

# RS ZONE INFORMATION MEETING WITH COUNCILLOR JANZ & CITY PLANNING STAFF

Jan. 28, 2025

**Hosted by Aspen Gardens & Royal Gardens Community Leagues**

---

Below are comments & questions written by meeting participants on flip sheets at the event. They have been consolidated & categorized into several subject areas, including Meeting Format, To Councillor Janz, To City Staff, Consultation, Density, Neighbourhood Character, Parking, Traffic & Access/Egress, Trees & Green Space, Infrastructure Capacity, Who Pays For Growth, Property Values, & Right of Appeal.

## **MEETING FORMAT**

- Why are we worried to have a proper town hall meeting?
- Absolute insult to have more security here than at LRT stations. It shows great disrespect by Council. Shameful?
- Really disappointed (meeting) format was changed from a town hall to an open house.
- Why no town hall?
- Town halls, policed by residents, are required.
- Terrible to support understanding, discussion, debate, hearing concerns.
- All about benefits, nothing in the (display) boards / narrative about the costs, impacts, concerns.
- Would be more beneficial for a talk from the Councillor to address concerns of area, avoiding \_\_\_\_\_ to speak to them.

## **TO COUNCILLOR JANZ**

- Why don't you listen to & support your constituents?
- So thankful 2025 is an election year.
- Would like to have a Q & A as opposed to a "hijacked" Councillor Janz. driven 'open house' – shameful!
- Have the guts to speak with people.
- Lack of leadership from Mr. Janz to not take open-forum format.
- Councillor should have spoken to the entire group to ensure all could hear the same message / speaking points.
- Council's condescension & arrogance.

## **TO CITY PLANNING STAFF**

- Thanks for the information.
- Why are plans being prepared for residential densification & diversification infill around LRT stations, but no planning is done for infill densification in RS Zone neighbourhoods?
- This event was not beneficial. The people (City staff) at the tables (display boards) were unable to answer the questions and admitted that we would have to speak to Michael Janz, who was too busy.

## **CONSULTATION**

- Inadequate consultation (during the Zoning Bylaw preparation).
- Most of consultation was done during COVID when everyone stayed home.
- City needs to listen!
- No genuine interest in feedback.
- Insufficient info provided for specific neighbourhood lots.
- No public engagement
- How can residents provide feedback during the upcoming Zoning Bylaw review process?
- Plan together with the community – not the developers.

## DENSITY

- Density helps prevent Edmonton from becoming Toronto.
- Proposed development doesn't seem to follow City's zoning laws, i.e. 45% maximum site coverage.
- Blanket zoning is not "planning."
- Waste management already an issue in some back lanes. Adding a minimum of 4 black & 4 green bins plus recycle bags to 1 lot is too much to accommodate.
- 8 units require 16 waste bins, plus 8 blue bags, each spread 3 ft apart (approx. 100 ft of lane, driveway or vacant curb space needed) for trash pick up.
- 8 households on one single property is too many! Two times too many.
- From single family (detached) to potential 8 or 9 units is going WAY TOO FAR. Infills (replacing 1 home with another) or backyard suites are reasonable – this (8 or 9 units per lot) is NOT reasonable.
- There are many empty buildings & lots in the downtown. Why densify our community?
- City is pushing infill down our throats. Beautiful Royal Gardens is going to become a high density stressful place to live.
- Densification of 8 or 9 units per lot is not infill, but unplanned major redevelopment of entire neighbourhoods.
- This development is important for hitting \_\_\_ \_\_\_ of infill targets by 2050. It's a great opportunity to move Edmonton towards a more sustainable(?) way of living(?). Progress is uncomfortable sometimes, but it's important, nevertheless. We are in full support of these developments. Keep up the great work. GAPSS (Geography & Planning Student Society) U. of A.
- The proposed projects fit neither affordable housing or density proposals.
- The only affordable homes are the existing structures.
- The City is not listening to concerns of community – parking, traffic congestion, (only) 2 entrances to community; and stress on infrastructure, schools, roads, \_\_\_\_\_.

## **NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER**

- Have internal neighbourhood conflicts resulting from these developments been considered? What will the community culture be?
- No benefit for community.
- Total change of community character – developers seem only profit-driven.
- Neighbourhood already has an excess of construction/development.
- Empty lots & huge replacement structures.
- City will destroy mature neighbourhoods with these wide-open zoning policies.
- Do you think neighbourhoods with variable setbacks, heights, housing types will look good? Won't it just look awkward & not uniform?
- Are year-round homeless shelters and safe drug supply / injection centres allowed in the RS Zone? If so, where?
- Is there any RS neighbourhood in Edmonton where a single family detached homes won't be impacted by 8-unit apartments?
- Will families wanting low density neighbourhoods with larger lots now move to St. Albert or Sherwood Park?
- Prefer the Mature Neighbourhood Overlay.
- Listen to the community, rather than imposing the concept the City has drawn up in their imaginary world.
- The proposed projects fit neither affordable housing or density proposals.

## **PARKING**

- Why isn't underground parking required for multifamily (apartments)?
- Adequate (on-site) parking should be mandated – at least 1 stall / unit
- Can't own an EV if you don't have a parking spot (to charge EV)
- Parking issues make it hard for seniors & disabled
- How will the right amount of parking be provided (for apartments when the Bylaw doesn't require any on-site parking)?
- 16 cars having to park on the street is excessive, especially when they must be plugged in (block heaters & EVs).
- Lack of requirement for parking will be a disaster.

- How many people living in new 8 – 9 suite buildings have cars? I suspect most. Unrealistic to expect people to reside in our neighbourhood without a car!
- How is the absence of parking requirements for new developments going to result in the right amount of parking being provided?

### **TRAFFIC & ACCESS / EGRESS**

- Congestion coming in & out of Aspen Gardens, which has only 2 entry points, both located beside schools, is a safety concern.
- How are increased traffic safety risks associated with densification mitigated – especially around schools?
- Moving to fewer cars requires safe transit.
- Walkable city is not feasible in suburbs, especially with bus service cutbacks.

### **TREES & GREEN SPACE**

- Have losses to trees & greenspaces been considered? How will this be remedied?
- Why aren't trees bordering the development mandated to give neighbours some natural privacy?

### **INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY**

- Is there water/sewer/stormwater/roadway/school capacity to increase neighbourhood populations by several hundred percent?
- Is fire flow water capacity available to fight wildfires & additional structural fires in neighbourhoods being densified?

## **WHO PAYS FOR GROWTH**

- Who pays for necessary water/sewer/stormwater upgrades (for infill densification) – infill builders or taxpayers?

## **PROPERTY VALUES**

- How is landowner compensated when their home value depreciates with 3 walls on all sides?
- How are resale values of lots around (the new infill) being affected (by 8 unit apartments)? Where is the data?
- Densification will decrease resale values of existing homes.

## **RIGHT OF APPEAL**

- Zero appeal process (in RS Zone).
- There is no recourse for existing homeowners if they have an issue with a “new build”, as long as it meets the zoning requirements, regardless of its impact on neighbours, e.g., a 3 storey house / apartment would block sunlight to my solar panels & garden. This would impact the value of improvements we’ve made to our house. Sad that approval of such developments couldn’t be revoked.
- Received letter about new house to be built across the street. Two variances are proposed, but why must I pay \$100 to complain (appeal)?
- Why were all the discretionary uses (& a few additional new ones) changed to permitted uses in the new Zoning Bylaw, effectively eliminating the right of neighbours to appeal?