
City of St. Albert West Area Structure Plan

Public Discussion

(By Video Connection)

Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

October 19, 2022

SPEAKERS

City of St. Albert:

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Tracy Tsui | Project Manager |
| Christian Benson | Manager of Investment Attraction & Growth |

Stantec:

| | |
|----------------|-----------------|
| Scott Cole | Project Manager |
| Michele Perret | Engagement Lead |
| Kyle Witiw | Planning Lead |

ALSO PRESENT:

| | |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Dyana Pewarchuk | Court Reporter |
|-----------------|----------------|

* * * * *

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

(PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 6 P.M.)

MS. TSUI: Our city's FOIP statement is that (quoted as read):

"Personal information provided in submissions relating to planning and development matters is collected under the authority of Section 230 and 636 of the *Municipal Government Act*, RSA 2000 c M-26 and/or Section 33 (c) of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, RSA 2000 CF-25 for the purpose of receiving public participation in planning and development decision making.

Information collected will be treated in accordance with the privacy protection provisions of Part 2 of the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*.

Please note that public meetings are sometimes video recorded and/or may be transcribed. The meetings may be made available for viewing on the City's public website or forums either using the recording or the transcription. The recordings could include a full visual and audio recording of all presenters and any presentations. If you have questions regarding the collection and use of your

1 personal information, please contact the
2 City's FOIP coordinator at
3 foip@stalbert.ca or 780.418.6663."

4 MS. PERRET: Thank you, Tracy. I know
5 that that's not super exciting, but it's very
6 important information, isn't it? That's great.

7 Kyle, if you move to the next
8 side, please . . . Tracy, I think you're still on
9 for a safety moment, then we'll give you a break.
10 How is that?

11 MS. TSUI: Sounds great. So another
12 item we'd like to take a moment to talk about is
13 safety, and our safety moment topic for this
14 presentation is about driving. It is important to
15 avoid distractions such as mobile devices while
16 driving, and try to avoid aggressive driving and
17 always be patient and courteous to others. And that
18 is our safety moment, so I'll pass it back to
19 Michele to walk us through some of the meeting
20 etiquette.

21 MS. PERRET: Thank you, Tracy. So we're
22 all online obviously. I think we're all used to
23 being on Zoom, and we know how this works. There
24 are icons at the bottom. You're able to -- if you
25 click on the reactions thing, you can put your hand
26 up. So if you have a question, please use that.
27 We'll be watching that. We'll also be watching the

1 chat. If the presentation is continuing and you
2 have a question and you don't want to interrupt,
3 then just put your question in the chat. We'll be
4 monitoring that as well. Please remember to mute
5 your microphone if you're not speaking. It helps
6 with the quality of the audio for everybody else.

7 And most importantly we're
8 here today to listen to -- or to hear the draft of
9 the St. Albert ASP. This is something that the
10 group here from Stantec and the City of St. Albert
11 have been working on over the last few months since
12 we last met, and we want to recognize that they're
13 doing their job. They're doing their best. So
14 let's be hard on the issues, but easy on people.
15 These guys are pretty nice people. So we want to
16 make sure that we have a respectful conversation.

17 We also -- I think it's
18 important to commit yourself to the conversation.
19 Listen generously. You might hear some viewpoints
20 that are different from your own. But perhaps if
21 you're listening generously, you might learn
22 something, and that might be beneficial.

23 Finally some of you may have
24 lots of questions, and if I interrupt you, I
25 apologize in advance. I really want to make sure
26 that everybody has a chance to speak. And so what
27 I'm going to try to avoid -- it's a little trickier

1 online -- I'm going to try to avoid multiple
2 questions where possible so that others have an
3 opportunity to speak.

4 With that, I think we're onto
5 introductions, Kyle. Are we? Oh, we're onto the
6 agenda. Sorry. I don't colour within the lines
7 very well.

8 My name is Michele, and I
9 work for Stantec, and it is my pleasure to be
10 facilitating tonight's meeting. We're going to have
11 a presentation by Tracy. She's going to start us
12 off on the framework and the process and schedule.
13 Scott Cole, he's my boss as many of you might
14 remember from the last meeting, so I'll try to be
15 nice to him. He's going to talk about the Phase 1
16 engagement, what we heard, and he'll try to explain
17 what has been incorporated into this draft ASP.
18 Kyle will then walk us through the proposed land use
19 concept. We'll probably have some breaks in between
20 those presentations for some questions, and then for
21 sure at the end we'll make sure that we have -- we
22 leave enough time for a facilitated Q and A session.

23 So, Tracy, is there -- did
24 you want to introduce anyone from your team here?

25 MS. TSUI: Sure. We have
26 Christian Benson; he is from our economic
27 development department. And myself from the City as

1 well; I'm a planner. And I'll pass it over to Scott
2 to introduce the rest of the team from Stantec.

3 MR. COLE: Perfect. Thanks, Tracy.

4 Good evening, everyone. As Michele introduced
5 herself already, I am a colleague of Michele's, and
6 I am the project manager on behalf of Stantec. We
7 have Kyle Witiw here, who is our lead planner on the
8 area structure plan. And I guess also we do have a
9 court reporter here, Dyana here, who's taking all of
10 the notes as we go through our open house tonight.

11 MS. PERRET: Thank you very much, Scott.

12 So I guess we pass it back to you, Tracy, to start
13 us off with the discussion of the planning
14 framework, please.

15 MS. TSUI: Yes. So we'll start with the
16 planning framework. Area structure plans are
17 statutory documents that provide a framework for
18 future development of and developed areas. So on
19 the hierarchy to the right we see that ASPs sit
20 fairly in the middle of the overall planning
21 framework. As we move from the top to the bottom of
22 the hierarchy, the level of detail increases in
23 terms of land use designations and policies, and
24 each level must conform to its previous level.

25 So for example, area
26 structure plans must conform to the municipal
27 development plan. And then just below the ASP level

1 we see that there are neighbourhood plans. The two
2 of these plans, ASP and NPs will make up the City's
3 new two-tier planning system, and the West ASP will
4 be the first ASP that implements this new two-tier
5 process.

6 On this slide we have a map
7 that shows the location of how these plans are
8 applied. We have the municipal development plan for
9 the entire city, and then shown in the yellow we
10 have the area structure plans, which are typically
11 256 hectares in area or greater. And then followed
12 by the area structure plans we have the
13 neighbourhood plans, which are typically greater
14 than 64 hectares. So on this screen we see that
15 there are two neighborhood plans, and these are the
16 plans that we'll be working on after this ASP has
17 been completed.

18 This is the project schedule.
19 The green is representing the ASP process, and the
20 blue represents the NP process. As we can see, we
21 are currently halfway through the ASP process. The
22 first half dealt with a lot of in-depth review of
23 City documents such as the MDP and master plans, as
24 well site analysis. We also had a series of
25 engagement sessions with the internal and external
26 stakeholders, indigenous communities, land owners
27 within the project area, and an open house with the

1 general public back in May. This first phase was to
2 give us an opportunity to learn about the
3 opportunities and constraints within the area.

4 So for this month of October
5 we are having our second round of engagement, so
6 that includes tonight's public open house, and we
7 are here to present the land use concept and policy
8 highlights for feedback. After this month we will
9 work on cleaning up all of the maps, finalizing the
10 policy document and preparing it for council
11 approval in the new year, which is sometime in
12 spring of 2023. At that time we'll also work on the
13 neighbourhood plans for Lakeview Business District
14 and Badger Lands and servicing design for the
15 Lakeview Business District.

16 So that is the project
17 schedule. I'll now pass it over to Scott to talk
18 about what we heard.

19 MR. COLE: Perfect. Thanks, Tracy. And
20 good evening, again. I have three slides here
21 tonight to really talk about what we heard and what
22 we did as part of our proposed area structure plan
23 that we are going to talk about here tonight that
24 really came out of the spring sessions that Tracy
25 mentioned, the spring, summer sessions.

26 So the first slide in front
27 of us tonight is really with respect to natural

1 environment, and what we heard loud and clear was
2 that protecting the national environment as well as
3 the wildlife habitat was extremely critical and that
4 land adjacent to Carrot Creek, Big Lake, and
5 Sturgeon River must be protected. So as part of our
6 area structure plan that we're proposing we are
7 designating -- or we're proposing to designate it as
8 major open space.

9 In addition, areas will be
10 retained as well as buffers and setbacks will be
11 determined through site-specific technical studies
12 when preparing the second level, the neighbourhood
13 plans that would be forthcoming later on down the
14 line. Technical studies will also help determine
15 ecological stepping stones as well as those
16 locations for the wildlife crossings within the
17 overall area structure plan.

18 And in Phase 1 we heard some
19 conflicting feedback regarding preserving everything
20 south of Meadowview Drive as major open space versus
21 providing it as employment lands in the area. Now,
22 in saying that, council has directed that the lands
23 immediately south of Meadowview Drive and above the
24 flood line be designated for employment, and this
25 direction really aligns with the existing municipal
26 development plan that is in place.

27 So the second slide is with

1 respect to transportation and land uses. On
2 transportation we heard that a network of trails
3 connected to the rest of the City and region is
4 important, especially around Big Lake. So we're not
5 just looking at the trail connectivity in and around
6 Big Lake, but within the overall ASP and how it
7 would connect to existing St. Albert. While a trail
8 network -- and I think this is really important to
9 understand. A trail network won't be defined as
10 part of the area structure plan itself. We will
11 have policy in the ASP documents that requires
12 identification of the high level trail network
13 within each neighbourhood plan that comes forward.
14 The intent overall is to align with the Red Willow
15 Park West master plan.

16 We also received as part of
17 our Phase 1 feedback about providing development and
18 services to meet the needs of both employees and
19 residents, so residents within existing St. Albert.
20 And in response, the area structure plan is
21 proposing to provide a variety of commercial,
22 recreational, and other services to be accommodated
23 across the entire ASP area.

24 And the third slide is more
25 to do with the servicing and the technical pieces,
26 in particular the historical and cultural features.
27 So in terms of servicing, drainage and other

1 technical reports to support the area structure plan
2 are currently under way and will determine the high
3 level utility network for the overall ASP. Exact
4 sizing of the storm ponds -- so you're going to see
5 blobs of a bluish, greenish colour on the different
6 figures -- that will be -- the exact sizing will be
7 determined at the next stage of the neighbourhood
8 plan level.

9 On historic and cultural
10 features, from that perspective, the province's
11 historical resource mapping has indicated that a
12 number of areas with high potential for historic
13 resources are in and around Big Lake, and that will
14 be addressed further through what is otherwise known
15 as "historical resources impact assessments" or
16 "SJOs." And we've also had indigenous engagement as
17 part of Phase 1, and we will continue that as part
18 of Phase 2. We heard that a number of native and
19 medicinal plants have been found and were used
20 within the area. Proposed policy will encourage the
21 retention of these plants where possible and will
22 encourage landscaping that incorporates these native
23 plants in both public and private developments.

24 And that's a very high level
25 of our Phase 1, what we heard, and now I'm going to
26 pass it over to Kyle, the main piece de resistance
27 to talk about the land use concept.

1 MR. WITIW: Great. Thanks, Scott. And,
2 yeah, as Tracy and Scott and Michele mentioned, my
3 name is Kyle Witiw; I work with Stantec, and I'm the
4 planning lead on the project. So I'm going to hold
5 you all in suspense for a little longer here and
6 just talk about how we got to the land use concept
7 that you'll be seeing or you may have seen in
8 preparation for this meeting.

9 So the land use concept, what
10 that is, is it basically helps to determine the
11 types of development and activities that can happen
12 and where in St. Albert West. A draft concept was
13 prepared with the City's project team that brings
14 together four things: municipal development plan and
15 council direction, some information that was
16 gathered early on in the project on opportunities
17 and constraints in the area, some high level desktop
18 technical review, as well as stakeholder feedback
19 through Phase 1, which Scott provided a bit of an
20 overview on.

21 So the first thing we did
22 with that information was prepare a vision for the
23 ASP, and that vision really helps to inform the land
24 use direction and propose policy that is proposed
25 for the draft plan. The vision for St. Albert West
26 is to be a strategically important area for
27 St. Albert that helps achieve a sustainable tax base

1 and is a significant employment generator for the
2 City.

3 It's to be a place that
4 drives innovation and is home to the City's focus
5 areas, namely advanced manufacturing, agribusiness,
6 clean technology, construction, life sciences, and
7 transportation and logistics. It's a place that
8 will protect natural habitat and features like
9 Carrot Creek, Big Lake, and Sturgeon River for the
10 enjoyment for current and future generations. It
11 provides a mix of residential, commercial,
12 recreational, and other services to meet the daily
13 needs of residents and serves those employment lands
14 that we've been talking about a little bit. And
15 finally, it's intended to be a place that's vibrant,
16 walkable, and well-connected to the rest of the
17 community and region.

18 So without further adieu
19 here, what you see in front of you is the proposed
20 land use concept, and I'm going to really briefly
21 walk through the different areas and talk a little
22 bit about what all of the different colours mean.
23 So starting off with the yellow areas, these are
24 designated as neighbourhoods. Neighbourhoods are
25 predominantly residential areas in the plan
26 comprising the majority of the Cherot and Avenir
27 areas that are currently under the Cherot ASP.

1 There's also a small amount of neighbourhood area in
2 the very north east. It might be a little difficult
3 to see on this slide. The thing to note about this
4 area is in accordance with the Edmonton metropolitan
5 region growth plan, minimum density for the area
6 must be set at 40 dwellings per net residential
7 hectares. So what that gobbledegook means is
8 basically that about 3,000 homes would be located
9 within that area translating to about 8,000 people.

10 The other thing I want to
11 note, and this came up in one of our other
12 stakeholder sessions, is that there is intended to
13 be a mixture of low-density, medium-density, and
14 high-density development within this area. So
15 really intending to be for that Cherot, Avenir area,
16 intending to be consistent with all of the previous
17 planning that has gone into the Cherot area
18 structure plan, not intending to change any of the
19 intent of that area.

20 Next up we have the --
21 depending on your opinion -- purple or pink areas.
22 These are employment areas, and employment areas
23 comprise of fairly significant amount of land in the
24 area and really are intended to help the City
25 achieve that non-residential tax base that I
26 mentioned earlier. As also mentioned, the City's
27 focus sectors will be a priority for the types of

1 development sought in those areas, and particularly
2 Lakeview Business District, which is right in the
3 middle of the area. The area is intended to be
4 developed with what is termed Class A industrial and
5 office buildings, and the employment areas will
6 capitalize on key connections to regional
7 transportation corridors such as an Anthony Henday
8 Drive, Ray Gibbon Drive, Villeneuve Road, and the
9 future Fowler Way up in the north.

10 Mixed use employment areas --
11 so these are the lighter pink areas or hatched
12 areas -- will provide some complementary commercial
13 development to serve the employment lands and
14 residents. They'll also accommodate some smaller
15 scale light industrial and office development. And
16 for the area that's just north of the CN rail line,
17 that area has been designated as such also in part
18 to help provide a bit of a transition in development
19 intensity to the residential areas to the north.

20 Another really significant
21 area of designated land use is what is deemed major
22 open spaces. So these areas will help to protect
23 areas around Carrot Creek, Big Lake, and
24 Sturgeon River from development. They'll also
25 provide school and park sites for residents. One
26 thing I do want to note as well is that when we say
27 "major," major open spaces means open spaces that

1 are intended to serve the entire City and St. Albert
2 West area. When neighbourhood plans are prepared,
3 additional open space will be needed -- will need to
4 be identified to create what's called "ecological
5 stepping stones" to promote wildlife connectivity as
6 well as smaller, more community-based park sites.

7 We also have mixed use areas,
8 a small amount of mixed use area in orange in the
9 north. This, again, aligns with the Cherot area
10 structure plan that's already been approved and
11 would encompass a mix of apartments, townhouses,
12 retail, restaurants, other services, and may be a
13 mix of vertical mixed use, such as commercial on the
14 ground floor with residential above or more of your
15 horizontal where there's commercial buildings next
16 to residential housing.

17 Lastly, alternate
18 jurisdiction in grey. So this is another -- and, in
19 fact, I think the largest amount of land base in the
20 St. Albert West ASP. And this area includes
21 Ray Gibbon Drive and parcels of land that are owned
22 by the province, including Lois Hole Centennial
23 Provincial Park. So while the City does not have
24 authority to direct development on provincial lands,
25 we have identified it within the plan to basically
26 emphasize the desire for some partnership and
27 collaboration between the City and province on land

1 use development and ecological protections among
2 many other things.

3 Also to note, Ray Gibbon
4 Drive, while it's shown as alternate jurisdiction,
5 some parts of that land that are shown on here are
6 provincially owned and others are City owned. And
7 the intent for that and designating it as alternate
8 jurisdiction is really to ensure that we are able
9 to -- or the city is able to work with the province
10 to protect that area for future expansion.

11 Speaking of roads, we also
12 wanted to share a bit about the transportation
13 network that you see here. So the roads shown here
14 connect the area to the region, to the rest of the
15 City, and provide a bit of that big picture
16 structure of roads within the future neighbourhoods
17 and employment areas. What you don't see here are
18 local roads. So local roads would be identified
19 through future neighbourhood planning processes.

20 Another item of note that has
21 been raised just quite literally yesterday by the
22 City's transportation department is that there is a
23 road in the southeast corner. Hopefully you can
24 kind of see my cursor. If not I'll kind of jump
25 back to it in a second. But in the very southeast
26 there is a road that's shown as a neighbourhood
27 road. That is actually through some of the City's

1 transportation planning intended to be a crosstown
2 road, so an arterial roadway. So we'll have to
3 correct that on a future draft of this plan.

4 Getting to the end here, I'm
5 just going to really quickly breeze through some
6 next steps. Tracy's touched on a lot of this
7 already in terms of the process, but we're
8 continuing engagement with a number of other
9 stakeholder sessions this week. We're also
10 collecting feedback from an online interactive map
11 on Cultivate the Conversation. So that land use
12 concept that you saw, there's an opportunity to go
13 on there and drop some pins and provide some
14 comments on a number of themes.

15 We are -- as Tracy mentioned
16 earlier, we're targeting bringing a draft of the
17 area structure plan to council for first reading
18 sometime in the winter, likely winter next year, and
19 following that the plan will have to go to the
20 Edmonton metropolitan region board for review. That
21 review typically takes about three months at which
22 point a public hearing and council's second and
23 third readings can proceed as well. So that's
24 tentatively scheduled for the spring. And then
25 following that we would continue working on the
26 Lakeview Business District neighbourhood plan as
27 well as the Badger Lands neighbourhood plan and some

1 of that servicing design for those neighbourhoods,
2 and all of that is planned to carry us through
3 summer of next year.

4 So I want to thank you for
5 your time today on behalf of Stantec and the City of
6 Edmonton project team, and I am going to close my
7 big yap now and hand things over to Michele to help
8 facilitate some of our discussion here today. So
9 thanks for bearing with me.

10 MS. PERRET: Thanks, Kyle. And I think
11 you meant the City of St. Albert. But we --

12 MR. WITIW: City of St. Albert, yes.
13 Sorry.

14 MS. PERRET: We knew what you meant.
15 While you've been talking we have accumulated a
16 couple of questions, and one of them is from Raf,
17 and he is asking if there's been collaboration with
18 the City of Edmonton regarding zoning because south
19 of 137th Avenue is residential housing and the plan
20 that is being shown here is to have industrial and
21 commercial north of 137th Avenue. That makes --
22 he's suggesting the zoning plan is not consistent,
23 and he backs onto 137th Avenue and has the
24 Horseshoe Creek next to him. He's not looking
25 forward to massive commercial complexes behind him,
26 and right now -- oh, Raf. Raf has a great view of
27 the northern lights and doesn't want to substitute

1 those with industrial flood lights. That's
2 understandable, Raf. Who would like to talk about
3 that? Is that you, Kyle? About -- talking about
4 the industrial versus the residential in the
5 137th Avenue area.

6 MR. WITIW: Yeah, I can kind of start us
7 off there, and then I'll likely pass things over to
8 Tracy. So what is shown there in terms of
9 employment lands is consistent with the municipal
10 development plan for the City of St. Albert. That
11 plan would have gone through a referral process with
12 regional neighbours, including the City of Edmonton
13 for review and for them to kind of raise any red
14 flags through that process. The Edmonton
15 metropolitan region board process will also be an
16 opportunity for regional partners to review the --
17 review and sign off on the plans. So, yes, there
18 will be ongoing conversations with the City of
19 Edmonton to ensure alignment.

20 In terms of impacts on
21 adjacent properties, one thing that I think is very
22 important in terms of the development of policy for
23 those employment areas is ensuring that impacts --
24 whether it be lighting, noise, dust -- are contained
25 to the site. So we have drafted policy that is
26 being reviewed by the City right now, the City of
27 St. Albert, that basically says for the employment

1 lands any of those nuisance impacts need to be
2 self-contained within buildings or sites.

3 Tracy, I don't know if
4 there's anything else you wanted to add from the
5 City's perspective and maybe even just in terms of
6 implementation from a land use districting process.

7 MS. TSUI: No. Thank you, Kyle. I
8 think you touched on that question well. Just to
9 add with the policies around the Big Lake area, we
10 recognize that that is an area that's
11 environmentally sensitive and significant to this
12 area structure plan. So the policies around
13 development around Big Lake would have an emphasis
14 on urban design that touches on dark sky, bird
15 friendly development. Those are sort of the key
16 policies that we're emphasizing for that will form
17 around Big Lake.

18 MS. PERRET: And either Tracy or Kyle,
19 maybe for people like myself -- I'm not suggesting
20 that others on the call don't understand this, but
21 maybe the employment areas -- maybe you could
22 explain kind of what type of development you could
23 expect in there. Like, it's -- what it's not, what
24 it could be. Are there some examples you could
25 give?

26 MS. TSUI: The type of development that
27 we envision for the purple employment areas is light

1 industrial, professional office buildings. Some of
2 the focus sectors that the City is prioritizing
3 would include industries like agribusiness, clean
4 technology, transportational logistics, that sort of
5 thing.

6 MS. PERRET: So would it be Campbell
7 Industrial Park?

8 MS. TSUI: Yeah, similar to Campbell
9 Park. Yeah. For the mixed use employment areas we
10 envision a bit more commercial within those hatched
11 areas. Commercial being a use that would serve as a
12 complementary, secondary to the rest of the
13 employment area to serve the employees within the
14 adjacent employment areas.

15 MS. PERRET: Okay. Thank you, both. Ken
16 has three questions. So we'll start with one, and
17 then I'll pause to see if anybody has any additional
18 questions before we continue on with the other two.
19 So Ken's first question is with respect to Slide 19.
20 Kyle, would you be able to bring up Slide 19,
21 please. He's saying that Slide 19 is missing the
22 mixed use employment area north of 137th Avenue, or
23 has this been removed? Maybe it's just really
24 light? I think I can see it, but . . .

25 MS. TSUI: I don't believe we proposed a
26 mixed use employment area in the southern part.

27 MS. PERRET: So that would be that --

1 MR. COLE: It isn't mixed use
2 employment. It actually is the employment area
3 on -- I think it's the previous slide, Kyle.

4 MS. PERRET: Yeah.

5 MR. COLE: There you go. There you go.

6 MS. PERRET: Okay. Okay. So there's some
7 other questions that Ken has. Ken, bear with us.
8 I'm just going to pause to see if somebody else has
9 a question. Constance?

10 CONSTANCE: Constance.

11 MS. PERRET: Constance?

12 CONSTANCE: Yes.

13 MS. PERRET: Thank you for correcting me.
14 My apologies.

15 CONSTANCE: I just want to go to --
16 further on Raf's point and that area we're speaking
17 about, that island of employment area adjacent
18 137th Avenue. That is isolated. This plan shows a
19 change from the City's approved MDP insofar as the
20 designated alternate jurisdiction seems targeted for
21 recreation due to the environmentally significant,
22 sensitive nature of those lands. It's Alberta
23 Environment's in ownership, as I understand. And I
24 understand that the intervening alternate
25 jurisdiction between that employment area and
26 Ray Gibbon Drive is transportation-related purpose.
27 I believe the client for that

1 area designated employment is interested in some
2 sort of a residential accommodation and
3 institutional type use, whether it's supportive
4 living or whatever. That clearly type of
5 institutional is not something that's contemplated
6 in the City's approved MDP policies as they
7 currently read. It's complementary institutions and
8 that opportunity for supportive living, things such
9 as that. So a mixed use area would perhaps be a
10 more appropriate consideration and a more compatible
11 consideration given the residential south of 137th
12 is Starling as well as the environmental and the
13 Big Lake considerations to the west.

14 MS. PERRET: So, Constance, it sounds like
15 you have some information that the rest of us don't
16 have. You are aware of what is actually proposed
17 for that area?

18 CONSTANCE: No, I'm saying at this point
19 because the City's not entertaining plans for this
20 area it's still influx as West ASP is developed.
21 The land owner of that employment area that's shown
22 adjacent to 137th Avenue in this morning's land
23 owner engagement very clearly asked the question
24 about type of institutional and opportunity for
25 residential for, like, supportive living to be
26 accommodated. That was not something that currently
27 is contemplated in this plan. And given its context

1 and with Starling to the south, that should be a
2 consideration if, in fact, the City is not going to
3 consider institutional of that type in an employment
4 area.

5 MR. COLE: So, Michele, that is correct.
6 We did have a -- we had multiple meetings today, and
7 one of the comments was about institutional. So
8 for, you know, a senior's facility of some type, not
9 necessarily residential development. And that was a
10 takeaway for us from earlier today to look into
11 that. I wouldn't say it's an island considering it
12 has major transportation routes on both the south
13 and east side. And while it graphically looks like
14 an island, it is well-suited from a transportation
15 perspective from Ray Gibbon Drive and 137th Avenue.

16 MS. PERRET: Okay. Thanks, Scott. So it
17 sounds like maybe there was an undertaking from this
18 morning that the group isn't able to answer that
19 question right now. Is that correct?

20 MS. TSUI: Yes. I was going to go back
21 and talk -- have internal discussions to understand
22 institutional. The MDP -- the intent of the
23 institution definition in the MDP was that it would
24 be more about development along plans of education,
25 government type of uses. I'm not quite sure about
26 residential, but we're going to discuss that
27 internally and get back to the land owner.

1 MS. PERRET: Okay. Thanks. It sounds
2 like there was a conversation earlier today and the
3 answer is still pending.

4 Constance, can we go onto
5 another question and come back to you?

6 CONSTANCE: Yes. I just had one
7 supplement response to Scott and that we would
8 differ on whether it is more of an island as the
9 area surrounding it in terms of the majority of the
10 area synergistically doesn't quite support that type
11 of light industrial or medium industrial that the
12 current employment designation sets out in the MDP.

13 MS. PERRET: Well, okay. Thank you for
14 that comment. I'm going to go back to -- I believe
15 the gentleman's name was Ken. His second question
16 was, Can any commitments be made in the ASP that
17 administration will not invoke -- boy, you guys are
18 way smarter than me -- Section 5.1.13 (b) to allow
19 for encroachment on the MDP required setback for
20 Carrot Creek and the Sturgeon River under
21 Section 5.1.13 (a). So I don't know if we are aware
22 of what those sections are. That sounds like a
23 question for the City.

24 MR. COLE: I would just add -- and I'll
25 let Tracy or Christian specifically add to this, but
26 we are -- as part of our area structure plan we are
27 conforming to the municipal development plan, which

1 specifically states a 50-metre setback along the
2 various environmentally sensitive areas. Now, one
3 of the things typically that is done is that there
4 is that setback requirement within the MDP.
5 However, further technical work may be required by
6 the City, and there could be slight delineations,
7 et cetera, from that standard 50-metre setback. And
8 Tracy, Christian, I'll defer to you if I said that
9 correctly, or if there is --

10 MS. PERRET: And I think Ken may have put
11 his hand up.

12 MR. COLE: Okay.

13 MS. PERRET: He may have a clarification
14 on his question. Is that correct, Ken?

15 MR. CRUTCHFIELD: Yeah, that's correct. And I
16 appreciate tonight's presentation. Scott, the
17 reason that I brought this forward was that the MDP
18 had just recently been approved back last year when
19 council was confronted with a development at
20 230 Bellerose Drive, otherwise known as
21 Riverbank Landing. And in that particular
22 development they approved under Bylaw 9 a
23 50-metre tall building within 17 feet of the bank of
24 the upper bank of the Sturgeon River. And hence my
25 reason for making this statement in that when I
26 check with administration they pointed out that that
27 Section 5.1.13 (b) allowed them to, in fact, permit

1 the development inside the 50 metres.

2 And if you've ever been up in
3 that area it's fairly significant in terms of
4 providing oversight for the whole area of
5 St. Albert. But this area in particular,
6 Carrot Creek and the Sturgeon River are very dear to
7 me and a lot of residents, and I would like to think
8 that under the MDP -- because council expressly
9 isolated Carrot Creek and the Sturgeon River for
10 identifying setback, but at the very least that
11 setback would be honored and no encroachment would
12 take place.

13 Hence my reason, my ask is
14 whether, in fact, this ASP can be very much more
15 definitive in terms of limiting any potential
16 encroachment because I know that within the
17 environmental reserves St. Albert and other
18 municipalities are now allowed to put in storm water
19 management facilities within those areas. And we
20 see one example already on the Sturgeon River right
21 beside the riverside development. So that's the
22 little bit of the background about why I raised the
23 question. Thank you.

24 MS. PERRET: Thank you, Ken. Tracy, did
25 you want to address that question?

26 MS. TSUI: Sure. And I'll read out
27 Section 5.1.13 (b). It starts off by saying

1 (quote):

2 "Require appropriate setbacks from
3 identified natural features and lands
4 considered unsuitable for development, to
5 be established as follows: a. Based on the
6 greater of: i. A minimum 50-metre setback
7 from the top-of-bank of the Sturgeon River
8 or Carrot Creek to lot boundaries;
9 b. Or as determined through appropriate
10 studies and plans, as deemed satisfactory
11 by the City. The cost of supporting
12 studies and plans are the responsibility
13 of the applicant."

14 So this policy is saying that
15 the setbacks should be either 50 metres from the top
16 of bank or less depending on studies that identify a
17 lesser setback. And, yes, this policy would apply
18 for all ASPs, including this West ASP. But, yeah,
19 of course, area structure plan -- we're pulling
20 direction to apply the 50-metre setback. We see for
21 the Cherot ASP, their setbacks are less than the
22 50 metre, and that is because they've done further
23 studies to identify their ER being reduced. And so
24 the setbacks may be addressed at the neighbourhood
25 plan stage depending on the studies.

26 MS. PERRET: Okay. Thank you, Tracy.

27 MR. COLE: If I can summarize that, I

1 think what you're saying, Tracy, is, right now at
2 the high -- the main level, the area structure plan,
3 we are utilizing the 50-metre setback that is based
4 off the municipal development plan. When subsequent
5 neighbourhood plans come forward subject to
6 additional technical information like geotech,
7 environmental, et cetera, there could be adjustments
8 to the setback requirements.

9 MS. TSUI: Mm-hmm. Correct.

10 MS. PERRET: But they have to have other
11 studies done.

12 MR. COLE: A significant amount of
13 studies completed at the NP stage to justify any
14 change to setback requirements.

15 MS. PERRET: I saw -- as soon as you said
16 "change" I saw Ken's hand go up. Ken, I recognize
17 your hand. Please bear with us while we get to your
18 comment. And, Raf, I see you've added two more
19 comments, and, Ken, we still have another question
20 in the chat. I would just in the spirit of getting
21 as many voices as possible -- I'm going to go to
22 Hawley first, and then -- go ahead, Hawley.

23 MS. CAMPBELL: Thanks very much. Can you
24 folks hear me? Just to make sure my mic is working.

25 MS. PERRET: Yes. Yes. Thank you.

26 MS. CAMPBELL: Perfect. Thanks very much.
27 And thanks for the presentation. Really helpful

1 information. So my name is Hawley Campbell; I'm a
2 senior consultant with Nichols Applied Management.
3 We recently with ISL -- with Connie, who's on the
4 call as well -- completed a market study related to
5 non-residential lands in the city on behalf of the
6 City port land holdings in the Lakeview Business
7 District. Is everyone kind of familiar with where
8 I'm talking about, the City port land holdings? I
9 have a map I could show as well, but it's sort of
10 that part of the Lakeview Business District right
11 along the right hand along Ray Gibbon -- right along
12 the right-hand side of the district.

13 So my question is related to
14 the potential for sort of redesignation of the
15 employment lands contemplated for those City port
16 lands, and I have just a few comments I would like
17 to go through to summarize our market study to
18 provide some context. It should only take a few
19 minutes. I'll try to go quickly so that I'm not
20 putting anybody to sleep here.

21 But essentially we conducted
22 this study to evaluate whether a shift in the land
23 use designation for the City port lands to allow for
24 large scale commercial development would be
25 consistent with market conditions in the City. What
26 we found is that data with respect to the City's
27 historical, industrial, and commercial land

1 absorption as well as a recent market study that was
2 commissioned by the City and completed by FBM and
3 our own growth analysis all suggest that there is an
4 overdesignated of industrial land in newly
5 developed areas in the City and in the
6 Lakeview Business District as well.

7 This overdesignated isn't
8 necessarily driven by market conditions, but rather
9 a City policy objective that's outlined in the MDP
10 that looks to achieve a residential to
11 non-residential tax revenue/assessment split of
12 70-30 for the City overall. And that's achieved in
13 part by aiming for a split of 60-40 in newly
14 developed areas. So that policy objective from our
15 work we think is pushing for this overdesignated of
16 industrial lands.

17 Furthermore, we're aware that
18 that market study completed by FBM that I mentioned
19 has been relied on for developing the land use
20 concept for the West ASP, and I note that that study
21 is projecting that the City will absorb about
22 17 gross hectares of industrial land by 2030, and
23 they suggest that about seven of those hectares
24 would be absorbed in the Lakeview Business District.
25 So that's not necessarily pointing to a large
26 short-term demand for industrial development.

27 Additionally, that FBM study,

1 historical data, and our own analysis has all
2 suggested that the absorption of non-residential
3 land in the City is relatively even between
4 industrial and commercial development, and what
5 we're seeing in this proposed land use concept is
6 sort of a heavy favour to industrial uses with
7 commercial uses being restricted to more
8 complementary or supplementary activities outside of
9 that small mixed use employment area. But I'll also
10 note that our question was that that crosshatched
11 mixed use employment area would allow for commercial
12 activity beyond that complementary kind of
13 designation --

14 MS. PERRET: Hawley?

15 MS. CAMPBELL: Yeah.

16 MS. PERRET: Hawley, can I interrupt you
17 for a minute. It's almost like you're doing a
18 presentation on your study, and I just want to give
19 other people an opportunity --

20 MS. CAMPBELL: Sure.

21 MS. PERRET: -- to respond and react.
22 So -- sorry. But I just have one question. When --
23 it sounds like your study is based on the premise
24 that the policy is wrong. Is that correct?

25 MS. CAMPBELL: It's not necessarily --

26 MS. PERRET: You're saying that the policy
27 is 70 percent residential, 30 percent industrial,

1 and that's wrong? Is that --

2 MS. CAMPBELL: We're not necessarily saying
3 that it's wrong.

4 MS. PERRET: Okay.

5 MS. CAMPBELL: But in completing kind of our
6 market analysis we're suggesting that there might be
7 an optimistic objective with respect to industrial
8 land development. It's not necessarily the policy
9 is incorrect. It's an objective that the market
10 conditions and analysis that we completed suggest
11 that the City port land holdings could be shifted in
12 terms of their land use designation to allow for
13 that larger scale commercial development that would
14 honestly still be consistent with the City's goal of
15 increasing non-residential base.

16 MS. PERRET: Tax base.

17 MS. CAMPBELL: Yes, tax base.

18 MS. PERRET: Okay. Sorry. Not everybody
19 is -- it's hard to follow what you're saying
20 because --

21 MS. CAMPBELL: Sure.

22 MS. PERRET: -- we haven't read the -- and
23 I apologize for interrupting.

24 MR. COLE: And, Michele --

25 MS. CAMPBELL: No, it's okay.

26 MS. PERRET: I'll let Christian just step
27 in here for a second.

1 MR. COLE: Yeah. And, Michele, we were
2 made aware of this just late this morning --

3 MS. PERRET: Oh, okay.

4 MR. COLE: -- of the information. I
5 believe Christian has his hand up --

6 MS. PERRET: Yeah.

7 MR. COLE: -- and probably will go over
8 all of this.

9 MS. PERRET: I just asked him to respond.

10 MR. COLE: I don't believe the
11 information has been shared with the City.

12 MS. PERRET: Okay. It might be too much
13 for this meeting.

14 MR. COLE: Yeah.

15 MS. PERRET: Just go ahead. Go ahead,
16 Christian.

17 MR. BENSON: Sorry. Just a point for
18 clarification. I typed it out in the --

19 MS. PERRET: Oh, okay.

20 MR. BENSON: -- chat section. The FBM
21 report was in -- our inventory of non-residential
22 wasn't used for policy development in the MDP or the
23 West ASP. So just that point of clarification, the
24 FBM report was conducted by our economic development
25 department to look at current inventories for
26 non-residential.

27 MS. PERRET: Okay. I was really impressed

1 with your -- with what you were saying, Hawley.
2 It's -- you obviously know what you're talking
3 about. I'm just, like, Whoa. It's going over my
4 head here.

5 MS. CAMPBELL: No problem. And, yeah, I
6 apologize. I am trying to summarize, like, a lot of
7 information that we have in a very detailed report
8 just to provide the context for the -- that would be
9 the opportunity to --

10 MS. PERRET: So if I can just summarize,
11 it sounds like you have a case for maybe changing
12 some of these designations from industrial to
13 commercial based on a study that you've done. I
14 know I'm oversimplifying, but is that . . . ?

15 MS. CAMPBELL: (Inaudible.)

16 MS. PERRET: Okay. Okay. I'm going to --
17 okay. I want to get to Raf, and I want to get back
18 to Ken, but I see a new face popping up. And so
19 just to diversify the voices, I'm going to ask Susan
20 to chime in here.

21 MS. KEATING: Hi. Thank you. My name's
22 Susan Keating, and I am here as a resident of
23 St. Albert, but also as a representative for one of
24 the land owners. And I just have a question that's
25 actually quite, I guess, off topic sort of from the
26 direction this meeting is headed. But a quick point
27 of clarification on the new process with ASPs and

1 the neighbourhood plans. So an ASP, I understand,
2 obviously is going to council, and then once it's
3 approved do neighbourhood plans then also go to
4 council when they come forward?

5 MS. PERRET: So you're asking about the
6 approval process?

7 MS. KEATING: Yeah.

8 MS. PERRET: Tracy?

9 MS. TSUI: That's correct. ASPs go to
10 council for approval, and neighbourhood plans will
11 be approved internally by our director of planning
12 and development.

13 MS. KEATING: Okay. And so then when you
14 referenced -- like, as an example, there's the
15 50-metre setback, but it could be changed or
16 modified based on reports. And this is just an
17 example I'm using, but I guess I'm just wondering,
18 you know, like, how flexible really is the plan,
19 like, when it shifts from an ASP down to a
20 neighbourhood plan? Is there really going to be any
21 opportunity to make changes knowing that council
22 approved the ASP? If people bring forward some
23 adjustments or they're trying to take advantage of
24 some of the flexibility, is administration really
25 going to be empowered to kind of go down that
26 flexibility path or be open to it if council has
27 already approved the ASP as is?

1 MS. PERRET: Maybe, Tracy, you could
2 comment on the process that's required.

3 MS. TSUI: Sure. Yeah. So as we were
4 developing a two-tier system -- it's new to the
5 City, so there's a lot of questions of, How do we
6 split up a single-tier ASP into two levels now? So
7 I think we're trying our best to meet in the middle
8 between an MDP and the single-tier ASP. There is
9 flexibility for -- the ASP is intended to provide
10 flexibility. Everything is conceptual. Come
11 neighbourhood plan, the neighbourhood plan will have
12 to conform to the area structure plan, of course.

13 But for things like the
14 resizing of a storm water pond, if we're doing --
15 that can be done at the neighbourhood plan stage.
16 That can be internally reviewed. We don't need to
17 go back to council to amend the ASP because it
18 wasn't the right size initially. So the NP is meant
19 to allow for details like this in a more streamlined
20 fashion rather than spending six months getting
21 ready for council.

22 MS. KEATING: And then -- sorry. Just one
23 more follow up. With respect to the land use, like,
24 there's obviously a fairly clear understanding of
25 what, you know, residential is, but some of these
26 other areas that are -- you know, I appreciate that
27 they're kind of a bit vague in nature. Like,

1 employment area, mixed use area, and mixed use
2 employment area.

3 I guess I'm just wondering if
4 the City's going to -- you know, if they're sort of
5 just approaching all of those areas as kind of,
6 like, non-residential and that there will be some,
7 you know, market and neighbourhood specifics kind
8 of, you know, attention paid to what the needs are
9 of the community and of the residents at the time of
10 the development. Like, or are we kind of really
11 sticking to a really defined definition for what is
12 meant by employment area, or will administration be
13 able to kind of interpret that at the -- you know,
14 in the appropriate way at the right time?

15 MS. TSUI: Yeah. Thank you for the
16 question. For example, the residential we only show
17 one colour. So that would represent all the
18 densities. But come neighbourhood plan, all of that
19 residential will be divided up into low, medium, and
20 high density. Our yellow neighbourhoods also will
21 incorporate -- or we will be allowed to see
22 commercial within the neighbourhood lands. Mixed
23 use area would also include commercial. So a lot of
24 the land uses that we see at the ASP are kind of
25 combined or more broadened.

26 MS. PERRET: There's a high level, and
27 then there's policies within that. Susan, I'm going

1 to interrupt you to go to some of the other
2 questions just because we have only a half hour
3 left. But hold onto that thought. We'll come back
4 to you.

5 Ken, you had a question,
6 which was, What are the height restrictions for
7 buildings and mixed use employment areas?

8 MR. CRUTCHFIELD: I do have a question about
9 that, but I would like to back off that and just
10 come back to this thing about --

11 MS. PERRET: Just wait. Let's try to get
12 through all of these questions.

13 MR. CRUTCHFIELD: Okay. Well, it's about the
14 setbacks. That's my issue.

15 MS. PERRET: Right. Yeah. So let's
16 answer your question about, What are the height
17 restrictions for buildings and mixed use employment
18 areas? Who can answer that?

19 MR. WITIW: I'll take a stab at that. At
20 this point in time heights are not addressed in the
21 area structure plan. It would be more of a land
22 use, bylaw consideration along with neighbourhood
23 planning, which would define those locations for
24 medium and high density residential.

25 MS. PERRET: So no height restrictions.

26 MR. BENSON: I'll also mention just --
27 Kyle, just to supplement that. Hi, Ken. Nice to

1 see you. It's pretty atypical to see industrial
2 usage go above one storey. I don't think there's a
3 whole a lot of multi-storey industrial uses within
4 Canada within that context. So it's pretty atypical
5 to go above, you know, a 10-metre, one-storey type
6 of industrial -- Class A industrial use.

7 MS. PERRET: Thanks, Christian. And --
8 sorry. Just hang in here, Ken. We'll get back to
9 your setback question.

10 Raf had a follow up on the
11 137th Avenue light industrial zoning response.
12 Would it be possible to revisit zoning for
13 residential? That would be better suited for the
14 area in his opinion especially as it's next to the
15 provincial park. Who wants to take that one? So
16 we're talking about this little bit. You can't see
17 my cursor. Yes. Is that a question for the team?
18 Is it possible?

19 MR. COLE: It's something that can be
20 taken under consideration, but the intent of the
21 area structure plan is to focus on, you know,
22 overall the employment perspective. And so we can
23 take that into consideration, but we can't confirm
24 that that would be something that would be moved
25 forward with.

26 MS. PERRET: Okay. Thank you. Constance,
27 you've had your hand up patiently. Thank you so

1 much for waiting. Apologies.

2 CONSTANCE: No. No problem. I wanted to
3 go to the Lakeview area, and there have been
4 comments made by the team that the West ASP aligns
5 with the MDP. There are some subtle changes in how
6 land use is designated in particular in the Lakeview
7 area. So I'll just make mention of the fact that in
8 the City's own MDP the area west of Range Road 260,
9 which is north of CN rail, that little triangular
10 area was an employment area. I'm asking for the
11 City's flexibility to extend that mixed use
12 employment area south of the CN rail line adjacent
13 to Ray Gibbon Drive to recognize that potential for
14 the commercial market opportunities.

15 As I understand it, the City
16 has not done a market study to support in particular
17 the designations at this ASP level. As
18 Hawly Campbell spoke earlier, there has been one
19 done for the City port lands within the Lakeview
20 area, and that pointed to a more even split between
21 industrial and commercial uses. Furthermore, the
22 City doesn't in the MDP define what these various
23 terms of employment area and mixed use employment
24 area are. Rather in the preamble the policy and in
25 policy land uses are suggested or are spoken about,
26 but there are no clear definitions. There should be
27 definitions in this ASP for clarity for owners so

1 that they understand what the implications are of it
2 moving forward.

3 And I would also go further
4 to say that the City's own FBM study, as I
5 understand Hawley Campbell's point, pointed to a
6 relatively even split as well between industrial and
7 commercial use. And I go further to the Edmonton
8 metro regional growth plan which exists and is in
9 operation, and the definitions that are provided
10 there with respect to local employment area. In
11 that definition, that speaks specifically to
12 localized area with industrial, commercial, and/or
13 institutional land uses that have locally
14 significant business and economic activities that
15 generate employment and growth for the City of that
16 nature.

17 So we would suggest that that
18 direction be given to the team for definitions and
19 their policy framework for this ASP, and we would
20 support extending that mixed use employment area
21 within the Lakeview Business District adjacent to
22 Ray Gibbon Drive south of the CN rail to recognize
23 the commercial market opportunities and on behalf of
24 that land owner current investment interests of a
25 commercial nature larger scale than what the City's
26 discussion about what complementary commercial means
27 would suggest would be allowed. So we don't -- we

1 need some clarity on that, and we think there are --
2 there is clarity coming from the regional growth
3 plan, which provides direction to the City MDP, but
4 which City MDP doesn't include definitions of these
5 terms.

6 MS. PERRET: Thank you, Constance. And as
7 mentioned at the beginning, this meeting is being
8 recorded and it's also being transcribed, and so
9 your comments and that definition that you provided
10 will be in the transcripts. Thank you very much.

11 I'm going to go back to Ken.
12 Ken, do you want to talk about setbacks?

13 MR. CRUTCHFIELD: Yeah. This presentation has
14 been very useful only because I've come to better
15 understand the separation of ASP from neighbourhood
16 plans because as far as I understand is the ASP now
17 will set out general boundaries, but the
18 neighbourhood plan is subject to public review.
19 However, the neighbourhood plans outside of perhaps
20 people living within more than 100 metres of the
21 affected area, nobody else in St. Albert will be
22 aware of what is being proposed. And hence my
23 reason about the MDP setting out in particular
24 setbacks for Carrot Creek and Sturgeon River in
25 particular, in addition to general green areas where
26 they talk about 50 metres.

27 And what I understood Tracy

1 to say was that it is possible that when the
2 neighbourhood plan comes forward that administration
3 could exercise the privilege under that section that
4 I mentioned, 5.1.13 (b), to go ahead and allow for
5 encroachment on that 50 metres. What I find
6 interesting to hear is that in the presentation it
7 was pointed out that council was very specific with
8 regards to those employment lands south of
9 Meadowview Drive that the lands north of the flood
10 area would be employment lands.

11 And in this regard all I'm
12 asking is, given this break up between ASP and
13 neighbourhood plans, might it not be appropriate to
14 build into the ASP at this point that there is
15 direction that the 50-metre setback is a given and,
16 if anything, that it could be wider than that?
17 Because right now that particular 5.1.13 (b) says
18 any developed land. Well, between you and I, I
19 could get a lot of landfill, and I could fill in
20 that creek and it would be developable. It wouldn't
21 be publicly acceptable, but I'm just saying that at
22 a ridiculous end.

23 Hence my reason for saying
24 that I want explicit direction given to
25 administration that they cannot jump onto that
26 50-metre setback. And as Tracy pointed out, they've
27 already done it with Carrot Creek, with the Cherot

1 ASP. So I got some real concerns here that the best
2 of intentions are all-for-naught in that MDP. Thank
3 you.

4 MS. PERRET: Thanks, Ken. So you really
5 want to keep that 50-metre setback, and what I'm
6 hearing is that under the current policies and
7 guidelines, if there is sufficient studies done as
8 there was in that other area, then there could be
9 encroachment on that. So, again, I'm not sure there
10 can be anything added. We've heard you, and I
11 appreciate it. And thank you for your patience too.

12 Susan, hang on there. We're
13 going to get back to you. I want to get to --
14 sorry. Tracy, did you want to add anything?

15 MS. TSUI: I have nothing further to
16 add. Thank you.

17 MS. PERRET: Okay. Thanks, Tracy. I know
18 you're listening, so I appreciate that.

19 Raf has a question. Could
20 you please provide the approximate length and
21 width -- oh, this is a great question. Could you
22 please provide the approximate length and width of
23 the purple rectangle north of 137th Avenue. Kyle,
24 you did a great example, I thought, being a
25 non-planner in understanding some of this lingo.
26 You did a great job of explaining density, I
27 thought, when you were talking about the

1 neighbourhood area. Can you also explain what this
2 area -- the size of this area and . . .

3 MR. WITIW: Now we're getting into
4 territory where I'm going to have to break out my
5 protractor here. I do not have the length and width
6 of that area offhand, but if you folks give me a --

7 MS. PERRET: Okay. Why don't --

8 MR. WITIW: -- couple minutes, I can kind
9 of --

10 MR. COLE: You know what, Kyle? We
11 could provide that directly to Tracy, and Tracy
12 could provide that. I know we have representation
13 on this call for the land owners in this area. They
14 might have that. But we can provide that
15 information. Unfortunately we don't have that level
16 of detail at this stage.

17 MS. PERRET: Okay.

18 MR. COLE: Yeah.

19 MS. PERRET: Okay. Thanks. Sorry about
20 that, Raf.

21 Susan, we'll go to you, and
22 then we'll go back -- there's another question in
23 here about consultation.

24 MS. KEATING: Sure. Sorry. Yeah. I was
25 pretty much finished when we were chatting before,
26 but I just wanted to make the point -- I think my
27 question was interpreted as it applies to the

1 residential area, but I was also just in general
2 stating the importance of -- at this kind of high
3 level making it as flexible in the employment and
4 mixed use areas as possible so that administration
5 would feel empowered and comfortable to kind of
6 approve something at the neighbourhood plan based on
7 the ASP not being too rigid. So I would also
8 support what Connie suggested about having that kind
9 of flexible mixed use area extended along Ray Gibbon
10 Drive instead of just in that kind of northeast
11 corner of the purple area in the middle, if you
12 will. So that was the last point I wanted to make.
13 Thank you.

14 MS. PERRET: Thank you, Susan.

15 MR. COLE: Michele, if I could add, I
16 completely agree with Sue about flexibility, and
17 that is what we're trying to ensure. I mean, when
18 we're getting into items -- I can't speak to the
19 MDP. The MDP is a separate topic and we weren't
20 involved in it. But when we're getting into items
21 of, like, drilling down into exact definitions, I
22 think that's where we -- and we're at an ASP stage.
23 Generally ASPs don't have definitions. Yes, MDPs
24 do, et cetera. But when we're drilling down right
25 to the specifics that's where we generally have
26 those issues. And so we are trying to ensure as
27 part of the planning process here -- whether it's

1 ASP -- it's providing some guidance, but there is
2 opportunity for some flexibility.

3 MS. PERRET: Okay. Thanks, Scott. I see
4 your hand, Constance. I'm going to go to Raf's
5 question in the chat. What consultation or
6 communication have you had with the Big Lake
7 Environment Support Society, BLESS? Will there be
8 special care working next to Horseshoe Creek? So I
9 can say having facilitated some of these meetings
10 that there has been strong representation from BLESS
11 at these meetings and a lot of discussion about
12 setbacks. I don't know exactly about any comments
13 they might have made on Horseshoe Creek. Definitely
14 Carrot Creek they've raised. Michael -- is
15 Michael Keating -- did you put your hand up? Are
16 you a member of BLESS?

17 MR. KEATING: No, I'm just --

18 MS. PERRET: You have another question?
19 Okay. Sorry.

20 MR. KEATING: Go ahead and finish what you
21 were --

22 MS. PERRET: Okay. Thanks.

23 MR. COLE: Michele, I think we have Tony
24 on the call.

25 MS. PERRET: I thought so too. Tony?

26 MR. COLE: Yeah, we do. We do have
27 Tony.

1 MS. PERRET: Okay. There you are. Tony,
2 do you want to explain the representation of BLESS
3 and some of the comments that you may have raised
4 with respect to Horseshoe Creek? And hi, Tony.

5 MR. DRUETT: Hello. I was just listening.
6 I thought you had had enough of me this morning
7 actually.

8 MS. PERRET: Well, I wasn't there, so I --

9 MR. DRUETT: Oh, sorry. Well, they kept
10 stopping me and letting somebody else speak. But
11 anyway, we have -- actually on this issue we haven't
12 been -- you know, the plan doesn't actually affect
13 Horseshoe Creek and such. Horseshoe Creek comes in
14 just west of the area that you were talking about,
15 the rectangle down in the bottom corner. By the
16 way, it's -- 60 acres is the size of it. Anyway,
17 and then it goes across what is the future park
18 area.

19 So on this thing we obviously
20 want to preserve Horseshoe Creek. We're working
21 with the province to try and get a bridge built over
22 it for the trail system and to enhance the
23 connections down to the Starling neighbourhood. I
24 don't know if there's very much else I could say
25 about that issue. We would love -- one of the
26 Big Lake people, the residents association is on our
27 board. She would love to -- if you get in touch

1 with him, I'm sure she'd love to talk with you, Raf.
2 Actually, Raf, we've had some communication out
3 there, I believe, over the mowing that went on and
4 so forth. Thank you.

5 MS. PERRET: Thank you. Thank you, Tony.
6 And, yes, Raf is recognizing -- yes. Constance, I'm
7 going to go to Michael first, and then we'll go to
8 your question. Michael, go ahead.

9 MR. KEATING: Yes. There was just earlier
10 discussion, a few comments made about flexibility,
11 which I think is great, and the area structure plan
12 wasn't meant to be too specific. But I was
13 concerned with the term that was complementary
14 commercial when some -- earlier on there was
15 discussion about the City port lands mostly the
16 north node, and Kyle had mentioned something about
17 that. And I just -- I wanted just to make it clear
18 in my mind, what does complementary commercial
19 actually mean, and is it commercial then that is
20 just related to the balance of Lakeview Park -- or
21 District, or is it broader than that?

22 MS. TSUI: Thank you for your question.
23 The MDP's intent for mixed use employment node, so
24 the commercial within that employment area is that
25 it is secondary. So it's to serve the employees
26 within the adjacent employment areas. It's not so
27 much a regional sort of use, but more to serve the

1 local needs of the employees in the area.

2 MR. KEATING: So nothing to complement the
3 neighbourhoods in the area. And so we're talking
4 about a coffee shop --

5 MS. TSUI: It could be, yeah. It could
6 be a restaurant, yeah. It could be a gym.

7 MR. KEATING: So that -- so anyway, that
8 doesn't sound right to me. But then so by using
9 that term does that kind of lead the ongoing process
10 down that road? And, you know, Scott had just
11 mentioned as well and Susan had some great comments
12 about, you know, keeping a good level of
13 flexibility. And I think if we have that type of a
14 term sort of set in stone now it makes it hard for
15 us to get back onto that -- the idea of something a
16 little bit more highway, commercial type, and/or
17 regional shopping.

18 You know, we've -- we have a
19 long list of well-known companies and names that
20 you're all familiar with that have given us letters
21 of interest and want to move forward, you know, love
22 this location. A lot of them have other locations
23 within St. Albert already, and just -- and we
24 haven't really been marketing very hard because
25 we -- there's just too many unknowns in terms of
26 timing and what we're going to be allowed to do.

27 But I've just sort of added

1 it up. You know, we probably -- taking about half
2 of this list that I have we're already up to using
3 approximately 45 to 50 acres of land to service
4 these uses and these prospective tenants and owners.
5 And so there certainly is demand there, and that
6 kind of leads to the thinking, the highest and best
7 use of this land is definitely more on the
8 commercial side.

9 But so that's -- that was
10 really my point was that if we really are going to
11 be flexible and we are going to be able to respond
12 to some of these businesses that no doubt the
13 politicians, the community, the public at large are
14 going to want to have in their community, we should
15 make sure that we're putting together a document
16 that will allow us to entertain those opportunities
17 in a timely fashion.

18 MS. PERRET: Thank you for your comments,
19 Michael. Did you mention a City port?

20 MR. KEATING: Well, that's what we are
21 calling -- what would be considered the gateway to
22 Lakeview Business District is the more or less
23 85 acres running along Ray Gibbon that is -- we now
24 call that "City port."

25 MS. PERRET: Okay. Okay. Thank you.
26 Thank you for your comments. I don't know if there
27 is -- anybody wanted to reiterate or respond to

1 those comments. Otherwise we'll go to Constance.

2 CONSTANCE: I'll pick up where Michael
3 left off just for context.

4 MS. PERRET: Are you guys tag-teaming each
5 other?

6 CONSTANCE: Well, because City port is
7 something that I'm involved with as well, as well as
8 Hawley Campbell and where we're looking at a better
9 split in terms of commercial opportunity and
10 industrial overall within the Lakeview area to --

11 MS. PERRET: I have heard that today.

12 CONSTANCE: This is going beyond this,
13 though. For context let's take a look at the
14 Lakeview area, and I think Raf asked questions about
15 area. When we look at the Lakeview area the mixed
16 use employment area that is showing in the West ASP
17 is about 86 acres more or less. The dedicated
18 employment area south of the CN tracks is about
19 558 acres more or less.

20 And what we're asking for is
21 for -- the City group is asking for is that mixed
22 use employment opportunity that would accommodate a
23 better range of commercial opportunity that's beyond
24 complementary and larger scale as Michael has said
25 because truly City port would have about 58 acres.
26 And I can't imagine that 58 of 558 acres in an
27 employment area going to mixed use employment as

1 opposed to sitting there south of the tracks as
2 employment area is going to be a consequential
3 difference when the commercial opportunities are
4 there today to be realized and acted on.

5 So I would go further and
6 close off by saying that if this isn't recognized in
7 terms of the background that we've provided at the
8 land owner meeting this morning again and then today
9 as a mixed use employment opportunity area with that
10 broader range of commercial, we would have to speak
11 in opposition to this plan if this concept were to
12 return to council for first reading at a public
13 hearing.

14 MS. PERRET: Thanks, Constance. Have you
15 had conversations with the City about this? Like,
16 it sounds like you raised these issues this morning.
17 You're raising them again this evening.

18 CONSTANCE: As far --

19 MS. PERRET: You've talked to the City?
20 Okay.

21 CONSTANCE: Yes.

22 MS. PERRET: Okay.

23 CONSTANCE: And prior -- to answer your
24 question prior to the MPD being approved, commercial
25 opportunity adjacent to Ray Gibbon Drive on a City
26 group lands was looked at prior to the MDP being
27 approved, and there were discussions as far back as

1 that. And from my involvement, 2021 -- in May of
2 2021, we talked about these opportunities being
3 mixed use and with the commercial emphasis, not
4 industrial.

5 MS. PERRET: Okay. Well, thank you,
6 again. Your comments --

7 MR. COLE: Sorry. Can I just confirm
8 the exact location of the City port lands because
9 this is all new information to us as of today. City
10 port lands, confirm the location.

11 CONSTANCE: Right. It would be the area
12 that is south of Giroux, and it is immediately
13 adjacent to Ray Gibbon Drive extending south, and as
14 far south as McKenney.

15 MS. PERRET: It's the -- I think it's the
16 mixed use area there --

17 CONSTANCE: No.

18 MS. PERRET: -- that's north of the
19 railroad tracks.

20 CONSTANCE: No, it's --

21 MR. COLE: It's a combination of mixed
22 use and employment.

23 CONSTANCE: That's right, with the larger
24 part of it being employment area.

25 MS. PERRET: So it goes south of the
26 tracks?

27 CONSTANCE: Correct.

1 MR. COLE: And, Constance, would you say
2 that it's parallel, adjacent to Ray Gibbon?

3 CONSTANCE: We would.

4 MR. COLE: Okay. Okay.

5 MS. PERRET: Okay. Okay.

6 MR. COLE: Thank you.

7 MS. PERRET: Thanks.

8 MS. TSUI: And when you say "City port,"
9 it's Koda (phonetic) lands, or is that a new name,
10 or . . . ?

11 CONSTANCE: That is a new name, but Koda
12 is involved, and that is how the area is being
13 marketed, I believe, is what Michael had said.
14 Michael, are you going to elaborate?

15 MR. KEATING: Yeah. No. That's true. It
16 was distinguished between -- the total
17 Lakeview Business District came up with this name
18 City port, and originally it was known to be the
19 Koda lands. But . . .

20 MS. PERRET: Dave, I see you have your
21 hand up.

22 MR. DYRBYE: Hi there. I'm with City
23 port. Just to answer Constance's question more
24 clearly, so --

25 MS. PERRET: Who here is not with city
26 port?

27 MR. DYRBYE: So the City port lands are in

1 between Ray Gibbon Drive and Range Road 260 going
2 from Giroux all the way down to McKenney.

3 MR. COLE: Perfect. Thank you.

4 MR. DYRBYE: You're welcome.

5 MS. PERRET: Thank you. Thank you, Dave.

6 MR. DYRBYE: You're welcome.

7 MS. PERRET: Okay. So I'm seeing that the
8 time is 7:21. We have time for -- we have nine
9 minutes left. And I don't know if, Tracy, you have
10 some additional comments. Oh, now, Constance,
11 you're not going to raise issues you've already
12 raised this morning -- have you -- that have been --
13 okay. Then you're allowed to say something.

14 CONSTANCE: Thank you. I note in the
15 process for development of this ASP that this is the
16 last engagement prior to the plan -- the full plan
17 going to council for first reading and then being
18 referred onto the EMRB for their approval. My
19 concern is that we've talked about a lot of things
20 related to land use. We've not seen the full plan
21 as a draft ASP with the policies that have been
22 spoken to by both Kyle and Scott.

23 And I think it would serve
24 the City and the land owners, the public interests,
25 to allow us another engagement opportunity to see
26 and to provide feedback on this plan so that we're
27 not left to after an EMRB approval have to speak at

1 a public hearing, which may make it less of an
2 opportunity or inclination of the City to make any
3 further amendments. So I'm concerned about that
4 lost opportunity, and I would suggest that we should
5 see the full draft plan with the policies that
6 relate to what we've talked about tonight and to see
7 explicitly what changes have been made prior to the
8 first reading.

9 MS. PERRET: Thanks, Constance. So I
10 believe this is the -- in the schedule. Tracy, did
11 you -- you showed that this is the last engagement.
12 Is that correct?

13 MS. TSUI: Yeah, this is the last sort
14 of face-to-face engagement. But, yeah, the ASP
15 document -- when we continue working on the policies
16 and finalizing the document it will be shared online
17 as part of the first reading package and I believe
18 on our Cultivate the Conversation website as well.
19 So I'll send a notification of when that is posted.

20 MS. PERRET: Thank you, Tracy. We have a
21 question from Raf with respect to indigenous
22 consultation, what has taken place so far with
23 indigenous peoples. And he's referring to -- I
24 believe you're referring to Metis, First Nations, as
25 well as Inuit. Tracy, do you want to take that
26 question?

27 MS. TSUI: Thank you. Good question.

1 Over the two phases of engagement we had engagement
2 sessions with the indigenous communities
3 specifically as well. So in Phase 1 we've heard
4 from them through similar engagement sessions like
5 this one as well as the site visit that we did with
6 the communities around the project area. Got a lot
7 of good feedback. A lot of their feedback was
8 related to the native plants in the area and
9 protecting them for ceremonial purposes.

10 So that's -- one of the
11 policies that we have is to encourage the protection
12 of those plants and, you know, that way the
13 developers that come in are aware. Those plants are
14 located primarily along the CN rail. So, yeah, we
15 have another session tomorrow evening with the
16 indigenous communities. So it will be part of the
17 Phase 2 engagement sessions, and we'll be presenting
18 them something similar that we are doing tonight
19 with them tomorrow evening.

20 MS. PERRET: Thanks, Tracy. Indigenous
21 consultation came up early in the project as
22 something that was required by the City. Thanks for
23 your question, Raf.

24 Okay. Tony and Constance.
25 Two final questions. Five minutes. Don't go over
26 five minutes or you'll ruin my reputation. Go
27 ahead, Tony.

1 MR. DRUETT: I just wanted to agree with
2 what Constance is suggesting. I think we need
3 another full scale -- in fact, I would like a
4 live -- you know, what I would call a "proper open
5 house" where we can have all the public come in and
6 have a look at the final plan before it goes to
7 council and then make their comments because what
8 we're making the comments on now is a half -- you
9 know, a half-finished plan. It's going to be
10 changed. I think we need another full range of
11 public consultation once it's finalized.

12 MS. PERRET: Thank you, Tony.

13 MR. DRUETT: That's all.

14 MS. PERRET: Thank you.

15 MR. COLE: Tony, did you just want to
16 see me in person? Is that what it was?

17 MR. DRUETT: Exactly, and I -- also Connie
18 there. Connie and I go back even further than you
19 and -- me and Scott actually.

20 MS. PERRET: Go ahead, Constance. You
21 have the floor.

22 CONSTANCE: Well, just for the -- I agree
23 with what Tony is saying. And to reinforce my
24 point, without the engagement of a type that Tony is
25 talking about and I'm asking for, there is no
26 opportunity for public comment feedback until the
27 public hearing stage, and at that point it's too

1 late. And I don't think the intent is to delay, but
2 rather if this could be put out quite quickly and
3 people could see how comments have been interpreted
4 and reflected in the plan -- and I go to one point
5 again, what on earth is complementary commercial,
6 and what does that mean in terms of commercial scale
7 regardless of what's designated where? Definitions
8 are not in the MDP. We're still left up in the air
9 as to what the policy intent will be in this plan
10 until we see a full draft and can comment on it.

11 MS. PERRET: Thank you, Constance. Okay.
12 So thank you very much for your comments. As
13 mentioned, this has been recorded as well as all the
14 comments transcribed. You've given these guys a lot
15 to think about. Tracy, did you have any closing
16 comments before we sign off?

17 MS. TSUI: No, but thank you very much
18 for attending. All the feedback is very helpful for
19 us. We'll be preparing all of the feedback that
20 we're receiving into a What We Heard report, and
21 that will be posted on our website as soon as it is
22 ready. And we also have -- as I kind of mentioned,
23 we have that interactive map online through the
24 Complicate the Conversation website for more
25 feedback and that's live until October 28th.

26 MS. PERRET: Thank you, Tracy. And thank
27 you all for making my job enjoyable. I appreciate

1 hearing from all of you. You are all very
2 intelligent people that I have a hard time keeping
3 up with, and I really appreciate your time and
4 intention. Thank you so much. Have a great
5 evening.

6 (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 7:28 P.M.)

7
8 * * * * *
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

Certificate of Transcript - Remote Questioning

I, Dyana Pewarchuk, hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a true and faithful transcription of the proceedings and are a complete and accurate transcript of the remote video connection discussion taken down by me in shorthand and transcribed by means of a computer-aided transcription system to the best of my skill and ability, pursuant to Alberta Rules of Court r.6.20(4)(c), and conducted in accordance with those portions of the Alberta Protocol for Remote Questionings under my control.

Dated at the city of Edmonton, Province of Alberta, this 24th day of October, A.D., 2022.



Dyana Pewarchuk

Court Reporter