

McKernan-Belgravia Station Area Redevelopment Plan Collaborative Implementation On-line Survey Results Summary

An online survey was conducted to test support for ideas suggested by stakeholders in workshop 2 and collect additional feedback regarding collaborative implementation of the *McKernan-Belgravia Station Area Redevelopment Plan*. The survey was completed by 115 people of which 63 percent live in Belgravia, 25 percent in McKernan and 11 percent outside the area. A summary of the results is provided below.

Potential Implementation Action	Support (N=115)	
1	Develop a communications plan in consultation with the community to talk about the future of McKernan-Belgravia and what changes can be expected.	89
2	Initiate a community traffic management plan to reduce non-resident traffic and congestion while improving other travel modes (walking, cycling)	78
3	Measure planning success by quality, not quantity of development approvals.	75
4	Designate a community planning coordinator to assist with resident knowledge, capacity and involvement in local development	74
5	Increased collaboration between City departments when planning the future of neighbourhoods.	72
6	Appoint a City facilitator to provide a single point of contact and liaison between community and developers	69
7	Mass announcement and information when a development application is made including direct contact number for more information	68
8	Make pre-application meetings between the community and developers mandatory.	68
9	Provide a single point of contact at the City	65
10	Close the loop on resident concerns about rezoning applications and send a letter back to residents indicating what issues are and how they will be addressed	62
11	Review of all major development by an independent committee	61
12	Implement a community traffic management plan process and complete streets concurrently with ARP preparation and consultation.	58
13	Collaboratively design ARP implementation plan with community, developers, and City focusing on guidelines, standards and an evaluation strategy.	58
14	Use a full range of media to communicate the ARP to more people, more effectively (e.g. digital media, video, audio (podcasts), visualizations)	54
15	Create a single, direct point of contact at the City for neighbourhood information	54
16	Place McKernan-Belgravia Station ARP "on hold" until an "implementation" plan is figured out.	44
17	Improve bicycle infrastructure and install a cycle track on 76th Avenue.	44
18	Council should tie rezonings to a specific development plan / project	42
19	Form an Edmonton Design Committee (EDC)-type of entity for infill redevelopment (but smaller, 'lighter').	42
20	Existing road pattern should be maintained.	38
21	Test-pilot performance based zoning which uses regulation to control the effect or impact of a use (or activity) rather than limiting the use itself.	37
22	Streamline infill development by integrating City departments and processes (e.g. combining subdivision, development, and building permit)	32
23	Provide examples of water and drainage servicing showing how utilities could be provided in different development situations	31
24	Encourage residents who own their property to develop it collectively on a block by block basis.	30
25	Integrate aspects of the ARP into the City's zoning bylaw	29
26	Integrate guest speakers into a land development education program that is more localized.	27
27	Use Facebook / popular social media to provide ongoing or new information about development in the area	27
28	Provide education and information to assist local stakeholders in forming their own Community Development Cooperative(s)/Corporation.	27
29	Consider a way to open 116th street southbound to access Belgravia Road west bound.	27
30	Offer monthly education sessions with a focus on specific neighbourhood examples (e.g. Planning Academy)	24
31	Implement the ARP using form-based code (focused on physical building form) instead of conventional zoning (focused on uses, density, heights, parking)	24
32	City to purchase all properties identified for potential redevelopment on Figure 24 of the ARP for future development on an opportunity basis.	24
33	Rezone some higher density 'coloured' properties on Figure 16 to implement the ARP.	24
34	Rezone all higher density 'coloured' properties on Figure 16 including those within 400m of LRT station to implement the ARP.	23
35	Set a minimum density per land use zone to achieve.	16
36	Create a City land development bureau/office to form a development cooperative/corporation to implement the ARP.	15
37	Protect development opportunity.	14
38	City to expropriate all properties identified for potential redevelopment on Figure 24 of the ARP at 1.5x market price to facilitate land assembly.	13
39	Limit garage singles within 400m radius of LRT.	12
40	Support investment through crowdsourcing method(s) to finance local redevelopment projects.	11
41	Create a legal charter for the City of Edmonton to allow for more flexibility in planning process(es) to address sporadic land assembly.	7

The online survey also provided an opportunity for stakeholders to provide additional open feedback. Responses collected are summarized here and have been organized according to common themes to help inform future implementation of the plan.

Theme 1 – City-Community Contact

Respondents strongly supported the idea of a designated community planning coordinator and single point of contact at the City to assist resident capacity building and involvement in local development, provide information and liaise between community and developers. Formation of a smaller, 'lighter' Edmonton Design Committee to review infill proposals and find ways of streamlining infill development through greater City department integration received lesser support. A few respondents suggested that the City should take a greater role in assembling lands to implement the plan in order to provide greater certainty of change, and more uniform redevelopment while a couple people rejected the notion of expropriation or remained critical of any City efforts to try and implement the plan.

Theme 2 – Public Engagement and Communication

Development of a communications plan in consultation with the community to talk about the future of McKernan-Belgravia and what changes can be expected received the highest level of support among respondents. Positive support was also provided for increased collaboration between City departments when planning the future of neighbourhoods, mass announcements of development applications including contact information, pre-application meetings with the community, 'closing the loop' on rezoning application concerns through additional communication, collaborative implementation of the Area Redevelopment Plan and use of a wide range of media to communicate the Area Redevelopment Plan. A few survey respondents commented on the need for more public engagement and community control concerning development projects. This included engaging with communities earlier in the development process, providing meaningful opportunities to discuss projects that is constructive and provides closure (i.e. an end-point), ability to learn more about the City's planning processes and greater community control over rezoning and development decisions.

Theme 3 – Transportation

Survey responses firmly supported a community traffic management plan to reduce non-resident traffic and congestion while improving other travel modes (walking, cycling) and when a neighbourhood prepares an Area Redevelopment Plan. Improvements to bicycle infrastructure and finding ways to maintain the existing road pattern received support as well. A number of respondents commented on the need to address transportation issues related to implementing the plan. Keeping 116 Street closed and exploring ways to further reduce shortcutting and congestion during rush hour were strongly supported. Finding ways of improving traffic signal operations (e.g. 76 Avenue and 114 Street; University Avenue and 114 Street), slowing traffic speeds through the neighbourhood, and supporting active transportation through bike lanes was also suggested.

Theme 4 – Development

One of the top supported ideas from the survey and feedback provided was measuring planning success by quality, not quantity of development approvals with many also supporting major development reviewed by an independent committee. Some support

was expressed for placing the Area Redevelopment Plan on 'hold' until an implementation plan was further figured out. In general, actions in support of physical land development received limited or lowest support in the survey (e.g. rezoning higher density areas, City purchase of lands for future development, protection of development opportunity). Additional comments received focused on what needed to improve regarding infill (e.g. better enforcement of regulations, sensitive design, more housing mix, strengthen commercial around LRT) with a focus on quality design and ability to complete projects faster. In addition, a number of people indicated that the unintended impacts of infill development were of concern such as increased traffic and congestion, demand on infrastructure, lack of affordable housing units, lower quality design and impact on surrounding property values including neighbourhood character. Other comments included concern over development variances, construction-related damage to neighbouring properties, finding new ways to hold builders accountable during the design and construction process.

Theme 5 – Long Term Change

Comments by a few respondents indicated a strong preference for the preservation of single-family development on larger lots, rejection of medium density housing around LRT or introduction of multifamily housing along 71 Avenue that would otherwise erode the character of the neighbourhood. Contrasting these comments, a similar number of respondents indicated support for a mix of housing near the University of Alberta, LRT, and existing amenities and services whereby affordability, active transportation and transit ridership could be increased.