

**LOC2022-0201**

# **What We Heard Report**

---

February 2, 2023



# What We Did

## SUMMARY

Our engagement and outreach strategy centred around maintaining open communication and transparency. Our outreach activities included a combination of meetings, virtual communications, and an online open house.

## ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

### February 2022

#### Follow Up with Community Association

Given that this is the second land use redesignation application for this site, we followed up with the Community Association (CA) for feedback on our previous submission and to maintain communication.

#### Follow Up with Ward Councillor

We also followed up with the Ward 11 Councillor for additional feedback on the Public Hearing in January 2022 for our previous application.

### June 2022

#### Notification to Neighbours

We reached out to 14 residents within 100 metres of the site via email to notify them of the upcoming land use redesignation application and intended future development.

#### Meeting with Community Association

We met with the CA and five other community residents to share our vision for the site and gather ideas of what is important to the neighbourhood with regards to redeveloping the site.

### July 2022

#### Project Website

We developed a project-specific website to provide information and updates to the public as the project progresses.

[cultivateideas.ca/windsor-park](https://cultivateideas.ca/windsor-park)



Image 1.  
Screenshot of project website

## ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES CONTINUED

### September 2022

#### Online Open House

September 8, 2022  
7pm to 8pm

We hosted an online open house via Zoom to share our vision for the site and gather community feedback on potential development options.

#### Attendees

A total of 24 people registered for the event, including three members of the project team and a representative from the Ward 11 Councillor's office. A member of the CA was also in attendance.

#### Advertisement

The open house was advertised via postcard distributed to 194 residences surrounding the site, and the CA was invited directly via email. A link to register for the open house was posted on the project website for two weeks leading up to the event.




Image 2. Front of advertisement postcard.



Image 3. Back of advertisement postcard.

### January 2023

We met with the Ward 11 Councillor again to share results of our public engagement and gather feedback on the updated project proposal.

### February 2023

We received the City's Detailed Team Review 1 comments in January, which included two letters of opposition and a letter from the CA requesting that we amend the application to exclude secondary suites. We responded to the authors of the opposition letters and to the CA addressing their concerns about density, traffic impacts and safety.

Prior to responding to these letters, we commissioned a transportation review by Bunt & Associates to evaluate the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding road network, parking, and safety concerns resulting from more vehicles. The evaluation indicated that the roads and the lane will continue to operate below City guidelines after the addition of new development. Also, there is significant on-street frontage to accommodate up to 7 on-street stalls in addition to the bylaw required parking provided in the proposed garage. The results of this evaluation were shared with the authors of the opposition letters and with the Community Association. In our response, the developer offered to host one-on-one conversations to address any concerns.

# What We Heard

## ONLINE OPEN HOUSE

September 8, 2022 7:00pm - 8:00pm

### Attendees

A total of 24 people registered for the event, included three members of the application's project team and a representative from the Ward 11 Councillor's office. A member of the Windsor Park Community Association's Development Committee was also in attendance.

### Advertisement

A total of 24 people registered for the event, included three members of the application's project team and a representative from the Ward 11 Councillor's office. A member of the Windsor Park Community Association's Development Committee was also in attendance.

### Overview

The event included an approximately 15-minute presentation followed by 40 minutes of questions and discussion with participants. The questions and comments provided by participants are summarized and grouped into discussion topics below.

## DISCUSSION TOPICS

**Densification** Eight attendees expressed concern with general densification of the inner areas of Windsor Park, rather than keeping density and R-CG designations to the outskirts of the community along Elbow Drive and 50 Street SW. One attendee indicated that the additional proposed density is "really close to the park and the community association centre" and they "feel like it should not be."

The member of the CA stated that the CA is generally unsupportive of R-CG designations as they "don't feel they are appropriate to Windsor Park." The CA member also stated that they feel Windsor Park is "already pulling its weight with regards to densification." Another attendee echoed the idea that Windsor Park has "done more than its share of providing densification relative to our neighbours across 50th."

One attendee suggested revising the development concept to include a single-family home and a duplex, rather than a rowhouse, to reduce the proposed density. Another attendee suggested subdividing the lot and redeveloping into three single-family homes instead.

**Parking and Traffic** Attendees had concerns with the potential for increased vehicles parking on the street as a result of limited garage parking in the development concepts. There is the perception that additional cars parked on the street could lead to safety impacts for pedestrians or cyclists, especially within the nearby school zone. One attendee states that they are "terrified of what's going to happen to Windsor Park if we don't stay on top of [parked cars and traffic]."

**Mature Trees** Four attendees expressed concerns about the mature trees currently on the site, and the potential for their removal with redevelopment of the site. One attendee questioned if trees could be saved by developing only three units on the site rather than five to six.

**Development Concepts** One attendee stated that Option A “fit well within the neighbourhood” and that they liked the concept “very, very much.”

Attendees also had comments about the garages included in the development concepts, stating that they “are not big enough for vehicles other than a smart car” and will likely be used for storage rather than parking, further contributing to more cars parked on the street.

An attendee also asked if the development will include additional secondary suites, and whether or not garbage storage and collection had been thought of, as that was a notable concern at the Public Hearing earlier in 2022.

**Construction** An attendee commented that the R-CG rowhouses recently constructed at the NW corner of 51 Avenue and 6 Street negatively impacted immediate neighbours during construction to the point that they decided to move; this attendee expressed concerns about the potential for similar negative impacts during construction of the project site. Another attendee echoed these concerns, stating they “have no desire to go through anything like that again.” An attendee also had concerns over possible worker safety violations during future construction.

**Additional Engagement** Two attendees expressed interest in additional engagement sessions in the future in order to offer more opportunities for the community to provide input. Both attendees suggested the next session be in-person rather than online, as a number of neighbours aren’t comfortable using technology.

**Other** The member of the CA commented that, in their experience, the developer has been “the most willing to engage with the community” and that these efforts are appreciated by the community.

Two attendees expressed frustration over the fact that another land use redesignation is being applied for, when a previous application for the site failed at Council in January of 2022.

One attendee stated that lower cost housing within Windsor Park means “[we] are trying to lower the overall property values of the area.”

## How The Developer Responded

Based on what we heard from members of the community and the Community Association, the developer addressed concerns by revising the development concept and the area associated with the proposed R-CG land use designation.

The community expressed a preference for Option A (shown below), which includes a single detached home adjacent to the existing semi-detached home, and a four unit rowhouse building on the corner of 51 Avenue and 6 Street SW. Given the community's preference, the developer reduced the area associated with the proposed R-C2 designation and amended the application to accommodate the development shown in Option A.



Image 4. Option A: single detached home with 4-unit rowhouse.



Image 5. Option B: 6-unit rowhouse.