



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: BL-20-026 **Version:** 1 **Name:**

Type: Bylaw **Status:** Passed

File created: 3/2/2020 **In control:** City Council

On agenda: 5/19/2020 **Final action:** 5/19/2020

Title: Bylaws 11/2020, 12/2020 and 13/2020 Oakmont Area Structure Plan, Land Use Bylaw Amendments (1st Reading)
Presented by: Suzanne Bennett, Planner, Planning & Development

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: 1. Bylaw 11-2020 - Oakmont ASP amendment, 2. Oakmont ASP - Schedule 'A', 3. Bylaw 12-2020 - LUB Amendment - Redistricting, 4. Bylaw 13-2020 - LUB Amendment - DCMU text changes, 5. Oakmont ASP - REDLINE .doc, 6. LUB - DCMU - TRACKED CHANGES, 7. Location map, 8. Amendments map, 9. Proposed Site Plan (revised), 10. Public meeting transcript - sep 10-2019, 11. Sep 10 public meeting comments, 12. summary - public correspondence, 13. Correspondence from Public, 14. Alberta Health Services comments, 15. St Albert Public Schools comments, 16. Public Meeting Summary - Jan 29 2020, 17. FIA Summary Chart, 18. Construction Phasing & Trades Parking, 19. Applicant Presentation

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
5/19/2020	1	City Council	approved	

TAMRMS#: B06

Bylaws 11/2020, 12/2020 and 13/2020 Oakmont Area Structure Plan, Land Use Bylaw Amendments (1st Reading)

Presented by: Suzanne Bennett, Planner, Planning & Development

RECOMMENDED MOTIONS

1. Bylaw 11/2020 Oakmont Area Structure Plan Amendment

That Bylaw 11/2020, being amendment 4 to the Oakmont Area Structure Plan 12/97, re-designating the subject lands from Commercial and Low Density Residential to Mixed Use, be read a first time.

2. Bylaw 12/2020 Land Use Bylaw Schedule A Amendment

That Bylaw 12/2020, being amendment 176 to the Land Use Bylaw 9/2005, to redistrict the subject property from Direct Control to Direct Control Mixed Use, be read a first time.

3. Bylaw 13/2020 Land Use Bylaw Text and Schedule F Amendment

That Bylaw 13/2020, being amendment 177 to the Land Use Bylaw 9/2005, to enact textual changes to the Direct Control Mixed Use District, and amendments to Schedule F 'Building

heights for Redevelopment' be read a first time.

4. Public Hearing

That a Public Hearing for Bylaw 11/2020, Bylaw 12/2020, and Bylaw 13/2020 be scheduled for June 22, 2020 at 9:00 am MDT.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This purpose of this report is to present proposed amendments to the Oakmont Area Structure Plan Bylaw and the Land Use Bylaw, for first reading. The amendments include the creation of a Mixed-Use Designation within the Oakmont ASP, and the re-designation of lands to this Mixed-Use designation. The Land Use Bylaw amendments include redistricting the site from Direct Control (DC) to Direct Control Mixed-Use (DCMU), textual changes to the Direct Control Mixed Use (DCMU) District, and the addition of a height schedule.

ALIGNMENT TO PRIORITIES IN COUNCIL'S STRATEGIC PLAN

N/A

ALIGNMENT TO LEVELS OF SERVICE DELIVERY

Current Planning Application Processing: Processing and coordination of the approval of Statutory plans and amendments, subdivision, and condominiums applications.

ALIGNMENT TO COUNCIL DIRECTION OR MANDATORY STATUTORY PROVISION

Section 692(1) of the *Municipal Government Act* provides that:

"Before giving second reading to... a . . . bylaw amending a statutory plan or land use bylaw . . . a council must hold a public hearing with respect to the . . . bylaw . . ."

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

Arc Studio, on behalf of Boudreau Communities Ltd. has applied to amend the Oakmont Area Structure Plan (ASP) and the Land Use Bylaw (LUB) to impact the following properties:

Municipal Address

230 Bellerose Drive
250 Bellerose Drive
300 Orchard Court

Legal Address

Plan 122 4934, Block 1, Lot 5
Plan 122 4934, Block 1, Lot 1B
Plan 102 1490, Block 1, Lot 2A

The development site area is located between Bellerose Drive and the Sturgeon River, and east of Boudreau Road, and is approximately 4 hectares (9.8 acres±) in total. See the attached *Location Map*.

Although the amending bylaws are not an application for development approval, the applicant is

asking Council to make these amendments as the necessary legislative foundation for a particular development in respect of which the applicant is expected to seek a development permit if the bylaws are passed. Accordingly, in the interest of giving Council relevant background to assist in making their decision on the bylaw amendments, Administration has elected to present background information about the proposed development which is projected to contain approximately 466 units. Applying the 2018 Census statistics, the development would result in an expected population of ~820 residents, assuming the average household size of 1.76 residents per unit.

The applicant's concept for development of the lands is illustrated within the attached *Proposed Site Plan*. It is important to note that what is presented now, being only at the conceptual level, would have to be fleshed out in more detail as support for a development permit application. Therefore, what Council is now being asked to consider is ONLY whether the target site is suitable for THIS TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT and in particular whether the target site is suitable for the proposed building heights. Council is not being asked to scrutinize the details of the layout of the site as depicted in the *Proposed Site Plan*. These kinds of details would be very closely examined as part of the Planning and Development Department's evaluation of the anticipated development permit application, should Council approve of the proposed amendments to the ASP and the LUB. By passing the proposed amending bylaws Council would be saying: yes, the target site is suitable for this kind of development, including these maximum building heights.

The following documents were provided to the City of St. Albert by the applicant, per the Area Structure Plan Terms of Reference:

- Oakmont Area Structure Plan (ASP) Technical Report
- Images of the Land Use Redistricting map, proposed site plan, and a 3-dimensional rendering of an aerial view
- Proposed text amendments to the DCMU District
- Proposed height schedule
- Sun/Shadow Study
- Historic Resource Application
- Market Study
- Fiscal Impact Assessment (FIA)
- Topographical Survey
- Slope Stability Analysis
- Transportation Impact Assessment (TIA)
- Servicing Design Brief
- Environmental Site Assessment Level 1
- Public Engagement Plan, including public comments and the open house transcript.

Arc Studio, on behalf of Boudreau Communities Ltd., is requesting that St. Albert Council consider and approve the following proposed amendments within this application:

- Creation of a Mixed-Use designation within the Oakmont ASP;
- Amendment of the Oakmont Area Structure Plan Future Land Use at 230 and 250 Bellerose Drive, and 300 Orchard Court to a Mixed-Use designation. There are corresponding textual changes to the ASP;
- Amendment of the Land Use Bylaw, Schedule A to redistrict 230 and 250 Bellerose Drive, and

300 Orchard Court, from Direct Control (DC) District to Direct Control Mixed Use (DCMU) District;

- Land Use Bylaw text amendments to the Direct Control Mixed Use (DCMU) District increasing allowable building heights, and addition of a schedule to specify building height locations.

The bylaws, and background information relating to each, are listed below in the recommended order of approval.

Site History:

These lands are locally known as the Hole family homestead, and were annexed into the City of St Albert in 1980. A 1990 Area Structure Plan designated the properties as single-family residential and commercial.

In 2009, the subject lands, as well as the land developed as Botanica residences and the Shops at Boudreau, were districted by Bylaw 12/2009 as Direct Control (DC). However, the eventual development of these lands would be expected to conform to the ASP listed above. The density of single-family residential development would be 39 du/nrha, or less, in accordance with the LUB definition of Low Density Residential Area. Prior to this, the subject lands were a mix of C2 Commercial, R1 Residential, and Urban Reserve Districts.

Administration Analysis of Conformance to Statutory Plans:

EMRB Growth Plan

[NOTE: The proposed amendments did not require circulation to the EMRB because the subject lands are outside of the 800m radius surrounding future LRT alignment, and the proposed density of the ASP would be increasing based on the concept plan provided.]

- Guiding Principle #4 - “Achieve compact growth that optimizes infrastructure investment. We will make the most efficient use of our infrastructure investments by prioritizing growth where infrastructure exists and optimizing use of new and planned infrastructure”
 - The subject site of this proposal is outside of the planned LRT alignment 800m radius. The LRT alignment runs along the St. Albert Trail, which is prioritized for high-density infill development. The proposal does not fully support this guiding principle.
- Objective 3.2 - Plan for and promote a range of housing options
 - The concept proposed does provide a type of high-density housing not widely available in St. Albert at this time, thereby supporting this objective.
- Table 1B - Metropolitan Area - Growth Directions
 - Encourage intensification of built-up urban areas including brownfield sites to optimize existing and planned infrastructure; proposal supports this policy.
- Policies:

- 3.2.1 - Housing will be planned and developed to address the changing demographics in the Region by including housing that offers a diversity of lifestyle options, income levels, and to meet to meet the needs of all residents.
- 3.2.2 - Within the built-up urban area and centres, infill development, more compact housing forms, and increased density will be encouraged to achieve a more diverse housing stock in the Region.
 - The proposal supports this policy by providing high-density residential and commercial infill.
- 3.2.3 - The greatest density and diversity of housing in terms of type, form and availability, including row housing and low, mid and high-rise buildings, will be directed to centres and areas with existing or planned regional infrastructure, transit and amenities, at a scale appropriate to the community.
 - The proposal does not fully support this policy due to the location being outside of current MDP intensification zones such as the downtown core and TOD centre.
- 4.2.2 - Intensification will be directed to rural centres, sub regional centres, urban centres, TOD centers, the metropolitan core and downtown Edmonton, brownfield sites and along transit corridors at a form and scale appropriate to the community and corresponding level of service.
 - Subject project site is not located within the St Albert downtown (urban centre), or within proximity of a TOD centre, which does not support this policy.
- Schedule 6 - Aspirational Intensification target:
 - 17% (dwellings to Built Up Urban Areas) is measured as the percentage of new dwelling units that are constructed within the built-up area each year.

MDP:

Future Land Use Map

Map 2 of the Municipal Development Plan (MDP), Future Land Use, depicts the area to which built form intensification should be directed. These points of intensification are categorized as Transit Oriented Developments, Regional Shopping Centres, District Shopping Centres, and Urban Village Centres. Per section 4.12 of the MDP, these nodes are where medium and high-density residential should be centralized. The subject site of the proposed amendment is not identified as an intensification point on the Future Land Use map.

The proposed development has been deemed to not meet the intentions of an Urban Village Centre, and therefore was not evaluated as such.

Policy 4.11 Neighbourhood Design Principles

The proposed application conforms with this policy, as the application ensures that the neighbourhood includes a minimum of 30% of the dwelling units as medium and or high density residential. The application is proposing to maintain the ravine and tree stand within the development, and provides a focal point for interaction within the site.

Policy 4.12 Locations for Medium and High-Density Residential

The MDP identifies evaluation criteria for medium-density residential sites within Section 4.12. The City is to consider the criteria when recommending locations for medium density residential locations. The MDP is silent on the criteria for high-density residential development.

When applying the criteria, the application supports the following:

- Proximity to open space, shopping, and commercial and community facilities,
- Superior functional design,
- Compatibility with the existing Botanica/Shops at Boudreau, and
- Minimizing traffic impacts

However, it should be noted that the application does not support other aspects of policy 4.12 criteria, such as:

- Proximity to public transportation
- Dispersal of density throughout the neighbourhood
- Compatibility with the existing low-density residential community in Oakmont, and,
- Location in downtown, urban village centres, and neighbourhood activity centres

Policy 13.1 Provisions for New Developments

The City of St. Albert shall ensure that new development is consistent with the efficient, economic, and coordinated provision of municipal infrastructure, human services, and public utilities. This application supports this policy within the MDP.

Policy 18.4 Residential Densities

The City of St. Albert requires that the developments meet the Edmonton Metropolitan Growth Plan density targets for new development. The intent of these density targets is to reduce the amount of land consumed by low-density residential development and reduce the need to consume undeveloped lands prematurely. The density proposed within the amendment subject area is 135.4 du/nrha (dwelling units per net residential hectare), resulting in an overall increase of the Oakmont ASP density from 21.5du/nrha to 26.3 du/nrha. This application supports the residential density policy within the MDP.

Bylaw 11/2020 - Oakmont Area Structure Plan Amendment

Within the current ASP, the subject lands are designated as Low Density Residential on 300 Orchard

Court, and Commercial on the parcels addressed 230 & 250 Bellerose Drive (see attached *Amendments Map*). These parcels currently have the above described development opportunities, as permitted through the ASP via Council adoption. The parcel designated as Low Density Residential is 2.16 hectares. A low-density development of 39 dwellings per hectare on this site would produce up to 84 dwellings. A medium-density development could yield up to 203 units. These numbers may be reduced during development design as areas for roadway are removed from the calculations. The remaining 1.87 hectares, per the ASP, could be constructed as a commercial development with the associated impacts that commercial development would bring.

The Oakmont ASP does not currently have a Mixed-Use designation. The provided proposed amendment, attached as *Oakmont ASP - Redline – Changes Tracked*, has the proposed new designation included within the text, and revised maps have been provided to show the entire subject site as the Mixed-Use designation.

The proposed amendment would alter the existing development statistics, and these have been revised to include the new designation. Administration has updated the figures with an Aerial Map and Former Historic River Lots to reflect the proposed amendments.

As detailed previously in this report, the proposed amendments to the Oakmont ASP are only partially supported by the Municipal Development Plan. The proposed amendment to 300 Orchard Court is significant; as the request being considered would result in a change from Low Density Residential to Mixed-Use, being accompanied by a high-density concept.

Bylaw 12/2020 - Land Use Bylaw Schedule 'A' Amendment

The current districting of 230 & 250 Bellerose Drive and 300 Orchard Court is Direct Control (DC), which is a very special land use classification intended to “enable Council to exercise particular control over the use and development of land or buildings within the area so designated”. As such, land uses as well as development standards and conditions for development applications are totally within the control and authority of Council so long as the Municipal Development Plan and the Area Structure Plan are complied with. There is virtually no scope for any appeal once Council has made a lawful decision about what will happen, and on what conditions, in a DC district.

The proposed redistricting to Direct Control Mixed Use District (DCMU) would have significant implications for the process of development approval. Although the district has the words “direct control” in its name, it operates more like a normal land use district so long as a proposed land use falls **within** the list of permitted or discretionary uses. For any such use Council has no involvement in the development approval process, and the decision of a development officer is subject to the same potential for appeal (to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board) as in any other land use district. If a proposed land use in this district is **outside** the list of permitted or discretionary uses, then the district operates like a straight Direct Control district in which Council retains “direct control” of approval of the use and any associated conditions or regulations, so long as the development conforms with the ASP and MDP.

The DCMU District allows a maximum floor area that is 3.21 times the size of the parcel. However, a minimum of 25% of this floor area must be dedicated to commercial purposes. A site totaling 4 hectares results in an allowable 32,100 m² (345,521 ft²) of commercial space, with the remaining 96,300 m² (1,036,564 ft²) as residential.

At the redistricting stage where we are now, the exact configuration, size, and heights of the developer's proposed buildings are not known, however, applying the built-out Botanica development can provide scale regarding the number of units possible within the district. Applying the smallest unit size within the Botanica residential development would provide 1,250 units within the allowable residential floor space; resulting in a projected population of 2,200 residents. The largest unit size within Botanica would provide 314 units, creating a projected population of 553 residents. The applicant is proposing a development that would accommodate 466 residential units, resulting in a population of 820 residents.

If a development of this scale could be designed to adhere to the minimum setbacks, site design, and maximum height of 25m, the application would meet all the requirements of a permitted use within the DCMU District. So if Council passes the proposed LUB bylaw amendments, and if these design requirements could be met, the Development Officer would be compelled to issue a development permit - appropriate conditions could be imposed, but the permit could not be refused.

Bylaw 13/2020 - Land Use Bylaw Text and Schedule F Amendment

Bylaw 13/2020 contains the applied-for textual changes to the Direct Control Mixed Use (DCMU) District, and amendments to Schedule F 'Building heights for Redevelopment'.

The development concept provided contains:

Building 1:	2 storeys (10m)	restaurant and small conference centre
Building 2:	26 storeys (100m)	4-storey commercial podium, and 22 storeys of residences
Building 3:	9 storeys (40m)	apartments designed for seniors, with main floor commercial
Building 4:	3 storeys (15m)	mixed use residential and commercial
Building 5:	26 storeys (100m)	3-storey commercial podium, and 23 storeys of residences
Building 6:	3 storeys (15m)	office space

The standard height allowance within the DMCU District is 25 metres. A height exception was written into the DCMU District for the Grandin developments, as it was located within downtown St. Albert. These heights are written into Section 9 of the DCMU District, and depicted within Schedule F of the Land Use Bylaw. The applicant is requesting that a similar exception be written into the DCMU District, and that a second map be added to Schedule F to both allow for increased heights, but then restrict the locations of those increased heights.

The applicant has supplied a Height Schedule, which is included in the amending bylaw 13/2020 as Map 2 to Schedule F. The heights are proposed in relation to the developer's targeted number of storeys, as listed above. However, Administration does not concur with the metre/storey height assumptions used, as the metre/storey vary from Schedule F Grandin Heights. Administration has discussed the discrepancy in assumptions with the applicant, and the applicant has chosen to use the numbers originally provided in the application. It should be noted that if approved, Administration asks that Council approve the associated maximum building heights in metres (not storeys).

The text amendments requested by the applicant also include lowering the minimum commercial to residential floor area ratio from 25% to 5%, and the addition of a clause to enforce a maximum floor plate for the subject site, on floors constructed above 45m in grade elevation. A clause in Section 10 is proposed within the application to create a minimum distance between apartment buildings over 45m in height.

Other Considerations:

[IMPORTANT NOTE: The details of the “other considerations” discussed below are NOT before Council for decision and would be subject to extensive discussions between the developer and the Planning and Engineering departments if Council passes the amending bylaws. That said, this report provides a significant level of information about these considerations, so that Council will be well informed in making a decision on whether the subject site is suitable for this kind of development -- including the critical element of maximum building heights.]

Since the initial application for bylaw amendments was made, the applicant has provided additional information about servicing of the intended development and geotechnical analysis, at the request of Administration. The technical reports, including the Traffic Impact Assessment and the Servicing Report, do indicate that the proposed 466 units/820 residents could be achieved and serviced, so long as improvements are constructed as proposed.

With respect to traffic considerations, in order to provide an acceptable level of service through the intersections along Bellerose Drive, the following improvements are recommended within the Technical report:

- Add a shared left/through lane on the north approach of the Boudreau Road/Bellerose Drive intersection, and reconfigure signal timings to include split phasing on the north and south approaches to avoid interlocking left turn movements.
- Extend the existing southbound left turn bay at the Boudreau Road/Bellerose Drive intersection to provide additional queuing space.
- Develop a northbound right turn bay to improve existing operations of the northbound right turn movement at the Boudreau Road/Bellerose Drive intersection.

Due to the scale of the proposal, it will be required that the improvements to the intersection of Bellerose Drive and Boudreau Road be prioritized. This would delay other road improvement projects already scheduled for the City.

The cost of these improvements could be cost-shared between the City and the Developer. Cost sharing arrangements are established contractually in a subdivision agreement (which St. Albert has historically referred to as a development agreement) that is a condition of subdivision approval. The applicant has expressed interest in cost sharing the expenses of intersection upgrades, and paying the full cost to install an adaptive traffic signal system on Bellerose Drive adjacent to the subject site. The Transportation Branch of Engineering services has advised that due to the proposed level of traffic utilizing the Boudreau Road/Bellerose Drive intersection, improvements are required to this intersection to maintain acceptable levels of service.

The sanitary water servicing pipe, after the point where the proposed development's and Botanica's discharges converge, requires upgrading in size. This would be the responsibility of the applicant.

The Sun/Shadow Study illustrated the shadows cast by the proposed development concept. Shadows at the annual equinoxes were illustrated to extend north across Bellerose Drive and into the Erin Ridge neighbourhood, while winter solstice shadows extend far into the Oakmont neighbourhood

to the east. This extensive shadow path was a concern for many residents, as detailed below in Stakeholder Engagement.

The applicants provided a Slope Stability study which indicated that, so long as the recommended setback from the top of bank is adhered to, the site is “acceptable for building development”. Other recommendations were made in the report with regards to managing storm water runoff and maintain vegetation along the slope, to ensure the continued stability of the slope. If the proposed amendments are approved, additional studies are required at the development permit stage, to ensure the stability of the ground, slope, and structures.

The proposed development concept is anticipated to bring a positive net financial gain to the City. Unlike other residential developments, the positive net financial gain is immediate and is maintained throughout the FIA time horizon of 20 years. The *Fiscal Impact Assessment Summary Chart* is provided in the attachments.

The phasing of construction has been considered within the proposal. Construction is generally expected to move from east to west across the project site in four (4) phases. Provided in the attachments is an illustration of these stages, and where trades workers would be allowed to park. In the final stages, it is proposed that trades workers park offsite and be bussed in/out from the site. Please see the attached *Construction Phasing and Trades Parking*.

While the technical challenges have largely been addressed by the applicant (subject to detailed design) Administration believes there are aspects of the conceptual design of the proposed site that would not pass muster in respect of accepted best practices of urban planning, particularly related to height and transition. The scale of elevation between the developments in Botanica and Shops at Boudreau (8 storeys and 2 storeys respectively) and the high-rise residential structures (26 storeys), does not provide an adequate transition of scale. Nor does the transition between the seniors-oriented apartments on the eastern portion of the site (max 9 storeys), and the single detached homes of Orchard court have an effective transition in scale. A development pattern more in harmony with the surrounding built scale would be preferable.

STAKEHOLDER COMMUNICATIONS OR ENGAGEMENT

The applicant held two public consultations. The first event was a pre-application public meeting, which was held the evening of September 10, 2019. The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the project concept to the public, and to inform the proponent of the items of the application that might need mitigation to garner public support. During this meeting, the public raised concerns about increases in traffic, concerns about privacy, and a lack of context to the surrounding neighbourhood. The transcript is provided as attachment “*Public Meeting Transcript - September 10, 2019 event*”.

The application for bylaw amendments was received December 2, 2019, which included changes based upon public feedback. As per the standard process, the application was circulated to property owners within a 100 m radius, at minimum, and to any member of the public that attended the September 10 meeting. This circulation period started on December 12, 2019, with a comment period ending on January 10, 2020. The comment period was extended to January 22, 2020 after the City placed the application documents online for public access.

The applicant was directed by City Administration to host a second public meeting to advise the public of what changes had been made as a result of the feedback received in September. The

applicant held the open house meeting on January 29, 2020 and provided the public with the updated information regarding their proposal. There were 234 attendees. The applicants were in attendance and had many of their own consultants and staff available to answer questions on the project. Three members of the Planning Branch attended to observe the public meeting and answer the public's questions about the amendment process. The applicant's synopsis of the event is provided as the attached *Public Meeting Summary - January 29, 2020*.

From December 12, 2019 to January 22, 2020, City administration received 123 responses from the public. Of the responses received by administration, the most prevalent comments are listed below. The percentages provided are the calculation of the number of responses received which included each of the identified concerns. Many of the responses received from the public contained multiple concerns:

The proposed concept will exacerbate traffic and congestion issues	73.2%
The size and scale of the development proposal is too large for the area	44.7%
The development will cast excessive shadows on surrounding properties	25.2%
The proposed concept will retract from the "small town feel"	25.2%
The development will have environmental effects of the river and banks	22.8%
Cost of living and property values will be negatively affected	20.3%
Construction, and tradesmen parking will be a nuisance	17.9%
The proposed concept would remove views of the river for residents	15.4%
Safety concerns; access for emergency vehicles and pedestrian safety	11.4%

Of the letters received prior to the open house, 13% were in support of the proposed development.

Based on the public comments, the concern is that increased traffic will add to existing congestion at the intersection of Boudreau Road and Bellerose Drive. Some of the comments indicated that heights either similar to the existing Botanica development (which is 9 storeys), or in the ranges of 8, 10, and 15 storeys, would be preferable to the proposed 26 storey towers. Others would prefer to see no increase in height, or even no development at all.

The responses received from the public are provided as an attachment to this report. These responses, with personal information removed, such as names and addresses, are found in *Public Correspondence*.

From external agencies, responses were received from both Alberta Health Services and St. Albert Public Schools. Alberta Health Services were positive about the condensed nature of the proposal, and how it could contribute to a healthy community. St. Albert Public Schools had some concerns on how the increased traffic may affect the efficiency of school bus transportation. These letters are included in the *Public Correspondence* attachment.

IMPLICATIONS OF RECOMMENDATION(S)

Administration is recommending at this time that all three bylaws to amend the LUB and ASP, be given first reading and scheduled for public hearing, simply to comply with the City's obligation to allow the developer to propose changes to the land use bylaw and area structure plan that affect the proposed development.

Administration is taking a neutral position on the merits of the proposed amendments.

Financial:

There are no financial implications to the proposed bylaw amendments as such. If the amendments are passed, and a development permit is approved for a development generally in the nature of the one described in the concept plan, then the following financial considerations would come into play:

The City may enter into a cost-sharing agreement for the traffic improvements required at the Boudreau Drive/Bellerose Drive and the Bellerose Drive/Evergreen Drive intersections.

"The high-density development is estimated to provide the City of St. Albert \$1.94 million annually, prior to consideration of any capital re-investment costs" (Technical Report).

Comments from Economic Development:

Economic Development modelling based on the Alberta Economic Multipliers produced by Alberta Treasury Board has shown this project will have a significant local impact on our economy. Using economic multipliers captures the impacts of changes to the economy on labour income, output, employment, and GDP given specific inputs such as investment or gross sales. In this case, based on the proponents \$350 Million Dollar capital investment, the local projections are seen below, with the following caveats,

- This model represents a general estimate of direct and indirect economic impact and not absolute values.
- This model reflects only construction and does not attempt to estimate the economic impact of businesses or residents subsequent to construction completion
- This model reflects the economic impact in the Edmonton CMA and surrounding regions, not just St. Albert, as workers, goods, and materials will come from across the region.
- The employment impact represents an estimated number of direct and indirect jobs required to support the economic activity, not the number of jobs created by the activity.
- Construction investment was segmented into phases by calculating the total number of floors built in each phase divided by the total number of floors constructed, allowing modeling of the phased approach used by the builder.
- This models uses 2013 multipliers, the most recent available from the province. The inflation/deflation factor used is 0.1004

Location	Industry	Year	Investment in	Investment in	GDP Impact	Labour Income	Employment	GDP Impact	Labour
			Current \$	2013 \$	2013\$	Impact 2013\$	Impact	2020 \$	Income Impact
Phase 1	BS23B00	2020-23	51,333,333	46,179,467	29,231,602	17,224,941	222	32,166,455	18,954,325
Phase 2	BS23B00	2021-23	32,666,667	29,386,933	18,601,929	10,961,326	141	20,469,562	12,061,843
Phase 3	BS23B00	2023-25	121,333,333	109,151,467	69,092,878	40,713,497	524	76,029,803	44,801,132
Phase 4	BS23B00	2025-27	121,333,333	109,151,467	69,092,878	40,713,497	524	76,029,803	44,801,132
Phase 5	BS23B00	2026-27	23,333,333	20,990,667	13,287,092	7,829,519	101	14,621,116	8,615,602
Total			350,000,000	314,860,000	199,306,380	117,442,780		219,316,741	129,234,035

Legal / Risk:

Legal advice is provided on this matter on a confidential solicitor/client basis.

Program or Service:

Based upon the findings of the TIA, should the amendments go forward, improvements to the intersection at Bellerose Drive and Boudreau Road will require prioritization over existing identified projects.

Organizational:

None at this time.

ALTERNATIVES AND IMPLICATIONS CONSIDERED

There are no alternatives to giving these bylaws first reading, since a landowner has a right to have a council consider their proposals for amendments to a land use bylaw or areas structure plan, affecting their property. First reading is simply a mechanism to move the matter to the stage where such consideration occurs: public hearing and second reading.

Report Date: May 19, 2020

Author: Suzanne Bennett

Department: Planning & Development

Deputy Chief Administrative Officer: Kerry Hilts

Chief Administrative Officer: Kevin Scoble