

- Public Meeting -

Redistricting 55 and 57 Sturgeon Road

Speaker:

Greg MacKenzie,

Greg MacKenzie + Associates Consulting Ltd.

Taken at the Fountain Park Recreation Centre, 4
Cunningham Road, St. Albert, Alberta, on the 8th day
of December, A.D. 2015.

1 (PRESENTATION COMMENCED AT 7:00 P.M.)

2 MR. MACKENZIE: Good evening, everyone.

3 According to the clock on the wall there, it's
4 a little after 7. I'm glad we made it and you
5 folks showed up.

6 So I'm going to deliver a
7 brief presentation this evening, which is
8 really an overview of what you see before you
9 here on the board. So I'd like to start off
10 just by thanking everybody for coming out.

11 It's great to see such a turnout. That's very
12 exciting. I'm glad that people are interested
13 and able to make it out tonight.

14 If you haven't already had
15 something, there's water, coffee, and some
16 refreshments set aside there. And I just --
17 just as far as the meeting, I think, goes, I
18 just prefer to work our way through the
19 presentation and hold our questions until the
20 end, and then I'll be happy to field the
21 presentation at the end in a bit of a more
22 formal kind of question-and-answer period.

23 There is a recorder here
24 tonight, which is a requirement of the City
25 when we do pre-applications and a public
26 meeting for rezoning. So, this presentation,
27 what I'm delivering tonight, will be recorded,

1 as well as questions asked during the
2 question-and-answer period and those answers.

3 I'm using my cell phone
4 instead of paper notes, so if you see me
5 looking down, that's what it is. A little bit
6 different than what I normally do with paper
7 notes, but I am paying attention. I'm not
8 checking texts or anything like that.

9 So, there's a number of
10 materials in the room. And like I said, this
11 presentation will be largely a summary of those
12 materials for those of you who prefer to kind
13 of hear it rather than to read it. It also
14 gives an opportunity to kind of ask those
15 questions directly of project representatives
16 like myself.

17 My name is Greg MacKenzie
18 of Greg MacKenzie & Associates Consulting. I'm
19 a land use planner. I've been retained by Vic
20 Nikolic, the owner of 55 and 57 Sturgeon Road.
21 And on his behalf, I'll be leading the
22 preparation of a redistricting application for
23 these lots.

24 There are some other
25 project representatives in the room. David
26 Klippenstein, a fellow planner, and Vicki
27 Dodge, and Katrina as well, another planner who

1 I'm working with more and more often. So we're
2 all here to help direct you and answer
3 questions, you know, as needed.

4 In addition to ourselves,
5 the City of St. Albert Planning Department has
6 a couple of representatives here as observers.
7 This is not a City meeting, this is a meeting
8 that is sponsored by the landowner, but we have
9 Robin and Lenore from the City planning offices
10 here. So if I say anything wrong, they can
11 correct me. And with that, I think we will
12 start the presentation. I would ask you,
13 though, to ensure that you've signed in.

14 Lenore, go ahead.

15 MS. MITCHELL: We also have Margaux and
16 Adrian Cumming, and Councillor Cathy Heron is
17 here this evening, too, and Mayor Nolan Crouse
18 was here and has gone on.

19 MR. MACKENZIE: That's true. Thank you.

20 So I would ask you that you
21 ensure that you sign in at the front, if you
22 could, so that there is a record of how many
23 people and who attended the meeting. And also,
24 there is a survey, a brief survey, just to get
25 some thoughts from those who are participating
26 this evening. It's important that we get some
27 feedback at this preliminary step.

1 So as an introduction, the
2 red star identifies the site. It's inside the
3 Braeside neighbourhood, one of the older
4 neighbourhoods of the city. It was initially
5 part of River Lot 48, which is part of the St.
6 Albert Settlement, which was surveyed in the
7 1800s. Lots 55 and 57 are on the west side of
8 Sturgeon Road at the edge of the Braeside
9 neighbourhood. This isolates them somewhat
10 from the more single-family portion of the
11 neighbourhood.

12 So as you can see on this
13 map that shows -- and it shows the entire city
14 on the presentation board. It's slightly
15 cropped for the purpose of the presentation,
16 but as you can see the site and this entire
17 neighbourhood, really, is well-connected to the
18 city centre and to major transportation
19 networks that connect to the entire city and to
20 the larger region. It's also very
21 well-connected to the city's integrated
22 multiuse trail and sidewalk networks, which
23 connected very well to downtown St. Albert and
24 to St. Albert Centre and the variety amenities
25 of that are nearby.

1 They're outlined in the red dash line here,
2 lots 57 and 55 Sturgeon Road. Lot 55 is .2
3 hectares or about half an acre of land, and lot
4 57 is closer to half a hectare or about 1.2
5 acres of land. So the combined site area is
6 approximately .7 hectares or 1.7 acres of land,
7 and that's based on certificates of title and
8 some AutoCAD line work that we have. The final
9 size would have to be verified through the plan
10 survey later on in the process.

11 So as you can see, the
12 major features bounding the site are the
13 Sturgeon River and Red Willow Park to the west,
14 and Red Willow Park then connects over to
15 Sturgeon Road on the north side of the site.
16 And Sturgeon Road is a four-lane arterial road
17 that forms the east boundary of the site, and
18 there's an existing residence, number 53
19 Sturgeon Road, that's on the south of the site.

20 So we've had a lot of
21 discussion with the landowner and the
22 consulting team to date, and some elements of a
23 preliminary vision for the site include a
24 multifamily development that really addresses
25 some of the amenities that are around the
26 street or around the site. So how will this
27 development interface onto the Red Willow Park

1 system, both on the west and the north side.
2 We really want to make sure that when it comes
3 to the more detailed design stage, we're
4 thinking of things about how that site and
5 building design will have a positive interface
6 with those areas, be well-connected, have a
7 good edge similarly to the sidewalk and trail
8 network. With the site design, we want to make
9 sure that it will integrate with the street and
10 sidewalk and with Red Willow Park to the north.

11 At this stage, the
12 application is for redistricting to R3A. So we
13 don't have an architect engaged at this point
14 in time. That comes kind of in the next step,
15 but we are starting to look at a bit of vision,
16 and I'll get into that a little bit later when
17 we get into the discussion of the land swap.

18 There is also, just as a
19 side note, existing city services in the area.
20 So the site has a real strategic location.
21 It's very, very well-connected, as I previously
22 mentioned, to downtown and to the commercial
23 uses on the west side of the river, and there's
24 existing city infrastructure that can be taken
25 advantage of with an in-fill kind of
26 redevelopment opportunity. And that leads into
27 a bit of the supporting rationale for what

1 we're looking at doing here.

2 In addition to some of the
3 vision that we're starting to think about,
4 redevelopment also aligns with the objectives
5 of the Capital Region planning and also City
6 level planning, municipal planning level. So
7 just to read out quotes, the Capital Region
8 land use plan's purpose it to manage
9 sustainable growth that protects the region's
10 environment and resources, minimizes the
11 regional development footprint, strengthens
12 communities, increases transportation choice
13 and supports economic development. So that
14 speaks a lot to how we use land efficiently and
15 how we make use of infrastructure. And at the
16 municipal development plan, although which is a
17 City planning level, the vision for the City is
18 that St. Albert is an inclusive,
19 family-oriented community that values its
20 natural, cultural, historical, and recreational
21 amenities. Our community secures the safety
22 and wellbeing of its people through controlled
23 growth, innovation, and dynamic leadership. So
24 again, these higher-level policies and plans
25 are speaking towards efficient use of land,
26 taking advantage of recreational amenities and
27 cultural opportunities and controlling growth.

1 In addition, you know, the
2 redevelopment of this site for higher-density
3 uses will also address market demand in St.
4 Albert and in the Capital Region, really which
5 is driven by economic growth. I think we all
6 know that's slowed in the last few years, but
7 there has been a strong demand for smaller
8 housing, for condominium-style development, for
9 apartment-style development, and it responds
10 also to some of the changing demographics in
11 the city.

12 St. Albert has more and
13 smaller households with fewer children. It has
14 a younger generation, which is taking longer to
15 gain education and secure wealth and to buy
16 property and to start families. It has an
17 increasing population of what are sometimes
18 called pre-seniors, people from 50 to 65, who
19 may be looking to downsize, as well as seniors
20 who are living longer and more independent
21 lives, and also living more accurately. I mean
22 actively. There's also a decreasing population
23 in the City of St. Albert. According to the
24 demographic information that we have access to,
25 younger people from the ages of 20 to 40. So
26 in our room, we're kind of asking ourselves the
27 question of where are these people living and

1 why are they not living in St. Albert. And
2 we're thinking that housing choice is one of
3 the things that's driving that statistic.

4 This map shows the existing
5 districting from the Land Use Bylaw, the City's
6 Land Use Bylaw, in the Braeside neighbourhood
7 and some of the surroundings as well. So you
8 can see lots 55 and 57 outlined in red are
9 currently zoned R1, which is the low-density
10 residential zone, which is the same zoning as
11 the majority of the Braeside neighbourhood.

12 So this application
13 proposes to redistrict the site to R3A, which
14 is a medium-density residential district, and
15 that allows for redevelopments of apartments
16 and townhouses is what we're contemplating.
17 There's a number of other things that are
18 detailed in that districting. I'm not going to
19 get into all of them here. There is a
20 presentation panel that provides a large
21 summary of that.

22 So, redistricting these two
23 lots to R3A really is essentially an extension
24 of the Tenor and Altura zonings there. That
25 level of density, as well as the Sturgeon Point
26 apartment buildings across the river, and it's
27 in -- kind of an extension of that downtown-use

1 in a way.

2 So just to kind of note
3 again on servicing in this existing
4 neighbourhood before we kind of move on to some
5 more details, we have had some analysis done by
6 a civil engineering consultant about servicing
7 capacity. So there is a sanitary sewer in the
8 Sturgeon Road, and the local service that's in
9 Sturgeon Road has capacity to accommodate the
10 densities in an R3A development, that
11 development here. But there is a constraint in
12 the larger sanitary network for the city, which
13 the City is working to address through
14 upgrading a sanitary trunk, but what that means
15 is until that trunk is online, that development
16 -- our understanding is that development in
17 this area cannot proceed until that trunk is
18 online and the larger capacity is provided.
19 And my understanding is that the timing for
20 that line is currently anticipated for 2017,
21 unless there's any update in that regard. No?
22 From a water perspective, similarly, there is a
23 water service in Sturgeon Road that does have
24 capacity to accommodate this development. It
25 also has adequate pressures for fire-flow. And
26 from a storm drainage perspective, there is
27 also a storm drainage pipe adjacent to the site

1 that can be connected to, but there is some
2 limited capacity inside that storm sewer. So
3 there are a few options that civil engineers
4 have suggested, that we're continuing to kind
5 of analyze. One is to upgrade that sewer line
6 or that storm line to accommodate additional
7 capacity and then provide some storage on the
8 site or to leave the line as is and provide
9 additional storage on the site and only
10 discharge at off-peak hours. So, essentially
11 store the water from a storm and then hold it
12 until the pipe has capacity and then release it
13 before you upgrade the line. So there are
14 options. So one of the advantages of this site
15 is that there are services in proximity.

16 This table presents a
17 shortened form of the larger table that's on
18 the presentation panel, and it highlights the
19 key differences that exist between the R1 on
20 the left-hand column and the R3A in the grey
21 right-hand column between the two zonings. So
22 the R1 is the existing zoning on the site
23 today, and R3A is what we would apply to have
24 for the site. So due to time constraints, I
25 won't get into every detail of all of this.
26 That's why I prepared this kind of summary of
27 some of the key pieces.

1 So as you can see, the
2 permitted uses in the R1 district are
3 single-detached housing, limited group home,
4 park, basement suite, accessory development.
5 And there are a number of similar permitted
6 uses under R3A, but, essentially, we are
7 looking at apartment buildings and townhouses
8 as the option but leaning more towards an
9 apartment building at this time. Considering
10 the size of the site and the cost of
11 development, we most likely look at an
12 apartment being on this site. So that leads to
13 the discussion of site density, which is the
14 next line item.

15 R1 doesn't have a site
16 density cap. It's based on lot size and
17 dimensions. R3A has a density limit. So a
18 minimum density of 35 dwelling units per
19 hectare, a maximum density of 94 dwelling units
20 per hectare, and what that works out to, based
21 on the size of this site, is approximately -- a
22 range of density, then, of approximately 25 to
23 approximately 65 units could be accommodated on
24 this site, according to the zoning. Now, that
25 said, if underground parking is provided, 27
26 and a half square metres can be added to the
27 site. So, essentially, you can increase the

1 density for every parking stall that's located
2 underground. So there could be some variation
3 in the number of units once we get to the point
4 of site design and we get an architect involved
5 and working through those kinds of
6 calculations.

7 Now, in addition to
8 density, the built form is governed by a
9 maximum height. So the maximum building height
10 in R1 is 11 metres or 11 and a half metres, if
11 it's a walkout building or a building with a
12 drive-under garage. Or, in this case, 6 metres
13 adjacent to St. Albert Road, which is
14 irrelevant to our site. For R3A, the maximum
15 height is 13 metres. So, approximately, it's a
16 2-metre difference in height. R3A also
17 requires some private amenity area, which is
18 on-site, open kind of space. Not necessarily
19 on the ground. It can be provided in a form of
20 a balcony or a patio or a partial balcony
21 system as defined in the bylaw. So there is
22 some amenity area requirement, and then there
23 are a number of yards. There's a minimum front
24 yard requirement, which is essentially the same
25 in both districts. A minimum side yard
26 requirement. In the R3A zone it's 3 metres,
27 and then there's additional setback once you

1 start to reach heights above 8 and a half
2 metres. And a rear yard requirement, which is
3 essentially the same as the R1 district.

4 There are also a number of
5 building location regulations that govern how
6 you locate a building on the site and how it
7 interfaces with if you have multiple buildings
8 on the larger site or if you're adjacent to
9 another building, how you provide the setback
10 and separation from those buildings on the
11 site. So quite a lot of regulation around that
12 in the R3A district, and then there are also
13 parking regulations for each of the districts.
14 So depending on the size of the units inside an
15 R3A development, that governs how many parking
16 spaces have to be provided for the residents,
17 and there's also a visitor parking requirement
18 as well.

19 So as we've previously
20 mentioned and seen, 55 and 57 Sturgeon Road are
21 really close to the downtown and to St. Albert
22 Centre as well. They're very centrally
23 located, and they have really, really strong
24 non-motorized conductivity.

25 So what this slide
26 indicates is -- there's two circles. And
27 again, this one is cropped just to make it

1 readable. The full version's there. So you
2 can see the inner blue circle is an approximate
3 10-metre or 10-minute walking distance from the
4 site, and the outer is an approximate 10-minute
5 cycling distance. You'll notice that on the
6 larger slide that the cycling distance is
7 slightly oblong. It's an elliptical shape and
8 that's because when you're located so close to
9 a multiuse trail corridor like Red Willow Park
10 provides, that the cycling distances actually
11 grow along the corridor and shrink as you have
12 to kind of work your way through the more urban
13 areas. So you can reach further out. It goes
14 from being a circle to being more of a football
15 shape.

16 So there's quite a lot of
17 services and amenities close to this site from
18 a shopping perspective. You're very close to
19 St. Albert Centre and the other commercial
20 development along St. Albert Trail. There are
21 department stores like Canadian Tire, Sport
22 Chek, Hudson's Bay Co., London Drugs. There's
23 quite a lot of them across the pedestrian
24 bridge here. There's a variety of restaurants,
25 there's banking, there are medical services.
26 It's also within walking distance at the edge
27 of downtown where the farmers' market is, where

1 there are other types of services like
2 accountants, lawyers, et cetera. So a lot of
3 services. From a recreation perspective, you
4 can see all of the darker green spaces, all of
5 the park spaces, and schools that are close-by.
6 So there are both public and separate schools
7 from elementary to high school levels within
8 walking and cycling distance of the site, a
9 variety of active recreation opportunities,
10 things like the Fountain Park Recreation
11 Centre, like the Fowler Athletic Park. And in
12 addition to that, there's the extensive -- kind
13 of what we call -- the planners speak to
14 passive recreation opportunities. So it's not
15 play fields, it's just more informal areas like
16 grass fields, the trail network, areas to walk
17 and ride your bike and walk your dog. So a
18 very, very well-connected site with a lot of
19 access to a lot of services and amenities.

20 And in addition to
21 non-motorized access, walking and cycling, the
22 site, as we previously discussed, is also very,
23 very accessible, from motorized forms of
24 transportation, including a private vehicle.
25 Sturgeon Road connects to St. Albert and also
26 to Boudreau Road, and those roads take you onto
27 the larger network of the city and the region,

1 but there's a lot of transit.

2 SPEAKER 1: Can I interrupt you just
3 for a minute? We all live in this area, so we
4 know what all the amenities are.

5 MR. MACKENZIE: Excellent.

6 SPEAKER 1: You know, and this is a
7 good sales pitch for Council, but --

8 SPEAKER 2: That's not why most people
9 are here.

10 MR. MACKENZIE: Well, we'll get to the end
11 of the presentation, which I think is the next
12 slide, and we'll open it up for questions.

13 There's one more thing to
14 talk about here. That is the potential land
15 swap with the City. So when we started to look
16 at this site, we kind of immediately saw a
17 potential opportunity to kind of re-imagine
18 what happens in the lower area in the back
19 portion of this site, which is slightly lower
20 and covered with trees. So we initiated some
21 discussion around a potential land swap with
22 the City.

23 Now, what we've proposed is
24 that on the far side, that the blue area be
25 transferred to the City to become park space
26 and the orange area then be exchanged back to
27 the owner to become residential. So the two

1 images on the right-hand side show the two
2 potential scenarios. So if the land swap is
3 something that the City considers acceptable,
4 what we would have is a more rectangular parcel
5 with the west side being transferred to park.
6 And if the land swap is something that is not
7 acceptable, then the proposal would be to zone
8 the site, as it is, to R3A zoning. And in
9 support of that or to advance those
10 discussions, a variety of information has been
11 requested. We've started to prepare a tree
12 assessment and a natural area assessment
13 prepared by an arborist to assess the health
14 and the value of the trees, both inside the
15 parkland that exists and inside the private
16 land as well. The field assessments have been
17 done and the reporting, the draft reporting, is
18 now complete for that.

19 In addition, a land
20 appraisal, just looking at land value, has been
21 requested. So that has been initiated as well.
22 And then the final piece of information, which
23 has been requested and which we're working on
24 is -- it's a long title. But essentially, it's
25 more of a design type of document that
26 considers a future vision if a land swap went
27 ahead. So what would this blue area look like

1 as park space instead of as private land and
2 what would that orange area look like as part
3 of the development rather than as part of that
4 area of park there with the grass on it, and
5 how do the trails get realigned and how does
6 the development interface with those new edges.
7 So that is something that now that we have the
8 tree assessment essentially complete, the field
9 work complete, that we're starting into that
10 now.

11 And the next steps after
12 this meeting are to consider the input that we
13 get tonight and then to submit the
14 redistricting application, and then that
15 application gets circulated through the City,
16 and we receive comments from that review, which
17 we work to address with City administration,
18 and then the application would proceed to
19 Council for consideration. And as part of that
20 process, there would be a public hearing, and
21 then assuming that the districting is approved,
22 we'd move more toward construction, which we're
23 targeting as a 2017 date.

24 My information is there.
25 Again, I'd appreciate if you complete the
26 survey. And with that, I'll wrap up the
27 presentation and open it up to questions.

1 Thank you.

2 SPEAKER 3: Can you go back to the
3 previous slide, please, before this? Can you
4 tell me what portion of that grassland will be
5 taken over if the proposal goes through?

6 MR. MACKENZIE: Well, that depends on the
7 outcomes of the studies, right? Right now
8 we're contemplating about -- I think the area's
9 about 1,200 metres, square metres, right now,
10 of land in the back corner. So this image
11 represents kind of an equal land-for-land swap.

12 SPEAKER 3: But there would be a
13 substantial portion of the park left there?

14 MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, that's right. The
15 park exists today kind of from the end of
16 Berrymore all the way to the red line. This
17 would remain as park space.

18 SPEAKER 3: So would you say you're
19 taking 5 percent? 2 percent? 10 percent?

20 MR. MACKENZIE: I'd say we're taking --
21 looking more like 10 to 20 percent,
22 approximately, if you're just eyeballing kind
23 of this grassed area, but it's a bit difficult
24 to say because it's all one giant Red Willow
25 Park, right, of the upland portion. If you
26 look at it kind of like this swath right here,
27 I'd say it's more in the order of around maybe

1 10 or 15 percent.

2 SPEAKER 1: Your land swap, it's going
3 to be a parkland from grass? You're giving us
4 treed area on the lands? So, basically, the
5 treed area is just a treed area? It's not for
6 kids to play or anything else? And my second
7 question is, you say that the sewer and water
8 and storm all possibly have to be upgraded.
9 Who absorbs the cost if you have to upgrade
10 some of those lines? Do we all in the whole
11 neighbourhood have to absorb it, or does the
12 developer absorb it? How does that work out?
13 Because we pay enough taxes already without it
14 taking a big -- all of a sudden Council says,
15 Oh, we've got to upgrade this and we've got to
16 raise your taxes 10 to 12 percent. And you are
17 saying that it's hard to get younger people
18 here. It's hard to get younger people here
19 because our taxes are higher. We're older. We
20 can pay it, but if you get new people in, like
21 the 20- and 30-year-olds, they can't afford
22 four or \$5,000 taxes when they can go into the
23 city of Edmonton and buy a starter home that's
24 got \$1,200 taxes. Those are the reasons I'd
25 like to know why -- who's paying for all this
26 and how it's going to work out.

27 MR. MACKENZIE: Sure. To answer your first

1 question, the blue area could be a variety of
2 things. It would depend on -- potentially if
3 the City was in favor of it, you could look at
4 it as a more active space with parks or
5 whatever --

6 SPEAKER 1: I like the trees and the
7 grassland.

8 MR. MACKENZIE: But I think, you know, from
9 the perspective of the consultants, we have a
10 landscape architect starting to work on
11 envisioning this site as well, but my personal
12 feeling as a planner and some of the
13 discussions we've had now is that there's a lot
14 of very, very nice trees inside the private
15 property right now. Very, very healthy, large
16 specimens, and this existing area could be
17 naturalized, right, to form a wider Red Willow
18 Park, natural area corridor. So when you're
19 using the trail, you know, it's more of a
20 natural area that could be re-vegetated and
21 replanted. It could be a variety of things,
22 and we're just starting out on that vision. So
23 that's kind of the discussion around that blue
24 area.

25 Related to your question
26 around services, water does not need to be
27 upgraded. The pipe is there.

1 SPEAKER 1: You said possibly the storm
2 and the sewer.

3 MR. MACKENZIE: The sanitary sewer?

4 SPEAKER 1: Yeah.

5 MR. MACKENZIE: Also, the local service
6 line does not need to be upgraded, but before
7 we can develop the other trunk line, which the
8 City is working to install, it has to be online
9 to provide capacity. So that's a project that
10 the City's already undertaking. Now, further
11 to that, it's my understanding that the costs
12 associated with that are at least, in part, if
13 not fully, going to be recovered through
14 development levies, and redevelopment also
15 would have to pay a proportionate share of
16 that. So it's not a taxpayer-funded
17 initiative, it's a development-funded
18 initiative, is my understanding of it. So
19 that's sanitary. And from a stormwater
20 perspective, again, the pipe exists in the
21 road. So there's two options. Either we don't
22 upgrade the pipe and we provide on-site
23 storage, which would be developer costs, or we
24 upgrade the pipe, which would be developer
25 costs, and provide a smaller amount of on-site
26 storage. So none of the servicing upgrades
27 that would be required would be taxpayer

1 funded, they would be developer funded.

2 SPEAKER 4: You said the City was going
3 to upgrade the sanitary trunk line anyway?

4 MR. MACKENZIE: Yes.

5 SPEAKER 4: What was driving that?

6 MR. MACKENZIE: I can't speak to that
7 project. I don't know if anybody in the room
8 is going to want to speak to that.

9 MS. MITCHELL: I'll try. I'm not the
10 engineer. When the city was built, it had
11 boundaries, but as we expanded our boundaries,
12 now you need more capacity in your lines, and
13 that's what needs to be upgraded. Right now
14 almost all development is on hold until that
15 line gets put in. And that means the Amacon
16 downtown. It is only using its existing
17 capacity before it can move. We can't even put
18 any new apartments anywhere in the city. Every
19 single lot that we look at, that we subdivide,
20 we have to question, is there any more room?
21 So that line's critical to any further growth
22 in the city. So this project, whether it
23 happens or not, we need the line.

24 MR. MACKENZIE: Thanks, Lenore.

25 SPEAKER 5: As far as rezoning goes, is
26 it a best practice to leave lot 53 like that?

27 MR. MACKENZIE: But I think, optimally, you

1 know, the R3A zoning to the south and what we
2 may have to the north, you know, a continuation
3 of that R3A through all those properties would
4 make sense, but we don't have control over
5 that, of lot 53.

6 SPEAKER 5: So if you're successful in
7 your application, the potential is that
8 property is left over?

9 MR. MACKENZIE: That's one potential.

10 SPEAKER 5: Theoretically, if you do,
11 say, purchase that house and then that gives
12 you -- is your landmass going to reach a
13 hectare or would it still be under a hectare?

14 MR. MACKENZIE: I don't know the exact size
15 of that, and it would also somewhat depend on
16 the land swap, but I think we'd be getting very
17 close, yeah.

18 SPEAKER 3: And you have no interest at
19 this point in time in 53?

20 MR. MACKENZIE: I'm not the landowner.

21 SPEAKER 3: No, I understand that, but
22 you don't have any interest in 53 at this point
23 in time?

24 MR. MACKENZIE: I don't.

25 MR. BEUKENS: He's just the engineer
26 asked to work on these two lots. He doesn't
27 own any of these lands. He's just a

1 consultant.

2 MR. MACKENZIE: Just.

3 MR. BEUKENS: He's a nice consultant. Is
4 that better?

5 SPEAKER 4: I have one more question.
6 Those apartments or condos, are they going to
7 be entry-level, like low-income, or are they
8 going to be medium or high-end apartments? If
9 they're going to be, like, low-to-medium entry,
10 it does nothing for our property value. Even
11 medium has its potential that 15 years down the
12 road they turn into a slum and everything else,
13 like you see around Beverly and everywhere else
14 where they started off high-end homes. Like,
15 you know, and then all of a sudden we've got,
16 you know, bums living over there. That's one
17 thing I would like to know. Is it going to be
18 like medium-class or low-class? And I'm not
19 trying to say that the low-class don't have to
20 be there, but it affects our property value if
21 it's, like, you know, low-rise or, you know,
22 Alberta Housing or something like that.

23 MR. MACKENZIE: At this point, it's too
24 early to say exactly what the price point on
25 those units would be, but when you consider the
26 location of this site --

27 SPEAKER 4: No. But we've had a lot of

1 places in the city where they looked at the
2 locations and it just changed and went to
3 nothing after -- with nobody voicing their
4 opinion.

5 MR. MACKENZIE: I can't speak to that. And
6 it will respond to market condition at the time
7 that it's built.

8 SPEAKER 6: Greg, just to be clear, are
9 these -- you say apartments and townhouses.
10 Okay. But are they condominiums? Are they
11 rental properties? What are they?

12 MR. MACKENZIE: Again, at this point it's
13 too early to say. There'll be apartments.

14 SPEAKER 7: Has there been a study on
15 road traffic on Sturgeon Road? In bringing in
16 that amount of density -- I mean, Sturgeon Road
17 has increased considerably. Traffic in St.
18 Albert has increased considerably, but when
19 you're bringing that amount of living into the
20 area, have they done any studies as to the
21 road? I mean, you know, it's sometimes
22 difficult to get out of Berrymore Drive because
23 of traffic.

24 MR. MACKENZIE: Yes.

25 SPEAKER 7: Have they done studies on
26 that?

27 MR. MACKENZIE: Yes. We've engaged a

1 transportation engineer to do an assessment of
2 the traffic, and we've submitted a draft report
3 to the City for review. The findings are
4 basically at 65 units, which would kind of be
5 the maximum density that we can achieve under
6 the R3A, depending on underground parking.
7 That, overall, the traffic volumes at Sturgeon
8 Road that it's currently handling, it would be
9 very, very minimal. It would be --
10 essentially, it would be kind of a fraction of
11 a percent of total volume. Essentially what
12 the Transportation Impact Assessment says is
13 that the level of service on that roadway and
14 at those intersections is essentially unchanged
15 by this development. It will be kind of what
16 it will be from a service perspective whether
17 this remains as it is or whether you add that
18 65 units.

19 SPEAKER 7: Thank you.

20 MR. MACKENZIE: You're welcome.

21 SPEAKER 8: So that report didn't
22 recommend potential for lights at all on
23 Sturgeon?

24 MR. MACKENZIE: Not associated with this
25 development, no. The one recommendation that
26 it did provide was the potential for a stop
27 control at Bishop. A three-way stop.

1 SPEAKER 8: Let's say 53, 55, and 57
2 all goes through, then, potentially, how many
3 units are we looking at potentially?
4 SPEAKER 3: And I think that is what I
5 was thinking myself.
6 SPEAKER 8: And I think that there is a
7 gentleman here from the City that knows the
8 size. Sorry for putting you on the spot,
9 Robin, but we did talk earlier about the size
10 of all three.
11 MR. BEUKENS: Yeah, I think Greg knows
12 what the sizes are as well.
13 MR. MACKENZIE: I would suggest it's
14 probably about another .2 hectares.
15 MR. BEUKENS: Yeah, something like that.
16 MR. MACKENZIE: So if you're looking at 94
17 units and .2 hectares, you're looking at about
18 another 50 units, I would guess. So maximum
19 density, you would maybe go from 65 up to 75 or
20 80 units, would be my guess, without --
21 SPEAKER 8: So we're talking possibly?
22 MR. MACKENZIE: Possibly, without a
23 detailed analysis.
24 SPEAKER 8: It could be more?
25 MR. MACKENZIE: Not really. Not without
26 significant underground parking.
27 SPEAKER 8: So we're talking

1 high-density?

2 MR. MACKENZIE: Maximum.

3 SPEAKER 8: Is it steel and concrete?

4 Is it going to be steel and concrete in terms
5 of the building?

13 SPEAKER 9: You said there was some
14 consideration about a four-way stop at Bishop?

15 MR. MACKENZIE: It would be a three --

16 SPEAKER 9: Or a three-way stop

17 MR. MACKENZIE: Yeah, that's right.

18 SPEAKER 9: Where is that exactly?

19 MR. MACKENZIE: Bishop Street is the -- I
20 believe Bishop is shown here. Maybe I have a
21 better one that can be --

22 MS. MITCHELL: Maybe, Greg, to qualify
23 Horizon for that because it was, like, 2027
24 (sic).

25 MR. MACKENZIE: That's in the long-term.
26 Exactly. There's a better one that shows
27 Bishop here, right? So, here's the site.

1 Here's Beacon Crescent running its away around
2 here and Burnham Ave. Bishop is in this
3 location here.

4 MS. MITCHELL: That's because people use
5 Bishop to get through to the other part of --
6 SPEAKER 9: Then we slow all the
7 traffic down again.

8 MS. MITCHELL: It has to be looked at.
9 We're reviewing their study because you
10 typically don't put a four-way stop on an
11 arterial roadway. So that's a question that we
12 have looked at already. So don't get hung up
13 on that stop sign, okay?

14 SPEAKER 9: But it's a possibility?

15 MR. MACKENZIE: Yes.

16 SPEAKER 10: I have a question. If the
17 land swap doesn't happen, so that property
18 extends right down to that trail, is there any
19 sort of guarantee or something, to me as a
20 member who lives there, that that backside
21 closest to the trail isn't going to be
22 destroyed? Like, they took more buildings.
23 They didn't do any sort of landscaping on the
24 backside. So when you take a walk and all of a
25 sudden it turns into dirt and thistles and all
26 that, it kind of decreases the value of the
27 parkway, I think. I guess.

1 MR. MACKENZIE: I think -- yeah. I agree.
2 That's one of the reasons why we proposed the
3 land swap because we see value in widening the
4 Red Willow Park corridor as well, but I guess
5 what I would speak to is this is essentially
6 the scenario without the land swap, right?
7 It's a rezoning of the private lands. So then
8 the development of the site is governed by the
9 Land Use Bylaw. There's a rear-yard
10 requirement, so you'd have to create a yard,
11 but it essentially would be private property.
12 I would say, though, that the difference
13 between this property as well and the Tenor
14 site is that there's a flatter area at the
15 bottom here. So I don't think you'd see quite
16 the same grade change right at the back of the
17 building the same way, even if development went
18 into the back corridor.

19 SPEAKER 11: That landscaping between
20 Tenor and the walkway, does the City approve
21 what they've done there? Like, is that
22 something that -- I agree it is not pretty.

23 SPEAKER 12: It's a naturalization area.

24 MS. MITCHELL: I'll speak to that. I can
25 speak to that. We have worked for a number of
26 years with the Tenor because the original
27 developer, you know, went bankrupt, and then

1 the banks held it for a long time, and then
2 Landrex bought it, and now it's back, sold out
3 again to different people. So it's been kind
4 of a rough ride even. So ideally, if you keep
5 with the same developer, it's easier to get
6 compliance. So the City has, over the years,
7 been trying to work on that hillside. So, yes,
8 it's been a bit of an ongoing battle because,
9 you know, the slopes, as Greg mentioned, they
10 have washed down, and they tried different
11 things, and it's been a weed mess. So the City
12 hasn't -- they've been trying to work with the
13 various owner over time.

14 SPEAKER 13: Along the same vein, if you
15 do get permission from the City -- it's
16 probably more a question for them. But if you
17 do get permission from the City, can they put
18 certain criteria or restrictions on that very
19 edge of your property so that it remains kind
20 of in keeping with a little bit more of a
21 parkland kind of atmosphere? Or because it's
22 your property, you can just do whatever you
23 want regardless?

24 MR. MACKENZIE: No. There is control. The
25 Land Use Bylaw provides some level of control
26 from the perspective of creating yard space and
27 then there are requirements around landscaping

1 plans that you have to submit at the building
2 and development permit stage that would have to
3 be signed off by the City. And they identify
4 what kind of landscaping they're putting in
5 there, subject to review and approval by the
6 City. And there are standards of the City.

7 SPEAKER 14: I have a question.

8 MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, go ahead.

9 SPEAKER 14: Okay. When I looked to buy
10 a house in St. Albert many years ago, the
11 reason I moved into that Braeside area was
12 close -- you know, I was so close to
13 everything, be it St. Albert Centre that wasn't
14 there when I moved there. I was close to the
15 downtown area, farmers' market, all that. I
16 enjoy living in that area because it's got
17 single-family homes. My property value is fine
18 because I'm a single-family home. I put in
19 this kind of high-density, you know, with all
20 these extra people on that Sturgeon Road, that
21 we can't handle an extra hundred people, or
22 whatever, for how many units you're going to
23 put in, it's going to devalue my house. I know
24 what I have in my house as a single-family home
25 in my area. That's the reason why I moved to
26 St. Albert. That's the reason why I moved to
27 that area. I don't want to see an area that

1 has a park area or houses area being developed
2 into a high-density value. We're putting in
3 more homes, making it tighter, making more
4 people, putting a strain on our sewer system,
5 putting a strain on everything, putting a
6 strain on the roads, putting a strain on just
7 about everything you can think of that belongs
8 to this. You're taking away the -- you're
9 devaluing my property by putting in this.

10 MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you for your comment.

11 SPEAKER 15: I'm sorry, I'll speak to
12 that. I'm a real estate agent. I actually
13 owned -- just recently sold property that I've
14 owned in my family for more than 30 years in
15 South Edmonton. The --

16 SPEAKER 14: St. Albert is different
17 than Edmonton.

18 SPEAKER 15: Well, let me finish
19 speaking to that because property value being
20 affected by development like this has the same
21 reaction regardless of the market unless we're
22 talking Iraq. But my family homestead, if
23 you'll call it that, in South Edmonton, backs
24 onto where they built the LRT line with 14- and
25 16-storey high-rises that went in. I just
26 recently last year sold the home because my
27 mother passed away, and I can assure you that

1 our property values were affected not one bit
2 by the LRT line, by the station that you could
3 see out of her backyard, or by those 14-storey
4 buildings that were built right there. So the
5 distance of this from Berrymore Drive -- it
6 won't affect you.

7 SPEAKER 14: It affects me.

8 SPEAKER 3: What's to say that doesn't
9 affect me?

10 SPEAKER 15: But it doesn't affect your
11 property value, and that was your statement.

12 SPEAKER 16: This is going to affect me.
13 This is going to be my view.

14 SPEAKER 15: And I get that, but she
15 spoke to property value. So I have personal
16 experience with property values from
17 developments like this, and while it might not
18 be the view you want, and by all means, speak
19 to that. In terms of the dollar value of your
20 land and your home, this won't even be a blip
21 on your radar, folks.

22 SPEAKER 16: It depends what they're
23 putting in.

24 SPEAKER 17: That's your opinion.

25 SPEAKER 15: Yeah. It's my opinion from
26 17 years and more than 2,000 real estate
27 transactions.

1 SPEAKER 14: Well, it's my opinion
2 because I live in St. Albert.

3 SPEAKER 18: This is personal.

4 SPEAKER 15: So do I.

5 SPEAKER 14: So do I live in St. Albert.

6 SPEAKER 15: But personal views,
7 personal preference, is one thing. Property
8 value is, you know -- and I get what you're
9 saying. I don't know that I'd want to back
10 onto a building like this myself; however,
11 property values -- your investment is safe.
12 Regardless of what they develop on this land
13 and what shape it is, your investment is safe.
14 From your dollar value.

15 SPEAKER 19: There is also something
16 that affects property values and that's the
17 character of the neighbourhood. Right now
18 there is a wooded area down by the river there,
19 south of our property and -- or north of our
20 property, and kids go down there and take drugs
21 now and again. If there's enough increase in
22 population just south of this neighbourhood,
23 and a lot more kids. It's a very popular place
24 for kids to go down there, and they're hidden
25 down there in the trees, and that's the kind of
26 thing that does lower property values.

27 SPEAKER 14: High-density.

1 MR. MACKENZIE: Just to speak to that a
2 little bit, there are some considerations.
3 That's related to design as well. And the City
4 does have guidance for how you design a site
5 and buildings in a redevelopment situation.
6 And one of those considerations is related to
7 crime prevention, and there are a number of
8 strategies as to how you design a site, modern
9 design practices, that increase views to those
10 types of park areas and how they're kind of
11 proven to reduce some of those activities in
12 those types of areas, but that is a very
13 important consideration.

14 SPEAKER 3: Because you're increasing
15 the number of people.

16 MR. MACKENZIE: Yes.

17 SPEAKER 3: You know, the chances could
18 possibly increase.

19 SPEAKER 20: I just have a comment.

20 Tenor, as you described, had all these issues.

21 There's still lots for sale. So, I mean,

22 you've got lots of units that are still empty.

23 Now you're looking at putting in something
24 bigger, to more empty opportunities, possibly,
25 because, again, if you can't get that one
26 filled, what says you're even going to get this
27 one partially filled? We've lost the green

1 space, we've lost the character of the
2 neighbourhood, we've added all this extra
3 density. As described here before, yes, we've
4 had issues already with police having to
5 control those kids moving out of the park
6 because of the drug use because of all that.
7 You add that many more people, that much more
8 whatever -- I mean, when my kids now use that
9 little walking trail, I get a little nervous
10 after dark because of everything else that goes
11 on in that park. You add that many more
12 people, we're going to have that many more
13 problems, and Tenor's not going to be filled.
14 So -- why? What is the real push for getting
15 even more people into this lovely neighbourhood
16 that we all chose? Because, why? It was
17 single-family homes in Parkland close to all
18 these lovely things. We chose that, we pay the
19 property tax for that, we've upkeeped (sic) our
20 homes for all that. Our property is wonderful,
21 and now you want us to get, okay, onboard with
22 this when we have one property there already
23 that's not even filled, and all of those
24 issues?

25 MR. MACKENZIE: I appreciate your comments.
26 I can't speak to Tenor as far as their -- I
27 guess their vacancy or why that is.

1 SPEAKER 21: It's because they're
2 high-end.

3 MR. MACKENZIE: It could be --

4 SPEAKER 21: The low --

5 MR. MACKENZIE: -- the sizes are too large
6 in configuration -- I'm not sure (inaudible).

7 SPEAKER 20: But we have low-end living
8 across the river.

9 MR. MACKENZIE: Sorry?

10 SPEAKER 20: We already have all of that
11 low-end on the other side of the river, and we
12 have a lot of people coming and going there
13 already. So you want to do that down the other
14 side too?

15 SPEAKER 14: Way too much high-density
16 in the Braeside area.

17 MR. MACKENZIE: This gentleman had his hand
18 up for a question.

19 SPEAKER 22: So, Greg, as a resident and
20 -- I mean, I'm not going to speak to degrees of
21 impact, but we're right on -- we're right at
22 ground zero. We're right adjacent, in the
23 cul-de-sac, and I guess one question I'd like
24 to ask you: Is there openness to bring
25 development concept into this dialogue? I
26 think that if everybody understands impact and
27 interface, that will help to quash some of the

1 concerns. To be honest, I don't disagree with
2 the argument on residential values. I mean,
3 there has been a number of studies that
4 substantiates that. It's the amenity, and I
5 will say as a person that was involved in
6 dealing with issues that plague the park area,
7 that, actually, people coming to the area
8 helps, if they have an ownership to the area.
9 One thing we know as a community, by using the
10 park system, you're using it appropriately, and
11 that usage helps to deter a lot of those
12 negative behaviours. But there has to be some
13 respect to the amenity that's there and the
14 amenity that's been provided to the residents.
15 And I think it's understanding that interface
16 because -- pardon my French, but I think in a
17 lot of cases, the City -- and this isn't
18 pointed to the City and staff. It's just as a
19 community, we've done a piss-poor job in
20 respecting that river and the communities along
21 it. And there is real character there. So
22 understanding the development concept might
23 help this discussion.

24 MR. MACKENZIE: I absolutely agree. And
25 that's something that the City has asked us to
26 provide as part of this land swap discussion,
27 and Vic has engaged, in my opinion, a very good

1 team to look at what that vision is in these
2 areas and how this development can work with
3 what we're proposing, and with Red Willow Park,
4 either in the existing situation or in a land
5 swap scenario, and that's exactly a big
6 component of that is, how does the site
7 design -- in terms of pathways, open spaces,
8 what you're doing with gates and fences and
9 walls and balconies and windows, as well as the
10 building design -- how does that interface with
11 it? How does the trail connection inside the
12 public area interface with walkway connections
13 and routes through the site? How's the
14 sidewalk tied in? All those kinds of questions
15 are something we're starting to move into now
16 as part of this land swap discussion.

17 SPEAKER 22: So is there an opportunity
18 to bring that into the public process prior?
19 Because when the zoning's there, the discussion
20 moves to development agreement between the City
21 and the developer.

22 MR. MACKENZIE: I think as part of the
23 information that we put together and submit to
24 the City, that becomes part of our application.

25 SPEAKER 23: How sure are you about
26 getting rezoning done?

27 MR. MACKENZIE: Ultimately, that is a

1 decision of Council. We haven't submitted an
2 application yet. The purpose of this meeting
3 is before we even submit an application.

4 SPEAKER 23: So my next question is,
5 basically, what can we do as a community to
6 stop this?

7 MS. MITCHELL: Well, this is, first, your
8 opportunity to learn about what the concept is.
9 You have the forms to fill out. Then when the
10 application comes in, we would also send people
11 that are in a hundred-metre radius and that
12 attended the meeting tonight that the
13 application has been made. You know, maybe
14 you didn't make a comment tonight. So you
15 still have that opportunity again.

16 So you can't stop them from
17 making an application. They can do that.

18 SPEAKER 23: I understand that.

19 MS. MITCHELL: Okay. But your comments,
20 we take those, we share them with Council, and
21 then Council get the hard decision of how to
22 proceed or not to proceed with this. So that's
23 why the applicant is doing all these
24 requirements. We've asked them to undertake
25 several studies to answer some of the questions
26 we anticipated that residents may have. And
27 then you can make more of a decision yourself,

1 too, of what you're hearing.

2 SPEAKER 24: So I hear you saying that
3 it's very important that we show up. If we're
4 here in town, that we show up to the council
5 meeting to show or to talk about how we feel
6 about this?

7 MS. MITCHELL: That is one way, but also
8 your letters, I submit every one of them to
9 Council in their package so they can read the
10 letters that are submitted.

11 SPEAKER 24: We can send them to you
12 instead of trying to write them tonight? We
13 can send them to you?

14 MS. MITCHELL: Yeah. That's what I'm
15 saying. You have -- tonight you have the
16 opportunity. When they make their application,
17 I'll send you a letter, or Robin. It's going
18 to be Robin's file. You'll get a letter, and
19 you'll have a certain time frame. It could be
20 14 days, approximately, to give a letter, and
21 it's better to write it because then it's your
22 opinion, right? And then, again, when the
23 public hearing happens, you're going to get
24 another letter saying now it's going to go to
25 Council. So there's another time. And then
26 physically in front of Council. So it's at
27 least three or four times you have an

1 opportunity. So you don't have to do it all
2 tonight. You do have time.

3 SPEAKER 24: Is that advertised in the
4 paper?

5 MS. MITCHELL: Yeah. And we advertise in
6 the paper. And you'll know when his
7 application's been made is they'll stick a sign
8 up, one of those four-by-eight signs, on the
9 property also.

10 SPEAKER 25: I'd just like to make
11 basically two comments. One is that, you
12 know -- I mean, a few of us have mentioned this
13 little house over here. I find it kind of
14 interesting that neither the City nor the
15 potential developer knows that if that comes
16 into the mix, whether or not it becomes a
17 complete hectare, which my understanding it
18 makes a big difference on the amount of --

19 MS. MITCHELL: This man doesn't own that
20 land. It's a different landowner. And we
21 don't know his interest.

22 Mr. NIKOLIC: Didn't want to buy it
23 because it would make the drug problem a little
24 bigger. So I wanted to keep it down a bit.

25 MS. MITCHELL: So, you know, if that
26 changes, I think --

27 SPEAKER 25: I mean, if that changes,

1 are we going to have -- are you going to -- or
2 are they going to have to have another public
3 meeting like this?

4 MS. MITCHELL: Yes. They will have to
5 have another public meeting. At this point, I
6 don't know how that's fitting with their
7 timeline, quite honestly.

8 SPEAKER 25: And my second comment is, I
9 live in Braeside, and I did not receive any
10 information about tonight. And I found that
11 very disturbing.

12 MS. MITCHELL: Well, we do a hundred-metre
13 radius, and that's our minimum, and that's why
14 they also put it in the paper. And then from
15 that, we start building a list. So everyone
16 who's come tonight, you're now on that list,
17 plus the people that are in the hundred-metre
18 radius. And then when it goes to Council,
19 that's when it will be put in the paper again
20 because there may be people that are, again,
21 just on the edges or some other place that have
22 an interest, so, yeah.

23 SPEAKER 26: I think it went into the
24 paper because someone here made sure it went in
25 the paper.

26 SPEAKER 8: I put it in.

27 MS. MITCHELL: Well, no. They pulled two

1 ads.

2 MR. MACKENZIE: We posted two
3 advertisements in the paper.

4 SPEAKER 8: Because it went in. Chris,
5 the editor, put it in on the 11th.

6 MR. MACKENZIE: Oh, you work for the
7 Gazette?

8 SPEAKER 8: Yes.

9 MR. MACKENZIE: Oh, I see.

10 SPEAKER 25: Where did it go into?

11 MR. MACKENZIE: I have a copy of the ad in
12 my --

13 SPEAKER 25: No, no. Did it go in the
14 Gazette, or did it go in the Journal?

15 MR. MACKENZIE: It's in the Gazette.

16 SPEAKER 25: Okay.

17 MS. MITCHELL: Yeah. We require them to
18 run two ads in the local newspaper, which we
19 have, the Gazette.

20 SPEAKER 25: Obviously none of us paid
21 much attention to things like that.

22 MS. MITCHELL: Not everyone gets it, so
23 word of mouth is important too. So you as
24 residents, you talk to your neighbours and, so,
25 that's the best we can do, right?

26 SPEAKER 25: Fair enough.

27 MS. MITCHELL: But we'll keep building our

1 list.

2 SPEAKER 26: Most people that I know
3 that are living in condominiums as well is a
4 problem with parking for guests and that kind
5 of thing. If there's a problem there, I can
6 see you coming in on our street and parking and
7 taking up, so we're actually the guest parking
8 lot. What assurance do we have that that's not
9 going to happen? That there's going to be --
10 never mind the building codes. Is there going
11 to be ample there? Because I think, typically,
12 condominiums never provide enough parking, and
13 in many cases, like, if it's a couple living
14 there, both of them working, they need two
15 parking stalls per apartment, in those cases,
16 and that's without guest parking. So, I guess
17 that's my concern. Like, how do we know that
18 our streets are not going to just turn into a
19 big parking lot for the condominiums?

20 MR. MACKENZIE: Essentially, parking is
21 controlled under the Land Use Bylaw that's set
22 by the City to set the rates of parking that
23 are felt to be appropriate for that style of
24 development, depending on the size of the units
25 and the number of bedrooms. That's really what
26 regulates it. I suppose it's a minimum
27 requirement. And if we felt through the design

1 that there was a need for a change to that,
2 then we could look at that, but that's how it's
3 governed. We're not at that point.

4 SPEAKER 26: That's minimal, but when
5 you look at actual requirements, you know,
6 because that I could see happening quite
7 easily. You know, with the green area there
8 and with the walking trails and everything
9 there that our back streets become the area for
10 surplus parking where their guests can stay and
11 that sort of thing. That's a big concern
12 because there a lot of children that play on
13 our street and things like that. I think
14 that's a great concern if we have a lot of
15 strangers and different people parking there.

16 MR. MACKENZIE: That is a consideration,
17 yes.

18 SPEAKER 5: But what we're all talking
19 about is potential problems. That crescent at
20 the end of Berrymore is a perfect place for
21 drug deals. The cops know all about it. You
22 can -- people drive down there. Because it's
23 so isolated and there's lots of trees, parking
24 in the crescent, people can come up the trails
25 and do the drug deals and disappear into the
26 trees very quickly. So this is increasing the
27 potential market for kids at a very good spot

1 for making drug deals right in the crescent at
2 the end of -- that's a perfect spot for doing
3 the selling. It happens all the time. It's
4 probably going to increase with the condo, or
5 apartment. I mean, the odds are it could.

6 SPEAKER 27: Is there a precedent in St.
7 Albert for doing this kind of swap where we are
8 giving up our green spaces to a private
9 development? But this isn't setting a
10 precedent, is it?

11 MR. MACKENZIE: No. There's a process in
12 place, and I believe there are some other land
13 swaps.

14 SPEAKER 27: Taking public green space?
15 MR. MACKENZIE: It's not a matter of taking
16 public green space. That's the point of the
17 swap is it's swapping land for land. So, some
18 of the park space is transferred to the
19 development.

20 SPEAKER 27: I understand that.

21 MR. MACKENZIE: Some of the private land is
22 transferred park space. So it's not a take of
23 park space.

24 SPEAKER 27: Well, take and give.

25 MR. MACKENZIE: Yeah.

26 SPEAKER 27: I'm just concerned about
27 the take part. I don't care about the give

1 part, just the take part. Because we're losing
2 -- because on this conceptual land swap, we
3 lose a huge chunk on the end of this green
4 space. I use this green space every day, so
5 I'm sensitive to it and how it's used. The
6 second part of my question, though, is, of
7 course, right now there's a walkway, a cement
8 walkway, that goes right there across to there.
9 So who redevelops that?

10 MR. MACKENZIE: That would be -- my
11 understanding -- and we're still in the early
12 phase of the discussion, but our understanding
13 is that with development, the development would
14 have to reconfigure that green space, and we're
15 likely talking about the design of what this
16 would look like and what this would look like
17 should a land swap proceed. We would also be
18 looking at a larger context, right? This whole
19 space, how those trails function. Where is the
20 connection rerouted to? How does this
21 development work with Sturgeon Road and the
22 existing crossing opportunities there? How do
23 you maintain that? So it is in a larger
24 context, and the costs associated with changes
25 inside those public areas would be development
26 costs.

27 SPEAKER 28: That blue area there --

1 I've lived in there for over 40 years. That
2 blue area would just be bush, west of that.
3 There's no reason to develop that. It's not
4 close to that lot path. It's in the middle of
5 nowhere. It would just be left as bush for as
6 long as I'll be alive. Whereas the other part
7 there, the swap part, is being used. That's
8 what I'm saying. I can't see them doing
9 anything with that blue part. I can't even
10 conceive anything right now other than bush,
11 like the rest of it where the drug problems
12 area already.

13 SPEAKER 29: It's a fenced property.
14 Nobody uses it.

15 SPEAKER 28: No. It won't be used
16 because it's not [indiscernible] by kids.

17 MR. MACKENZIE: It's used as a yard right
18 now.

19 SPEAKER 28: Yeah, it's got a nice yard.
20 It's very nice down there.

21 MR. MACKENZIE: It has the development
22 potential.

23 SPEAKER 28: It does. I don't think it
24 will be developed --

25 SPEAKER 14: And is it close to the
26 residential area that Braeside is currently
27 that you want to put all the apartments? No.

1 SPEAKER 30: Maybe I'll speak to the
2 City. Is there some potential in improving
3 lighting? I'm hearing a lot of conversation
4 about activity occurring along this trail. You
5 know, I do live on Berrymore, and we've had a
6 few vandalism in the area, which has been a
7 concern for me, particularly this year, and
8 what's happened with the City is they've cut
9 back big trees to allow the branches to kind of
10 pull back. But the lighting is very, very dim
11 on Berrymore Drive. So if something like this
12 was to go through, or even if it doesn't go
13 through, my recommendation is that they improve
14 the lighting along the trail somehow without it
15 glaring in people's homes, but giving the
16 comfort to residents to be able to walk safely,
17 take their dog for a walk, and there would
18 likely be less activity that's negative along
19 the river. You know, even down where that
20 beautiful rock is where you can sit. You know,
21 even a potential of some form of lighting that
22 would detract anyone from thinking I'm in the
23 dark, I can do what I want. So I just wanted
24 to make that a suggestion.

25 MS. MITCHELL: I'll take that as a
26 suggestion. I can't comment to that at all
27 because that involves a different project, I

1 think.

2 SPEAKER 30: Okay. I just wanted to say
3 that.

4 MS. MITCHELL: Thank you for raising that.

5 SPEAKER 31: I'm looking at your map
6 there, and I see that the proposed apartments
7 that are going in there are suddenly backing up
8 on three, four properties that previously had a
9 clear view of the river valley, the park area.
10 Now you get to look at apartments? That's
11 going to be really great. One of those
12 properties happens to be ours. I'm not very
13 happy about that at all.

14 MR. MACKENZIE: Thanks for your comments.

15 SPEAKER 32: You said before that this
16 could be a four-storey?

17 MR. MACKENZIE: Correct.

18 SPEAKER 32: That's by going down into
19 the concrete down in the ground? Is that how
20 they do that?

21 MR. MACKENZIE: Well, the maximum height
22 above grade is 13 metres?

23 SPEAKER 32: 13 metres.

24 MS. MITCHELL: We measure from the lowest
25 to the highest. So at street level, he's not
26 going to get four storeys at a street. It will
27 take from the lowest level, is how we measure.

1 So you need to know that.

2 SPEAKER 32: Is there going to be
3 parking underground?

4 MR. MACKENZIE: We can't say at this point,
5 but considering the configuration of the site,
6 it seems that's something that we would
7 definitely be looking at.

8 SPEAKER 32: That's one of the things
9 that's unclear. I mean, going down into the
10 ground and underneath concrete, that's very
11 expensive and that's one of the things that
12 bankrupt the Tenor.

13 SPEAKER 5: Which one of those maps is
14 the accurate one? Because I was going to look
15 when I got home to see how far it's going to
16 encroach. And this one has three trees past
17 the sidewalk and this one only has one covered.
18 So if I wanted to eyeball it on my way home,
19 which one would be more accurate?

20 MR. MACKENZIE: You're right. Yeah,
21 that's a good point. At this point, the final
22 land swap area is not determined. So these are
23 intentionally conceptual, but, yes, this
24 probably should have been expanded, but, like I
25 said, we're working through that process right
26 now. So there are a number of things we're
27 considering in, you know, the value of that

area from its existing condition, both the park space and the private land, as well as the kind of monetary value from a land appraisal perspective, and then also what can be done with the space. So once we get through all of that analysis and discussion, it's really a negotiation with the City to determine what would actually be swapped. So these are intentionally conceptual.

10 SPEAKER 33: As you're aware, you know
11 that the Allure (phonetic) apartment buildings
12 are wanting to add onto their property. Is
13 that going to affect the sewer or water and
14 everything else, and traffic if their proposal
15 goes ahead?

16 MS. MITCHELL: I guess I'll speak to that.
17 So the Allure (phonetic) is the older apartment
18 that's been there since the '70s, and they're
19 looking to add on the -- I don't know -- I call
20 it the north side, but going towards the
21 project we're talking about, yeah. So 12 to 16
22 units they're looking at. It did go to the
23 Subdivision Development Appeal Board and it was
24 turned down. Typically, when that happens, you
25 can't come back for six months, so I don't know
26 what they're planning. They did have some
27 challenges with site access and meeting the

1 parking requirements that the City set out. So
2 I don't know where that one's at. It did not
3 go on the sewer line. Moving that sewer line
4 is a big dollar item, so it didn't touch it.
5 They stayed all within their property boundary.
6 Did I get all of it?

7 SPEAKER 33: Yeah. It seems like you're
8 talking about one area, but there's also this
9 other one on the back burner that maybe nobody
10 else knows about.

11 SPEAKER 14: That was at City -- they
12 went to city hall to propose that. So
13 basically, they want to make that whole area
14 all into apartments, and that's what was the
15 proposal right next to that old complex is they
16 wanted to put in that one, but they didn't have
17 enough for parking. So that would impact the
18 parking on all of our residential streets, like
19 Burnham and Beacon and Bishop and everything
20 else, when there's already fourplexes on some
21 of those right on the Sturgeon Road and stuff.
22 So, potentially, all those units that they want
23 to build in and next to the old complex, plus
24 this new complex, that's adding a huge amount
25 of people in there with not enough parking
26 that's going to come into our streets on the
27 residential areas.

1 SPEAKER 34: It has nowhere else to go.

2 SPEAKER 14: No. It has nowhere else to

3 go except to come on the streets, so -- no.

4 SPEAKER 34: I'm with you.

5 MR. MACKENZIE: Okay, go ahead. Somebody

6 else had a question?

7 SPEAKER 8: I guess all of us are

8 showing a keen interest in what's going on

9 here, and I've come here trying to find out as

10 much as I can. I've heard very interesting

11 stuff from people, but I don't feel that I've

12 got specific answers on a number of things.

13 What is the building type going to be? If it's

14 concrete and steel, that means it's a higher

15 level. Okay. So I don't know that. I don't

16 know the number of condos that are going to be

17 there. So it could be two or three houses that

18 are going to be gone. I think it's going to be

19 three. We're being realistic about this. So

20 that increases the number. I didn't realize

21 that that apartment is on the back burner and

22 it may go through and add more people. It

23 could or couldn't. I had heard that it had

24 been turned down. That was it.

25 SPEAKER 14: They still want to come

26 back. They want to come back with another

27 proposal.

1 SPEAKER 8: Okay. So that's another
2 thing I didn't understand. Amount of parking
3 for guests. I didn't even consider the
4 overflow would come to Berrymore. This
5 gentleman over here said if you look out his
6 back window and see this bloody, excuse me,
7 apartment, that would take away his view. And
8 it will impact -- in my opinion, it will impact
9 his property and the property -- you know, the
10 cost of the property or resale value of the
11 property. The land swap, I don't understand
12 enough about it. It could be this or it could
13 be that. I still don't have enough
14 information. The amenities, how is that going
15 to work? Like, we've got some information but
16 nothing definite. Like, the big thing is
17 concrete and steel means it's a higher level.
18 And there's a lot of other things. A lot of us
19 have more questions, but I hear from you, Well,
20 we don't know yet. We need more information.
21 And that's -- now I'm more concerned than I was
22 before.

23 MR. MACKENZIE: That's great. And not
24 great that you're concerned. That's a great
25 summary of kind of what we're hearing here as
26 far as the concerns. And the purpose of this
27 meeting is, before we even make an application,

1 to make people aware of the fact that there's a
2 potential application and to present the
3 information that we do have at this very, very
4 early stage, right, and to get some feedback as
5 far as what some of the concerns are. And,
6 so, as part of this process, we consider that
7 input and we prepare the application and submit
8 it to the City. And then through that process,
9 the concerns that we hear tonight are
10 essentially considered, and then we have a
11 review process. Once we make a submission and
12 we work through the process to hopefully -- to
13 get it to Council and have a decision made at
14 the Council level. And there are additional
15 opportunities for input, and I think as we move
16 through the process, more details, once we set
17 more direction based on some of this
18 conversation as well, will emerge that we can
19 hopefully answer your questions. And I would
20 like to indicate that, you know, we are open.
21 My contact information is on the brochures. We
22 are open for further discussions, to talk with
23 you more about these concerns. Hopefully,
24 we'll be able to generate more answers to the
25 more specific questions you're bringing to us
26 tonight, at this early stage, as we kind of
27 work our way through this process.

1 SPEAKER 8: I understand that, and I
2 appreciate your feedback, but I also get the
3 feeling that no matter what people say or --
4 it's going to happen. Not that we're trying to
5 stop it, but maybe we need to make some serious
6 changes or -- you know?

7 SPEAKER 35: I think part of the problem
8 is people -- you know, a developer, his whole
9 intent is to make money. So, people are
10 somewhat skeptical when a developer comes up
11 with a plan knowing that it's potentially going
12 to be increasing it because he can make more
13 money at it, and that's part of the questions
14 here is we just don't know what the plans are.
15 And, I mean, we can't stop the developer from
16 wanting to make money. Everyone wants to
17 increase their return on their investment, but
18 that's now part of the confusion. And knowing
19 the fact that if something was approved has
20 nothing potentially stopping the developer from
21 expanding it [indiscernible].

22 SPEAKER 36: When you do make this
23 application, then -- I guess this is where I'm
24 confused. Here's my application to rezone this
25 land. The City just rubber stamps? No matter
26 what's going on there, we're just going to
27 rezone it to this higher-density level? Like,

1 they don't need any sort of vision, any sort of
2 concept, before they say, Yes, we approve this
3 restructuring, I guess, of the area?

4 MR. MACKENZIE: Well, at the zoning stage,
5 typically to an R3A, you wouldn't have, like,
6 detail engineered drawings.

7 SPEAKER 36: Not detailed. But I would
8 imagine something like, I want to make this
9 kind of development versus this kind of
10 development. Like, I would imagine that the
11 City would have to take that into consideration
12 as well.

13 MS. MITCHELL: I'll speak to that. With
14 the Land Use Bylaw, the regulations -- and Greg
15 kind of went over them -- they say this is
16 where your boundaries are. You can build
17 within the boundary. You have to be this far
18 away from this property line and this far away
19 you can build this high. That's the detail
20 that it gives at this level. So I know you
21 guys are saying, Well, what is it going to look
22 like? What is the build-out? It's way too
23 early to put that kind of investment into the
24 architectural drawings. They need to know, can
25 they even get the land districted (sic). And
26 so that does put you as residents into the
27 unknown.

1 SPEAKER 22: Is it going to be apartment
2 or is it going to be condo?

3 MS. MITCHELL: You don't know that either.

4 SPEAKER 22: And I think that's one of
5 the more important things that most people --

6 MS. MITCHELL: You will never know that
7 because you can own your house and rent it.

8 SPEAKER 22: People care for their
9 apartment, though.

10 MS. MITCHELL: Just let me finish. We
11 don't dictate if you can rent or own your
12 house. We don't do that. We don't say who can
13 live there. We don't manage people. We manage
14 the land and how it is built on. And I think
15 it's important that you have to know that
16 because a lot of you are wondering, Well, what
17 kind of people will live there? I can never
18 tell you what kind of people will live there,
19 and we can never manage that either. It is how
20 the land can be used and the boundaries in
21 which it can be built on. That is what the
22 question is tonight in what they're proposing.

23 MR. MACKENZIE: I would just like to say
24 that we have the room until 8:30, so we'll
25 continue to take some more questions.

26 MS. HERON: I have to leave. Sorry. I
27 have to leave, everyone. I have, like, five

1 cards with me. I'm Cathy Heron, I'm Council.
2 E-mail me. I can be a conduit to ask
3 questions. I'm not saying I'm completely going
4 to support everything you're saying and Greg's
5 work, but Lenore's right. Like, the only
6 example I can think of is the Alliance was
7 rezoned for one thing and then it got sold
8 later, and it was a totally different concept
9 than what was originally proposed to Council.
10 That we can't control. You can buy a unit --
11 you can buy a house and rent it out. You can't
12 control that. But I understand what you're
13 saying and -- seriously, I only have five
14 cards. Sorry. Share my e-mail and my phone
15 number. It's on the website. You do have
16 opportunities tonight, you have opportunities
17 to come to Council, but you also have
18 opportunities to e-mail and call the
19 councillors. There's seven of us you can call.
20 And we will listen. I grew up in this area, so
21 I know it very well. So I've got to leave, and
22 I'm really sorry because I have to go pick up
23 my daughter, but it was really good
24 conversation. It was nice to see so many
25 people out tonight.

26 MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you.

27 SPEAKER 22: Lenore, just to summarize

1 the, I guess, submission will comprise --

2 MS. MITCHELL: Go over that again?

3 SPEAKER 22: Yeah.

4 MS. MITCHELL: Yeah, for sure. I'll just
5 come up. So, I haven't let Greg know, but I'm
6 sensing we need to have another public meeting
7 on this, okay? But that would come after his
8 application is submitted. That way the
9 application comes in, we can -- staff will read
10 what their studies say. You'll get a letter
11 saying they've made their submission, and
12 they'll put a sign also on the property saying,
13 We made the submission to rezone the site.

14 Once we get these comments
15 back from you, this is where I'm thinking I'm
16 going to want a second public meeting, just
17 because I think you've raised some points, and
18 I think that you want some more answers, too,
19 and that will give the applicant the
20 opportunity to try to answer them. May not be
21 able to. They may still come back with the
22 same thing, I don't know, but it gives them a
23 chance to at least come back and try to answer
24 your questions.

25 So -- now I've gone and
26 lost myself. So make applications, stick up
27 the sign, have a second public consultation

1 meeting, then it would go to Council. And
2 again, you'll get a notice saying now it's
3 going to go to Council, and you can write a
4 letter also. And the date of the public
5 hearing, you can come to Council. The
6 developer gets 10 minutes to speak. Each
7 person as a resident get five minutes to speak
8 to Council. Council -- this Council -- Cathy's
9 left, but this Council typically does not make
10 a decision in one night. They like to think
11 about it. And some of the more contentious
12 ones that I've gone to, we just schedule
13 another night if we don't get through
14 everybody, and we keep going until everyone has
15 had their chance to speak, okay? So I don't
16 want you all thinking this is a done deal. It
17 is not. This is a public process. And like
18 Greg said, this is just the first chance for
19 the applicant to say, This is what we would
20 like to do. So that's kind of where we're at
21 with it.

22 SPEAKER 37: Question. You're talking
23 about another public meeting like this. Why?
24 If they're going to make a presentation to the
25 rezoning and it goes to Council, wouldn't you
26 just go to Council chambers and --

27 MS. MITCHELL: So the benefit -- so

2 SPEAKER 37: This is a lot more informal
3 than down there.

4 MS. MITCHELL: Yeah. Well, the reason for
5 a second public meeting like this is -- the one
6 lady summarized. You know, there's a bunch of
7 things that were flagged, okay? You know, the
8 shape wasn't quite right, and, you know,
9 they'll probably never be able to tell you what
10 the building is going to look like, but maybe
11 they'll have some more details about, well,
12 what this park development can look like, okay?
13 And bring that back to you so you can at least
14 hear some of that. And we also show Council --
15 like, this court report is part of Council
16 package the next time. And it will demonstrate
17 to Council, did the developer listen to
18 anything? Have they made a change? And I have
19 to be honest, he doesn't have to. That's for
20 Council to make that decision, okay? So that's
21 why -- from what I'm hearing tonight, I think a
22 second one's going to be needed. I don't know.
23 Do you guys feel you would like more
24 information?

25 SPEAKER 37: Yeah.

26 MS. MITCHELL: Would you come out again
27 and see how they do?

1 SPEAKER 37: Yeah. I'd like to see how
2 they respond to this meeting.

3 SPEAKER 38: So that's up to St. Albert
4 Council? They have to have a second meeting,
5 then?

6 MS. MITCHELL: Yeah. It is in our
7 guidelines of our public consultation. It
8 shows that you may need a second one. And what
9 I'm hearing tonight -- it's not a -- there's
10 too many questions that you guys have raised,
11 so I think it's important to report back to
12 you.

13 SPEAKER 8: Sounds good.

14 MS. MITCHELL: And the notification would
15 be to you and the same hundred-metre radius
16 that we sent it out to originally. And they'll
17 put it in the paper again.

18 SPEAKER 27: How does Council look at
19 precedents because of Tenor being rezoned and
20 now this one area looking for rezoning, and
21 Tenor was approved? Is there precedents that
22 they would look at that and say, Well, since
23 that's there, we can do that over here?

24 MS. MITCHELL: No. That was a different
25 Council, so I don't know how they would view
26 it, right? That would probably be a history
27 point we might have to put in the agenda report

1 just for that knowledge because a lot of those
2 councillors weren't there in, what? 2006, I
3 think, that went through. So it just might be
4 a history point. But as far as precedent, they
5 need to look at each on their own merits.

6 Colin?

7 SPEAKER 22: I will say one thing. I'm
8 saying this as a public (inaudible). But, I
9 mean, pretty good understanding of how the
10 Capital Region is looking at development
11 pressure. I do think -- and I get the sense
12 that the City and the Council are looking at
13 intensifying the means of making development in
14 the city more sustainable in the long-term
15 asset management because that trunk line is an
16 example. That is because we're growing. But
17 that density we're seeing in more areas, that's
18 also helping to offset huge growth and taxes
19 because our current densities and -- and I'm
20 saying that again as a -- we all have a little
21 [indiscernible] in us. Not my back yard. I
22 wouldn't be unhappy if those houses decided to
23 stay because, you know, visual and this. So
24 I'm saying this sincerely. The City is
25 grappling, and as many municipalities are, with
26 the cost of infrastructure in sustaining the
27 city. So that -- I would say not as

1 precedents, but that is something that's, you
2 know, a broader psyche of a lot of
3 municipalities right now. That would probably
4 -- Council would consider it in line with the
5 Capital Region Land Use Plan.

6 MS. MITCHELL: And we have to speak to
7 that in the agenda report, but I'd like to be
8 fair in the report and give everything that has
9 gone on about a project because at Council,
10 they need the information to make the decision.
11 So I'm going to say this is what happened, this
12 many people came out, these were their
13 concerns. And, you know, if the Capital Region
14 Board says this, these are the types of
15 densities being achieved. But, again, I'm also
16 going to be honest and say, Well, the rest of
17 us don't like it because of this. And Council
18 -- they have a very hard job because now they
19 have to decide, what do we do, you know? But
20 we're not there yet. We're just at the start,
21 okay? But, Colin, thank you for that because
22 that is a consideration that cities do have to
23 look at.

24 MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much,
25 Lenore. We're kind of at the five-minute
26 mark, so I would like to kind of wrap it up.

27 SPEAKER 39: Will the second meeting be

1 conducted by the City of St. Albert or by the
2 consultant?

3 MS. MITCHELL: The consultant -- it's all
4 their costs. This costs -- all the costs is
5 them. The City doesn't pay for these meetings.

6 SPEAKER 2: And, please, in the second
7 meeting, know your audience and have materials
8 appropriate. That would serve everyone a lot
9 better. Thank you.

10 MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you.

11 SPEAKER 39: I would just like to say
12 that I appreciate the City people and them
13 having a councillor here. I thought that was
14 good that you are represented here.

15 MS. MITCHELL: It's so important for us
16 because we're the ones -- you know, you can
17 phone us. Robin's got his card there. Robin's
18 going to be doing the file. I'm the senior
19 planner, so I'll be coaching him in the
20 background. So, make your calls to Robin and
21 then he'll walk down the hall and talk to me,
22 okay? Thank you for coming out.

23 MR. MACKENZIE: Thank you very much.

24

25 (PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 8:25 P.M.)

26

27

1 I, Jamee L. Cherniwchan, Court Reporter,
2 hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a complete
3 and accurate transcript of the proceedings taken down by
4 me in shorthand and transcribed to the best of my skill
5 and ability.

6 Dated at the City of Edmonton, in the
7 Province of Alberta, this 4th day of January, A.D. 2016.

8

9

10

11 J. L. Cherniwchan, CSR(A)
12 Court Reporter.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27