

## **Attachment #5: What We Learned Summary – from June Sessions with Industry & Residents**

The following summarizes feedback captured in themes, presented alphabetically, at the virtual **Industry Session** held on **June 15, 2026**, and the in-person **Public Open House** on **June 18, 2026**:

### **Built Form & Design**

Feedback noted the importance of high-quality, context-sensitive design in multi-family and infill development. Key considerations included adequate outdoor and amenity space, building orientation, and privacy, particularly where new development interfaces with lower-density housing.

Concerns were raised regarding the potential for reduced greenspace, lot coverage, and loss of tree canopy.

The use of more fire-resistant building materials in higher-density developments was also identified as a consideration.

Feedback raised concerns that overly prescriptive design guidelines, if implemented, may constrain innovation and limit functional site design. Flexibility in design standards, including provisions for exceptions, was identified as important, particularly in response to site-specific conditions and project efficiency.

Questions were also raised regarding the timing, development, and application of urban design guidelines, including the extent of industry involvement.

### **Development Decisions, Flexibility & Land Use Impacts**

Feedback included questions regarding the development decision-making processes and the magnitude of changes brought on by the project, such as the change in proportion of subdividable lots.

Concerns were expressed about potential property tax implications related to increased land values under a “highest and best use” framework. Concerns were also raised regarding construction debris and its potential impacts on surrounding lots.

Feedback highlighted a preference for greater flexibility particularly in relation to development standards such as building length limits and lot grading (drainage) requirements. There was interest in performance-based or design-led approaches rather than rigid numerical limits. Feedback also noted the role of Development Officer discretion and the importance of clarity and consistency in how it is applied. While flexibility to deviate from City standards was acknowledged, it was noted that such considerations are contingent on sufficient technical justification and support from the City.

### **Employment & Commercial Development**

A lack of local employment opportunities and a disconnect between housing growth and job creation were identified as contributing factors to outbound commuting.

Interest was also expressed in expanding commercial and service uses beyond the St. Albert Trail corridor to improve accessibility and commercial opportunities in established neighbourhoods and reduce congestion, including consideration of alternative areas such as Ray Gibbon Drive.

### **Housing Diversity & Affordability**

Feedback identified interest in a broader range of housing types, including smaller and more affordable units such as studio apartments, to support younger residents and those entering the housing market. There was also a recognized need to expand housing options to support diverse demographics and enable aging in place. Limited rental supply and rising costs were noted as ongoing challenges, with concern that many new developments are positioned at higher price points.

At the same time, some participants expressed less concern about affordability and seemed to show greater acceptance of St. Albert as a more exclusive housing market, resulting in varied perspectives on this issue.

Additional considerations included limited walkability and amenities in established neighbourhoods which could hinder being able to realistically 'age in place'. Input from a housing industry representative indicated support for intensification along key corridors.

### **Industry Alignment & Implementation Process**

Feedback expressed support for a range of development forms, including standalone commercial and mixed-use configurations. It was noted that market conditions and site context may favour separate buildings over integrated mixed-use forms.

Feedback also noted the limited alignment within the development industry on certain proposed measures, such as parking regulations. It was further emphasized that continued engagement and collaboration are important, particularly in advance of bringing recommendations forward to Council, alongside the need for clear processes, defined expectations, and opportunities for industry input into guideline development.

Interest was also noted from developers in increasing high-density and mixed-use development within the city, as well as in financial incentives (e.g., grants) similar to those offered in Calgary.

### **Infrastructure and Community Services**

Feedback raised questions about the ability of existing City infrastructure and community services (including schools, healthcare, and emergency services) to accommodate additional growth. Interest was expressed in additional healthcare facilities within the City.

Operational considerations were also raised, including waste collection logistics and the balance between bin storage and parking space in higher-density contexts.

Feedback noted that aging infrastructure in established neighbourhoods requires reinvestment, with particular concern that roadway conditions and broader infrastructure may not keep pace with planned housing growth; for example, whether electrical capacity is sufficient to support EV charging demands as growth occurs.

### **Parking & Transportation**

Feedback highlighted concerns that existing parking supply may not meet current demand, with suggestions to consider a minimum of one parking stall per unit on newly developed sites. Concerns were also raised that certain design requirements, such as potential restrictions on parking at the corners of street intersections, may create unintended operational challenges and reduce overall usability.

Traffic congestion was also identified as a current perceived issue, particularly at Boudreau Road and Bellerose Drive, with additional density viewed as a potential contributing factor.

It was further noted that, without additional local employment opportunities, increased residential density may lead to more commuting to Edmonton, placing further strain on the transportation network.

### **Project Objectives and Engagement (General Feedback)**

Feedback noted improved clarity and reassurance after receiving additional information, and appreciation was expressed for the opportunity to provide input and for staff responsiveness.

Additional feedback reflected relief that more intensive density forms (e.g., six- or eight-plexes) are not proposed. There was also support for the City's approach to managing growth, including efforts to address suburban sprawl, support infrastructure renewal, and maintain long-term affordability through this project. There was also general recognition that accommodating a range of housing types will contribute to a diverse and sustainable community.