



## WHAT WE HEARD REPORT

### Online Public Engagement Feedback Summary LDA20-0229 - Holyrood Gardens

---

**PROJECT ADDRESS:** 8310 93 Avenue NW and 8311 93 Avenue NW

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** This application proposes to make adjustments to a recently approved Site Specific Development Control Provision (DC2.1001). The existing DC2.1001 Provision was approved on July 9, 2018 and allows for a mixed use primarily high density residential development which includes 10 buildings and up to 1300 residential units. The primary change with this rezoning is to increase the total number of allowable units to 1750, an increase of 450 units. Removal of minimum requirements for vehicular parking in accordance with [Open Option Parking](#) is the other main change.

**PROJECT WEBSITE:** [https://www.edmonton.ca/residential\\_neighbourhoods/neighbourhoods/8310-93-avenue-nw-and-8311-93-avenue-nw.aspx](https://www.edmonton.ca/residential_neighbourhoods/neighbourhoods/8310-93-avenue-nw-and-8311-93-avenue-nw.aspx)

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

**ENGAGEMENT DATES:** November 9 - 30, 2020

**NUMBER OF VISITORS:**

- Engaged: 43
- Informed: 84
- Aware: 264

See “Web Page Visitor Definitions” at the end of this report for explanations of the above categories.

---

## **ABOUT THIS REPORT**

The information in this report includes feedback gathered through the online engagement web page on the Engaged Edmonton platform from November 9 - 30, 2020. Because of public health issues related to COVID-19, the City wasn't able to host an in-person public engagement event to share information and collect feedback, as we normally would have done.

Input from Edmontonians will be used to inform conversations with the applicant about potential revisions to the proposal to address concerns or opportunities raised. Feedback will also be summarized in the report to City Council when the proposed rezoning goes to a future City Council Public Hearing for a decision.

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

---

## **ENGAGEMENT FORMAT**

The Engaged Edmonton webpage included a video, written text and documents available for download. Two tools were available for participants: one to ask questions and one to leave feedback.

The comments are summarized by the main themes below with the number of times a similar comment was made by participants recorded in brackets following that comment. The questions asked and their answers are also included in this report.

---

## **WHAT WE HEARD**

Support: 0

Neutral/Mixed: 3

Opposed: 40

## Comments

### Developer Intent/Process Integrity/Consultation

- Community shouldn't have to go back and look at this again/not fair (x17).
- This re-application must be viewed as bad-faith negotiation after agreement was met (x16).
- This developer has been pushing and pushing all along and is not interested in community needs (x9).
- The developers assertion that it needs the extra units to secure lending seems implausible, not the City's or community's problem (x5).
- The developer does not need to increase the units being built just to satisfy their earning potential (x5).
- The developer is trying to make more money without having to give anything back to the city, such as affordable or family housing (x4).
- COVID has impacted everyone. It shouldn't be used as an excuse for the developer (x4).
- This shouldn't be allowed to happen while the community is distracted by COVID-19 (x3).
- Some of the developer's other sites in the city are not developing and are eyesores.
- The City should consider the previous consultation done in their recommendation.

### Transportation

- Traffic and parking will overflow into the community/"parasite parking" (x15).
- There are many small children/seniors that live in this community and safety on neighbourhood streets is critical and this increase in density decreases safety (x9).
- If there is an increase in about 450 units that will just add more congestion (x8).
- It is going to put an even bigger strain on traffic and access for the surrounding houses (x3).
- There is no information about how many parking spaces the developer intends to provide/increase in units without increasing parking doesn't work (x2).
- Walkability concerning (x2).
- Analysis should look at the impact on the community of the combination of the LRT and development. LRT was not fully considered last time.
- The subsequent approval of the future Bonnie Doon development will likely mean existing roads would be further over taxed.
- The rezoning shouldn't go forward until after LRT so that impact can be observed and measured.

- Traffic study shows negative functioning of intersections. This shouldn't be allowed.
- Edmonton does not have a comprehensive transit system to support a walking only development.
- Entrances to the parkade ramp cannot and should not be adjusted at the development permit stage at the whim of the developer.
- Existing maximum number of parking spaces for 2 bedroom units should be maintained and not relaxed slightly to align with Open Option Parking.
- The paths through the site that connect the community to the LRT station cross the lane, which will have increased traffic. These are potential safety issues with all these crossings and traffic.

### Density

- This massive increase is absurd and absolutely unacceptable (x5).
- I am against the increase in units because I believe that 1200 units will already make a big impact on the surrounding neighborhood (x4).
- An increase in density should not be considered until the design issues brought forward by the Edmonton Design Committee are better addressed (x2).
- During the time since the initial zoning approval, there have been no changes to the circumstances that would warrant increasing the previously approved unit counts by city council (x4).
- The increase in the number of units is concerning as I assume this means there are less 3 bedroom units and more single or loft units.
- I believe this choice of higher density will overall improve the quality of the project.
- Doubling the number of units does not improve quality of life for those who will live in these properties. History has shown that increased densification of developments can potentially have a detracting, and opposite effect.

### Massing, Building & Site Design

- For houses across the lane, there are privacy impacts already and this makes it worse (x6).
- Not enough/loss of green space/should be more with increase in density (x5).
- Sun shadow impacts (x4).
- Tower Floor Plate should not be allowed to increase above 750 m<sup>2</sup> (x2).
- The DC2 should require the development to follow recommendations from the Edmonton Design Committee (x2).
- The space does not warrant massive sky rises.

- The increase in the height of the buildings is concerning as this was a major concession for the approval when the first approval was given.
- Any building over 4 stories takes away from community interaction.
- Should have to conform with the draft tall building guidelines.
- Buildings should be more energy efficient.
- While the overall size of the public park space isn't decreasing, with the ramp and new building orientation, it is being cut up and less usable compared to the wide open design in the existing zoning.
- The proposed development now looks more and more like an ill fitting wall of similar towers, albeit of somewhat varying heights, on the western edge of our community.
- The shadow studies are incomplete.

#### Broader Neighbourhood Impacts

- Dangerous precedent if this expansion is approved. Gives the impression that developers can consult with neighbourhoods and then when the project has started, come to Council asking for more (x3).
- Tall, large buildings will change the feel of the neighbourhood (x2).
- There are 3 massive developments within a 10 block zone, Strathearn, Holyrood, and Bonnie Doon. Population will quadruple. Please do not ruin our incredible community with these massive monolithic developments they will destroy the fabric of our streets (x2).
- I question to what degree the impact of other nearby potential developments are being considered.
- The development, current or proposed, has never been truly compatible with the surrounding area.

#### General/Other

- Construction impacts are already problematic. Want this over as soon as possible (x4).
- There should be more family oriented housing if the total density is going up (x3).
- Crime will increase with increased street and foot traffic.
- There should be more commercial space with the increase in units.
- New units need to be affordable.
- Concerned about storm runoff.

- Wording in the DC2 for drainage requirements has been degraded and does not provide as much of a guarantee that things will be done properly and will be properly looked at.
- 

## Questions & Answers

1. Suppose someone who lives at the site owns a car and uses it for daily commuting, but parks it on a residential street a couple of blocks away because she does not have an assigned parking space on site. Does the Traffic Impact Assessment count trips made using this car as site generated traffic?
  - The transportation study attempts to estimate all vehicle trip activity associated with the site. In this way, the study accounts for this trip. However, the study assumes that development-related vehicle trips start and end at the development. This is standard in transportation studies in that generally the activity with a site is assigned to the site, unless parking is known not to be provided or otherwise significantly constrained. So while the study accounts for this trip's impact on the broader network, the exact travel patterns for it may not be entirely accounted for.
2. In the draft Traffic Impact Assessment, Table 5.1 summarizes daily traffic volumes for selected streets in the vicinity of the proposed development. Why doesn't this table include 85th Street, which is an arterial roadway adjacent to the site? Table 5.1 also indicates that daily site generated traffic volumes in the North-South Alley in 2050 are predicted to be as follows: South of 95 Avenue : 156 vehicles per day North of 93 Avenue : zero vehicles per day South of 93 Avenue: zero vehicles per day North of 91 Avenue: zero vehicles per day In contrast, the same table indicates that in the under the current zoning (2018 TIA), the site generated traffic volumes at these same segments in 2047 are predicted to be 521, 313, 237, and 237 vehicles per day. Can you share some insight as to how the proposed rezoning will facilitate such spectacular reductions of site generated traffic in the North-South alley, even as total site generated traffic is projected to increase in lockstep with the proposed 37.5% percent increase in housing units?
  - This Traffic Impact Assessment submitted by the developer is still under review by the City and has not yet been accepted. The purpose of Table 5.1 is to compare traffic volumes with a previous transportation assessment completed in support of the Holyrood Gardens rezoning. The City will be

requesting that the applicant update the assessment to include comparisons of 85 Street.

- In terms of the alley volumes, the consultant's draft assessment concludes that segments of the alleys will not see an increase in traffic volumes, which is a change from the previous analysis and is currently under review by the City. The City will be requesting the applicant to address the discrepancy in alley traffic volumes before the report is accepted.

3. Why do the sun-shadow studies only go until 4 pm in the March/Sept example (AVG sunset 7/8 pm), show semi-darkness at 6 pm in the June example (AVG sunset 9 pm), and show almost complete darkness at 2 pm in Dec (AVG. sunset after 4 pm)? This is the same issue that took place in the original DC2, where the community had to pay out of pocket for a thorough shadow impact assessment. Will the community be asked to provide this crucial piece of information again?

- Shadows near (1-2 hrs before) sunset are very long, even for a short building like a house, so these times are not very useful for looking at shadow impacts of proposed buildings because most of the area is already covered in shadow from existing buildings. As a result, having our software run images for this time of day is not very effective because it is very difficult to differentiate between the shadows from the proposed buildings and the existing buildings in the image.
- We certainly do not want residents to feel that they have to pay out of pocket for their own sun shadow impact assessment. If there are specific dates/times for which you wish to see a shadow comparison, please email the file planner at [andrew.mclellan@edmonton.ca](mailto:andrew.mclellan@edmonton.ca) and we will find a way to produce an image that shows these shadows for your review.

4. Why is Strathearn development not included in the new traffic study you are doing?

- The new Transportation Impact Assessment uses the City's latest 2050 traffic model. Compared to the 2047 traffic model used with the application that created the current DC2 Provision, the 2050 model includes the recent rezoning of Bonnie Doon Mall and the currently proposed rezoning of Strathearn Heights (not currently approved).

5. In terms of the zoning regulations and what is currently noted as "Minor Alcohol Sales" and is being requested to be revised to "Liquor Stores". The current wording sounds more specific and implies a defined scale of business whereas the proposed revised seems to imply a larger scale and multiple stores. I would like to understand

more about these proposed changes as Liquor stores can bring longer business hours that extend well into the evening and therefore more traffic to a very residential neighborhood during later evening hours.

- On June 17, 2019, City Council approved an amendment to the Edmonton Zoning Bylaw that consolidated the Uses of Minor Alcohol Sales and Major Alcohol Sales into one Use: Liquor Stores.
- In short, the rationale for this was that the only distinction between the two was based on Floor Area and analysis of past Development Permits identified that there was no land use impact related rationale to maintain the distinction. Some of the highest volume retailers by sales and traffic, were classified as Minor Alcohol Sales, while some lower volume retailers by sales and traffic were Major Alcohol Sales.
- You can find out more information about this change by reviewing the minutes from the [June 17, 2019 Public Hearing](#). It was dealt with in Item 3.5 on that agenda.
- Because Minor Alcohol Sales and Major Alcohol Sales are no longer Uses within the Zoning Bylaw, Administration cannot bring a DC2 Provision to Council for consideration that contains these Uses. Liquor Stores must be used in this proposed DC2 Provision for Holyrood Gardens.

6. What rental prices are expected for 2 bedroom apartments?

- Zoning regulates the use of land, which includes what types of buildings are allowed on a site (eg. residential or commercial) and the basic size and shape of those buildings. It does not control who can live or work in the buildings, how the buildings are operated, or whether the units are rented or owned. Rental rates will be set by the developer at the time they are built, which is likely still years away for most units.

7. Is there no way to mandate more on-site parking for this project? With the density they are talking about, a small parkade might be an appropriate choice here.

There is no information about how many parking spaces the developer intends to



provide. Zero parking spaces? One thousand parking spaces?

With 1200 already and wanting another 450 where is everyone all 1650 dwellings going to park?

Will homeowners be given street parking passes so that we can have cars towed?

Did I not read that this new policy (Open Option Parking) is scheduled for review by City Council in January 2021?

### **Open Option Parking**

- On June 23, 2020, City Council approved [Open Option Parking](#), which provides developers' flexibility to choose the amount of on-site parking that they feel is appropriate for their projects.
- It's important to note that open option parking doesn't necessarily mean no parking. It is actually more likely to result in the "right amount" of parking as builders know their parking needs best and have an interest in ensuring they are meeting market demand for parking spaces.
- The parking supply for this project will accordingly be determined at the development permit stage while having to stay below defined [maximums for near LRT stations](#).

### **On-Street Parking Congestion**

- The City recognizes that residents living in vibrant, high-demand areas, such as near major LRT stops and commercial shopping districts, have concerns about on-street parking congestion. Some level of parking congestion is to be expected in these high demand areas and is an indicator of their success and popularity among Edmontonians.
- This pressure is not new. Even under the old rules, there were instances where parking for a new development was not sufficient or certain areas experienced a high rate of redevelopment that led to an increase in curbside parking pressure.
- The City will continue to work with neighbourhoods as we do now to apply on-street parking management tools, such as paid parking and restricted parking, to manage on-street parking where needed in these instances.

- In alignment with the Open Option Parking project, the City has embarked on a parallel project to review and modernize the City's public parking management approach.
- At the June 23, 2020 City Council Public Hearing, Administration was given direction to examine the impacts of how the opportunity of shared parking has affected communities in specific high-demand locations.
- This shared parking work and the review and modernization of the City's public parking management approach will be presented to the Urban Planning Committee in the first quarter of 2021.

8. Parking is expensive so why would a developer put in anymore than the absolute minimum they can get away with?

- This is one of the key motivations behind the [Open Option Parking](#) strategy. It is a recognition that businesses and homeowners know their parking needs best and have an interest in ensuring they are met, making this approach more likely to result in the “right amount” of parking.
- Among other things, this will lead to a more efficient use of land helping to keep costs to both the developer and future owners/renters as low as possible.
- Again, this parking pressure is not new and the City will continue to work with neighbourhoods as we do now to apply on-street parking management tools, such as paid parking and restricted parking, to manage curbside parking where needed.

9. Where will all the traffic go?

- This is being analyzed very closely and a draft Transportation Impact Assessment is available for review on the [Application Webpage](#).

10. Why is this being revisited?

After many years of discussion and finally coming to what was an agreed upon plan, why are we talking about this?

What is the point of zoning regulations and guidelines for building height (and transitions) and storm runoffs and traffic studies if the city of Edmonton doesn't

hold developers to them?

By approving this dramatic increase, does City Council leave an option open for every future developer to consult with neighbourhoods and then when the project has started, come to Council asking for an additional 40% increase in density?

- We can appreciate that it may be frustrating for the community to have to address the redevelopment of this site again so soon after the current zoning was approved. With that said, under the Municipal Government Act and the City's Zoning Bylaw, developers have the right to make a rezoning application and have it considered by City Council and the City is obligated to process such applications.

11. What is being removed to make room for additional units? Public park space. Justification?

The proposed changes reduce the green space and its openness considerably, creating a closed-in appearance and environment. Where will the children of this area play?

- Visually on the site plan appendices, it does appear that the "green space" is getting smaller, but that is simply because it was initially shown at a larger size than what was required by the text.
- There will be no loss to the 1000 m<sup>2</sup> Publicly Accessible Private Park required under the current zoning.
- Anyone, including children in the area, will be able to use the Publicly Accessible Private Park through a registered Public Access Easement. For children that might live in the proposed development, there are two communal areas required to be designed for children and the DC2 provision requires all 120 dwellings designed for families to be within a 150 m walking distance of these places.
- These are not changes associated with the current zoning adjustments, but are in the existing DC2 Provision already.

12. Why is Holyrood being singled out as the high density development area for Edmonton?

- There is no intention by the City to single out any neighbourhood for more intense forms of development.
- Council has approved [Transit Oriented Development Guidelines](#) and [The City Plan](#) which, generally speaking, support more intense forms of development near LRT and along key nodes and corridors throughout the City.

13. Did Regency Developments fail to secure financing for this project after receiving City Council approval to build. If so, why? And why would they now fail to take advantage of exceptionally low interest rates and available government loans?

- From the Applicant: Phase 1 is well underway with construction of building 1 and the parkade as you have likely seen, which means financing was secured. Current world and market conditions are dictating much stricter requirements for what is needed for Regency to commence the second building for construction, hence the rezoning application we have submitted.

14. Does this rezoning application meet our new City guidelines for tall buildings in residential areas?

- The City is analyzing this application with reference to all applicable policies and guidelines, though the draft [Tall Building Guidelines](#) are not yet approved by Council. The conclusions of this analysis will be publicly available in the Council Report if and when this application proceeds forward to Public Hearing.
- It should be noted that the only proposed change relative to tall building design is the increase in the allowable floor plate of 2 towers from 750 m<sup>2</sup> to 800 m<sup>2</sup>.

15. What evidence do you have that this new building will meet new energy efficiency guidelines?

- Zoning does not typically regulate the energy efficiency of buildings. That is left to Building and Energy Codes, which are superior legislation.
-

## **Web Page Visitor Definitions**

### Aware

An aware visitor, or a visitor that we consider to be 'aware', has made one single visit to the page, but not clicked any further than the main page.

### Informed

An informed visitor has taken the 'next step' from being aware and clicked on something. We now consider the visitor to be informed about the project. This is done because a click suggests interest in the project.

### Engaged

Every visitor that contributes on the page, either by asking questions or leaving a comment, is considered to be 'engaged'.

Engaged and informed are subsets of aware. That means that every engaged visitor is also always informed AND aware. In other words, a visitor cannot be engaged without also being informed AND aware. At the same time, an informed visitor is also always aware.

---

If you have questions about this application please contact:

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