

Public Comments

I am a Riverside home owner and I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposal by Genstar Development Company to amend the Riverside Area Structure Plan (ASP). My specific concerns centre around three issues:

- 1) The addition of a school site in NE Riverside, resulting in the loss of significant planned and approved park space;
- 2) The City's possible plan to reopen Meadowview Drive at Mission Avenue and to align Rankin Drive to Meadowview, quite likely resulting in the creation of an undesirable automobile short cut through Riverside for Mission, downtown, Northridge, and west Lacombe Park Estates residents as well as future residents living west of Ray Gibbon Drive; and
- 3) Redesign of the planned streets in SE Riverside (bordered by McKenney Avenue and Ray Gibbon Drive)

Following the public information meeting held by Select Engineering and Genstar in April 2019 to inform residents about the proposed amendment to the Riverside ASP I submitted my concerns in writing on May 20, 2019, to Genstar, Mayor Heron, all City Councillors, and the City Planning and Transportation departments. On May 21, 2019, I received a response from Mayor Heron, which included the following statement:

"I am a believer that once development starts in a neighborhood and people start to invest and move in any changes to a plan need to be carefully considered, minor in nature and supported by the residents. It is my understanding that the city did not request the addition of a second school site. There is a need for school sites in any growing city, yet as I believe these need to be spaced out and not at the expense of park space. We will need to look at the schools that are accessible to Riverside, such as Bertha Kennedy and Vincent J Maloney and St. Albert High which are all very close." [excerpt of email from Mayor Cathy Heron to Nancy Robert, May 21, 2019]

I agree wholeheartedly with Mayor Heron's comments and would note that these proposed changes are certainly not minor, do not appear to have been carefully considered, and certainly do not have my support. I, and all Riverside home owners, invested several hundred thousand dollars each on our homes based on the 2015 approved Riverside ASP. That plan and the Riverside Parks Master Plan that was approved by the City just last year included a significant focus on parks. The proposed amendment removes the two planned parks leaving the part of the neighbourhood SE of McKenney with no neighbourhood parks or playgrounds and one large empty field, all of which will devalue our properties. It is completely unfair to simply toss away the plan the City approved in 2015 without a very compelling reason. As I will set out below, nothing about the demographics or number of people expected to live in Riverside has

changed since the ASP was approved in 2015 and I have yet to be presented with any kind of information that would justify the City going ahead with this amendment.

One further general comment I have is to express significant disappointment that neither the City nor Genstar will acknowledge which of the two requested this ASP amendment. Genstar has invariably indicated to residents that it is the City that wants the second school site and to re-open Meadowview Drive at Mission Avenue. However, in my correspondence with Mayor Heron she indicated that it is Genstar asking for the second school site and that she has no knowledge of any plan to reopen the Meadowview/Mission intersection. Obviously the ASP amendment was someone's idea. I think we residents are due at least enough respect to be given some honest information about where this proposal is coming from.

1) Addition of school site

The proposed ASP amendment includes a second designated school site in Riverside, located at the corner of Riverside Drive and Meadowview Drive/Rankin Drive. This is a significant departure from the approved Riverside ASP and the 2018 Riverside Parks Master Plan. My understanding from Genstar is that the addition of the second school site will use up a significant portion of the 10% municipal reserve and therefore parks areas in other parts of Riverside will be reduced, changed, or removed entirely in order to keep the municipal reserve at 10%. Indeed, in looking at the proposed ASP amendment the neighbourhood park labeled in the Riverside Parks Master Plan as np3 has been completely removed leaving that part of the neighbourhood with no planned park space. In addition, the site where the proposed school site would be located is adjacent to a planned neighbourhood park (labelled np4 in the Riverside Parks Master Plan). That park was to include a playground, a walking loop, and fitness stations. When the City hosted an open house regarding the west Red Willow Park Master Plan a year or so ago, City staff told me that this park in Riverside was planned as part of an entire heritage area in conjunction with the Grain Elevator Park and the Red Willow Trail expansion. The information the City provided was consistent with the information I received from my builder and was a significant part of the reason I decided to build in Riverside. If this school site is designated the park plan that was approved will disappear. According to Genstar and Select Engineering and the City's letter to Riverside residents dated July 8, 2019, the school site and adjacent park area will "be seeded" for grass but that is it until an actual school is built on the site, which, in Genstar's estimation would likely take 12+ years. So, in summary, the beautiful, functional park that would have been well used by Riverside residents and those visiting the Grain Elevator historic area will now be a giant, unused field for at least 12 years, and quite likely significantly longer, until a school may be built. With the planned removal of np3 and np4 there will not be one neighbourhood park in Riverside to the east/south of McKenney. Furthermore, the wide, grass-lined path set out in the approved ASP to provide a pedestrian linkage from the end of Riverside Drive to a pond and Red Willow trail has been significantly narrowed and will now cut through the middle of a street in the proposed plan.

No Apparent Justification for this Change

There does not appear to be any legitimate justification for Genstar or the City to change the ASP as proposed. The 2015 approved Riverside ASP says, "[t]he anticipated number of students in the Riverside neighbourhood at full build-out is around 1,925 students between the ages of 5 to 19 years." That approved ASP includes one school site in Riverside west of McKenney Avenue. The July 8, 2019, letter to residents from the City indicated essentially the very same information, that "[t]he student population projected [in Riverside] is approximately 1,900 students between the age of 5 and 19." If 1,900 students warranted one school site in Riverside in 2015 why does that same projected student population warrant two school sites now?

Furthermore, according to the 2018 St. Albert Census report, our demographics are changing. According to the census report, p. 9, the percentage of seniors increased to 17.9%, for the first time, surpassing young adults, who decreased to 15.9% of our population. The census report indicated on p. 10 that over the past 20 years "the change in composition is clear, with seniors growing from 6.9 per cent of the population [in 1998] to 17.9 per cent, surpassing the percentage of young adults in 2018." During the 20-year period from 1998 to 2018, the only segment of our population that increased is mature adults (50-64) and seniors. The percentage of toddlers and young adults (20-34) remained relatively flat, decreasing very slightly over the 20-year period. However, the percentage of school-aged children and adults aged 35-49 decreased somewhat more significantly over the period. These census results taken with the fact that the population and demographics projected for Riverside have not changed since 2015 provides further evidence that a second school site in our neighbourhood is not warranted.

Potentially Misleading Information

The July 8, 2019, letter from the City indicates that Riverside will have "1,300 more [students] than [are projected] in Erin Ridge North. What is not mentioned in that statement is that the attendance area for the public elementary school in Erin Ridge North includes both Erin Ridge North residents and a significant portion of Erin Ridge residents. The Erin Ridge North ASP projects 701 school-aged children once it is completely built. According to the 2018 St. Albert Census, there are 1,208 school-aged children in Erin Ridge. Taken with the projected student population in Erin Ridge North that is 1,909 school-aged children in a neighbourhood with one elementary school. In my estimation the information provided by the City suggesting that Riverside will have 1,300 more students than those accessing the elementary school in Erin Ridge North is misleading and should not form the basis of any kind of justification to add a second school site to the ASP.

As Mayor Heron noted in her May 21 email to me, it is also important to consider the existing schools nearby in making decisions regarding school sites. The projected

Riverside school-aged population and the Lacombe Park and Mission school-aged population according to the 2018 Census is approximately 3,360 (Riverside 1,900, LP 1,256, Mission 204). There are already three elementary schools, two junior high schools, and two high schools in place to service those students, not to mention the Riverside school site approved in the 2015 ASP. In comparison, the Jenson Lakes and Erin Ridge North projected school-aged population and the Erin Ridge school-aged population, according to the 2018 Census, is approximately 2,900 (1,000 in Jenson Lakes, 701 in ERN, 1,208 ER). There is one elementary school, two elem/junior high schools, and one Francophone high school in place to serve that population of 2,900 students. To summarize, five schools (each elem/JH is considered two schools for the purpose of this comparison) service a projected/actual school population of approximately 2,900 students in Jenson Lakes/ERN/ER while seven schools service the Riverside/LP/Mission area for a projected/actual 3,360 students. The Riverside approved school site NW of McKenney will make that eight schools servicing 3,360 students. Based on those numbers Riverside and its close neighbours have more than sufficient school infrastructure. Please see the table below, which sets out this information a more easily digestible format. I would further note that, according to school utilization reports, at least two of the three elementary schools in the LP/Mission area have been significantly underutilized for a number of years and at least one of the junior highs has recently been facing declining enrolment. Based on this information it is not immediately apparent, at least to me, how one, let alone two schools in Riverside would be approved for provincial funding in the foreseeable future.

Neighbourhood	Student-Aged Children (Projected or 2018 Census)	Total Student-Aged Children in School Attendance Area	Schools Servicing Area
Riverside	1,900	3,360	Bertha Kennedy elementary* Ronald Harvey elementary Father Jan elementary+ VJM junior high^ WD Cuts junior high St. AB Catholic high school St. Gabe's high school Approved school site (2015 Riverside ASP)
Lacombe Park	1,256		
Mission	204		
Jenson Lakes	1,000	2,909	Joseph Demko elem/JH Sister Alphonse elem/JH Lois Hole elementary Alexandre-Tache Francophone high school
Erin Ridge North	701		
Erin Ridge	1,208		

* According to information on the St. Albert Catholic School Board website Bertha Kennedy's K-6 student population as of September 30, 2018, was 216 students but it has capacity for 406 students. The student population was 209 in 2011-12 so has only grown by seven students in the past seven school years.

+ Student population 2018-19: 258, 2011-12: 277.5

^ Student population 2018-19: 473, 2011-12: 579

In summary, based on the fact that the projected number of students in Riverside has not changed from 2015, when one school site was included in the approved ASP, the existence of seven schools in the Riverside attendance area, some of which are underutilized, and the changing demographics in our City, I do not understand how the City could justify changing the ASP to add an additional school site. The Riverside projected student-aged population information the City had in 2015 is the same as it is today. Frankly, if the City wanted two school sites based on a projected student population of 1,900 it should have insisted on a second school site in 2015. Had the City made that decision in 2015 the hundreds of people who purchased homes in Riverside would have been aware of the City's plans before deciding if this was the neighbourhood for them. It is completely inappropriate and unfair to home owners to change the ASP so significantly after they have invested many hundreds of thousands of dollars in this neighbourhood based on a different ASP.

2) Consideration of reopening Meadowview Drive at Mission Avenue and connecting Rankin Drive to Meadowview Drive

At the public information meeting on April 18, 2019, the presenters told residents that the City is considering opening access to Meadowview Drive at Mission Avenue. In the approved ASP Meadowview Drive is a local road only with no access from Mission Avenue that ends at a T-intersection with Riverside Drive. In that plan, Rankin Drive begins from further NW on Riverside Drive, making it a local road also. When I attended the Red Willow Park west plan public meeting in 2018 I was told in no uncertain terms that access to Meadowview Drive from Mission would not be reopened. The presenters at the park plan meeting in 2018 indicated that the City was planning to expand the historical area to incorporate the neighbourhood park off of Riverside Drive and the expanded Red Willow Trail and that having a through road would detract greatly from that objective. This vision was reiterated in the Riverside Parks Master Plan and by my builders and was a significant factor in my decision to build in Riverside.

Given the approved ASP, the Riverside Parks Master Plan, and the assurances of City employees, and my builder, I, and I am certain, many other Riverside residents were surprised and extremely disappointed to find out that the City is now considering opening Meadowview Drive at Mission Avenue. Moreover, Genstar has redrawn some of the roads in its amended ASP so that Meadowview will now become Rankin Drive which will run the entire length of the neighbourhood from east to west with access to McKenney near the end of Rankin Drive. By doing so the City and Genstar would

effectively be creating a bypass through road for residents of Mission, downtown, west Lacombe Park Estates, and Northridge, and the future residents west of Ray Gibbon Drive. Add to this the fact that a grocery store is being built near the McKenney end of Rankin Drive, and the non-local traffic on Rankin Drive will increase even more. In my estimation this will be, at best, annoying for Riverside residents and, at worst, unsafe and exceedingly disruptive, causing property values to decrease. I built my house in this neighbourhood with the assurance of the approved ASP that the road adjacent to my street would be a local road, not a bypass for the neighbouring residential areas.

No one at the public meeting on April 18 was able to provide consistent rationale for the City possibly changing its mind and re-opening the Mission/Meadowview intersection. The Mayor, in my communication with her, had no knowledge or information regarding this potential change in policy. Some officials indicated that the City was contemplating reopening the access point because of its decision to put the second school site in Riverside; others suggested that it was because alternate access to Riverside is needed. If the reason is to provide alternate access, why was this decision not made during the original ASP process, which was approved in 2015? What has changed?

I understand that the City is planning to conduct a traffic study before making a decision on reopening the road. What will that entail? Will the anticipated traffic from neighbouring residents be considered in the study? If so, how? If not, why not? Will feedback from Riverside residents, including this submission and others like it be considered in the study? When will the study be complete? I would strongly urge the City to reconsider possibly opening Meadowview Drive at Mission Avenue for all the reasons I have outlined above, especially with Genstar's proposal to join Meadowview to Rankin Drive. It is not fair for all the residents who paid a significant amount of money for our lots on the basis that they would be located in a quiet, park like area, to now have to live with a busy bypass road.

Apart from my specific concerns regarding reopening the Mission intersection I would think Genstar would have some concerns regarding a possible bypass road in the middle of its development. It is my understanding that the lots in southeast Riverside (south of Rankin) are intended for higher end single family homes. What does Genstar imagine will happen to its lot prices in that area once potential buyers realize their homes will be right beside a very busy road?

3) Redesign of the planned streets in SE Riverside (bordered by McKenney Avenue and Ray Gibbon Drive)

The approved ASP for the SE area of Riverside that is south of McKenney and east of Ray Gibbon features four cul-de-sacs and three setbacks from the street that allow for mini-courts (i.e., areas similar to the lots for the Riverside show homes at the start of Riverside Drive). As noted above, it also features neighbourhood park 3. The proposed ASP removes all but one of the cul-de-sacs and all three of the smaller mini-court areas in favour of long straight streets, laned houses, and all the planned green space (e.g.,

park is removed completely). I have no issue with laned houses but why were all but one of the cul-de-sacs and all of the mini-courts removed? The cul-de-sacs and mini-courts and the general design of the roads was interesting and the park made it beautiful. The new plan will consist of long, straight streets, severely lacking in any design creativity and, to be blunt, the lack of a park will make the area ugly. **I urge the City to reject this proposal so that this part of the neighbourhood more closely resembles the original plan.**

In addition, with respect to the section of Riverside that included a wide green space starting at the end of Riverside Drive heading toward Red Willow Trail, I am disappointed that this walking area has been narrowed in the amended ASP and that it would now go straight through a cul-de-sac. Why is that? In the approved ASP the cul-de-sac was on the opposite side of the road. I would ask that the City reject this proposal – the design was much better the way it was. Finally, in the area immediately to the NE of the White Spruce Park bordered by a waterway, Rankin Drive, and Red Willow Park there was a long curved road that ended in a cul-de-sac with a long green space just in front of the road. In the amended ASP that road now would be connected to the area to the east instead of being a cul-de-sac and the green space is reduced in length. Why has this been done? **The original plan was more pedestrian friendly and definitely more attractive and interesting. If there is no good reason to change it I would ask that the City reject this proposed change.**

In conclusion, Genstar has marketed the Riverside concept as healthy, pedestrian-friendly living in a park-like setting close to nature. That concept is what I was sold on and I was happy to pay for it. Now, either the City or Genstar has, four years and many built houses later, decided to make major changes to the design of our neighbourhood by adding a second school site even though there is no demographic change to warrant the second site. If approved, residents of the area east and south of McKenney will lose both of their planned neighbourhood parks/playground and the other green spaces will be severely reduced. These are major changes, not minor tweaks. The park-like setting I paid for will vanish if this ASP amendment is approved, being replaced by a large, empty field, which will not be developed for the foreseeable future. Furthermore, if the City decides to reopen Meadowview Drive at Mission Avenue and Genstar goes ahead with its plan to connect that road to Rankin Drive I will also be living in a neighbourhood with a bypass road instead of the quiet local road I was given to believe (in City-approved documents) would be built. To say that I am disappointed is an understatement. I believe that changing the ASP so significantly as to change the character of the neighbourhood, after residents have paid for their lots (at prices reflective of neighbourhood amenities promised) and built their homes, is at best unfair and at worst unethical. For all the reasons I have outlined above, I strongly urge the City to reject the amended ASP proposed by Genstar. Please give us back the neighbourhood we paid so dearly to live in.

Regards,
Nancy Robert

Hello, I am writing in response to the latest changes outlined in the Riverside Amendments from Genstar. We have a few questions/concerns regarding the plan.

If the park site is now re-zoned to a school site, will we no longer be getting any true playgrounds in this area in the near future? We have lived here for four years and have been patiently waiting for crosswalks, access to path systems, and playgrounds. The residential structure set up by the show homes is not sufficient to service such a large number of small children. All of these families were promised a large number of services and amenities when purchasing their houses, none of which we have so far.

When you look at the development that's happened in Jensen lakes in such a short period you start to wonder if we have become a forgotten area. With two small children and two large dogs Riverside is the least walking friendly area we've lived in in St. Albert. We have to run across the street when there is a break in traffic because cars won't stop if there is no crosswalk, which is incredibly dangerous and stressful to do with babies in a stroller. Just to go for a walk outside of our area. After four years we still will not have a complete pathway out of Riverside, and will have to drag strollers through wet, muddy areas still. It's very frustrating and is making us seriously question if St. Albert merits the tax dollars we are paying anymore.

We have lived in St. Albert almost all of our lives and are very frustrated with the poor upkeep of the area including weed management in boulevards that are to be taken care of by the developer still, constant garbage blowing into out yards from home builders, and crime (not your area, I'm aware). We are a high income young family and are discussing if St. Albert is the place we want to be anymore, and we know we're not alone. The way this area is being developed and serviced is so unlike the St. Albert we knew and loved.

Major concerns are:

- No safe (and clean) way out of area

- No playground for all of the young children to go to (current one sways when too many children on it...as it is for residential use)
- No crosswalk that can be accessed directly via pathway

Thank you for hearing our concerns and we look forward to hearing your decisions.

Dana Paniccia

Dear Sajid,

We would like to comment on the letter we received from you dated July 8, 2019 regarding the Proposed Riverside Area Structure Plan Amendment. We have lived in the neighbourhood since the fall of 2015 and have actively followed the development and future planning for the area. We have the following concerns regarding this proposed amendment:

- All neighbourhood parks seem to be eliminated in area B and C. One of the big selling features for the Riverside neighbourhood to us was the access to a park directly across the street from our home. We participated in the Riverside Parks Masterplan consultations and were pleased to see the plan be passed by council in November 2018. This new proposal negates this plan and is in conflict with the City's Parks and Open Space Standards and Guidelines. According to these guidelines a Neighbourhood Park is to be "the outdoor recreation focal point of a neighbourhood and provide unstructured active and passive recreation". Access and connectivity is described such that "from their home, every resident will be within a 400m unobstructed walk on the active transportation network to a park or open space." This new ASP proposal eliminates Neighbourhood Park 3 and 4, leaving 2/3 of the neighbourhood without access to any green space, playground or active/passive recreational space.
- The proposed changes include a new school site in Area C which means the neighbourhood will not have a park or playground until the school is developed. Historically in St. Albert, we have seen this development take upwards of 15-20 years depending on funding from the government. Given St. Albert has just built several new schools and that the Riverside neighbourhood is already in close proximity to several elementary, junior high and high schools, this new school site makes no sense. Access to this school site is also problematic as there is currently no thru-road at the Heritage site. It makes more sense to place the second school site in Area A, adjacent to the first school site.
- Should the school site be non-negotiable we ask that consideration be given to developing the park space immediately to allow current residents to enjoy the space now as was promised by the developer upon purchase of properties in the area.
- Finally, we are concerned that this newly proposed ASP seems to eliminate access points to the planned Red Willow Park system for the NE corner of Riverside. Another desirable aspect that we were drawn to in the Riverside neighbourhood was walkability and access to the downtown core and the trail system.

As a whole, we have enjoyed living in the Riverside neighbourhood. We have great neighbours and have been tolerant of the ongoing development believing that the end result will be amazing. Frankly, it is unfair to change plans when people have made significant investments in property based on an approved ASP. Thank you for the opportunity to share our thoughts.

John and Angie Dedrick

Hello I am a Tennant at 21 Royal Street and would like to emphasize how much we need a playground there had been nothing for kids in this neighborhood for 5 years which seems unreasonable.

When they are done twinning McKenney will there be a pedestrian crossing at the entrance to Riverside?

Thank you

Kira Stewart

Hi Sajid,

We have a few questions and comments regarding the proposed Riverside Area Structure Plan Amendment which was recently mailed to us.

- Why has the light green park legend been eliminated from the Proposed Land Use (Figure 3)?
- What is the reasoning for the removal of green space/park from the north-south linear walkway area C on Figure 3?
- How much area will a school site and parking lot take away from the green space in area C Figure 3?
- When will the park portion in the NE section of Figure 2 be completed in accordance with the approved Riverside Parks Master Plan?
- Will there be misappropriation of taxpayer funds and time for further studies, presentations, and future changes when the plan has already been developed and approved?
- When will reforestation begin in Area C Figure 3 of the proposed school park/site and along proposed Rankin Drive where the mature tree stands were clear cut?
- When and where will playgrounds be built?
- Will current Land Districting remain the same in areas within 100m of existing residences in Area C?
- Why is the commercial site not located along Ray Gibbon drive?
- What will be the speed limit on the proposed Rankin Drive thoroughfare realignment?
- Will the proposed park/school site in area C figure 3 have trees planted soon or will it just be seeded?
- Will the second proposed park/school site in area C figure 3 be exposed to re-designation for a future different land use or will the current promised approved park be implemented and protected from such future change?
- Is the City of St. Albert or is Genstar requesting the proposed second park/school site in area C figure 3?
- If the City is requesting in part or in whole the second school site, please identify the department making the said request.

- Trees are needed to battle climate change (particularly in taking up excess water from increased precipitation and given proximal location to the river). Will initiatives for future tree planting for this community be implemented?
- We invested in the Riverside Community in October 2014 and have seen many changes to the plan which we have tolerated since then.
- We have paid property taxes accordingly for the past five years with negligible provision of City services and no City amenities.
- Additionally, there is no transit service, are no sidewalks to available bus stops in Mission, and no crosswalk across McKenney Avenue at Riverside Drive.
- Promised approved parks have not been created and are now being threatened with elimination rather than amalgamation. Please consider creating a park with proper landscaping (including trees and playground) rather than just a seeded field within the future school site (Area C, Figure 3).

Thank you in advance for answering our questions and bringing our concerns and comments forward to City Council,

Concerned Homeowner of Riverside

Hi Sajid,

We have a few more questions regarding the proposed Riverside Area Structure Plan Amendment.

- Why has the trail system along the south end of area C been fragmented rather than leaving it as a continuous trail?
- Will the trail system connect with the current trail at Mission Ave. and Meadowview Drive?
- What is the reasoning for no access points to Red Willow Park at the South East corner of Area C?
- Will trails that run through Storm Water Management areas be accessible during heavy rains or spring melt?

Regards,

Concerned Riverside Homeowner

Hi Sajid,

We have a few questions and comments with regards to the proposed Riverside Area Structure Plan Amendment.

Why has the light green park legend been eliminated from the proposed land use figure 3?

What is the reasoning for the removal of green space/park from the north-south linear walkway area C on figure 3?

How much area will a school site and parking lot take away from the green space in area C figure 3?

When will the park portion be completed in the NE section of figure 2 in accordance with the approved Riverside Parks Mater

Will there be possible misappropriation of taxpayers funds and time for past studies, presentations and future changes

thereof?

When will reforestation begin in area C figure 3 of the proposed school park/site and along proposed Rankin drive where the mature tree stands were clear cut?

When and where will playgrounds be built?

Will current Land Districting remain the same in areas within 50m of existing residences in Area C?

Why is the commercial site not located along Ray Gibbon drive?

Will the proposed park/school site in area C figure 3 have trees planted soon or will it just be seeded?

Will proposed future school sites be able to be re-designated as affordable housing areas?

Is the City of St. Albert or is Genstar requesting the proposed second park/school site in area C figure 3?

If the City is requesting in part or in whole the second school site please provide the department making the said request.

Trees are needed to battle climate change(absorb floodwaters,release oxygen), will initiatives be implemented for this community or will they be removed as has been done previously by council?

We invested in the Riverside community and located there in October 2014 and have seen many changes to the plan which we have tolerated since then.

We have paid property taxes for

Caroline and Douglas

Hello,

We built a home at 15 Riviere Terrace back in 2015. We were one of the first to build in Riverside. The lot we chose backed a large green space. This is why we chose this lot. We paid a lot more for this lot as it was backing a park.

Now I'm learning of the green space to be amended into a second school site.

I'd like to know how the owners that are directly affected by this change will be compensated? We all paid a lot more for these "green space backing" lots.

Would it be possible for the homes on Rivière Terrace backing the new school site to be offered more land? Maybe if we could extend our lot size it would allow more space for planting trees and creating privacy from the school?

Also, what are the plans with the land until a school is developed?

Surely, the land cannot be left the way it is.

We have been living with the dust and noise from the field for years already! It's an absolute mess.

What about creating a temporary playground? Seed the field & plant some trees?

How about an outdoor hockey rink?

There are so many children in riverside. We need something! There are no parks close by. The children are constantly playing in there front yards and riding biking up and down the sidewalks. We are kinda trapped in our neighbourhood right now. There is no easy access to the trails or other neighbourhood parks since we lost access across the train tracks.

Personally if the school is a go ahead, I'd at least like to see the land developed to the point our children can run and play. An outdoor rink would be amazing to bring families together.

I would love to hear feedback from
these suggestions.

And, if there would be a possibility of offering those on Rivière Terrace extra land.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Joleen and Geoff Cowie

15 Rivière Terrace

Hello,

I am emailing you with regards to the notice sent July 8th regarding Riverside ASP B.14.7. In particular, I wanted to voice my concerns to you and let you know that I am strongly opposed to the reclassification of the park site along Riverside Drive to a school site.

My family was one of the first residents of the Riverside community. We were the third occupied house in the area, and have lived here for 4 years. At the time we selected our home to be built, we carefully considered which lot would be perfect for our family, was safe for young children, and afford us the level of privacy and safety we had envisioned for our family.

We are a family of seven including five children between the ages of one and 12. Our perfect home backed onto a large quiet park. It had low traffic where children could safely ride their bikes and play in the front yard. A space where at the drop of a dime, we could run outside and have a family game of soccer and as the children grew, allow them to set out and explore the neighborhood on their own knowing they would always be in line of sight.

We carefully selected a lot that was perfect for our needs. We found a site with a large park behind it that was off the busy streets. A space that was quiet enough our young children could nap and sleep without interruption. In exchange for this perfect location, we paid a significant premium for our parcel of land and received a much smaller yard than lots away from the park.

For the past four years our children have not had an accessible park to play in. Riverside has been cutoff from the rest of St. Albert; other parks and pathways are inaccessible by foot. When it rains, you cannot cross the train tracks because mud fills up the tires of your stroller and wagons and bikes. The snow is not cleared. We have no public transportation to our neighborhood. Any shortcuts that we may have used to go to the library, or reach the trails, have been cutoff by large fences, or filled with construction debris.

I have still loved my home and not regretted the purchase until I heard of this amendment that will take away our park and build a school. A school site that will bring in significant traffic and leave me afraid to let my children play outside. There will be

noise, litter, and lack of concern for safety. With five kids, you can imagine how difficult it can be to keep your eyes glued to everyone at the same time.

I would have never built in this location if I knew I was going to back onto a school. We were promised a park.

I love St. Albert - I have lived here since I was four years old. I wanted to give my children the same experience I had growing up. But it will not be the same with a school directly outside my doors.

It is unfortunate that Reidbuilt went bankrupt. However that does not negate the fact that the builder made promises to the people who purchased their homes that should be forgotten just because it went into receivership. Genstar took over developing the land with the knowledge of the plans and the promises were made.

Mayor Cathy Heron, please do not allow Riverside to continue to be segmented from one of St. Albert's best assets, our parks. You have a whole neighborhood of children with nowhere safe to play for years to come. The temporary park Genstar erected has nothing for my toddlers. We can't leave our neighborhood. Our own yard isn't even safe because there is a pond of rainwater in the undeveloped lot beside us my children could drown in. We need a permanent, safe space for children of all ages. I feel Genstar is requesting this amendment not because it is what is best for the community, but because they are a profit driven organization. Please help ensure the promises that were made are kept. As residents, we have no recourse but to ask for your help. Please do not allow a developer to renege on the promises they agreed to assume, and please do not allow your residents to bear the financial burdens of drastic changes to the use of the space when there is no evidence the school will ever be needed or approved. We need the park now.

I urge St. Albert to reject this proposed changes to the park site.

Thank you,

Melissa McKay

17 Riviere Terrace

Hello Sajid,

I am emailing you in regards to the recent notice Riverside residents received in regards to the proposed changes to the Area Structure Plan.

I have been a resident of the Riverside neighborhood for the past 4 years, and I have significant concerns around the proposed changes to the park site in Riverside. While reviewing the plans and speaking with neighbors, many of us agree that these changes will be a negative impact to our neighborhood.

My family spent our life savings building our dream home in the Riverside community, paying a significant premium to be backed on to a park, with promises from the builder and developer that this will always remain a park, however since Reidbuilt went into receivership, Genstar has now changed the park into a school site. Living immediately next to a school is significantly different then backing onto a park, and if we would have known this was going to be a school, we definitely would not have purchased this lot, let alone pay a significant premium. This school site will bring significant amount of traffic, noise, garbage, among other things, that people typically take into consideration when moving.

There is already no parks available in the neighborhood, and the city had already approved the park plan for this neighborhood, so it doesn't make sense for this to be changed at the last minute.

I understand from the letter that the Riverside community will be growing, however you need to be cognizant that developers provide these numbers in misleading ways to get their plans approved. It is not right that you would force residents of St.Albert into a situation that they never agreed too and were mislead. A school site has already been allocated in the neighborhood, and in the unlikelihood that a second school site is actually required, I am sure Genstar could find land for this school without sticking it in a already allocated Park site that has been allocated as a park for many years.

Please share our deep concerns with this proposed plan to city council, and let them know that many residents in Riverside are strongly against this proposal to change the park site to a school site.

Thank you for your time.

Micheal Hatter

Riverside Resident

Thank you for sending the letter regarding the changes for Riverside Plan, my comments as a family for 4 including 2 kids under 6:

- my biggest concern with Riverside is that this plan will slow the existence of a playground until the funding for the provincial school is approved which might be in 10 years. I would like to a there is be a condition for the playground portion to be completed ASAP.

- I love that the Grey Nuns White Spruce Park is included as a municipal reserve but we can't access it. They should also be addressed with Genstar.

What's is happening right now is upon planning community events, we as resident have to request permission from Genstar to use the empty lots and they list conditions such as only on Friday afternoon. It is hard to build a community that way.

Sara