



Correspondence: May 18, 2021 CCPH Item 3.8 ANDERSON

1 message

OCM OCC Internet Mail [REDACTED]Mon, May 17, 2021 at 11:51 AM
[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **ERIC AND MARILYN ANDERSON** [REDACTED]

Date: Mon, May 17, 2021 at 11:03 AM

Subject: Re:Charter Proposed Bylaw 19697
[REDACTED]

To whom it may concern,

We would like to add our voices to the ongoing discussion regarding proposed zoning for Cavanagh in Edmonton.

It is our hope, as new residents to this beautiful new area in Edmonton, that there be a balance of residential and commercial development. We are of the opinion that more commercial retail development is needed in this area so residents don't have to drive so far to the Heritage Valley Commons area to shop. There are currently no grocery or other food services in the area. Please consider a balance of residential and commercial development before approving any further residential zoning approval.

We certainly enjoy the green space that Cavanagh affords citizens. This is one of the reasons we decided to move to this area. Thanks to the City of Edmonton for providing much green space for wildlife and recreation.

Thanks for the opportunity to provide some public feedback for consideration during this discussion.

Yours truly,

Eric and Marilyn Anderson.



Correspondence: May 18, 2021 CCPH Item 3.22 BETTERIDGE/DOW

1 message

OCM OCC Internet Mail [REDACTED]Mon, May 17, 2021 at 10:38 AM
[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **William and Kathleen Betteridge** [REDACTED]

Date: Mon, May 17, 2021 at 12:25 AM

Subject: proposed Charter Bylaw 19682
[REDACTED]

As residents of 123rd street and 108th avenue and 109th avenue we do not support this proposed change to the Zoning Bylaw for the properties at 10911-124 street and 12320-109 Street NW for the following reasons:

SIZE:

The proposed project will cover almost the entire site. It will extend to the property line with no green space or allowance for landscaping.

There are no other building of this size in the area. The 124th Street Grand, on the site of the former Colonel Mustards is three stories and has a generous parking area in the back. St. Lawrence Court at the north end of the block from this site is five stories with a set back from the street with lawns and trees surrounding the project.

A project of this height will cast shadows and block sunlight for neighbours east south and north of the project. Balconies, patios and large windows on the east side of the building will invade the privacy of those living eastnorth and south of the site.

This rezoning would double the number of suites from the thirty five units currently approved.

There is concern about the Floor Area Ration.

Underground parking accessible from the east side of the building, potentially for seventy suites, means increased traffic on to 109th avenue and 123rd street as vehicles gain access to the back alley.

COMMERCIAL AREA ON 109TH AVENUE:

Having a commercial area on the avenue will also increase traffic flow into the residential area. It will also add to the parking issues that residents already contend with.

PARKING;

With the increase of businesses moving into the 124th Street area the issue of parking for residents on 123rd street has become a problem. . Employees and patrons of these businesses use 123rd street and 108th and 109th avenues as their unpaid parking lot between the hours of 7 am and 5 pm. The recent addition of handicapped and two hour parking limit stalls on the south side of 109th avenue only added to our parking problems. Parking for the 124th street businesses

has migrated further east on 109th Avenue. Extending this parking restriction to the north side of the 109th avenue would only move parking further east and west on the avenue.

The problems with parking existed when the DC2.904 Site Specific Development Control Provision was granted in October 2015. Area residents have been told repeatedly since that time parking studies are being conducted to resolve the issues and we are still waiting for results.

SEWER INFRASTRUCTURE:

We are concerned that another major project will have serious implications for what seems to be an overworked old combined sewer system.

On most days the smell of sewers is overwhelming. With the increase pressure placed on the system by new and more housing units and many other multiuse projects planned (the site of the former Grinder Restaurant, several supportive housing projects) the system is going to be further taxed. The situation a group of residents faced the day we met with the developer in October 2020 is only a small example of what residents face on a daily basis regardless of the season.

WHAT WE WOULD LIKE TO SEE HAPPEN WITH THESE PROPERTIES:

We would like to see a four story building that maintains the heritage flavour of this community.

We would like to have any commercial development confined to 124th Street.

We would like to have balconies, large windows and patios on the west side of the building facing 124th Street.

We would like a resolution to the sewer smell problem, not an addition to it.

We would like parking restrictions that would resolve our neighbourhood being used as a parking facility during peak business hours for example two hour parking for those who are not residents.

Thank you for the opportunity to present our views.

William and Kathleen Betteridge

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

James Dow MAAA(HON), MRAIC, RCA

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10



Correspondence: May 18, 2021 CCPH Item 3.23 MEADOWS

1 message

OCM OCC Internet Mail [REDACTED]

Mon, May 17, 2021 at 10:39 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Scott Meadows** [REDACTED]

Date: Mon, May 17, 2021 at 9:31 AM

Subject: May 18 Public Hearing - Agenda Item 3.23 - Charter Bylaw 19709 - To allow for a mid-rise building, Windsor Park
[REDACTED]

Dear Mayor Iveson and City Councillors

This email is to update you about the Windsor Park Community League's approach to the Windsor Terrace rezoning and the league's interactions with Pagnotta, the new owner of the Windsor Terrace site, and with the City planner. We have provided information to community residents about the rezoning proposal and encouraged their participation in engagement opportunities but have not taken a position.

We met with Pagnotta three times. The first was in person early in the process when they were in the process of acquiring ownership of the site and thinking about making some changes to the footprint of the building. We met online with them when the draft rezoning proposal was circulated last fall. We let them know we were pleased they had retained the ground-level commercial space and acknowledged the improvement in site design and footprint that reduces impact on nearby residential developments. We expressed concern about height and density and indicated interest in:

- finding some uses other than parking for some of space in the underground parkade area to reduce the amount of parking so the height and density could be reduced
- family-sized 3-bedroom units to accommodate families with children since the development is near an elementary school
- information on mix of units that wasn't included in the draft.

We provided similar input in a discussion with the City planner assigned to the file. Hence the use of the community amenity contribution toward providing a minimum of three family-oriented 3-bedroom units and the addition of a couple of small scale uses in the parkade in the revised draft that was prepared for online public engagement. The slope of the parkade ramps prevents incorporating a large underground use such as a gym or retail.

We participated in the public engagement process and met with Pagnotta again when it concluded. Our main concerns were

- the 25% maximum of studio units, which we thought provided too much student housing, which is not in short supply in the area (we suggested 10%),
- insufficient number of 3-bedroom units for families with children (we suggested a minimum of 6 instead of 3),
- the large number of units (160) and
- the height increase to 40 metres from 30 metres.

We're pleased that the final proposal addressed three of our four concerns, notably significantly reducing the maximum percentage of studio units to 10%. The height was reduced to 34 metres and the maximum number of units to 140. No change was made in the minimum number of 3-bedroom units.

In our March meeting with Pagnotta, they indicated discussions had taken place with the owner of three contiguous properties on 118 St north of the Windsor Terrace site that are currently zoned RF1. The league also had a preliminary

discussion with the new owner of those properties last year and learned they were interested in purchasing the Windsor Terrace site for the purpose of developing a large residential project without any commercial space.

The league prefers two separate developments. We're glad Pagnotta did not sell and is proceeding with Windsor Terrace rezoning that includes commercial space at ground level.

We expect the rezoning of the three RF1 properties to commence in a couple of years. In anticipation, we want to go on record that we'd prefer a rowhouse or stacked rowhouse development. Knowing the owners have a 6-storey development in mind, at the very least we'd want to see:

- the impact on adjacent single-family houses minimized, especially the abutting neighbour to the north
- provision of 2-storey townhouse-style units at ground level, and
- a substantial percentage of 3+ bedroom units included in the development since the site is directly across a residential street from an elementary school. Currently there are two apartment buildings in Windsor Park, The Bentley and an 8-unit building under construction. Neither has any 3-bedroom units. Windsor Terrace is only required to provide three such units.

Since the league hasn't taken a position on the Windsor Terrace rezoning, we won't be signing up to speak for or against the rezoning at the public hearing. Instead, we're providing this email so you are aware of our engagement with the residents in our community, the developer and the City planner.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide this input.

--

Scott Meadows
WPCL President



Correspondence: May 18, 2021 CCPH Item 3.23 PORTEOUS

1 message

OCM OCC Internet Mail [REDACTED]

Mon, May 17, 2021 at 10:33 AM

To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Ken Porteous** [REDACTED]

Date: Sun, May 16, 2021 at 3:05 PM

Subject: Input Re - May 18 City Council Public Hearing: Charter Bylaw 19709 Windsor Park; Windsor Terrace Development

To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

City Administration is recommending approval of this Bylaw which will allow the developer to increase the height of this development to 11 stories. A previous development approved for this site was 8 to 9 stories. While the new plan checks all the boxes within the City's zoning regulations to increase the height and this is the basis for the City Administration's recommendation, City Council should not just automatically pass Charter Bylaw 19709 without considering the following.

First, while the Windsor Park community accepts that there will be a multi story apartment/condo building constructed on this site the proposed building is still too high for the area. Two previously approved applications for developments on this site were for 8 to 9 stories. Input collected during the City's public engagement process on the proposed building, which was 13 storeys, shows the the majority of Windsor Park residents were opposed to the increase in height. It is unfortunate that the original developer ran into financial difficulties but this should not give the new developer an approval to increase the height. The City Administration will argue that they reached a compromise with the new developer by only approving an 11 storey building which represents a "moderate increase in height" according to the City Administration Report which supports of the proposed bylaw. A 20 to 25% increase is hardly moderate!

The biggest concern which is not addressed or at least addressed adequately relates to parking, first during construction and then after the building is complete. This site is just south of Windsor Park School which is on the opposite side of 118 St. At the beginning and end of the school day parents are dropping off or picking up their children and their cars are parked on both sides of 118 St and 119 St. Construction workers for in fill houses in Windsor Park often park on both sides of the street even though parking is restricted to residents and is only permitted on one side of the street. If construction workers on this mid rise apartment project do the same, this is going to be a major safety concern for students attending the school. So where are these construction workers supposed to park

without causing major congestion and endangering students? Is there a plan to deal with this?

The proposed building has apartments with commercial space on the ground level. The current building design has three levels of underground parking. It was my understanding that the two previous iterations of this building included four levels of underground parking. It appears that the existing excavation hit the water table before reaching the required depth for the four levels of parking. There does not appear to be any analysis of the adequacy of parking for apartment tenants, their visitors and the customers of businesses in the commercial space. How much parking is provided and where for vehicles in each of these categories.

Traffic in this area is already heavy due to the proximity of the site to the University and the University Hospital. The increase in traffic along 118 St attributable to this building adds to the existing risk for students at the school. Permanent closure of the west end of alley north of the building would help manage the traffic volume on 118 St.

City Council should ask for answers to the issues raised and not just rubber stamp the recommendation of City Administration.

Sincerely

K C Porteous, PEng

Sent from my iPad



Correspondence: May 18, 2021 CCPH Item 3.23 DEWAAL

1 message

OCM Council Correspondence <ocmcouncilcorrespondence@edmonton.ca>

Tue, May 11, 2021 at 9:21 AM

To: [REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [REDACTED]

Subject: Contact Council - City of Edmonton - Windsor Park Terrace Rezoning

To: <crscouncilcorrespondence@edmonton.ca>

The following information has been submitted via the Contact Council web form.
This message is in regards to a **Public Hearing, Council or Committee meeting**.

Submission DetailConfirmation Number: **CTCC034146**Submission Date: **May 10, 2021 - 15:34:09**IP Address: **10.163.2.53****Contact Information**First Name: **Sharan**Last Name: **de Waal**Email Address: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Street Address: [REDACTED]

Street Address (cont.):

City: **Edmonton**Province: **Alberta**Country: **Canada**

Postal Code: [REDACTED]

Agenda InformationMeeting Type: **City Council Public Hearings**Meeting Date: **May 18, 2021**

Agenda Item Title:

Agenda Item Number:

Message

Subject: **Windsor Park Terrace Rezoning**

**Hello Councillors and Mayor, Thank you in advance for taking the time to read
Comments: my attached thoughts on the Windsor Park Terrace Rezoning. Please feel free to
reach out if you have any questions. Sincerely, Sharan de Waal**



City_Council_Letter-_Windsor_T.pdf

156K

May 7, 2021

Re: Rezoning of Windsor Terrace, Charter Bylaw 19709

Dear City Councilors and Mayor,

Thank you for taking the time to read my thoughts about the proposed change to the zoning for Windsor Park Terrace (Public Hearing Scheduled for May 18, 2021). This zoning has been reviewed 2 times previously and is now up for a third review due to the failure of the previous developer to complete the project. On behalf of Windsor Park Community League Members, we are asking that the City encourage the developer to provide more family units and to maintain the height of the building to the currently allowed 29.9m.

The proposed changes are identified to be in keeping with the following design principle of the city:

1. Increased Density close to major employers

City administration does not appear to be considering the multiple other design guidelines and reports that have been created and reviewed with Citizens, I will specifically be referencing the following documents:

1. Transit Oriented Development Guidelines
2. What we Heard: Infill Stakeholder Engagement Results
3. The Way We Move, The Way We Green, The Way We Live

When the initial documents about the Way We Move, Green, and Live came out I was very excited to be a part of a city that was moving forward and thinking ahead. As the years have passed since these documents came out, I am disappointed in the lack of uptake and sometimes the disregard of the principles highlighted in these documents. These guidelines promised to “improve livability, shift transportation modes, sustain the environment, and transform urban form.”

Our mature neighborhood has been a welcoming neighborhood for lot subdivision, garage suites, and 4 storey apartment buildings. We are located next to a new project on University Avenue which has removed two city blocks of single detached homes to create a 6 storey apartment style housing. Our neighborhood supports increasing density and have gone through multiple rounds of good faith discussions regarding this proposed development. Please note that originally this was approved to be 6 storey building, after multiple years of no development it was then approved to be an 8 storey building, now we are hearing that yet again a request to increase the height and density of this building. It is disappointing and disheartening to feel unsupported by our City Council.

Following the failure of the previous developer to complete the project, our neighborhood has been faced with the following for the past three years: a large hole with pooled water, uneven sidewalks, and temporary fencing acting as a safety barrier. There seems to have been no city intervention to remedy these concerns.

I would like to encourage City Council and City Administration to consider “The Transit Oriented Design guidelines” prior to approving this new request. These guidelines indicated that in our neighborhood of predominantly single-family homes that the following design guidelines should be used (please note the bolded points are directly taken from the “Transit Oriented Design Guidelines Document” from the City of Edmonton Website):

May 7, 2021

Re: Rezoning of Windsor Terrace, Charter Bylaw 19709

- **Infill should be 2 storey townhomes and duplex housing, except on arterials, collector roads and large sites where 4 storey apartment housing is appropriate.**
 - This project does not meet these criteria, the site is only 2043 square meters (0.2 hectares) and the developer is requesting up to 11 storeys, this would make this building taller than many of the UofA buildings.
- **Improved pedestrian and bike access**
 - This project does not meet these criteria as setbacks are proposed to be 0m at some points, which will limit accessibility to bikes and pedestrians.
 - The University has some buildings at the proposed height of this development but have significant setbacks and easy access for both bikes and pedestrians.
- **Apartment developments should incorporate family suitable housing, particularly at the ground level where there is a private exterior unit entry and opportunity for a private at-grade amenity area.**
 - Only three family-oriented units are being incorporated, this will limit the desirability and interest of families for these units.
 - Ground level units for seniors should also be considered.
 - The previous developer had these type of units incorporated into their design, this has now been eliminated and the creation of additional studio apartments have been added in.
- **Parking requirements in LRT station areas and transit centres should be lower than outside of these areas. The separation of parking for residential land use and shared parking for non-residential land uses should be considered also in these areas.**
 - Sadly, this proposed development stated that the driver for creating a taller and larger building was the fact that a large underground parkade had already been created with more available parking spots.
 - Since the parking lot is so large, we are unsure of why an outdoor parking area is also being proposed.
- **Development of 4 storeys in height: On sites abutting a single detached, semidetached, or row housing zone, the height of the abutting facade should be stepped down to the maximum height permitted in the adjacent zone so that there is a transitioning of height between the two developments to be more compatible in mass and scale.**
 - The neighboring homes to this property (within 5-10 m) are single storey bungalows, this principle has been completely disregarded in the planning of this building.
 - Previous developers put a lot of effort into ensuring that the scale of the building would be decreased with the use of setbacks.
 - Currently the use of setbacks has been decreased for this building.
- **Development over 6 storeys in height should only be located where a Station Area Plan has been prepared to accommodate transitions or on a large site of 1 or more hectares so that appropriate transitions can be accommodated on site**
 - Again, this is not being met.
 - Size of lot: only 2043 square meters (0.2 hectares), quite below the required 1 hectare of land.

May 7, 2021

Re: Rezoning of Windsor Terrace, Charter Bylaw 19709

Lastly, in the report: "What we Heard: Infill Stakeholder Engagement Results" Edmontonians and City Administration identified a "Missing Middle" when it comes to infill housing. These are described as a range of housing types that are missing between low scale and high scale infill.

The missing middle includes the following housing forms:

- Row Homes Stacked Row Homes
- Fourplexes
- Courtyard Housing Apartment
- Courtyard Housing Low-rise Apartments (up to four storeys)
- Mid-rise Apartments (less than 6 storeys)

This feedback was gathered from people throughout the city. The previous unsuccessful development did incorporate row homes into the design of the building. This proposed development does not address the "missing middle" and does nothing to address the needs and wants of the Citizens of Edmonton.

Please note that this project is directly opposite to our community school which will also impact the safety of our kids walking to and from school, increases the number of cars coming in and out of the school zone, and will impact visibility for cars.

The decision that is made here will be precedent setting and will impact other neighborhoods (e.g., McKernan, Belgravia, Park Allen, etc.) in the future. I am asking the council to reject a further increase in the height of this building, or at the very least consider some of these other design principles prior to changing the current DC2 criteria for this site.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to our concerns,

Sharan de Waal

Windsor Park Community League Member



CRS Council Correspondence <ocmcouncilcorrespondence@edmonton.ca>

Correspondence: May 18, 2021 CCPH Item 3.23 PETA

1 message

OCM OCC Internet Mail <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Wed, May 5, 2021 at 2:55 PM

To: [REDACTED] >

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Linda & Ron Peta** [REDACTED]

Date: Fri, Apr 30, 2021 at 8:15 PM

Subject: Written Comments for Public Hearing Lot 9A , Block24, Plan 9221629

To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Hello,

Please see attached form in regards to [Lot 9A](#), [Block24](#), [Plan 9221629](#) public hearing.

Regards,

Ron and Ven Peta

**Lot 9A , Block24, Plan 9221629.pdf**

60K

Ron and Ven Peta
[REDACTED]

City of Edmonton
Development Services
10111-104 Ave NW
Edmonton, Alberta, T5J 0J4

Dear City of Edmonton Development Services,

This letter is in regards to notice of the proposed land changes for **Lot 9A , Block24, Plan 9221629**

We are in **opposition** to the zoning bylaw change. The 11 story building with a parkade access from the east - west lane is an **extreme danger** to the very young students that attend Windsor Park Elementary. It is easy to see that an **increase in traffic** from this proposed **high density** building with such close proximity to an elementary school is an accident just waiting to happen. We think the proposed development requires a much further set back from the property lines due to safety and privacy concerns. An 11 story building is too large of a project with too close of proximity to the other smaller residential buildings that surround the proposed development. It also sets a precedent to change the character of the entire neighborhood. We think this project would be better suited on the east side of the campus where there are already multiple floor structures and no elementary school nearby.

Sincerely,

Ron and Ven Peta
[REDACTED]
