

Addendum – Circulation Summary

65 Carleton Drive

As part of the review of this application, the proposal was circulated to relevant internal departments. A summary of responses is provided below:

Copies To:

Chief Administrative Officer	No comment
Managing Director, Infrastructure & Planning	No comment
Managing Director, Operations	No comment
Managing Director, Corporate & Emergency Services (CFO)	No comment
Director, Legal & Legislative Services	No comment
Director of Planning and Development	Comment received: Ok... without knowing any of the infrastructure details, etc... it is exciting to see St. Albert perhaps is getting some new cultural amenities.
Director of Engineering Services	No comment
Director of Fire Services	No comment
Peace Officer Program Supervisor	No comment
Director, Public Operations	No comment
Director of Economic Development	No comment
Senior Manager, Assessment & Taxation Services	No comment
Senior Manager, Utilities	No comment
Director, Recreation & Parks	No comment
Director, Community Services	Comment received: We have no comment on this, but what an exciting addition to the community.

CC To:

Manager of Development Branch	No comment
Manager of Planning Branch	No comment
Manager, Asset Management, Land & Integrated Infrastructure Services	No comment
Manager of Environment	<p>Comment received from Environmental Compliance Associate on behalf of the Manager of Environment:</p> <p>The Environment team has reviewed the details of this application and have no comments at this time.</p>
Manager of Investment Attraction & Growth	<p>Comment received: Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this proposed project.</p> <p>Campbell Business Park is a well established light industrial district that supports a robust business community. Ease of accessibility for customers of these businesses within the specific area of the district is paramount to their success. The number of patrons that would attend the proposed development, based on the schedule and figures provided, would greatly impact the surrounding businesses with a high potential of disruption to the nearby businesses.</p> <p>The submitted plans indicate 141 parking stalls are planned for the site, however some of the suggested attendance numbers would greatly surpass the allotted stalls. What would the plan be for the overflow of patrons and vehicles, stating upwards of 500 on Fridays? Additionally, a primary concern would be the substantial increase overall in vehicle and pedestrian traffic to Campbell Business Park and how it will impact all businesses and local amenities that our community relies on.</p>
Manager of Business Retention & Expansion	No comment
Manager, Assessment Operations	No comment
Manager of Transportation	No comment
Manager, Transit Service Delivery	Comment received: Transit has no objections to this application. We ask that you inform the applicant that the site has a bus stop adjacent to it.
Manager of Development Engineering	No comment

Manager of Utilities	No comment
Utilities Engineer	<p>Comment received:</p> <p>My comments to this proposed development are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site plan is missing calculations for water, sanitary, and storm services. This should also include the future two-storey commercial building. 2. The site proposes two water services side by side at acute angles from the City main, which is not acceptable. If two meters are needed, they should be split at the plumbing stage, not from the water main. If two water supplies are required for fire flow, it is recommended that the connections come from different supply mains. 3. The lot should have its own underground drainage system for stormwater. It should not burden the swale in the PUL by discharging surface runoff toward it. The discharge rate shall not exceed the approved rate specified in the DA. 4. There is an existing overland concrete swale within an easement on site. If the current drainage pattern is to be maintained, the post-development discharge rate shall not exceed existing conditions. Any additional storm flow must be retained on site. <p>Response received from Senior Municipal Land Specialist to Utilities Engineer comment noted above:</p> <p>I am just preparing comments but comment 4 is not completely correct. There is no easement on site for this concrete swale- which is considered private infrastructure. Additional information will be provided to Development on the history of this swale.</p>
Utilities Engineer	No comment
Senior Municipal Land Specialist	<p>Comment received:</p> <p>Asset Management, Land & Integrated Infrastructure Services offers the following comments regarding the proposed mosque at 65 Carleton Drive as outlined in your memo dated June 11, 2025.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Any relocation or addition of both private and public utility services will be at the cost of the applicant, and requisite approvals must be obtained from the Development Engineering Branch prior to commencing work.

	<p>2. Development Engineering Branch to provide specific comments/requirements in relation to access, drainage, servicing, internal circulation design, and landscaping, as well as the amount of the required Letter of Credit.</p> <p>3. The Transportation Branch will provide any comments related to the submitted traffic impact analysis and any other transportation-related requirements.</p> <p>4. There is one Utility Right of Way registered on this property:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instrument 062 435 412 is for URW Plan 062 5846 which is the first 3.0m adjacent to Carleton Drive and Circle Drive. Utilities commented that there is an existing overland concrete swale within an easement on site. This is not correct. <p>A review of the initial engineering plans for Campbell Stage 4 show this lot was planned to be subdivided into several smaller lots and there was a 2.0m drainage easement planned with a 1.0m wide concrete swale in it. These lots were going to drain into this swale over several lots and empty into the PUL. At endorsement it appears the developer chose to register this entire area as a single lot, but it appears they may have made graded the lot and installed the swale as originally planned. The City considers this a private swale on this lot and is not an interest holder in it. It is probable the site will need regrading to ensure the stormwater on site can direct its site water in accordance with accepted engineering drawings.</p>
<p>Development Engineering Supervisor(s)</p>	<p>Comment received:</p> <p>Here are my comments,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A full set of civil engineering plans will be required as per the format outlined in the City's Engineering Standards. -This site is institutional, and it will need to meet 300L/s fire flow. -A CoSA pre-qualified contractor will be required for any underground work occur in the City right of way
<p>Landscape Technician</p>	<p>Comment received:</p> <p>Thank you for the "Issued For Development Permit" landscape plan dated 04-30-2025. Please refer to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to Land Use Bylaw 3.100 Perimeter Landscaping <p>(1) A development located in the BP2 district that adjoins a public roadway must be landscaped in accordance with the following:</p> <p>(a) There must be a landscaped area at least 3.5 m wide around the perimeter of the private lot adjacent to the public roadway;</p>

	<p>(b) If deciduous trees are planted, they must be planted at regular intervals and, if coniferous trees are planted, they must be planted in clusters of three;</p> <p>(c) Trees must be located a minimum of 2.0m from the property line; and</p> <p>(d) Trees must be a minimum of 6.0 m in height at maturity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to Land Use Bylaw 3.99 Blank Wall <p>(1) Any development that has a blank wall facing a park, natural area or public roadway must be landscaped in accordance with the following:</p> <p>(a) If deciduous trees are planted, they must be planted along the blank wall at regular intervals and, if coniferous trees are planted, they must be planted in clusters of three; and</p> <p>(b) The trees required under section (a) must be a minimum of 6m in height at maturity;</p> <p>(c) Shrubs may be planted between the trees, provided they reach a minimum height of 2m at maturity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to Land Use Bylaw 3.101 Landscaped Buffer <p>(1) A landscaped buffer:</p> <p>(a) Must include a mix of deciduous trees and coniferous trees comprised of at least 60% coniferous trees, unless otherwise determined by the Development Authority in consultation with Engineering Services;</p> <p>(b) Must include trees that, in the opinion of the Development Authority in consultation with Engineering Services, would be sufficient to screen the proposed use or District from the adjacent lot,</p> <p>(c) Must have trees that are a minimum of 6m in height at maturity; and</p> <p>(d) May at the discretion of the Development Authority, include shrubs in addition to trees in the landscaped buffer, provided that the shrubs have a minimum height at maturity of 2m.</p> <p>(2) In a Non-Residential District, a landscape buffer must be provided when adjacent to a park, natural area, or public utility lot. The minimum landscape buffer width is specified for each District below:</p> <p>(b) BP2 District is 6m Width of Landscaped Buffer.</p>
--	---

	<p>Please include the landscape buffer along the Western perimeter adjacent the Park district.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to Land Use Bylaw 3.102 Trees <p>(1) Trees required for a landscaped area must meet the following standards: (f)Where at the time of development, the area between the front property line and the curb and/or sidewalk is not landscaped, this area shall be landscaped to City standards.</p> <p>Please refer to City of St. Albert Engineering Standards 3.4.6 and indicate topsoil, sod, mulch and boulevard trees along Carleton Drive, Center Street and Circle Drive portion of Development.</p> <p>Please reference City of St. Albert Engineering Standards 3.4.15.2 Tree Selection for acceptable Boulevard Tree Species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the Land Use Bylaw 4.12 Parking Lot Landscaping <p>(1) When a parking lot is required to be landscaped in accordance with section 4.10(3), trees must be planted at a minimum ratio of one tree per five parking stalls for single-row parking, and a minimum ratio of one tree per 10 parking stalls for double-row parking.</p> <p>Please indicate ratio on landscape plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please refer to the City of St. Albert Engineering Standards 3.4.14 Fencing <p>.1 Uniform fencing shall be provided and installed by the developer adjacent to the following locations:</p> <p>viii) Institutional sites</p> <p>.2 Screen, uniform and solid fences are to be designed to compliment other proposed architectural and urban amenities, and meet the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Delineation of private and public lands. c) Pedestrian barrier d) Visual continuity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please include sq. m sod on landscape plan. • Please refer to City of St. Albert Land Use Bylaw 5.11 Business Park 1 District <p>(7) Parking and Loading Areas</p>
--	--

	<p>(a) Parking and loading areas must conform to the following requirements:</p> <p>(iii) The minimum setback for a parking lot or loading area is 3m from any property line that abuts a natural area or park;</p> <p>(A) Notwithstanding section (iii), no parking lot or loading area shall be permitted within a required landscape buffer or perimeter landscape area.</p> <p>(iv) A parking lot or loading dock shall be screened from the public right-of-way, natural area or park to the satisfaction of the Development Authority.</p> <p>Please refer to 3.101(2) (b) BP1 and BP2 District adjacent to park, natural area or public utility lot minimum landscape buffer width is 6 m. Please note this will accommodate the mature conifer growth. Landscape plan to include landscape buffer adjacent to the dog park.</p> <p>Please include transmittal addressing revisions and/or additions required and provide 2 full size sets of AALA stamped plans for review and acceptance.</p>
Safety Codes Manager	No comment
Planning Technician(s)	No comment
Manager of Capital Projects	No comment
Transportation Planning Engineer	<p>First Comment received: My comments are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed access off Carlton Drive is located just south of an existing streetlight and bus stop. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The access needs to be located such that it maintains a minimum 1.5m clearance to the nearest street furniture (i.e. streetlight, bench, garbage can, etc.), fire hydrant and tree. If they are not maintaining this separation, the access or the streetlight will need to be relocated. ○ They will need to provide sufficient separation between the transit stop and the site access. Please check with Transit regarding their requirements for the bus stop. • A traffic impact assessment prepared by a qualified transportation professional is required that considers the Friday prayer traffic operations and includes the following intersections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Centre Street/Carleton Drive ○ Centre Street/Circle Drive ○ Carleton Drive/Proposed Site Access

- Centre Street/Proposed Site Access (including the existing access on the north side of Centre Street to 100 and 125 Carleton Drive, which is offset slightly from the proposed site access)
- The proposed development meets and exceeds the parking requirements of the religious assembly land use as defined in the Land Use Bylaw. However, with 400 – 500 people anticipated to attend Friday Prayer every week, the proposed parking lot of 102 or 137 stalls is not anticipated to be able to accommodate all the parking demands generated during this timeframe. They will need to rely on surrounding on-street parking and/or agreements with neighbouring properties to supplement their parking demands. Because of the weekly pressures expected on the surrounding road network, it is recommended that the proponent have a parking impact assessment prepared by a qualified transportation professional that considers the existing on-street parking supply in the surrounding area, measures the existing demands on Friday afternoons aligning with the range of Friday prayer times throughout the year, and estimates the parking demands generated by the mosque during this time. This will provide a better understanding of whether the surrounding on-street network can support the anticipated demands and if additional mitigation or travel demand management measures are worthwhile. The parking impact assessment should also consider the additional demands generated by the future 2 storey commercial building.
 - With the expected reliance on the surrounding on-street parking to meet the Friday Prayer parking demands, the site would benefit from providing sidewalk along the property’s frontage to Carleton Drive, Circle Street, and Centre Street for improved pedestrian access.
 - The current plan includes two site penetrating sidewalks, which flare out where the sidewalk meets the roadway face of curb. If no sidewalk is provided around the property, the flare should be removed to eliminate any confusion as to the sidewalk purpose (i.e. for people not vehicles).

As a side note for discussion with Transit, the area is currently serviced by bus route A12 and A13, which circulates between Campbell Business Park, Pineview, Akinsdale and Naki Transit Centre. A12 only operates on weekday mornings (6:30AM to 9:00AM), while A13 only operates on weekday afternoons

(4:00PM to 7:00PM). Both fall outside the peak demands of Friday prayer. If the development is approved, Transit may want to consider adding off-peak/midday transit service to better serve mosque operations. In turn, this can help reduce reliance on private automobiles.

Second Comment received:

My comments on the 65 Carleton Drive TIA are as follows:

- Section 2.4 Existing Traffic Volumes
 - o Please include in an appendix the raw count data from the counts performed.
- Section 2.5 Background Traffic Volumes
 - o The TIA has included the proposed strip retail plaza as part of the background traffic; however, the development is not part of the development permit application and is not being considered for approval at this time. If strip retail is going to be considered as part of this TIA, the trip generation should be included with site generated/development traffic, not background traffic. Because the mosque is expected before the strip retail, only considering trips generated by the strip retail in the 2031 horizon is acceptable. However, we recommend removing consideration of strip retail from this assessment from both a traffic and parking perspective. Even if included with this TIA, additional traffic and parking analysis will likely be required for any future retail considered on this site, which will allow for better consideration of the real-world traffic and parking data at that time.
- Section 2.6 Proposed Development Characteristics
 - o The report references 12,800 SF GFA for the main floor and second floor areas combined; however, these numbers do not align with the drawing set from July 20, 2025 (the most recent plans the Transportation Branch has of this site), which indicates a main floor of 9,475 SF for the main floor and 3,925 SF for the second floor. Is there a more recent drawing set with different numbers? Please confirm that the numbers align.
 - o The July 20 drawing set included an 8,875 SF basement with additional prayer space for around 250 people, as well as a kitchen and several flex rooms. Will this basement space be regularly utilized during Jum'ah?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The TIA references 500 people; however, the July 20, 2025 plans reference prayer space for 300 people on the main floor and 230 people on the 2nd floor, plus another 250 people in the basement space. Please confirm the number of attendees expected for Jum’ah on a weekly basis. ○ While not impactful to the TIA analysis and findings, the secondary access from Carleton Drive should be a minimum of 9m wide to meet Municipal Engineering Standard (Drawing 3.17), not the 7.6m referenced in the TIA. - Section 3.1 Trip Generation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If including the strip retail in the analysis, please include the trip generation in this section. See the comments provided under Section 2.5. ○ The ITE Trip Generation Manual (11th Edition) provides a Trip Generation Rate for Mosque (Lane Use Code 562) as 23.55 trips per 1000 SF GFA, with 43% entering and 57% existing. However, this rate is based on only two studies raising some concerns over the reliability of the data. Assuming a GFA of 12,800 SF and using the ITE rate described above, the Mosque is estimated to generate 302 vehicle trips on a Friday afternoon. Based on 500 persons in attendance during Jum’ah, where most attendees are expected to arrive by car, this equates to a vehicle occupancy of 1.66 persons per car. With Jum’ah occurring on a Friday, with many attendees arriving from their daily weekday routines rather than a home-based trip, is a vehicle occupancy of 1.66 reasonable or are more single occupancy vehicles expected? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If a lower vehicle occupancy is expected, we request that the mosque related site generated trips be based on first principles. - Section 3.2 Trip Distribution and Assignment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ While it is agreed that the majority of the Mosque traffic will be to/from the west on Centre Street, having only 10% being to/from the east seems low given that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vehicles can access Chevigny Street which connect to Corriveau Avenue and provides a convenient connection to both Veness Road to the east and Campbell Road/Poirier Avenue to the west.
--	--

- Veness Road provides convenient access to/from north Edmonton without the need to access Anthony Henday Drive.
- Because the parking lot is not large enough to meet all the expected Jum'ah parking demands, vehicles will be required to circulate around the neighbourhood to find available on-street parking, which can make entering/exiting from the east and south more prevalent.

Is there any information on where attendees are coming from and going to? Are most attendees expected to come from St. Albert or will a greater number of attendees come from Edmonton or the surrounding metropolitan area. Please consider further if a 90/10 split is considered reasonable.

- Section 4.1 Capacity Analysis
 - Upon addressing some of the comments in Sections 2 and 3, changes to the analysis and findings are expected.
- Section 4.1.1 Existing Traffic Condition
 - Please indicate the traffic control in the tables.
 - Include a summary of the existing Centre Street/Site Access intersection operations.
- Section 4.1.2 2026 Traffic Condition
 - Please indicate the traffic control in the tables.
- Section 4.1.3 2031 Traffic Condition
 - Please indicate the traffic control in the tables.
- Section 4.2 Parking and Loading Review
 - The estimate of 222 parking stalls required to meet Jum'ah parking demand will need to be increased if the basement space is included in the GFA calculations.
 - How much on-site parking will be available if strip retail is developed? In addition to removing stalls, the inclusion of strip retail will also generate its own parking demands that need to be considered, which includes opportunities for internal trips and shared parking between the two land uses. To reiterate comments provided in Section 2.5, we recommend removing consideration of strip retail from this assessment for both traffic and parking. It is best considered under a separate assignment if a future development permit application is made for the

strip retail. This will allow for better consideration of real-world traffic and parking data at that time.

- It is noted that because the on-site parking is insufficient to meet all the Jum'ah parking demands, vehicles will need to circulate around the neighbouring roads to find on-street parking. With about 1/3 of all vehicles to/from the site for Jum'ah needing to park on-street, consideration of parking management strategies is recommended to help reduce vehicles needlessly entering/exiting the site searching for parking. Without applying parking management strategies, the amount of inbound/outbound trips at the site accesses will be higher than indicated in the TIA. Within the TIA, consideration of how the on-site parking limitations will impact travel patterns/turning movements should be considered.

Final Transportation Comment:

I've gone through the revised Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment (TPIA) and corresponding comment log. I accept the findings of the TPIA. Friday Prayer will represent the busiest time of the week for both traffic and parking demands. From a traffic perspective, all the study area intersections including site accesses are expected to operate well without intersection improvements. From a parking perspective, it is recognized that while the on-site parking meets and exceeds the Land Use Bylaw parking requirement, during Friday Prayer the mosque is expected need to rely on available on-street parking in the area, which the assessment shows has sufficient capacity to accommodate this overflow parking.

While we are not requesting further updates to the TPIA the following is noted:

- The TPIA assumes that no traffic to/from the east will use the Carleton Drive access for inbound or outbound movements. In addition, the TPIA assumes that 70% of all traffic to/from the west will use the Centre Street access. This results in low utilization of the Carleton Drive access, which may not be realistic. However, because the intersections are all projected to operate well, making any adjustments to these assumptions will not change the overall findings of the TPIA. If anything, assigning

	<p>more traffic to the Carleton Drive access, which can support increased traffic, would reduce the reliance on the Centre Street access and improve the south approach operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For clarity, the TPIA notes that all traffic to/from the east is destined to Veness Road; however, some of the traffic to/from the east will come from Chevigny Street.
<p>General Fire Services</p>	<p>Comment received:</p> <p>A couple questions come up for me that I would like clarification on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will it be sprinklered? NBC 3.2.1.5 and basement size suggest that this may be required. In this case, additional hydrant is required. Need confirmation. 2. Hydrant from road to building as required by code is measured via path of travel by a fire truck. If no hydrant on site and no sprinkler it is unclear whether the street hydrant to face of building meets requirements. This has to take into account point 3 below. Need dimensioned drawing showing compliant path of travel. 3. FD access to the mosque appears to be only from Centre St. Future Building B through access is not dimensioned. Need a dimensioned drawing demonstrating a code compliant route with a swept path analysis for both current and future project.
<p>Supervisor, Park Planning and Stewardship</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>Indigenous Relations Coordinator</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>GIS Senior Data Architect</p>	<p>No comment</p>