

We would not have built in riverside had we known that the high density housing was going to be increased. Very much feel that we have been duped, with sneaky changes pushed through after we had closed on our house. We moved to St. Albert to get away from high density, apartment complexes and rentals. You are ruining the neighbourhood before it is even built.

■, 5 Apr 2024, 12:26

---

I am very against this as we already have 120 units which struggle with parking and use significant street parking narrowing the roads and making it less visible for red crest way to see turning, numerous accidents have almost happened at redspur and red crest already this winter because of visibility, another 141 units will be extremely difficult to accommodate . Will there be a set of lights installed at the intersection? Adding this much traffic to north riverside will impact the intersection of mckenny and redspur Children have almost been hit by cars travelling this road already, what will this take to fix the problem? This should remained zoned at middle and as planned should be row homes like Morrison has on the other side or duplex's We have apartments already there and are planning for 3 more units. We need to find a solution to this over populated small community already

■ 5 Apr 2024, 13:49

---

Why add to congestion traffic on this roadway? Almost t boned again today from traffic flying out of apt block across from this proposed location. Far end of street- some houses have up to 4 vehicles each using all street parking. I moved from the city to this area to get away from all that is now being proposed here. Coyotes and wildlife interactions occur daily - I've been chased by coyote toward 3 others waiting while walking my dog. High density development is NOT going to improve this area . Even living at the end of present dead end street - my company has no where to park - I am incurring expense of extending rear concrete pad for build of larger garage this season for this reason.

■, 5 Apr 2024, 16:57

---

Lights will need to be installed at that intersection.

■, 5 Apr 2024, 17:18

---

The absolute last thing we need in Riverside is more high density residential buildings. Parking is already a concern within the community, small crimes have increased since the apartments have been occupied, traffic is becoming an increasing concerns with the volume of vehicles coming into the neighborhood and driving down McKenny. Another 200 units is a terrible idea for the community and this proposal should be highly scrutinized by the city and it's residents. This is not the community we were promised when we bought in 7 years ago, and the constant zoning changes are affecting the character of the community, and the value of our homes.

■, 6 Apr 2024, 11:09

---

I don't agree with high density, as there is already too much congestion on the streets.

█, 22 Apr 2024, 9:26

---

When is the "vote" for that ?

█, 26 May 2024, 11:53

---

Our new neighbourhood of Riverside is now facing TWO more density increases. We have already been forced to accept previous density increase since we built our new home. We feel betrayed by the City of St Albert and developer. We didn't move here because we like density. We want to live in a family area with mostly single family homes, and this was a major consideration when choosing where to build.

█, 10 Jun 2024, 15:51

---

Slowly but surely the neighbourhood of Riverside is being turned into high density. One zoning change at a time. Parking on the road along the existing apartments is already an issue!

█ 10 Jun 2024, 21:45

---

ASP amendment 4 Redspur Drive I am writing to object to the proposal to change the zoning at this address from medium to high density. I am cognizant of the need for affordable housing in all urban areas and I think there is already a lot of it in Riverside. Two apt bldgs have already been built across McKenney Ave from this area in Riverside and it looks as if two more are being added. In addition there are numerous townhomes across Rose Gate with more being built. In other words, we're doing our part! The traffic is already heavy in that area and the streets are lined with parked cars. The City has a responsibility to maintain some balance to the type of devt in our neighbourhood. Approving this change in addition to other proposed changes to density Riverside is too much! The residents who have invested here over the past 8-9 years should be able to rely on the overall plan and character of the neighbourhood being maintained. The developer will not do that. It will do what makes it the most money. The City's responsibility is to ensure the residents' rights are represented. I hope this msg will be relayed to Council. Many Riverside residents are fed up, especially after the major ASP amendments agreed to in 2020 and 2021, against our express opposition.

█, 11 Jun 2024, 12:11

---

Disappointed in yet another proposed rezoning from low/medium to high density housing in Riverside. We moved here from Edmonton to get away from this. I'm concerned about adding more residents to an already over populated school zone - I hope the focus can be put into building the 2 schools that were promised in this neighborhood instead.

█, 12 Jun 2024, 21:19

---

[Telephone call]

Opposed. Complained about traffic, construction, no street parking. Says there are enough apartments.

██████████, 13 June 2023

---

No thank you, with the other buildings it is quite enough !

██████ 22 Jul 2024, 16:27

---

It seems the city is dumping all of it's high density projects in Riverside. There have already been many changes involving increased density in the neighborhood, where traffic and infrastructure is unable to handle the significant increase in population in such a small part of the city.

██████ 6 Aug 2024, 13:19

---

If the land use is changed, is their a firm and binding requirement that it must be used for a seniors housing complex and nothing else?

██████████, 10 Sep 2024, 8:25

---

I am strongly opposed to increased density on the corner of Redspur. The condo complex was not required to provide adequate parking for bigger vehicles so the end of Redspur near McKinney is constantly crowded. Access to McKinney is very difficult from Redspur due to the amount of traffic. To add that much more activity it will be a nightmare for all of us. Also with the dogs being walked the impact on our boulevards is noticeable and means the grass is unsafe for little children. Increased density will make this area very unsafe for drivers and pedestrians.

██████████, 13 Sep 2024, 11:00

---

A big no, traffic, parking is already a nightmare. School bus stop is actually there and already not safe ! When is the vote for that ?

██████████, 18 Sep 2024, 15:33

---

Didn't receive any of this info by mail neither ours neighbours.

██████████ 18 Sep 2024, 15:44

---

When is the council for that ?? Are residents allowed?

██████████ 18 Sep 2024, 15:44

---

Absolutely do not agree with this. There is already high density in the only exit in and out the neighbourhood. This is a huge safety concern. Not to mention all the cars parking on the street when you drive in. I've almost been hit multiple times from cars leaving the townhome, due to low visibility with the cars parked on the road. There shouldn't be anymore room in the neighbourhood to add more apartments and townhomes.

██████████, 19 Sep 2024, 11:02

---

Absolutely do not agree to change this. It is already parked outrageously at the entrance, compacting the only entrance in and out the neighbourhood. Many times, I almost get hit already due to high density when people leave the townhomes.

██████████, 19 Sep 2024, 10:59

---

St. Albert Council, Dear Mayor Heron and Council members, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed high-density senior housing development, presented as a high cost residence, at the corner of McKenney Avenue and Redspur drive. While I understand the need to provide housing for our growing senior population, I believe that a high-density building at this particular location would create a number of challenges and unintended consequences for the community.

1. Increased Traffic and Parking Congestion First and foremost, parking is already a serious issue in this neighborhood. Even with the installation of "No Parking" signs, cars continue to park in restricted zones, creating congestion and safety hazards. A high-density development would likely increase the number of vehicles, both from residents and visitors, as well as service and healthcare providers. This would further exacerbate the existing parking issues, making it increasingly difficult for both residents and visitors to find safe and legal parking spaces. Increased vehicle traffic will also impact road safety. McKenney Avenue and Redspur Street are not designed to handle the influx of traffic that a high-density building would bring. The narrowness of these residential streets makes it challenging to accommodate increased vehicular movement, and it would lead to more traffic bottlenecks, further reducing the quality of life for local residents.

2. Pedestrian Safety Risks More vehicles on the road pose an increased danger for pedestrians, especially children and seniors. Currently, parked cars frequently block visibility for drivers, making it difficult for them to see pedestrians crossing or walking along the street. This is particularly concerning for children who walk to school or play in the neighborhood. Likewise, seniors, who may have slower mobility, are at increased risk of accidents in a congested environment with reduced visibility. A high-density development would only add to these dangers, making the streets less safe for those who walk or cycle through the area.

3. Environmental Impact and Strain on Infrastructure A high-density building could also have adverse environmental impacts. Increasing the population density in this small area will result in greater pressure on local infrastructure such as water, sewage, and utilities, which may not be equipped to handle the increased demand. The additional strain on the local environment, including noise pollution and the heat island effect from a larger building footprint, would negatively affect the living conditions of current residents. In addition, the increased impermeable surfaces (from parking lots or building expansions) could lead to inadequate stormwater drainage, raising the risk of localized flooding. This would not only damage the local infrastructure but also pose risks to nearby homes.

4. Aesthetics and Neighborhood Character From a visual and aesthetic perspective, a high-density building would disrupt the existing character of the neighborhood, which consists primarily of medium- to low-density homes. The residential area has a distinct charm that comes from its consistency in design, size, and scale of homes. A taller, more imposing structure would detract from this, creating a stark visual contrast that does not blend with the surrounding homes. This type of mismatch in building scale could also negatively affect property values. Many residents moved to this neighborhood because of its residential charm, and introducing a larger, more commercial-looking structure may reduce the appeal of the area to prospective homebuyers.

5. Strain on Local Health and Emergency Services A large influx of seniors concentrated in one high-density development will likely place additional strain on local healthcare and emergency services. Seniors typically require more frequent healthcare, and placing a large number of them in one location could overwhelm local services such as the hospital, outpatient clinics, and emergency response teams. Our healthcare system is already under strain, and concentrating such a high number of seniors in one building would lead to longer wait times for medical care, potentially impacting the quality of care that all residents

receive. 6. Economic Viability and Sustainability While high-density developments might seem more economically viable in terms of housing capacity, they could be less sustainable in the long term for this area. A medium- to low-density building would offer a more balanced approach by providing sufficient senior housing without overwhelming the neighborhood's infrastructure and services. Such a development would be more in line with the community's current layout and could integrate seniors into the existing social fabric more seamlessly, creating a supportive and inclusive community for all ages. Conclusion For these reasons—parking and traffic congestion, pedestrian safety risks, environmental impact, strain on local services, and the overall disruption to the neighborhood's character—I respectfully urge you to reconsider the current proposal for a high-density senior housing building at this location. Instead, a medium- to low-density development would be far more appropriate for the needs of both the senior population and the existing residents. This approach would balance the need for housing with the preservation of safety, aesthetics, and livability in our community. Thank you for considering these concerns. I look forward to your response and hope to work together toward a solution that benefits all residents. Sincerely, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], 19 Sep 2024, 9:13

---

Is is a guarantee that this land will be used for a “senior housing complex”? Or can/will that be changed to accommodate say rental properties like across the street?

██████████, 20 Sep 2024, 13:04

---

Very disappointed to have to start looking for somewhere to move & sell my new home. Location of home purchased was taken seriously with future of area & this being proposed after then is frustrating. Selection of area was fully with future in mind & that living in a high density area was NOT preferred. Property taxes are insanely high. We are lucky IF any snow removal is done at our end of the street (was NOT done after the last big storm 2024). Now we will need to navigate the increase of traffic to reach our homes. The existing apartment block at McKenny & Redspur consistently has the street blocked up & is hazardous with those residents shooting out into the street being blinded by the on road parked vehicles. It's a good day if one does not almost get hit driving to the intersection. The build of this complex will increase traffic to the Raspberry park at the end of Redspur as well that is currently comfortable with local residents usage. The multitude of illegal rental units on this street (City zoning did not allow the built side entry homes to have legal rentals due to "mess up" with garage pad size & placements) already has most homes using 4-6 street parking spots where residents cannot park in front of their own home. Lets add in the SevenM dirt pit trucks whipping around the corner daily & raising so much dust with tracking muck down the road to the loss of comfort residents on this street already deal with. The increase of illegal activity, graffiti & vandalism at the park, stabbings at the apartment complex resulting in death is making this a less than desirable area -HOW does it make sense to add to the congestion where this can only intensify? Re zoning for the addition of the complex at the end of the street is Beyond frustrating & a disappointment that the City values their additional revenue over the already overpaying taxpayers. I welcome any opportunity to attend & address City Counsel at the time this is brought forward.

██████████, 22 Sep 2024, 12:36

---

The addition of high density areas within riverside on redspur is going to increase already congested traffic and cause for additional dangers for children whose bus stop is right on McKenney avenue. I am a resident of rosewood way and there has already been very questionable activity on redspur by the construction crews working on the apartments (fist fights) and additionally a murder! Genstar needs to stop trying to pile people on top of each other at the entrance of the sub division.

██████████, 3 Feb 2025, 8:51

---

The entrance to Redspur is FAR too congested and dangerous right now. If there is to be high density, commercial, retirement and townhouses at the entrance than more parking or no street parking signs are mandatory. Myself and neighbors have had many close calls leaving the complex and dealing with people exiting vehicles parked all over the side of the road.

██████████, 4 Feb 2025, 11:53

---

I attended a session today outlining proposed changes to density on the land pocket on the north west corner of McKenney Ave and Redspur Dr. I object to the proposed shift from medium to high density on a corner that already sees traffic congestion without the completion of the seniors housing or commercial buildings. I'm in support of various housing options but believe the high density would be better suited beside the other high density on the south side of McKenney. After socializing the proposed changes with neighbors, those currently living in areas north of McKenney and utilize Redspur as a primary artery agree it's already a challenge without this change. Please reject the current plan in favour of a plan with density south of McKenney.

██████████, 18 Feb 2025, 21:56

---

Tonight I attended a session outlining the proposed changes for this pocket from medium to high density. Without construction being finalized for the new seniors living facility or the commercial zones, this intersection, specifically the north side, is problematic. Despite hearing that consultants suggest minimal impact, adding additional density in this location will negatively impact life in the area and I, along with many neighbours strenuously object to the change.

██████████, 18 Feb 2025, 22:00

---

1. Figure 2 - north end - There are narrow what appear to be four public utility lots between the roads and the the CN railway. Are these intended to be available for public access? Do these public utility lots abut the CN Rail ROW for its length? What is their purpose if not access? and access for what? 2. Figure 2 - south of Rankin Drive - there are two walkways into the drainage way. Is it intended to have a east-west bridge over the drainage way? 3. Any reason why the public utility lots that appear to be walkways are not identified as walkways?

██████████, 19 Feb 2025, 21:49

---

We are not in favour of having a high density housing complex in this area due to the already heavy traffic.

██████████, 20 Feb 2025, 16:40

---

As a current Riverside resident, I oppose the proposed redistricting at the corner of Redspur Drive and McKenney Avenue from R3A(medium density) to R4 (medium to high density) residential. It concerns me that this only exit out of my neighborhood (currently still under construction) is already congested. A switch to high density would definitely be unwise in this area in my opinion.

██████████, 20 Feb 2025, 16:48

---

What about the traffic issue that plagues that entrance? How is that going to possibly work? Commercial, medium density, high density and retirement all at the single entrance to a growing neighborhood? Who thought this was a good idea?

██████████ 20 Feb 2025, 11:08

---



We are not in favour of changing the density of this due to the already high traffick

██████████, 20 Feb 2025, 16:41

---

1. Clarification on the walkways and trail connection to the east of Raven Point. The stormwater channel shown on Figure 2 of the letter sent to residents shows the trail crossing it. While the Walkways will not have a formal crossing the trail will? I am familiar with the location on the stormwaterr channel and it would be difficult to cross without a crossing structure of some sort. It does not make sense that trail location should be south of the two walkways. If there is no change in plans then I suggest the walkway exiting onto Redwing from the northwest parkland should cross Redwing and continue south to connect to Red Willow Trail. 2. As for the decision on whether a PUL should be paved/harden path, a decision in favor of paving should be taken concerning the PUL outlined in Box 4 of Figure 2 that connects to the Parkland. This would remove the need for residents of Raven Point having to access the busier Rankin Drive to get to the Park.

██████████, 21 Feb 2025, 13:14