

Correspondence from the Public – 230 & 250 Bellerose Drive and 300 Orchard Court:

1	<p>Thank you for allowing residents near this proposed development to provide their input. On July 5th I submitted a letter to the Gazette outlining my concerns with what I view to be a flawed traffic study, the current traffic congestion which my neighbours and I experience every week day morning when schools and regular business hours are in effect, and the impact this is having on our quality of life. I don't know why the letter was not published but I am forwarding a copy to you.</p> <p>If these tall residences and commercial spaces are added to our area I believe it will add roughly 1000 extra residents and increased commercial traffic. With limited access to the proposed development there must be great concern not only for current and future residents' quality of life, but for the supply of basic emergency services. As it was with the timing of the traffic study, the fact that this amendment was submitted over the holiday season, (when the public is distracted), with a deadline for response by January 10, makes me question the integrity of the developers.</p> <p>To: "gazette" <gazette@stalbert.greatwest.ca> Sent: Friday, July 5, 2019 9:24:58 AM Subject: Re: July 3 - Residents spooked by possible 20-story high rise</p> <p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>Traffic study equipment appeared at the intersection of Bellerose and Boudreau at the same time local high school classes ended and there was a marked reduction in weekday traffic congestion. There was a further reduction in traffic volume when all St. Albert schools closed for summer vacation. Boudreau Developments' Traffic Study is inherently flawed due to its timing.</p> <p>I conveyed my concerns via e-mail to City Planners in 2016 regarding traffic in our area. Evergreen Drive is the only exit point for people living on Evergreen Dr./Pl./Cl, Everest Cr, Elm Pt. and Eden Ct. I told the planners how very difficult it was to exit Right onto Bellerose to make a left hand turn and travel south on Boudreau. A set of traffic lights was installed at Evergreen and Boudreau and the light sequence was changed at Bellerose and Boudreau. These changes made a small difference but the problem still exists.</p> <p>When I drive up to Evergreen and Bellerose on a winter's morning, I most often see Erin Ridge and Oakmont Residents in a line of idling vehicles that stretches up the hill and around the corner. School and Stat buses compound the problem. Drivers are extremely frustrated. They block the intersection during red lights. They cross over Boudreau to make U Turns near the entrance to the RCMP building. Some drivers are very rude.</p> <p>Many times I cross Boudreau in desperation to legally turn around inside the Ironwood Estates complex.</p> <p>This traffic volume is affecting the communities of Erin Ridge and Oakmont and it is spilling into Ironwood. It is causing a great deal of stress and altering the way we treat our neighbours.</p> <p>One cannot stand in the way of "progress". We have already lost our river valley views and there is nothing to be done about the extra light, noise and vehicles emissions. Our property values have been impacted and we have seen a reduction in our quality of life. Residents from these areas need to speak up with their personal stories of how this high density development is affecting their daily lives. City Planners need to consider how this future population increase will be accommodated with effective infrastructure put in place.</p>
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2	<p>I have concerns as to why St. Albert would want two towers of the proposed size (26 stories) in this part of the city.</p> <p>Cities grow, I understand that when we bought here. And if all the buildings being built were like the Botanica, we would understand. But two of these towers are three times that size. They far exceed anything that exists in St Albert right now, and would partially determine the skyline of St Albert for years to come. All of it very close to standard single dwelling homes.</p> <p>Me and my wife consider ourselves very realistic people. But we spend half our time wondering if this is some strange development permit tactic. Because what is being proposed just seems so strange for this part of the city.</p>
3	<p>Hi, We received a letter from you regarding proposed use of the Riverbank Landing. In reviewing the proposed development we do not have too much issue with much of the proposal. We do NOT think 2 - 26 story buildings is appropriate for this community. We do not think the infrastructure was designed to accommodate this much development in such a small area, not to mention the extra noise, congestion etc. We already see a lot of traffic in this area without any more development, we can't imagine what that looks like with significantly more people living in this small area. We feel that buildings similar in size to Botanica (10 story buildings) would make more sense, given the way that Bellerose and Boudreau roads are designed currently. There also does not seem to be any space to widen the roads. Thank you.</p>
4	<p>My name is [Redacted] Sinclair. My wife [Redacted] and I have been very active in our neighbourhood of the Evergreens; as for years our neighbourhood was used as the parking lot for the workers of the Botanica development. This resulted in not being able to park in front of our own properties, cleaning up garbage left daily as just some of issues. Finally with help from city officials and the Mayor we received help in the form of a parking ban.</p> <p>I understand the area proposed to be amended needs to be developed, and I agree it will do good for the community. However the proposed plan as it currently is for lack of a better word ridicules! 26 stories is completely over kill for this area. Do people not realize that even 15 stories is too much? That you will be robbing several neighbourhoods and communities of their privacy? Not to mention the impact it will have on traffic.</p> <p>Buildings like this are designed for dense areas where there is lots of opportunity for work. Within this area are we suddenly going to create another 1000 jobs? The reason buildings like this exist and work is so individuals can walk to their office buildings or places of work such as hospitals. Or take transit a short distance to their employment. The new proposed traffic circle is also for lack of a better word a complete joke. These roads and areas are no designed for this type of traffic. As well you are simply taking the problem and making it move an extra block. The bottle neck is not being fixed.</p> <p>I truly believe that if the city let's anything larger than a 10 story building up that it is a big mistake and they do not truly care what the community thinks.</p> <p>Several neighbourhoods have residential parking bans Monday to Friday. What happened on the weekends when the friends and family come over to the two massive high rises and spend the night..? The close areas get used as a parking lot again. Vehicles get left for days in front of homes so the owners cannot use the space.</p> <p>This is a very quick response to the proposed amendments change. To say the least we do not believe Anything over 10 stories is acceptable or needed and would be detrimental to the close communities and be the worst thing for traffic since the terribly timed traffic lights on the trail and Boudreau in St. Albert.</p>
5	<p>I am writing in regards to the application from a developer to construct 500 units on the old Hole's location. We are strongly opposed to the Riverbank Landing application and</p>

	<p>some of our reasons include things like density, traffic congestion, tower height, tower shadows, improper access, environmental impact, inappropriate use of public roads, lack of appropriate buffer zone, property values and construction period. There is a lot of voters who strongly oppose this development.</p> <p>This land was originally planned as single family homes. The original suggested development for this site was sold by builders to home owners as being the planned approved development. -single family homes, not 30 story condos?!?</p>
6	<p>This letter is in response to the letter we received from the City of St Albert, dated Dec 12, 2019. I will formally state my position as a very concerned, long-time St Albert residential homeowner.</p> <hr/> <p>Background</p> <p><u>Sturgeon River</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other communities in Canada take specific steps to preserve skylines, water access and the watersheds along their rivers and lakes. • St Albert has taken the opposite approach. The City has already allowed two high-rise condo buildings to be built right beside the Sturgeon River. • It is unthinkable to picture the Riverbank project being built on this site as well. This project certainly does not align to St Albert's motto, "<i>Botanical Arts City</i>". <p><u>"Old Holes Site" Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This intersection is already saddled with new residential and commercial development that would have never been contemplated for this intersection nor this area of St Albert. • The property manager had the nerve to give a letter and a map to retail managers of The Shops at Boudreau, directing them to have employees park their cars in the lower portion of the Evergreen residential community of Erin Ridge. I hand-delivered this letter and map to the City's Engineering Department. If there is insufficient parking for customer and employees in the parking area for the Shops at Boudreau then a serious error was made – either by the developer or by the City Administration. Adding in even more commercial/retail business in this extremely cramped footprint of land, will only worsen the problem. • The developer has shown little corporate responsibility, other than landscaping the site. <hr/> <p>Oakmont Area Structure Plan ASP – Bylaw 12/97</p> <p>The congestion on Bellerose Drive is already an issue due to an excessive build up of traffic. And this is <u>before</u> the second condo tower is finished and occupied. One can only imagine the traffic mess once that second tower is occupied, only to be possibly followed by a massive increase in density due to Riverbank Landing.</p> <p>The review of this site application must include the ongoing construction and growth in the northeast communities of Erin Ridge and Oakmont. The traffic on Bellerose Drive is already extremely heavy. As that part of the city continues to expand the problem will get worse, and that is before considering the impact of the proposed Riverbank Landing development. There is a good reason why the Ford Explorer photo radar vehicle is set up most days to catch motorists heading up and down Bellerose Drive, just east of Boudreau!</p>

<p>NOTE - The traffic pressure to deal with the growth in this part of the City could have been addressed, to some degree at least, by developing <u>Coalmine Road</u> into a 4-lane commuter through-fare (the land was available to use!) but for some “reason” the City allowed the closure of Coalmine Road. I assume this was approved so the developer could sell more building lots (more profit for them) and perhaps to create a pedestrian walkway. As a result the City allowed this logical artery to be permanently blocked. An unbelievably poor decision.</p> <p>One does not have to be a logistics expert to see that the roadways and adjacent intersection at Bellerose and Boudreau were never intended for “Mixed Use” (in other words high density). Therefore the request to change the zoning for this land to “Mixed Use” should be rejected. It needs to remain as “Low Density Residential”.</p>
<p>Land Use Bylaw 9/2005</p> <p>It is crystal clear that the communities of Oakmont and Erin Ridge do not want this project to proceed as submitted, or likely in almost any form. If the City feels there is a good reason for the project to proceed, <u>it should only be with the approval of the surrounding community</u>. City Council is there to represent our interests meaning the citizens of St Albert, not the interests of a developer.</p> <p>If there is a compelling and acceptable reason to allow some level of development at this site, other than designating the land for “Low Density Residential”, the City needs to reject the amended proposal from the developer and should limit the land use to something along the following lines :</p> <p><u>Building Height</u> The building height should be limited to 3 stories for any new construction at this site. The City has already allowed the two condo high rise towers at this general site - enough is enough.</p> <p>By restricting the building height, the City will address multiple issues :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse shadowing to the surrounding residential community will be significantly reduced • The density problems, arising from putting too many people and vehicles into a location that was never designed for this type of density, will be significantly reduced • The parking issues will be significantly reduced plus more land will be available for surface parking (something that should have been addressed during the design and approval of the Shops at Boudreau application). <p>How could anyone not see the problems that an additional 800 people will create in this location, along with the increased traffic from the business occupancy?</p> <p><u>Number of Buildings</u> The number of new buildings should be reduced by one third. This decision would have the same positive impact as noted above regarding Building Height. But the much better decision would be to leave it zoned for single family dwellings, and 2 storey town houses and/or senior residential.</p> <p><u>Density</u></p>

	<p>The major underlying issue is <i>density</i>. Even if it is deemed that this is an attractive development for St Albert, it is in the <u>wrong location</u>. The developer's walkability pitch is smoke & mirrors. To jam this development in this location so a few people might walk up the street to Canadian Tire or Second Cup, does not come anywhere close to offsetting the damage the project will cause to hundreds or thousands of surrounding homeowners and residents.</p> <p>The developer and City should be exploring virgin land area for a development of this magnitude, such as the areas to the west, IE near the Enjoy Centre. Building such a project on bare land would give all future homeowners full transparency of the project before they build (or buy) in the new area, the roadways can be developed to accommodate the traffic volume (including the twinning of Ray Gibbon), and ample space for customer and employee parking can easily be achieved.</p>
	<p>Summary of Proposal Revisions following the Public Information Meeting</p>
	<p>Upon reviewing the developer's revisions here is what I see as ongoing issues :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The developer claims that they needed "time to address concerns expressed by the community". They state their goal was to provide "desirability for future residents and tenants" • This claim by the developer is just a <u>token response</u> to the community concerns. They want to "check off the box" that they consulted with the public, even though their response falls miles short of addressing the public's concerns. • Their real priority is to get the project approved as close to their original design as possible, and to maximize profits through the sale of units, period. • Building 2 – reducing the height from 28 stories to 26 stories • No improvement for the surrounding community whatsoever • Building 3- reducing the height from 12 stories to 11 stories • No improvement for the surrounding community whatsoever • Building 4 - None of the changes address density nor building height issues
	<p>Traffic Issues</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) shows that "bringing over 800 residents to the area will result in an influx of 600 two-way trips at evening hours" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The suggestion of some type of "intersection improvement" (light timing?) by Boudreau Communities Ltd are simply hollow words. No "improvements" will reduce the massive increase in traffic congestion and noise. ○ At most it may address a few safety concerns which will no doubt result in further traffic slow down and even more congestion (see any major intersection on St Albert Trail now – reduced collisions but slower travel times along the Trail) • Signalized Intersection or Roundabout Suggestion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It was ridiculous to see a set of traffic lights placed on Bellerose at Evergreen because it is practically right on top of the Boudreau traffic lights. ○ The idea of jamming in another set of traffic lights or a roundabout as indicated in the amended proposal is almost laughable. It would be only a matter of car lengths from the Evergreen lights!

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A proposed roundabout is simply to allow for a “<u>legal U-turn</u>” for traffic trying to exit the proposed Riverbank complex. That suggestion solves nothing. It does not reduce the number of vehicles and it only adds to the traffic congestion on Bellerose Drive ● Immediate future <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Imagine what traffic will be like when the second condo tower is occupied ○ Imagine what the traffic will be like as the north and east communities of St Albert grow ○ Then add in the Riverbank development..... <p>The City has a chance to stop this <u>traffic problem</u> from developing into a <u>traffic nightmare</u> for the “immediate neighbours’ and citizens in the north and east part of St Albert.</p>
	<p>Boudreau Communities Ltd</p> <p>Boudreau Communities Ltd has a marketing pitch on their website, “<i>Riverbank Landing – Life in Balance</i>”. On their website, three things stand out for me :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>They claim to be governed by “quality of life principles”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What they are saying is that the new tenants may experience quality of life, but they are saying nothing about how they are going to adversely impact the surrounding communities. How convenient for them! ○ This tells me they have no moral compass and little corporate responsibility for the community. Their goal is maximizing the return on their investment...period. The rest is spin and phrasing to try to deflect opposition. ● <i>“Urban sprawl is reduced when less land is taken to provide higher density housing and services in a community”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What they are really saying is that the more units they can jam into this small parcel of land, the more money they can make. Any claim that they would be helping to reduce “urban sprawl” is pure spin, nothing more. ● <i>“We believe that creating a well planned, high quality, mixed-use community is the very best possible use of this special land, benefiting not only our immediate neighbors, but that this new town square will act as a hub for everyone in St. Albert”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How can they dare to make the claim that this project will “benefit our immediate neighbours”? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are they tone-deaf? ▪ Were they at the public consultation meeting? ▪ The immediate neighbours do not want this project to proceed and that position has been made repeatedly over the past several months. ● <i>“Residents are resisting...”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dave Haut, Boudreau Communities, is trying to make the claim that although residents (local & existing homeowners) are resisting the project, they will embrace it down the road. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Really? ▪ How will that happen?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How can he validate that claim? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The passage of time will not reduce the height of the buildings, it will not reduce the massive increase in population and vehicles on such a small footprint, and it will not make the traffic & density problems disappear. We will be “stuck” with the mess while the developer profits and moves on to their next project. ○ Haut’s pitch is nothing but a marketing pitch, if not a political pitch, to try to deflect legitimate and well-founded objections that have been repeatedly communicated. (There is a president south of the Canadian border who is an expert at such deflection!)
	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>I am pleading that the <u>Planning & Engineering Department</u> (and any other City departments involved in the due diligence stages) see the flaws in the project design, and the issues that will arise by allowing such a massive amount of density to be developed in this particular area. Do the right thing.</p> <p>I am pleading that <u>City Council</u> has the political will, common sense and social accountability to make the right decision and turn down this project, starting with the Land use and Rezoning request. Please restrict this land to Low Density Residential only. Do not allow developers to control the direction and destiny of the City of St Albert.</p> <p>As we grow from a small town to a mid-size city, we need to take more care in municipal planning. We cannot fall into the trap of chasing tax revenue to try to offset the UCP decision to cut back on the provincial government’s support of municipalities.</p> <p>Let’s keep Commercial, Mixed Use and High-density development limited to the new areas of the city where the developments can be well planned at the macro level, placed in the correct locations, and supported with the right type of infrastructure and roadways to make these developments a success.</p> <p>However, if the City allows this project to advance, the surrounding property owners in Oakmont and Erin Ridge are at risk and face two very adverse outcomes :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) <u>Home Value Depreciation</u> – Whereas Boudreau Communities stands to profit handsomely from this project, the surrounding homeowners stand to be on the losing end through reduction in property values due to the encroachment of the buildings at the site and resulting traffic issues 2) <u>Loss of Quiet Enjoyment of Our Homes</u> – Homeowners who build & buy single family homes in areas of St Albert that are designated for this type of zoning, are entitled to have the zoning in their communities remain the same. Otherwise why would they invest their life savings to build or buy in an area that could be re-zoned at the whim of the City Council? <p>If the City approves the rezoning of the land and the development of the project site, the surrounding homeowners should be entitled to significant compensation :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A one-time reimbursement (IE 5-7% of 2019 assessed property value, or \$35,000 - \$40,000) or, • A permanent cut to our property tax mill rate (IE 30% reduction)

	<p>If that level of compensation sounds rich, so be it. It underscores how significant these issues are for the two communities and how wrong-headed this proposal is for this location in St Albert. To meet the profit driven needs of one developer over the serious and valid objections of hundreds, if not thousands of St Albert citizens, is not what any City Council or Administration should be doing.</p> <p>Decisions like this must be driven by an element of <u>fairness</u>, especially for long time homeowners who moved to St Albert for the characteristics it was known to offer. We have stayed in the City, we have supported the City and local businesses, and we pay the highest level of property taxes in the province. We deserve to have our well-thought-out opinions respected and supported. For the City to do otherwise would be an <u>unforgiveable breach of trust</u> by our Municipal politicians and City administration.</p> <p>Growth can be accomplished but not by allowing developers to shoe-horn projects like this into well established neighbourhoods. Let's not change into a city of driven by greed, poor planning and traffic gridlock. We need to be patient, control our growth, and move forward with solid and respectful long-term planning.</p> <p>Please give my submission very serious consideration. Please represent us effectively and act in our interests as citizens. Please do the right thing and reject this proposal.</p>
7	<p>My name is [Redacted] Cholak and my husband and 2 young children live in the evergreen area of St. Albert. My husband grew up here and I have called St. Albert home for 12 years. We love it here. One of the many reasons we love it is because St. Albert has a small city feel, though we are essentially connected to Edmonton. Even now, traffic is often busy, especially at the Bellerose/Boudreau intersection. We are deeply concerned about the safety of our children, with an increase in traffic. In addition, the crime rates that increase with such developments, as they did in our area when the condos went up near Shops on Boudreau. The reason we love it here is because we feel safe and secure in a tight-net community, the planned developments will truly affect St Albert's reputation. I can appreciate the potential benefits of such a build, but why in the middle of St. Albert? And why without changes to roads, etc. Anyways, though I feel the decision has already been made just want to express my deep concern and feel that this project has not taken the full consideration of the negative impacts this will have on many of its citizens.</p>
8	<p>I am a resident of St. Albert for 16 years. My family and I currently reside in the Oakmont area. The application from Boudreau Communities requires that the City of St. Albert's Mayor Cathy Heron and Counselors review this proposal thoroughly and objectively. The citizens of St. Albert expect that this group will take into account all the information and concerns from residents about this rezoning application. If this application is approved and the development of the remaining parcel of land proceeds, the natural beauty and uniqueness of St. Albert will be forever altered. Further development of this land to include 2 (twenty-six story) high rises, 9 story rental seniors complex, a conference center, medical facility, restaurant and numerous commercial spaces on a property which will already have both Phase 1 and 2 of Botanical Gardens/businesses existing at that time, will only create chaos for those that will need to navigate in and out of the property. This is not a NIMBY matter, far from it, it is a concern for all residents and visitors of St. Albert who live, work, visit and commute in the area. The rezoning approval will have serious and damaging consequences for thousands of people and will undoubtedly affect the delicate ecosystem of the Sturgeon River Valley. I encourage development on this site, however</p>

I am strongly opposed to the scale of this project and the long-lasting impact it will create for this area.

Traffic

The existing site development of Botanical Gardens, bordering on the communities of Oakmont, Erin Ridge, Inglewood, and Woodlands poses tremendous challenges with traffic flow and congestion. Phase 2 of Botanical Gardens is slated to open in the spring of 2020 which **will flood** this area with hundreds more residents and vehicles. One can see that plans to add an additional **6 new buildings** crammed into a small section of land will only create unsurmountable accessibility complications. The scale of the development added to the current traffic problem will permanently gridlock this entire area. Currently there is **one traffic controlled** entrance/exit to Botanical Gardens and during peak times, vehicles have difficulty turning left onto Bellerose as well as traffic from the Evergreen Drive able to turn right to leave Erin Ridge. Once the vehicle is allowed access to the road, there are continued traffic light delays preventing flow of traffic.

Other issues exist for the residents of Botanica Gardens as they leave or access their underground parkade entrance located on the south-east side of Phase 1. Drivers are not permitted a left hand turn into or out of the parkade. This has left many drivers taking a U-turn in front of the Fire Hall and RCMP station or darting across 4 lanes of traffic and pedestrian sidewalks to make the turnabout to accomplish a left-hand turn from the parkade.

A **traffic circle** on the top of Bellerose at Oakmont Drive and Edward Way was proposed to alleviate traffic congestion, though this circle placed at crest of the hill is deemed **dangerous** and will compromise a driver's ability to visualize other traffic when approaching the circle. The placement of a circle on a curved uphill grade demonstrates poor planning and insight from this developer. I gather the traffic circle is a desperate measure to ensure that traffic can flow up Bellerose from another **proposed residential exit** further up Bellerose, but this flow is only temporary as they will be caught up in the bottle neck at the bottom of Bellerose. Frustrated with this option, drivers will continue to seek exit from the area and will be forced to drive through the residential areas of Erin Ridge wrought with its own traffic and the addition of 2 new schools.

River Valley and Environment

For the longest time, St. Albert has been recognized and known for its beauty and livability. Granted, we are a growing community and are accepting the growth and expansion slowly. The scale and magnitude of this development will not enhance the current location. In fact, the cramming of this development on banks of the struggling Sturgeon River will only reflect a lack of concern about our fragile river ecosystem. With towering high rises and multipurpose complexes comes the need for just as much underground parking. The developer has suggested they will "try" to keep some of the mature trees but this is unlikely when they start the excavation process and need to remove and destroy the roots and debris to pour concrete. Long gone will be a habitat for many animals and birds. I feel it is the responsibility of all St. Albert citizens to preserve and protect the fragility of our river valley and trails. This development affects all St Albertans!

Need for Development

Boudreau Communities and the development of this grandiose scheme seems to compare similarly with Grandin Parc Village. Amacon in 2008 proposed its own version of an "urban village". Almost twelve years later, the development is comprised of a couple of condominium blocks, far from the proposed 3-5 towers, and several thousand square meters of commercial and retail space. In fact, many of the condos needed to go to the rental market because of poor sales. The multi-level Lions Village Senior's

	<p>apartments under construction (next to Canadian Tire) has taking years to build with many stalls. Look no further to Phase 2 of Botanica Gardens – not sold out yet. Is there a steady need and a growing market for condominiums and seniors' rental apartment? If not, why would St.</p> <p>Albert council approve of Boudreau Communities and their aggressive plan to develop in the heart of an already establish community. At the information session at the St. Albert Inn this past fall, the developer stated that this development would introduce many niche shops "like shoe shops". A member of the crowd shared with him that the shoe store that was there had to close its doors due to lack of business. My vision for the remaining "Holes" land is for development of a true urban village, where all homes, condos and businesses mirror not compete with each other.</p>
9	<p>We have two major concerns about these proposals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact of the high rises on the river-bank skyline and neighboring residences. A key feature attracting people to St Albert is the Red Willow trail and the access to the length of the Sturgeon River. 20+ storey buildings are completely inappropriate in this riparian landscape. The 25 meter height maximum should be rigorously maintained. 2. Impact on traffic on Bellerose Drive. During commuter hours there are already lengthy waits to turn South onto Boudreau, and we have not yet seen the impact from the new development at Botanica. The proposed traffic circle will not improve traffic flow; it will simply provide congestion at an additional site and encourage increased use of short cuts through Erin Ridge to get to and from St Albert Trail. <p>We see no reason to agree to any amendments of the existing carefully developed land use bylaw. The developers were fully aware of zoning before purchasing the land and have failed to alleviate the concerns raised at the previous open house.</p>
10	<p>After viewing the application at city hall, we would like to oppose the Riverbank Landing development proposal.</p> <p>We currently just completed and moved into 96 Orchard court and are very concerned of the tower height (especially the 12-story building which will be less than 100 ft from our fence line). Due to the closeness, shadowing after 3pm will blanket not only our home but the neighborhood. Notice the application does not show shadowing after 3pm. This will not only negatively affect our 1.7M appraised home financially, it will seriously affect our views and privacy.</p> <p>The only solution is less stories (4 or less) or much larger buffer zone.</p> <p>Due to the small land footprint, I understand the developers need to go with height but this proposal is simply ridiculous and greedy. This type of development suits a downtown location, not in the middle of an established community that's infrastructure including traffic will be pushed passed its limits.</p> <p>We encourage anyone to walk on the south side of the river and notice the size of the current massive 8 story condo being build. Now imagine the addition of 2 -26 story and 1 – 12 story buildings...makes no sense.</p>
11	<p>I have many concerns to the planned development off of Bellerose Drive including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the planned height will stick out no matter where you look in our city. It is ridiculous that multiple towers of over 20 stories is even being considered. Do city planners not appreciate sight lines or is the almighty dollar the leading reason for this? - traffic issues are already abundant as you leave the neighbourhoods and adding these high rises will only make this worse. Again poor planning is the root of this.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - adding a new access into the development also adds to the congestion. It seems the answer to all traffic is another set of lights in this city. Disappointing once again. - the application to amend the Area Structure Plan and Land Use Bylaw is over the top. I am. It opposed to further development but it should be made something that is reasonable when considering traffic and views. - incompatibility with adjacent neighborhoods should be a top consideration. Once again it appears that there is no planning and this city will accept anything thrown at them. when does common sense set in? - clearly there will be over densification for the area given the current road design. We can't change that any longer and your predecessors never envisioned a such a development going into this location. It was not designed that way. - the current development at the previous holes greenhouses has been ongoing for years. Parking, garbage, noise, etc. have all been put up with and temporary measures meant the problem shifted to another neighbourhood. <p>I certainly hope that our council and city planners use some common sense for this development. Any report that is provided by a developer is always skewed towards their point of view.</p>
12	<p>I wish to express my concerns about and opposition to the Riverbank Landing development.</p> <p>There are a number of issues, only a few of which I will elaborate on.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. High traffic volume. A great deal of traffic already passes through the intersection of Boudreaux Rd. and Bellerose Dr. and there can be significant delays. This will only be exacerbated with the addition of some 600 more vehicles to the morning rush. 2. The traffic circle that has been proposed will only benefit the new residents, not the residents of existing neighbourhoods. Very little traffic moves northeast up Bellerose Drive in the morning. This means that the residents of the new complex can enter the circle unhindered. Everyone entering from Oakmont or Erin Ridge will have to wait for gaps in the traffic flow from the new development. What is intended to look like a solution for all traffic is only a solution for the new development. 3. Safety concerns. Among other things, a 25 story tower will require a crane operating somewhere around 100 meters above a residential area. 4. We have dealt with construction at this site for the better part of 10 years. It is unrealistic to assume that they will complete a much more extensive section of development in only 7 years. Seventeen years of construction is an unreasonable request to make of the residents of Oakmont and Erin Ridge. 5. As a resident for over 25 years, like many other long-time residents, I bought a home with the expectation of living here for many years, not with the idea that I would sell in order to profit. The development firm bought their property based on speculation that they would be able to make an enormous profit even though they would need to run roughshod over the existing building bylaws. We need to ask ourselves 'at what point does developing a new community give way to just plain greed'. I have questioned whether Boudreau Communities has made an outrageous proposal, with the expectation of opposition, so that we will be relieved when they make 'concessions' and drop the height of the towers to 15 stories, or that we will completely forget about the 12 story seniors building. I also wonder how many other requests to bypass the existing bylaws we can expect as the City makes more accommodations for the developer. 6. Boudreau Developments has proposed moving one of the towers further from Oakmont. This only moves the problem to other residents. It would place it right in front of my house. One of the things that my children loved about the house was a large window in one of the bedrooms that would now be immediately in front of the tower. My children have now grown up and moved away but this would mean that when I decide

	<p>to sell, anyone with children would see the 25 stories of apartments looking directly into their children's bedroom. This could cause an enormous reduction in my property value. I know that I am not alone in this concern.</p> <p>7. There have been many new neighbourhoods built since I moved into Erin Ridge and several that are in the process of being built. Why are there no 25 story towers being built adjacent to single family dwellings in these new neighbourhoods. The answer (obviously) is that nobody would buy those houses.</p> <p>8. According to the article in the December 25 edition of the St. Albert Gazette the developer said that he believes that once it is completed the current residents of Oakmont and Erin Ridge 'will embrace it down the road when they see the benefits drawn from the development'. This is not a comforting statement as there is no contingency plan if we find that the problems outweigh the developer's anticipated benefits.</p> <p>These are just a few of my concerns. There are others like environmental impact, river access and shade that I do not have the relevant information to discuss in depth but that I am sure are shared by others in the adjacent areas.</p>
13	<p>I am writing to you as a concerned resident who has been living in the Erin ridge area for the past 22 years. I have decided I cannot remain silent regarding the plans for the Riverbank Landing expansion. My concerns centre on traffic and safety.</p> <p>The traffic on Bellerose Dr. and Boudreau Rd. is of great concern. The completion of Phase 2, a 9- story apartment is not even compete yet and we have seen the traffic increase to levels that are already taxing the current infrastructure. As you are aware, we already have an area around the Mall where traffic can become fairly conected. Recently due to some changes to the timing of the lights on the corner of Bellerose and Boudreau, I have already experienced on several occasions being stuck in traffic literally took me more than 15 minutes to get from the Canadian tire through the lights on Boudreau. What scares me is how much worse it will become after Phase 2 and the twin towers are built.</p> <p>On the corner of Bellerose and Boudreau there is a fire station and police station that are essential services to the community that may very well be impacted by this proposed development.</p> <p>If there is a fire in Oakmont or Erin Ridge and the fire department needs to make a left hand turn out of their station this can be an issue as we are already seeing traffic back way past the fire station and around the corner to the lights entering the Riverbank landing development. How are our emergency responders expected to respond when they can't even get out of there parking lot without risking a serious accident in the process? I can only imaging just how much worse it will be once phase 2 is complete let alone these purpose 26 story high rises. If you allow this development to proceed, there is no way to fix the traffic problems it will create. If traffic becomes as big a problem as I assure you it will, no one will want to live in the area. Who will want to live in an area you can't get in and out and that will put you and your family at risk for emergency services that can't get to you in a timely fashion during a real emergency.</p> <p>Another factor that should not be overlooked is the fact that these new proposed towers are in the flight path of STARS air ambulance as it approached the Sturgeon hospital. Just another potential hazard of this project that is unnecessary.</p> <p>I don't know of any other bedroom community that has allowed the development high rises of this type right in the middle of an established single family dwelling. Most people move to these types of communities to raise their families and escape the problems associated with High density living. In my opinion, allowing this development to proceed in this location would be irresponsible and would lead to long-term problems, which in turn will bring about more problems than prosperity for the city of St. Albert. I feel so</p>

	strong about this that, if council approves this plan I will show my disapprove at the poles or move out of St. Albert altogether.
14	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I hope that you have had a lovely holiday season. I would like to take a minute to address my concerns regarding the proposed development on the former Holes site by Boudreau Communities Ltd.. As a resident or part of St. Albert for my entire life of 64 years, we are all very proud of our city, our sense of community, its green spaces and moniker of "Botanical Arts City".</p> <p>While I understand Boudreau Communities Limited's desire to make the most of the property that they wish to develop, I do not agree with or support the building of 26 story towers in the middle of existing and established residential neighbourhoods. I feel that a development of this nature would be better suited to a new neighbourhood where families purchasing homes would have the opportunity to make their decision with all the information at hand and the knowledge of high density residential towers being a part of that neighbourhood. Keeping in mind the developer's desire to build a walkable "urban village" with all the amenities needed close at hand, I would suggest that Erin Ridge North or Jensen Lakes would be a better fit for their vision.</p> <p>While I realize that Boudreau Communities does not own land in other areas in St. Albert, I do feel that the development of 230 & 250 Bellerose Dr. and 300 Orchard Court should be held to the same height restrictions as followed by the Botanica and Shops of Boudreau developments and that can be found in the Urban Village Centres: Planning and Designs Guidelines. On page 4 of that document it states 2.3 A maximum of five storeys will be considered through attention to such matters as identified above in Section 2.2. In addition, when discussing "Residential Development", 2.9 speaks to "The overall average residential density to be achieved within the residential area shall range between a minimum of 25 units per gross residential hectare and a maximum of 50 units per gross residential hectare. A higher overall density may be considered provided that the development is determined to be Protect scale and character of adjacent land uses Height provisions Common design and finish elements are carried throughout the development Additional provisions relating to residential Development. Multi-family and other housing forms Residential density compatible as per Section 2.2 and consistent with the character of the area." I do not believe that having towers of 26 stories compliment the adjacent neighbourhoods.</p> <p>I would also like to address traffic for a moment. With Evergreens of Erin Ridge, Oakmont and Botanica already limited to only being able to exit onto Bellerose Dr., this is a huge concern for us all. Riverbank Landing will also be a "one way out" neighbourhood emptying onto Bellerose Dr. and with the addition of proposed commercial outlets along with the high density residential, this development will increase traffic in much the same way that The Shops at Boudreau have. As this is a yet to be approved development, roads could be adjusted to accept the additional traffic that goes hand in hand with a development of this nature. Having the increase in traffic be a fore-thought is always better than trying to squeeze in the extra cars on our already over crowded Bellerose Dr. It is not unusual for cars to be backed up from the lights at Bellerose and Boudreau to past Evergreen Dr. and the bend in the road up the hill towards Oakmont. Although the left turn signal at that corner has been lengthened at peak hours (thank you), it still can take several cycles of the light to be able to get out of Evergreens to make the left turn onto Boudreau Dr. and head south. With no options available to widen or add extra lanes to Bellerose Dr., how does the City propose to handle the increase traffic flow? The developers have already said that it is not their problem. But it is ours as residents of Evergreens and Oakmont.</p>

	<p>There are several other issues that I feel need addressing on this development having lived through the construction of Botanica and the Shops of Boudreau, however, height of the proposed buildings and increased traffic are the 2 most immediate. I do understand that St. Albert, like many other cities, cannot continue to grow outward - that higher density housing is the future. I do hope, however, that the Mayor and City Council will hear the residents whom this development directly effects and will uphold its standards, what the city is and what it stands for.</p>
15	<p>I'm a resident of Evergreens of Erin Ridge and I want to comment on the proposed development across the street from my home at [Redacted] Evergreen Drive. I expect you'll be getting a lot of comments on this; it's a polarizing topic in our area, so I'll try to be brief.</p> <p>I'm generally accepting of the move to denser neighborhoods in our evolving world, and I can appreciate the logic of adding density near services.</p> <p>Still, on reflecting on the public meeting held in September, I'd like to focus my comments on two takeaways I had: the track record of the developer in addressing neighbor concerns, and the future plans of accommodating the population and traffic growth.</p> <p>In regards to the developer's track record, the concerns over worker parking is a good place to start. For an extended period of time residents, individually - and we later learned of the large number of them - had attempted to have a dialog about the conduct of the workers from the construction site, and the volume of them in the Evergreens of Erin Ridge. At the public meeting, the developer took a moment to acknowledge that experience as a 'lesson learned for the next phase'. The reality from my viewpoint is that it was only after being forced by a parking restriction, did any alternatives arrive, and then it became a shifting field where the workers ended up in another neighborhood, or faced extra fees to work on the project. This ongoing example of what the developer views as a lesson learned, is a troubling example of what can be expected for a larger project, over a longer time frame.</p> <p>At the same meeting, the developer expressed that the issues of increased density were just not their problem; the developer is not responsible for roads and infrastructure around the site. A few comments were made about turning lanes at the Boudreau-Bellerose intersection, but a closer look exposed how superficial those changes might be, or even when they might be. There was nothing about increased transit, or alternatives for residents in the area. The tone was, growth will happen, get used to it, it's going to get 'worse' from a traffic volume perspective.</p> <p>If a large community is being proposed - planned ideally - to be added to an existing neighborhood, putting off the needed infrastructure for it, is contrary to the responsibility of planning. Should the city decide to accept the developer's intentions, there has to be a demonstration from the City to own its portion of the scope.</p> <p>I'll be closely following the discussions of this project.</p>
16	<p>I wish to express my opposition to the proposed project and the request for a change/ amendment to the Oakmont ASP and the land use bylaw designations by Boudreau Developments.</p> <p>I am opposed to this project for a number of reasons.</p> <p>The first is the traffic impact which will paralyze traffic flows in and out of Oakmont and Erin Ridge. Currently it typically takes us at least 2-3 lights on Bellerose turning left onto Boudreau to leave our home between 4:30 and 7 nightly and sometimes these restrictions are felt as early as 3 p.m. Traffic into and out of the area on Bellerose is</p>

<p>backed up on any given day in “rush hour/peak times” with the current residents. This situation is soon to be exacerbated by the opening of the second building at Botanica. As there is no other way in or out of Oakmont, except to shortcut through our neighbouring community of Erin Ridge and Erin Ridge North, the far-reaching traffic impact must be analyze far past the current TIA which only reaches Oakmont Drive. The traffic congestion into and out of Oakmont, Erin Ridge and Erin Ridge North is already unacceptable and will become overwhelming if this project is approved. City counsel needs to halt the developer’s mentality that if they dream it then city counsel will approve it. The ridiculous “new” suggestion that the traffic impact can be managed and/or alleviated by the installation of a traffic circle on the bend of the significant hill on Bellerose Drive is simply laughable. The number of rear-end and near-rear end collisions at the current right-in, right-out access to this development is increasing as businesses become more established. To add further density, commercial or otherwise, is a recipe for disastrous outcomes.</p> <p>Secondly, the intent and purpose of any ASP is to give residents assurances that they know and understand the anticipated development in their community as well as to protect the quality of life that comes with the expectations and assurances of any ASP or LUB. It is respectfully submitted that the proposed amendments and the resulting development substantially interfere with the reasonable enjoyment of the residents of Oakmont and Erin Ridge and Erin Ridge North and in particular those homes in close and visual proximity to the balconies and windows of these proposed towers. If counsel amends ASP’s and LUBs without serious consideration to the impacts densification brings, then the validity, reliability and credibility of this ASP and all ASPs in general becomes mute. Citizens should be able to rely on the governance in place to make informed decisions on where they purchase homes and raise their children, without fear or concern that a simple request by a greedy developer will upset the sense of balance, safety, accessibility, security and privacy of the residents of any community that ASP’s were developed to ensure. Boudreau Developments knew or ought to have known the limitations of the current ASP and LUB when they purchased the property and any potential argument by them that their financial investment is at risk or unrecoverable with the current designations is not a valid or sustainable argument in favour of these amendments. If they didn’t do their due diligence before their own purchase, that is their problem not that of the St. Albert counsel or the citizens of St. Albert.</p> <p>I am also very concerned that the river valley should be protected and preserved at all cost as an area to be enjoyed by all. It is my opinion that the river valley is becoming “contaminated” by the most recent developments on the river’s shoreline near Canadian Tire and now Oakmont with the development of Botanica I and II and this new proposal by Boudreau Developments and their unreasonable vision. If density development along the Sturgeon River’s banks continues to be allowed nothing can or will return the beautiful, natural river valley to its natural state. The entire river valley, from one end of St. Albert to the other, should in fact be a reserve area with minimal development and minimal impact. The current ASP addresses minimal impact and development with low-rise commercial buildings and low density residential housing. At one of the public open houses, Boudreau Developments admitted that the current Botanica I is situated so close to the river that accessibility and a walkway in front of the building will be denied as it infringes on the riparian protection zone of the Sturgeon River. Then there is the issue of the mechanical infrastructure which looks more like a “cattle trough” on the top of Botanica I, which cannot be screened as required by St. Albert’s bylaws, because</p>

<p>this developer did not and now cannot comply with these requirements and the building, as built, cannot be retrofitted to comply. So all visitors to this area, including adjacent residents, have to view this ugly piece of equipment into perpetuity.</p> <p>The towers, whether they are 12 storeys, 25, 26 or 28 are imposing, cause shadowing, impact security and privacy and will impact the river valley and its enjoyment for all. The increased mass density will cause traffic that St. Albert has no ability to address or manage in this area. There are no other options for traffic management at this location other than to restrict development and density to no more than what the current ASP and LUB allows. To amend the ASP to allow more than the current Oakmont ASP contemplates is an affront to good governance and common sense and is a slap in the face to those of us who did our due diligence and investigation before purchasing our homes. If any one of us wished to live in the shadows of high rise buildings with the traffic issues, lack of privacy and lack of security, we would have chosen downtown Edmonton not the quiet bedroom community that we now call home.</p> <p>While our home is several blocks from this project, we bought knowing that some neighbours in two storey homes would have the ability to see into our yard but we never expected to have to fight against multi-storey development in our backyard, to protect our security, privacy, views, river valley enjoyment and vehicle access. Our back yard will become much less private, much less secure and much less enjoyable with the ability of residents in these proposed towers to peer into our yards, shadow our sunshine and leave us with a much less secure feeling in our own homes and surrounding community. The ridiculous suggestion by Boudreau Developments that all can be alleviated by the installation of skinny towers moved to the centre of the development, double left-hand turning lanes and a traffic circle is irresponsible and simply confirms their greed and selfishness in trying to push this development down the throats of the Oakmont, Erin Ridge, Woodlands and Sturgeon Heights residents and St. Albert in general without consideration or thought to the impacts to be felt for a lifetime in these communities and the current and future residents of all of St. Albert by this unsustainable increase in density.</p> <p>An amendment to the ASP and LUB does not prevent or protect the City against the developer arbitrarily increasing density, moving buildings or causing further detrimental impact so long as it is done within the parameters of an existing ASP and LUB. This was seen quite significantly in the ASP amendment that City Counsel approved in 2015 and, because of delays and revised visions of the developer, then had no control over at 50 Edinburgh Court.</p> <p>It is my hope that City administration and City Counsel will see the detrimental effects that this type of development will cause and put a stop to this developer's mindset that they can do anything in the face of greed and the all-mighty dollar. While I am not against density or densification, it must be done in the right situation, in the right location, and with the majority support of those that will be impacted on a daily basis. This amendment to the ASP and the LUB and the development itself does not have that community support and the impact is unsustainable with the current and/or proposed infrastructure changes.</p> <p>It is incumbent upon this mayor and counsel to manage and maintain the small town feel of St Albert while embracing growth. It is essential that this municipal government maintains the reputation and designation that St. Albert is a great place to raise a family</p>

	<p>and that it is a safe community. This is important to St. Albertans and that mindset should be upheld by this and future governing members of counsel.</p> <p>Now lets step away from the residents of the adjoining communities. How will families and children from all over St. Albert feel while they participate in water sports at the water park, walk, skate board and bike through this leg of Red Willow Park, play baseball on its fields, walk through the botanical gardens or simply enjoy a family picnic when they look up and see residences that could be watching their every move.</p> <p>It is my opinion that if Lois and Ted Hole were alive they would be at the front of the line in expressing opposition to this proposal. A wise man recently said to me that he believed Lois would be the first one to throw a potato at this plan. While Lois was always in favour of and embraced change, it would not have been on the backs of the majority for the benefit of the minority. The minority in this case is Boudreau Developments and their unrealistic proposal which, if allowed, will impact the entire St. Albert community, far-reaching throughout the city. The only one that benefits from this proposal is the developer and their pocketbook. I think that the Hole's would embrace the type of low-density development currently contemplated in the existing ASP, single family, townhomes or duplexes, sporting front verandas and a park-like setting giving way to a neighbourly feel where neighbours from all across Oakmont could meet, greet and know each other as they walked through and enjoyed this new development. The commercial development should be low-rise and possibly embrace the Hole's culture of family and community, while incorporating their history as well as the history and possibly the facade of the "red barn". Tall towers, whether residential or commercial in nature, where people living or working on the same floor don't even know each other, does not embrace or maintain St Albert's culture or small-town feel.</p> <p>I plead with city counsel to show good governance, good common sense and a commitment to St. Albert to refuse these amendments outright.</p>
17	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to this proposed development. I am strongly against this proposal for several reasons.</p> <p>I live on Everest Crescent and have lived here for over 10 years. Since the completion of Botanica's phase 1 and Shops at Boudreau, traffic has increased significantly. With phase 2 about to be completed, I can't imagine the congestion it's going to add to an already overloaded area. We are often blocked from entering Evergreen due to vehicles sitting in the middle of the intersection. Also adding to this traffic congestion is additional homes being built in North Erin Ridge and Oakmont. To add the volume of suites suggested for Riverbank Landing would create a nightmare of congestion for this area. The infrastructure just isn't there to handle the volume. A traffic circle is a laughable solution.</p> <p>Additionally, it is my opinion that structures of this size (26 stories!!) are more suited to a downtown area than the residential area being proposed.</p> <p>I have lived in St. Albert my whole life. I am turning 60 this year so I'm a longtime resident. My husband and I are considering moving out of St. Albert for a few reasons, one being traffic frustrations. Adding to this problem will likely make our decision that much easier.</p> <p>Please reject this unreasonable proposal.</p>
18	<p>Currently I live in Botanica and am in favour of densification, but object to the size and scope of the proposed project for the following reasons:</p>

	<p>1. the current traffic system is unsustainable and does not lend itself to the huge number of cars passing through. I invite you to sit in your car at our building's egress driveway facing Boudreau Road and try to merge with the traffic traveling north between 2:30 and 6:30 p.m. No one stops or slows down to let your car merge and if you finally do get a break in traffic to turn west onto Bellerose Drive the line up can easily reach the Fire Hall and it can take several lights just to make the turn. The same situation already occurs at the light on Bellerose and Evergreen Drive. With the addition of Phase II residents, this bottleneck will become worse. Perhaps better traffic timing will help this, but with the addition of so many cars from a future, very large development, new ways will have to be found to allow for traffic. Enlargement of Bellerose Drive, Boudreau Dr. and the Boudreau Bridge will be required.</p> <p>2. the addition of two 25 plus storey towers seems so out of context with our skyline. One half the height would not appear so formidable as it can blend better into the current construction. Also the residents of Oakmont would not have the towers overshadowing their houses, yards and privacy. Will these towers stand vacant for years before they can be filled and become eyesores. Does St. Albert, (traditionally a bedroom city) show enough of an appetite for these high-rises.</p> <p>I do not have objections to the other aspects of this project, but do ask that Council carefully consider the long term aspects of it on the residents who live within this area and the future costs and consequences of the increased traffic and human costs.</p>
19	<p>I am writing to you to state my concerns and objections to the Riverbank Landing proposal. My husband and I are absolutely opposed to the Riverbank Landing development and the application to amend the Area Structure Plan and Land Use Bylaw.</p> <p>I have been a St. Albert resident for over 30 years. My husband, myself and our two young children live in The Evergreens of Erin Ridge. I am proud to call St. Albert home and absolutely love the small town feel to raise my children in. My husband and I choose to stay here to raise our family as we value the parks, community feel, trails, playgrounds, schools and recreational center St. Albert offers.</p> <p>The communities of Oakmont and Erin Ridge clearly oppose this project. The reasons have been made clear at the town hall meeting (which I attended) in the fall. Concerns with traffic safety, massive increase in density, years of construction, and the environmental impact to the river valley watershed were all covered by residents at the meeting. I know these concerns have been emailed to council as well from residents.</p> <p>Traffic Safety Have you been on Bellerose around 8:10 in the morning? I can sit at the lights at The Evergreens 2-4 light changes waiting to turn left onto Boudreau and then get into the left turning lane to take my son to school at Neil M. Ross. The traffic volume is already ridiculous.</p> <p>With only entrances to the development on one road, emergency vehicles will have a difficult time entering when they will inevitably be needed. I'm also concerned with their ability to get through the intersection at Boudreau and Bellerose as it is as traffic is already so congested there. We are a family of 2 young children and we are concerned for their safety. What if a fire truck or ambulance can't make it to our house because traffic is backed up through the intersection at Evergreen Drive?</p>

	<p>The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) shows that “bringing over 800 residents to the area will result in an influx of 600 two-way trips at evening hours”. No “improvements” will reduce the massive increase in traffic congestion and noise. It is ridiculous to see a set of traffic lights placed on Bellerose at Evergreen because it is practically right on top of the Boudreau traffic lights. The idea of jamming in another set of traffic lights or a roundabout (on a hill around a bend) as indicated in the amended proposal is almost laughable.</p> <p>There is nothing in the proposal to solve the traffic volume increases that will inevitably occur.</p> <p>For the immediate future can you imagine what traffic will be like when the second condo tower is occupied? The City has a chance to stop this traffic problem from developing into a traffic nightmare for the immediate neighbours and any citizens in the north and east part of St Albert.</p> <p>Increase in Density</p> <p>The major underlying issue is density. This development would provide over densification for the site and area. This development is in the wrong location. The developer’s walkability pitch is a joke. We live a 3 minute walk to the Shops of Boudreau now and if we want to go as a family we drive as I don't find the intersection out of The Evergreens very safe and I will not allow my children to cross the road there. To jam this development in this location to encourage community gatherings, does not come anywhere close to offsetting the damage the project will cause to hundreds or thousands of surrounding homeowners and residents.</p> <p>The developer and City should be exploring unused land area for a development of this astronomical size. Building such a project on bare land would give all future homeowners full transparency of the project before they build (or buy) in the new area, the roadways can be developed to accommodate the traffic volume (including the twinning of Ray Gibbon), and ample space for customer and employee parking can easily be achieved. My husband and I purchased our house believing that we would be living near single family homes. We value our neighbours, their families, and the children that my children have come to call their friends.</p> <p>Years of Construction</p> <p>When Phase 1 was being built our neighbourhood became a parking lot for the construction workers. It got so bad with cars being parked on both sides of the road that the hill in The Evergreens became a one way. Again, the safety of my children was put at risk. The construction site managers refused to find alternative transportation for it's workers. It fell on the city's shoulders to create a parking ban in our area.</p> <p>At the town hall meeting it was stated by the developer that they would ensure that the construction workers would be transported in to ensure that they would not be parking in residential areas. Have you been on Ellesmere Drive during working hours? The workers are parking there now. That has made that road unsafe. The road that goes in front of the park my children play at. As the city creates parking bans the workers will find new areas to park in. I know residents in</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Oakmont are now dealing with this issue as well.</p> <p>The city will be dealing with residents complaining about workers parking in their neighbours for the next 10 years if this development goes through.</p> <p>Environmental Impact to our Sturgeon River How can we be a "Botanical Arts City" while we have massive structures built into the waters edge. The City has already allowed two high-rise condo buildings to be built right beside the Sturgeon River. It is unthinkable to picture the Riverbank project being built on this site as well. This project certainly does not align to St Albert's motto, "Botanical Arts City". To add to this point, as the buildings sit now we as a public can not access the river bank to enjoy our Botanical City.</p> <p>I spend time with my neighbours on our front lawn watching the kids play, at the parks and green space, and by using the trails. It would be nice to have open green space along to river to meet and spend time together. A set up with picnic tables, parks and a field would be a great use of some of the space along the river. The high rises will block more of our access to the river.</p> <p>Yes, growth is inevitable. However, we as a city need to do it responsibly. There can continue to be development along the river. Perhaps a 2 storey residence and a strip of one storey commercial might be a compromise. We homeowners who have built or bought single family homes in areas of St Albert that are designated for single family zoning, are entitled to have the zoning in our communities remain the same. Otherwise why would we invest our life savings to build or buy in an area that could be re-zoned at the whim of the City Council? We are also concerned about our property values. This development will negatively affect our property value and will put us at risk of losing money on our valued investment.</p> <p>The residents of St. Albert are asking their elected representatives to represent their wishes. I am pleading with you to stand up to the developers, represent the people of St. Albert and do the right thing. Turn down this proposal! As I stated at the town hall meeting, we don't need this!</p>
20	<p>I am writing this letter to city council to express my objection to the plan to develop the towers at Riverbank Landing via amending the Area Structure Plan and Land Use Bylaw.</p> <p>We have been long time residents of the City of St. Albert, have owned a home building company in St. Albert and in the past have advised customers of the Land Use Bylaws in place. To change the Land Use Bylaw to now allow 2 buildings with not only 26 floors and thousands more residents, but the increase of traffic diverting onto 1 arterial road - Bellerose Drive is unacceptable. The change the Land Use Bylaws to satisfy developers and the bottom line of dollars in their pockets is unacceptable to residents that live and bought into the community based on the Land Use bylaws that were passed by city council. You owe it to the residents to maintain those decisions and land use bylaws. As well, Bellerose Drive is extremely busy and as a resident of Botanica Phase 1 we currently have to drive up to Sturgeon Road and turn around to access our Parking Parkade on Boudreau Road as there is no left hand turn allowed if going east on Boudreau. That is crazy in itself! Now imagine the increase of residents in the area with just the opening of Botanica Phase 2.</p>

	<p>Over the years we have enjoyed living in St. Albert because of the community feel and the strict land use bylaws in place and the restriction of “sky scraper” developments. With the potential of this development going through our property values will decrease and the aesthetic appeal of our neighborhood will be greatly decreased. Boudreau Developments claims that once it is all complete the residents will be “overjoyed”, a quote taken from a recent St. Albert Gazette article ... maybe they should actually listen to the residents of the area before commenting as that is not the culture or feel of St. Albert residents and why we chose to live in St. Albert. There have been several promises made to the current residents of Botanica by Boudreau Developments that have not occurred after construction and they have lost the trust of not only myself but several other residents. I hope that the City Council of St. Albert listen to our concerns as residents and does not change the Land Use Bylaws established to protect the integrity of our housing developments!</p>
21	<p>I know that my small little voice will not have any impact whatsoever on final outcomes regarding Land Use and density issues etc. I do realize that continued development, and -approval of development projects will go forward despite citizens' complaints and concerns.</p> <p>However, for the first time in my life (and I've lived in St. Albert since 1974) I would like to voice my opinion regarding continued development.</p> <p>If traffic density is not considered - and it certainly would appear it is NOT being considered - then the already troubling traffic- tie- ups of the intersection of Bellerose at Boudreau will not improve but, unbelievably, actually increase, especially because Bellerose Dr will be the overreaching access point. Phase II at Botanica is set to open in the late spring of this year and another five or perhaps six hundred vehicles will be added to the increasing congestion. The mere thought of <i>yet another</i> six or seven hundred (likely far more) units being built in this area, is nightmarish. The congestion will then become an even bigger issue for residents and even perhaps, city council. It is my hope that there will be some forward thinking by council and it's advisors NOW. I would beg you to be PROactive thinkers and planners. I think that if you are about to engage in a huge activity like this, planners must devise some doable plan to address traffic. Please allow common sense to enter the conversation and not just the dollars development will bring.</p> <p>I have lived at Botanica (Phase 1) for almost three years and <i>just getting out</i> of the parkade has increased in difficulty immeasurably. Knowing that you are about to make my life even more difficult is not a great way to start 2020.</p> <p>I do realize that nothing I have said in this letter is a surprise or anything new. And, I also realize that my getting out of my building is not of any consequence to anyone at city hall. However, I value this opportunity to make my voice heard and, should you actually read this letter... thank you.</p>
22	<p>My name is [Redacted] Sponchia, an Erin Ridge resident and homeowner. I am writing you today to express my deep concern and objection to the proposed Riverbank Landing development.</p> <p>Structures of this magnitude have no place in this community. When I purchased my home it was because it was in a quiet neighborhood that I wanted to raise my children in. I am already seeing major changes in the massive amounts of traffic that the current development has brought forth. I can't imagine how much worse it will be by adding to</p>

	<p>it. I realize that they have proposed a traffic circle to help alleviate the issue however living next to something like this was never what I, nor my community envisioned when choosing this as our home. Sky scrapers mixed in amongst single family homes makes no sense and frankly would be an eyesore. The incredible amount of time it would take to complete such a project is unfathomable. For years we have been suffering through construction from the Botanica development and it isn't even completed yet. I don't want to spend decades living next to construction either. I don't want my children growing up next to sky scrapers... If that was my vision my family would have moved to a downtown setting and not chosen the beautiful neighborhood that we did. Please assure me and my neighbors that we can keep our beautiful neighborhood by rejecting the developments proposal. Please do not change zoning to allow something like this. Thank You.</p>
23	<p>We are currently opposed to the Riverbank Landing development. We are not opposed to the rezoning of the land but we are opposed to this size of development that is going to create so much traffic. Traffic is already a concern for us and Botanic Phase 2 has not been completed yet.</p> <p>We live at [Redacted] Evergreen Drive and are already living with difficulties getting to and from our house onto Bellerose Drive during rush hour. There are nights when we are not able turn into our street, or turn out of our street in order access the southbound left turn lane, because traffic is so backed up the hill on Bellerose Drive. Traffic now is backed up in both directions at the intersection of Bellerose and Boudreau Road. Evergreen Drive is already being used constantly by people who are using it as a U-turn location because traffic is so bad. Creating another interchange on Bellerose Drive between Evergreen Drive and Edward Way/Oakmont Drive, whether it be an intersection or a traffic circle, will only create more issues for everyone who use Bellerose Drive.</p> <p>We believe that Bellerose Drive may need to be widened to allow for any increase in traffic. I would hate to see this because St Albert's trees and green space worth protecting. We already know that the light pattern needs to be changed at Bellerose Drive and Boudreau Road in order to get traffic moving. We would like to see a sound barrier wall built and more trees planted along Bellerose Drive so that our neighbours and ourselves do not have to listen to the amount of traffic that is using Bellerose Drive behind us.</p>
24	<p>I OPPOSE THE PROPOSED RIVERBANK LANDING EXPENSION FOR MANY REASONS. EXPENSIONS NOT ALWAYS SERVE THE NEEDED INTERESTS OF THE CITY.</p>
25	<p>My family attended the developer's meeting regarding the project for the Boudreau Development. We stat and listened to the developer and residents. We who live in Oakmont and Erin Ridge made it clear this proposal was and remains unsupported in our area.</p> <p>We have seen traffic increase and have already experienced ongoing construction of Botanica Towers that have taken away our beautiful views without care or concern for the environmental impact. We already cannot turn into our area due to high traffic volume. We strongly oppose having 20 floor or higher condominiums shading our home and adding more of a negative foot print in our area. We work hard and chose our home here because of our quiet neighborhood charm that makes St. Albert so desirable to live. Who and what planning was put into place to say we need a project of this size and scope here? Perhaps somewhere out side of the city?</p> <p>We as home owners in these areas made it crystal clear at that meeting that we oppose this project and yet who is listening?</p>

	<p>Our hope is that our elected council listens to the city's voters and residents. We oppose this proposal and do not want large condominiums, retail or a convention center in our quiet residential area.</p>
26	<p>Due to the traffic issues on Bellerose and Boudreau roads it may be prudent to rethink opening up Orchard court road to allow traffic to go thru to Evergreen Drive to exit Oakmont. This would eliminate travel up Oakridge DR south to Oakmont drive then onto Bellerose only to go down to Boudreau where there are issues with traffic jams at most times during the day. There would also be a way for the people in Botanica to exit to Oakridge DR south and Oakvista to get to Bellerose to go out to Sturgeon County. There are many other issues that need to be addressed but traffic flow will be on of the top issues.</p>
27	<p>I would like to add my voice against the proposed development for the remainder of the former Hole's property. The increase in population density in this area and the subsequent increase in traffic will gridlock the intersection of Boudreau Road and Bellerose Drive for hours each day because there are so few alternate routes for many residents of the surrounding neighbourhoods. This gridlock will also make emergency access to these same neighbourhoods impossible for many hours each day. And then there is the incompatibility of this development with the surrounding, mostly single family residential, neighbourhoods. Two of the proposed buildings are far taller than any other building in the entire city and they will loom over the river valley, casting long shadows over parts of Oakmont and Erin Ridge. They will be visible from all parts of the City.</p> <p>City council calls St. Albert 'the Botanic City' and is so proud of our city being rated as one of the best places to live in Alberta so I don't understand why they are even considering a development that will negatively impact so many residents and their property values. Part of the land wanted for this development is presently zoned single family residential and it should stay that way. Also the heights of the proposed buildings on the zoned commercial land should not exceed the 10 stories of the Botanica building.</p>
28	<p>Good day. I am an owner of a condo in the Botanica building and a very concerned resident. I want it to be known that I object to the plan. The height, traffic problems that will arise and environmental issues are just a few of my concerns.</p>
29	<p>I am writing to all of you to let you know that I am opposed to the Proposed Amendments to Oakmont ASP and Land Use Bylaw -Schedule A and Direct Control Mixed Use District and the Development Proposal for Riverbank Landing.</p> <p>We live in the Evergreens of Erin Ridge and have lived here for 25 years, and we have lived in St. Albert since 1973.</p> <p>My concerns include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The impact on the Sturgeon River and Parkland.: I think with all the concerns about climate change, we need to keep as many natural green spaces as possible. Our river valley area in St. Albert should be kept in its natural state rather than having more and more development destroy the natural green areas that are wildlife habitats and contribute to our clean air. 2. The traffic congestion: As it is now, Bellerose is already very congested. At peak times, westbound traffic is backed up past the intersection into the Shops at Boudreau and the east bound traffic is backed up past the intersection at Ironwood Drive. At these times, it can take as many as 5 light changes to make a left turn onto Boudreau. And I can only assume that this congestion will get worse once the second phase of the Botanica condo is completed and the residents move in. If these new amendments and development get approved, then I think serious consideration needs to be given to an alternate traffic route such as a new bridge

	<p>that exits onto Sturgeon Road or another route other than Bellerose Drive; one that does not exit directly or indirectly onto Bellerose Drive and is already not currently congested.</p> <p>3. Safety: The traffic congestion creates a situation where drivers become impatient with other drivers and try to get ahead of each other causing road rage and also trying to find ways to get through faster such as u-turns, etc. Also I have a concern that Emergency services which are located near the intersection of Boudreau and Bellerose will not be able to get through in a timely manner if the intersections are backed up.</p> <p>4. Length of the construction, the disruption and noise: Our area has already been through and continues to be impacted by the redevelopment at the old Holes site for the Shops at Boudreau and the Botanica condos. This has been in progress for a number of years and this new development could go on for many more years.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to these concerns and your consideration for the impact these new amendments and proposal will have on our community.</p>
30	<p>I am a resident of [Redacted] Elm Pt. And wish to raise concerns of the intended development.</p> <p>I have lived in St. Albert since, well I sat in front against the hedge at the drive-in as a kid. (now 56)</p> <p>I have never been against progress but it also must be resident friendly.</p> <p>I see the congestion we currently have on Bellerose and Boudreau and I am certain more development will create a bottle neck at this intersection that would be unacceptable.</p> <p>Fire rescue, RCMP will be stuck in the traffic with no way through as well.</p> <p>I am absolutely opposed to development that has little regard for residents in the area.</p>
31	<p>I am a very concerned resident who is an owner of a condo in the Botanica Complex (200 Bellerose Drive).</p> <p>I want it to be known that I object to the plan for the Oakmont Boudreau Development area. The heights of the proposed towers/buildings, congested traffic problems that will arise and the environmental issues are just a few of my concerns.</p>
32	<p>am a resident of Erin Ridge and I object to the proposed Riverbank Landing development. The two tall (25 story) towers will ruin the visual aesthetic overlapping the natural atmosphere with an urban blotch. Clearly, the developers are trying to increase their return on investment by building higher. There will also be a huge jump in traffic that will contribute to making living in the area much less appealing. Residents of Erin Ridge and Oakmont live there for the natural and relaxed feel to the area. The last thing they want is two tall towers destroying that. To reiterate, I strongly object to the Riverbank Landing development.</p>
33	<p>I am writing to you today to indicate my concerns over the proposed development by Boudreau Communities.</p> <p>I live at [Redacted] Evergreen Place and have lived there since 1996. I have seen the area develop over time and have endorsed many of them with my neighbors. This however is one I cannot.</p> <p>As I have seen the area grow, I have seen some significant changes especially to my families safety and livability within this area. With some of them, I can easily adapt but this new development will significantly change that.</p> <p>As there is only one entrance in and out of my area, I face traffic at Evergreen Drive and</p>

	<p>Bellerose daily. In the mornings, I struggle to turn right out of my area in hopes of turning onto Boudreau. I have personally waited for two or three signal cycles before having space to enter the intersection. This is due to the traffic volume coming SW down Bellerose.</p> <p>When turning on Evergreen Drive to enter my community, it is even worse. Since there is traffic often backed up in this location with traffic trying to turn left on Boudreau, I take my life in my own hands as I cannot see traffic coming down the hill.</p> <p>During non peak times of course it is relatively safe but during peak times, it is scary. When my children begin driving, which is about the same time this development will rise, I cannot imagine how intimidated they will be and how stressful it will be on them. This development puts their safety at significant risk.</p> <p>The proposal has approximately 55 floors of residential space. Adding that amount of traffic in the area will make my location unlivable.</p> <p>What I do not understand is how we are replicating the errors made in major cities. As I lived in Edmonton and near the downtown core for almost all of my years as a minor, I saw how Edmonton earned the name "Deadmonton." The city core was abandoned in the evenings. Now with significant development and residential living in the city core, it is vibrant. This type of development is better suited in our city core and not in the middle of residential area.</p> <p>If this proposal is approved, I will be most likely seeking a new residence somewhere and considering the relative costs here in St. Albert as opposed to North Edmonton or surrounding areas, I suspect it may not be here due to the loss of property values being in the shadows of the towers. Considering all of my family and my wife's family live in St. Albert, that would be a shame.</p> <p>I simply have one question for you. If you had to deal with this or this development was in your backyard, would you want to live here?</p>
34	<p>I am writing to express my concerns for the proposed development on the old Holes farm site which entails the building of 6 buildings of varying heights - from 2 storeys to 26 storeys. While I am generally excited about new development if it is well done, and I am committed to living in the City and therefore accept that there will always be some noise and traffic issues, this project feels totally overly ambitious and very inappropriate for a site in the middle of St. Albert. I live on Eden Court and currently experience a lot of traffic build up and delays at the Boudreau and Bellerose intersection. Adding this many more residents and vehicles will exasperate the situation to the extreme. A 2nd entrance will of course be needed, but to put a traffic circle on Bellerose is both unsafe and will create more back ups. I definitely don't feel that 2 buildings of 26 storeys are suitable for this site from a physical and practical point of view. 6 or 8 storeys would still be substantial, but manageable. As a long time realtor in St. Albert and Edmonton, I have seen too many overly ambitious projects fail to complete due to political and financial factors or drag on for years and years. When this happens, the surrounding neighborhood is damaged. These are not times of economic buoyancy - but ones of dealing with a slowly improving economy. St. Albert has seen a huge explosion of rental properties in the past few years with more still being built. I don't feel that the absorption rate will be high enough for so many new units as will be available in this project. For a project of this magnitude, the area and the surrounding neighborhoods will be in constant turmoil for many years.</p>

	<p>To recap: My main concerns are traffic congestion and the ensuing safety concerns; Overbuilding/Overdensification for the area; overly ambitious for the uncertain economic conditions going forward.</p> <p>I fully understand that the City of St. Albert is looking is increase their tax base to allow them to provide more and better services for the residents, but it is an increase in the Commercial and Light Industrial tax base that will give the relief that we need. I have attended many civic addresses where the administration says that this is their intention, but whenever I talk to business people wanting to expand or locate in St. Albert, the ongoing paperwork, red tape, etc continues to be a huge deterrent. We can't become a prosperous growing city without expansion, but that expansion needs to be done carefully, keeping in mind the overall city plan that we want for St. Albert. We are different than many of the cities/communities around us and we need to find a way to continue to be "The #1 City to Live in" and still progress. Yours is not an easy job, but I really think that you need to listen carefully to the residents of St. Albert that will be directly affected by the scope of this development.</p>
35	<p>I have found traffic continues to grow due to the volume of people moving to St Albert, as well as families growing. This is exciting to me as we have a wonderful city! I do have to say the traffic growth has not developed as well as other areas of the city. We seem to have lights on every corner, and bandaid solutions instead of bigger picture resolutions being put into place.</p> <p>I'm currently considering moving to Oakmont or Erin Ridge, as they seem to be great neighborhoods but there is a major problem I have recently been informed of. The Riverbank landing expansion continues to come up in every conversation I have with people regarding these areas. After some of my own research, there seems to be some valid reason for concern. Simply put, I'm not sure how one exit road can support the needs for this volume of traffic. Is there any bigger picture thinking or long term plan in place for when these traffic issues become catastrophic? I'd hope these plans are put into place or will start prior to residents having to wait an extra 20-30 minutes just to exit their neighborhoods.</p> <p>Can you please share with me how the future traffic congestion concerns are being addressed of the riverbank expansion is approved prior to me putting myself in a horrible traffic situation?</p>
36	<p>I am voicing my concerns about the proposed expansion of riverbank landing as proposed by Botanic Development.</p> <p>There are many reasons I am opposed to this development as submitted as I am sure you have heard of by now. The most obvious and concerning problem will be traffic control or movement. Bellerose Dr. is the only outlet for the existing and future proposed riverbank development. Traffic is an issue on this road now and not counting the 2 projects nearing completion (Botanica 2 and the condo building by Canadian Tire) additional traffic both entering Bellerose Dr. before they can go anywhere else. At the least the city of St. albert should do is an independent traffic study for the whole area and not just rely on the developers consultant who would be biased at best. Part of the traffic congestion is traffic coming from sturgeon county which cannot be projected with any accuracy as the city has no control on county development.</p> <p>My other concern is 2 high rises and high residential density for the proposed development when the Erin ridge and Oakmont area are already fully developed and have little or no park space to which this area could be turned into a great location for a park honoring the original owners Ted and Lois Hole.</p>

	<p>26 story high rises for St. albert are totally against everything the city has done to date to develop a great city to raise families which we have done by being residents in St. albert since 1973. When I built our existing home in 1996 that area was never zoned for this type of development.</p> <p>When Hole's greenhouse decided to move the only proposal I saw for the area was a sketch that showed some shops and duplex residential area along the river comparable to the ones in Oakmont and then somehow 2 condo buildings with over 300 units were approved with little or no public input.</p> <p>If the city wants high-rises then they should start in the downtown core like any other city or at worst in the old Grandin mall area which has more roads to disperse traffic. Alternately any location on the south side of the river to relieve traffic unless the city builds another bridge so traffic can flow onto Sturgeon rd.</p> <p>I can only hope city council will look at all negative factors which include decreasing property values all around this development and remembers what happened to one of the previous councils when they fought to have ray gibbon rd. run through riel park. Consider how that decision would have impacted St. albert long term if the residents and businesses had not spoken out against it before it was too late.</p>
37	<p>Please accept this email as strong opposition to the Riverbank Landing development and the application to amend the Area Structure Plan and Land Use Bylaw.</p> <p>My husband and I moved to Erin Ridge - Evergreens in St. Albert in 2004 because of the small town feel you get with the beautiful boulevards, reasonable traffic congestion and a slower pace of living. In the last 15 years the city has grown considerable which is expected and understandable that people would want to live in the 2nd best city in Canada. We are not apposition to change and understand that change can signify a healthy community. However I have a number of concerns with respect to the proposed development, namely:</p> <p>Loss of property value. We purchased my home in St. Albert to get away from high rise and multi family living. We have since purchased another home in our crescent for our terminally ill son and upon his passing moved our elderly parents into the home to live out their days close to family. We pay a premium in property taxes for what we consider to be a premium living environment and would never have considered buying a residence in proximity to the proposed development.</p> <p>Loss of the small town feel and culture: I find the proposed high-rise buildings inappropriate for the area in that they are too close to established residential properties plus they appear to have insufficient setbacks for privacy. Another concern is their proximity to the Sturgeon River and public parkland areas raises concern for environmental issues and enjoyment of walking trails and views for all residents of St. Albert. I consider this development plan to be a gross over densification for the site and entire area as it will take away the small town feel with high rises over shadowing established public trails and environmental waterway ecosystems that are a joy to watch throughout the seasons.</p> <p>Market Analysis. At the town hall meeting the sales rep for Botanica said their assessment was based on the sale of units in the two existing buildings. He said people want a view and are willing to pay for it. That in their opinion as they already have sold 75% of the unoccupied building there is obviously demand. I do not feel this is an objective analysis of market needs. A risk assessment should also be conducted objectively. What if the developer goes broke mid-way through the project? There are still units un sold in phase 1 of Botanica, all of which are on the commercial side of the building, and the building has been operational for almost three years. This would indicate that yes people want to pay for the view of the river and do not want the view of</p>

	<p>the commercial buildings and parking lots. As this new phase is to include commercial buildings and parking there will be a high likelihood that new condos will have the same outcome.</p> <p>Traffic congestion entering and exiting the Botanica property is already causing major delays and safety concerns for pedestrians and motorists. The developer assured residents in town meetings that there would be no additional inconvenience or congestion from their development. There has been nothing but problems attempting to enter and exit Evergreen Drive. At the town hall meeting recently held at the St. Albert Inn there was a company who conducted a traffic flow survey and, in their estimation, there is no problem and they feel confident that the addition of 500 residences on the property should not have any significant impact. As a resident who has to access my residence by way of Evergreen Drive, there is rarely a day that traffic is not blocking access to Bellerose Drive. The synchronization of the lights is terrible and inhibits a reasonable flow of traffic, not to mention the backlog in attempting to turn left onto Boudreau. Suffice to say this is already a problem and this new development will compound the problem even more.</p> <p>The developer estimated construction if approved in the current proposal would not be complete until 2034. The current projects both went over completion dates by a year or more. It is not reasonable to expect residents to continue to endure another 14 + years of construction.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed plan due to the height and location of the proposed towers, the continued ongoing traffic problems, and the proposed second access onto Bellerose Drive which poses safety concerns not only at the entrance but at the access to the Oakmont sub-division while not addressing the congestion issues that will only intensify the current issues.</p>
38	<p>My name is [Redacted] Basso, my family and I reside at [Redacted] Orchard Court. Late last year we were informed that the developer of the Botanica Shops has a vested interest to build multiple high-rise apartments adjacent to our home.</p> <p>I am writing this letter to express our deepest grievance and concern with this proposal. When we were considering to move to St. Albert (from Edmonton in 2017) one of the attractions was the small-town appeal in conjunction with the understanding that the green space behind our home was not zoned for anything close to the proposed structure.</p> <p>If this development id to go forward, I am concerned about our property value, privacy, duration of construction and overall appeal of St. Albert.</p> <p>I am asking you to consider, what characteristics allow St. Albert to consistently rank among one of Canada's top communities to live? I don't think it is high-rise apartments and more traffic!</p>
39	<p>My name is Kevin Halko and I am writing this letter in response and unequivocal opposition to the proposed Riverbank Landing development as it has been presented and proposed. My family and I live at 72 Orchard Court, which is directly adjacent to the proposed development and share many of the concerns that my fellow neighbours and fellow Oakmont/Erin Ridge residents have (this would include other friends and family that live in St. Albert but were not aware of this development before the open house due to only people living immediately near the development being notified of the development and subsequent open house in September 2019). My family and I are deeply opposed to this development for numerous reasons including the increase in traffic on our roads that are already over-capacity (and this is not including traffic from</p>

	<p>the 2nd Botanica building that is under development), the loss of privacy and the eye-sore(s) that we will have towering over our home, increase in shade due to the height of the towers, how it will affect the property value of our home (that we have only lived in for just over 2 years) as well as losing the small-town feel that our community currently enjoys and is the envy of other communities across Canada.</p> <p>I grew up in St. Albert in Akinsdale and lived here for 25 years before moving to Edmonton. After living in Edmonton for 12 years my wife and I decided St. Albert was the place we wanted to raise our children (schools, playgrounds, activities, traffic and overall small-town feel were the main factors). We spent over a year looking for the right area for us and we finally found it in Orchard Court. We worked hard to be able to buy our place and sacrificed a lot to be able to afford it. We have always justified the higher prices and property taxes by the lifestyle and amenities we enjoy in St. Albert. After researching and hearing about this proposal and attending the open house in September 2019, it became quite clear this development is 100% out of touch and out of scope with the values and reputation that St. Albert has as being family-friendly and consistently a top ranked community in Canada.</p> <p>While my family and I do enjoy the amenities and overall existing Botanica development (no 20+ story high-rises), we feel the proposed Riverbank Landing development is not consistent and does not abide by the existing zoning (low density residential) of the green space beside our house. We would have never moved to this area if there was even the slightest chance of a development of this scope and size being proposed, much less considered in our backyard. This development and its scale is something that belongs somewhere like the Ice District in Edmonton or downtown, not in the middle of an established residential area that simply cannot support any substantial increases in density or traffic.</p> <p>I hope you will take into consideration the concerns raised by myself, my neighbours and fellow residents when considering this development and its impact on not only our area, but the reputation of St. Albert as a whole.</p>
40	<p>I want to state my opposition to this development as it is proposed. Mr. Haut says we are afraid of change and he knows instinctively we will like the change once it is forced upon us. If I were afraid of change I would not have moved from my house to the Botanica. What I am afraid of is Mr. Haut's vision for change. I'm afraid his instinct does not include solutions for the problems this development will cause. What is his solution for the hundreds more cars clogging the intersection of Bellerose and Budreau? What is his vision for evacuation of this over crowded area in case of an emergency? What is his vision for enabling emergency vehicles into this area? Does the St. Albert fire department have the ability to deal with a fire in a 25 floor high rise? What is Mr. Haut's vision for protecting the surrounding environment?</p> <p>There are other problems which I am sure are of no concern to Mr. Haut but are a concern for the residents of Oakmont. Forcing so much development into such a small area will mean a lack of privacy, long shadows over surrounding yards, loss of property values, and living on a construction site for the next ten or more years.</p> <p>If Mr. Haut instinctively has viable solutions for these problems, perhaps he could share them with all of us, especially those of us who will be most affected. For all these reasons, I am definitely opposed to this development proposal.</p>

41	<p>I am a resident of St. Albert for 16 years. My family and I currently reside in the Oakmont area. The application from Boudreau Communities requires that Mayor Cathy Heron and Counselors review this proposal thoroughly and objectively. The citizens of St. Albert expect that this group will take into account all the information and concerns from residents about this rezoning application. If this application is approved and the development of the remaining parcel of land proceeds, the natural beauty and uniqueness of our river valley and the adjacent communities will be forever altered. Further development of this land proposes 6 more developments: Buildings 2 and 5: 26 storey high rises, Building 1: 2 storey restaurant and conference centre, Building 3: 11 story rental senior residence with main floor commercial, Building 4: 3 storey mixed commercial and Building 6: 3 storey all office space. This proposed development and the years it will take to complete will place tremendous strain on an area that will by then have both phases of Botanical Gardens filled. Navigating through and around this development will only result in utter chaos. This is not a NIMBY matter, far from it, it is a concern for all residents and visitors of St. Albert who live, work, visit and commute in the area. The rezoning approval will have serious and damaging consequences for thousands of people and will undoubtedly affect the delicate ecosystem of the Sturgeon River Valley. I encourage development on this site, however I am strongly opposed to the scale of this project and the long-lasting impact it will create for this area.</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>The existing site development of Botanical Gardens, bordering on the communities of Oakmont, Erin Ridge, Inglewood, Woodlands and Braeside poses tremendous challenges with traffic flow and congestion. Phase 2 of Botanical Gardens is slated to open in the spring of 2020 which will flood this area with hundreds more residents and vehicles. One can see that plans to add an additional 6 new buildings crammed into a small section of land will only create unsurmountable accessibility complications. The scale of the development added to the current traffic problem will permanently gridlock this entire area. Currently there is one traffic controlled entrance/exit to Botanical Gardens and during peak times, vehicles have difficulty turning left onto Bellerose as well as traffic from Evergreen Drive is not able to turn right to leave the Erin Ridge neighborhood. Once the vehicle is allowed access to the road, there are continued traffic flow delays preventing movement of vehicles. If this is the "normal" traffic flow now, accidents and weather related road conditions will further paralyze traffic. Other issues exist for the residents of Botanica Gardens as they leave or access their underground parkade entrance located on the south-east side of Phase 1. Drivers are not permitted a left hand turn into or out of the parkade. This has left many drivers taking a U-turn in front of the Fire Hall and RCMP station or darting across 4 lanes of traffic and pedestrian sidewalks to make the turnabout to accomplish a left-hand turn from the parkade.</p> <p>A traffic circle on Bellerose is proposed to alleviate traffic congestion, though this circle placed on a hill is deemed dangerous and will compromise a driver's ability to visualize other traffic when approaching the circle. The placement of a circle on a curved uphill grade demonstrates poor planning and insight from this developer. I gather the traffic circle is a desperate measure to ensure that traffic can flow up Bellerose from another proposed residential exit onto the road, but this flow is only temporary as drivers will be caught up in the bottle-neck at the bottom of the hill when they circle back. Frustrated with this option, drivers will continue to seek exit from the area and will be forced to drive through the residential areas of Erin Ridge, wrought with its own residential, school (2 new), and commercial development. Potential home buyers for the areas of Erin Ridge and</p>
----	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Oakmont will consider the negative impact this development will have on their choice of location.</p> <p>River Valley and Environment</p> <p>For the longest time, St. Albert has been recognized and known for its beauty and livability. Grant it, we are a growing community and are accepting the growth and expansion slowly. The scale and magnitude of this development will not enhance the current location. In fact, the cramming of this development on banks of the struggling Sturgeon River will only reflect a lack of concern about our fragile river ecosystem. With towering high rises and multipurpose complexes comes the need for just as much underground parking. The developer has suggested they will “try” to keep some of the mature trees but this is unlikely when they start the excavation process and need to remove and destroy the undergrowth and roots in order to pour concrete. Long gone will be a habitat for many animals and birds. I feel it is the responsibility of all St. Albert citizens to preserve and protect the fragility of our river valley and trails. This development affects all St Albertans!</p> <p>Need for Development</p> <p>Boudreau Communities and the development of this grandiose scheme seems to compare similarly with Grandin Parc Village. Amacon, in 2008 proposed its own version of an “urban village”. Almost twelve years later, the development is comprised of a couple of condominium blocks, far from the proposed 3-5 towers, and several thousand square meters of commercial and retail space. In fact, many of the condos needed to go to the rental market because of poor sales. The multi-level Lions Village apartments for seniors still under construction (next to Canadian Tire) has taking years to build with many stalls. Look no further to Phase 2 of Botanica Gardens – not sold out yet. Is there a steady need and a growing market for condominiums, senior rental apartments and commercial space? If not, why would St. Albert council approve of Boudreau Communities and their aggressive plan to develop in the heart of an already establish community with limited accessibility. At the information session this fall, the developer stated that this development would introduce many niche shops “like shoe shops”. A member of the crowd shared with him that a shoe shop in Botanical existed but had to close its doors due to lack of business. My vision for the remaining “Holes” land is for development of a true urban village, where all residential and commercial space mirrors a livable and an accessible community.</p>
42	<p>I just read Jerry Husar’s letter to the editor in today’s St. Albert Gazette and wanted to voice my concerns about the Riverbank Landing project. I hope this project is something the City will think through very thoroughly before making any decisions. I’m all for having a mix of higher and lower density housing in the city but I drive past that location every day and there’s just no way it makes any sense to build ONE 25 storey condo building, let alone TWO (in reality, if you look at St. Albert, 25 storey buildings would be out of place anywhere in our beautiful city). Our house isn’t so close that it would directly impact our view but it would seriously change the look and feel of the area and the people whose properties would back onto it have every right to be outraged if this goes ahead.</p> <p>Then there’s traffic. Traffic at the intersection of Boudreau and Bellerose is already very congested - I shudder to think of the impact of having two 25 storey buildings in that location.</p>

	<p>I truly hope City Council gives this matter some serious thought - St. Albert already has and can have more high density housing but it needs to be done in a thoughtful way that is consistent with the community and the type of housing we have. High rise condo buildings that belong in a big city really have no place in St. Albert.</p>
43	<p>My name is [Redacted]. My family are long time residents of St. Albert and the Oakmont subdivision for over 20 years. My wife and I attended the September 10, 2019 open house.</p> <p>First a comment on the open house. While I appreciate that Arc Studio and Boudreau Communities Ltd may not have had to hold the open house and did so as a courtesy to the residents of Oakmont and Erin Ridge, I came away from that session feeling like they were not there to listen to residents, but rather it came across as a sales pitch to try to sell residents space within their proposed facility. I did not hear one attendee with anything positive to say about the proposal.</p> <p>In regards to the letter sent on December 12, 2019 I have the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the developer has indeed 'edited' their proposal, it was definitely not an edit that gave any regard to the feedback that we heard at the open house and in fact ignored the majority of that feedback. The new proposal is nothing more than a "shuffling of the deck chairs on the Titanic" approach in an attempt to display an arrogant attitude of "look what we did for you"! • The amendment did not address in any way the concerns of residents regarding the traffic at the intersection of Bellerose Drive and Boudreau Road, which is already at or above capacity. Adding the number of vehicles as a result of this proposal does not get alleviated by adding a traffic circle on the downhill slope of Bellerose Drive. This will only create far more congestion and does not address the current high volume issues at Evergreen Drive or the main intersection at Boudreau Road. • The concept presented of two twenty-six story towers in an area that was not originally designated by city planners for such a high density use and was not the City's proposed long term vision (if that vision even exists). It is the developer proposing their vision of how the space should be developed that was presented to residents and should not be supported by not only the planning department nor by St Albert Council. There will be nothing pleasing about the intrusion to the skyline of the surrounding subdivisions of not only Oakmont but also Erin Ridge, Woodlands and Ironwood Estates. • Many residents brought up concerns regarding the traffic impacts on emergency vehicles and access to Oakmont and Erin Ridge. Again not addressed in the amendment. • The amendment does not mention any discussions with St Albert Fire Services ability to deal with buildings of this magnitude as it pertains to fire and rescue. • Also not mentioned is the question of whether or not St Albert has a need for the amount of high density housing proposed. This question was posed and did not get a response in the open house or the amendment. • The current commercial properties in the existing Shops of Boudreau development do not seem to be 100% occupied at any time, so I am not so sure of the amount of new commercial development in this proposal is sustainable or viable. • A Sun/Shadow study was done for the open house but was so incomplete in scope that it was laughable! This needs to be done for the full 365 days of the year when the sun is at all angles to the development and not only for the period of time when the sun is at its highest peak casting minimal shadows as was done originally.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The letter of December 12, 2019 also makes reference to the Public Hearing scheduled for May • 18, 2020 with "notification will be sent to property owners within a 100-meter radius, and to the attendees of the September 10, 2019, open house" but the impact of this proposed development has far reaching implications greater than those within 100 meters. I would propose that the notification should go to everyone in the aforementioned subdivisions as well as those in the adjacent county serviced by Bellerose Drive. <p>It is very clear to me that Boudreau Communities Inc is acting in their own self interests which is based upon profits and is not unexpected or a surprise to anyone. I would however expect the City of St Albert to place the needs and concerns of its residents as a priority, while doing what is best for the community as a whole, ahead of the wants of the developer.</p> <p>I have an alternate proposal for the City of St Albert planners. Allocate the land in this proposal as park land and develop it as a large green space connecting the Red Willow trail system. Develop it similar to Legion park with green space and picnic areas interspersed among the existing trees and natural slopes. Swap the land in this area with the land directly west of Service Place adjacent to the Kingswood subdivision and build this mixed use area in that location. The benefits to that area include the proximity to the new bus terminal and the Anthony Henday drive as well as access in and out of that area are well below capacity and the area has virtually no commercial development at this time. This would be a "win-win" for both the developer and the City with minimal impact on neighborhoods.</p> <p>In closing I would like to pose a question regarding how the developer was allowed to purchase this property knowing how it was originally zoned and with a concept that is going to impact such a large population in the immediate vicinity and to invest a significant amount of time as well as resources without someone within the city or planning departments knowing and halting or slowing the process based upon the long term vision of the City? This is truly a case of the tail wagging the dog!</p>
44	<p>am opposed to the Riverbank Landing development and the application to amend the Area Structure Plan and Land Use Bylaw. As a resident of the Evergreens of Erin Ridge subdivision, this development causes many, many concerns, including:</p> <p>Traffic Congestion: with the Botanica project almost completed and as Erin Ridge North continues expansion, the traffic at the Bellerose/Boudreau intersection has become extremely congested, with extra long wait times, especially if turning left. This causes long line-ups of vehicles along both roadways and greatly interferes with accessing/exiting the Evergreens subdivision. The Botanica project has further impacted the traffic congestion with an entrance/exit on Boudreau and an entrance on Bellerose, which is much too close to the traffic lights at Bellerose/Boudreau. If the proposed development is approved, the congestion will only but increase with the additional traffic. A suggestion that a traffic circle on Bellerose could alleviate some of the traffic congestion is not viable as this would be not only dangerous but also would further inhibit the flow of traffic, especially for large vehicles (buses, construction vehicles, moving vans, etc). The capability of providing timely emergency services to not only existing residences but also to the proposed 11-storey senior residences (which may require more frequent contact) and the other proposed buildings will be severely diminished as the traffic congestion builds.</p>

	<p>The Development as a Whole: the buildings, including the two 26 storey towers, are proposed to be a mixture of residential and commercial, with one three storey building devoted to office space. One only has to look at the current residential condominium market, which is "low demand, high supply" to realize that the market is very stagnant at this time and saturated with unsold condos. Does St Albert really require additional condominium space? One example of unused commercial/office space would be the handsome office building at 214 St Albert Trail which has been vacant and for sale for the past few years. I have observed that some businesses in the Shops at Boudreau have vacated the premises after a very short time. Will there be sufficient small businesses to fill the proposed commercial development? Does St Albert really require additional commercial/office space?</p> <p>A list of identified specific issues and concerns has been composed by others in my neighbourhood. I agree with these concerns, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on the Sturgeon River and surrounding park land (environmental issues) • traffic congestion • improper access to and from Bellerose Drive • potential dangerous traffic circle on Bellerose Drive • safety issues • tower height/shadowing/privacy • location and number of buildings on site • over densification • overall appearance and impracticality of the whole project for the area • risk assessment (today's current stagnant condo market may impact project completion) • negative impact on property value • length of construction and disruption • noise level during construction and due to traffic congestion • provision of emergency services • insufficient market needs analysis (for this project and/or for this time) <p>Although my comments are somewhat brief, I request that they be taken into consideration when preparing the agenda report to City Council.</p>
45	<p>I have many concerns about this project. I am concerned about the inevitable traffic congestion it will cause. I am concerned about the reduced privacy of the citizens who own houses in the area, as the high rise buildings will look down on them. I am concerned about the shadows that will be cast by the buildings. Furthermore, I am concerned about the precedent this project will set in building structures this tall in St. Albert and changing the spacious suburban feel we have always enjoyed here. I am concerned about the continued loss of our natural river valley, and the skyline of our community - as buildings of that height will be seen from many places in St. Albert and therefore affects many of the residents.</p> <p>I hope you take my many concerns into consideration before moving forward with this project. I am strongly opposed to the project, I do not believe it belongs in our community and I strongly hope it will not be going forward.</p>
46	<p>I live in Oakmont and I'm opposing this proposal. I believe the traffic congestion will not be able to be supported by this development.</p> <p>The traffic is already a serious problem at peak times by the Police station.</p>
47	<p>It has come to my attention that there is a proposal to develop the "red barn" site along the Sturgeon River. After looking at the proposed plan, it seems to me that the highly</p>

	<p>dense development is out of place for this particular area of the city of St Albert. Although I am very much a proponent of increasing urban density, there are much better places to put such a high density development. First, such developments should be located near public transportation hubs and second, they should never be placed along the banks of a river, especially so close to it. The plan offers minimum buffer between the development and the river's edge – which we all know fluctuates with the seasons. Already, some of the structures that have been built or are being built along the river valley are virtually on top of it and I'm not sure why this was ever allowed in the first place.</p> <p>Does the city have no conservation plan for the river valley? If not, it should. Most cities have conservation plans for their riparian areas and have strict guidelines that would prevent such over-development on sensitive landscapes.</p> <p>The City of St Albert seems to pride itself of its river valley: all of the photographs on our city's website home page are of our small river. Notice that not one of them shows the towering condo buildings that are sprouting along its edges.</p> <p>If we truly value the health and beauty of the Sturgeon River we would protect it by restricting further development along it. The fact that we can all access the trails by the river and momentarily forget that one is in an urban area is what makes St Albert unique and a great place to live. Having ostentatious high-rises that cater to those who can afford the views and that tower over the edge of our lovely river is not something that I can support.</p>
48	<p>I am emailing you with regards to the Riverbank Landing applications. As a resident of [Redacted] Evergreen Close, I would like to give you my disappointment in this development and the reasons why.</p> <p>I have been living at my residence since 2004 and have seen the many development changes over the years. When Holes Garden Centre left their original location across from my neighborhood, we not only lost a family business but the beauty Holes brought to our neighborhood. They used to plant flowers on the boulevard along Bellerose and planted beautiful flowers at the opening of our neighborhood. We did have quite a bit of traffic with Holes, but we knew it was limited to the spring/summer months.</p> <p>When Holes was demolished and the condos and businesses took over, the view from my top floor was taken from me. I have paid my taxes and absorbed all the increases, but I don't feel I have been compensated because I lost something. The more development in our area creates congestion and it is already extremely difficult to get out of Evergreen in the morning. Due to one access to our neighborhood, it is very difficult to exit onto Bellerose and be able to get into the left lane to turn left onto Boudreau. Due to this extra congestion has increased the amount of pollution in the air around my home.</p> <p>This new development will absolutely increase traffic and make it unbearable for us residents to exit our neighborhood in the morning. This new development will consume our whole view from our 2nd level of our home. This new development going to drive the value of our homes down. Who is going to want to move into our area with all the traffic, noise, pollution and construction? We already have a hard time relaxing in our backyard in the summer because of all the road noise.</p>

	<p>Will the City decrease our taxes to compensate us for the future losses we will incur on our homes? Will the City compensate me for having to leave extra early so I can get out of my neighborhood in the morning so I can get to work on time?</p> <p>A potential traffic circle will not fix any of these issues. We already have a permanent photo radar that plants himself in our neighborhood to catch all the speeders that fly down Bellerose and he has not been able to control traffic or help with slowing down drivers.</p> <p>If the City approves this development and the height of these buildings, you are taking away the already diminishing view we have. When does the integrity of keeping St. Albert a beautiful and luscious community fall to the bottom of our priorities for the sake of building high rises.</p> <p>St. Albert has been complimented in many magazines and websites as being a beautiful community with a beautiful river valley. Is this development worth more to the City of St. Albert? I don't believe St. Albert is hurting financially. We pay the highest taxes and the citizens of St. Albert still choose to live here because it is a beautiful community. If we allow the development of these monstrosities, the City is devaluing the properties of current residents, cause us more grief trying to commute to and from our homes and take away our views, St. Albert will drive out citizens that have roots here.</p> <p>I have a neighbor that has had her house up for sale for months and cannot sell it because her home backs Boudreau and the road noise from traffic is a deterrent.</p> <p>I ask that the City of St. Albert take a long hard look at what they are agreeing to with this development. This does not just impact the neighborhood I live in, but so many in this area and it will cripple all of us in so many ways.</p>
49	<p>As a citizen of St Albert and a resident of nearby Beaverbrook crescent, I want to express my shock, dismay and extreme concern about the proposed riverbank landing development that is being considered for the old holes greenhouse lands. This monstrosity will be out of place in this location. It will add to an already congested Boudreau road, cast a shadow on the river valley and the homes of adjacent neighborhoods and add years of construction noise and chaos. What is most concerning though, is the city's apparent willingness to change the area's land use plan without taking into account the public's opinions on the matter. Very few residents in this part of the city want to see this type of development in this area. The river valley is already quickly becoming a concrete corridor. No need to add these ridiculous, out of scale developments to an area ear makes for low density development.</p>
50	<p>As homeowners of [Redacted] Evergreen Close since 1998 we cannot believe that the City of St Albert would consider The Development Proposal for Riverbank Landing from Arc Studio.</p> <p>Currently the website Emphoris.com shows of the top 5 tallest buildings in St Albert 3 are within 2 block radius of our house – Careadon Village Inglewood – Botanica 2 and Botanica 1. Two of those three buildings are in the construction stages. Arc Studio is now proposing two 26 storey towers and one 11 storey tower on the adjoining property to Botanica 1 and 2. Really?</p>

	<p>Botanica currently has 121 units (Chandos.com) occupied. The second phase will add another 131 units. Careadon Village adds 163 more suites.</p> <p>Were Bellerose and Boudreau streets built to handle this concentration of domiciles and businesses? Arc proposes adding a second left turning lane to alleviate the anticipated increase in traffic flow from Bellerose onto Boudreau. This could be a solution for the current flow of traffic but it is not a solution to the future traffic coming from Botanica 2 and the proposed land development.</p> <p>Since the development of the Shops at Boudreau and Botanica 1 the traffic congestion and traffic noise has noticeably escalated to the point that regular conversation in our backyard is difficult. Not to mention any view of the river valley from our home has been consumed by a wall of buildings which the proposed development will extend even further.</p>
51	I am opposed to this expansion.
52	<p>Even though one of the towers has been relocated to the centre of the property, away from the previous position next to Orchard Court I still find the entire proposal for Riverbank Landing wholly inadequate.</p> <p>The biggest problem I have is the impact to traffic this development, as proposed, will have. The intersection of Bellerose Drive and Boudreau Road is already one of the busiest in St Albert with Bellerose Drive being the main arterial outlet for all of Oakmont and a large part of Erin Ridge. Adding additional pressure on this part of St Albert by proceeding with this proposed development is not feasible. There is simply nowhere for this additional traffic to go and with development already in place on all 4 corners of this intersection there is no room to add additional traffic capacity.</p> <p>The other problem I have is with the height of the two towers at 26 storeys each. Towers of that height have no place in St Albert if for no other reason than the lack of infrastructure to support them. Where is the money going to come from to purchase fire fighting equipment that would be needed to fight a fire in towers of that height?</p> <p>Even though one of the towers has been moved their height will still result in reduced privacy for neighboring single family homes as they were all built to the standards of the existing Area Structure Plan and Land Use Bylaws. To allow such radical changes to the ASP and LUB after the surrounding neighborhoods have been developed and are mature is not acceptable.</p> <p>I would only support this proposed development if the height of all buildings was no higher than the existing Botanica development and residential capacity was limited to 250 people.</p>
53	<p>I am writing to you in regards to the riverbank landing proposed expansion.</p> <p>This is the second time the Hole's have requested to rezone their property.</p> <p>The first time was around 15 years ago, the Hole's wanted to rezone some small parts of their property, to make a consistent property zoning, I did wonder why? During the town hall meeting, they reassured all of us that they were not going to sell the green house as this is their family's legacy and for sure they would never ever going to sell their homestead.</p> <p>We should have said NO back then, but we were too trusting, it's the Holes and now, after 6 years (February 2014) of construction, Botanica phase 2 is still under</p>

	<p>construction, our property value has gone down, traffic congestion, garbage of all types flying around, Botanica phase 1 & 2 is already blocking part of our river valley view.</p> <p>St. Albert is not meant to have 26 story high-rises (high density living), how many 26 story high-rise buildings are even built in Edmonton, outside of downtown.</p> <p>22 years ago when I was looking to buy this lot, I looked over the city's master development plan of this area, I would not have bought this lot had I known that this area would be marked for high density living in the future.</p> <p>I am the 3rd generation living in St. Albert, I grew up knowing how special this place is or was. I moved back to St. Albert knowing that I was going to pay more for property taxes, but I was ok with this, for a better quality of life and to get away from congestion. But now "is it worth it". This gem is eroding away and soon we will not be able to reverse the direction this city is going in, why stay or move here if this city is going to be just another nothing special, congested city.</p> <p>What's next, are you going to pave over the river valley to put in a dedicated road, to service these two 26 story high-rises, I hope not.</p> <p>Are they or you going to reimburse us for the lost value of our properties? Would anyone even want to buy our houses with these two 26 story high-rises looking down on my property? At least our property taxes will be going down (a lot) along with our property value.</p> <p>We have already taken 6 years of construction, we don't want to take another 10 to 15 more years of commercial construction in our backyard, for high-rises we don't want.</p>
54	<p>I am writing to Council and the City Planner to express serious concerns and dissatisfaction with the proposed plans for the Riverbank Landing expansion and rezoning the area to allow for two (2) twenty-six (26) storey apartments complexes to be built. Council is already well aware of the anger and anxiety that this has caused with the residents in the surrounding areas however this plan seems to still have momentum which is concerning as the Councillors are supposed to be committed to citizen engagement and represent the citizens of the City that they themselves represent. This is what I found on the City of St. Albert website:</p> <p>"Calling St. Albert home will be one of the best decisions you will ever make. Located minutes to the northwest of Edmonton, St. Albert affords residents an outstanding quality of life where they can enjoy a secure, small-town feel, without losing access to everything you could need from a major metropolitan region."</p> <p>"From the tree-lined streets, excellent schools and a thriving cultural scene to the low crime and unemployment rates, there are many reasons for you to consider St. Albert as a top place to call home."</p> <p>When choosing the location or "Why move to St. Albert", all the residents chose what suited us best, one reason being that it is a residential location, with "beautiful views for the low and medium residential housing" in Erin Ridge. <u>Our view in particular has been compromised by the existing Botanica complexes.</u> The City of St. Albert and Landrex's promise of when we built our home that nothing would be built to impede our view (that we bought) as there would never be anything over two (2) storeys, was reneged upon</p>

<p>without consideration of promised agreement. In contract law, if the parties exchange promises, each promise is "consideration" (a valuable item) for the other promise. In this case the valuable item is our homes.</p> <p>The Community Vision is "A vibrant, innovative and thriving City that we all call home, that sustains and cherishes its unique identity and small-town values." We do NOT want our beautiful residential communities to become rezoned to high density housing nor high density / high rise apartments that will no longer provide the privacy that we all enjoy in our predominantly single family home community. The High Rise / High Density Apartment style housing will become intrusive and an eye sore and significantly impede the view that we "bought into".</p> <p>When the City of St. Albert states being committed to building a community to meet the needs of the residents, I would expect that 'should' mean respecting and honouring the residents that have already "bought into" the neighborhood after great thought and expense. This should never be an opportunity to change or rezone and build high rise apartment / condo complexes and redefine a beautiful and well established community.</p> <p>There are many other concerns as well, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of privacy due to high rise complex, increased exposure to nuisances such as noise and bright lights from visible properties and a almost certain increase in vandalism and crime. It is far easier to monitor properties and the comings and goings of residents if you can see them in plain view. - Exponential increase in traffic. Currently at rush hour, without the additional residents, the traffic is congested. - High rise building casting shadows throughout the day. - High concentration of hard surfaces and lessening the green spaces which makes it difficult to manage storm water and prevent flood hazards. - Heavy equipment along roadways also causing vibrations and foundational shifting and foundation breaks of adjacent properties. - The residential taxes in the area may rise to supplement the Apartment's taxes and potential negotiated tax breaks given to high rise property owner, plus the adding the infrastructure and equipment that will need to be purchased and in place to support this plus the public sector human resources increase. - Lack of adequate access for emergency vehicles, especially with the increased traffic jams. This puts the person calling for support at great and perhaps grave risk. - With apartments and condos also comes the inevitable infestations that plagues apartments and condos across the country, cockroaches and bedbugs. They are the unwanted traveler and in the case of bedbugs, they infest all adjacent units as well as above and below units and have now been found to travel two apartment / condo units over. They also travel on the shoes and clothes and infest wherever they may travel - shops, restaurants, etc. Many property owners do not do a great job of managing this due to the cost of eradication. This neglect only creates a greater problem and exponentially greater expense. This also gets you on the bedbug registries which is not good for the property nor the City that it resides in. You just need to speak with someone in Emergency Medical Services who go to great lengths to take precautions to not bring them home and a Pest Control Company to get the bold and unfettered truth of this. - Decline in property values - Negative environmental impact

	<p>These are just a few of my concerns. I am strongly opposed to building high rises of any kind and any height, and am strongly opposed to changing the zoning.</p>
55	<p>I am writing you, the Mayor and City Council with my most ardent opposition to the Riverbank Landing expansion and land use changes.</p> <p>I have lived in St Albert since 1996 and at the address above since August of 1997. My wife and I built our home in the Evergreens of Erin Ridge for a number of reasons. The location was in a district with a single vehicle access in and out of the district. We are at the top of Evergreen Drive which afforded a beautiful view of St Albert. We did inquire with the builder and developer at that time what the zoning and planned zoning was for the Hole's Greenhouse area. We were advised that it would be Low Density Residential. St Albert, as a city, was identified as one of the safest cities in Canada. We are within a short walk to Woodlands Park area and the river valley path. These were all important factors in us deciding to buy, build and raise a family where we currently live. At that time Hole's Greenhouse was located across from the entrance to our district. While at times it did create a bit of a traffic inconvenience, we considered Hole's to be an iconic part of St Albert and supported it as a local business. We do on occasion support the current local shops in that area.</p> <p>Now we have in place of Hole's a number of "Boutique Shops", one completed and one still in construction phase, multi-storey condominiums. These both are located close to the Sturgeon river's bank. I am not an environmentalist but can imagine that these do not have a positive effect on the flora and fauna located in that area. The shops and current condominiums already affect the view that we were overjoyed to have when we purchased our property. We do now endure a consistent increase in traffic and difficulty at times exiting from our district onto Bellerose Drive to turn left onto Boudreau Road. From the intersection of Evergreen Drive and Bellerose Drive, on occasion, it will take 8-10 to make it to the light. I have noted that because of increased traffic the north to south flow will at times block the Evergreen and Bellerose left lane as they are trying to get where they want. Traffic has also taken to continuing straight and making a U-turn at Bellerose and Ironwood Point intersection in order to speed their access to Boudreau Road east bound. Just as a point, there is a cross walk with cross walk lights at the Ironwood Point intersection. I can see an accident waiting to happen here. With the addition of two (2) high-rises, Twenty-six (26) stories and an eleven (11) storey senior's complex the increase in the traffic daily would be far too much for the current traffic control and flow patterns to manage. I can imagine morning and evening rush hours lines of traffic much longer than they currently are. With the Police station located at that intersection and the Fire/Ambulance hall just east of them, how will this affect their response into Oakmont and Erin Ridge area. With the introduction of a Senior's residence, what will be the increase in EMS response directly into that area and how will it affect the response for whole of St Albert. Does our fire service have the equipment to adequately respond to a fire in a twenty-six (26) storey high-rise? If they do not, what would the equipment purchase, and training of personnel cost the City of St Albert residents? Additional financial concerns that would impact all St Albert residents include waste removal, sewer and water issues, land maintenance, snow removal, assessments of environmental impacts to the river and river's edge, just to name a few. What about land taxation? Is the developer getting a tax break to encourage development and maintenance of the area? Lastly on this would be what would happen if the developer goes broke, who will be responsible to complete the project, or will it sit abandoned?</p>

	<p>For several years now our district has had to tolerate the disruption brought on by the preceding and current construction of buildings. So much so that the community petitioned to have a parking ban in our area. I do not begrudge the workers in this case. These are people just trying to provide for their families. The developer and construction company should be providing suitable parking for their employees and contractors. For how many more years and for how many more buildings will the residents of this area have to endure the nuisances that this development has brought.</p> <p>Apart from basically taking two (2) very tall buildings and putting them right in my line of view whenever I look out my window or from my deck at the sky, there is still the issue of potential invasion of privacy, real or imagined, from some of the suites in those two (2) high-rises. I would say that this is even more of a factor since the repositioning of the high-rises as it now also affects both Oakmont and Erin Ridge residents.</p> <p>At the last information meeting regarding this project it was emphasized as a place for residents of St Albert to "Work, Live and Play". I have to ask who they feel would be renting in these high-rises and would the average senior be able to afford to live in a complex that they are building? Based on what I have heard regarding the prices for the condominiums, I cannot imagine them to be affordable to the middle-income person/family. Then of course there is the work part of the statement. Well I am pretty sure most of the businesses in that area pretty much pay minimum wage to their employees. So that means commute to Edmonton, as St Albert is not known for wanting to or is actively working to attract industry to help with the tax base within our city. I am fairly certain a large portion of our residents either work outside the city of St Albert, or are military and work at the base, therefore they commute. Currently, it is difficult for the average senior to pay the taxes in St Albert.</p> <p>In conclusion, I am passionately opposed to building these high-rises as I do not feel they are of any benefit to the ALL the residents of St Albert. It directly will affect those in the area around the buildings with disruption by construction for years, significant traffic issues as the width of the roads and intersection will not support the flow and privacy and safety issues that come with high-rises in such close proximity to single family homes. The support and services the city will have to provide in which the cost will have to be shared by the ALL residents of St Albert. The environmental impact on the Sturgeon river and river's edge. I ask; How does allowing the construction of these monoliths fit in with the City's Mission, Vision and Values? Are two (2) Twenty-six (26) storey buildings truly needed in a small "bedroom community"? How will these benefit / impact ALL the residents of St Albert?</p>
56	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We use Bellerose & Boudreau a lot and it is always busy. The traffic is already unbelievable. For example, at Christmas we took the long way around to avoid this intersection. What are they thinking? • Having lived in St Albert for 30 years; the trend has been that, yes, residents get their voice, but developers will get what they want anyway. Money talks, and if the City allows it, it'll happen. • We would go to Edmonton or Calgary if we wanted to live in a concrete jungle. These changes do not feel like what the residents want. • Not one person I've talked to likes the proposal. It's not fair to ask people to live next to construction for ten years straight. • The proposed development has to have another exit out.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please travel this intersection at rush hour to see the problem for yourself. • This matter is similar to the downtown angled parking where residents were against it, it happened anyway, and then in a year the decision was reversed. • It does not feel like city hall listens to their residents. We need to use common sense instead of focusing on the dollar and cents. • <u>Please</u> do not do 26 storeys. It will ruin the City. • Make the developer travel the route. • There are million dollar homes that will have towers looking down into their yards. • High rises would be better placed by the enjoy centre. • Do they really think it will sell? Grandin is renting units because the sales weren't moving.
57	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I live in the Evergreens neighbourhood. We already have trouble getting out and Botanica 2 isn't even built yet. There is also a strange psychological thing that happens at this intersection, where people turning left seem to think they have the right of way. • The site plan document shows a roundabout or signalled intersection on the curve of the hill. Roundabouts are usually placed on a fairly even plane. Having either a roundabout, or a signalled intersection, will not be safe on this grade. Especially in winter conditions. • Driving the area, I find that the Kinsmen place next to Canadian Tire dwarfs the river, and it's only 6 or 8 storeys tall! • The downtown area needs the traffic and population, therefore towers should be placed downtown.
58	<p>We strongly oppose the proposed development Riverbank landing.</p> <p>St. Albert is a community built on a sense of belonging, living here is a conscious choice. Most of us have longer commutes and pay higher taxes than the alternative of living in Edmonton.</p> <p>So why do we live here? Because we don't want to live in the large city. For some of us it's the feeling of community, it's the quiet, we grew up here and while we see our community growing the core reason we choose to live here is because we are not trying to, and don't want to compete, with the big cities.</p> <p>Adding a very dense pocket of residential space bordering a predominantly single family detached neighbourhood does nothing for the sense of belonging and community.</p> <p>Enough has been said about shadows of high rise buildings, property values and traffic issues, of which we have many, despite efforts with new traffic light timing programs and calming measures; the concerns remain. Why add more issues in the name of tax dollars.</p> <p>Once the reasons for living in this community start to lose their value, as this project will surely do for many residents the alternatives become more attractive, property values fall and the ability to raise tax dollars becomes harder as St. Albert becomes just another place to live and holds no special value.</p> <p>While we understand the need to grow and move forward, it does not mean large tower and developments that mimic those of much larger cities. Is this who we strive to become or are we a small city with a huge sense of pride? Voted the best place to live many times, do we think that adding this development will keep us in the running or add to our shared community values?</p> <p>This is a community that we love to live in, for many different reasons the majority make no financial sense but we do so anyway, this shows we love this City and feel a sense of connection. Once that is lost so is the desire to live here and St. Albert becomes just another city, nothing special, nothing notable, no emotional value and a great loss for those with a deep sense of connection to this place we call home.</p>

	<p>Allowing this project to proceed sets a dangerous precedent for others to come and we believe may mark the beginning of the end for small unique community loved and treasured by so many.</p> <p>For these reasons any many others that make more logical sense, we ask that this project not be allowed to proceed.</p>
59	<p>I am writing in regards to the proposed plans for the Riverbank Landing expansion in Erin Ridge.</p> <p>Adding additional high rises in that area is cause for concern as –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic has already become congested at prime times, I believe this will increase substantially with more residents condensed in a small area. When the public was invited to attend to hear of the builder's plans to expand. I noted the company hired to research how traffic would be affected performed their tests in June. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ By June, most university and college students are out of classes by May/June, the school students are out at the end of June. A true reflection of such studies would have been more beneficial in September/October when everyone is back to school and back to work – very poorly planned research or maybe 'strategic' on the part of the builder. • When we moved into the area, it was known as single house dwellings, which is considered attractive when purchasing a home. It has been reflected in cities where apartments are built near homes, the house values go down. • It is evident to me once these high rises are built that will be the end of the builder's concerns and the owners that purchase the high rises will only be looking at the profit margin. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What would have made more sense is to build these high rises downtown to be in the midst which would generate more income for the businesses. ○ The City of St. Albert is considered to have a low crime rate – when residents become congested that is when the crime rate will increase. With the congestion of the population also comes the dreaded infestations that inevitably occur. <p>We are very unhappy in regards to this development and what seems to be equally evident is that plans seem to be going forward and not enough 'proper research has been performed and the concerns of the residents of St. Albert are not heard.</p>
60	<p>I do NOT think that the towers are good for St. Albert or it's residents on the grounds of they make the entirety of the oakmont, erin ridge and partially the woodlands area look bad. I enjoy canoeing down and up the river and seeing a bunch of towers and buildings doesn't make it more enjoyable whatsoever. Along with the fact that the congestion of traffic will make it even worse to live by the Boudreaux/Bellerose intersection, and making the likely hood of accidents higher. But I would like an email back from you telling me why it would be a good idea to change my mind.</p> <p>Hopefully you actually read this.</p>
61	<p>live in VERY close to this proposed development. I am definitely NOT in favor of this construction.</p> <p>I've lived in St albert for 9 years and moved to new home (which I had custom built) 2 years ago. We are now confronted with the reality of moving and moving OUT of St Albert because of this. I am concerned on all and every level that has been raised to date. If Hr. Haut would like a "walkability " location for the people of St Albert then maybe this site should be declared a Historic Site and left alone.</p>

	Please add my (and my wife's) name to the number of concerned/distressed tax paying members of this community.
62	<p>I appreciate you may be receiving plenty of feedback about the proposed 26 story buildings for the former Hole's site.</p> <p>I struggle with the bind we are in as we recognize we don't want to pave over quality farmland as a side effort urban sprawl. Yet, towers as tall as the CN tower along the little Sturgeon river and overshadowing neighborhoods (which had no warning such behemoths would be considered in their neighborhood) seems extreme.</p> <p>It's not for our city to placate developers who may feel the land price warrants massive densification in order for them to profit 'enough'.</p> <p>St Albert is already making strides to find a balance with densification and walkability. I personally believe we need to limit the height of buildings to maintain the character and feel of our city. We can achieve densification through infills, secondary suites, carriage/garden suites and even tiny homes. I hope it's not too late to turn this ship around.</p>
63	<p>I am writing in regards to the application from a developer to construct 500 units on the old Hole's location. We are strongly opposed to the Riverbank Landing application and some of our reasons include things like, traffic congestion, density, tower height, tower shadows, improper access, environmental impact, inappropriate use of public roads, lack of appropriate buffer zone, property values and construction period. There is a lot of voters who strongly oppose this development. This city needs to keep in mind that you do not work for developers but rather what is best for your residents.</p> <p>This land was originally planned as single family homes. The original suggested development for this site was sold by builders to home owners as being the planned approved development. I was given a handout directly from Sarasota when we considered building in the orchard and they were selling these lots as if single family was what was planned, not 500 high density units. Who is responsible for misleading all those who built in the orchards?</p>
64	<p>I am a long-time resident of Erin Ridge in St. Albert (since 1989), and I am alarmed at the proposed development of the old Hole's site. I wish to express my strong opposition to towers higher than the current buildings being built (10-12 stories) along the Sturgeon River. The proposed amendment calls it a change from "commercial" and "low-density residential" to "mixed-use". This is misleading - the kind of density being proposed is "high density", and very high density at that. I believe this will set a dangerous precedent - with the threat of concrete towers looming over the river valley as developers try to get the most return on their investment by building up and up.</p> <p>When my husband and I built and moved into our current home, the Evergreens area was still carrot fields, and the Boudreau/Bellerose intersection didn't yet have traffic lights. Understandably, cities grow and change - areas that old-timers remember fondly as open fields and wetlands evolve into developed neighborhoods. However, I would hope that city planners would try to preserve some natural zones within all this development for the enjoyment of all St. Albert residents; and nowhere does this apply more than to the Sturgeon River valley itself. Of course there is a lot of development along the river - from the commercial upstream in Riel, down through the city center (with St. Albert Place) and past more commercial including our mall (St. Albert Centre), Canadian Tire and numerous apartment/condo complexes. Generally speaking, however, the developments have been lower in height...still allowing people to walk along the river trails and enjoy nature.</p>

	<p>I feel the current buildings of the Botanica, at 10 stories, are as high as should be allowed right along the river valley. I have kayaked down the Sturgeon, and can attest to how looming the buildings that height already seem. So the thought of 26-story towers being built along there is, in my opinion, going much too far. I am not against further development of the site, but towers are a definite no-go. I find it quite ironic that the developer is proposing this so as to wring maximum profit - by charging a premium for "river views" - while destroying those river views for everyone else. And there is the whole issue of traffic woes that come with this kind of densification, on top of the already problematic traffic flow along Bellerose and Boudreau.</p> <p>I was at the open house and heard the universal disapproval of residents, and their concerns. The planners' replies for how to deal with traffic and parking, loss of property values etc were underwhelming and unconvincing. We saw pretty slides of European town squares where "walkability" and "life-balance" were touted. Interestingly, none of the pictures showed towers. Maybe because Europeans understand the importance of human scale in their town centers.</p> <p>Frankly, I am extremely disappointed in past and current city councils for not having the foresight to put in place provisions to protect our river valley from the kind of over-development being proposed. I would hope that they will look at this proposal as incentive to finally put into place a vision for preserving the Sturgeon River valley. Certainly they should be making sure there is a proper, <i>independent</i> environmental assessment done on this and any other future development. In conclusion, both my husband and I feel that the Riverbank Landing development is wrong for the area and should not be allowed.</p>
65	<p>We purchased one of the Phase 2, Botanica condos at 200 Bellerose Drive, two years ago. As you know, the developer of the proposed Riverbank Landing has also developed Botanica. However, the developer, to this date, has never advised us of any details of the proposed Riverbank Landing. Our present home is north of Tofield. We were not aware of this planned development, until notified recently by another resident of Phase 1 of Botanica. It is hard to believe that the developer would not advised all of those who have purchased in Phase 2, of this proposal.</p> <p>Since learning of this new proposal, we were referred to your postings on the City website. We have reviewed all of the documents posted.</p> <p>We would like to ensure that our opposition to this development is recorded. We are specifically opposed to the two 26 level high rise apartment buildings and have significant concern with the increased traffic issues that will result for all residents in the area and all Botanica residents. With nearly 500 units being proposed and only one roadway servicing this entire area, the traffic will be a significant problem and will have a direct negative affect on residents accessing Oakmont and Erin Ridge. I have reviewed many other traffic studies and the one completed for this proposal does not adequately address the volume issues. There is no reference to the number of employees working in the proposed commercial buildings or the estimated number of customers and resident guests who will access the site. Even with the addition of a second traffic circle access, the existing single access road simply cannot handle the volume.</p> <p>We have reviewed all of the comments provided by attendees at the September 10th Public Meeting and agree with most of the residents, that this proposal is unacceptable</p>

	<p>and should not be approved. While we understand that this property will likely have some form of residential and commercial units, the two high rise buildings should not be approved.</p> <p>Again, we must emphasize that even though we purchased a condo in Phase 2 of Botanica and the developer is well aware of our present address and email address, we have never received any notice of this proposal or invitation to any public meetings.</p> <p>It is our understanding that the City of St. Albert does not approve buildings of this height. It is important to respect that the existing residents who live adjacent to this site will be significantly affected by these large apartment towers and excessive traffic. The approval of this proposal will be completely unfair to those residents and likely negatively affect all property values in the immediate area, including Botanica. I only ask you to consider how you would feel, or react, to the construction of these two tall buildings adjacent to your home property. The City of St. Albert is known for a rich history with a "Community" environment. People choose to live here because it is not a high density & cramped city. Thank you for asking for public input regarding this proposal.</p>
66	<p>I am writing you, the Mayor and City Council with my most ardent opposition to the Riverbank Landing expansion and land use changes.</p> <p>I have lived in St Albert since 1996 and at the address [Redacted] since August of 1997. My wife and I built our home in the Evergreens of Erin Ridge for a number of reasons. The location was in a district with a single vehicle access in and out of the district. We are at the top of Evergreen Drive which afforded a beautiful view of St Albert. We did inquire with the builder and developer at that time what the zoning and planned zoning was for the Hole's Greenhouse area. We were advised that it would be Low Density Residential. St Albert, as a city, was identified as one of the safest cities in Canada. We are within a short walk to Woodlands Park area and the river valley path. These were all important factors in us deciding to buy, build and raise a family where we currently live. At that time Hole's Greenhouse was located across from the entrance to our district. While at times it did create a bit of a traffic inconvenience, we considered Hole's to be an iconic part of St Albert and supported it as a local business. We do on occasion support the current local shops in that area.</p> <p>Now we have in place of Hole's a number of "Boutique Shops", one completed and one still in construction phase, multi-storey condominiums. These both are located close to the Sturgeon river's bank. I am not an environmentalist but can imagine that these do not have a positive effect on the flora and fauna located in that area. The shops and current condominiums already affect the view that we were overjoyed to have when we purchased our property. We do now endure a consistent increase in traffic and difficulty at times exiting from our district onto Bellerose Drive to turn left onto Boudreau Road. From the intersection of Evergreen Drive and Bellerose Drive, on occasion, it will take 8-10 to make it to the light. I have noted that because of increased traffic the north to south flow will at times block the Evergreen and Bellerose left lane as they are trying to get where they want. Traffic has also taken to continuing straight and making a U-turn at Bellerose and Ironwood Point intersection in order to speed their access to Boudreau Road east bound. Just as a point, there is a cross walk with cross walk lights at the Ironwood Point intersection. I can see an accident waiting to happen here. With the addition of two (2) high-rises, Twenty-six (26) stories and an eleven (11) storey senior's</p>

<p>complex the increase in the traffic daily would be far too much for the current traffic control and flow patterns to manage. I can imagine morning and evening rush hours lines of traffic much longer than they currently are. With the Police station located at that intersection and the Fire/Ambulance hall just east of them, how will this affect their response into Oakmont and Erin Ridge area. With the introduction of a Senior's residence, what will be the increase in EMS response directly into that area and how will it affect the response for whole of St Albert. Does our fire service have the equipment to adequately respond to a fire in a twenty-six (26) storey high-rise? If they do not, what would the equipment purchase, and training of personnel cost the City of St Albert residents? Additional financial concerns that would impact all St Albert residents include waste removal, sewer and water issues, land maintenance, snow removal, assessments of environmental impacts to the river and river's edge, just to name a few. What about land taxation? Is the developer getting a tax break to encourage development and maintenance of the area? Lastly on this would be what would happen if the developer goes broke, who will be responsible to complete the project, or will it sit abandoned?</p> <p>For several years now our district has had to tolerate the disruption brought on by the preceding and current construction of buildings. So much so that the community petitioned to have a parking ban in our area. I do not begrudge the workers in this case. These are people just trying to provide for their families. The developer and construction company should be providing suitable parking for their employees and contractors. For how many more years and for how many more buildings will the residents of this area have to endure the nuisances that this development has brought.</p> <p>Apart from basically taking two (2) very tall buildings and putting them right in my line of view whenever I look out my window or from my deck at the sky, there is still the issue of potential invasion of privacy, real or imagined, from some of the suites in those two (2) high-rises. I would say that this is even more of a factor since the repositioning of the high-rises as it now also affects both Oakmont and Erin Ridge residents.</p> <p>At the last information meeting regarding this project it was emphasized as a place for residents of St Albert to "Work, Live and Play". I have to ask who they feel would be renting in these high-rises and would the average senior be able to afford to live in a complex that they are building? Based on what I have heard regarding the prices for the condominiums, I cannot imagine them to be affordable to the middle-income person/family. Then of course there is the work part of the statement. Well I am pretty sure most of the businesses in that area pretty much pay minimum wage to their employees. So that means commute to Edmonton, as St Albert is not known for wanting to or is actively working to attract industry to help with the tax base within our city. I am fairly certain a large portion of our residents either work outside the city of St Albert, or are military and work at the base, therefore they commute. Currently, it is difficult for the average senior to pay the taxes in St Albert.</p> <p>In conclusion, I am passionately opposed to building these high-rises as I do not feel they are of any benefit to the ALL the residents of St Albert. It directly will affect those in the area around the buildings with disruption by construction for years, significant traffic issues as the width of the roads and intersection will not support the flow and privacy and safety issues that come with high-rises in such close proximity to single family homes. The support and services the city will have to provide in which the cost will have to be shared by the ALL residents of St Albert. The environmental impact on the</p>

	<p>Sturgeon river and river's edge. I ask; How does allowing the construction of these monoliths fit in with the City's Mission, Vision and Values? Are two (2) Twenty-six (26) storey buildings truly needed in a small "bedroom community"? How will these benefit / impact ALL the residents of St Albert?</p>
67	<p>We have been residents of Oakmont at the top of the hill for over 20 years. Even though we are not sure that we will be able to see the top of the proposed high-rise planned at Riverbank Landing beside Botanica, we fear the results of one more high density housing area on the old Holes property.</p> <p>26 storey buildings do not belong in the backyard of residential areas. We certainly would not want that many balconies looking into our "newly shaded" yard if our house was in the shadow. Horrible does not describe how we feel for the people who reside in Orchard Court and the rest of the lower Oakmont area.</p> <p>The effects of another huge building being placed on an already busy road will compound the traffic on Bellerose Drive to a point where our drives to work will double or triple in time. The line-up of traffic at the two sets of lights in front of Botanica and the Police Station are ridiculous in the morning and after work. It often takes 3 or 4 sets of light changes for us to go straight through. The traffic already backs up well past Evergreen Drive on red lights for people waiting to turn left onto Boudreau during rush hour traffic. (And don't get me started on how long I have to wait to come home if I am driving between 4:30 - 6:00 p.m.!!)</p> <p>This area was not designed for the amount of traffic that it has now, let alone the huge extra surplus of vehicles that Riverbank Landing would bring. Botanica 2 is not even completed yet, and we have been dreading the day when it fills with people and their vehicles. It is dangerous for incoming Emergency vehicles, pedestrians and local traffic to have so much traffic in an area that was not designed to handle such high numbers of vehicles. There is really only one way out and one way in to Oakmont, unless we want to take a "Sunday drive" through the country to get home or to work. Unless the city is planning on taking out sidewalks & trees and adding two more lanes on Bellerose Drive, we are not sure how the traffic can be handled there.</p> <p>We have yet to be consulted or invited to discuss the impact this will have on our community. Please consider inviting the neighbors "up the hill" to come to a meeting to add our two cents before making a decision that will affect an already overly congested route. The residents of Erin Ridge and Oakmont deserve to have a plebiscite to air our concerns and be heard, as we are the people that this will affect the most.</p> <p>We would be more than happy to discuss this with anyone who will be involved in the decision making process. Our feeling is that this process has not been fair to ALL of the residents that this decision will affect. Lois Hole certainly would not have been in favour of this potential construction, rest her soul.</p>
68	<p>Given that it is relatively rare for an almost fully built out neighbourhood ASP to be amended I have decided to take a holistic view of the ASP and see if there is anything that should be amended by "the City" while Council is considering other amendments proposed by "the developer". The item I note below is directly affected by the proposed development and is a shortcoming in all of the iterations of the Oakmont ASP I have seen since the early 1990's.</p> <p>New Pedestrian Trail Connection Opportunities:</p>

	<p>1. In order to allow for full public access (by pedestrian trail) to the north side of the River Valley through the Oakmont Subdivision I believe the ASP should be amended to show a future trail from Boudreau Road to Otter Crescent. This would take advantage of the dead end trail that exists behind Botanica One and would continue to the Oakmont pedestrian bridge.</p> <p>2. Secondly, a public access trail could be provided from Bellerose Drive to the new trail along the PUL for a storm-water outfall that exists between Botanica two and the Riverbank Landing Development.</p> <p>3. Lastly, a public trail could be added within the PUL/MR that exists between the Orchards of Oakmont and the proposed Riverbank Landing Project.</p> <p>I believe providing public access to our river valley corridor is of utmost importance to all St. Albert Residents and that this is one of the few gaps in the trail system as it sits today.</p>
69	<p>I am very concerned with the amount of additional traffic that will be caused by the 460 residential units and commercial space. The existing road Bellerose will not be able to handle it, the intersection at Bellerose and Boudreau will not be able to handle it and the main entrance into and out of the development at Bellerose and Evergreen will not be able to handle it. The solutions proposed by the developer to handle the increased traffic are not sufficient and the proposed solutions in the written comments are not the same as shown in the site drawings so it is unclear as to what is actually being proposed.</p> <p>Developer acknowledges traffic volumes will be an issue and proposes as one solution to increase space for “<i>vehicle queuing</i>” (space for a longer line up of cars waiting to exit) rather than a real solution.</p> <p>Developer acknowledges in their report that traffic is already at over capacity as noted “Based on the assessments completed, the full TIA report identifies a number of movements that are approaching or over capacity at the Boudreau Road/Bellerose Drive intersection during the AM and PM peak hours based on existing and 2034 background traffic volumes”.</p> <p>The traffic volumes (study period out to 2034) also do not account for any future increase caused by the proposed annexation / development of land from Sturgeon county which is underway. This land annexation and development will also significantly increase traffic along Bellerose Dr.</p> <p>Traffic volumes do not take into account any growth in Sturgeon county in the PGA (priority growth area) i.e. around Allen ridge, etc. as identified in the Sturgeon County MDP Municipal Development Plan. this development would increase traffic growth along Bellerose dr.</p>
70	<p>My family and I are long time residents of Lacombe Park and proud St. Albertans. We have seen our beautiful city grow and prosper thanks in no small part to the vision and guidance provided by this and past city councils and administration.</p> <p>Recent developments in our neighbouring community of Oakmont are of increasing concern to us as they have the potential to affect the entire area and the City at large, especially those established residential communities such as ours.</p> <p>Following the failed redevelopment in Grandin, some 15 years ago, the City established and emphasized a limit of 25 metres for all buildings throughout the City, except in the Downtown where it was capped at 15 metres (other than LUB Schedule F for Grandin</p>

	<p>Park and certain minor exceptions could be approved by administration and council). These limits were confirmed, over and over again in the more than 170 Land Use Bylaw amendments that have been approved by Council since 2005. The most recent such confirmation took place on <u>September 16, 2019</u>, when the Land Use Bylaw 9/2005 and all these amendments, etc. were consolidated by Bylaw 27/2019.</p> <p>We ask ourselves what is so worthy and compelling in the application by Boudreau Communities to warrant approving an increase in building heights from 25 metres to 100 metres (roughly 6/7 storeys above ground to more than 20 storeys), and this in a very small, compact, mostly residential area framed by parkland and our river valley. Especially when looking at the effects the resultant densification will have on the critical traffic infrastructure in that area of the city.</p> <p>If this project goes through, we run the risk, and a very high one at that, of seeing many more such high- rise towers being applied for throughout the City. As one writer pointed out in a recent letter to the Gazette, this is not Mississauga. Not even Toronto, Vancouver, Edmonton or Calgary would allow this kind of development to take place other than near established major transportation corridors such as subway or LRTs.</p> <p>We hope and trust that you will listen to all the voices of concern out there and put a quick end to this unworthy proposal.</p>
71	<p>I have been observing the proposed development of Riverbank Landing on the former Hole's homestead for a little over 6 months. I am very aware of the several iterations of the Oakmont ASP over the past 25+ years and appreciate how the neighbours that are directly affected by this proposal would be extremely upset by the proposed changes in land use for this area. As a former City Manager and member of the St. Albert MPC in the 1990's I am also very cognizant of progress and change and how Council must grapple with the needs of current residents while taking into consideration the need to plan for the St. Albert of the future. Land Use planning decisions are one of the most if not the most significant decisions a Council will make in it's term.</p> <p>I have looked at the proposal and have tried to see if there is a compromise between the very high density development that is being proposed and the current single family zoning that exists in the ASP. Simplistically, I believe the entire easterly lot (lot 300) could remain as single family and could be designed as an extension of Orchard Court. This would leave the 2 westerly parcels (lots 250 & 230)for a higher density development. For these lots I think a replica of one of the Botanical buildings along with a further extension of the Shops of Boudreau would blend nicely into neighbourhood and satisfy the developers desire of intensification.</p>
72	<p>There have been some very eloquent letters written to the editor by concerned citizens of St. Albert regarding the development of Riverbank Landing. I find these people have done their research and have very valid thoughtful points. What really concerns me is that as per usual, when there is money to be made, no one is listening and greed and the almighty tax dollar will prevail.</p> <p>The developer feeds us lies similar to the ones the people who built in Orchard Court were told: "pay premium price for this beautiful view" - which we will gladly take away from you when there is money to be made. "Oh and no, your taxes won't go down silly, there are roads to be built, oh, and more stoplights will be needed". We do not have</p>

	<p>enough of those. Let's throw a lot of pedestrian corridors to boot and some of those traffic calming things too as we will have to slow down the incredible amount of traffic we will be creating in this already taxed intersection. It can take up to 5 minutes to get through the intersection of Bellerose and Boudreau at peak hours now!</p> <p>Then there is the lie about existing property values going up. How is this ever going to happen? Who will want to buy the existing homes knowing they will have to deal with construction delays for years to come? Who will want to buy when the skyline becomes high-rises instead of trees? Who will want to buy when traffic becomes unmanageable?</p> <p>We are told that the people who will live in these high-rise buildings will make a smaller carbon footprint. I guess they will all leave their cars in the parkade and find jobs at Mercato so they can walk to work and buy their groceries.</p> <p>When Orchard Court was developed, many Oakmont homes had their sewers back up one day. One wonders what may happen next. Keep it up city council, let the developers win! Do not listen to your people and slowly, one by one, we will be leaving what used to be the best place to live. Glad to hear you are accepting comments. Disgruntled to know it is all for not. Greed is capitalizing on river property.</p>
73	<p>Given the contingent of people that continue to voice concerns over the proposed development of Riverbank Landing, I feel the need to ensure my voice of STRONG SUPPORT is also heard by Mayor and Council.</p> <p>I am an owner in the second Phase of Botanica, and the proposed Riverbank Landing concept of an urban community village is a well thought out and progressive development. We need more 55+ residences in St Albert, along with amenities that do not require people to get in their cars to drive for everything required for day-to-day living. This development will allow an aging population to move out of single family dwellings into condos, and ultimately into care facilities all while maintaining access to professional services and other day-to-day amenities. Until Botanica was developed, my wife and I felt we would have to leave St Albert, instead we have been able to remain residents of our fine city.</p> <p>While I am a STRONG supporter of this project, I do have concerns about the proposed building height of 26 stories. I would remain a strong supporter of the development with the higher density buildings having a larger base, thus reducing the required height of the buildings to still ensure the development remains economical to build.</p>
74	<p>I am a long term resident of St. Albert and have lived her since 1986. The proposed Riverbank Landing development will be an enhancement of our active lifestyle. It will be so convenient for us homeowners. I look forward to the enjoyment of professional public services, dining and restaurants, grocery stores, boutiques, coffee shops, and walking trails. I also look forward to spending time with my grandchildren, family, and friends, in this friendly environment.</p> <p>This will be a huge asset to the St. Albert community and will benefit many.</p>
75	<p>I am writing to you as an extremely concerned member of Oakmont, the neighborhood directly adjacent to Oakmont Boudreau Development.</p> <p>My husband and I built our dream home at 82 Orchard Court just over three years ago, moving from Northridge with our two small children. We had purchased a home in 2009 on North Ridge Drive only to find that as we started our family the street was becoming too busy for small children. Finding the Orchard Court Development by Landrex was</p>

	<p>like a dream come true for us. A quiet street, where we would be the first home built and settled with the builder of whom we choose! As a designer myself, this really could not have been a better fit for us. We have watched all of the homes on our street be built, greeted our amazing neighbors one by one as they have moved in, and spent countless hours with them all meeting out on the street while the kids ride their bikes and play street hockey. We have found the perfect place to raise our little family and are so thankful for what we have here everyday.</p> <p>As you can see from the attached renderings [shadow studies], our perfect little street that the kids are playing in every afternoon and evening Spring, Summer and Fall will now be shaded, dark and cool. Our private, safe street will now have walkable access from thousands of residents and shoppers. (Our Home circled in red on these attachments.)</p> <p>There will be noise and light pollution from these huge towers that will now look into all of our backyards and onto our street. Not to mention there will be years of construction noise, garbage, contractors parking on which is obviously the closest access for them in our neighborhood. And lastly, the commute on Bellerose drive which every morning already takes me three lights to turn left out of onto Boudreau will be unbearable. Our home which is a dream come true for us will become our worst nightmare if this development moves forward.</p> <p>Aside from my obvious personal objections to this development, as a resident of St. Albert and taxpayer, these towers will be an eyesore for this beautiful community we live in. Having grown up my entire life in small-town Saskatchewan, I fell in love with the beautiful city my husband was born and raised in. It's small-town feel and incredible sense of community is what makes this St. Albert so special. Placing these large towers right in the center will completely ruin the picturesque landscape, not to mention look completely out of place.</p> <p>Please don't let a money-driven developer whose objective is just that, take away from what the city of St. Albert's planners have so beautifully planned our city to be.</p>
76	<p>As a resident of St. Albert for 40 years and currently reside in the Botanica adjacent to the proposed Riverbank Landing Development, I wish to strongly express my support for the Riverbank Landing project. It is my belief that this development is visionary and will become a premier live, work, play, master planned community whilst further enhancing St. Albert's reputation as one of the top places in Canada to live.</p> <p>For many years through my involvement in the Canadian Home Builders Association I have lobbied for higher densities within our wonderful city and am excited that this rezoning opportunity has arisen. Some would argue that a project such as this would do little for housing affordability within St. Albert however people like my wife and myself, who moved from our home of 38 years in Akinsdale, will by doing so open up St. Albert's affordable housing in similar areas of the city. (Akinsdale, Forest Lawn, Sturgeon, etc) This will give young people who were born and raised in St. Albert the opportunity to stay and not have to move away (as my two sons did) in order to purchase that first affordable home.</p> <p>I attended the initial public hearing on this development where, as is the norm, emotions ran high at the thought of change. As in the past, although many in St. Albert would support such a change, the "not in my neighborhood" factor dominated much of the discussion.</p>

	<p>Reviewing the latest zoning application, I notice that the developer has addressed many of the issues raised at that meeting. Firstly, the two tower heights have been reduced from the original proposal. Tower locations have been altered to reduce or eliminate shadows whilst still maintaining the much-desired river views. Walkability of the site has been maintained to enhance the live, work, play aspect of the project.</p> <p>A good portion of the discussion at the initial public hearing centered on traffic flows, but I believe the report of the traffic engineer was overlooked in the emotion of the moment. This combined with the change in business culture that many professional companies, both small and large, are in many metro areas, moving to offsite (work from home) scenarios. This assists in reducing traffic at peak hours as well as traffic in general. St Albert as a recipient of fiber optics installation is prime to become a leader for this kind of business approach.</p> <p>Please consider that those in support of zoning change often remain part of the silent majority and I would take the liberty to ask on their behalf that you give this zoning proposal your favorable support.</p>
77	<p>As a resident and board member at Botanica, I have great faith in Boudreau Developments. When we moved in Boudreau Developments more than delivered.</p> <p>Our board at Botanica comprises of 4 residents and 3 members of Boudreau. We all have equal voting rights, at our monthly meetings. None of the resident directors have ever owned condos before. The board was formed 2 years ago. Botanica's board is the most hard working and respectful board I have ever had the pleasure of serving. As a new building there were issues, as in any new building, all these issues were handled in a fair and equitable way. Trust between the board and Boudreau has grown as we work together.</p> <p>The information evening held at the St. Albert Inn, for the proposed River Bank Landing, was highly disruptive and confrontational, by many Oakmont Residents. The residents attending from Botanica were there to be informed and ask questions. I know that Boudreau Developments were open to listening to real concerns and suggestions, however they were not given a chance, with the angry mob attending from Oakmont.</p> <p>The only real issue presented was that of traffic congestion. One solution to alleviate the traffic is to make the pedestrian bridge at the bottom of Oakmont Drive into a traffic bridge. This would allow the traffic flow from Erin Ridge and Oakmont access via Sturgeon Road to Winston Churchill to Campbell to the Anthony Henday. This would take much of the traffic from Bellerose and Boudreau.</p> <p>Life at Botanica is greatly enhanced by the addition of the Shops at Boudreau, so the idea of an extension of this, with walk ways, and more shops really excites me. I grew up in England and walking to amenities is very much the way of life there. Riverbank Landing can only add to the beautiful City of St. Albert, which we all know and love. Making this a more environmentally responsible city. Incidentally, the Shops at Boudreau are enjoyed by many St. Albert residents, as will Riverbank Landing.</p> <p>The nay sayers are always the loudest. This proposed new development is truly visionary. I believe that River Bank Landing will make St. Albert an even greater place to live, work and play. I say go for it.</p>

78	<p>I own a business in the Shops of Boudreau shopping complex. I have heard comments towards this new proposal for Riverbank landing. Some positive and some negative. I do agree with the negative comments but overall I think this proposed development will bring new customers through my door which is #1 for me. "As a business owner, having a density of residents around makes for a steady stream of reliable pedestrian traffic – essential for the success of my business"</p> <p>Instead of separately emailing everyone if you wouldn't mind forwarding a "yes" vote towards it for me that would be appreciated.</p>
79	<p>As you consider this development let my wife and I express the excitement and anticipation of this developments approval to move St Alberta into the 21st century. As a representative in "Smart Cities", I find this type of foresight and detailed communication by Boudreau Developments to residents and interested parties is exactly the type of development partner that St. Albert desperately needs.</p> <p>We were at an information session tonight and the amount of tax off sets to the mil rate from this development is significant. As a St Albert resident I am looking for more parks, green spaces, public safety, etc. Such a development would be a big contributor to those social demands.</p>
80	<p>I'm writing you today to address the proposed development by Boudreau Communities next to "Shops at Boudreau".</p> <p>I was born and raised in St. Albert and have lived almost my entire life here. Whenever someone asked where I live, I've been proud to tell them we live in St. Albert. Four years ago, my wife and I with our two kids decided to move to Orchard Court from Northridge. We picked Orchard Court because of the quiet neighborhood, river view and safe area for kids. The proposed development changes all of our reasons for moving. We are deeply upset at thought of this proposal.</p> <p>The appeal of St. Albert are the clean streets, parks/green spaces, trails and small town feel within a city (along with numerous other amenities). This proposed development not only changes the landscape of our great city but culture that everyone is proud of. The current zoning for this area is nowhere close to the proposal and shouldn't be considered or allowed.</p> <p>Changing the zoning for Boudreau Communities proposal would do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase traffic strain in an already high traffic area - reduced value of property near or adjacent to development - cultural shift away from family oriented community - eyesore to the existing landscape of St. Albert <p>What makes St. Albert great is not large high rise condos, but the characteristics like parks, trails and other amenities I mentioned previously. We're proud of our community right now and would like to keep it that way. I would urge you to stand with the majority of St. Albert residents and keep the zoning as is and preserve the title "Highest Living Standard in Canada".</p>
81	<p>During public meeting held earlier in September residents of Oakmont and Erin Ridge spoke unanimously against the project, citing numerous concerns with the proposed mega development.</p> <p>Proposed highrises will forever change St. Albert's skyline converting a well-established neighbourhood in the heart of the Botanical Arts City into a concrete jungle which in turn will put an end to the small town feel our city is well known for. Such a development will have a far reaching implications on infrastructure, safety and diminished quality of life.</p>

	<p>Here are some of the concerns we have with this proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intersection of Boudreau Rd and Bellerose Dr. is over capacity and is ranking third in both: High Injury Collision and Top Ten High Collision Intersections. <p>All this, is without future Botanica phase 2 residents adding to the traffic volume later in 2020. Proposed residential multi highrises with a commercial and office space developments will only make the matters worse. Traffic-clogged roadways statistically lead to increase in both, collisions and bodily injuries leading to rising costs and diminished quality of life. Riverbank Landing expansion has a potential of creating a gridlock during peak hours, impacting emergency services access and response times, even with proposed “improvements” to the above intersection.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Newly proposed traffic circle on the incline of Bellerose Dr. goes to show the desperation of the developer who has no regards for our safety, it seems and due to the area limitations is not able to provide a safe and adequate in/out access without impeding existing traffic flow. According to Fiscal Impact Analysis obtained through FOIA request there is a possibility of a bus stop right before the proposed traffic circle which will constrain the traffic further. 3. Excessive building height will create an aerial obstacle (another deathtrap) for helicopters (STARS etc.) operating out of Sturgeon Hospital adding unnecessary risk during the landing approach as it will be directly in the flight path, with the winds predominantly from the W and NW. 4. Presented Sun shadow study by the developer was not to scale and completely avoided times during which the shadows are at its longest (mornings and evenings). Failing to disclose winter months when the shadow created by 100+ meters buildings will affect not only the residents of Oakmont neighbourhood and houses within 100m radius but will also have an impact on: Erin Ridge, Inglewood, Woodlands and Kingswood. I invite each and everyone of you to take a moment and model the shadows, by visiting and setting location on the map, inputting day of the months, specifying object height and scrolling the sun along the top time scale to see the length and location of the shadows, so you can see for yourself the affects in your neighbourhood. 5. Twin tower configuration will effectively create a wind tunnel as the wind must speed up in order to get around the buildings creating a snow drift in the winter times and extremely windy conditions in the warmer months. I invite anyone to take a walk around Ice District in Edmonton to experience it firsthand. 6. Considering current state of economy is there even a need or a demand for such a luxury apartments when many are downsizing and choosing renting over owning? There are always vacancies when it comes to commercial space in Botanica which poses a similar question, if there is a need for more commercial space? 7. Elimination of the green belt around the river will permanently impact wild life and have an adverse environmental consequences on the local ecosystem. 8. During September 10th meeting – developer was quoted saying that the construction will last for at least 10 years and done in multiple stages. Haut said, he believes
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>residents will embrace it down the road. What he was really referring to, is a condition called a Stockholm syndrome, where he holds the residents hostage with his mega development and we have no choice but to like it down the road. The hostage situation revolves around the fact that owners of surrounding properties don't want to live in a construction zone for a next decade nor incur a financial loss if attempted to sell now or later once these skyscrapers are built. It raises a question, who will be covering our losses? If developer really wants to preserve Hole's legacy - create a green space that can be enjoyed by everyone.</p> <p>Proposed mega development will affect the majority of St. Albert residents and surrounding areas, therefore, notifying residents within 100 meters seems inadequate to say the least. We would like to extend the radius of notifications to at least include all the properties that will be affected by the longest shadow created by the proposed towers. Decisions of such magnitude should not lay solely on council's shoulders or residents within 100 meters radius. Skyscrapers and highrises belong in downtown Edmonton since all the supporting infrastructure is already in place. This notion was unanimously supported by the residents during the meeting. Before the city makes a decision on the proposed development, we are, the residents of St. Albert requesting to hold a public petition on this matter. Constructing highrises on a riverbank in a well-established residential neighbourhood, goes against St. Albert values and its resident's best interest. We all hope that Mayor Heron will stand by her election platform promises to: preserve natural environment and river valley, plan growth effectively with the right balance and care for the beauty Botanical City has to offer.</p>
82	<p>As a resident of Oakmont, I feel that the roadways are not able to handle the existing traffic efficiently, let alone adding more from high-density developments. Have you ever tried to turn left (southbound) onto Boudreau from Bellerose? With traffic backed up the hill, it will take a long time! Have you ever driven down that hill at -30? Sheer ice and an intersection are not good combinations (and yes, at 40 kph or slower, it is still dicey at times). A roundabout is not a good solution.</p> <p>I also disagree with the height of two buildings. 20+ stories do NOT belong on the banks of the fragile Sturgeon River, nor do they have a place in our community that has the appeal of being like a small town. The shadow and eyesore issues of these concrete monsters is another area of concern, as well as a decrease in property and resale values. People have built their dream homes in Oakmont (me and my husband included) based on the ASP of the day. It is hardly fair to come along after the fact and change it so drastically!</p> <p>Also, if the city is going to allow a behemoth high rise, then it should send information letters to homes farther out than 100 metres from the build site!</p> <p>Please note that just because an open house or two are held, it doesn't mean that people can fit those particular dates into their already full schedules.</p> <p>One of my favourite things about living here is how close we are to nature. Walking down my Otter Crescent or along the trails, my view will be marred by concrete and glass (which is a danger to birds, which are already in severe population decline).</p> <p>I suggest the traffic and density studies be revisited on this project. I am absolutely opposed to it! Perhaps something on a more reasonable and "botanic city"-like scale should be considered.</p>

83	<p>After reviewing the plans, hearing discussions on the new development and owning (with my partner) a suite in Botanica I fully support their vision.</p> <p>The reasons for support are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Love the unique boutiques, walk-ability and village square which offers a great sense of community • Developers have put forward a vision for the future which provides further reason why St. Albert is somewhere folks want to live and raise families • Good tax revenues • Strategic use of space and services (transit, green space, amenities, community feel) • Excellent use of River Views and Valley • Towers are fantastic, nice to see many people will be able to enjoy river views vs a small few • Vision for the future and environment, ie: shared space, less single use vehicles • Economic sense for business owners, having a community surrounding and supporting small business is something I encourage.
84	<p>Please add my family's name to the long list of St. Albert residents who are very opposed to the Riverbank Landing Development as it is presently proposed.</p> <p>I am certain you have heard all of the reasons numerous times and ours are no different. Our two biggest concerns are:</p> <p>The buildings are TOO TALL - they will affect sunlight and shadow and make the corner look like concrete heaven. Anything over the height of the existing buildings is unacceptable in that location. Buildings of that size and impact belong downtown - not in a quiet residential area.</p> <p>The traffic issue is of huge concern - the corner of Bellerose and Boudreau is already a stressor and can barely handle the new status quo as it is - it is already becoming a corner of last resort - and there aren't many options for getting out of Oakmont!</p> <p>A walkable urban village sounds kind of quaint, friendly, and even 'European'. But the reality is that it cannot and should not be plunked down in the middle of an existing neighbourhood with an already overtaxed infrastructure. Proper planning does not allow for quality of life to be jeopardized by short sighted leaders and smooth talking developers.</p> <p>I believe our Council is above this and will do everything they can to protect its citizens well being and high quality of life.</p>
85	<p>As tax paying residents of our City for 30 years, my wife and I are deeply concerned regarding the details to amend the Oakmont ASP in order to make way for the Riverbank Landing Project. We have a number of concerns with this project :</p> <p>(1) Twenty-five story towers in this area are too high. This is being done along the edge of the riverbank in the heart of a residential area. It will primarily affect residents of Oakmont, but also residents in Woodlands and Erin Ridge, completely changing the sight lines from nearby homes in these communities as well as blocking the sun. We do not see how this development cannot have anything but a negative impact in these communities as well as the river valley. My understanding is that this area was originally designated by planning as low density residential. For council to change this plan now,</p>

	<p>after many homes in the area were purchased and built based on this designation, is misleading and unfair. This Project will negatively impact home values in surrounding areas.</p> <p>(2) There will be an exacerbation of existing traffic problems for traffic entering/crossing Boudreau Road at all entry points, but in particular from Bellerose Drive as a result of this project. The addition of 4 Towers (three from Riverbank Landing + the second Botanica Tower) and nearly one thousand residents, all trying to access Bellerose Drive will lead to even worse traffic issues than are already occurring.</p> <p>(3) One of St. Albert's greatest assets is the beautiful river valley winding through our city. Walking the trails allows one to feel removed from city life and offers the opportunity to enjoy the wildlife attracted by the river and surrounding vegetation. We are deeply concerned about the amount and sheer scale of all the development occurring along the Sturgeon River in the last five years. It is ruining the natural beauty of the area that has been one of the main reasons we have continued living here, and without doubt will have negative impacts on the wildlife and the river itself.</p> <p>We believe that a development of this scale and size, at this location so close to the Sturgeon River is not in the best interests of St. Albert residents. On this basis we are strongly opposed to the Riverbank Landing project as it is currently proposed.</p>
86	<p>My wife and I wish to provide a statement of support for the Riverbank Landing; Boudreau Communities Development Proposal. We are active seniors who will soon be moving to our new condo in Phase II of the Botanica development in St. Albert. As such we feel we have a vested interest in the newly proposed Riverbank Development.</p> <p>The amended Project proposal (Submitted November 2019), Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA) the City of St Albert's Strategic Plan 2018-2021, the media (St Albert Gazette) coverage and ongoing comments from the Oakmont Boudreau Development concerned residents FaceBook account have helped in framing our view.</p> <p>It is our belief that the scope, and scale of Riverbank Landing is a key element to meeting elements of the Council's priorities specifically STRATEGIC PRIORITY #5: <u>Housing: Enhance housing options. Facilitate an increase in the variety of housing types in St. Albert to respond to market demands and accommodate the diverse needs of residents.</u> The mixed development concept provides a diversity of residential housing options all of which aids in achieving the stated Priority.</p> <p>Further, the mix of planned retail and professional services well supports Council's STRATEGIC PRIORITY #2: <u>Economic Development: Enhance business/commercial growth. St. Albert will work towards an innovative, investment-positive environment that will support and encourage the development of new, existing, and emerging sectors.</u></p> <p>Additionally, we believe that the projects social and economic outcomes are also harmonized with the expectations of Council and the overall residents of the City. People want to belong in a growing and vibrant entity that provides amenities and quality of life that respects community and environmental values. We feel that the mixed development proposed by Riverbank Landing will achieve this balance.</p>

	<p>Economically, it is clear from the FIA that the return to the City is very positive. The reports Conclusion states:</p> <p><i>Without Capital Reinvestment: At full build-out, the proposed Riverbank Landing development is estimated to generate a net financial gain to the City of St. Albert in the order of \$1.94 million annually, prior to consideration of any capital re-investment costs (and associated utility revenues).</i></p> <p><i>With Capital Reinvestment: When the annualized municipal costs associated with maintaining and eventually replacing the assets that are constructed to service the proposed Riverbank Landing development are considered, the City is projected to experience a reduced gain in the order of \$1.77 million per year.</i></p> <p>It qualifies this with the following statement: <i>This annual reduced gain is only temporary. After the debt associated with City-funded infrastructure is repaid in 20 years, the net municipal financial impact associated with the proposed Riverbank Landing development improves to a net gain to the City in the order of \$1.91 million per year.</i></p> <p>Further, the City must also consider the overall economic impact that a project of this size will have on the City, the region and Provincially. The numbers of people estimated to be directly employed, as well as the indirect, and induced employment, needs to be factored. The taxes generated at not only the City local level but the regional, provincial and possibly the federal levels need to be considered. Also, the ongoing capital expenditures, and operating expenditures for the projected life of the development must also be weighed. To do otherwise is to undervalue the economic contribution of Riverbank Landing particularly in the current challenging time for our Province.</p> <p>In conclusion, we strongly encourage the approval of the development. Granted, it represents change, but we believe that this is positive and will add to and enrich the wellbeing of the people of St Albert.</p>
87	<p>We live at [Redacted], St. Albert, immediately adjacent to the proposed development and we are strongly opposed to the applications. The amendments sought should not be allowed. If Council does allow the project to proceed in some fashion, changes to the proposed amendments need to be made.</p> <p>In our view, in considering the amendments sought both City administration and Council should bear in mind the following planning principles:</p> <p>A. Density: Let's get this one out of the way first. We are not opposed to high density. We are opposed to high density at this location. Some people seem to think that high density vetoes all other planning considerations. It does not. Proper planning requires a balancing of all relevant planning considerations. This is not a greenfield development. It is an infill project that would significantly change the nature of an existing neighbourhood. The site was never contemplated for high density prior to this proposal, was not planned for high density and is ill-suited for high density. The development proposed is completely incompatible with the existing neighbourhood and has been overwhelmingly rejected by its residents.</p> <p>B. Public Participation: The resident's vision of their neighbourhood is important. They are the ones who live in the neighbourhood and they should have a direct say in how their community is to be developed. This is why all municipalities spend a significant amount of time developing statutory plans with the public. Some have suggested that Council will only listen to developers and experts (most of whom are hired by</p>

	<p>the developer). However, there is a reason why both the Municipal Government Act (MGA) and the Provincial Land Use Policies (LUP) require public participation. The public should and does have a legitimate interest in how their communities are developed. Public hearings, and other forms of public participation, are statutorily required for a reason and that reason is not merely to listen to planners or other experts.</p> <p>C. Statutory Plans Should Not Be Amended Lightly: Statutory plans like the Oakmont ASP are visions of what and how a community is to develop. Effectively, they are also representations by the municipality as to how the community is to develop. Residents purchase their property and build their homes based on the vision expressed by the City in those statutory plans. Residents invest money, time and emotion into that vision because it is the vision of the community that they want to live in. That should not be taken away lightly.</p> <p>D. Compatibility: Good planning includes the use of planning principles which avoid incompatible uses, forms or scales in proximity to each other. The City's Municipal Development Plan also contains a number of specific policy statements designed to ensure compatibility or minimize adverse effects created by the lack of compatibility.</p> <p>E. Transition (Buffer) Zones Between Different Uses: Providing adequate buffer zones between different forms of land use is a basic and well understood principle of proper planning. If Council does approve the development in some form, an adequate buffer zone between the project and the existing residential neighbourhood should be guaranteed by specific textual regulation.</p> <p>Bearing these principles in mind, we submit the following:</p> <p>1. DEFICIENT APPLICATION MATERIALS: The application materials themselves are deficient for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unlike the pre-application materials, there were no dimensioned drawings showing distances between buildings or property lines (especially between existing residences and proposed project buildings). The developer should make that information available. • We have reason to doubt the accuracy of the sun/shadow drawings submitted. The shadow drawings produced by [Redacted] (not attached but incorporated in these submissions by reference) show significantly greater shadows compared to the drawings provided by the developer. The developer should be required to provide all of the background data used to create their shadow drawings and a detailed explanation of how their shadows were projected/ drawn, including exact heights of the buildings, the elevations used for both the base of the buildings and the locations of the top of the shadow, the length of the longest shadows produced by the towers, the area of the shadow zone during all of the four seasons, and times of longest and shortest shadow. The developer should also confirm whether the drawings are to scale, and if so, the scale of the drawings. • All persons within the shadow zone of the proposed buildings are directly affected by the developer's proposal and should get direct notice of the applications and procedures associated with them. • The developer's environmental report is limited to a Phase One report regarding potential contamination on the property. There is no Natural Area Assessment or
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>other analysis of the environmental effect on flora, fauna, wildlife corridors, the river or the river valley, including the effect of increased drainage on the river eco system resulting from the hardened surfaces (concrete and paving) this project will produce. Neither is there a tree inventory and assessment. These reports should be provided before Council makes their decision regarding these applications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bunt traffic assessment does not consider traffic on Boudreau Road, which is used extensively by residents and others as they enter or exit the neighbourhood from Bellerose Drive. Heavy traffic is experienced on Boudreau Dr. during rush hour, especially as it approached Bellerose. In short, back-ups on Boudreau affect back-ups on Bellerose and vice-versa, but there is no analysis of the effect of the additional development generated traffic on Boudreau Road and how that will affect traffic on Bellerose Drive. • In regard to the above, it is worthwhile to note the findings of the City's latest (2017) Traffic Collision Statistics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ "Previous traffic safety research has shown that there is a relationship between collision occurrence and traffic volume – as traffic volume increases; vehicle collision also typically increases" (p.13) ▪ "Figure 7 ... clearly identifies that most reported collisions occurred along the St. Albert Trail and Boudreau Road corridors." (p.13) ▪ In terms of St. Albert's top ten collision intersections the Boudreau Road and Bellerose Drive intersection ranked third highest for the number of collisions in 2017, third highest for the number of collisions between 2012-2017, and third highest for the number of injury collisions between 2012-2017 • The developer should be required to provide all analytic material used to provide their so called market study, which appears to consist of one table found at p.24 of the ARC report. This is not a market study, and for all we know it is nothing more than wishful thinking. How were those absorption rates obtained? No analysis was given and we have no idea whether they bear any air of reality. • In regard to the above, the City should be mindful of past projects which failed even though all required permits and approvals were obtained. Examples include Braeside (we understand that the land was immediately sold after redistricting was obtained, and the project has still not gone ahead) and Grandin where (we understand) 25 story towers were approved, but have still not been developed. The Landrex redistricting application is also relevant as they don't think there is a market for a mixed use development. There was also an infamous case in Calgary a number of years ago. Excavation was done for a downtown office tower (underground parking as will be the case here), but the developer went into receivership before the tower was built. This left the City of Calgary with a very large downtown hole in the ground which was deteriorating and dangerous. The City had to start enforcement proceedings which then became mired in complicated receivership litigation. • The developer's application materials put inordinate emphasis on its June 2019 "Red Barn" meeting which was not properly advertised and gave absolutely no indication that the meeting pertained to 300 Orchard Court. Indeed, no addresses were given at all, and there was no indication that our neighbourhood would be affected. This was not a meeting of the public and we understand that it was primarily attended by Botanica residents. They are entitled to their opinion but Council should not be under the impression that the views stated represent a full cross-section of the public.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>2. TOWERS: The developer now tells us that they want to build two towers, each of which would be 26 stories high. They also wish to build a seniors complex 11 stories high (also a tower by St. Albert standards) as well as a 3 story residential/ commercial building, a professional building and a restaurant/conference building. However, the actual zoning requested would allow other or different buildings, including a hotel. Leaving that issue aside for the moment, the towers themselves are obviously incompatible with the existing neighbourhood. They are completely incompatible in mass and scale as there is nothing approaching buildings of this size or type in the neighborhood. Indeed, there is not even anything like this in St. Albert, and very few buildings of this height in Edmonton outside its greater downtown area. It seems like the developer is trying to create a new downtown St. Albert in Oakmont. We suggest that if the developer wants to build towers like this, it should be done in either the downtown area, or a developing area in St. Albert where people can chose to live close to it if they wish. Development of this type should not be forced on residents who chose to live in Oakmont because there was no development of this type. In that regard, please review the comments from the September public meeting. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One resident wanted to purchase for the view. She specifically sought and obtained promises from both the CITY and the developer of Erin Ridge that there would never be anything built higher than two stories in this area – Transcript, p.28, ls. 2 to 19; p.66, l. 25 to p.67, l. 11 • Others were opposed to the form and scale of the towers – Transcript, p.30, ls. 8-25; p.69, l. 18 to p.70 l. 2 • Others built or wanted to build their dream home here, but now feel that they will be forced to move even though they will now have to accept a reduced rate for their property as a result of the proposed development – Transcript, p.59, l. 20 to p.61, l. 14 ; p.70, ls. 3-18 <p>3. TOWER SHADOWS: As indicated, we doubt the accuracy of the shadow information provided by the developer and ask that the information requested be provided. We also ask that the City then review that information for accuracy and impact. What can be said at this point in time is that the shadows will have a significant detrimental impact on the residents in the area. The impact on the river valley and its ecosystem is yet to be determined. We are also aware that at least one family on Orchard Court has invested heavily in solar energy and has installed 35 solar panels on their roof. There will be a direct negative impact on that family, and the shadowing effect of the towers will discourage others from investing in solar energy. For ourselves, we can say from personal experience that the developer's assertion that the trees at the edge of the property shade our property so completely that we won't notice the buildings is definitely not accurate, especially when the deciduous trees drop their leaves in the winter. In accordance with typical passive solar design, the majority of our windows face south (toward the development) to take advantage of the sun. See the attached picture [Not Included in Summary] of our house in the sun on December 29 2019, taken at 1:50 pm. The shadows from the towers, the senior's complex and the building proposed behind us will have the effect of blocking out sunlight, increasing our heating costs and increasing our carbon footprint. The shadows will also affect many more people than suggested by the developer. The December shadow drawing provided by Mr. Wiebe shows the 9:00 am shadow going right off the page and it is calculated that it will go right across St. Albert Trail for a total distance of over 3.9 km. The shadows will also affect a portion of</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Woodlands and the baseball diamonds on the other side of the river. The towers will have other negative effects as well.</p> <p>4. TOWERS OTHER NEGATIVE EFFECTS: The towers will also create a lack of privacy for residents, dramatically so for those of us living closest to the development. Ask yourselves how you would like it if multiple high rise towers (with mandatory balconies) were to be built overlooking you, especially if you bought into your neighbourhood to avoid that type of development. The towers will have a negative effect on views and the availability of sunlight. The Towers are also likely to create reflections, especially from windows and other reflective surfaces, affect wind patterns, create bird mortality given the significant amount of bird flight in the river valley, and be a potential flight hazard for helicopters landing or taking off from the Sturgeon Hospital. The shadowing effect could also have negative environmental effects on the river valley, and potentially create additional danger for drivers using Bellerose Road who at times will be driving in and out of multiple shadows and into bright sunlight, and likely reflections. To our knowledge, most of these things have not been studied, and they should be.</p> <p>5. INCOMPATIBILITY: As mentioned, the development is incompatible with the existing neighbourhood in mass, form and scale, in density, in use type and in vision. The developer wants to do an extreme makeover of the neighbourhood in the developer's vision, and contrary to the vision of the residents. The makeover would be so radical that it is not an exaggeration to say that the developer is trying to create a new downtown in Oakmont. In fact it is an understatement as not even St. Albert's downtown has towers approaching this height. Through DARP and similar initiatives the City has been trying to attract this type of development to the downtown core where it belongs. The Developers plans would compete with and be contrary to the City's stated downtown goals, and would also be contrary to the residents vision of what Oakmont should be. It should not be allowed.</p> <p>6. COMPATIBILITY PROVISIONS: The City's Design Guidelines for Compatible Development in Established Neighbourhoods contain provisions regarding compatibility. While Oakmont is not defined as an "Established Neighbourhood", and these guidelines do not therefor strictly apply to Oakmont, the guidelines themselves incorporate proper planning principles which should be considered, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (1.3) compatibility in height, scale, and design of other buildings in the neighbourhood, compatibility with surrounding land uses, infrastructure capability and public consultation • (5.1) the height of the new infill or an addition must be particularly sensitive • (5.4) A new development should not unduly limit the amount of sunlight available to adjoining houses and yards. Avoid building height and mass that will unduly restrict sunlight in neighbouring yards <p>The Developer has (and still does – see their website) advertise this development as an urban village. The City has planning and design guidelines applicable to urban village centres (C53-2002). While the developer may change their website and deny that these guidelines are applicable, even if that were the case (which we do not accept), they still contain planning principles which should guide this development, and which Council is free to apply, most specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s.2.0.2: "The Village Centre will complement the adjacent neighbourhoods. The scale and character of adjacent land uses both within and outside the Urban Village Centre will be protected through attention to such matters as land use
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>transition, compatible building height adjacent to low density residential, stepping back of facades, reduction in massing, appropriate separation distance and/or building setbacks, landscaping or some combination of the above.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next subparagraph goes on to state that a maximum of five stories will be considered in conjunction with the above, while paragraph 2.10 provides that an Urban Village Centre should provide “for a graduated density pattern with a stepping down of height and a reduction in massing where it abuts low density residential areas.” <p>The following provisions can also be found in the MDP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • s.4.0 (Housing and Neighbourhood Design) – one of the objectives is to facilitate the development of COMPATIBLE infill housing subject to infrastructure evaluation and public consultation • s.4.10 (Low Density Infill in Existing Neighbourhoods) provides that due regard be given to (1) compatibility in height, scale, and design of other buildings in the neighbourhood, (3) compatibility with surrounding land uses, and (6) infrastructure capability • s.4.12 (Locations for Medium Density Residential) (a note provides that this is also applicable to high density) provides that in evaluating locations for medium (or high) density...the City shall consider (4) compatibility of medium (or high) density residential sites with adjacent land uses • the MDP definition of “infill development” means development in mature or built up areas of the City of St. Albert occurring on vacant or underutilized lands, behind or between existing development and which is compatible with the characteristics of surrounding development <p>7. BUFFER ZONE: Buffer or transition zones are well known planning mechanisms which are employed to alleviate the negative effects of incompatibility. If Council allows these applications, there should be an adequate buffer zone between the existing residential neighbourhood and the proposed multi-use high density development.</p> <p>300 Orchard Court adjoins our property and is immediately south of us. The Oakmont ASP currently provides that 300 Orchard Court is to be used for low density residential. The best option here is to reject the application to amend the ASP and thereby allow the property to be developed as contemplated in accordance with the current ASP (see later submissions). Failing this however, while the trees are not enough of a buffer zone by themselves, it is absolutely vital that the trees be maintained, and specific textual regulation be included in the amending bylaw to ensure that this will happen. Otherwise, there will be nothing binding on this developer, or any successor in title, which requires that the trees be maintained (keeping in mind that, as in past cases, development lands can be sold/transferred, and developers can be subject to receivership/bankruptcy). In addition, we note the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.4.11 (2) of the MDP indicates that the design of residential neighbourhoods should, wherever possible, maintain stands of trees.... • The developer, during the focus group process (Planning has the approved minutes), agreed to maintain the trees, including consultation with an arborist
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>regarding the health of the trees and replacement of any unhealthy trees with new trees in consultation with neighbouring residents.</p> <p>As indicated, the trees are vital, but do not in and of themselves create an adequate buffer zone. In addition, there should be a transition zone of no development (including structures, roads or hard surfaces) for 50 meters from the property line of the adjoining neighborhood, with a further transition of 50 meters in which a maximum structure height of three stories is allowed. If any towers above three stories are allowed, they should be no closer to the existing residences than the center of the project as shown for the two large towers on the current site plan. There should be no road in the vicinity of the residences and no external access point within 100 meters of the property line. Once again, all of this should be set out in specific textual regulations included in the LUB amending bylaw.</p> <p>8. ENVIRONMENT: As previously indicated, further environmental studies are required. See previous comments. In addition, St. Albert badly needs an overall river valley plan and this should be done before all the river valley land is developed. The cumulative effect of development in the river valley needs to be considered. Higher density does not justify risking what is left of the river valley.</p> <p>9. TRAFFIC: Most if not all other neighbourhoods in St. Albert have access from at least two arterial roads. Bellerose Drive is the only arterial road servicing Oakmont, and all residents of Oakmont and those in the Evergreen section of Erin Ridge must use Bellerose Drive to get in and out of their neighbourhoods. Bellerose Drive is also heavily used by people living in other parts of Erin Ridge and residents of Sturgeon County, even more so since the closing of Coal Mine Road. We also understand that at some point in time a connection between Bellerose Dr. and 127 St. is planned. As 127 Street will become a new route into and out of St. Albert, this will obviously add a considerable traffic load onto Bellerose Drive. The annexation area along Bellerose Drive east of current City limits will also create additional development and traffic. Traffic is already congested and will get worse over time even if the Riverbank landing development does not proceed.</p> <p>The Application Management (AM) Report contained in the Riverbank Landing application materials estimates that Riverbank Landing would add 466 dwelling units and 820 residents to this 4 hectare site, based on an average of 1.76 persons per household (pp.9 and 10). The Bunt Report states that Botanica II will add a further 128 units. Using the same average of 1.76 persons per household, this equates a further 225 people, and a total of 1045 new residents. These are only estimates and the numbers could, and likely will (in our view) be greater. There will also be significant traffic generated by the commercial tenants and their employees and customers, and delivery and service vehicles for both residential and commercial development. One of the buildings is to be a restaurant and conference/special events/rental hall centre which will be about 7500 sq. ft. in area (different figures have been given at various times) which has the potential to draw large amounts of people and traffic at one time. At times such events will inevitably coincide with of rush hour. In addition there will also be a certain amount of other traffic.</p> <p>The developer's current website refers to the development as an "urban village", says that "this new town square will act as a hub for everyone in St. Albert" (St. Albert's new downtown?) and that people will be attracted by events such as</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>“movies in the square”. Obviously they envision larger amounts of traffic than has been calculated.</p> <p>Current statutory plans for this area do not contemplate the high density contemplated by Riverbank Landing, which means, among other things, that high density was not planned for this area. It shows. Traffic in this area is already congested, horribly so at rush hour. Numerous residents described the backlogs of traffic at the September public meeting. Bunt, the experts paid by and acting for the developer, say not to worry, that the situation can be handled by tinkering with the lights and adding turning lanes. We, and all of the residents we have talked to, don’t believe this will be the case. We are the ones who know how bad the traffic can be, often taking three to five light changes (some say six – see transcript) at rush hour to clear the intersection at Bellerose and Boudreau. Sometimes Bellerose even backs up to the area of the Canadian Tire store and beyond. It is sometimes difficult to get out of the neighbourhoods (Oakmont or Evergreen Drives to Bellerose Dr.), particularly during morning rush hour.</p> <p>It is regrettable that Council sometimes defers to experts and discounts the views of residents. However, here there is no doubt. Bunt has acknowledged in their report that the current traffic systems in the neighbourhood have already failed and are inadequate to handle the heavy traffic volumes already being experienced.</p> <p>According to Bunt (p.23) “a number of movements are approaching or over capacity during the AM and PM peak hours” and “southbound left turn queues were observed spilling back to or beyond Evergreen Drive during peak hours.”</p> <p>Bunt recommends changes. One recommended change is a right turn bay on Bellerose, but Bunt then acknowledges that “if due to right of way constraints a northbound right turn bay is not possible, the northbound through/right turn movements are anticipated to exceed capacity”. Bunt also recommends “that opportunities to lengthen the southbound left turn lane be explored”. The trouble with this is that the exploration is not likely to go very far. The left turn lanes (north and south) already take up most if not all of the room between Evergreen and Boudreau, with little if any additional room remaining.</p> <p>Why shouldn’t we believe that the additional traffic generated by Riverbank Landing can be fixed by the band-aid solutions proposed by Bunt? A Traffic Impact Assessment was required by the City when the Botanica/Shops at Boudreau was developed. At p.1 of their report, Bunt acknowledged that they authored that report. Their “expert” traffic analysis was obviously wrong and Bunt has effectively acknowledged that by recognizing that current systems are failing existing traffic requirements. The reality is, neither this area nor its roads were planned to handle the high density proposed by the developer, and even without this development traffic will get worse. Band aid solutions won’t work and the last thing St. Albert needs is yet another traffic problem. See Transcript p.40, l. 11 to p.42, l.24; p.63, l. 12 to p.64, l.25; p.70, l. 18 to p.71, l. 11; p.76, l.24 to p.77, l. 15.</p> <p>10. ACCESS: To make matters worse, there is no proper access to this site. The primary access would be Evergreen Drive which Bunt acknowledges and residents confirm, is already overloaded by traffic on Bellerose backed up from Boudreau. Trying to force all the traffic created by this project through that intersection would not only be excessive but completely inappropriate. This confirms once again that the neighbourhood simply was not designed or planned for high density. To get around that problem the developer has proposed a secondary “right in/right out” access onto Bellerose Drive which would send traffic in a direction that most drivers</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

do not want to go and thereby create more U-turns and traffic cutting through the neighbourhoods. Worse, accesses of this type are dangerous due to the traffic problems they create: they increase the risk of collisions between different traffic flows travelling at differential speeds, and also back up traffic further increasing the risk of rear end collisions. It was undoubtedly for these reasons, and the general disruption to traffic flow which they create, that the City created rules prohibiting driveways onto arterial roads (see s.3.7 of the City's Engineering Standards). We pointed this out in a September letter to the Gazette. But the developer has devised further strategies to circumvent the City's rules (below).

11. **ACCESS BY PUBLIC ROAD:** The developer now attempts to circumvent these rules by trying to make a private condominium road a public road. But the developer requires the City's help to do so. Let's be clear here. During the September public meeting there was no suggestion of a public road. Neither was there any such suggestion in the pre-application materials. It was only after our September letter printed in the Gazette pointing out the City's prohibition of such accesses that the developer hatched the plan to have this declared as a public road. This is a private condominium road like so many others in the City. There is no legitimate public purpose to having this declared a public road. It will also create liabilities for the City related to its upkeep, maintenance, and eventual replacement, not to mention claims by abutting landowners for damages pursuant to s.534 of the MGA, and claims arising from traffic accidents.

The City should not allow this road to be declared to be a public road: To do so would be tantamount to colluding with the developer's attempts to circumvent City rules and would also be detrimental to the ratepayers of St. Albert.

The City has also taken a very firm and public stance against allowing such access onto arterial roads. Residents of Erin Ridge North pleaded with both Council and administration to provide a new condominium project with direct access to Neil Ross Road to avoid the only alternative - putting children in danger by routing the traffic through a school zone. The City's emphatic answer: there were rules against these types of accesses and they could not and would not be allowed.

We also point out that the City's Engineering Standards (1.0) specifically provide that "the distinction between private property and public property is irrelevant to the adherence to the Municipal Engineering Standards". The dangers created by these types of accesses will remain, regardless of whether they are public or private.

12. **LOCATION OF ACCESS:** The location of the access has been changed since the September public meeting. But for the other problems with such an access it could have just as easily been left in the vicinity of its previous location (coming straight out to Bellerose between buildings # 5 and #6). However, the developer now proposes to move it northward so that it now enters Bellerose Road immediately adjacent to existing homes on Orion Close in Oakmont. This is completely unacceptable as it will create numerous nuisance factors for existing residents and will severely impact the use and enjoyment of our properties.

To begin with, the orientation of the road, as shown on the current site plan, would route traffic so that exiting vehicles would be pointed straight at our living room windows (see attached picture), which means we will have vehicle headlights shining straight into our living room (and other) windows at any time of year that the trees are not in full leaf. Even when the trees are in full leaf we would be subjected to excessive traffic noise not only from vehicles passing in close proximity to our

	<p>house, but also from the noise of breaking and acceleration and deceleration at the intersection of the road and Bellerose Drive.</p> <p>Exiting traffic will be required to drive uphill both on the internal road and as and after they exit on to Bellerose Road, which will require faster acceleration creating additional noise even when they do not squeal their tires. And yes, it is inevitable that there will be the sound of collisions as well. Dust, dirt and garbage will also be factors. Most concerning however is the danger posed by the proposed location. When travelling uphill on Bellerose (northward) this access would be located on a curve, so it will be very difficult for oncoming traffic on Bellerose to see vehicles attempting to turn onto Bellerose. It will also be very difficult for exiting traffic to see the oncoming Bellerose traffic bearing down on them. Exiting vehicles are also likely to be obscured or partially obscured by the terrain as they would be coming into the exit from a lower elevation. It is foreseeable that an access at this location would become a new high collision location in St. Albert, and it would be virtually on our back doorstep.</p> <p>The Arc report indicates that developer listened to the public and made changes to its proposal, which implies that the changes to the internal roads and the location of the access came at the suggestion of the public. As we were part of the focus group that met with the developer we can confirm that this was definitely not the case. Indeed we note that the covering letter in the Bunt report specifically says that the real reason the access was moved was to allow for a potential round about in the future. In our view there should be no traffic circle at this location in the future and there is no need for the access at this location.</p> <p>13. TRAFFIC CIRCLE: It is hard to imagine that someone would actually propose a traffic circle at this location. That is because it is hard to imagine a more dangerous and detrimental location for a traffic circle. As noted above, the location of the proposed traffic circle, as shown on the current site plan, is located on a curve. The curve is somewhat banked, and the traffic circle would also be located on a slope. The traffic circle would therefore be located on a banked, curving slope. Bellerose also has side slopes in this area, and as previously mentioned, sight lines are limited by the curve in the road. We have certainly never seen a traffic circle in such a dangerous and unlikely location.</p> <p>In addition to the obvious danger created by such a traffic circle, inclement weather would pose an even greater risk. The Bunt Report (p.27) states the obvious: "round about operations could be impacted by downstream queues spilling back into the roundabout." One can easily foresee vehicles skidding downhill into a backed up traffic circle during a snow storm or icy conditions. A traffic circle and/or traffic lights would also greatly increase the noise level for homes on both sides of Bellerose Drive and would also add another clog/back-up point to Bellerose Drive, a major arterial road which is supposed to move traffic efficiently. There are currently three intersection traffic lights between Oakmont Drive and Boudreau Road, and six between Oakmont Drive and the St. Albert Trail. Some of these (Evergreen and Boudreau are the best examples) are so close that they back up into each other. A further exit from the Shops at Boudreau adds to the congestion. Please do not add this further back up point. It will not only disrupt traffic flow, and create excessive noise, but will be dangerous.</p> <p>We should also mention that there is limited room for a traffic circle at this location, and we have doubts about whether a properly constructed traffic circle would fit into the limited space.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>14. CONSTRUCTION: The estimated construction period for this project is excessively long. Residents are already fed up with the amount of time it has taken to build Botanica, which is not yet complete. The developer has indicated that the estimated construction period for Riverbank Landing is subject to market conditions and has failed to provide any meaningful market analysis. Residents should not be subjected to a perpetual construction zone of monumental proportions with all of its accompanying noise and traffic. Construction traffic, and the length of time we will be dealing with it, is also relevant to the issues (#'s 9-13) above. Traffic during this time will include heavy construction vehicles, some of which will be lengthy, noisy and slow. If the developer is allowed to construct internal roads in proximity to our homes we will be directly impacted by that. The developer also intends to use the right in/ right out access for construction access, which will have a significant negative impact on traffic using Bellerose Drive. Large vehicles will require both lanes to make the contemplated turn, and because it will be a sharp downhill turn (on a curving slope) some will need to back up perhaps several times to complete their turn.</p> <p>15. OTHER INTERNAL ROADS: The current site plan shows an internal road running roughly parallel to our back fence which will create unwanted traffic in close proximity to us. There should be specific regulation prohibiting this. See our previous comments under the heading "Buffer Zone" (#7).</p> <p>16. DENSITY: The developer's vision for this site contains many flaws but its most fundamental difficulties relate to the developer's attempt to force high density into an infill site that will not properly bear it. Physically, the site is constrained by its lack of proper access. The traffic generated by the proposed development is greater than that which the site can legitimately bear. It will get worse even without this project. The reality is that the road network in this area was never planned for the kind of density proposed and it would be foolhardy to try to force the traffic for over 1000 new residents plus significant new commercial traffic through the limited access and onto the already overtaxed roads. Trying to fit an oversized square peg into a round hole is an entirely apt analogy. The density of the proposal is also incompatible with the existing neighbourhood, and the existing resident's vision of and for the neighbourhood.</p> <p>17. PROPERTY VALUE: The developer has suggested that the development will increase the value of homes in the vicinity of the project. However, when asked at a focus group meeting if they could provide any studies or reports verifying this claim, the developers representatives said that they could not (once again, Planning has the approved minutes). It seems pretty obvious to us that our property value will be negatively impacted by this development for all of the reasons outlined in this submission. The developer obviously wants to make money, but they do so at our expense. There has been no offer of compensation from this developer as obviously that's not in their business plan (see transcript: p.59, l.20 to p.61, l.14; and p.65, ls. 2-24).</p> <p>18. FORM OF BYLAW: Direct Control bylaws should be used rarely, and when used they should specifically regulate what is going to develop on the site, and require that the developer come back to Council for any material changes that they require</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

in the future. St. Albert's version of direct control seems to be designed to keep Council out of their own direct control bylaw (i.e., a bylaw where Council is intended to have direct control over what happens on the development site). It is true that direct control bylaws can take different forms but St. Albert's form of direct control is unusual. A more typical form of direct control bylaw would see a site plan incorporated as part of the bylaw, with limited scope for minor deviation from that plan. Another more common form of bylaw would provide a limited amount of permitted uses with either all discretionary uses coming back to Council, or definite direction to the development officer setting out the limited forms of discretionary uses they could approve. Often such bylaws would also provide direction in the form of specific regulation and/or a binding site plan as to the location and size of structures or other improvements or features, including those designed to minimize negative impact and enhance compatibility.

The developer seeks amendments to the City's standard DCMU bylaw, most notably in regard to the height of buildings. If the City does allow this project to proceed in some fashion, it would be absolutely critical to provide further textual amendments which would specifically regulate the project, and most particularly, the height of the buildings and a buffer (transition) zone between the project and existing residential neighbourhoods. Unless there are specific regulations prohibiting certain forms of development in proximity to the residences, the developer could, for instance, construct its events centre/rental hall (think weddings and late night alcohol related events and all that goes with them), a bar (drinking establishment) or perhaps even a hotel immediately behind our house. Regulation of this type would also help to mitigate potential issues associated with commercial operations as per the City's Area Structure Plan Technical Terms of Reference Report (noise, light, odour, delivery trucks, garbage locations, screening, staff and patron accesses and hours of operation are specific issues referenced in that report, and are all concerns here). Such provisions should include:

- Maximum building height of 5 storeys (15m)
- No conference/events centre closer to residences than shown on existing site plan
- No external access within 100 meters of residents property line
- Buildings located between 50-100 meters of residents property line to be stepped down to a maximum 3 storeys (10m), and any commercial uses be subject to restricted hours, use and/or seating capacity
- A transition/buffer zone of at least 50 meters from the property line of existing residences where there would be no buildings, structures, roads, parking lots, or hard surfaces (other than approved park features). This provision would also provide a limited wildlife corridor to the river.
- A requirement to maintain all trees on the perimeter of the property, with a requirement that unhealthy trees be identified by a certified arborist and replaced with healthy trees after consultation with adjoining neighbours
- Changes to the proposed height schedule to show transition zone(s) (no building zone and reduced height zone), with tower locations maintained or no closer to residential neighbourhood
- "hotel" should be deleted as an allowable use
- There should be size restrictions or smaller size restrictions on use classes such as "apartment buildings", "grocery store", "specialty store", "shopping centre" and "commercial school"

	<p>The developer has provided a proposed site plan as part of the application materials. However, it must be kept in mind that these are merely pretty pictures, and Planning has confirmed that such site plans have no binding effect on the developer (email chain between Lenore Mitchell and Bill Barclay dated October 7, 2019). As far as the actual form of the development is concerned, what really matters is the text of the amended land use bylaw. Once a permitted use is granted the developer has an absolute right to develop that use anywhere on the site, subject to any applicable development regulations like setbacks etc. In the result, the actual development on site could be completely different and inconsistent with the current site plan, with significant potential to negatively impact adjacent residents. In addition, through legal process like receivership or simple transfer, the current developer may not be the developer that actually builds the project, and any successor may not feel bound by this developer's representations.</p> <p>If Council does allow this project to proceed in some fashion, Council must at least adequately regulate the project to minimize the adverse negative impacts of the project on the existing residents and the public. The better option however is to deny the applications and allow these properties to be developed as intended, without the need to amend the Oakmont ASP or the LUB.</p> <p>19. THE SOLUTION: The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board (EMRB) Growth Plan does not impose binding density requirements regarding infill developments, which recognizes the futility of trying to impose high density in all situations. Rather, the targets for infill development are "aspirational". Regardless of this however, the current Oakmont ASP is grandfathered and needs no approval from the EMRB. Currently the Oakmont ASP contemplates low density residential development on 300 Orchard Court and commercial development on 230 and 250 Bellerose Dr. That is what the current statutory plans (including the MDP) contemplate for the neighbourhood. Leaving the existing plans in place will allow the neighbourhood to develop in a more appropriate manner, will allow for adequate buffer zones to be created between residential and commercial uses, and will avoid all the problems associated with trying to shoe horn an incompatible high density development into an existing neighbourhood, including the very significant traffic problems identified at the September public meeting, and in these submissions. The reality is that the neighbourhood was simply not designed or planned to handle the type of density contemplated by the developer. Allowing this land to develop in accordance with the current plans would also allow for more commercial development than this developer proposes. This would have the advantage of increasing the City's non-residential assessment, something the City has been trying to do for decades.</p> <p>CONCLUSION: We have addressed these submissions to the City of St. Albert Council, Planning Branch and Transportation Branch, but have not delivered the submissions to Council. We ask that the Planning Branch deliver these submissions, in their entirety, to Council for the purpose of the Public Hearing which is to be scheduled. We will refer to these submissions when we address Council at that time. We also thank Council and administration for reviewing our submissions and giving them consideration.</p>
88	<p>I am against the application for proposed changes to the land use bylaw 9/2005, against the proposal change from DC to DCMU and the adjustment of maximum heights allowable.</p>

The mentioned lands in the Application are currently zoned Low Density Residential and should remain as such.

Why?

Traffic congestion on Bellerose Drive from Oakmont Drive to Boudreau there already is a set of lights at Evergreens of Erin Ridge. The citizens of Oakmont & Erin Ridge were told by Bundt and Associates that the Development including Botanica 1 & 2 and the Shops of Boudreau would not cause any traffic congestion or traffic flow problems. Well guess what it has had a significant negative impact on traffic congestion and Botanica 2 is not completed or sold out. In the near future, traffic from 118 units in Botanica 2 will be exiting their parking via Bellerose Drive. So now Bunt and Associates are telling us again that this proposed high density style development will not negatively impact traffic and we are supposed to believe them???? Currently between 2-7pm (and possibly other times) we often wait for 4-5 sets of lights on Bellerose Drive South bound to turn on Boudreau east bound. Putting a double lane traffic circle in close proximity to two sets of lights, on a slope, is there enough space, what about the sidewalks and the boulevards? In Oakmont we have only one way in and one way out of our subdivision, we do not have another option and currently it is not handling the traffic congestion very well.

River Valley – where do I start? Since I moved to St Albert in 1992, the number one thing the citizens of St Albert surveyed liked most about St. Albert was the park system, green space and the trail system and so did and do I. That feeling hasn't changed in the community engagement survey for 2019. Our river valley is the centre of the Red Willow Trail system, our parks and much of our green space. It is also a wildlife corridor for many animals to travel from the County to Big Lake, a place to walk and enjoy your surroundings and to partake in recreational activities. It is time to start protecting our river valley from large developments for future generations. As a citizen who cares and loves the river valley and what it gives to our

community both environmentally and recreationally, I took an initiative to coordinate the fundraising, purchasing and planting of 500, 3 foot spruce trees along the river between the Oakmont Bridge and the Boudreau Bridge to protect our River Valley. At one time the spruce tree was in abundance in our river valley until developers cut them down for development. As some of us are trying to save our river valley, developments have been allowed to encroach in on our river valley, all so that developers can fill their pockets and move on. St Albert might consider saying no to anymore larger developments in the river valley and setting policies to have a road between the river valley and any future developments and have the developments along the river be low density residential or recreational lands. If you walk along the river past Canadian Tire, you come upon this building being built right at the trails edge. Esthetically it is awful for the river valley and you feel like you are downtown, not amongst nature. Not to mention the effective it will have on a wildlife corridor and the loss of trees, vegetation and trail park space and home to many animals and birds. In Riel, Lacombe, Mission, parts of Braeside the City has kept development at a distance from the river valley. But the Tenor, the lands rezoned on Sturgeon Road (rumor is the applicant just made money by the rezoning, he is selling the land, go figure!) the building by Canadian Tire being built and homes in Oakmont have all encroached the River Valley. You don't drive by these places and see the river. If you walk you walk next to them. In this world of everyone becoming "wired" and there becoming a disconnect with nature, a nature deficit, would you rather walk your child or grandchild on a river trail next to developments or next to

	<p>trees listening and watching the birds, seeing a rabbit hiding in the bush, seeing a frog in a marshy area or a beaver or muskrat on the side of a trail. Through nature is how we teach our children to care about the environment, to nurture, and respect. It reduces stresses and encourages the use of imagination. It provides space for spontaneous play. We are losing these spaces that are so important to us humans. Do you want to be a part of saving these spaces and finding the right locations for densification and developments? You were voted in and get to make the decision on behalf of all of us. I hope you make the right decision for everyone today and in the future. Yes this sounds emotional, but we will not get back our River Valley as we know it today once it is developed.</p> <p><u>Botanical City</u> – what does that mean, just a name or does this city and council live up to what it implies. Protecting our river valley and not allowing developers to profit from developing it should be a priority. Why is it that communities across North America are trying to save their Urban River Valleys but not St Albert. Idling in traffic and being known as the “City of Lights” doesn’t sound green to me. When driving to leave St Albert to the south, I will idle and drive 20 minutes to get to the southern end of St Albert. With a rezoning of the Hole’s land it will probably take me longer to get out of St Albert than it takes me to get to South Edmonton from the south boundary of St Albert. We have an idling bylaw, but I think I spend more time legally idling at the traffic lights in Oakmont.</p> <p><u>City of St Alberts Credibility with its citizens and future citizens</u> – City Council was voted in by the citizens of the City to represent the citizens and their views. We purchase our homes and choose our community carefully by reviewing ASPs, LUB’s. We then make the biggest purchase of our lives, our home in a location that has been researched and carefully selected. To have the City Council decide to change the ASP and LUB to accommodate a sales pitch by a developer who sees the potential to make a lot of money at the detriment of our River Valley and people’s homes. This seems wrong. Are people in other parts of the City aware that their morning coffee on their deck might no longer get the sun? There are far too many reasons against the rezoning application to list and I am sure many citizens who have written would have named a few. Why would anybody want to move to a City that has high taxes, and will change ASP’s & LUB’s to accommodate developers in existing subdivisions. High Density, 26 storey towers belong in the downtown of a large city, in a new development where it is predetermined in an ASP, not in the City of St Albert and not in the City of St Albert River Valley.</p> <p>Botanical City seemed to be a good way to describe our City when the name was chosen, but now I think we are better known for accommodating developers and as being the City of Lights!</p> <p>PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE THE REZONING APPLICATION FOR THE HOLE’S LANDS IN OAKMONT AND PROTECT OUR RIVER VALLEY.</p>
89	<p>We need to add our names to the growing list of residents opposed to the Riverbank Landing project in Oakmont. There are numerous considerations leading to our opposition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction parking. Where will daily construction workers park? Later, where will overflow resident, visitor, and Shops at Boudreau customers park? In spite of the newly-created neighbourhood parking rules on our street and the efforts of Bylaw

	<p>Enforcement, construction workers for Botanica I and II have used our neighbourhood for daily worksite parking due to the convenient walking path between Orion and Bellerose. Construction parking, Botanica I and II, and Riverbank resident and visitor parking, and parking for the already congested parking at the Shops at Boudreau, will only make the parking situation worse and will result in a lifetime of traffic disruption and parking congestion in our neighbourhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic Congestion. As someone who travels through the Boudreau-Bellerose intersection multiple times each day the traffic in all directions is already congested throughout the day. We have recently idled in traffic backed up to Inglewood Drive to the west, Sturgeon Road to the south, and regularly past Evergreen Drive to the east due to the congestion at Boudreau-Bellerose intersection. Adding residents from the soon to open Botanica II and Careadon Village will make the present situation even worse...while adding hundreds of vehicles from Riverbank Landing with no new safe alternative traffic options will result in ensuring local traffic is unbearable. Traffic improvements for Bellerose-Boudreau intersection are needed now, even without adding the construction and resident/visitor traffic from the proposed Riverbank Landing. Adding a traffic circle on a corner on a hill metres from two intersections does not seem to be a safe or practical alternative to congestion. • Environment. The Botanical Arts City will be a misnomer with continued massive development in what was a picturesque area of the city. The enjoyment of living in a suburban botanical city will be lost...with the corresponding loss of community energy. And where we now see and have access to trees and parkland...we will see the high-rise urban sprawl that we moved to St. Albert to avoid. • Community. Adding a urban high-density high-rise “community” in what is a single-family residential neighbourhood is poor planning. With the numerous new houses built in Orchard Court and the addition of Botanica I and the still to be completed Botanica II the increase in population and related congestion has already impacted our community. We used to have block parties and we knew our neighbours...with the number of new houses recently added to Orchard Court we are now becoming a collection of strangers. Adding Riverbank will ensure the community feeling is lost. The reason we moved to a suburban residential neighbourhood was for the community interaction. Adding an additional high-density residential units in our neighbourhood will eliminate our “community” and a reason we chose to live in St. Albert. • Construction Noise. Massive construction projects are inherently noisy. Botanica I and II construction noise was noticeable in our home, and disruptive. Having Riverbank Landing high-rise construction being built over a number of years only 150 metres from our house is not acceptable. Living within the sound of the pounding of foundation pile driving and the constant noise of high-rise construction, even for short periods of time let alone years, is a reason to leave the city. • Property values. With the associated congestion, noise, foot traffic, vehicle parking, traffic congestion and the loss of our community energy it is easy to predict that our property values will continue to decline. Living with construction for years and adding high-density residential urban development to a low-density residential suburban community will undoubtedly impact our property value. • Shadows. Non-developer shadow line research has shown that our home may be exposed to shadow from Riverbank Landing during a time of year when we get minimal sunlight during the day. We do not want to live within the shadow of a tower.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>There is such a thing as too much urban development. Sadly, there is little doubt that constant development is one of the reasons our city continues to drop in the rankings from being regarded as the most livable city in Canada only 6 years ago.</p> <p>High-rise high-density development does not belong in a low-density residential neighbourhood and approval of Riverbank Landing will ensure St. Albert continues to lose the community environment that once made us the most livable city in Canada. Please do not approve Riverbank Landing development as presented.</p>
90	<p>I wish to express my deep concerns regarding the proposed future development by Boudreau Communities. I do not feel that this type of high density development (26 story building) is appropriate or feasible for this site. As an owner of a small business which requires me to drive throughout St. Albert on a daily basis, and most days on Bellerose Drive into the Oakmont and Erin Ridge neighbourhoods, the increase in traffic will make it even more challenging than it already is to move through this city efficiently. Traffic is already a challenge and the second phase of the development hasn't even opened yet. I will purposely avoid travel in this area of the city in the early morning and later afternoon. In a city where we try to be as environmentally friendly as possible, the amount of time spent idling waiting at the traffic lights to turn onto Boudreau (going eastbound) from Bellerose is already unacceptable due to high traffic volumes. As I understand, there will also be commercial as well as medical offices in this development which will only increase traffic congestion in addition to the daily residential traffic that will exist with such high density developments.</p> <p>I have already noticed a significant reduction in the hours of sunlight in the summer evenings as the sun now disappears much sooner behind the new buildings than it used to. I am very concerned that a building 26 stories in height will severely impact our summer daylight hours and cast unwanted shadows very early in the evening. With an agricultural background and ties to a family farm in north Edmonton I am well aware of the need to be mindful of our need to use our land resources wisely as we continually take valuable agriculture land out of production for residential and commercial development. However, this is not the place for 26 story buildings. Any further development at this site should be similar to or less in size than that which has already begun.</p> <p>This type of development is completely incompatible with the surrounding neighbourhood and the river valley. I ask that our City Council please act as good stewards of our precious river valley and surrounding communities. I ask that you please prevent this high density development from happening and that any future development be similar to that which is already in place.</p>
91	<p>Please consider this document my formal submission of concerns regarding the application submitted by Boudreau Communities Ltd (BCL) to amend the Oakmont Area Structure Plan (ASP) and the Land Use Bylaw (LUB) to allow for a development referred to as 'Riverbank Landing'. My intention within this submission to briefly discuss selected concerns as they impact the adjacent and surrounding communities in the area of the proposed development.</p> <p>My 1993 property, as detailed within Attachment A '[Redacted] Close Proximity', along with numerous other community properties in proximity will be profoundly impacted by the development due to the following concerns listed that have been limited to six (6) for this submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building sun shadowing

- Privacy reduction
- Buffer zone between development and adjacent low density zoning
- Heritage trees – preservation and replacement
- Property value reduction
- Zoning changes from low density to high density for in-fill development

Building Sun Shadowing Refer to Attachments B

Considering that the building sun shadowing drawings submitted by the developer were limited to two or three times during the day, the attached four (4) season drawings were generated to determine how the 26 story towers and 11 story senior residential building would actually impact the river valley during daylight hours.

As you review each seasonal drawing, take into consideration the times of day and where the sun shadow is projected. These tower shadows are the longest in the morning and evening while intervals in between have shortest shadows depending on the angle of the sun. During the summer June 21st projection, the shadows are shorter but do rotate over a wider angle of adjacent properties. Properties, even in the summer months, will have multiple shadows pass over for varying lengths of time depending on the building profile and where the property is positioned from the building.

Properties nearest the Riverbank Landing site will experience a longer shadowing interval due to the shadows moving at a shorter pace nearest the buildings as compared to properties further away. At times of the day, as one building shadow pass over a property, a second building will then create another follow-up shadow. The concerns many property owners will express will be the lack of outdoor sunshine during the course of a day and not enjoying sunshine when you previously used to such as your morning breakfast. Some shadows will last several hours at a time.

Privacy Reduction

The fact that these tall buildings will be residential and overlooking our properties, there will be a significant loss of privacy in those areas viewed from the towers. Homes purchased back in the 90's adjacent what was then zoned to be a low density development naturally were very acceptable to those purchasers at that time. After 27 years; yes all nearby property owners did expect the development to change but not with the proposed high density 93 meter / 305 ft. towers. The proposed structures will totally change the dynamics and lifestyle of the original low density home owners both in their yards and any windows viewed from the Riverside Landing development. This is not acceptable.

Heritage Trees

When our Orion Close residence was constructed in 1993, I met with Ted Hole, the original owner of the Hole's Greenhouse, and an agreement was established to maintain privacy between the residential boundaries. We each, along with other adjacent boundary sharing neighbours planted trees and shrubs that now over time have grown to 65 feet providing the privacy that was initiated 27 years ago. My concern is that the developer has not guaranteed that the historic trees that border adjacent properties will be left intact and when necessary be replaced with mature trees of similar size. This requested preservation of heritage trees and shrubs must be documented and maintained.

As an added note, when the Orchard Court properties were developed south of our residence, we took it upon ourselves to purchase the largest re-locatable heritage trees possible to maintain the privacy we had endured up to that time. These trees now serve as a natural privacy barrier that does allow adjoining neighbours their own privacy they fully expect and deserve. These trees however do not provide the privacy from 26 story towers that are in close proximity to adjacent homes such as those in Orion Close and Orchard Court. The Riverbank Landing developer must construct buildings that conform to the neighbourhood housing plan which did limit the permitted height of building when those homes were constructed.

Buffer Zone

When in-fill development is normally proposed and acceptable to both the adjacent land owners and the land developer, an agreed buffer zone is established between parties. If this development is constructed according to the developer's plan, which is not guaranteed, the distances to the proposed buildings and adjacent residences are not acceptable as indicated in the Attachment C drawing. The distance to the property line northwest of Building #4 three story commercial with upper loft residential building is only 49 metres. This three story commercial and upper loft building will be in excess of 14 metres / 45 feet high. The Orchard Court homes to the east of the 11 story active seniors residential Building #3 area is only 23 metres to those existing residents. All of these distances are insufficient, and in any event, they could be completely disregarded by the developer unless additional safeguards were put in place

The proposed north access road just north of Building # 4 designed to handle high volume commercial and residential traffic in and out of the site is only 8 metres from the existing residential lot. This road, when installed, will destroy the existing heritage trees planted decades ago, and generate vehicle noise levels significantly louder to the residents than the adjacent Bellerose Drive traffic that is much further away. Each time you add a source of noise, those decibel levels are added to existing levels compounds the overall noise well above acceptable levels.

Property Value Reduction

During the course of attending all public and a couple of private meetings with the developer, there has been a consistent statement from the developer that Riverbank Landing will increase the value of nearby Oakmont and Erin Ridge homes. There have been many questionable reasons presented for this increased ownership value such as is would be structured for allowing walkability to the diverse amenities that include an Urban Village. According to the developer they are going to provide the neighbourhood with a hub idea where you have commercial, recreational, restaurants and stores – places where people will gather as a community.

Based on a recent discussion with a local real estate firm, it is the opinion that property values in the vicinity of the proposed development will decrease with the building of 26 story towers and adjacent 11 story senior residence building. These decreased property values would be due to loss of privacy, loss of river valley views, destruction of heritage trees by the developer if left unchecked and lengthy building sun shadowing throughout the river valley and surrounding areas. Nobody wants a high density development parachuted into a low density single family dwelling community.

	<p>Zoning Reclassification</p> <p>Back in the early 90's, the Holes ownership of Orchard Court lot 300 was classified as residential under the Area Structure Plan and considered to be low density. This 2.12 hectare lot, based on its area, would accommodate approximately 36 dwellings. This dwelling density could vary slightly depending on the actual development. The adjacent 230 and 250 Bellerose Drive lots later changed the zoning from commercial to Direct Control. This rezoning process now has, along with adjacent rezoning, could increase the dwellings from 36 to 450+ under the developers conceptual plan resulting in an exponential increase. This significant increase in the dwelling density is going to be vigorously opposed by St. Albert residents who feel the impact creates numerous other issues not expressed in this document.</p> <p>Development Concerns Summary</p> <p>The proposed in-fill development will exceed the zoning density of the Oakmont Community based on the criteria now in place by the City of St. Albert. Documentation available supports this claim. The building heights proposed are unacceptable for the in-fill development adjacent low density residential. Also these tall structures do not belong in a river valley. Note that the Sturgeon River valley width is 2700 meters and has a depth 37 meters creating a scenic valley void of structures higher than 10 stories / 21 metres in height. These proposed towers will be a minimum of 93 metres/ 305 feet tall and will stand above the valley 63 metres or 206 feet based on their base elevations.</p> <p>The buffer zones proposed between existing low density residents and the 26 story towers / 11 story active senior lifestyle residence retirement building are not adequate; again minimizing privacy for those existing homes. Installing access roads 8 metres form existing residential lots is not acceptable.</p> <p>In summary, The City of St. Albert must focus on what this property initially was zoned and later advertised to the community when they purchased their properties. The subsequent development of this site then should follow in the direction to a finish line that maintains the uniquely interesting and vibrant small town living we call St. Albert. This development, as it is proposed, will destroy the Sturgeon River Valley as we know it.</p>
92	<p>I am writing this letter as a resident of St. Albert to express my deep concerns with the Riverbank Landing proposal. I was shocked to learn that City Council may approve 9 more years of construction and 6 more buildings being erected beside the two 10-storey Botanica condo buildings in Oakmont. Three of these proposed buildings are to be 28-, 25- and 12-storey towers. My mistake, I forgot how the developer took into consideration the public's comments at the September 10, 2019 public meeting (which mainly included comments of "Keep them below the tree line!") and so thoughtfully revised his application so that these 3 proposed buildings are now to be 26-, 26- and 11- storey towers. The two Botanica buildings will bring approximately 400 new residents into an already traffic-congested area. Now City Council is considering cramming in another 1000 residents. That would make driving/ walking/ shopping in that area truly enjoyable!</p> <p>City planners already made the decision (not even 10 years ago) to zone these areas as 'low-density residential' and then 'commercial' next to the Shops at Boudreau, which I'm sure the majority of St. Albertans would support in keeping it that way. So it infuriated me to find out that a developer had the audacity to march into our city,</p>

<p>purchase this land (where all of the surrounding community has already been established), and then attempt to brainwash us with a bunch of misleading and incomplete information... telling us all (like we're a bunch of idiots) that honestly, rezoning this area is the best thing to do with this land.</p> <p>Developers have always ranked high in my books of people who typically should not be trusted as their job encourages brainwashing tactics and skewing the facts in their favour. I am given the perception more often than not, that developers desire to line their pockets as quickly as possible and then disappear in a cloud of dust onto their next project. Mr. Haut clearly doesn't have the best interests of our community in mind here. What he is proposing will create an even greater traffic-congested nightmare for all those who drive anywhere near the Boudreau Road/ Bellerose Drive intersection. Furthermore, the height of those towers (1) will not only continue to destroy our beautiful skyline along the river, (2) will block the sunlight creating massive shadows, (3) will infringe on the privacy for adjacent residential neighbourhoods, (4) will decimate the property values for hundreds of residents, (5) will create unnecessary strains and costs on our emergency response teams and (6) are ridiculous for St. Albert where the population is only 66,000. Towers that are almost triple the size of the Botanica buildings belong in cities like Edmonton, not here.</p> <p>My husband and I, along with our 3 young children, specifically moved to Woodlands because we loved walking and biking with our kids along the river trails, enjoying the natural beauty of the outdoors and admiring the incredible skyline thick with gorgeous mature trees. When we accessed the trails along Sturgeon River it felt like we were immersing ourselves into a little slice of heaven. Unfortunately over the past few years, City Council has permitted developers to begin slowly eroding our little slice of heaven. One 8-storey and two 10-storey condo buildings along the river have gone up, forever changing the skyline and views along the river of this so-called 'Botanical' city. Furthermore, the one 10-storey Botanica condo building was built so close to the edge of the river that it looks like it will compromise the future stability of the riverbank. Now with the possibility of 3 more condo towers going up (way above the tree line along the river), I worry that City Council is not only jeopardizing this city's 'botanical' appeal, but is at risk of damaging St. Albert's family appeal as well. Like K. Van Hoof of St. Albert wrote in the Gazette's October 12, 2019 edition, I would also like to know "What is the city's vision for our river valley?". As of now, I'm starting to think it's a wall of towers and condo buildings looming over the riverbank. For all I know, there are Council members who share a like-minded mentality to Donald Trump, chanting "Build that wall!" behind the scenes.</p> <p>I have been reading from and listening to far too many St. Albert residents expressing frustrations and genuine concerns with the developments being approved in this city. Time and time again I am given the impression that City Council (1) sides with developers over residents, (2) sides with condo owners over family home owners and (3) sides with future residents over current ones. But I'm trying to remain optimistic that common sense will prevail in the end here. As Kevin Scoble outlined in the Gazette's January 18, 2020 edition, "When reviewing the proposal, administration considers a variety of factors such as housing diversity, transportation/ infrastructure impacts, sun shadow, construction noise and vibration, integration of the development with the existing community, etc." If this is true, I feel confident that the City will make the right decision and reject Mr. Haut's proposal. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that the drawbacks clearly outweigh the benefits and that this development is just</p>

	NOT at all suited for this area in St. Albert. I hope you and your team of City planners agree.
93	<p>I would like to take this email as an opportunity to voice our support for the proposed Riverbank Landing Development (Botanica Phase 3), located along Boudreau Read and Bellrose Drive in St. Albert.</p> <p>Our firm, Protostatix Engineering Consultants has a long history of working with Boudreau Developments and have known them to be among the most trustworthy, thoughtful and diligent of clients that we've had the pleasure of working with.</p> <p>Over the course of our work with them on Botanica Phases 1 and 2 they have displayed their interest in developing not only a residential development but fostering a sense of <i>community</i> through the layout, architecture and intent of their developed spaces.</p> <p>We feel that the proposed Riverbank Landing Development would be a fantastic addition to the surrounding community and through its density and thoughtful design serve as a hub for the surrounding areas.</p> <p>Subsequently, I would like to take this opportunity to urge yourself and Council to consider and approve this application for rezoning to help grow and shape St. Albert and add to a vibrant and rich community.</p>
94	<p>Prior to recently moving into a new home in Edmonton I lived in Erin Ridge in St. Albert for 6 years. I cannot speak highly enough of the city, it was a cherished 6 years. In fact after moving back into the city I have come to realise just how much I adored St. Albert and it is my intention to move back as soon as circumstantially possible, and I would look in the same neighborhood ideally.</p> <p>When the Shops of Boudreau opened up my household was very excited. We became very fond of the area and regulars in the shops and restaurants, our personal favorites being Bucu, Good Earth Café, Sarah's Kitchen, Mercato is amazing, I even get my hair done at Suburbia Hair Salon and Spa. Suffice it to say, we are big fans of the amenities and the area. Being close to the river it's a great place to bike to or walk to in the summer months, it's also a great place to sit outside and enjoy the fire place with a coffee.</p> <p>In summary, I would like to voice my support for the Riverbank Landing project. As someone who lived in the area for years, and hopes to soon live in the area again (perhaps even in one of the upcoming developments) I believe this is a great addition to the city of St. Albert which would serve only to increase my fondness of the area with more try and explore.</p>
95	<p><u>Re: Comments Regarding Proposed Amendments to Oakmont ASP and Land Use Bylaw – Schedule A and Direct Control Mixed Use District</u></p> <p>I hereby submit my comments regarding the application submitted by Boudreau Communities Ltd (BCL) to amend the Oakmont Area Structure Plan (ASP) and the Land Use Bylaw (LUB) to allow for a development called Riverbank Landing.</p> <p>I understand that comments about the proposed redistricting can be provided to Suzanne Bennett, Planner, City of St. Albert (the City) Planning Branch, no later than January 22, 2020. I also understand that my comments will be "taken into consideration" when the City's staff prepares the agenda report for City Council.</p> <p>My comments are organized in the following manner:</p>

1. Introduction
2. City Vision, Mission and Values
3. Proposed amendments to Oakmont's ASP, as described in the City's December 12, 2019 letter;
4. Proposed amendments to the LUB, as described in the letter;
5. Development proposal, as described in the letter;
6. Documents provided with the application, as listed in the letter; and
7. Other matters of relevance to the application and/or the proposed development.
8. Summary and Conclusions.

Note:

- Paragraphs throughout the submission are sequentially numbered for ease of reference.
- Text, other than headings, is underlined in the submission for emphasis.

1. Introduction

1. For full disclosure, I have a very profound and vested interest in this development because my property is adjoining the development site on its northwest corner.
2. I will admit that the proposed development does have some interesting characteristics. But, the height of the buildings, the massive scale of the development and many related issues, such as density and traffic congestion, make this development wrong for this particular location.
3. Also, I acknowledge that I am not opposed to the concept of higher densification. However, high densification must be *planned* for and primarily introduced into "new" areas when and where it makes sense to do so; even the City recognizes this in its policies and guiding principles. In any event, I strongly oppose over-densification, regardless where it may be in the city.
4. In this submission, references have been made to sections of the LUB related to development permits. I suggest it is pertinent to do so because, if council approves the proposed amendments, council in effect will have permitted the development in the way the conceptual plan and application propose. Therefore, I suggest that at that moment the plan is no longer "conceptual" and decisions normally made by the Development Officer (e.g., approving height, etc.) will have been de facto decided by Council.

2. City Vision, Mission and Values

5. The City's Vision, Mission and Values for its Council are set out in policy and are reviewed by Council after every election. The Community Vision shall be: "A vibrant, innovative and thriving City that we all call home, that sustains and cherishes its unique identity and small town values. We are the Botanical Arts City." *"As community elected leaders, Council's Mission shall be to represent the residents of St. Albert, make decisions in the best interests of the entire community and ensure the corporation delivers results that will help sustain a high quality of life for St. Albertans."*

	<p>6. Following extensive public consultations in 1999 and 2000, the CityPlan Advisory Committee worked with the community to create a vision statement for the City supported by nine guiding principles, which are a fundamental part of the MDP. Of the nine guiding principles, I believe the following three principles are worth focusing on in this case:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Our small-town atmosphere and our quality of community life are St. Albert's strengths. <u>Preserve our unique character and integrity in the region by maintaining independence, controlling and managing future growth.</u></i> • <i>The beauty of nature feeds people's soul, from natural areas, such as Big Lake, Sturgeon River and river valley, our parks and trails, to the tree-lined streets and boulevards. <u>Cherish and protect them for future generations. Support conservation efforts to minimize negative human impact on the environment and enhance environmental sustainability.</u></i> • <i><u>Red Willow Park is the community's gift to future generations</u> and as such continues to grow and unify our neighbourhoods. Treat it with care and respect.</i> <p>7. Allowing high-rise towers to be built near or adjacent to the Sturgeon River valley flies in the face of the City's guiding principles. The City must preserve the nature of its river valley and Red Willow Park. Citizens who use the park and trail system don't want to have the aesthetics of the river valley spoiled by the obstruction of excessively tall buildings.</p> <p>8. There are no high-rise buildings in the developed areas of Edmonton's river valley. And, there shouldn't be any in St. Albert's river valley too.</p> <p>9. If Council approves this development, they will be signalling to citizens that it is okay to build high-rises throughout the river valley (20-storey+ towers have already been approved on the former Grandin mall site). Ultimately, this Council will have to decide whether they want high-rise development in the river valley to be part of their legacy.</p> <p>10. Hopefully, this Council will not be hoodwinked by the developer's rhetoric into believing that this project is in the best interests of the city and affected communities.</p> <p>3. <u>Proposed amendments to Oakmont's ASP – Bylaw 12/97</u></p> <p><i>To create a designation within Oakmont ASP for 'Mixed-Use'</i></p> <p>11. Generally, I have no concerns with the idea of a mixed use designation. However, I do not support the mixed-use designation being applied to the property described as 300 Orchard Court for the several reasons described elsewhere in this submission.</p> <p><i>To amend the Oakmont ASP to change the land use designation of the three properties from 'Commercial' and 'Low Density Residential' designations to 'Mixed-Use' designation.</i></p> <p>12. I oppose changing the land use designation of the parcel designated as 'Low Density Residential' (300 Orchard Court) to 'Mixed-Use' because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) the <u>preferred</u> land use shown in the MDP is residential only; b) the <u>future land use</u> in the ASP for this parcel is low density residential. Properties are bought and sold on the basis of the designations in the statutory documents, and roads and intersections were designed with the land uses for
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>the entire neighbourhood in mind. The Oakmont ASP is a representation of how the neighbourhood is expected to develop. <u>The City should not make significant changes to designations</u> that were deemed to be in the best interest of the community.</p> <p>c) the proposed DCMU designation and its uses are not compatible with surrounding residential properties; and</p> <p>d) I submit that low density dwellings (i.e., duplex, semi-detached or single-detached dwellings) ought to be included in the permitted or discretionary uses described in subsections 10.6(4) and (5) of the LUB (DCMU Land Use District).</p> <p>13. Council could prescribe that low density residential uses be in a DCMU, in accordance with LUB subsection 10.6(3), and they may impose appropriate standards and conditions to the applicable properties, including height, setbacks and building separations.</p> <p>14. The MDP under section 4.0 Housing and Neighborhood Design, has an objective to “<i>phase development in an orderly way</i>”. To this end policy 4.2 states that “<i><u>new residential development should be contiguous with existing residential land use and should be designed to develop an efficient land use pattern</u></i>”. The proposed development does not achieve this policy.</p> <p>15. Another objective under section 4.0 of the MDP is to “<i>require appropriate development policies and standards for residential development and redevelopment</i>.” However, pursuant to policy 4.15, the City has yet to review the criteria for high density residential development and develop suitable regulations and design guidelines for its development.</p> <p>16. The application does not fully or adequately address factors that the City must consider in evaluating locations for medium and high density residential. MDP policy 4.12, in part, states that when the City evaluates “...<i><u>locations for medium density residential in Area Structure Plans and Area Structure Plan Technical Reports the City of St Albert shall consider the following factors:</u></i> “(1) <i>proximity to open space, schools, public transportation, shopping, commercial and community facilities;</i> (2) <i>superior functional design of the medium density residential;</i> (3) <i><u>dispersal of medium density residential sites throughout the neighbourhood;</u></i> (4) <i><u>compatibility of medium density residential sites with adjacent land uses;</u></i> (5) <i><u>minimization of negative transportation or other impacts;</u></i> (6) <i>location in downtown, urban village centres and neighbourhood activity centres;</i> and (7) <i><u>minimization of transportation or other impacts.</u></i> <i><u>These factors would also be considered in evaluating locations for high density residential, should the City of St. Albert approve it.</u></i>”</p> <p>17. Council has delegated the Development Officer (DO) the authority to approve the permitted and discretionary uses in the DCMU district; therefore Council has no means of directing the DO to impose a non-listed use, including low density residential.</p> <p>18. Riverbank Landing is an infill development surrounded by single-family detached residences on the west (Evergreen subdivision) and on the north and east</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>(Oakmont). These residences were built long before the Botanica condominiums and the Shops of Boudreau.</p> <p>19. The master plan for the Oakmont's ASP contemplates the appropriate density and orderly development for 300 Orchard Court as low density residential - not medium density, or medium/high density.</p> <p>20. The application does not include a list existing or potential commercial lands, as required by MDP policy 7.9.</p> <p>4. <u>Proposed amendments to the LUB - Bylaw 9/2005</u></p> <p><i>To amend Schedule A of the LUB to change from Direct Control (DC) District to Direct Control Mixed Use (DCMU) District;</i></p> <p>21. I oppose this amendment as presented for the reasons given elsewhere in this submission.</p> <p>22. I propose that the parcel described as 300 Orchard Court be designated as R1/R2, and the two parcels described as 230 Bellerose Drive and 250 Bellerose Drive be designated as DCMU or Commercial. Regardless, ample separation must be established between existing residences and buildings in the proposed development, through the use of buffer zones, building setbacks, etc.</p> <p>23. For a development of this magnitude and with this wide-spread impact, the City should make every effort to ensure that all relevant information and data has been gathered so that Council can make a fully informed decision about the proposal. In my opinion, the City can, pursuant to LUB section 1.10(3)(d), request any additional information it feels necessary to properly evaluate and make a recommendation on an application to redesignate to a Direct Control district – a DCMU is a direct control district.</p> <p><i>Changes within the DCMU District to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Enable heights greater than 25 meters;</i> <p>24. I strongly oppose an amendment to exceed the building heights allowed in the LUB. The heights and separation distances of buildings in this development should be restricted to consider adjacent residences, and to the common 3-storey to 4-storey heights of multi-family dwellings found throughout the city.</p> <p>25. The heights of the proposed buildings are, to me, the crux of several issues with this development. The heights are overly excessive for the Sturgeon River Valley, for the City and for the surrounding neighbourhoods.</p> <p>26. This amendment should not be considered until the City has collected information from every height-related study and/or assessment described in LUB and MDP. Some of the relevant sections cited below may not be strictly applicable since they apply to a development permit, but requiring all of the information now follows good planning practices. Furthermore, in my opinion <u>the City does have the discretion to request</u> the following information at any time pursuant to LUB section 1.10(3)(d):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ LUB section 8.34(12)(c) - R4 District Building Height: <i><u>"For any building that is proposed to exceed 20 m in height, a building height impact assessment, prepared by a registered Architect or Professional Engineer, shall be required. The assessment shall address the shading impact of the proposed building on adjacent properties and buildings and where applicable, the impact of glare and noise reverberation associated with façades that are to contain a substantial proportion of glass. (BL2/2018)"</u></i>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To ensure complete unbiasedness, the architect or engineer selected in LUB section 8.34(12)(c) should be an independent, third-party person chosen by the City. The public, particularly owners of adjacent residential properties, should be able to review the terms of reference for the any study or assessment. ○ <i>LUB section 10.6(6)(d) – Pre-Application Requirements: “In addition to the application requirements of Section 3.3 of this Bylaw, an applicant for a development permit within a DCMU Land Use District must submit, to the satisfaction of the Development Officer:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(d) a building height impact assessment for any building that is proposed to exceed 15 m in building height, demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Development Officer that the impact on either adjacent buildings or adjacent property has been minimized.”</i> ○ LUB section 10.6(13)(d)(vi) – townhousing height in a DCMU: “(d) all townhousing developments in a DCMU district must comply with the following requirements for development in the R3A District: (BL16/2016) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (vi) <u>building height</u>; and” <p>27. The developer is requesting a distinct height schedule for the development site, similar to Schedule F in the LUB. When one compares Schedule F with the proposed height schedule, why is BCL requesting a height extension to <u>100 metres for 26 storeys</u> while the heights for the residential towers in Schedule F are set at <u>80 metres for 25 storeys</u>? The need for the Riverbank Landing towers to be 20 metres higher needs to be explained (given the “rule-of-thumb” of 10 ft per floor, 100 m seems way too high for 26 storeys). Also, if overall height in a schedule (e.g., 100 m) takes precedence over the number of storeys (e.g., 26-storeys), could these towers be 30 storeys or higher?</p> <p>28. This corner of Oakmont already has the tallest residential buildings in St. Albert – the two Botanica condominiums at eight and 10 storeys, and nearby is the under construction Caredon Village senior living residences at eight storeys (162 suites).</p> <p>29. The height of the proposed 26-storey towers will rival the heights of residential towers found in Edmonton’s downtown core.</p> <p>30. I do not agree with the heights allowed for the Grandin Park Village towers because, again, I believe the heights are too excessive for a “river valley” location. Nonetheless, there is a park separating the 5-storey Tache residences from the single-family residences.</p> <p>31. The height of almost all the R3A and R4 residences throughout the city <u>appear to be three to four storeys</u>, which fits within the building heights prescribed in the LUB. These “common” heights are particularly noticeable in “new” neighbourhoods, like Erin Ridge North, Jensen Lakes and Riverside, where the ASPs are relatively recent, and where the City could have planned for taller buildings. Thus, it appears that the City has established “the character” for high density residential buildings to be three to four storeys. The exceptions I’m aware of are the 10-storey and 8-storey Botanica condos, the 8-storey Careadon seniors’ residences by Canadian Tire, and the 5-storey Tache apartments.</p> <p>32. When combined with the Botanica condominiums, the number of dwelling units for an 11-storey building and two 26-storey high-rises would result in over-densification for the area. And, the proximity of <u>the tall buildings will adversely affect the value of adjoining residential properties</u>.</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- ***Reduce the amount of required floor area for commercial, for this development only;***

33. I oppose this amendment, because the application does not give a clear and thorough explanation as to why the amount of required commercial floor area needs to be reduced.

34. The application does not include a list of vacant commercial sites and potential commercial sites that is required pursuant to MDP policy 7.9.

35. If other requested amendments, such as height and building location, are rejected then this amendment may become moot and unnecessary.

36. According to the City's December 12 letter, "the site plan is conceptual at this time, and has potential to change." By granting this request the City would, in effect, be approving the conceptual plan with only the "final design" to be reviewed.

- ***Define a maximum floor plate size; and***

37. I oppose this amendment, because the application does not give a clear and thorough explanation as to why the floor plate size needs to be defined.

38. If other requested amendments, such as height and building location, are rejected then this amendment may become moot and unnecessary.

39. According to the City's December 12 letter, "the site plan is conceptual at this time, and has potential to change." By granting this request the City would, in effect, be approving the conceptual plan with only the "final design" to be reviewed.

- ***Regulate separation between towers;***

40. I oppose this amendment, because the application does not give a clear and thorough explanation as to why the separation distance between towers needs to be regulated.

41. The application looks at building separation within the development site but it does not consider expanding the separation distance from existing residences, or from the Botanica residences.

42. If other requested amendments, such as height and building location, are rejected then this amendment may become moot and unnecessary.

43. According to the City's December 12 letter, "the site plan is conceptual at this time, and has potential to change." By granting this request the City would, in effect, be approving the conceptual plan with only the "final design" to be reviewed.

Add a schedule to the LUB within the DCMU District to identify and restrict where extended heights can go on the development site.

44. I strongly oppose this amendment for the reasons stated in the paragraphs found under "*Changes within the DCMU District to: Enable heights greater than 25 meter*".

5. Development Proposal

Buildings

Building 1: 2 storeys – restaurant and small conference center

45. I oppose the conference center because this type of use is better situated near hotels and better traffic routes.

	<p>46. A conference/function center will add to traffic and will create bothersome noise to the surrounding communities, especially late evening events.</p> <p>47. Who will fund and operate the conference centre?</p> <p><i><u>Building 2: 26 storeys – consists of 4-storey podium containing commercial and 22 storeys of residences</u></i></p> <p>48. I strongly oppose the excessive height and the high number of dwelling units that will add to over-densification (also see paragraphs found under “<i>Changes within the DCMU District to: Enable heights greater than 25 meter</i>”).</p> <p>49. The tower is too close to existing residences.</p> <p><i><u>Building 3: 11 storeys – senior residences with main floor commercial</u></i></p> <p>50. I strongly oppose the excessive height and the high number of dwelling units that will add to over-densification (also see paragraphs found under “<i>Changes within the DCMU District to: Enable heights greater than 25 meter</i>”).</p> <p>51. The location of the seniors’ residence in the conceptual plan is way too close to dwellings in Orchard Court</p> <p><i><u>Building 4: 3 storeys – mixed use of residential and commercial</u></i></p> <p>52. I oppose the height; the height should be limited to the same heights as nearby residences</p> <p>53. The building is way too close to existing residences.</p> <p><i><u>Building 5: 26 storeys – consists of 3-storey podium containing commercial and 23 storeys of residences</u></i></p> <p>54. I strongly oppose the excessive height and the high number of dwelling units that will add to over-densification (also see paragraphs found under “<i>Changes within the DCMU District to: Enable heights greater than 25 meter</i>”).</p> <p>55. The tower is too close to Bellerose Drive and to existing residences.</p> <p><i><u>Building 6: 3 storeys – all office space</u></i></p> <p>56. I oppose the height; the height should be the same as building #1 and the two-storey Shops of Boudreau.</p> <p><u>6. Documents Provided With Application</u></p> <p><u>Oakmont Area Structure Plan (ASP) Technical Report</u></p> <p>57. In my opinion, the Technical Report submitted with the application did not fully satisfy the requirements outlined in MDP policy 17.6 for the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ transportation, particularly section 12.7 (noise attenuation); ○ provision of public transit service; (more population means more bus service) ○ a description of the market demand for medium and/or high density residential and for commercial development (the Technical Report mentions a Market Report, but there are no details included with the application);
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

- other topics deemed appropriate by the Approving Authority. (also see Other Matters – Information Required)

Images

58. The application lacks sufficient drawings of cross-sections to accurately illustrate the heights of the three towers to surrounding buildings and from different perspectives, such as from Woodlands, from adjacent residences and from Botanica, to name a few.

Proposed Text amendments to the DCMU District

59. See paragraphs in *Section 4 Proposed Amendments to LUB*.

Proposed height schedule

60. I strongly oppose this amendment for the reasons stated in the paragraphs found under *Changes within the DCMU District to: Enable heights greater than 25 meter*.

Sun/shadow study

61. The developer's sun shadow study does not include the effect of glares or reflections from high-rise windows that may be cast onto the surrounding neighborhoods.

62. The developer's study does not include shading from the seniors' residence, which will have a significant impact on adjoining residential properties.

63. Properties nearest the Riverbank Landing site will experience a longer shadowing interval due to the shadows moving at a shorter pace nearest the buildings as compared to properties further away. At times of the day, as one building shadow pass over a property, a second building will then create another follow-up shadow. Some shadows will last several hours at a time.

64. Shading from the tall buildings will adversely affect the value of adjoining residential properties.

65. I support the shading study prepared and submitted by [Redacted]

Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA)

66. The TIA states that a number of movements are approaching or over capacity at the Boudreau Road/Bellerose Drive intersection during the AM and PM peak hours. Furthermore, southbound queues at the Boudreau Road/Bellerose Drive intersection were observed spilling back to Evergreen Drive during peak hours." The TIA made recommendations to lessen congestion but the design problems may be incurable - Bellerose Drive and the two intersections were never designed to handle the anticipated traffic.

67. The TIA also supposes that the "roundabout option is projected to operate very well during the AM and PM peak hours." However, the TIA does not mention whether the location has enough space for an adequate roundabout, or that the location is on a slope and on a curve, which may result in a lot of accidents especially in the winter. And, the study does not recognize that buses and large trucks will have difficulty navigating through the roundabout with the flow of traffic.

68. The traffic study period up to 2034 does not account for any future increase in traffic resulting from the proposed annexation of land from Sturgeon County and future development in the area.

	<p>69. The consultant proposes some solutions to alleviate traffic congestion, such as “vehicle queuing” and traffic light synchronization but these are likely band-aid solutions that may improve some of the traffic some of the time, but the report discusses few scenarios and no mention of potential consequences.</p> <p>70. The <u>study does not attempt to track vehicle movement northwards from the development site</u> from the new right-in/right-out access point. It can be expected that most people will want to drive southwards towards Boudreau Road or St Albert Trail. And, normal behaviour is to take the shortest route – a person wanting to go south will not drive northwards all the way out to Sturgeon County. Instead, they may do a u-turn somewhere along Bellerose Drive or they may veer through Oakmont or Erin Ridge on collector roads, sometimes past schools, until they find their way out. This will undoubtedly cause unsafe conditions for vehicles and pedestrians, especially when trucks are involved.</p> <p>71. The TIA should be expanded to include a more comprehensive review of the traffic impact on Boudreau Road and at the Bellerose Drive/Boudreau Road intersection. <u>The intersection was identified in 2017 as one of the highest collision and injury collision intersections in St. Albert.</u> With more population in the area, even more collisions may be expected.</p> <p>72. Also see paragraphs under <i>Section 7 Other Matters – Roadway Design and Traffic</i></p> <p><i>Public Engagement plan, public comments and open house transcript</i></p> <p>73. First, I want to acknowledge the positive communications that I've had with the City's staff. They have shown patience answering my questions and information was always provided in a timely manner. That being said, the public communication and engagement process was not all rosy, as described in some of the following paragraphs.</p> <p>74. BCL placed ads in the Gazette for an open house on June 15 to share their “vision and concepts for a dynamic <u>new community on the ‘Red Barn’ site in St. Albert.</u>” We thought the concept would be mostly about commercial since the Red Barn is on 230 Bellerose Drive. However, we discovered the concept also included 250 Bellerose Drive and 300 Orchard Court, and was much, much larger than we could have imagined. We felt that the ad was misleading. There is no way of knowing whether more people would have attended the Open House if the public would have been informed of a more expansive development.</p> <p>75. Notices of the September 10, 2019 public information meeting were published in three issues of the Gazette (August 28, September 4 and September 7). The first two ads were the same; however, a sentence was added in the third ad: “<i>The amendment to the DCMU will include a proposal for two towers with heights of 25 and 28 storeys.</i>” There's no way of knowing if more people would have attended the public information meeting if this minor but important piece of information was also in the first two ads.</p> <p>76. In the City's December 12 letter and in articles in the Gazette, the public was told that the developer edited their initial proposal due to the feedback given by the public at the September 10 meeting and from direct correspondence from the public. I can say that my wife and I were not impressed by the changes. In fact, the changes to the building configurations are so trivial they are somewhat insulting to nearby residents. In my opinion, very few affected residents think the new conceptual plan is better while most residents believe the plan is just as bad or</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>worse. The building heights remain grossly excessive. Personally, the new roadway design with the new exit point behind my property is extremely absurd and horrendous – traffic will add noise, I will have no privacy and my property's value will decrease even more than before.</p> <p>77. BCL submitted its application for amendments to the ASP and LUB on December 2, and a deadline for comments to the City about the application was set for January 10. The timing was curious because the Christmas and New Year holiday season was dab-smack in the middle. If any party was affected or inconvenienced by the timing it was the public.</p> <p>78. Access to BCL's application submission was difficult and inconvenient for the public. If anybody wanted to see the application and its accompanying studies, they had to go to the Planning Department in city hall, sit down and leaf through the pages of a binder. They could only do so during office hours, and were refused a copy in paper or electronic form. This approach to making the report "public" was unfair to the public – it limited their ability to review the submission.</p> <p>79. Subsequently, a concerned Oakmont resident filed a FOIP request on December 16. After it reviewed the FOIP request, the City agreed and, on January 7, 2020, posted the application's contents on the City's website, subject to redaction of personal information. The date for filing comments was thereafter extended to January 22.</p> <p>80. Owners of property within 100 metres of the development and persons who attended the September 10 Public Information meeting were informed of a second "Open House" for January 29, one week <i>after</i> the January 22 filing deadline. As a result, <u>a person will not be able to include comments from the Open House in their filing.</u></p> <p>81. It appears that the logistics of the January 29 Open House is more in line with a "marketing" session than an information gathering opportunity, even though written comments from attendees will be collected and provided to the City. So, <u>the City and the developer will have the comments, but the public will not</u> – is that fair?</p> <p>82. The developer's own shading study showed an extensive range from the effects of shading. In the interests of fair public awareness and participation, the City should, in the same manner the Development Officer can under LUB section 3.10(3), have <u>extended the area (beyond 100 m) for notifying property owners about BCL's application.</u></p> <p><i>Public Hearing</i></p> <p>83. The MGA sec 230(5) enables a council to <i>"make any amendment to the bylaw or resolution it considers necessary and proceed to pass it"</i>. In this one-of-its-kind application, if Council made an amendment to the application, it might be akin to Council becoming a co-developer of the development.</p> <p>84. I have been advised that it is desirable to have subject matter "experts" speak before Council at the Public Hearing because Council is likely to give more weight to what a qualified person says compared to an ordinary resident voicing concern. In any event, it is neither practical nor feasible for most citizens to retain experts.</p> <p>7. <u>Other Matters</u></p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Additional information

85. The statutes cited below may relate to an application for a development permit (see paragraphs 4 and 29), and some studies/assessments are either required or *may* be required at the discretion of the City. Nonetheless, considering the magnitude of the overall development and its multi-neighbourhood impact, it's crucial that the City do its due diligence and gather all the information it can to help Council make informed decisions. Accordingly, I request that the City acquire the following information and make it available to the public:

- a traffic impact analysis evaluating pedestrian safety and traffic movements within the Oakmont and Erin Ridge neighbourhoods resulting from a right-only exit onto Bellerose Drive (LUB s.10.6(6)(b))
- a building height impact assessment for any building that is proposed to exceed 15 m in building height and the impact on either adjacent buildings or adjacent property (LUB s.10.6(6)(d) and ASP Technical Report T of R s. 6.0)
- data to show how the form, mass and character of the proposed development will relate to neighbouring developments (LUB s. 3.3(4)(b)).
- a noise attenuation and vibration study, as well as mitigation measures prepared by a professional engineer (LUB s. 3.3(4)(d) and ASP Technical Report T of R s. 6.0). The noise and vibration study should consider the 7-year construction timelines.
- an emergency response plan (LUB s. 3.3(4)(m)).
- A market analysis for commercial and multi-family residential for market demand, trends, etc. (Technical Report T of R, s. 6.0) Absorption rates are shown in the developer's Technical Report.
- a study to estimate the development's effect on the market value of adjoining residential properties (LUB s.3.3(4)(o)).
- a natural area assessment to identify environmentally sensitive areas, wildlife corridors, wetlands, impacts of development and recommendations for conservation, naturalization, and best management practices. This assessment should be extended to include river valley lands abutting the development site (Technical Report T of R s. 6.0)
- information about parking during the construction period, and impacts on traffic (Technical Report T of R s. 8.0)
- mitigation measures to address potential issues from commercial operations such as noise, light, odour, delivery trucks, garbage locations, screening, staff and patrons accesses, and hours of operation (Technical Report T of R s. 8.0).

Roadway Design

86. I oppose having a public road within the boundaries of the development site. It does not matter that the developer offers to pay for the construction of the road, and its year round maintenance – the City may be responsible, accountable and liable for the road. It is plain and simple an improper use of a public road.

87. Furthermore, I oppose the location of the new proposed in/out access point. Vehicles going up the roadway towards the exit will be moving towards the back of my home. As such, headlights will be shining directly into my backyard and

windows. Furthermore, since the road is sloped, the noise from vehicles, especially trucks, will be more pronounced.

88. The grades of the roadways within the development site are fairly steep – 7% up to the northwest corner of the site and 3% up to the sidewalk at the new proposed in/out access point. The roadway up to the sidewalk is also curved making visibility and traction in the winter real issues.

89. I am also opposed to a potential signalized intersection or roundabout at the new in/out access point which is shown on the proposed site plan. Both options will create traffic flow problems and add to the frustration currently felt by drivers. However, it's incomprehensible to think that a roundabout is even being considered on a slope and curved roadway, particularly given winter conditions. In addition, I think Bellerose Drive is not wide enough for a two-lane roundabout – buses and large trucks would have difficulty navigating through it. It truly is a recipe for disaster.

Traffic

90. The public has duly expressed concern with the amount of additional traffic and congestion that will be caused by the 460 residential units and commercial space. There is a common belief that Bellerose Drive, the Bellerose Drive/Boudreau Road intersection and the Bellerose Drive/Evergreen Drive intersection cannot handle the increase in traffic. Of course they can't – planners designed the roads based on the future land uses set out in the ASP and LUB. These roads and intersections were not designed to handle such an infusion of density from such a compact area, and they were not designed for expansion.

91. The conceptual plan for Riverbank Landing includes plenty of commercial space, which when added to the Shops of Boudreau will generate a lot of truck traffic. MDP policy 12.10, requires the City to minimize the adverse noise and pollution impacts associated with truck traffic by continuing to:

“(1) designate specific truck and hazardous goods routes;

(2) discourage truck movement, unless essential, on collector roadways in residential neighbourhoods; and

3) restrict land use activities that generate substantial truck traffic to industrial and major commercial areas.”

92. There is no consideration for pedestrian movement and safety along Bellerose Drive and into the intersections. Elderly people from the proposed seniors' residence will need cross-walking lights with longer times to safely cross Bellerose Road.

93. There is no thought of the impact on response times for emergency vehicles if the Bellerose Drive/Boudreau Road intersection is blocked.

94. Bellerose Drive is the only arterial road for the residents of Oakmont and the Evergreen community in Erin Ridge – the residents must drive on Bellerose Drive or cross it. Every other neighbourhood in the City has access to at least two arterial roads.

95. If over 460 dwelling units are added to the area, the demand for more public transit is inevitable. Consequently, more bus times may have to be scheduled and/or the length of time that buses stop and wait may be longer, which will add to traffic stoppage and congestion. The same may apply to school buses. Passenger safety may become an issue.

Density

96. The current Oakmont ASP states that 69.5% of Oakmont's 1,721 projected dwelling units are low density residential and 30.5% are multi-family residential. The MDP has a goal of having a minimum of 30% medium and/or high density residential dwelling units in a neighborhood. Thus, it appears that Oakmont has already met the city's density goal, and the addition of more than 460 dwelling units will be over-densification, particularly for such a confined corner.
97. The proposed development along with the Botanica buildings could be one of the highest density areas in the metropolitan region, after Edmonton's downtown area.

Market Synopsis

98. The City should want to know what the market need for such a development is. As mentioned before, the Technical Report mentions a Market Report prepared by BCL and shows absorption rates, but there is no data or analysis to substantiate market demand or the suppositions made by the developer.
99. The developer for Grandin Parc Village planned to redevelop the on the old Grandin Mall site into an urban village with 17 buildings, including three high-rise towers. The project also met opposition from neighbouring residents. Nonetheless, council amended the LUB and extended the building height limits that would allow residential towers to be built on the site, two of which could be up to 25-storeys. It's the same kind of amendment Boudreau Communities is asking for at Riverbank Landing. So far, the Tache Residences have been built at Grandin Parc Village and the mall has been demolished, but there's been no construction of the high-rises yet – maybe "there is no market interest"!
100. In the December 21, 2019, issue of the Gazette, it was reported that Landrex Inc submitted a proposal to amend Erin Ridge North's Area Structure Plan (ASP) and rezone a 5.18 hectare parcel from Direct Control Mixed Use (DCMU) to commercial. This change would eliminate the possibility of a "walkable" urban village, including 120 residential units, on St. Albert Trail near Coal Mine Road. It's the same kind of description used for Riverbank Landing. However, according to the article, information in council's agenda package indicated there has been "no market interest" to develop the site as mixed use. Shouldn't we find out if the same is true for Riverbank Landing before making any unnecessary amendments to Oakmont's ASP and the land use bylaw (LUB)?
101. There is vacant commercial space in the Shops of Boudreau. The St Albert Crossing office building on St Albert Trail is vacant and has been for sale for months.
102. There are several commercial developments coming on stream in St Albert in Erin Ridge North and Jensen Lakes. Will the demand still be there for Riverbank Landing?
103. Besides the obvious target residents for the seniors' building, we do not know the target demographics and income levels for the other residential components of the development.
104. BCL President Dave Haut has been quoted in the Gazette of saying that the development will increase home values. Common sense suggests that this is not true! And, Mr. Haut has not put forward any study or analysis to support his claim.

Risks

105. Does the City *really* need a development of this magnitude, with such tall buildings, at this location? The developer will undoubtedly answer “yes”. They are in this on behalf of their investors, who expect to make the highest return of investment possible. As such, it would be hard to believe that their first concerns are about the community and neighbouring residents.
106. With that in mind, what if the market does not support the development, or if the developer’s goes bankrupt during the course of construction (it happens!), who will finish the project? Or will the City be left “holding the bag”?
107. Will the developer consider substantial changes to the development, such as lowering the heights of multi-family residential buildings to three to five storeys, or significantly decreasing the number of medium/high density dwelling units (e.g., about 120 as was the 5.18 ha Landrex site)? Some people have suggested that the developer has a strategy of “shooting for the stars” – start very high; then the public will feel gratified when minor concessions are granted.
108. Does the City know all the costs it will or might incur? For example, will the City have the fire equipment to properly respond to alarms or emergencies on 26-storey towers?

Compatibility with adjacent/neighbouring properties

109. The MDP under section 4.0 Housing and Neighborhood Design includes an objective to “*phase development in an orderly way*”. To this end policy 4.2 states that “*new residential development should be contiguous with existing residential land use and should be designed to develop an efficient land use pattern*”. *The proposed development does not achieve this policy. (also see MDP policy 4.11, 4.12 and 4.13*
110. The MDP recognizes the importance of ensuring developments are compatible with neighbouring properties. In the MDP under definitions “*“infill development” means development in mature or built up areas of the City of St. Albert occurring on vacant or underutilized lands, behind or between existing development and which is compatible with the characteristics of surrounding development.*”
111. The LUB also enables the City to impose conditions to ensure a development is compatible with surrounding development (LUB s. 3.11(6)(i))
112. The developer’s Technical Report states, “*Along the east property line, the site design and architecture reflect a sensitive transition to the adjacent residential homes in the Oakmont neighborhood.*” Some of the homes in Orchard Court will only be about 98 feet from the 11-storey seniors’ apartment, according to the developer’s own material. How is that a “sensitive transition”?

8. Summary and Conclusions

The proposed amendments to the ASP and LUB should be rejected for the reasons set out in this submission, which include, but are not limited to, the following reasons:

- The development is out of character for the city and the river valley;
- The heights of the buildings are grossly excessive;
- The development poses several traffic issues, including possible pedestrian safety issues;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development is not contiguous or compatible with neighbouring residential properties; and • The scope of the development is not practical for the location and results in gross over-densification.
96	<p>My husband and I have lived in St. Albert for more than forty years. We raised our two daughters in this beautiful, safe city. We have loved the schools, green spaces, parks and long walks by the river. We feel the present space with the Botanical condos, restaurants, the Mercato and other tenants has been designed into a lovely complex. The parking in this mall space is already becoming an issue and there have been several times I could not find a place to park. The traffic along Boudreau and Bellerose is often congested. The Riverbank Landing proposal seems quite preposterous with the height of the two condo buildings at over twenty storeys. They would block out the sun, be an eyesore in our beautiful river valley area and cause unbelievable congestion. We would suggest nothing over the height of eight stories or find a new location.</p>
97	<p>We moved to St. Albert from Edmonton mid-November 2019 as we found a house and neighborhood that appealed to our search for a “forever” home. We now reside in Erin Ridge and more specifically, Evergreen, which is directly impacted by the proposed development.</p> <p>We have taken the time to review the online documents as well as the strategic direction of Council on behalf of all residents. We understand the need to generate taxes as well as the need to reduce “urban sprawl” that has impacts on City infrastructure. Additionally, we see the benefits of a multi-use development in that it condenses residential land use and creates its own little neighborhood with stores and amenities; this is evident in the current Shops at Boudreau.</p> <p>As newcomers to the area, we feel particularly poised to submit feedback on what has been a negative aspect of moving into the Evergreen area of Erin Ridge – the traffic volume. Residents in Evergreen are limited to one entry/exit point, Evergreen Drive, which has been challenging to navigate to say the least. During peak periods and even some non-peak periods, we have had to wait longer than what is reasonable to turn onto Bellerose Drive in an attempt to get onto the Boudreau Road turning lane. We can see that this will only get worse when phase two of the Botanica development is complete.</p> <p>Therefore, our feedback is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We oppose the additional heights of the residential towers due to the negative impact on traffic, shadowing on current homes (there are conflicting reports on this so a second assessment should be completed), and their incongruency with the landscape of the area. The towers should be limited to 11 stories as originally proposed. 2. The options in the Traffic Impact Assessment should be put into place immediately, not when Riverbank Landing is complete. Namely, the Bellerose to Boudreau traffic lights should be a double-turning lane instead of one turning lane. Additionally, the traffic lights at Evergreen Drive should allow for a 10 second delay for Evergreen residents attempting to get onto Bellerose to Boudreau. <p>We would ask Council to personally experience the traffic in the area during peak periods instead of relying solely on written assessments from parties who do not live in</p>

	<p>the area. We would welcome you into our home on a weekday morning and after having a nice coffee, we would drive out together on Evergreen Drive and attempt to get on Boudreau so you can personally experience what your constituents are concerned about. If any of you do live the area, then you know what the concerns are. Add shadowing on our home into the mix and we fear we will lose the feel of what brought us to St. Albert to begin with.</p>
98	<p>We are writing to you today as concerned residents in opposition to the proposed development, Riverbank Landing at Boudreau Landing. As you are aware, the proposal includes the development of six buildings: two residential high rises (a 25-storey tower and a 28-storey tower), a 12-storey private seniors housing unit, a restaurant, and two commercial and professional buildings. Having completed an in-depth review of the studies and reports provided by the applicant, including the Site Plan, Fiscal Impact Analysis, Traffic Impact Assessment and the Sun Shadow Study, we have numerous concerns regarding the high rises proposed, and for the lack of content clarity provided to the public.</p> <p>We chose St. Albert to raise our two daughters for a number of reasons, including its proximity to Edmonton, the great schools and for our family connections. Nearly 3 years later, and fully immersed in our neighbourhood of Erin Ridge, we enjoy many of the characteristics of our neighbourhood including its walkability and quick access to (by car) to most amenities and services. However, moving here from our previous home in the centrally located neighbourhood of Woseley in Winnipeg has been a big adjustment. The bicycle-friendly community featured picturesque rows of Wolseley Elms that towered over blocks of Edwardian housing with most of the original housing still intact. New development, including mixed-use and residential, has emerged but with the utmost respect to the existing urban form - providing a great example of contextual sensitivity.</p> <p>Contextual sensitivity is a planning principle that in not new- planners and NIMBYs alike have been using his term for decades to support or object new development. However, the importance of this principle cannot be overstated as its impacts are far-reaching and include the behaviour patterns of residents, safety, walkability, real estate market viability and community sustainability. The proposed high rises at the Riverbank Landing are not contextual sensitive in that they provide little regard for the built relationship of the adjacent neighbourhood and stand as an invasive example of development.</p> <p>While we understand the appeal of the proposed development, we implore Council to ensure the public interest and explore the deeper issues and consequences this unsupported density will create. The following information reflects our opinions based on the information provided on the websites of the City and Developer but is not conclusive. We hope, however, this letter will strengthen the voice of opposition and highlight concerns that may have been overlooked.</p> <p>Fiscal Impact Analysis</p> <p>As you know, the City has an annual growth rate of about 1.1 percent or about 719 new residents per year. The Background Study conducted last year as part of the new Municipal Development Plan process identifies a need for approximately 9,000 new residential units to accommodate the projected 100,000 new residents over the next 40 or so years. By directing this level of density to a site so out of line with any strategic plan, we are oversaturating the market with condo development and impacting housing</p>

values across this City - a fact and item not covered in the Fiscal Impact Analysis. In fact, no mention in any of the documentation provided by the applicant provides a clear understanding of financial and growth ramifications clustering development at this level will have on other parts of the City. However, the consequences are very real. This level of redirected density will create a low demand for housing, subsequently minimizing revitalization in other areas of the City and pulling redevelopment away from the downtown core and other priority areas. We encourage Council to fulfil its planning vision and ensure sustainable growth for all areas of the City. The information provided by the applicant and City offers no insight as to how this density will impact St. Albert overall or the subsequent consequences real estate values. This is a timely issue considering much of older Erin Ridge is at the end of the neighbourhood life cycle.

Contextual Considerations

Perhaps our primary concern with this development is the lack of alignment with good planning principles. Densification of urban structure is a hot topic in all cities, but densification requires a justified response to urban growth that embraces local experiences and ways of living. While high rises development provides more varied housing options, it requires consideration for the broader community context and uses to ensure contextual sensitivity. Furthermore, for a high rises development to be appropriate, it should support the City's strategic planning vision (MDP, DARP), reflecting the objectives of these strategies and the data collected through community input. This proposed development not only neglects the contextual sensitivity of the adjacent neighbourhoods, but it also does not align with any of the City's strategic documents, which were created at a considerable cost to taxpayers. To us, this is a clear infringement of public interest.

The Sun Shadow Study

In discussions with our neighbours regarding this proposed development, one of the major concerns was the shadow that the two larger buildings would cast on the surrounding community. The study examines four dates at three different time intervals with no reference to the methodology, data sources, or the study framework. This lack of due diligence puts the validity of the study into question. Also missing from the study is a list of impacted properties with details noting the duration of impact - creating unease for many residents. As a result, individuals in the community have taken it upon themselves to clarify the results of this study by creating hand renders of shadow outcomes. While the legitimacy of these interpretations is questionable, this action in itself demonstrates how residents' concerns have not been addressed by the information provided by the applicant - highlighting a significant communication gap. If the developer is willing to impose permanent shadowing on adjacent properties, I think it's reasonable they provide further details.

Traffic Impact Assessment

Our current commute to work is challenging, primarily due to the heavy traffic flow encountered at the end of our neighbourhood: the intersection of Boudreau Road and Bellerose Drive. Based on the findings of this study, this intersection is already at a low serviceability level with current traffic levels. The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) recommends several improvements for this intersection that will only increase functionality to an average Level of Service D (LOS D)- the lowest acceptable level in the North American Highway Standards (NAHS). This also indicates that even after improvements are made, traffic volume during peak hours will approach unstable flow and will decrease to a LOS E level for north-bound traffic - a level lower than

	<p>acceptable NAHS standards. The information in this study confirms that the proposed costly infrastructure upgrades will not support this level of density at this location, and will result in service levels below acceptable practice - this is unacceptable for the City and its residents, and is not sustainable city-building.</p> <p>Furthermore, and perhaps more concerning, are the assumptions of the TIA, bringing into question the accuracy of projected traffic volumes within the report. The report indicates that a percentage of the traffic will be internal trips meaning that vehicles will move within the boundary of the development. This is standard TIA practice; however, these vehicle trips were not considered in the impact on external traffic volumes, particularly at intersections. For the study, percentages were used based on vague standards: 16 percent for morning traffic and 23 percent for the evening. We have been advised by a Professional Traffic Engineer that these percentages are high, and would decrease projected volumes of external traffic jeopardize the findings of the TIA. The engineer strongly suggests the City conduct a sensitivity analysis to review the impact on external traffic flows if lower percentages of internal trips occur.</p> <p>In closing, the City of St. Albert is a young community in terms of its planning and built form. We are in a unique position to set a standard of how we want to develop in the coming decades. The work being undertaken by the City to define its strategic vision through its new Municipal Development Plan, and outlined in existing plans such as DARP, ensure the City is making responsible and sustainable decisions based on community input and supported by technical research. By letting development and proforma performance lead, Council would be setting a dangerous precedent. We urge you, as a member of Council, to consider the long-lasting negative impacts the Riverbank Landing high rises would create should this development move forward. The consequences to traffic and contextual sensitivity will compromise the overall sustainability of the community and our vision for St. Albert.</p>
99	<p>In October of last year, I sent a letter to Mayor Heron stating my concerns for the proposed development at the former “red barn” site.</p> <p>Since writing this letter, my position regarding the development has not changed. If anything, I am more worried than ever that rezoning of the site will pass. The amendments that were made from the developer following the initial phase of consultations with the city were not short of insulting. Reducing the height of the tower by a few floors and moving it back from the river edge is negligible given the extent of development that is proposed for this rather small parcel of land. I urge all those on city council to go down to Woodlands park this winter and take a walk along the trail that runs along the river and consider the negative impact the current buildings on the north side of the river have had on the esthetic appeal of the river. Without the leaves on the trees, there is no hiding how these structures have been constructed without any regards to the river and it’s surrounding environment in that they have been built so close to the river that they are virtually on top of it. These buildings are a fraction of the tower that is currently being proposed.</p> <p>Let me remind you that according to Part 1 the Municipal Government Act, “the purposes of a municipality are among other things to provide good government and to foster the well-being of the environment”. I would argue that building high density projects like this one on riparian land is not fostering good environmental stewardship. Instead of protecting the distinct resource that is our river, we are slowly turning it into a canal. When developers come to council with proposals for development along a</p>

	<p>natural resource, such as the river, there should be clear direction from our leaders that land redevelopment in those areas will follow strict guidelines that restricts any land use that would further degrade it. It's up to the city to define those guidelines so that developers know up front what type of development will and what will not be allowed along the riverfront and the residents of St Albert can feel confident that the river will remain an attractive feature of the city for years to come.</p>
100	<p>I recently moved into Oakmont and love the community and while I usually support development I honestly do not support the current riverbank landing proposal as is.</p> <p>My two issues are;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The size of the two residential buildings in my opinion are in stark contrast to the rest of the city and I don't believe they will benefit anyone (aside from the builder and city tax revenue, ever slightly). A 15 or 16 story building, sure, but the current buildings are going to become a landmark seen from everywhere in St. Albert and I don't think that is a good thing. The topo survey shows a 664 m base elevation and the amendments call for a 100 m building height. To put that in perspective campbell road at the Henday is 687 m elevation thus from Campbell at the Henday the top of the new building will be 764m or 77m above road elevation. Elsewhere in the city the elevation above ground could reach as high as 100 m. I'm not sure exactly where it will be visible from but given that the Edmonton skyline is cluttered with large buildings greater than 50m and they are easily visible from the Henday it is very likely this building becomes visible for miles which is a shame. 2. I read through the traffic study and while I appreciate the recommendations I really think it undersells the issues at Boudreau and Bellerose. At peak times I have already waited through 5 light changes travelling east along Bellerose through Boudreau as the duration of light is not long enough due to volume of traffic heading North on Boudreau. I have also waited through 3 light changes travelling west along Bellerose trying to turn left onto Boudreau as left hand turning traffic backs up along Bellerose towards evergreen. Under both instances I easily waited minutes with the east along Bellerose being a 10+ minute wait on multiple occasions. Due to low volumes during non peak hours the LOS for the intersection does not reach F status however it is not really fair to say the intersection is acceptable when during peak times Boudreau North is used by many people to access Inglewood, Erin Ridge, Oakmount, Deer Ridge, Lacombe and thus traffic significantly backs up along Bellerose from St. Albert Trail. This new development will drive more traffic along Bellerose as public come to shop or head home from work and the development will also cause significant backlog heading west and turning left at Boudreau as the river prevents any other left turning from the development. A vast majority of occupants will make a left onto Bellerose followed by a left onto Boudreau to exit which will slow traffic down even further. <p>I do not see how this new development will not cause more traffic issues, especially during peak hours and by 2034 I believe it will be typically to wait minutes at the intersection during any sort of heavy flow.</p> <p>I really hope the city considers these comments while evaluating the proposal and I would recommend that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building heights be capped at 16 stories or a height that will not extend far into the skyline creating a focal point for all of St. Albert and;

	<p>2. Significant changes to the intersection of Boudreau and Bellerose occur such as double left turning lanes to minimize intersection time allotted for turning, dedicated right hand turning lanes to stop backlogging into through lanes and synchronizing lights along Boudreau such that throughput along Bellerose is increased when vehicles travelling northbound would be stopped at other intersections either before or after.</p>
101	<p>I am against the proposed changes to the land use bylaw 9/2005. Specifically, I am against the proposed change from Direct Control District to Direct Control Mixed Use. I am also against adjusting the maximum height allowable.</p> <p>I purchased my land in March 2015 and began building our home in June 2016. My family of 6 moved into our home in March of 2018. While looking at land and where to build a home, I chose St. Albert over other communities because I value the what St. Albert has to offer. Beautiful trails connected all along the Sturgeon River, excellent schools and services that my family and I enjoy. We have been residents of St. Albert since 2002 and chose to stay here and raise our family. We chose to pay higher property taxes and live, volunteer and participate in the community we work in. I have been a local, full time business owner (multiple business locations in St. Albert) in St. Albert since 2001 and my wife has worked in St. Albert since 2005. We planted our roots and continue to be excited to see the fruits of our labour. When we chose the location of our home where our family would grow up in, to move away from Heritage Lakes, we chose Oakmont for a few reasons: 1. We wanted to stay in St. Albert. 2. The Area Structure Plan of Oakmont showed a great spot, close to the Sturgeon River, to build a home in a quiet residential area. 3. Close access to trails to enjoy our Sturgeon River Valley and all it has to offer: green space, wildlife, ability to be active. We built our home with the intention of it being net zero. We invested millions of dollars into the land and our home. Specifically, over \$100,000 into solar panels, electricians work, all LED lighting and high efficiency hot water and furnaces. \$40,000 on the solar panels and solar energy system alone.</p> <p>I am extremely concerned about the proposed rezoning and against it for multiple reasons. Had this been the plan prior to me purchasing my property, I would not have purchased it. I would have opted for land in Pinnacle Ridge or River Stone Point, in Sturgeon County. The land in question is currently zoned for a maximum building height of 10m. Anything higher will cast shadows on our house and prevent me from utilizing the sun's energy, thus increasing our carbon footprint. Our home will no longer be net zero. Half of our daily energy production will be lost. My huge investment in protecting our environment will be stolen by the shadows of the developer's opportunistic cash grab. I am very disappointed with the current locations of Botanica 2 in addition to proposed building with this amendment. I am disappointed with other decisions City Council has already made with other developments. I cannot believe our current City Council has voted to erode our river valley so developers can come into our city, get the vote they want and then sell the land at a handsome profit, leaving residents with lost wildlife, trees, sunshine (in the shadows of their development) and the ability to enjoy the Sturgeon River as it is meant to be. Botanica 2 is IN the river valley! The ability to connect river trail systems is becoming more and more difficult with Councils desire to continue to move development closer and closer to the river's edge. St. Albert residents voted strongly in the 90s that the river valley and walking trails throughout the river were the most important item to them. Yet the river valley is being taken away from St. Albert residents and given to developers to maximize their</p>

	<p>profits with no concern for what is left afterwards for all of us to live with. Cities around the world are trying to buy back and reclaim their waterways and river valleys, most finding it impossible. Once it is gone, it is very difficult and sometimes not possible to get back.</p> <p>Traffic is a major concern. Already, between 3:30 and 7:30pm on weekdays, a left hand turn from Bellerose drive southbound onto Boudreau Eastbound can take up to four light cycles. Traffic is backed up past the next intersection to the north. The City has done nothing to alleviate this congestion. Now, City Council is proposing buildings for 500 more families in the immediate area? A traffic circle is proposed at Bellerose and Oakmont Drive. Is there room for a two lane traffic circle? On a slope? Will this mean we will lose sidewalks, boulevards and meridians to allow for adequate space? This does not sound reasonable and does not address the increased congestion at Bellerose and Boudreau that we already have without 500 more families adding to the congestion.</p> <p>I am in favour of increased density housing, but does St. Albert need more? Only the lower two of the four approved Grandin towers have been developed. City Council approved a bylaw amendment of 80m for two unbuilt towers. There is vacancy in the Erin Ridge developments as well as the Riel Developments. There is also vacancy in the Botanica 2 tower. Increased heights of buildings and increased density makes sense in some places, but not in our river valley. Our river valley should be for everyone to enjoy. Increase access to the river valleys by connecting the trails, build more trails; Please don't replace our sunshine, trees, and wildlife with shadows, concrete and barriers to walk our river valley.</p> <p>I am against building in our river valley. I am against rezoning once residents have made decisions based on the current ASP and bylaws. I have major concerns about current traffic conditions on Bellerose Drive, future proposals for a traffic circle and adding to the congestion. I am against blocking the sun and its energy from our energy producing solar panels and increasing our carbon footprint. I am against ruining our environment. Please vote against the proposed changes to the Oakmont ASP and the proposed changes to the Land Use Bylaw 9/2005.</p>
102	I also agree with this letter in opposition [Above] to the proposed amendments to the Oakmont ASP and the LUB.
103	<p>In general, I am in favour of ASP revisions. There does exist a need for more affordable housing and young folks (and I suppose retirees) are much more interested in condo / apartment housing than ever before. I am happy to see that ample space is provided between buildings and the provision for treed lanes (a part of the St. Albert experience) is maintained.</p> <p>I do have issue however, with the proposed changes to the DCMU, specifically to do with changing the permissible building heights from 25 m to 45 and 100m. It sounds confrontational, but I'd be suing the city if I found my home suddenly shaded by a high rise. Fortunately, I'm not in Oakmont. (a recent article on CBC news page (Goodbye gas furnace? Why electrification is the future of home heating) talks about the conversion of home heating system from gas to electrical in 10 to 15 years and the need for residence to supplement electrical demand with solar panels. Imagine the impact to home in that falls within the shadow zones)</p>

	<p>Too me, and what drew me to St. Albert 20 some years ago (and a big part of why I'm willing to keep paying more in taxes) are three things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treed boulevards • Access to trails / trail system • Layout and views of the city. <p>Having travelled to Europe many times, very few cities in Canada have the European feel like St. Albert. What I mean here is that we have a gently sloping river valley on both sides that is large enough that the majority of St. Albert falls within it or has some kind of view across the riverbank. At night, it stunning to see the lights on the other side climb in a consistent and orderly fashion. By day, un-obstructed views provide a sense of openness and peace and natural (nature) focus. This, to some degree has already been compromised with the development next to Canadian-tire (driving south down the hill on the trail, one cannot see past that structure looking east. Botanica, a beautiful development, is slightly better concealed but to me, that would be the limit. 26 stories will completely change the sky-line and river valley in St. Albert. Additionally, once we open that door, more applications will come – it is a one way street without opportunity to turn around once you're in. We must not comprise on that which makes St. Albert special and unique. We must set limits, develop a vision and stick to our guns.</p> <p>Furthermore, the impact to views and the river valley scape affect more that then the local Oakmont community. A proposed change to the DCMU of this magnitude needs city wide notice, city wide consultation. I only found out because of an article in the Gazette on the weekend.</p>
104	<p>As a long time resident of Woodlands, I feel compelled to comment on the Riverbank Landing proposal as it introduces too many conflicts into the community that residents value. The development is proposed as a mixed use neighbourhood activity centre but the residential component overwhelms other uses and brings another 500 units into an already busy location. While it represents a move towards more compact growth in the city in line with Policy area 4 of the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Growth Plan, the submission does not refer to Policy area 3 which focuses on increasing housing diversity within complete communities. The Growth Plan provides that the greatest density will be directed to centres and areas with existing or planned regional infrastructure, transit and amenities, at a scale appropriate to the community. The site is not in a suitable location for the proposed high density because it is not appropriate to the neighbourhood and does not offer sufficient transportation choice and accessibility. The proposal does not conform to the current Municipal Development Plan nor does it align with the vision, draft goals nor growth scenarios arising from the public participation and technical work on the new MDP, "Flourish." The MDP directs higher density growth to more central locations with good access to transit and services. The proposal would create a new centre of concentrated residential development that exceeds the density and built form planned for this area by the MDP.</p> <p>While new development can successfully contribute to a more sustainable city with a greater variety of housing types and a more compact development pattern, it is critical that such development takes place in an appropriate location, where infrastructure and services can support the development; where development is compatible with the surrounding community; where land uses are suitable and there is no conflict with City policies. This site was not identified in the current MDP as a suitable centre to be an appropriate focus for the type of mixed use high density growth that this 500 unit proposal represents.</p>

<p>The Oakmont ASP amendment does not provide information on how the development would fit into the existing neighbourhood. As designed it appears to have little connection to the neighbourhood. The impact on parks and other community facilities is not identified. Adding 500 residential units to the existing Botanica 500 units (approx.) brings an additional 1600 people into the neighbourhood. What are the impacts?</p> <p>The DCMU district permits a wide range of uses which could have an impact on the surrounding area, especially as there are no limits to the size of commercial uses except restaurants. The technical report lists hotel and conference centre as possible uses even though these uses have not been brought to public attention so far. Approval of the amendment to the DCMU district would mean that these opportunities would be in place on the site if the current developer does not proceed after the DCMU is approved. Development of any of the DCMU uses then would not require Council approval. The revised site plan does not include an effective transition to the adjacent low density single family housing. Two of the towers would reach 26 storeys and the building on the east side of the property would have eleven storeys next to the site perimeter. This is a very abrupt change from the existing housing and the project should include a more gradual change from low density to high rise buildings. There is no mention of affordable housing as part of the plan, where St Albert's greatest need lies.</p> <p>The project will have a big impact on the Red Willow Park and Sturgeon River. The proposed development overwhelms the river valley. Other medium to high density residential developments have been built close to the river and there is a "wall of development," overshadowing the river valley in several areas, with Botanica being the prime example. The current proposal would add considerable height to properties overlooking the river valley and would greatly impact the views from the trails along the river where people are hoping to enjoy the natural environment. The Sturgeon River Valley, the Red Willow Park and environmental policies are priorities in the MDP and it is important to the quality of life of citizens to maintain the natural aspect of the river valley. An objective of the Red Willow Park Master Plan is to create a continuous system of parks along the banks of the Sturgeon River linked by a continuous multi-purpose trail on both sides of the river. There is no completed trail from Boudreau Road east on the north side of the river and if slope instability makes a trail below the bank unsafe, then a trail should be included through the Botanica site and the site of the current proposal.</p> <p>The addition of a further 500 residential units to the existing Botanica apartments creates an impact on traffic along Bellerose Drive and Boudreau Road. Traffic impact studies were conducted during June when traffic is much lighter and moves more easily than during winter months. The studies do not include traffic generated by school trips in the afternoon when congestion is common. The assessment therefore may not be fully representative of the expected transportation picture nor the impact of the proposal. Furthermore, all emergency services, police, fire, ambulance and hospital are located on Boudreau Road. Adding additional traffic congestion will surely affect the ability of these services to respond quickly to emergencies.</p> <p>The Riverbank Landing proposal is not in keeping with the City's growth policies as the site is not in an appropriate location for such intensive high rise development. The proposal's impacts on existing neighbourhoods, infrastructure capacity and the river</p>

	valley are considerable and may lead to future City investment costs. I believe this development will be detrimental to our river valley and the city.
105	<p>I have completed my review of the material submitted in support of the application, to amend the Oakmont Area Structure Plan (ASP) and the Land Use Bylaw (LUB), to allow for infill redevelopment at 230 & 250 Bellerose Drive and 300 Orchard Court. Based on my review of the supporting documentation I am not adverse to development of the present Commercial lands (230 & 250 Bellerose Drive) for mixed commercial-residential use, exclusive of 300 Orchard Court. I favor RETAINING the residential zoning for 300 Orchard Court as well the Commercial zoning for 230 and 250 Bellerose Drive. I DO NOT SUPPORT altering the Land Use Bylaw for the aforementioned lands to Direct Control Mixed Use. Rationale for my position is outline below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deviation from the vision and future land use direction of the current Municipal Development Plan (Bylaw 15/2007). The existing MDP is the over-arching document that should be guiding development. The context provided by Arc Studio in support of the commercial and high density development is made in the absence of St Albert having completed "...a review of the development criteria for high density residential development, and developing(<i>sic</i>) suitable regulations and design guidelines for its development." The existing land use districting for Bellerose 230 & 250 provides enough latitude for a range of commercial and residential use without expanding the height options. Under no circumstances should consideration be given to exceeding the 25 m height limitation. Consideration has to be given to safeguarding "the views and vistas" of existing Erin Ridge and Oakmont property owners whose properties are assessed for tax purposes with this consideration in mind. The lands under discussion were not identified in the MDP as a "Neighborhood Activity Center". Riverbank Landing falls on the margin of the Transit Orientated Development Corridor (TOD) and no analysis was provided on what transit demands the development would present or how they would be handled. 2. Scale of development - The scale of proposed infill development is excessive for the single residential area in which it is situated. None of the reports outline how the proposed scale of development optimizes infrastructure investments, especially concerning transportation. A reduced scale of redevelopment that would incorporate a range of housing options, with commercial development, has potential, but not the current proposal. 3. Promise of development – the proposed scale of "infill redevelopment" (pg7) is aspirational; "...plans are subject to market conditions and proven customer demand..."(pg8) (<i>Riverbank Landing Technical Report & Proposed Amendment to the Oakmont ASP</i>). It is clear from the context of the developer's proposal and existing sections of the Land Use Bylaw that the developer is wanting to secure as broad a range of land development options as possible. Given the mature nature of the Oakmont neighborhood, strong consideration has to be given to the impact/effect of the proposed rezoning that ensures as development permits are applied for that the development "suits" the neighborhood. This philosophy of infill blending and complementing the existing neighborhood is embedded in the MDP and should be safe guarded. Reference is made to the creation of a Schedule to define building heights and locations for redevelopment similar to Schedule F in the Land Use Bylaw. As previously noted, this should be done before any consideration is given to accepting this redevelopment proposal.

	<p>4. Fiscal Impact Analysis – the <i>Riverbank Landing – Fiscal Impact Analysis</i> is based on a “full build out”. As previously noted, the proposed development is responsive to market pressures and much could change as a consequence. St Albert should seek to obtain an analysis for a range of likely scenarios. Not to be disregarded are the social and environmental consequences of situating this development in such close proximity to the “top of the bank” of the Sturgeon River. Without explanation of how the building locations can complement St Albert residents use of Red Willow Park, consideration should be given to incorporation of wide setbacks from the “top of bank”, e.g., 20-25 m. Analysis is missing of the impact of development on adjacent property tax assessments affected by any proposed development.</p> <p>5. Transportation – the <i>Riverbank Landing Traffic Impact Assessment</i> acknowledges traffic provides a modelling version of what should happen; however personal experience on the burgeoning traffic flow on the Boudreau Road – Bellerose Drive intersection present a different perspective for this writer. The practicality and effects of a right in- right out onto Bellerose Drive not only deserves more scrutiny because of its location on a steep slope, but it disregards the transportation planning that went into the original ASP.</p>
106	<p>Re: Oakmont Boudreau Development</p> <p>While I am in favour adding high density residential buildings to St. Albert, I'm not in favour of this new development as proposed for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The traffic at Boudreau and Bellerose is problematic right now and a second turn lane should be added even without this development. 2. High density developments like this should be built in an area where there is proper public transit – near transit stations or designated bus stops. 3. High rise buildings are too high for a city this size. You need to think about the aesthetics and overall landscape of the city. It's going to look like a middle finger sticking up. 4. Have the developers looked at whether the heights of these buildings will cause any safety issues for the Stars helicopter since the hospital is so close?
107	<p>I have purchased a unit at Botanica Phase 11, and will be moving in within the next couple of months.</p> <p>I would like to take this opportunity to express my opinion on the development of the Red Barn area where the proposal for two 26 floor condo units and additional retail and residential units are to be built.</p> <p>I understand there is very much concern over this type of development and there were a few things of concern to myself as well when I first heard. The first being the exposure to construction for a long while, the second being the traffic congestion and lastly, I was concerned about a great deal of rental accommodation being built and if it would affect the value of the property I purchased.</p> <p>After attending a meeting with the developer, my concerns were completely alleviated ... 100%. Boudreau Developments shared their vision for the area which brought many naysayers around completely. They anticipated our objections and offered solutions to all. The height of the towers may still be an issue with some people, but I honestly do not know what is the matter with going up. It greatly reduces the footprint and provides the population density needed to support the businesses in the Square.</p>

	<p>St. Albert is very lucky to have this type of development and the residential areas in close proximity are as well. To be able to walk to almost anywhere you need....parks, trails, restaurants, services, groceries, hospital etc. is something special in our cities now. Even if I was not going to live in this community, I would still be able to see the benefits it has for the city. The tax base alone is a huge benefit.</p> <p>I definitely support the vision Boudreau Developments has for this area and look forward to watching it come to life.</p>
108	<p>We are condominium <u>owners</u> in Phase1 of Botanica and we are also <u>purchasers</u> under an agreement executed in June 2016 of a unit in phase 2 of said project. We are writing in response to your letter of December 12, 2019 in which you request comments and questions regarding the proposed amendments to the Oakmont ASP – Bylaw 12/97, and Land Use Bylaw 9/2005.</p> <p><u>Summary:</u> We are not in favour of the proposed amendments to either/both the above Bylaws for the reasons detailed below. Our concerns are primarily related to the following three aspects of the Riverbank Landing proposal:</p> <p><u>1. The use of overly tall structures to attain the goal of the applicants' proposal.</u></p> <p>As a general comment, we feel the injection of such high-rise, high-density buildings have no place in the magnificent Sturgeon River Valley adjacent to Red Willow Park. The view of the river will be spoiled for almost all nearby residents, (ourselves included among the most severely- impacted, in a radius extending far beyond Oakmont). Privacy will be compromised for many.</p> <p>Ever since the failed redevelopment in Grandin some 15 years ago, the City established and emphasized a maximum limit of 25m throughout the City (with but a very few minor exceptions allowed). These have been reviewed many times, most recently in 2017 and just this past September when the height limits were re-confirmed.</p> <p>While doing research for this letter, we came across a very thorough report dated 4/5/17 (File # PH-17-011) prepared by your Planner R. Beukens) which provides a detailed overview of the situation and appears to have been the basis for the City's ongoing re-confirmation of the limits then approved. We have been guided by his thoughtful observations and recommendations.</p> <p>Among those observations/recommendations: (a) Regulations specific to Grandin Park regarding building heights, etc., are NOT applicable to other locations in the City. (b) DCMU districts which were originally created to apply city-wide, should be relatively compact, attractive, pedestrian friendly and <u>reasonably compatible with surrounding areas.</u></p> <p>Q. If the Riverbank proposal is approved, and 26-storey condos become the norm for all DCMUs, will those 100m structures become standard in all quadrants of the City? Letters to the Gazette as well as oral presentations made by many city residents at the three open houses held in the past half- year are a strong indication of the lack of appetite for the high-rise towers proposed.</p> <p>Summation: the developer comes up short in making the case for approving an increase from 25m to 100m. We are confident that the City's review and recommendations to Council will see it that way.</p>

2. Over-densification for the site and the overall area

What is being looked at under the proposal is an increase of some 800 new residents, not to mention all the visitors, workers, and support people, etc. Transportation internally and externally becomes a major issue here.

The whole concept of densification was to get cars off the road, reduce pollution, and save the planet. Of the multitude of “live, work, and play”, high density/mixed use developments such as is being proposed by Riverbank, the successful ones are those that are closely connected to mass transportation, (Subways, LRTs, and BRTs) and provide “action”, and services. A few of the cities, including Toronto and Calgary “implemented mixed-use developments as a way to resolve sites that were considered “urban blight” (1) Urban blight is certainly not a question in St. Albert, but in our case the high volume corridor seems destined for the Trail, not Bellerose.

A better model for our site would be what is being created and built in Jensen Lakes. Riverbank is not linked to their kind of transportation infrastructure, nor does it have the location, or the land on which to build those types of facilities/services.

(1) see “Toronto leads the way in global urban mixed-use trend” Property Report Globe and Mail October 29, 2019

Summation: The developer’s argument that these buildings need such height (read density) in order to be economically feasible are outweighed, in our humble opinion by the risks, to the developer, the city as a whole, and the rest of the development area, including Botanica, of a half-complete eternal construction site. Shuffling the buildings, especially the three high rise towers to please one group of objectors does little to make the problem go away.

If these proposed changes to the bylaws are approved, it would be very unfair to those residents mentioned above and most likely would result in a significant loss of value in their properties.

3. Traffic congestion

The traffic study that came with the package has been heavily challenged by experts in the field as well as regular citizens who have reviewed the report. There have been so many proposed revisions that we feel we need to have the report totally updated so that we can comment appropriately on what we feel is the most commonly shared concern out there.

The intersection at Bellerose/Evergreen remains the only current access point to the development. Over the months, we have received information that one, two, or even three additional exits onto Bellerose could/would materialize, only to be shot down / dropped for one reason or another and replaced by something else, not necessarily an improvement.

Until we have the information we require to make an informed call, we prefer to leave the matter in your capable hands, secure in the feeling that you will come up a solution that is reasonable and fair to all the stakeholders involved.

4. Final Summation

In our humble opinion, this is one of the finest pieces of property around. It has history, character, is well situated within the greater community, and ready to be developed. However, we respectfully suggest that the proponents abandon their request for a DCMU re-zoning and tailor their project to what is now low to mid-density commercial and residential land.

	<p>They have some very appealing designs that would truly enhance the site, if only they would get away from trying to cram so much into so little space, horizontally and/or vertically.</p> <p>With our thanks and gratitude, Ms. Bennett, for your assistance and that of your colleagues in the Planning Department in navigating the “binder” and explaining the process. We very much appreciate the opportunity of having our voices heard.</p>
109	<p>Insane!</p> <p>Why in this proposed development even getting this far!</p> <p>(1) it's a blight on our river valley</p> <p>(2) there's zero infrastructure to handle the traffic (or is there a plan in place to have traffic routed along the river to the foot bridge ... then down through Kingswood Park????????????)</p> <p>(3) nobody wants it</p> <p>Reject the whole friggen plan... the area needs to be Park Space. Keep our river valley the Gem it is! My God I hope someone is listening.</p>
110	<p>Boudreau Developments has big plans to invest in St. Albert but these plans hinge on the public and City Council to support their vision. As a resident of St. Albert, I for one have no intent to support any changes to the current ASP and hope that the city will listen to the huge number of residents that feel the same way.</p> <p>In order to allow for the development of Botanica 1 & 2, the previous City Council modified the zoning that was in place. In my opinion, erecting two 10-story condo buildings was not in the best interests of residents, the surrounding neighborhoods, the Sturgeon river and the environmental reputation that this city is known for. Approving the Riverbank Landing application, which includes 3 high-rises and an additional 1000 residents in such a compact area is ludicrous! I do not support the Riverbank Landing application for the following reasons: 1) there should be no further high-rises along the Sturgeon river, 2) the shadows created by high-rises will not only impact the residents, but I'm deeply concerned about the possible environmental impacts as well, 3) the traffic in this area is already beyond capacity (this being said when Botanica 2 is not yet occupied), and 4) the parking around the shops of Boudreau is already difficult, if not impossible at times. And lastly, I don't support the Riverbank Landing application as 5) it will have a very negative impact on the current residents of Oakmont and the surrounding neighborhoods. Approving such a development in an already established community will cause a huge degree of mental and financial stress for them. I can only imagine the number of sleepless nights these residents have had since the developer initially shared their vision for Riverbank Landing, thinking about loss of property value, loss of privacy, over a decade of dust, dirt, pollution and noise due to construction and unavoidable shadows.</p> <p>My vote is to leave the ASP the way it is. Additional low-density housing and commercial shops would enable all St. Albert residents to enjoy this area. The developer purchased the land with full knowledge of the zoning in place, so it should not come as a surprise if it remains unchanged. It is my hope that the Mayor and City Council carry out their fiduciary obligation to represent the residents of St. Albert and do what is in the residents' best interests. Furthermore, I would also like to hear from the City as to what their vision is for the river valley. Residents shouldn't be kept in the dark about what lies ahead for St. Albert's prized river valley. Lastly, as we move into 2020, I hope City Council remains focused on what has allowed it to gain the reputation as</p>

	botanical and environmentally-conscious, and what has allowed it to earn the distinction of being one of the best cities in Canada to live in.
111	<p>I wanted to write to you all today regarding the high-rise complex in the works for The Shops at Boudreau area, and express a differing opinion from the very vocal minority.</p> <p>My wife and I have lived in Erin Ridge in a house we built for approximately 14 years, so I think we've earned our opinion on this subject. And, although they may not say much due to time constraints, or not having any specific opposition, I believe our opinion is shared by the majority of St. Albert residents. I've been watching the news, and the Facebook groups protesting this development, and one thing is abundantly clear. This is a very vocal minority who don't care about what everyone else wants, or what is good for the community, only what they perceive to be good for them.</p> <p>Whether people like it or not, St Albert is a growing city, not the sleepy small town that some people wish it still was. The double income no kids demographic, which we are, is relatively small, but people like us spend our income in local shops and restaurants which have a very hard time making it in St. Albert. I know firsthand as my wife's shoe store, Shoeuphoria, was one of the victims of lack of local support. I've watched restaurants like Saviour's close as well as numerous establishments downtown. We also have close friends whose kids are now grown who are essentially re-starting their lives, and a big part of that is more disposable income going to night life and shopping, which I'm sorry to say, is currently lacking in the city. The huge number of families with children in St. Albert are also going to be joining this group a whole lot faster than anyone realizes, and if there isn't a life outside of hockey practices and school events for them, they will look elsewhere. The way to prevent those people from leaving, and have a nightlife, shopping etc. is to bring in people who can justify the investment by restaurant and shop owners now. There is only one path to that available, and that is to build complexes like this now. Double income people like us, young professionals etc, we spend money, but don't believe in wasting \$100.00 on Ubers just to go and have 7 or 8 drinks with a nice dinner in a restaurant that isn't dedicated to families. I know that people say St. Albert is a family community, and they're not wrong, but that is not all it is, or all it should be.</p> <p>The second issue I keep hearing is "traffic". While I personally disagree with the 50 km/h speed limit n Boudreau, volume really isn't a problem. If I have to wait for two lights to turn left off Boudreau when it's icy, so what. I know that the developers have done extensive work to ensure that there is very little impact on traffic and I for one believe this won't be an issue. St. Albert is not Vancouver where the TransCanada highway becomes a 4 lane street. Besides that, high rise complexes aren't typically the place where every single resident drives to and from work at 7:45 am.</p> <p>In closing, I would just like to remind city council that there are many of us who either love the idea of these complexes being built, or just don't see any issue, and therefore don't say anything. Please take that into account when making this decision and don't let a very loud but very small group of NIMBYs make the decisions for tens of thousands of people who will benefit from this.</p>
112	We would like to provide our input for the development at Riverbank Landing. We have many concerns with this development and would ask you to seriously consider them and bring them forward for discussion. The first concern is the location of the development in relation to existing residential homes. The height of the towers

	<p>absolutely does not suit the location for many reasons, including sun/shade patterns, decreased privacy for single family home owners, and the “fit” within the area.</p> <p>The second concern is increased traffic; currently the intersection of Bellerose Drive and Boudreau Road is over capacity, and that is prior to the additional traffic that will be added from the second condominium at Botanica. An additional traffic impact assessment is not required as anyone who travels through the intersection can tell you that at morning and afternoon rush hour the intersection is a definite friction point as you move through it. There is no other way to divert traffic because all residents of Oakmont and many residents of Erin Ridge need to travel through the intersection to come and go from the area. There is a median on Bellerose Drive north of Boudreau with beautiful fruit trees; however, removing the median to widen the road for increased traffic would be less than ideal for our Botanical City.</p> <p>The third concern is for the planners and all involved with this proposed development to fully understand the implications if this development goes ahead as planned. Obviously the towers will be permanent, and the decreased attractiveness of houses in the area for so many reasons will also be permanent. We live in Oakmont and absolutely love the area for its beauty, green spaces, and lack of density. If we did not, we would have built our home somewhere else. To now increase the overall density of the area will have long lasting, negative effects.</p> <p>Lastly, building communities ought to be more about what fits with the area and what residents desire and will be proud of, and not "shoe horned" in an over dense, unsightly “add on.” That is exactly what this looks like, with the ultimate driver being increased tax revenue for the city. Our request is for everyone involved with the project to put aside the added tax revenue component, and look at this development with a fresh focus. The infill area in Oakmont, the Orchards, is an excellent example of what fits with the area and what is desired by its residents. As you may be aware, the Orchards is directly adjacent to Riverbank Landing, and stands as the absolute correct way to develop what remains of the Hole’s property.</p>
113	<p>I have been made aware of the potential high rises being built on the old Holes site/riverbank.</p> <p>I cannot express enough my displeasure with the City of St Albert for allowing this to happen. I choose to live in St Albert because of its small town feel even though it isn't really a small town. I don't live in the Oakmont area but do not like the idea of large buildings going up there. I do enjoy paddling the river and towering buildings would not be something I want to see there.</p> <p>I feel for the residents of the area.</p> <p>If this is allowed to go through, I would make sure this is discussed in the next election. I question city council's priorities. If they let this go through, I have no doubt it is the beginning of a troubling trend.</p>
114	<p>As a resident of Oakmont, I recently read a wonderfully written article in the Gazette this week, written by fellow Oakmont resident K&D Montpetit.</p> <p>This letter echoes my feeling towards the traffic concerns that any future development in that riverbank area will present. The entirety of Oakmont must use the Bellerose hill to get in/out of Oakmont. There is no other way we can commute to work. The adjoining intersection with Boudreau is already way overtaxed with the current level of traffic. This is even before the 2nd phase of Botanica accepts residents and their cars are added to traffic. I am shocked that the city feels adding twin 26 story high density</p>

	<p>housing will not completely disrupt traffic in the already congested area to a literal standstill. I have not heard any traffic solutions from the city, which is not surprising, as there is no solution. Unless you want to extend poundmaker road and build another bridge for Oakmont residents to use so we can avoid the Bellerose/Boudreau intersection.</p> <p>All Oakmont residents I have spoken with are in complete opposition to the Riverbank Landing development for many reasons. Many flat out don't want high density towers in the area, but all Oakmont residents that I've spoken with (and other non-Oakmont St Albert residents) are in complete disbelief that the city is pushing this project forward that will have a devastating affect on traffic and commuting.</p> <p>So, my question is, why doesn't the city hold a plebiscite, open to ALL Oakmont residents, and then we can see if the community supports this Riverbank Landing project.</p> <p>Alternatively, don't allow any residents of the twin towers (or Botanica 2) to have a single parking spot, as we can't accommodate their vehicles into the existing traffic flow.</p> <p>Either way, somethings gotta give?</p>
115	<p>Future of Oakmont does not look bright. I foresee more traffic congestion, more pollution, more commuting time just to get in and out of Oakmont and Erin Ridge. Traffic is horrendous with the addition of Phase 1 of Botanica, Phase 2 will made it 3x worse since there will be no exit except through Bellerose. We need two lane turning now to turn south on Boudreau. When phase two kick in, we will need three lane turning. If 26 storey towers get build, will need 3 turning lanes and another bridge to get across the river into Red Willow. Let's make things right for the residents in the North East.</p>
116	<p>I am a 3 year resident of Botanica.</p> <p>I have been to 3 separate presentations regarding the proposed development and would support this development or something with offers that closely resemble the latest proposal.</p> <p>I have listened to a small number of people quite vocally object to the size, the height and the additional traffic that the proposal will bring to this area.</p> <p>In my mind the only concern with any merit is the traffic and the traffic will increase along Bellerose and Boudreau due to the ongoing development of Erin Ridge North and Highway 2. With the relative high percentage of retirees and Snowbirds in the present Botanica development the traffic footprint is minimal.</p> <p>We travel on off hours or not at all.</p> <p>My only concern is the traffic exiting on Bellerose at the controlled intersection. I have mentioned to the presenters. Work will be required to prevent lengthy stacking for people trying to go left on Boudreau.</p>
117	<p>I chose to live in the Community of St. Albert to avoid a congested city of Edmonton lifestyle, for my children, my wife & myself. Choosing the far north of St. Albert allowed our family a quite near rural type of lifestyle. I understood development would occur, however relied on the Landrex Development company as promising a single-family land development plan in our immediate area. I spoke with City of St. Albert's Business Development officer to confirm a residential development plan for the foreseeable future. As a long time resident (1993) of 15 Orion Close, within 50 meters of the proposed Riverbank Landing Boudreau Development of the Holes Gardens property, I have concerns to the overbuild within this proposal.</p>

	<p>This proposal reveals a drastic change to our lifestyles by the following concerns I have identified below.</p> <p>My Concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Privacy <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. As a back-yard vegetable gardener we spend many hours in our very private backyard. The proposed towers residents will invade my peace of heaven that I do not have to share with more than one neighbor to my southwest of my garden. 2. View <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. My view will be corrupted by towers to my southern view. Our Landrex company promised single family development of our area. b. As I look out my front windows, I currently have a southern winter view of the river valley, that would be turned into a wall of windows with noses pressed to them as the resident check out the bird count in Orchard Court back yards. 3. Shadow <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Towers will block critical growing sunshine to my garden vegetables, & attractive flowering landscaping plants. b. Shadowing with change the important growing temperatures for my garden. 4. Traffic <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Congestion <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Vehicle Traffic is very busy as it is to day, and a oversaturated River Landing development will take congestion over the top. b. Noise <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. We are subjected, to heavy vehicle traffic, buses, & individuals cars/SUVs ii. The limited traffic egress of the Riverbank Landing development will introduce accelerating vehicles starting from the new right hand turn only up hill at a Stop sign approximately 50 Meters from my residence. c. Heavy Vehicle ground vibration <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Heavy vehicles during multiple years of construction, will increase within 50 meters of my residence. I feel the buses & heavy trucks today, these will surely increase due to the most northern right-hand turn egressing from the Riverbank Landing development. d. Dust & Mud <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. We are so tired of the increased dust introduced from the Sarasota, & Landrex development of Orchard Court for what seems for ever rather than 8 years. ii. A new Riverbank Landing will continue this mud dropping truck & construction traffic dust enveloping over my sidewalks, deck, & garden. This has become exhausting of cleaning the Barbeque, the deck, windows, every few days when trying to enjoy the backyard. e. Construction Workers Parking <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Construction of the Botanica filled Orion Close with construction workers parking personal vehicles in front of our homes. Most likely Riverbank Landing will create addition parking needs for the construction workers. f. Oversaturation of multiple story buildings <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The Riverbank landing appearance is that of a over saturated development in too small of a land pocket. ii. Stopping at Meracato, or Buco, or Sarah's Kitchen is a challenge to find parking. One wants to make a quick shopping stop, & many times it a pass,
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>as can not park. Riverbank Landing has the appearance of worsening a very POOR parking situation for existing businesses.</p> <p>iii. The vehicle entrance into the Riverbank Landing will only further congest access to search for the limited parking.</p> <p>g. Traffic Study Forecasting</p> <p>i. The Riverbank Landing traffic study does on identify a traffic increase forecast adequately. I would expect a phase forecast during construction, & construction completion with full occupancy of Botanica & Riverbank Landing.</p> <p>ii. A complete forecast is needed before the City of St. Albert should consider this proposals impact on the Oakmont, Erin Ridge residents & the current Shops of Boudreau businesses.</p> <p>h. Emergency evacuation</p> <p>i. I do not see any Emergency contingency planning for the Riverbank Landing development combined with the Shops of Boudreau, & Botanica, should an emergency situation ever occur.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction Phase 2. Completion Phase with full occupancy <p>i. Orchard Court road is closed from the Riverbank Landing and must continue to prevent construction & overflow traffic through a residential street. Residential means children, playing, accessing bussing to schools.</p> <p>j. Traffic circle as a 3rd outlet/emergency outlet of the Riverbank Landing/Boudreau Development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The grade is poor for a winter weather situation ii. Traffic circle egress to Bellerose increase vehicle acceleration noise.
118	<p>My husband and I are long time residents of St. Albert having moved here in 1973. It was a small town then, with a drive-in theatre, a couple of schools, and a strip mall in Grandin, as well as one indoor arena (the old "Ducky Dome"!).</p> <p>St. Albert had historical buildings, parks, a safe friendly atmosphere and natural beauty. Residential buildings were no more than 2 - 3 stories high. It was a lovely place to live, to work in and to raise a family. Over the years many others thought likewise, and thus St Albert grew. And grew.</p> <p>But as it became a city, and then an even larger city, it still retained its historical roots, its small-town atmosphere, and its natural beauty. Where else in Alberta is a city so aesthetically pleasing?</p> <p>St Albert was, is, (and in my opinion should remain) a garden city; an historical garden city composed of low level residential and commercial buildings.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the proposed Riverbank Landing does not honour these aspects of St. Albert. Our major concerns with this proposed development are twofold (a) the look of it and (b) traffic congestion:</p> <p>a) The scale of the proposed development of two 26- story buildings is out of sync with the rest of the city. St. Albert was never meant to be a high rise city with 26- story buildings blocking out sunshine, casting long shadows over vegetation and residences, making streets grey and grim, and providing density resulting in traffic congestion (see (b) below).</p> <p>As a city matures, it does not have to build vertically to such high levels. It is well documented that high rise density compromises mental health. And why 26 stories? What is that based upon? Why not 20, 15, or any other number? The Botanica</p>

	<p>development is comprised of ten stories. This should be the limit of future developments, because although Botanica is high for St. Albert, it is not out of sync with the surroundings. Furthermore, if 26-story heights are approved, it would set a precedent for other developers to make similar, even taller, proposals.</p> <p>When I first looked at the artist's rendition of Riverbank Landing, I was struck by how jarringly incongruous these towers looked in their surroundings (I am an artist, with an eye for visual appeal). To me these buildings will mar the landscape. To me they look like two fingers sticking up. To me they are ugly eye-sores, not at all in harmony with the rest of St. Albert.</p> <p>b) Traffic congestion is another area of concern. The majority of vehicles from the whole development will be turning to the West out of the area rather than turning to the East. While there are three entrances into the total area of development there is only one left turn exit out of the area. Without another left turn exit out of area there will be serious congestion at this existing exit location. At the open house on Monday January 20th, 2020, it was indicated that the City had determined that the most easterly right in and right out intersection was too close to the existing traffic lights to provide another fully signalized intersection. With the modern traffic control systems now available it should not be a problem to link these traffic signals together.</p> <p>My family and I love this city. We have watched it evolve over the 47 years we have lived here and are happy it still retains elements of being an historical garden city. This is however in danger of being sabotaged by the developers of Riverbank Landing.</p> <p>We believe that you, as our elected city council have the best interests of the city and its residents at heart. So you need to ask yourselves just what you are allowing St Albert to become? As a guideline I quote Prince Charles (conference in Brighton, 1999) when he said, "We should build legacies, not blots, on our landscape".</p> <p>I respectfully request that you do not approve these potential blots on St Albert's landscape.</p>
119	<p>We built our home 25 years ago in the Evergreens of Erin Ridge and have watched the communities of Erin Ridge and Oakmont develop and expand. As the second Botanica building nears completion and we read about the Riverbank Landing proposal, we have several concerns.</p> <p>Have any of you witnessed the traffic coming down the hill on Bellerose drive in the morning? It has become virtually impossible for us to exit the Evergreens onto Bellerose Drive, despite the green light. The left lane is always full and we are therefore unable to turn left on Boudreau which is the route we take to get to work. For several months now, we have had to drive to the mall to turn around so we can get onto Boudreau. Every week we see more and more vehicles doing this (or making illegal u turns) and it is totally frustrating. It now takes me 15-20 minutes to get to work when years ago it took 7 minutes. I dread the day the second Botanica building opens and if the Riverbank Landing is approved, this traffic congestion will be truly unsafe. I urge you to come and see what hundreds of citizens are experiencing on a daily basis.</p> <p>If this proposal is approved, the property values in our neighbourhood will be negatively impacted. We feel for our neighbours and those living in Oakmont whose views will be obstructed and who have had to experience ongoing construction and disruption for years. I remember the good old days when I would walk down to the greenhouse with</p>

	<p>my four preschoolers and inevitably, we'd see Lois Hole who always had time to chat despite her busy schedule. I wonder what she would think of the developments that have taken place on the land she so proudly cultivated for years.</p> <p>We are opposed to the Riverbank Landing proposal and hope that you will not approve this development.</p>
120	<p>I may not be able to attend the Open House being held 29 Jan to provide the developer's position on the Riverbank Landing Project. As a consequence, I wish to make my objections known to the City Planning Department.</p> <p>First off, let me state that I am completely opposed to the proposal. Not only will it destroy the cultural identity of St. Albert, but I fear it is fraught with poorly thought out elements. Various comments have been made and printed in the Gazette and expressed by Oakmont Residents, which I support and which I will not be repeating in this short note.</p> <p>A serious concern that I note is the intention to include an 11 story seniors residence. This does not make sense to me as the safety of residents would be very much compromised in the event of evacuation of residents due to fire or other crisis. I believe that a fire department review and analysis would highlight this concern. Given recent experiences with fire at much smaller seniors residents elsewhere in Canada and abroad, this should be a show stopper.</p> <p>I have lived in St Albert, off and on due to my profession, over the last 50 years and can only state my sadness that the river valley has become a venue for high rise development at the expense in some areas of community use. While everything must evolve with time, the culture of the City of St Albert is one that I hoped would be preserved. Alas, I am concerned that too is disappearing.</p> <p>Suffice to state in closing that, as a resident of St. Albert, I oppose the proposed amendment to the Oakmont ASP and the Riverbank Landing Development.</p>
121	<p>I have lived and worked in St. Albert all my life. St. Albert is a progressive city and has the opportunity to develop leading edge projects within its current boundaries.</p> <p>Many long time residents of St. Albert have commented to me about the quality and class of the Shops at Boudreau and Botanica Developments. I know several people who have moved, and who are planning to move there. Everything they need and want in a community are within walking distance.</p> <p>Great cities build great communities by allowing developments like Boudreau's Riverbank Landing. This visionary development will help confirm St. Albert's status as one of the best communities in Canada.</p> <p>The City of St. Albert must take advantage of this opportunity.</p>
122	<p>I am writing in support of the Riverbank Landing development in St. Albert. In my view the existing development is one of the nicest in the Edmonton region. Cities and municipalities the world over are stopping urban sprawl in favour of densification. The next phases of this project are an excellent example of how to do that while staying true to the things that make St. Albert great. Another trend in urban planning is intergenerational living which has been proven to improve community wellbeing in many aspects.</p>

	<p>This project incorporates those benefits in spades. Another consideration is site coverage, the current plan has 46% of the site dedicated to the public and natural space. Attracting investment in the city is difficult in these trying economic times. This development will generate significant new tax revenue for the City of St. Albert that otherwise would not exist. Cities and municipalities that are open for business will attract private investment and tax revenue as proposed here. Those investments contribute to the fiscal/social well-being of communities.</p>
123	<p>On behalf of the Board and senior leadership of Chandos, I am writing to express our strong support for the Riverbank Landing development adjacent to the Botanica Condominiums in St. Albert.</p> <p>We believe that this type of premier, master planned community built around the vibrant lifestyle aspirations of the City of St. Albert will have significant benefit to the local economy and the local workforce. Having the unique opportunity to build such a diverse development within existing urban infrastructure complements the emphasis on livable communities that is essential to the City and it will bring together much-needed housing options for seniors, millennials and families. This will be further supplemented with family-centric retail and professional services, dining options, expansive walking trails and natural spaces.</p> <p>The development of Riverbank Landing will provide a clear path to ensuring sustainability and vitality for the City of St. Albert through significant tax revenue and job creation. It will build upon the strong community feel that already exists at Botanica and will continue to enhance it with additional lifestyle options. While Chandos isn't currently looking to relocate its head office outside of Edmonton, this is definitely the type of progressive development that we would entertain moving into, if the need were to arise.</p> <p>We thank you for this opportunity to voice our support for such an important development; one which will have a tremendous positive impact on the continued growth and livability of the City of St. Albert well into the future.</p> <p>Open House Held January 29, 2020</p>
124	<p>I would like to take this opportunity to show my support for Riverbank Landing Development with Boudreau Developments.</p> <p>I have personally worked on and built Botanica Phase 1 & Phase 2 over the last 5 years. I was also a partner in a local St. Albert Business operating out of Campbell Business park for 9 years. I love St. Albert, I love the community and I think this development has the potential to be the hub for St. Albert supporting new local business, restaurants and density.</p> <p>With a close relationship with the developer I can attest to their core values striving to deliver a world class facility. They are committed to unprecedented quality, family centered retail, and professional services. We are proud to be part of this development and we sincerely hope yourself and Council consider and approve this application for rezoning.</p>
125	<p>I would like to express my support for the proposed Riverbank Landing Development, Botanica Phase 3 in St. Albert.</p> <p>My company has worked with Boudreau Developments in the past and I found them approachable, professional and honest.</p>

	<p>With Botanica Phase 1 and 2 Boudreau Developments created a residential development that is thoughtful and beautiful. A community for all ages and incomes. For people and families starting out and for those who are downsizing and thinking about their personal footprint.</p> <p>I encourage Council to consider Boudreau Developments application for re-zoning.</p>
126	<p>I attended the open house yesterday at the Red Barn. I went in with an open mind, but after seeing the design plans I am very concerned. It strikes me that two 26 story towers does not suit the site well at all. The density of the proposal is just too high for the area. As I am sure you have heard other people say the traffic congestion is already bad and will simply become unbearable with the density that the group is proposing. In addition, I was shocked to see the shade that towers of that size would throw over Erin Ridge, Oakmont, and Woodlands.</p> <p>I understand fully that the city wants to increase density to spread out the tax burden on residents. I also understand that our business to residential tax split is not ideal currently, I do not think that the city can simply cram more high density in to placate the developers and reduce the tax load of existing residents. I am strongly against the density proposed in Riverbank Landing. The city has thoroughly botched up the traffic in Erin Ridge and adding this kind of density to Oakmont will continue the problem.</p>
127	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>FOLLOW UP LETTER</i></p> <p>Further to my letter to you dated Dec 28, 2019, I would like to restate my views on this proposed development project. I also feel the need to send another letter as a result of this past week's "Open House" held by the developer.</p> <hr/> <p>Summary of My Previous Letter</p> <p>The request from the developer to have this land rezoned to permit their proposed construction should be rejected by the City Administration (and City Council):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is totally inappropriate for this type of construction and density • The traffic congestion on Bellerose, and at the Bellerose/Evergreen/Boudreau intersections, is already a problem. This is <u>before</u> the second Botanical condo is even occupied • The density from this development would be far too much for the site and the surrounding neighbourhoods • The idea of allowing any more development along the Sturgeon River watershed would be irresponsible. It would negate the claim to be a "Botanical Arts" city! • The land is adjacent to mature, developed residential neighbourhoods. The expectation was that development on the Holes land would be maximum two storey structures. • The shadowing of the surrounding neighbourhoods is unacceptable. • If this project is permitted to proceed, the damage to St Albert will be permanent. One or two traffic roundabouts or some changes to traffic light timing at Bellerose and Boudreau will do virtually nothing to deal with the permanent mess that will be created. • A development like this might be acceptable new, undeveloped areas where the entire community can be planned in a coordinated manner. Allowing a developer to "shoehorn" in a high-density project in the middle of mature neighbourhoods benefits the developer's investors, no one else

	<p>Developer Community Consultation</p> <p>It is clear, the developer's idea of "community" consultation is to hold events <u>to market their project</u>... period. They have no desire and nor intention, to make major changes to their plans at this point.</p> <p>They just want the "community to go away quietly" so they can get their project approved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Their objective is to maximize the return on their investment. Any claim to be thinking of the City and community is "smoke and mirrors" • Their response to the extensive community objection is to propose a few very minimal "cosmetic" changes to create the <u>illusion</u> that they are listening and responding to the surrounding communities • Reducing the height of the two high-rises by a floor or two is a totally inadequate change • Repositioning one of the high-rise towers might reposition the shadowing but it does nothing to address the density problem this development would create. • Building a round-about just up the hill on Bellerose will only make the all the traffic flow worse (just a way for the people exiting the development to make a legal "U-turn") • Replacing the traffic lights at Evergreen with a round-about is beyond ridiculous. • I understand that the developer expects there to be an average 1.5 vehicles per unit and they are suggesting therefore that the traffic problem will be less than expected. Really? This is another very weak pitch to try to soften up the community and to get their project approved • Any idea of having the developer collect feedback from the community at these 'Open Houses" and then provide the feedback to the City is extremely inappropriate. That provides them the opportunity to "edit and shape" the feedback to their advantage. Feedback on this proposal from the community needs to flow directly to the City Administration, and City Council...unfiltered and unedited. <p>Summary</p> <p>By now it should be crystal clear to the City and Council that the surrounding communities do not want this project to proceed. The rezoning should not be granted.</p> <p>I am sure the community understands and accepts that some type of development could take place on this land. But it should be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low-rise residential homes, condos, senior residential to a maximum of 2 storey heights. It is possible that some structures could be 3 storeys, but the number of structures would have to be reduced as a result, to control the density of people and vehicles • Low-rise commercial / business occupancy might be of value to the residents on site and the surrounding community. Same height maximums of 2 storey structures, perhaps 3 storeys • The location of even these low-rise structures should be positioned away from developed homes. • Parking must be properly designed to eliminate any chance of excess and/or overflow parking ending up in the surrounding residential neighbourhoods
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>We are not only relying on you, the City Administration and City Council to protect our neighbourhoods and our life-time investments in our homes, but we are placing our trust that you will represent our interests and protect us from inappropriate development in our neighbourhoods.</p> <p>As in my Dec 28, 2019 letter :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am pleading that the <u>Planning & Engineering Department</u> (and any other City departments involved in the due diligence stages) see the flaws in the project design, and the issues that will arise by allowing such a massive amount of density to be developed in this particular area. • I am pleading that <u>City Council</u> has the political will, common sense and social accountability to make the right decision and turn down this project, starting with the Land use and Rezoning request. Please restrict this land to Low Density Residential only. • Do not allow developers to control the direction and destiny of the City of St Albert. Please do the right thing.
128	<p>Thank you for taking the time to read this email. I am a concerned citizen of St. Albert who proudly lives in Oakmont. I had the opportunity to attend an open house hosted by the developer on Wednesday, January 29th for the Riverbank Landing project. I was already aware of the forthcoming development through the St. Albert Gazette and was looking forward to learning more from the source.</p> <p>Allow me to preface by saying I am not a NIMBY (not in my back yard). I understand this was private land that was sold to a developer who wants to make a maximum profit from their investment. That is just how life works, even in sunny St. Albert. I must however, strongly voice my protest about the height of the two proposed towers. The open house had an excellent video display that demonstrated the effect of the tower shadows on the surrounding neighbourhoods using four points of the year (March 21, June 21, September 21 and December 21). I was surprised to see even my home which is located quite far east in Oakmont would be affected, but was shocked to see how many houses in Woodlands lay in the shadows. Not just Woodlands, but properties in Erin Ridge, and even Deer Ridge, and into Lacombe were affected. Two 26 storey towers is simply unnecessary for St. Albert, even if future civic planning is part of the design.</p> <p>In this economy even Edmonton doesn't need another high rise as they have already overbuilt. St. Albert does not need to be in the same position where our homes are devalued because we have so many empty suites/houses.</p> <p>I also do not see why this project requires more retail space. The Shops at Boudreau, a relatively small commercial space, have already experienced multiple retailers moving in and out and there is one space that has been empty for months. St. Albert continues to overbuild its commercial buildings in a desperate bid to acquire more tax revenue and reduce the burden on its residents. Nice in theory, but empty buildings in every new neighbourhood do not actually contribute to the communities. This city needs to attract medium sized industry, not more strip malls.</p>

	<p>Another serious concern for me is the increase in traffic on Bellerose Drive, which I drive each day as part of my commute. The lights at the intersection of Evergreen Drive are already poorly timed with Boudreau, which is a key intersection in the northeastern side of the city. I have noticed the volume of traffic has increased over the past two years as more local development has finished. I have exactly zero confidence in the city to manage existing traffic much less plan for the additional vehicular and foot traffic associated with two 26 storey high rises and its commercial offerings.</p> <p>I understand development on this site is going to happen, I think limiting the height to 10 stories, like the Botanica projects, will be an acceptable compromise for the affected communities. I would prefer to see more of the land used as a community garden project, or a public art park than another strip mall. This would be more in line with our city branding as the Botanic Arts City.</p> <p>As for the traffic situation, I think once again the citizens will have to adjust their schedules rather than expect city planners to come up with a real solution.</p>
129	<p>I look at our city as a living organism. To be healthy and sustainable, all living things require balance to live in harmony. Growth is only beneficial to all when it provides as much as it takes.</p> <p>The developments to date of Botanica I and II appeal to wealthy seniors and empty nesters. The Shops at Boudreau provide upscale amenities to suit Botanica I and II and surrounding neighborhoods. Even though we in the surrounding neighborhoods have had to suffer through pile driving, dirty roads, worker parking in our streets, etc... over many years I find the results to be acceptable with the exception of a significant increase in traffic congestion. This is not purely as a result of the Boudreau developments, but nonetheless, they do contribute.</p> <p>Now the city is contemplating a proposal to add 2 x 26 Storey Towers and an 11 Storey Tower. To continue down this path is the antithesis of balance. To date, one would believe that this expansion is mostly pros and that the cons can be easily solved. I would argue otherwise. Any structure over the current 25 metre bylaw will throw the landscape out of balance and will detrimentally affect the surrounding neighborhoods which represent long term investors in the city of St. Albert.</p> <p>The current 7 storey Botanica I and II structures are noticeable, but they do not dominate the skyline. The simple pleasure of having sun pass across ones property unimpeded adds untold value and richness to one's life experience. By foresaking the 25 metre bylaw means that the contract everyone signed into by moving into their properties long ago now is broken. As the sun shines anywhere on the horizon, a homeowner in St. Albert somewhere will be forced to accept darkness. I have yet to see any studies that suggest quality of life is improved by having extra doses of shadow invade the visual environment. Gardens that once provided fresh fruit and vegetables will perish. The free energy of the sun's heat will no longer be available. Heating bills will go up, property values will go down, and moods will worsen. What value is lost in this transaction ?</p> <p>An obvious desire for any city is to have a vibrant mix of different age and cultural demographics. Increasing density per square kilometre is a noble enterprise and I am not against efforts to provide more affordable housing such that young families and those below median income have a chance to enjoy what our great city has to offer and</p>

	<p>to contribute to the experience that is St. Albert. Good examples of this are seen in Erin Ridge by the Costco, North Ridge and Ray Gibbon, as well as Grandin. Except for the Grandin Apartments, these new communities were developed with the bargain that homeowners understood they would have high density structures nearby and therefore had the chance to accept this precondition. For the Boudreau developments, we did not have this understanding when many chose to make the largest investment in their lifetimes. Whether Boudreau developments will actually meet the cities objectives of affordable housing remains in question. It's difficult to believe that a developer would be so charitable as to build low cost structures on a river bank when we all understand that property such as this comes at a premium.</p> <p>St. Albert has been growing significantly over the last decade and this has put considerable pressure on our roadway systems. It is a common gripe among St. Albert residents that have to make the daily drive to and from Edmonton that traffic congestion is frustrating at best. Since Erin Ridge expanded along with neighborhoods in Sturgeon County and the addition of Botanica I, the congestion at Bellerose and Boudreau has become problematic. This is without Botanica II coming online. Now we are to understand that somehow Boudreau developments holds some magical solution to this problem? Just opening another entry into the Boudreau developments isn't going to do much when the amount of families expected to sign up to the current plan are expected to be added to morning and evening traffic. So... what next? Take away the beautiful boulevard of apple trees that Lois Hole so gratefully donated to the city. Make it a 6 lane highway to get to further congestion on the Trail and Ray Gibbon. More noise, pollution, safety issues, etc... Is this a balanced and sustainable approach?</p> <p>St. Albert must take great pains to consider all impacts that are wrought from the desire for expansion and increased density planning... especially in mature neighborhoods. It is my hope that you will seek impartial, third party consultants when evaluating what is placed before you by a company that is driven by profit. I trust that you will do your best on our behalf. Thank you for considering my position.</p>
130	<p>Area structural plan (ASP) for a municipality are important, and usually developed in a consultative fashion by city planners, hopefully without influence from special interest group, and also, with community consultation and some sort of consensus. Oakmont, as I understand it, meets existing ASP requirements. Changes to ASP should involve compelling reasons. Boudreau Communities suggested changes should be made to improve walkability and lifestyle quality, enhance access to boutique retail outlets and increase home values.</p> <p>Improved walkability, in my judgement, would be better planned by community representatives. My view is a group of reasonable people would not start an improved walkability and lifestyle project in the shadow of two 26-storey and one 11-storey buildings. St. Albert residences can improve walkability and lifestyle without the help a developer, allowing a builder to make this change seems simplistic, but maybe, I am missing something.</p> <p>Boutique retail has limited community appeal yet important. However, it does not necessarily need to be concentrated in Boudreau Communities perhaps other residence might have an opinion about the location.</p> <p>Increased property values are a national issue, city council would not, I hope, think Boudreau Communities has the answer to increasing home values in St. Albert without any demonstration and citing empirical evidence how this applies broadly to Edmonton, the province and the rest of Canada.</p>

	<p>Changing ASP needs compelling reasons. I would like to hear what these reasons are. Please let me know why the St. Albert City Council would change the ASP for the Oakmont area in response to the interest and direction of the Boudreau Communities.</p>
131	<p>I have worked in St Albert for 40 years and lived here x 16 years. I was living in Vintage Oakmont. I chose to move into Botanica on the eighth floor because I will be 70 years old soon and wanted a home that would enable me to travel more easily. When I am home I love the lifestyle this whole development gives us. I can pop downstairs and walk to pick up groceries have a hair cut purchase a bottle of wine buy a present for my grandchildren and stop and visit friends for a coffee. My wife often comments I was sent to pick up fruit and returned an hour later...I walked into so many friends in this community I got distracted. The point is this is not just a development. It is a beautiful way of living.</p> <p>Without the density of housing we could never support the high end stores. With vertical development Riverbank Landing will obstruct less views to present home owners at the same time afford the new residents stunning vistas of Sturgeon Valley.</p> <p>I am proud to see St Albert moving into the 2020s with a futuristic modern development that breaks the mould of past antiquated urban sprawl.</p> <p>My wife [Redacted] and I strongly support this new concept and hope its success will encourage similar future communities to be designed.</p>
132	<p>I attended both information sessions regarding this proposal. The objection to this major development was obvious to the majority of those present and others through various discussions within the community. Our opinions are that it would be detrimental to allow this development as proposed. Major concerns are the traffic congestion and the change in our St Albert landscapes to which we are so proud.</p> <p>We reside at [redacted], citizens of St Albert for 40 years.</p> <p>We trust City Council takes heed to these concerns.</p>
133	<p>I am opposed to this drastic change in density for 3 reasons, sun shadows, city aesthetics and traffic.</p> <p>When I attended the open house on January 29th, the sun shadow modeling raised some serious concerns for my wife and myself. Based on the developer's sun shadow model, once this project is built, we will never again see the sun shining in our back yard after 3:00 PM between Sept 20 and March 20th. In December we will not see the sun anytime after 11:00 AM. This is unacceptable. We deliberately chose our lot for its southerly exposure as my wife suffers with seasonal affective disorder.</p> <p>The topography of St. Albert's river valley with its gently slopping banks on both sides, afford many lovely view of the valley from a variety of locations. The recent trend of lining the river edge with tall buildings cuts off the view of the valley from everyone further up the bank. This needs to stop. The two Botanica buildings and the building under construction by the Canadian Tire store are significantly affecting the view. I've attached a picture from McKenney Ave. If tall building were placed at the top of the bank on the flat plateau, the occupants would still have a view of the valley and surrounding city and all the single-family residents on the slope would also maintain their view. The Sierra's of Inglewood is a good example of how this can be done.</p> <p>My third concern is the increased traffic. I was pleased to see that the proposed traffic circle half way up Bellerose Drive was removed. The proposed right turn in and right turn out of the Riverbank development is only slightly better. The issue is that all the vehicles using the right turn out exit will be going up Bellerose Drive opposite to their preferred direction. These drivers will seek a U-turn at the top of the hill or will wind</p>

	<p>there way through Erin Ridge, compounding the existing traffic issue in that neighborhood.</p> <p>Generally I'm in favor of traffic circles over traffic lights. However placing one on Evergreen Drive, which is only 100 m from the Boudreau intersection, is not going to work. The 2nd Botanica building is not even occupied and in the future we will have 127 street adding to traffic on Bellerose Drive. To this over loaded situation the developer is proposing to add this Riverbank development. All this traffic will overwhelm this area making it excessively congested.</p> <p>If this high-density site is allowed to proceed, not only will the immediate area be an issue but all this traffic congestion will extend to the surrounding intersections as well. (Boudreau / St. Albert trail, Bellerose and St. Albert trail, and the Boudreau and Sturgeon Road intersections.) Will Bellerose and Oakmont Drive intersection need to be a traffic circle to accommodate all the u- turn traffic? Will the City be ripping up and redoing all these intersections as well? If so at who's cost? Please do not say it will be the taxpayers because I am tired of short-sited traffic work on my tax bill.</p> <p>To my thinking the best solution would be to maintain a lower the density on this site and direct the traffic to the Evergreen drive intersection.</p>
134	<p>Oakmont Area Structure Plan ASP Bylaw 12/97</p> <p>I am writing to you today about the application to change the Residential area into DCMU.</p> <p>The situation at the intersection of Boudreau Road and Bellerose Drive during rush hours and certain parts of the day can best be described as chaotic. Using A.I. to help the traffic flow may work at this time with the current amount of traffic. However, what is your plan when the second building at Botanica is open and occupied?</p> <p>And now you want to add twin towers 26 storeys high, an 11 story retirement facility, a 3 storey mixed residential, 3 more strip malls and a professional building all on a postage stamp sized plot. How do you plan to control all this traffic using two entrances and one exit? Putting another intersection 100 feet up the road will only compound the problem especially if you decide to put in a roundabout as suggested by the developer.</p> <p>The twin towers are also a big (tall) concern of mine. At 26 storeys the shadow of these towers in the winter months are unbelievable. The developer's model projects shadows reaching all the way into Woodlands subdivision. Not a good idea when we are limited to a short time of sunlight as it is.</p> <p>At 26 storeys I am wondering what kind of aircraft warning lights will have to be installed? Will I be forced to see a blinding white strobe light every time I look out my back window? How many cell towers do they plan to erect on these twin towers and at what height? 26 storeys and so close to the Sturgeon Hospital, what effect will it have on the STARS helicopter?</p> <p>Botanicas pitch of helping the community and having plenty of mixed use residential areas, how many suites will be subsidized units for students and low income retired people?</p> <p>The developer plans to show outdoor movies at night. How many noise complaints are you willing to deal with, having existing residential homes so close to this development? How can you approve such a massive undertaking when Alberta's economy is on a downturn with no sign of improvement in the near future? City council approved construction of towers on the old Grandin Mall site which remains a vacant, barren lot, with no sign of development in the near future. What guarantees do you have that this project will be completed? I fear that this project will end up going into receivership and</p>

	<p>we will be left looking at two empty towers half complete, looking like some scene out of a bombed out city.</p> <p>They plan to complete this project in seven to ten years. How do you expect the citizens of the surrounding area to put up with the pounding, noise, and heavy equipment for that long? We have already put up with the inconvenience long enough. Another decade of the same would not be tolerable. I wonder if you would be so eager to go ahead with this project if it was being built in the neighborhood of Kingswood, where even a strip mall was not allowed to be built. It seems that all neighborhoods are not created equal.</p> <p>I moved to St. Albert in 1983, where I met my wife who has lived here all her life. And her family has been here for 3 generations. When we got married we decided to stay in St. Albert to raise a family even though the taxes were a lot higher instead of moving to surrounding areas that were less expensive. We were willing to pay the extra cost to stay in an urban setting with a small town feel. We saw the city grow as the years went by, and had no reason to complain about living here. With this proposed project I feel that I need to speak up. This project has no business going ahead. It was planned for residential housing and this is how it should stay, along with a large green space buffer between the residential side and the existing commercial business.</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------