

 **REZONING APPLICATION**  
**CALDER**

**11606 – 129 Avenue NW**

To allow for the preservation and rehabilitation of the Shop-Easy Grocery store as a mixed-use commercial and residential development.



**RECOMMENDATION AND JUSTIFICATION**

City Planning is in SUPPORT of this application because it allows for:

- the preservation, rehabilitation and redevelopment of the historic Shop-Easy Grocery building;
- a balance of housing types that is compatible with the neighbourhood; and
- alignment with the Calder Neighbourhood Development Concept Plan.

## THE APPLICATION

Through Bylaw 18190, the applicant proposes to amend the Zoning Bylaw from (RF2) Low Density Infill Zone to (DC1) Direct Development Control Provision. The intent of the rezoning is to allow for the preservation and rehabilitation of the historic Shop-Easy Grocery store with the opportunity for additional infill housing.

The proposed development includes the following:

- Preservation and rehabilitation of the historic “Shop-Easy Grocery” building;
- Small-scale, neighbourhood-oriented commercial uses, to be located inside the Shop-Easy building;
- A maximum of four apartment units located above and/or within the Shop-Easy building;
- A maximum of three row housing units located on the north side of the site; and
- A maximum height of 8.9 m (the same as the existing RF2 zoning).

## SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA



AERIAL VIEW OF APPLICATION AREA

	EXISTING ZONING	CURRENT USE
<b>SUBJECT SITE</b>	(DC1) Direct Development Control Provision	Vacant
<b>CONTEXT</b>		
North	(RA7) Low Rise Apartment Zone	Vacant/Community Garden

East	(RA7) Low Rise Apartment Zone	City Storage/Utility Services
South	(RA7) Low Rise Apartment Zone	City Storage/Utility Services
West	(RA7) Low Rise Apartment Zone	Vacant/Community Garden



VIEW OF SITE LOOKING NORTH FROM 129 AVENUE NW



VIEW OF SITE LOOKING WEST FROM 116 STREET NW

## PLANNING ANALYSIS

### LAND USE COMPATIBILITY

The proposed development conforms with the Calder Neighbourhood Development Concept Plan which designates the site as “Small Scale Renewal/Rehabilitation” area. The proposed development will maintain the low density residential with a maximum of seven units on the 1,393 m<sup>2</sup> site (equivalent to 50 Dwellings / hectare).

The additional housing proposed above the historic Shop Easy Grocery building and the second residential building on the site are compatible with the size and character of the surrounding low density residential area.

### PLANS IN EFFECT

The subject site is within the Small Scale Renewal / Rehabilitation District of the Calder Neighbourhood Improvement Plan.

The rezoning application conforms with the general intent of the Plan, which emphasizes the rehabilitation of commercial buildings and revitalization of the residential areas.

### HERITAGE

The Shop-Easy Grocery store was designated a Municipal Historic Resource by Bylaw 17776 on November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2016. The regulated portion of the Building includes the south and east historic exterior façades only. Its defining features include a Moderne commercial style which applies to the form, scale, and mass of building. The Shop-Easy Grocery is a one storey commercial structure with clean horizontal lines, projecting canopy, brick and stucco finish, corner counter-point vertical parapet, large display windows and the original Shop-Easy Sign.

## TECHNICAL REVIEW

All comments from affected City Departments and utility agencies have been addressed.

## PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

<b>ADVANCE NOTICE</b> January 6, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Number of recipients: 470</li></ul>
<b>OPEN HOUSE</b> March 13, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Number of participants: 26</li></ul>

Feedback details received through public engagement are included in Appendix 2 – Public Engagement – ‘What We Heard’ Report

## CONCLUSION

City Planning recommends that City Council APPROVE this application.

## APPENDICES

- 1 Application Summary
- 2 Public Engagement – ‘What We Heard’ Report

## APPLICATION SUMMARY

### INFORMATION

Application Type:	Rezoning
Bylaw(s):	18190
Location:	North of 129 Avenue NW and west of 116 Street NW
Address(es):	11606 – 129 Avenue NW
Legal Description(s):	Lots 7 and 8, Block 5, Plan RN41
Site Area:	1392.8 m <sup>2</sup>
Neighbourhood:	Calder
Ward - Councillor:	2 – Bev Esslinger
Notified Community Organization(s):	Calder Community League
Applicant:	City of Edmonton

### PLANNING FRAMEWORK

Current Zone(s) and Overlay(s):	(RF2) Low Density Infill Zone
Proposed Zone(s) and Overlay(s):	(DC1) Direct Development Control Provision
Plan(s) in Effect:	Calder Neighbourhood Improvement Plan
Historic Status:	Designated November 8, 2017

Written By: Ania Schoof  
Approved By: Tim Ford  
Branch: City Planning  
Section: Planning Coordination

## WHAT WE HEARD REPORT

### “Shop-Easy” DC1 Rezoning - Calder (LDA16-0601)

**PROJECT ADDRESS:** 11606 -129 Avenue NW

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The proposed DC1 for the Shop-Easy site will allow for the preservation and rehabilitation of the historic Sho-Easy grocery, with the opportunity for additional infill housing. The proposed development includes the following:

- Preservation and rehabilitation of the historic “Shop-Easy Grocery” building
- Small-scale, neighbourhood-oriented commercial uses, to be located inside the Shop-Easy building
- A maximum of four apartment units located above/within the Shop-Easy building
- A maximum of three row housing units located on the north side of the site
- A maximum height of 8.6 m (the same as the existing RF2 zoning)

TYPE OF ENGAGEMENT	DATE	RESPONSES/ # OF ATTENDEES
Advance Notification	Mailed on January 6, 2017	470 recipients
Open House	March 13, 2017	26 Residents/Landowners Media - CTV news
Other Feedback	Ongoing	1 call

### ABOUT THIS REPORT

The information in this report includes responses to the application notification and feedback gathered before, during and after the March 13th, 2017 open house. This report is shared with everyone who has emailed the file planner (Sarah Ramey) directly, and all attendees who provided their email address during the event on March 13th, 2016. This summary will also be shared with the Applicant and the Ward Councillor. If/when the proposed rezoning advances to Public Hearing this report will be included in the information provided to City Council.

Planning Coordination  
CITY PLANNING



## MEETING FORMAT

The meeting format was an open house where attendees were able to view display boards with project information and ask questions of City Staff (Planning Coordination and Heritage Planning) and the Applicant (Architect and property owner). Participants were invited to share their general feedback on comment forms which featured three questions:

- What did you like about the proposed development?
- What are your concerns with the proposed development?
- Are there any other comments that you want Council to consider when they review the proposed development?

We received a total of 14 forms, and 13 of these forms had additional comments on the application. The comments and questions we received are summarized by main themes below.

---

## FEEDBACK SUMMARY

The most common comments included:

- **Positive Comments:** General support for the preservation of the heritage building/character, art deco design, and overall site improvements. Many people also commented on specific uses that they'd like to see in the space.
  - **Uses:** Positive comments with respect to bakeries and coffees shops. Many people expressed concern about the possibility of group homes, body rubs, and cannabis sales.
  - **Density Concerns:** Concern about the number of units proposed for the site and proposed height.
  - **Site Design Concerns:** Concern with the amount/positioning of landscaping and green space and the location of the waste pick-up spaces.
  - **Parking/Traffic Concerns:** Concern that there was not enough parking on the site, and that traffic congestion in the area would increase. There were also comments about the safety of the 129 Avenue crossing.
- 

## WHAT WE HEARD

### Positive Comments:

- Our greatest concern was parking. This has now been answered. So we are ok with these buildings.

- It keeps a historic feel.
- Maintaining our heritage.
- A nod to the art deco design.
- Density is a plus.
- Huge improvement to the looks of that corner.
- Dilapidated building/eyesore being removed from my neighbourhood.
- About time!
- Get it done!
- The original style of the building is being kept.
- They are keeping with the style of the neighbourhood.
- I like that they are keeping the old building/the character.
- Refreshes the neighbourhood and encourages redevelopment.
- Could be beneficial for children, the school is close.
- Coffee Shop, Child Care, Garden Centre, School/Preschool, RCMP/Police office would be nice.
- Even more height would be ok.
- Pleased with improvement.
- Coffee/bakery/restaurant would be enjoyed by all.
- There would/could be a bakery/coffee shop place to get together with and meet the neighbours.

**Uses:**

- No rentals.
- No group homes.
- Limit certain items in the zone, such as group homes. Take a holistic view of the cumulative amount in the area.
- Do not allow group homes.
- No group homes.
- No group homes!!!
- We are against some of the proposed uses – ex. group homes, there are already an over-proportionate amount in our neighbourhood.
- No pot shops, massage parlours, or second-hand stores. We want to draw in more young families, less riff-raff.
- No group homes – enough in Calder already.
- The building shouldn't be used for criminal activities, like drugs, rape, alcohol, or kidnapping.



- No more cannabis shops/rub shops.
- No group homes please – we have enough in the area.

**Density Concerns:**

- The proposed venture is not what we want. Maybe you should re-think your proposal.
- Too many people living in the area – ie. four apartments located above/within the Shop- Easy building as well as three row housing units.
- High density.
- Concern about the height and impacts on privacy to adjacent properties.
- The addition of apartments is not compatible with the intent of heritage preservation.
- Small business is acceptable with a couple or few units but seven is too many.
- The proposed building is too high, and too dense.
- Too many units on the proposed plan.
- Too many units, they will take up way more parking than is provided. The lot seems small.
- Already too many houses/apartments in area.
- A small bakery might be nice to preserve the historical site but not apartments building or row housing.

**Site Design Concerns:**

- Not enough landscaping.
- Use local materials in the landscaping, as noted in the heritage inventory.
- More landscaping around the parking areas.
- Needs more green space.
- No outdoor area for children to play on this development.
- Want discreet garbage areas.
- Where is the recycling?
- Concern about the proximity of the commercial waste location to the adjacent property.
- Max windows on south side of townhouse complex.
- Tie into adjacent heritage school north of site.
- No chain link fencing.
- Concern about drainage of the Shop Easy building.

**Parking/Traffic Concerns:**

- No parking on the street.
- Parking is taking away from the site – right on the corner. Too many parking stalls – why not push transit within the MNO.

- Too congested for the area.
- Increased parking flow.
- Parking!!!
- Extra volume of traffic on an already busy residential street.
- Crossing 129 Avenue is a safety issue.
- Parking.
- Parking is a concern – 129 Avenue it a very busy road with high speed traffic. Crosswalk with lights will be needed.
- Not sufficient parking.
- Definitely not enough outside parking for the amount of new residents and commercial area.
- Traffic studies need to be completed on 116 Street and 129 Avenue. It's very congested with residents parking on the street in all directions. Heavy traffic flow for a residential street.
- Proper crosswalk on 129 Avenue!!!
- Make sure there is enough parking.

**Other Comments/Concerns:**

- Insurance companies will not provide property insurance because of the rezoning application.
- Garbage/littering with a potential business on site.
- Possible increase in crime with so many extra families in a very small space.
- I want to see the comments from the Open House noted in the report to Council and to have an impact on the design/building, as usually these meetings cannot influence the post zone changes, as they are at the discretion of the DO [Development Officer].
- Coffee/Food at the Open House next time?
- Venue could have been slightly bigger, more spread out. Couldn't see the boards – too many people.
- Refreshments would have been nice.