

- Public Presentation -

Proposed South Riel Area Structure Plan Amendment

Speakers:

Stephen Yu and Kaylyn Stark
Planners with Invistec Consulting

Taken at The Enjoy Centre, 101 Riel Drive, St. Albert,
Alberta, T8N 3X4 on the 13th day of February, A.D. 2018.

1 **(PRESENTATION COMMENCED AT 6:30 P.M.)**

2 MR. YU: Hello. Welcome. Thank you so
3 much for coming out tonight. It's great to see
4 so many people here, and welcome to the South
5 Riel Area Structure Plan and land use bylaw
6 amendment public meeting. Just a quick
7 run-through of what we'll be talking about
8 today. We'll do some introductions of the
9 project team. We'll go over some housekeeping
10 items, discuss the plan use framework, the
11 project background, the proposed South Riel
12 Area Structure Plan amendment, the land use
13 bylaw amendment, and summaries of both of these
14 amendments.

15 So just going back to the introductions.
16 My name is Stephen Yu. I'm a planner with
17 Invistec Consulting. I have Kaylyn Stark here,
18 also a planner from Invistec; We have Petrea
19 Chamney, project manager; We have Ken Liu in
20 the back there, who is president and engineer
21 of Invistec; And Rob Dollevoet, vice president
22 and engineer of Invistec; representing Averton,
23 we have David Chiu, also in the back there.
24 He's a senior project manager; I'm not sure of
25 your name. I'm sorry. And then from the City
26 of St. Albert we have -- from the planning
27 side, we have Kristina Peter, planning branch

1 manager; In the middle there, Lyndsay Francis,
2 planner, beside her; and Michelle Brooking. And
3 we also have Mary here, who is our court
4 reporter.

5 Okay. So housekeeping. So the
6 refreshments are located at the front. Feel
7 free to grab some anytime during this
8 presentation because it is a little bit long.
9 So if you get a little snack-ish, feel free.
10 Washrooms are located out that way to both
11 ends.

12 And just a quick breakdown to why we're
13 here today. Through the City of St. Albert,
14 the Area Structure Plan and land use bylaw
15 amendment process is about a 12-step process.
16 Last time we were here in the Enjoy Centre, we
17 were at stage 2, which was a public meeting on
18 February 13th, 2018. We're now at stage 8,
19 which is a public meeting with the Arrow there.
20 Since the meeting we held in February, we had
21 drafted technical reports and submitted those
22 to the City for review and circulation. They
23 provided their feedback. So with their
24 feedback and the feedback that we received on
25 the last open house, we were able to revise our
26 application and resubmit that to the City,
27 which is why we're having another public

1 meeting here today.

2 From there, the application began to be
3 reviewed and circulated. And with the feedback
4 we received from the City and from residents
5 today, we'll be revising our application again,
6 and go from there, which is a public hearing.
7 Then Council will be able to make a decision on
8 both these amendment applications.

9 And as you walked in today, you should
10 have received a feedback form. If you did not,
11 please feel free to grab one at the front
12 there. These forms are very valuable to us
13 because they provide your input to us formally,
14 and makes sure we understand what your
15 concerns, questions, comments are about what
16 we're proposing here today. So please feel
17 free to fill those out. You can either return
18 those tonight, or grab one of our business
19 cards up at the front and email them to us.
20 Send your comments, questions, concerns to us.

21 So moving to the planning framework. So
22 in February, we had -- we presented the South
23 Riel Area Structure Plan amendment. And today,
24 we're also talking about a land use bylaw
25 amendment. So we wanted to go over the
26 framework, discuss how these all fit together.
27 So in the planning framework, there's kind of

1 four major areas. So we have the Municipal
2 Development Plan at the top, which governs the
3 City as a whole. We have Area Structure Plans
4 that govern areas or neighbourhoods. And we
5 have the land use bylaw that provides
6 development regulations or rules as to how
7 these lands and development are built. From
8 there, we have your subdivision, your
9 development permits, and your building permits.
10 And these are -- and these are where the
11 details about where those are being located,
12 where the heights of those will be, what
13 they're going to look like, get them fleshed
14 out. So what we're here today for is the Area
15 Structure Plan and the land use bylaw road
16 districting phase.

17 Just going over a quick background of
18 the project history for the South Riel area.
19 So the Municipal Development Plan for St.
20 Albert was approved in 2007. The original
21 South Riel Area Structure Plan was also
22 approved in -- around 2007. Since then, the
23 lands have been redistricted. And as you know,
24 the commercial industrial areas are redeveloped
25 as we've seen in one of that -- once those
26 areas have been developed. After -- since
27 then, the residential areas have been sold

1 still. In -- And in 2015, the planning then
2 was done to change the current of -- to change
3 the original South Riel Area Structure Plan to
4 what it is today. However, there has not been
5 any amendments to the -- to the land use bylaw.
6 So there is a bit of a disconnect between the
7 Area Structure Plan and the land use bylaw,
8 where these plans do not align.

9 So that is one of the reasons why we're
10 here today. And the second reason is also
11 because Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board,
12 which governs growth in the Edmonton region,
13 including City of St. Albert, has updated its
14 growth plan, and has placed higher density
15 targets on municipalities in the Edmonton
16 region, including the City of St. Albert. And
17 one of the regulations that they also have, is
18 that they don't want density decreasing in
19 these municipalities. So that is something
20 that we had to incorporate in this Area
21 Structure Plan amendment.

22 MS. STARK: So now, I'm just going to get into the
23 South Riel Area Structure Plan as it is today,
24 and the proposed amendments.

25 There were go. So this is the existing
26 South Riel Area Structure Plan. As you can
27 see, it includes a mix of residential,

1 commercial industrial, and parkland. So
2 existing, there's 54 hectares of commercial
3 industrial land located to the south and west
4 of the Midtown site that we're talking about
5 today.

6 There's 6.24 hectares of storm water
7 management facility, and there's 3.07 hectares
8 of park space. So within the Midtown site that
9 we're talking about amendments, there's 9.9
10 hectares of residential land.

11 The Area Structure Plan proposes 81
12 dwelling units per hectare, which gets 792
13 units. So a breakdown of the land use is, the
14 orange is medium density residential, the brown
15 is medium-high density residential, and the
16 hash colouring in the south is mixed use.

17 So this is actually the proposed Area
18 Structure Plan amendment. It is very similar
19 to the existing, in that there is the same 54
20 hectares of commercial industrial land, the
21 same 6.24 storm water management facility, and
22 3.07 hectares of park space. Within the
23 Midtown site, there is actually a change in the
24 road alignment. That's the most significant
25 change. The road has been changed from a local
26 road, to a collector road. And the road has
27 been realigned to gain efficiency. So as a

1 result, we've gained residential land that's
2 developable. So develop the land from the 9.9
3 hectares to the 12 hectares you see on this
4 plan.

5 The density is remaining the same, 81
6 dwelling units per hectare. And that's
7 creating 904 dwelling units. So as I said, the
8 number of -- the amount of residential land has
9 increased, the density has stayed the same, but
10 the population has only increased slightly. So
11 we've split this Area Structure Plan into three
12 areas: Area A, in the brown; area B in the
13 yellowish colour; and then area C in the
14 orange. Area A and B are intended for medium
15 density residential, and area C is for mixed
16 use.

17 So I shouldn't have clicked through
18 both, but for C, the park is on the north side.
19 They are intended for connections and amenity
20 spaces. They provide connections the
21 surrounding communities, the Enjoy Centre, and
22 the regional trail system within St. Albert.

23 The park space adjacent to the Enjoy
24 Centre provides a green space for passive and
25 active recreation. The green spaces on the
26 south provide a west connection into the
27 community, and an opportunity for social

1 gathering within the mixed use area.

2 So now I'm getting into the similarities
3 and differences that I kind of already spoke
4 to. First, looking at the similarities. The
5 density is 81 dwelling units per hectare,
6 that's what's existing, and we're still
7 proposing the exact same, the reason being,
8 Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board. They do
9 not support Area Structure Planning Edmonton,
10 the decreased density. So our application has
11 to go forward at 81 dwelling units per hectare.
12 Second similarity, is the amount of park space.
13 The 3.07 hectares of park space is remaining
14 the same. The Midtown site is only
15 redistributing the park space between north and
16 south of the AltaLink to provide connections
17 and recreation opportunities.

18 And so then, getting into the
19 differences I spoke to. The road network has
20 changed from a local road to a collector road.
21 And the road alignment has changed
22 significantly. So the road alignment change
23 has resulted in the increase in residential
24 land. So that goes into the second difference.

25 The residential land has increased from
26 9.9 hectares to 12 hectares. So this has
27 resulted in an increase in population, even

1 though the density is remaining the same. And
2 the last difference is, as you can see, the
3 high -- medium-high density residential has
4 actually been removed from the plan. The 81
5 dwelling units per hectare is going to be
6 achieved through the medium-density residential
7 and the mixed use.

8 MR. YU: Okay. So next, we're going to be talking
9 about each area that Kaylyn just mentioned.
10 Each area was intended to have different
11 characteristics, which is why they're all A --
12 area B, and area C.

13 So focussing on area A first. It is the
14 areas that were north and south of the AltaLink
15 right-of-way, so the brown area right there.
16 It is entirely residential. And it is going to
17 consist of housing forms, including duplexes,
18 semi-attached, and town housing. It has the
19 maximum height of four storeys and is intended
20 to be the lowest density of the Midtown site.

21 And so examples of what that could look
22 like. Area B is located on the north side of
23 the site. It intended to be primarily
24 residential, but there is park space in there
25 as well, as Kaylyn just mentioned. It is
26 bounded by a road to the north and Riel Drive
27 to the west, and CN Rail to the east.

1 In terms of housing forms, we're looking
2 at -- similar like area A, we are looking at
3 duplexes and semi-attached, town housing.
4 However, it does also contemplate apartments.
5 We are looking at maximum heights of five
6 storeys in this area. So this would be at the
7 medium -- middle density of all three areas.

8 MS. STARK: So now looking at area C. Area C is
9 located along the Riel and south of the
10 AltaLink. It is also north of LeClair Way. It
11 includes a mix of residential and commercial
12 that is in standalone form and vertically
13 integrated. The intension is, the commercial
14 creates an urban village centre, where people
15 gather, access goods and services, and
16 employment opportunities. The buildings will
17 be street oriented, and will create pedestrian
18 oriented environments.

19 So the housing forms include the town
20 housing -- oh, my mouse is not working --
21 apartments, and then mixed use buildings. So
22 housing forms will range from four to 12
23 storeys. So this is a large range in order to
24 obtain the density that we spoke to, that we
25 have to achieve. So within the mixed use
26 buildings, there will be small scale commercial
27 uses on the ground floor, and the second and

1 third floor. And second floor -- second, third
2 floor will be more typically professional
3 offices, and the uses may include coffee shops,
4 restaurants, personal services, retail,
5 specialty shops, and et cetera.

6 MR. YU: So that wraps up the Area Structure
7 Plan amendment portion. We're going to be
8 doing a summary at the end. But when we next
9 move forward, we'll be talking about the
10 proposed land use bylaw amendment.

11 So as I mentioned at the beginning, the
12 current South Riel Area Structure Plan and the
13 current land use bylaw do not match, and that
14 is one of the reasons why we're here today. So
15 for the Midtown site, the current land use
16 bylaw has districted into a variety of
17 different districts, including the medium
18 density residential, which is the R-3 district.
19 Another medium density residential, which is an
20 R-3A district. The medium-high density
21 residential, which is the R-4 district, the
22 public services, which is the PS district, and
23 the public park district, which is the P
24 district. What we are proposing is to
25 redistrict all the residential land of the site
26 into the Midtown district, and a public parks
27 district.

1 So on the left is what is currently seen
2 in the land use bylaw, and what's on the right
3 is what we are proposing. So as you can see,
4 what's on the left does not match the map that
5 we have shown earlier for the Area Structure
6 Plan. And although Midtown district covers the
7 entire residential portion of the park spaces,
8 we did -- it is broken down into those
9 three-character areas that we had discussed
10 earlier. So area A has different regulations
11 than area B, versus area C. Because they had
12 different characters, they needed to be
13 developed differently.

14 Okay. It's a lot of information so I'm
15 going to break this down pretty -- hopefully
16 pretty easily, digestible. So we're going to
17 group area A and B together because they're a
18 little bit similar in terms of what kind of
19 things are allowed in each area.

20 So we're going to be talking about these
21 from uses that are permitted in the land use
22 bylaw, building heights, and density.

23 Starting with uses. So in the start
24 of -- the best way to read this is, if you see
25 a P, that means that use is permitted in that
26 district. If you see a D, it means it's
27 discretionary, which means that residents would

1 be notified if something -- if one of those
2 discretionary uses is being proposed, and I
3 guess, is proposed. And where there's a dash,
4 it means that it's not a use that is allowed in
5 that district. So we're comparing the Midtown
6 districts for areas A and area B, compared to
7 the current districts in that area. So we have
8 R-3, R-3A, and R-4. So that's your medium
9 density residential and your medium -- second
10 medium density residential district, and the
11 medium to high density residential district.

12 One caveat that we have to put onto
13 this, is for the R-4 district. It currently
14 allows commercial uses to be allowed in the R-4
15 district. We are not proposing any commercial
16 uses in areas A or B in the Midtown district.

17 So focussing on the permitted uses,
18 because there's a very limited amount of them
19 in all of these districts. In the R-3
20 district, the only permitted use is town
21 housing, everything else will be discretionary.
22 So that will be -- create a notification to
23 residents nearby, if something is being
24 proposed. And R-3 district, town housing and
25 apartments are permitted, while everything else
26 would be discretionary. And the R-4, town
27 housing and apartment once again, is permitted,

1 everything else is discretionary.

2 So for the Midtown district, for area A,
3 we are proposing town housing, semi-attached,
4 duplexes, group homes, public utility
5 buildings, and certain accessory buildings to
6 be permitted, while other things would be
7 discretionary. And for area B, we have the
8 same uses permitted, so town housing,
9 semi-attached, duplexes, group homes, public
10 utility buildings, and certain accessory
11 buildings.

12 The big difference here in terms of uses
13 between area A and B, is that area B allows
14 apartments discretionary, which means if an
15 apartment is proposed, you guys would be
16 notified if you lived within this landing area.
17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me. Okay. So this is
18 one that will --

19 MR. YU: Can you save your questions till the end,
20 please? Everything's happen -- there's a lot
21 of information and we want to focus everything.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: All right.

23 MR. YU: Thank you. Building heights. So building
24 heights, for types of use it ranges. So for
25 town housing, it ranges from 13 to 25 between
26 the R-3 to R-4 district. We are proposing 18
27 metres, at a max, for Midtown district for town

1 housing, for areas A and B. For apartments,
2 again, a range of 13 to 35. However, in the
3 R-4 district, there is a caveat there as well.
4 There is a max of 25 -- a 10-metre bonus,
5 depending on certain criteria being met. We
6 are only proposing 18 metres. So the duplexes
7 and semi-attached is allowed to go up to 13
8 metres in R-3, not in R-3A or R-4. We are
9 closing 15 metres in area A and area B.

10 However, another note on this is that,
11 although we have height maxes, we also have
12 storey maxes, as set out in the Area Structure
13 Plan. So that -- both these will work together
14 to restrict and provide additional guidelines
15 as to how those areas will develop.

16 In terms of density, we're looking at
17 ranges. So each district has a range per
18 density. So R-3 is 35 to 42, R-3 is 494, R-4
19 is 94 to 131. So for Midtown, for the area A
20 here, we're proposing a range of 40 to 54, and
21 for area B, 54 to 94. So these ranges kind of
22 fall within what is allowed in the R-3A
23 district.

24 MS. STARK: Okay. So I hope you digested the area A
25 and B. We're now going to move south into area
26 C. Area C, again, is mixed use. So it started
27 with permitted discretionary uses within the

1 residential area only. So within the mixed use
2 area currently, the R-3A district is permitted,
3 the public park district, and the public
4 services district. The R-3A district is a
5 residential district. The public services
6 district is a community service district.

7 So just focussing on the residential.
8 Within R-3A, apartment buildings, town housing
9 are the permitted uses. Within the Midtown
10 district, we are also proposing apartment
11 buildings and town housing as permitted. Then,
12 you have supportive housing, long-term care,
13 mixed use buildings, public utility buildings,
14 all as permitted use. And this is due to it
15 being mixed use, rather than purely
16 residential.

17 So just as a disclaimer, because there
18 is no commercial uses existing in districts,
19 we'd like to show you a comparison with an
20 existing district within the City of St. Albert
21 that may not actually be on the Midtown site,
22 but it kind of is a good comparison. So the
23 mixed use commercial district is an existing
24 district that has commercial uses similar to
25 the Midtown district. As you can see, most of
26 the use that are permitted, are discretionary
27 within the mixed use commercial, are also

1 permitted or discretionary within Midtown. The
2 main difference is here at the bottom. There
3 are about eight that are different. I'll just
4 list them off for you. They're the community
5 amenity area, grocery store, plaza, public
6 market, amusement parkade, animal service,
7 broadcasting studio, and religious assembly
8 that are either permitted or discretionary
9 within the Midtown district, that are not
10 currently listed within the mixed use
11 commercial district.

12 So moving on to building height. The
13 existing district supports up to 15 metres.
14 And the Midtown district is proposing 18 metres
15 for town housing, and up to 35 meters for
16 apartment buildings. Again, disclaimer, 25
17 meters is actually the permitted height. If
18 the height is any higher than 25 meters, we
19 only have a 10-metre height bonus, and the
20 development would be required to meet some
21 additional treatments.

22 So I'll list off the additional
23 treatments that the development officer would
24 review: Superior or innovative building style;
25 high quality exterior finishings; terracing of
26 upper storeys; green building products; or
27 high-quality landscaping.

1 So like the existing R-4 direct, in the
2 north, the same height regulation would apply,
3 25 metres, and the additional ten meters would
4 be a discretionary -- at the development
5 officer. And they would review, and would be
6 applied at that development.

7 And then, moving into density, the
8 existing district permits 40 to 94 dwelling
9 units per hectare. And Midtown proposes 120 to
10 174. So the density, again, is more similar to
11 the R-4 district that is existing in the
12 northern area of this section.

13 The R-4 permits 94 to 141. So that's
14 more close to Midtown. But -- so I know that
15 densities don't mean a lot to most people, so I
16 just wanted to give some examples. So the 120
17 to 174. The minimum of 120 dwelling units per
18 hectare, this could be in many different
19 configurations.

20 So a one character site could be
21 seven -- 70 three-storey town housing units on
22 one five-storey apartment building. And then a
23 different configuration could be two buildings
24 that are apartment buildings, that are five
25 storeys. Again, looking at the maximum, 174.
26 This would be two 9-storey apartment buildings
27 with commercial uses on the ground floor. So

1 this would be retail on the ground floor,
2 professional offices on the second and third,
3 and then nine stories of residential above.
4 This would give the 12 storeys a bit of height
5 that the Area Structure Plan allows, and it
6 allows us to achieve the density that the
7 EMR -- Edmonton Metropolitan Board requires.

8 So I know we went through a lot of
9 numbers tonight, and I know you guys have a lot
10 of questions. So I'm just going to summarize
11 everything.

12 So first of all, the Area Structure
13 Plan. The existing Area Structure Plan and
14 land use bylaw did not align. So something has
15 to be amended. Either the Area Structure Plan
16 does, or the land use bylaw does, or both of
17 them do.

18 Next, the road amendments perform --
19 improve efficiency. The role item has changed,
20 the road has changed from a local to a
21 collector, and we've gained residential land
22 from 9.9 to 12 hectares.

23 The density is 81 dwelling units per
24 hectare. That is a required by Edmonton
25 Metropolitan Board, and we are very limited to
26 be able to change that because they do not
27 support decreases in density. And the same

1 park space is being dedicated. The 3.07
2 hectares that was originally approved in the
3 existing south Riel Area Structure Plan, is
4 remaining the same. It's only being
5 redistributed between the north and south of
6 the AltaLink.

7 And then, the next is the land use
8 bylaw. Same point that we want to drive home,
9 is that the land use bylaw and the Area
10 Structure Plan currently do not align. We have
11 to do something before any development on this
12 land can occur. So applications do have to
13 happen. As we both described earlier, it is
14 similar in permitted structural uses with the
15 existing districts. And area A and B heights
16 are similar to the district R-3A. And area C
17 is similar to the heights proposed in the R-4
18 district. The density ranges do provide
19 flexibility to achieve these ASP density
20 targets.

21 So just because it's a large range,
22 doesn't mean we're going to hit the maximum
23 because we are only allowed 81 dwelling units
24 per hectare. So the maximum will not be on
25 every site. And lastly, the Midtown district
26 provides an opportunity for unique urban
27 lifestyles and housing choices for residents at

1 all stages in life. This can't be achieved
2 with the current land use bylaw. It doesn't
3 align with the current vision of the land use
4 bylaw. So housing choices will range within
5 this development, whether it be for first-time
6 home buyers, to seniors' residence, which will
7 create a complete Midtown community.

8 So I'd like to thank everybody for
9 joining us tonight. I like that everyone is
10 active in their community. I appreciate if you
11 have any questions, we'd be happy to answer
12 them. My team is also here, and they are able
13 to answer, so ... Yes?

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What is the EMR mean? When
15 did it come into being? Why is St. Albert a
16 part of it?

17 MR. YU: The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board
18 is the new name for the Capitol Region Board.
19 So that was put into place by the Government of
20 Alberta in 2013, I believe, or 2010, something
21 like that. It was put into place to regulate
22 how growth happens in the region, so that the
23 Edmonton region can compete competitively in
24 the international market as a region instead of
25 Spruce Grove, and St. Albert, and Edmonton, and
26 Beaumont, and Fort Saskatchewan, and Leduc all
27 competing against each other in the

1 international market.

2 So the point of it, of the Edmonton
3 Metropolitan Region Board is for the region to
4 work together collaboratively to be competitive
5 in the international market.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So how far and wide does it
7 extend?

8 MR. YU: It goes from Sturgeon
9 County to Parkland County, Leduc County, and
10 Strathcona County, and all these piles in
11 between.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And so does that also
13 include roads?

14 MR. YU: The ones that are owned by
15 the municipality, not Provincial roads. But
16 Provincial roads are complicated as to how they
17 work with the Government of Alberta. So there
18 is compensations there because the Edmonton
19 Metropolitan Region Board is a board that's
20 created by the government. So they're an arm
21 of it, per se. So ... and I know there was a
22 question. Sorry. Does that answer your
23 question?

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh, no. I was just kind of
25 wondering about the area B, if you can bring
26 that back up on the screen there.

27 MS. STARK: Yeah. M'mm-hmm.

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah. So right in the
2 northeast corner there, you've got the P for
3 the parkland, and then you've got the R-3 area.
4 So that's just part of the proposed amendment,
5 or what?

6 MS. STARK: So area B is going to be
7 this yellow colour.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah. That's it.

9 MS. STARK: The P -- the R-3 and R-3A
10 are the existing districts.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Correct.

12 MS. STARK: So those are the existing
13 lines. The Midtown district will cover the
14 entire area, but the regulations within the
15 Midtown district will only apply to certain
16 areas.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. So the northeast to
18 the east corner on that, right at the P --

19 MS. STARK: Yeah.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- is that what's going to
21 be there? Is that basically going to be public
22 park space?

23 MS. STARK: So the public park space is
24 the green on the map.

25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Right.

26 MS. STARK: Sorry. So if this park
27 space has approval of this Area Structure Plan,

1 it will be dedicated park space.

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What does that mean,
3 though, exactly? Is this grass? Would it be
4 benches, trees? Is there going to be anything
5 to do there?

6 MS. STARK: So park spaces will be
7 under the authority of the City of St. Albert.
8 And they will be working on the design with
9 conversation with Averton. So that's to be
10 determined what will be in those park spaces,
11 but the intention of this one in specific, is
12 to provide that lane or connection through the
13 community.

14 MR. YU: And park spaces are
15 generally landscaped.

16 MS. STARK: Yeah.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Will you get some parkland
18 around there, some trees? Will you make it
19 look a little bit more, you know, as -- how --
20 looking to see what you guys have, you know, if
21 you make it water, you know, put more stuff
22 around there? You guys have anything to do
23 with that?

24 MS. CHAMNEY: We do have a landscape
25 architect that has been retained by Averton,
26 and they are looking to incorporate something
27 in to make it cohesive to the neighbourhood, so

1 the residential flows into the park spaces.
2 Currently, we're working through St. Albert to
3 come up with a plan that functions for what the
4 municipality wants and needs, in addition to
5 what the development would like to provide for
6 the neighbourhood.

7 MR. DOLLEVOET: And they will have to
8 comply to the City of St. Albert standards.
9 There are standards for landscaping, and
10 that's -- you have to meet those minimums.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So is Averton the sole
12 developer of the entire area?

13 MR. YU: Of the area that we are amending, they
14 own the land, yes, everything that is west of
15 Reil Drive and south of LeClair.

16 MS. CHAMNEY: East of Riel Drive and
17 north of LeClair.

18 MR. YU: Oh, I'm saying that they
19 don't.

20 MS. CHAMNEY: Oh it is. Okay.

21 MR. YU: Yeah. So everything that's
22 in colour here, is what they do.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is what?

24 MR. YU: Is what they -- what
25 Averton owns, as well.

26 AUDIENCE MEMBER: This is not a good room for
27 public speaking.

1 MR. YU: Sorry.

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's reverberating.

3 MR. YU: M'mm-hmm.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. And so Averton is

5 the sole developer of the ...

6 MR. YU: Residential portion, yes.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay.

8 MR. YU: Yeah.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Question. So what I'm

10 hearing is that area C --

11 MS. STARK: Yes.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- which is where we live,

13 right on the train tracks on the other side, is

14 going to be apartment buildings and condos. So

15 we're going to have big buildings right behind

16 us now?

17 MS. STARK: So area C is intended to

18 put town housing and apartment buildings.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah.

20 MS. STARK: So there will be a variety

21 of those. And it will be a range of four to 12

22 storeys.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We were, you know, we were

24 told --

25 MS. STARK: M'mm-hmm.

26 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- back -- that our, you

27 know, that would be -- that would not happen.

1 That we would not have big towering buildings
2 right behind us. And now everything has
3 changed.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And now we are.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Our property values go
6 down, because there's this --

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We were told five.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think pretty well all of
9 us are here because we live in the area east of
10 the tracks, right?

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Right. Yeah.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Most of us. Yeah.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Most of us are here -- so I
14 think what's -- what's happening is that a
15 bunch of us have been at the previous meetings.
16 We've had lots of meetings with Averton.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: They have to come to our
18 home.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: They've come to our home
20 personally. We've had all sorts of
21 conversations about qualify of lifestyle that
22 they're trying to represent in this -- in this
23 area.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And keep for us.

25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Right. And -- and all of
26 us are, I'm sure, freaking out that these
27 amendments are going to allow the possibility,

1 not the surety, but the possibility of giant,
2 four-storey battleship sized condo units.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: 12 storey.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Or 12 storey apartment
5 buildings right behind us, right? And I think,
6 you know, I'm just going to lay it out. We're
7 freaking out.

8 MS. STARK: Yeah. So I understand your
9 concern. There is some things that are going
10 to help buffer that height. So first of all,
11 we have the rail. We have to build a berm. So
12 there is going to be that decision, which I
13 know the engines would know the exact number.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You see --

15 MS. STARK: Yeah.

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- that doesn't matter.

17 MS. STARK: Right. And then --

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Having the height of a berm
19 blocking our -- part of our view of a 12-storey
20 apartment block doesn't matter.

21 MS. STARK: And then, in addition to
22 that, the road -- the building design is
23 intended to be street or oriented, so the
24 buildings are going to be fronting the
25 street --

26 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That still doesn't solve
27 what we're trying to say.

1 MS. STARK: Yeah.

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You know, so it's set back
3 30 feet or 40 or 50 feet, I mean, it doesn't
4 matter because there's still a giant concrete
5 box sitting right above our houses.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's the height. It's the
7 first time I've been told 12 storeys ever
8 before, and I've been to all the meetings.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We were told 5 storeys at
10 maximum.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah. And if we look over
12 at this property over here, it's six storeys.
13 And I'm not, you know, it's not unreasonable.
14 And now, you're talking about buildings twice
15 as high. It's another 25 feet higher up the
16 street, because the elevation changes here.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So I mean, whatever you do,
19 we are going to see it. There is -- no matter
20 what you do. I mean, we're already seeing the
21 apartments that are being built right next to
22 the -- We are already seeing those plain as
23 day.

24 MS. STARK: M'mm-hmm.

25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. And of course, if it
26 was far enough away and it looked good once
27 it's finished. Hopefully it's not going to

1 look like --

2 MS. STARK: Yeah.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- just some ugly thing.

4 And so you say, Okay, well, you know, that's
5 reality. But now --

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's in our backyard.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- it's literally right
8 there.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And I mean, I understand.
10 It's -- the area has to be developed. It's
11 going to be developed. And the people that,
12 when they developed our area, other people were
13 probably saying, Oh, why are they putting
14 houses there? So I totally get that, you
15 know --

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You know --

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- or you get blank field.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- like, it's just killing
19 me. And I'm -- this is just a layman's
20 observation, right?

21 MS. STARK: M'mm-hmm. Yeah.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm sure there's all sorts
23 of engineering issues and all sorts of stuff.
24 But you've got an unusable triangle of land
25 directly south, the southernmost part across
26 the tracks where there's no housing, right?
27 There's absolutely no housing. So you'd think,

1 Well, if you're going to put a massive
2 apartment block, at least put it there because
3 nobody else will have to deal with it, right?
4 Or, if you're going to put a giant building,
5 why would you put it anywhere along the railway
6 tracks and disrupt anybody's sight lines. Why
7 not put it to the northwest, where on the other
8 side, it's an industrial area --

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's right.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- and I don't understand
11 it.

12 MS. CHEMNEY: Where is this triangle of
13 land you're referring to?

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, it's when you come
15 down towards the church on Hill Avenue, there's
16 that kind of little chunk of land that's ...

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So it's east?

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah. East of the railroad
19 tracks.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And you know -- you know,
21 right now, today, the existing area I realize
22 is 20 years old, but there's no building
23 greater than three storeys, maybe two, I'm not
24 sure, within a 40-block radius. The closest is
25 downtown, you know? And so you're changing the
26 complete dynamic of Heritage Lakes and
27 everywhere north. You're changing the complete

1 dynamic.

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And we have no control.

3 MR. LIU: I obviously -- I didn't go
4 to your house and met with both. I didn't know
5 exactly what your concerns about. One thing I
6 want to point out, this portion, a range of
7 density has met medium to high density. So
8 original one, like, way back ten years ago, it
9 is said the medium to high density.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So what does that mean?
11 What are you telling me?

12 MR. LIU: What I'm trying to say is,
13 we didn't try to -- try to change the
14 significant of the original intent of the
15 space. The original intent of investing in
16 this area is medium to high density. But to go
17 back to your points, I didn't -- obviously, I
18 went to your house. I didn't know exactly your
19 concerns. We did relay the message very well
20 to the developer. It's not that we didn't hear
21 your voice. This is general guidelines, right?
22 General guideline is five to 12. It doesn't
23 mean we're going to get the 12.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: But it doesn't mean you're
25 not.

26 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Right.

27 MR. LIU: Yeah, that is correct.

1 That's -- you know, that's the zoning bylaw.
2 You cannot say you're going to build five or
3 six; we don't know.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You know what? As a
5 minimum, I'd like to see something in place
6 that says if anybody proposed to build anything
7 over five storeys, that there's a public
8 hearing, and before the building the permit is
9 approved.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah. And -- and quite
11 honestly, a lot of times, public hearings are
12 basically forums to say, This is what we're
13 going to do to you. It's not about what do you
14 think about this and giving us a certain amount
15 of power over what's going to happen to our
16 neighbourhood. You know, I'm sorry if I'm
17 coming across quite bitter and angry, but the
18 reality is, all of these meetings, they just
19 seem like you're saying, Well, this is what
20 we're going to do to you, and we're obligated
21 by law to tell you what we're going to do to
22 you.

23 MS. STARK: Yeah.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: But we have no real say in
25 it.

26 MR. LIU: You do. You do have real
27 say. It's not that -- again, today is not just

1 a consultant and developer, right? We have the
2 City of St. Albert representatives down here
3 too. They have their regulator. Whatever your
4 voice, you're heard. It's not that you'll be
5 lost. We have a court reporter. We'll send
6 the report in detailing -- detailing what you
7 said. We have to, like I said, you're voice
8 for sure is heard. So that's why I went to
9 your house because I want to know the exact
10 concern you guys have.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And we appreciated it. It
12 was -- we were very surprised and grateful that
13 you did that.

14 MR. LIU: We don't want this to be
15 here and tell you what's happening. We do want
16 to hear the concerns. And we did talk to the
17 developer. We talked about it, the
18 architecture format, right? We talked about
19 the landscaping.

20 I also did mention, you remember, we
21 talked about the angle. We will do our best.
22 The development plan -- I always look at both
23 sides, right? I do look at it from residential
24 side; I also look at it from the developer's
25 side. Because in the regional, they have a
26 density target. We need to achieve that
27 density target, right? If we don't achieve,

1 this area has no meaning. Beside this area
2 we're talking about behind your house, again,
3 it's medium to high density, right? But we
4 didn't say, Hey, suddenly we're like, creating
5 this high density zone. I heard a concern,
6 what happens when the high density moves to
7 here, right? I don't know. Like, I cannot
8 give you that answer. Because obviously, that
9 would have happened ten years ago, maybe. So at
10 that time, I don't know, maybe City people can
11 shed some light. Because this -- obviously,
12 this density had to be set.

13 So what we are doing right now, is, as I
14 explained to the public, the big change we are
15 doing is the road. Because we didn't think the
16 road was laid out properly, right. So we
17 changed the road shape, make sure the
18 transportation is much more efficient, and we
19 also make sure the land is better used.

20 So I do hear your concern. And the
21 density, I know, this is not my first public
22 meeting. I obviously go to these very often.
23 We do understand the residents have a concern
24 about heights, and we related this very well to
25 the developer. So ...

26 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay.

27 MS. STARK: There was a question way at

1 the back.

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't have a question,
3 I'm just clarifying because you talked about
4 the Edmonton requirement and I think that the
5 way it works anywhere in the region right now
6 would have to meet the new density target. So
7 it's kind of that regardless of where you are
8 in the region, everybody has to operate under
9 the rules. I was wondering if that had an
10 effect on how you guys are developing it right
11 now.

12 MS. STARK: Yeah. So one of the things
13 we were really tied to was 81 dwelling units
14 per hectare. That is what existingly [sic] is
15 approved. We cannot decrease that. Edmonton
16 Metropolitan Board does not accept any Area
17 Structure Plan amendment that decreases
18 density. So 81 was the number we had to stick
19 to, and as a result, these height ranges and
20 information on housing forms, aligns with that
21 81 dwelling units per hectare, which the City
22 of St. Albert does not have control of. It is
23 governed by the Edmonton Metropolitan Board, as
24 we previously spoke to, is a provincial
25 authority.

26 AUDIENCE MEMBER: At your first meeting
27 there just a while ago --

1 MS. STARK: Yeah.

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- you guys had 700, I
3 guess, dwellings; now it's 900.

4 MS. STARK: So the reason for that is
5 the Edmonton Metropolitan Board -- Region
6 Board, would not accept the decrease in
7 density. If I recall correctly, the meeting
8 that we had in February was 60-something
9 dwelling units per hectare -- 66 --

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Why is that? Why would
11 they, you know, why would they say no?

12 MS. STARK: The reason being is that
13 their growth plan guidelines do not allow
14 decreases in density.

15 MR. YU: It's to improve the
16 efficiency of land so that we're not removing
17 valuable agricultural land for land
18 development. That's the main reason -- one of
19 the main reasons for the growth plan, is to
20 preserve as much agricultural land that we have
21 in this region because it's one of the assets
22 of the Edmonton region. And it's better to
23 develop more dense neighbourhoods so that we
24 aren't stripping away land that could be
25 farmed, for land development.

26 AUDIENCE MEMBER: A range of 5 to 12 storeys,
27 to me, seems to be really, really large. Is --

1 what has to happen in order that the maximum
2 number of storeys in any one building in our
3 area, is no more than five storeys? Why can't
4 you -- why can't you be more specific when you
5 identify how -- how tall these buildings are
6 going -- that they could potentially be?

7 MS. STARK: So that goes with the site
8 design that Stephen was speaking to. That's
9 going to happen in the subdivision and
10 development permit phase. We are -- and at the
11 Area Structure Plan and in districting phase.
12 So the actual site design has not happened. So
13 we can't tell you where each apartment building
14 is to be located, and we have brought ideas,
15 but at this point, the site design hasn't
16 happened. So that will be a future stage that
17 we'll delineate where the four to 12 storeys
18 happens.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Does it stand to reason --

20 MS. STARK: I think there's a response
21 also that Kristina has for you.

22 MS. PETER: I just want to -- I'm with the City
23 of St. Albert. Just to provide some
24 clarification, this is a proposal that the
25 developer is providing. And thank you for your
26 input because this will go into the report that
27 Council will consider when we bring this

1 amendment forward. But to your specific
2 question about density and 5 to 12 storeys, or
3 sorry, 4 to 12 storeys, what the developer is
4 trying to do is to make the density to work
5 within the parcel. So we would like to have --
6 or the company would like to have a range of
7 different housing products, which include
8 semi-detached housing or duplex houses, we
9 commonly call it, all the way up to apartments.
10 And in order to facilitate having duplex or
11 town housing, that's a lower density product.
12 They will need to have -- the more duplex
13 housing we have, the more apartments the higher
14 stories they're going to have. And we don't
15 know at this stage, as Ms. Stark has discussed,
16 but we don't have the actual development
17 proposal in hand. But that is why the range is
18 there.

19 And if they develop a lot more
20 townhouses or a semi-detached housing product,
21 we will have probably more 12 stories.
22 Otherwise, it may be a blanket of all three --
23 well, it will probably be more like four
24 storeys.

25 So that's where the -- the land
26 developer is trying to balance that mixture of
27 housing units, trying to make it into a

1 community that they think people will want to
2 move into. But that's the general rationale
3 for why they're asking for up to 12 storeys.
4 But if -- all of this input goes towards a
5 Council decision.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We have the developer here?
7 Where is the developer?

8 MS. STARK: So that is David Chiu --

9 MR. CHIU: So a couple of things I
10 want to point to. What we have on my left is
11 the current ASP and we have on the right is the
12 proposed. As you can see at the south end, the
13 zoning is already there, like what Ken drew
14 previously. Medium to high -- or sorry.
15 Medium -- medium density is toward the south.
16 The zoning is already in place. Down here,
17 this is the spot. What we're doing, is
18 redistricting this area. And it's still the
19 same zone, actually, right? It's still --

20 MS. STARK: It's still mixed use.

21 MR. CHIU: Mixed use.

22 MS. STARK: Medium-high.

23 MR. CHIU: Same density. So we're not
24 really changing, per se, in terms of the 12
25 storey issue. That's all in respect of our
26 development on site. So lastly, like you
27 mentioned, it went from 600 or 700 units to

1 900. That's a reflection of the site
2 development, right? So because we've got more
3 land, and because we have to hit that 81 per
4 unit hectare target [sic], you got to cram more
5 units in. So if you develop any real
6 development, you've got 45 hectares involved.
7 We're going to have literally 2,000 units in
8 there, right? So how do you get 2,000 units in
9 there? Build a high-rise, right? So
10 strategically, if we plan this correctly,
11 location of parks, location of roads,
12 everything is integrated, everything works
13 well, we might not even see a 12 storey at all,
14 right?

15 So it all comes down to the design,
16 which we're trying hard to work with the City
17 to get this bylaw worked out. Okay. Right
18 now, like now, like, Kaylyn is saying, the two
19 ASP might be built together. We're trying to
20 mesh these together, come up with something
21 that's workable for everybody, right?

22 So two points. Existing shows medium
23 density. We're still keeping the same density,
24 we're not changing anything. The height
25 restriction of the site, the 12-storey height
26 issue, it all comes down to design. You will
27 have a say when we come to development permits.

1 We'll go to the City. I'm sure we'll all be on
2 our toes. And Ken said we'll come visit you
3 any time you want.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Every time we have a
5 meeting, there's always changes, always
6 changes, always changes. That's what we're
7 trying to say. We don't want the change.

8 MS. STARK: There was something in the
9 middle there, previously.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What is it that's driving
11 the higher density stuff to the southeast of
12 the corner as opposed to the north -- the
13 northwestern portion of that area? Like, that
14 would be -- the higher density stuff there
15 would be least impact on the existing residents
16 along the north side and Riel.

17 MR. YU: So my understanding is that
18 what's driving density in this area is the
19 types of roads that are here. So on LeClair
20 Way is -- it's intended to be a flyover as to
21 how it should be expanded to --

22 MS. CHAMNEY: It's a major arterial.

23 MR. YU: It's a major arterial,
24 basically. Once extended, it can handle the
25 volume of traffic better than Riel Drive can.

26 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm just wondering about
27 the stores and all of that commercial stuff

1 that's going in. We had heard, and I hope it's
2 still true, that there's not any of the big box
3 stores.

4 MS. STARK: That is still accurate.
5 The building are going to street oriented.
6 Yeah, street oriented. It's going to be more
7 small-scale commercial that is actually going
8 in the Area Structure Plan text. It will be
9 retail, specialty shops, small coffee shops.
10 If there is a grocery store, it will be more
11 street oriented.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is that what you're hoping
13 for, or that's what already you know?

14 MS. STARK: That's the intention.

15 MR. LIU: That's the planning.

16 MS. STARK: Yes. And --

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: But you don't know. You're
18 hoping?

19 MR. YU: However, we're working with
20 the City on Midtown district, and one of the
21 things that we're looking to put in is an urban
22 design review to help ensure that all these
23 visions are being maintained at the development
24 stage.

25 MS. CHAMNEY: The mixed use zoning part
26 of bylaw doesn't allow for a big box store.
27 Like it's not going to be a Superstore or a

1 Walmart.

2 MR. YU: It's a different --

3 MS. STARK: Yeah. It's a whole
4 different -- it'll be commercial on the bottom
5 with residential on the top.

6 MS. CHAMNEY: I'll tell you right now,
7 that roadway is not going to take an Ikea.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Mostly small stuff. Okay.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What arrangement or
10 accommodation has there been for parking?
11 Because these days, every household has at
12 least two cars.

13 MS. STARK: So we're actually in
14 discussions with the City of St. Albert
15 currently with the parking requirements. There
16 will be specific parking requirements for the
17 Midtown district. They will be very similar to
18 the City of St. Albert standard, which is one
19 per -- one parking stall per -- no, two parking
20 stalls per dwelling unit, I'm mixing up my
21 numbers. Or one-and-a-half parking stalls per
22 dwelling unit. We're still working out what
23 number we're going to stick with, and then
24 there will also be visitor parking. And then,
25 in addition to that, along this interior
26 stretch of road, there will be on-street
27 parking.

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Parking is going to take up
2 a lot of space as well.

3 MS. STARK: Yes.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Which is going to add to
5 the necessity of building high in order to meet
6 this --

7 MS. STARK: And --

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- 81 units high.

9 MR. YU: And there is opportunity as
10 well to underground parking as well. So there
11 is a mix of all these different forms of
12 parking to accommodate the parking needs of the
13 site.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: How do you park in half a
15 stall?

16 MS. STARK: Pardon?

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: How do you park in half a
18 stall?

19 MS. STARK: It would be dedicated to
20 the dwelling unit, but it's for an overall
21 condo site in the order to calculate parking.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. I guess ...

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Get smart cars.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It needs a really small
25 car.

26 AUDIENCE MEMBER: A smart car, that's it.
27 Pickups don't even fit on driveways anymore.

1 They all overhang the municipal sidewalks.

2 MS. CHAMNEY: Yeah. Well, I'd like to
3 point out, it's very challenging for any
4 municipality to design their roads and their
5 parking stalls to account for a Ford Super
6 Duty. That would be reckless of us because
7 nobody wants to pay for the additional roadway
8 paving and all that sort of stuff. So we do
9 have average vehicles that they use to size it.

10 My husband also drives a giant red neck
11 truck, and it's hard to park and stuff, but
12 people usually generalize or learn to
13 accommodate themselves with existing parking
14 stalls.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I can name one area right
16 now that I don't know the name of the complex,
17 but it's at Gate Avenue and Grandin Road, right
18 there on the southwest corner. And every car
19 overhangs the road.

20 MS. CHAMNEY: That's -- to me, that's a
21 bylaw issue.

22 MR. YU: And the City of St. Albert
23 does have parking stall requirements. So
24 obviously, from all the parking stalls on the
25 Midtown site will have to meet those
26 requirements as set out in the latest bylaw.

27 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I was talking to Ken. Now,

1 you got to know how tall it is going to be.
2 And now, you're also telling me there's going
3 to be a fence on there. Is it going to be a
4 chain link, is it going to be a wall, or do you
5 kind of know what's going to go up there?

6 MS. CHAMNEY: So we're currently working
7 with the rail company to determine the actual
8 height of the embarkment. We believe that the
9 minimum requirement is going to be a single
10 metre, with a fence over top, or --

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And by fence, do you mean a
12 chain link, or a wall? Is it for sound, or --

13 MR. DOLLEVOET: That gets put out through
14 discussion. We're way -- we're not there yet.

15 MS. STARK: Yeah.

16 MR. DOLLEVOET: But in typical parts of
17 St. Albert and other municipalities, CN asked
18 for tips.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You can see through it,
20 that's good.

21 MS. CHAMNEY: Yeah. And also, the only
22 thing, everybody has asked about the berm.
23 Is -- there's going to be -- there's going to
24 be landscape requirements for that berm. It's
25 not just going to be a pile. I know right now
26 it's a pile of dirt, but that pile of dirt will
27 not look like that pile of dirt all the way

1 through.

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: How long did you say that
3 berm was? I didn't catch that.

4 MS. CHAMNEY: Sorry. Right now, we
5 anticipate a minimum of one metre, and then it
6 will go up from there.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So you think it could be
8 higher?

9 MS. CHAMNEY: Yeah. It's -- it may be
10 higher, depending on what the rail company
11 comes down with.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. I have to talk to
13 them too then.

14 MS. STARK: So if that -- if that is
15 everybody's questions, we'll be around here
16 tonight. So thank you for attending, and any
17 specific questions, we can help you out
18 afterwards.

19 MR. LIU: Just want to get one more
20 thing. I want to emphasize your voice is not
21 lost. That one, I can guarantee you on that.
22 Like I said, we have a court reporter. We do
23 know some of you. And we try to accommodate.
24 That's the part that, like I said, we heard the
25 specific concerns, we heard general concerns.
26 We took that, we talked to the developer. We
27 try our best to accommodate. It's a balance.

1 Our vision is beautiful, right? It's a
2 balance between our development and the
3 neighbourhood. We want to maintain the
4 character. We want to maintain the intentional
5 planning, and we also want to make sure the
6 neighbours in the area, generally, your
7 lifestyle doesn't change, right? So we know
8 that.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I just think we don't -- I
10 just think we don't care what you do, but we
11 want nothing high. I mean, that's what we're
12 trying to say here. And you can put roads and
13 this and that. We just don't want anything
14 high because we have a great view. That's why
15 I moved here. That's why I moved here, you
16 know? So --

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's going to be like
18 living in a fish bowl.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can these charts be emailed
20 out.

21 MS. STARK: Yeah, I could email out the
22 open house boards if you leave your email
23 address at the front, that's not a problem. Or
24 if you emailed in your feedback form, my email
25 address is on there. I can give you some
26 digital information.

27 MR. YU: And there's another

1 question here.

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You know, I'm with Cam, you
3 know? The observation and the cold hard
4 reality of this is, and I know you say the plan
5 has never changed, and that's okay. But I'm
6 stunned that the City would decide to put the
7 possibility of 5 and 12 storey apartments
8 blocks right next to our houses, when there are
9 other parts of the land that could
10 conceivably -- and I'm sorry, I don't buy the
11 road usage thing totally. I mean, I understand
12 what you're getting at with -- with, you know,
13 arterial, whatever.

14 But you know, the reality is, is there
15 is still a possibility, despite what everybody
16 would like to have happen, what the developer
17 would like to have happen. There's still the
18 possibility that we are going to find a
19 12-storey apartment block directly behind our
20 houses. That's disturbing.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And we are right on the
22 tracks. Like, our house is probably the
23 closest one. So ...

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You know, and we've been to
25 meetings before, where it's like, Oh, you know,
26 we'll try our best to do blah, blah, blah. And
27 it doesn't happen because it's about numbers,

1 it's about money, it's about all sorts of other
2 things that we have no control in the end over.
3 And that's what's so disturbing and making me
4 so angry, is the feeling of helplessness. So
5 there we go.

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And I think if the
7 developer, we understand --

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You know --

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- we understand --

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- the stalls --

11 MR. CHIU: Actually, we'd not prefer
12 to build a 12-storey because that's lots of
13 money, lots of time.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah. Okay.

15 MR. CHIU: This allows it, or we can
16 just build it, so that way, we can't. They're
17 making us feel -- Our preference is to keep it
18 as low as possible. That's the reason. That
19 could be achieved. We develop the north,
20 comeback to the south.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Like over here.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just based on -- based on
23 the numbers you have here, in your
24 developments, you should be -- If you would
25 have filled that entirety with three-storey
26 buildings, would you need that 81 hectare --

27 MR. LIU: We would have seen it.

1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You would have seen it?
2 Duplexes, townhouses, two-storey, would you
3 need that if you built the entire area?

4 MR. LIU: No.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No.

6 MS. PETREA: You couldn't -- I
7 actually -- just for clarification, I do not
8 think that you would be able to build the units
9 per hectare with just two-storey town housing.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Innovative field grounds.

11 MS. PETREA: We wouldn't have been --

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah. Yeah. That's --
13 yeah.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: In the original plan, you
15 said that we have to look to high density, at
16 best, five levels. Would you need that?

17 MR. YU: I would think so. Right
18 now, with the design, it shows that we can.
19 But again, if we're creating a larger green
20 space, we're using all the land.

21 MR. CHIU: Just to give you a small
22 taste of when we're finished with this project,
23 if you can imagine Griesbach, we're going to
24 develop this into an urban village. If you can
25 imagine Griesbach.

26 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah.

27 MR. CHIU: Exactly. It's going to be

1 like, five to ten times as good, if not better.
2 Believe it or not, this is going to be the
3 future.

4 MR. LIU: I want to clarify. So
5 you've established whether it's medium or high
6 density, right?

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, yeah. I was
8 told that from the very beginning.

9 MR. LIU: All the ones from medium to
10 high density. Right now, we don't have high
11 density. So right now, what we're proposing is
12 medium density. So that's what I'm trying to
13 point out, it has a medium to high density.

14 MS. STARK: A medium high density is
15 right here along the rail.

16 MS. CHAMNEY: And then up the north.

17 MS. STARK: And in this corner.

18 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So in one area, there on
19 the bottom there, there is nothing there. So
20 why couldn't you build there, 12 storeys there?
21 There's nothing in -- no housing, nothing. You
22 got building complaints from us if you build
23 that right there, the 12 storey.

24 MS. CHAMNEY: You're talking about the
25 space down in here?

26 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah. Well, no. No.
27 Yeah. There's no houses there. So why

1 couldn't you build that there?

2 MR. DOLLEVOET: We could.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Put a 14 storey there. And
4 nobody would complain because there's nothing
5 there.

6 MS. CHAMNEY: That's the area that we're
7 asking to build mixed use in.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, it also goes up to
9 where our houses are.

10 MR. LIU: That's exactly what I wish.
11 At the end of day, we will balance, right? So
12 it's -- it's a -- in this area, we do have,
13 like, a mixed use. We do have, like, a medium
14 use -- a mixed use to medium density as well.
15 And then, when we come to design, we do have to
16 balance, right? I would think that the
17 developer and I can --

18 MR. CHIU: We're not going to cluster
19 one block for the whole development. We're
20 going to spread things around. It's just not
21 feasible.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I know. But ...

23 MR. LIU: That's what I mean.

24 MR. CHIU: Selling is needed. We want
25 to sell.

26 MR. LIU: That's what I mean.

27 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You got to sell to us,

1 that's the problem. You're not selling us.
2 Because I totally disagree, you know?

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Have there been
4 considerations for the traffic, the increased
5 traffic in the area? I mean notwithstanding
6 how Ray Gibbon has been needing to be twinned
7 from the day it was built, what about Sir
8 Winston Churchill?

9 MS. STARK: So a traffic impact
10 assessment has been conducted as part of the
11 ASP amendment application. It considers the
12 traffic impacts of this development on the
13 surrounding roads. So that has all been taken
14 into account. It's being reviewed by the City
15 of St. Albert. And realizing that the roads
16 surrounding the site are intended to be
17 upgraded. Like LeClair Way, it's intended to
18 be upgraded. Like LeClair Way, it's intended
19 to be an arterial road. So the City of
20 St. Albert has the traffic impact analysis, and
21 upgrades will happen according to development.

22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: For people who live there,
23 ten years from now and everybody's, you know,
24 living, and their manicured lawns and
25 what-have-you, they're going to want to access
26 the City of St. Albert right where they live,
27 by going north on Riel --

1 MS. STARK: Yes.

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- leave Sir Winston
3 Churchill, and dispense that way. And 900
4 people, some of whom may not be drivers, but
5 whatever percentage of that would drive, will
6 have a pretty big impact on two lanes on
7 Winston Churchill Drive. And two lane
8 Levasseur Drive.

9 MS. CHAMNEY: Okay. So we have to look
10 at this more holistically. You're focussed on
11 just the development of Midtown specifically,
12 right? Is that -- there's a massive amount of
13 this happening within St. Albert itself,
14 expanding to the west on the other side of Ray
15 Gibbon. There are improvements that need to
16 happen within the transportation network, and
17 because there's always a transportation master
18 plan that has been considered.

19 I don't want to speak to what St. Albert
20 20-year road plan would be, but this traffic
21 has been incorporated in when this ASP was
22 originally done in 2007. These traffic
23 volumes, while we have added some density, have
24 been incorporated into the transportation
25 network. This traffic is theoretically
26 accounted for within the traffic network.

27 It's not practically, because it's not

1 there yet. And the roads surrounding it, like,
2 Ray Gibbons. Because let's face it, the
3 backups that are happening within LeClair
4 itself, are impacting all of the transportation
5 network, even going into the city, right? If
6 you have backups on LeClair, they affect your
7 upstream network, which affects everything.

8 So it is already part of the system,
9 you're just not able to see the benefit because
10 the roads aren't built. So you're right now
11 looking at half a road.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: But did you say that you
13 were planning on upgrading LeClair Way?

14 MS. STARK: Not this development. It's
15 part of the City's long-term plan. It's the
16 same as provincial --

17 MR. DOLLEVOET: So Nancy is going to be a
18 fly -- it was her long-term plan 20 years ago
19 to fly over the LeClair and Riel Drive.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Right.

21 MR. DOLLEVOET: And again, it's added two
22 more lanes to the west. Those drawings are
23 done. It was designed 15 years ago.

24 MS. CHAMNEY: And if I can make the
25 Province do what I wanted, it would be built.
26 But I have no power.

27 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, that wasn't -- my

1 question is when or that kind of stuff.

2 MS. CHAMNEY: Yeah.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- but if -- I'm sorry. If
4 you're -- if -- I thought I heard LeClair could
5 end up being arterial?

6 MS. CHAMNEY: It is actually arterial.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay.

8 MS. CHAMNEY: You're only operating on a
9 staged arterial.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay.

11 MR. DOLLEVOET: It's not built to ultimate.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So if it's arterial, and
13 you're still saying it won't be able to handle
14 the traffic. The traffic flow issues, by
15 putting high density housing closer to Holes,
16 is that -- if it's arterial, and the plan is to
17 expand it, then why would it not be able to
18 handle --

19 MS. CHAMNEY: No. No. I'm saying --
20 sorry.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah. Please explain that.
22 I don't understand.

23 MS. CHAMNEY: Okay. So LeClair, being
24 down here --

25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh, no. I'm sorry. I was
26 talking about LeClair as it goes past Holes.

27 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh, that's Reil my bad.

1 I'm sorry.

2 MS. CHAMNEY: So Riel itself is a small
3 roadway.

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah.

5 MS. CHAMNEY: It's a collector, right?
6 It's never going to be intended to carry a
7 bigger network. It's the piece that says, I
8 drive out here and I go to the main road to get
9 where I need to go in the city.

10 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I understand.

11 MR. DOLLEVOET: It's always been a
12 collector road.

13 MS. CHAMNEY: So that's the reason. I
14 know you had some questions about it.
15 Transportation is kind of my wheel house. So
16 when we looked at the original ASP that was out
17 there, having those high density parcels to the
18 north, where there's very limited access to the
19 arterial, and have it come through here and
20 down into the neighbourhood, is not an
21 efficient transportation model. Having them to
22 be able to access this main road and disburse
23 is a better transportation model.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, I understand that.
25 Thank you.

26 MS. CHAMNEY: Okay.

27 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just off topic here. In

1 the future, behind Holes there's a signal lane.
2 I heard that maybe they might twin it to go to
3 the Henday.

4 MR. DOLLEVOET: Is that Ray Gibbon Drive?

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah. I heard they may
6 twin it.

7 MR. DOLLEVOET: That's the ultimate plan.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Have you heard anything?

9 MR. DOLLEVOET: It's outside the scope of
10 this project.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, I know.

12 MR. DOLLEVOET: I do know there's a lot of
13 traffic.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, yeah.

15 MR. DOLLEVOET: And a lot of it is just
16 obviously going south.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, we need to tell them
18 to twin it.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'd like to add a comment
20 regarding heights and all this information and
21 transportation. I'd just like to say it's nice
22 to see the City working towards mixed use. I
23 think that's a benefit, as well as looking into
24 versatile housing interests, especially for my
25 age group that may not be able to afford a
26 single detached home. It's nice to see that it
27 is going.

1 MR. LIU: Okay. So we will answer
2 individual questions.

3 MS. STARK: Thank you, everyone, for
4 coming.

5
6 (PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 7:38 P.M.)
7

8 I, Mary C. McNeely, Court Reporter,
9 hereby certify that I attended at the above
10 proceedings and took faithful shorthand notes,
11 and the foregoing typewritten sheets are a
12 complete and accurate transcript of my
13 shorthand notes to the best of my skill and
14 ability.

15 Dated at the City of Edmonton, in the
16 Province of Alberta, this 13th day of November,
17 A.D. 2018.

18
19 
20

21 M. C. McNeely, CSR
22 Court Reporter.
23
24
25
26
27