

- 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.

---

SNOW'S COURT REPORTING  
Edmonton, Alberta

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.

26                  This air photo shows a  
27                  little bit more detail of the subject parcels.

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 a 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 Altire 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?

6 MR. MACKENZIE: I can't speak to that at  
7 this point. We're not that far down the road.  
8 It wouldn't have to be for the building code  
9 because it's a four-storey walk-up, but it  
10 would depend again on those market conditions  
11 and what kind of a building we'd be looking to  
12 produce.

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 upkeep (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



1 area from its existing condition, both the park  
2 space and the private land, as well as the kind  
3 of monetary value from a land appraisal  
4 perspective, and then also what can be done  
5 with the space. So once we get through all of  
6 that analysis and discussion, it's really a  
7 negotiation with the City to determine what  
8 would actually be swapped. So these are  
9 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

1           tonight's meeting --

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