A letter from the West Jasper Place Community League has not been included in the summary below as the community requested the opportunity to share their comments with Council directly.

One respondent wanted to see additional opportunity for secondary suites in semi-detached housing and more flexibility in providing front garages. They also encouraged city-initiated rezonings along key corridors and areas of change to encourage more redevelopment and create greater certainty for developers.

Another respondent noted concerns as a commuter through the area that traffic congestion would increase. The need for left hand turn bays on 149 Street was noted.

A resident noted concern about the move to commercial uses along the east side of 164 Street between Stony Plain Road and 100 Avenue. There was concern that residents in existing condo buildings would be forced to move.

Another resident wrote that the plan should include measures to mitigate basement flooding and that more visible traffic signs are required at certain intersections to ensure safety.

A number of key points were highlighted by a community member letter. The need for stronger language in the plan was highlighted, as well as a clearer explanation of how the regulations of the Zoning Bylaw applied in relation to the plan. Stronger provisions to protect mature trees was noted.

A number of concerns around historic character areas were noted, including the ability of Heritage Officers to enforce protection measures and concerns that designating a historic area as Transit Oriented Housing would increase the likelihood of these areas being lost. There was also concern that the plan states an objective to restrict new commercial areas, yet includes additional opportunities for small scale commercial uses outside of the Stony Plain Road area. The location of small scale commercial areas was also highlighted as a concern, as well as a lack of clarity for which roads were considered arterial and collector.

The need for a stronger commitment to provide new park space was noted, as well as concern that the 100 Avenue shared use path could be negatively impacted by future redevelopment. Accommodating safe crossings of busier roads for pedestrians was also seen as being missing from the plan, and the need for the plan to reflect new parking restrictions in the neighbourhood was noted.

The need to ensure the plan is delivering housing diversity was noted, as well as concerns about decreased setbacks in Transit Oriented Housing areas. An area of Active Edge housing was also seen as inappropriate due to the context. Lot shading was highlighted as a concern, and the need for the plan to address urban agriculture noted.

JASPER PLACE ARP

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING COMMENT SUMMARY

On May 5, 2015, City staff presented the Jasper Place Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) to Executive Committee. The presentation provided an overview of the process and plan direction, the strategic approach taken to develop the plan, and next steps towards finalizing the plan.

Following the presentation, members of the community had an opportunity to speak to Executive Committee and answer questions from Councillors. A total of eight community members participated, including six members of the West Jasper Place Community League, a resident from West Jasper Place, and a resident from Canora. Written comments were also submitted by the West Jasper Place Community League. The key themes heard from the community are summarized in the table below.

| THEME | OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Pedestrian safety | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to ensure safe crossings of 100 Avenue was highlighted. Request made for crossings at 155 Street and 153 Street to be immediately upgraded. |
| Housing diversity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The desire for seniors' focused housing was highlighted. Request for small lot single detached bungalow priority area for seniors in the area of West Jasper Place between 99 Avenue and 100 Avenue between 150 Street and 155 Street. |
| Apartment Housing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern regarding the high proportion of apartment housing was raised. Request for rezoning to exclude development of new apartment housing. |
| Small scale commercial development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern was expressed that too much commercial opportunity was being provided in neighbourhood interiors, which could result in traffic, parking and road safety issues. Concern about creating competition with Stony Plain Road businesses. Request that small scale commercial be contained to 156 Street. |
| Clarity and detail | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Missing information from the plan was noted, particularly reference to the Mature Neighbourhood Overlay. Maps were seen to be inaccurate, particularly regarding street ends along 100 Avenue. Concern over the lack of enforceable language of the policies and desire to see similar wording to policies in other plans were noted. Request for stronger policy language and the inclusion that location criteria not be varied in all land use areas in the neighbourhood interior. |
| Park Space | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that the plan lacked a concrete way of delivering new required park space was raised. Request made for a link between population expectations and park provision, as well as a more concrete plan for delivering new park space in West Jasper Place with input from the community. |
| Contextual Development Regulations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need to ensure design quality in West Jasper Place was highlighted. Request made that a contextual zoning pilot project be undertaken in the neighbourhood. |



| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Plan process and outcomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns were expressed over the process undertaken to develop the plan. • It was felt that there was inadequate communication and a lack of alignment between plan policies and actions of administration. • Concern that the plan created more uncertainty and would lead to more rental development. • Request for more iterations of the plan before adoption. |
| Secondary suites | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire for secondary suites in semi-detached units to be allowed was expressed. • Seen as an opportunity to increase housing choices in proximity to transit and improve existing units in the neighbourhood. |

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MOTION

The Executive Committee meeting concluded with the following motion:

That prior to bringing the Jasper Place Area Redevelopment Plan forward for consideration at a City Council Public Hearing, Administration include consideration of the following:

- reference to the general application of the Zoning Bylaw 12800, and the Mature Neighbourhood Overlay
- language indicating that the commercial uses for 100 Avenue be removed
- clarification of the intent for small scale commercial development across from the park, including a consideration of possible Direct Control zoning
- a pedestrian crossing strategy for 100 Avenue
- a strategy for mature area parks acquisition
- the requests, as appropriate, outlined in page 1 of the handout submitted by the speakers representing the West Jasper Place Community Residents and League, at the May 5, 2015, Executive Committee meeting.

The feedback received was used to inform the finalization of the Jasper Place ARP.



THE WAY WE GROW

TRANSFORMING | **EDMONTON**
BRINGING OUR CITY VISION TO LIFE

JASPER PLACE ARP

PUBLIC HEARING AUGUST 24, 2015

The Jasper Place ARP was adopted by City Council at Public Hearing on August 24, 2015.

At the Public Hearing, Council made a number of minor amendments to the plan including:

- Adding policy references to the Residential Infill Guidelines and Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Guidelines descriptions
- Moving the paragraph on supporting innovation to the Amendments and Monitoring section
- Replacing 'should' with 'shall' in a number of civic infrastructure policies
- Adding an appendix with historical information on each of the neighbourhoods

These updates are included in the final adopted ARP.

Council also passed motions directing Administration to provide a:

- Report to Executive Committee in January 2016 on the status of the drainage work being done in West Jasper Place and the communication plan that has been in place to keep residents informed.
- Memo on the proposed pedestrian crossing types for each location in the Jasper Place ARP following the completion of the pedestrian crossing priority list in 2016

For more information about the motions and the changes to the plan directed by Council, please refer to the August 24, 2015 Council minutes.