



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 SAMPLE

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 9:59 AM

To: [Redacted]

Please see attached.

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

From: **Heather Sample** [Redacted] >

Date: Sat, May 1, 2021 at 11:36 AM

Subject: Written Comments for May 4th Public Hearing - Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681

To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>, <hdc@holyroodcommunity.org>

Please find attached my written comments submitted for the May 4th public hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681 - To allow for mixed use, high density, transit oriented development Holyrood.

I would appreciate a reply to confirm that this has been received.

Thanks,

Heather Sample



Letter re Item 3.25 May 4th Public Hearing (H Sample 5-1-2021).pdf

131K

Heather Sample

Edmonton AB T6C 2Z7

Edmonton City Council
1 Sir Winston Churchill Square
Edmonton AB T5J 2R7

RE: May 4th Public Hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681 – To Allow for mixed use, high density, transit oriented development Holyrood

May 1, 2021

I am writing to register my strenuous objection to the proposed changes to the Holyrood Gardens redevelopment. My home on 83rd St NW backs onto this site. I purchased this home after the previous zoning approved in 2018. Prior to purchasing the home, I reviewed the approved Holyrood Gardens design. I understood it to be an attempt to balance an apparent demand for higher density housing on the LRT corridor with the family friendly neighborhood on its border. I was particular pleased with the attention to public open space between my laneway and 85th Street. I felt that the plans were reasonable and went ahead with my home purchase.

The proposed changes to the Holyrood Gardens redevelopment are unreasonable because they are an overdevelopment of the site for the following reasons, listed in order of concern:

1. Increasing the height of a building along 85th Street from four to six stories while also adding a 4-story wing into a portion of the area previously designated as open space. This completely changes the character of the buildings, and indeed the site itself, as it no longer has any openness. It destroys any balance between the towers and the lower buildings achieved in the current plan. I can no longer envision how this would be attractive to families. It will increase shadowing to the surrounding area and removes any transition between the higher density towers already approved and the adjacent single-family homes.
2. Increasing the highest of the 2-story building immediately north of 93rd Avenue – this results in a wall of building on that side of the avenue and a tunnel effect due to the development's buildings on the south side. This is unattractive and unsuitable for a residential area.
3. Increasing the floorplate size of two 12-14 storey towers from 750m² to 800m² - exceeding the city's residential infill guidelines for towers.
4. **NO increase in family friendly housing** and removal of open space that degrades the attractiveness of the development to families. **Does your vision of transit-oriented development only include high-density options?**

In summary, the proposed design changes effectively undo most of the previous compromises made by the developer that led to the approval of the existing plan and double-down on existing design flaws. **I strongly urge you to vote against this proposed re-zoning.** Thank you for considering the input of this extremely concerned citizen and homeowner.



Heather Sample
CC: Holyrood Development Committee (HDC)



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 MEDHURST

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 1:31 PM

To: [Redacted]

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

From: **Tamara Medhurst** [Redacted]
Date: Mon, May 3, 2021 at 11:11 AM
Subject: May 4 Public Hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681
To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>
Cc: [Redacted], <ben.henderson@edmonton.ca>

Dear City Clerks' Office,

Please distribute to all Councilors and Mayor as part of the upcoming public hearing.

Thank you

Sincerely,

Tamara and Brian Medhurst

[Redacted]

Edmonton, AB [Redacted]

Concerned Holyrood Residents

[Redacted]

 **Holyrood Development Letter.docx**
19K

May 3, 2021

To: Edmonton City Council
Re: Public Hearing for Holyrood Gardens, May 4, 2021
Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681

Sirs and Madams;

As a 29 year resident of the Holyrood community I vehemently protest changes to a previous agreement from 2017 with community residents, fought and compromised over years, only to have its ugly head rear again.

Unsustainable Growth

At the time of previous agreement, the total homes in the community were 1626, this mega development, approved for 1200 units is now surprisingly projected to 1650. Since the original approval, we've had a 12 unit apartment built on a SINGLE FAMILY LOT, a FOURPLEX on a SINGLE FAMILY LOT, a 90 unit complex built across from a school, plus the addition of several split lot developments in the area.

Although increased urban density has benefits, I contest that this current plan is excessive in its approach, ignores community concerns, and aging infrastructure and is not a reasonable or safe approach to development. The developers should be held accountable to uphold the original number of units as was decided **after extensive consultations** with the community. This amounts to bait-and-switch tactics that are entirely unethical. It's appalling.

The traffic studies have shown a **GRADE F along an Elementary School Zone!** And even with current construction alone in the area we have noticed increased traffic along 83 St. This quiet residential road is becoming a rush-hour cut through for nonlocals to get around the outer perimeter traffic.

I would also like to acknowledge the failed development plans like Strathearn Heights and having never been started despite causing considerable disruption for the residents of those units. Developers repeatedly try to apply business models to our City that simply do not fit and City processes allow for this to happen. Not to mention the exorbitant number of units that will likely materialize there one day adding further to the excessiveness currently being asked for.

The city government should be taking a much stronger lead in urban planning and development to ensure that we have sustainable and logical growth evenly distributed throughout for decades to come. It **MUST** look beyond a project-by-project assessment to all that is proposed or possible in the area in the immediate and longer term. Please note that BONNIE DOON MALL area development will also add an excessive amount of new traffic. This repeated and manipulated processes demonstrate weakness in administration and council which underlies the distrust and apathy from taxpayers.

Parking, Public Transit & Crime

The new Open Option Parking Policy proposed in the Holyrood Gardens project with reduced on-site parking will result in our streets full of tenant and their visitors parking. To think people in these new

developments will not need or have cars is naïve. LRT will not stop the use of cars. In fact, transit users I know personally have had their ability to use transit diminished because of the recent transit changes. And although the LRT will soon pass their homes, they have much further to walk in order to use the LRT. With buses less accessible, I know one family personally that is forced to MOVE AWAY FROM THE AREA because of limitations now imposed by an LRT line and reduced/changed bus routes.

This is a **green** community with lots of trees and pedestrians. This is what your Forerunners designed it to be. The increase in theft, vandalism and collisions with bikers, walkers, etc. will increase substantially as most current residents have their own spaces. It is a well known fact, substantiated by discussions with members of EPS that crime increases along LRT lines. I was personally advised by an EPS member to invest in more security cameras on our property. It would help them as well with what's coming.

Ending Homelessness

This original site accommodated low-income families for over 6 decades, but this new development is giving little consideration to that worthy cause. Ending homelessness is a clear mandate of this City council, and yet this plan has failed to clearly address how it is part of the solution. Maximum density with little regard to the needs of lower income families is antithetical to the plans of this city to reduce homelessness to zero. More expensive density will not have the desired result with a broken community.

I know our representative, Councillor Ben Henderson, is on his way out but he was elected to stand up for us to his last day - as is the rest of Council. I implore city council to make the right choice for this neighborhood, and the city at large, and say no to reckless and greedy development – particularly in MATURE OLDER NEIGHBORHOODS where people have invested their time, money and energy because they are MATURE OLD NEIGHBORHOODS.

Frustrated with the repeated effort to have our agreements respected,

Mr and Mrs Brian Medhurst

[REDACTED]
Edmonton, AB [REDACTED]



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 KOSOWAN

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 12:53 PM

To: [Redacted]

Please see attached.

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

From: **James Kosowan** [Redacted]
Date: Mon, May 3, 2021 at 9:27 AM
Subject: Bylaw 19681 - Holyrood Gardens
To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Please enclose the following submission as part of the package for Councillors regarding the reapplication for zoning of the Holyrood Gardens site, which is scheduled to be discussed tomorrow afternoon at the public hearing.

Sincerely,

James Kosowan

 **Bylaw 19681.docx**
14K

April 29, 2021

Office of the Councillors
2nd Floor, City Hall
1 Sir Winston Churchill Square
Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 2R7

Re: Bylaw 19681 – Holyrood Gardens

Dear Councillors:

Although I am unable to attend the public hearing on May 4, in which City Council will be discussing this most recent application to rezone a portion of the Holyrood Gardens site, I wish to express my opposition to this application.

I am extremely dismayed that Regency has sought to reopen this zoning issue less than three years after the exhaustive consultative process involved in the original application. This raises a serious issue in terms of the integrity of community engagement. If developers, after having sought an extensive rezoning that resulted in significant community engagement (requiring residents to spend large amounts of personal time to weigh the merits of the proposed development), are permitted to subsequently reapply a few years later and are granted further amendments, it seriously undermines the community engagement process and brings into question the efficacy of community consultation. Why should residents even bother to voice their opinions and concerns when their views will be later disregarded? Why take a day off work to attend a public hearing on the issue if the decisions at those hearings will be subsequently renegotiated when the developer seeks further concessions a short time later?

I think this rezoning should be categorically denied on the basis that the developer has not provided any legitimate justification for reopening this zoning and the short interval since this matter was dealt with at City Council should necessarily preempt a request to reconsider the matter. To do otherwise would be to seriously undermine the integrity of community engagement and bring into question the value placed on citizen input in the whole process.

Sincerely,

James Kosowan



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 WINTER

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 12:17 PM

To: [REDACTED]

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

From: **Allen Winter** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sun, May 2, 2021 at 10:49 PM

Subject: Holyrood Gardens rezoning & Council Meeting-May 4, 2021 Public Hearing - Item 3.25-COMMENTS

To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

**RE: May 4 public hearing; Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681;
Holyrood Gardens-To allow for mixed use, high density, transit oriented development**

To City Clerk/City Council:

Please find attached my comments regarding the **new proposed changes** for **Holyrood Gardens**.

Regards
Allen Winter
[REDACTED]

 **HOLYROOD GARDENS - PUBLIC HEARING - May 4, 2021.pdf**
56K

Allen Winter,

Edmonton,

May 2, 2021

HOLYROOD GARDENS EDMONTON CITY COUNCIL MEETING

- PUBLIC HEARING - Tuesday, May 4, 2021

RE: May 4, 2021 public hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681 - To allow for mixed use, high density, transit oriented development Holyrood

I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes.

All parties had agreed to the results of the previous zoning that was approved on July 9, 2018. This included the rework that was required when the City Council sent the proposal back for rework. A deal is a deal - not something to be changed when developers figure the time is ripe to press for more changes. NO MORE CHANGES!

The revised design **at that time** was **reviewed** by **experts** on the **Edmonton Design Committee** (EDC), who **did not support that design**. The current proposals make the new design even more unsupportable by the EDC. Even in 2018 the EDC stated that "a fundamental redesign of this project is needed" - which never happened. These current additional changes make the current design even more flawed and unacceptable - quite the opposite to actually improving upon them. The proposed design changes will effectively undo most of the **previous compromises** made in 2018 that **led to the approval of the existing plan**. What's the point in retaining a body of experts such as the EDC if you are going to ignore their advice and recommendations?

So the City Administration does support the current proposal. But look at their guiding principle that "supports" this application: *"...it does not change the overall intent for the site to build a mixed use, high density, transit oriented development centered around an LRT Stop..."* This is an extremely general and open-ended principle. **EVERY** new proposal from the developers could be supported based solely on this guiding principle. **This cannot be stressed strongly enough**. The City Administration's support becomes meaningless.

I would also like to note that with the City Administration working on this project for several years, which would include many, many interactions with the developers, there develops a special relationship between the two entities. As such, the objectivity of the City Administration becomes questionable. At the City Council meeting on July 9, 2018, I noted with interest at how the leading City Administrator at the time - a woman - and the leader of the developers greeted each other just prior to the beginning of the meeting. But they did NOT shake hands. No. **They actually hugged**. So what's wrong with that? Well, this is a business relationship. Shaking hands is normal and expected. Women have been shaking hands in a business environment for decades now. But to hug is going one huge step further. It strongly implies a special

relationship between the two parties. Certainly not love - but definitely a degree of familiarity and/or affection. How can anyone really believe that the City Administration is still objective in their assessment of the current proposal?

The HDC is a volunteer group. As such, the incredible time that they spend responding to the numerous changes and issues of this entire project is all on their own time, AFTER finishing their daytime jobs. This eats considerably into the small number of hours left in the day for supper, family activities, home duties, friends, hobbies and recreation. There is almost no time left for them to recharge their minds and bodies. These people are highly susceptible to burnout. Over time and many meetings, their energy drops and key people are lost as time passes. The developers on the other hand do all of their development related activities at their normal, paid daytime jobs. They can spend 8 hours a day, every day, working on development activities and issues. And at the end of their working day, they get to go home and relax. They can fully enjoy supper and relax with family activities, hobbies and recreation and to "recharge". The HDC, with that degree of commitment, really should be taken very seriously.

Resident of Holyrood,
Respectfully,
Allen Winter



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 BENVENUTO

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 1:09 PM

To: [Redacted] >

Please see attached.

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

From: **Tiziana Benvenuto** [Redacted] >

Date: Mon, May 3, 2021 at 9:48 AM

Subject: May 4 Public Hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681

To: city.clerk@edmonton.ca <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Cc: [Redacted], Ben Henderson <ben.henderson@edmonton.ca>

Dear City Clerk's Office,

Please distribute to all Councilors and Mayor as part of the upcoming public hearing.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Tiz Benvenuto

[Redacted]

Edmonton, Alberta

[Redacted]

[Redacted]





Specializing in Enhancing Human Potential, Leadership Development and Creating Work Environments Where People and Results Flourish

CTT Practitioner in Organizational Culture Transformation

BCom, CPA CA, CMC, TNLP, MTLT, TCHt

www.REALRESULTS.ca



A **HIGHER LEVEL** of
management consulting

CERTIFIED MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT

The Certified Management Consultant (CMC) designation is the profession's only international certification mark, recognized in 43 countries. It represents a commitment to the highest standards of consulting and adherence to the ethical canons of the profession. CMC-Canada (the Canadian Association of Management Consultants) administers, and its provincial institutes confer, the CMC designation in Canada. For more information, please visit www.cmc-canada.ca.



Holyrood Development Letter.docx

17K

May 3, 2021

To: Edmonton City Council
Re: Public Hearing for Holyrood Gardens, May 4, 2021
Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681

Sirs and Madams;

As a 31-year resident of the Holyrood community I vehemently protest changes to a previous agreement from 2017 with community residents, fought and compromised over years, only to have its ugly head rear again.

Unsustainable Growth

At the time of previous agreement, the total homes in the community were 1626, this mega development, approved for 1200 units is now surprisingly projected to 1650. Since the original approval, we've had a 12 unit apartment built on a SINGLE FAMILY LOT, a FOURPLEX on a SINGLE FAMILY LOT, a 90 unit complex built across from a school, plus the addition of several split lot developments in the area.

Although increased urban density has benefits, I contest that this current plan is excessive in its approach, ignores community concerns, and aging infrastructure and is not a reasonable or safe approach to development. The developers should be held accountable to uphold the original number of units as was decided **after extensive consultations** with the community. This amounts to bait-and-switch tactics that are entirely unethical. It's appalling.

The traffic studies have shown a **GRADE F along an Elementary School Zone!** And even with current construction alone in the area we have noticed increased traffic along 83 St. This quiet residential road is becoming a rush-hour cut through for nonlocals to get around the outer perimeter traffic.

I would also like to acknowledge the failed development plans like Strathearn Heights and having never been started despite causing considerable disruption for the residents of those units. Developers repeatedly try to apply business models to our City that simply do not fit and City processes allow for this to happen. Not to mention the exorbitant number of units that will likely materialize there one day adding further to the excessiveness currently being asked for.

The city government should be taking a much stronger lead in urban planning and development to ensure that we have sustainable and logical growth evenly distributed throughout for decades to come. It MUST look beyond a project-by-project assessment to all that is proposed or possible in the area in the immediate and longer term. Please note that BONNIE DOON MALL area development will also add an excessive amount of new traffic. This repeated and manipulated processes demonstrate weakness in administration and council which underlies the distrust and apathy from taxpayers.

Parking, Public Transit & Crime

The new Open Option Parking Policy proposed in the Holyrood Gardens project with reduced on-site parking will result in our streets full of tenant and their visitors parking. To think people in these new

developments will not need or have cars is naïve. LRT will not stop the use of cars. In fact, transit users I know personally have had their ability to use transit diminished because of the recent transit changes. And although the LRT will soon pass their homes, they have much further to walk in order to use the LRT. With buses less accessible, I know one family personally that is forced to MOVE AWAY FROM THE AREA because of limitations now imposed by an LRT line and reduced/changed bus routes.

This is a green community with lots of trees and pedestrians. This is what your Forerunners designed it to be. The increase in theft, vandalism and collisions with bikers, walkers, etc. will increase substantially as most current residents have their own spaces. It is a well known fact, substantiated by discussions with members of EPS, that crime increases along LRT lines. I was personally advised by an EPS member to invest in more security cameras on our property. It would help them as well with what's coming.

Ending Homelessness

This original site accommodated low-income families for over 6 decades, but this new development is giving little consideration to that worthy cause. Ending homelessness is a clear mandate of this City council, and yet this plan has failed to clearly address how it is part of the solution. Maximum density with little regard to the needs of lower income families is antithetical to the plans of this city to reduce homelessness to zero. More expensive density will not have the desired result with a broken community.

I know our representative, Councillor Ben Henderson, is on his way out but he was elected to stand up for us to his last day - as is the rest of Council. I implore city council to make the right choice for this neighborhood, and the city at large, and say no to reckless and greedy development – particularly in MATURE OLDER NEIGHBORHOODS where people have invested their time, money and energy because they are MATURE OLD NEIGHBORHOODS.

Frustrated with the repeated effort to have our agreements respected,

Ms. Tiz Benvenuto

[REDACTED]
Edmonton, AB [REDACTED]



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 RAYNER

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 10:35 AM

To: [Redacted]

Please see attached.

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

From: **Lynn Rayner** [Redacted]

Date: Sun, May 2, 2021 at 1:00 PM

Subject: Re: May 4 public hearing, Item 3.25 Charter bylaw 19681 Holyrood Development

To: city.clerk@edmonton.ca <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Dear City Clerks Office,

Please Distribute to all Councillors and Mayor as part of the upcoming public hearing.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Lynn Rayner

[Redacted signature block]

[Redacted signature block]

 **Holyrood dev letter 2.docx**
14K

May 1, 2021

To: Edmonton City Council
Re: Public Hearing for Holyrood Gardens, May 4, 2021
Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681

Sirs and Madams;

As a 30-year resident of the Holyrood community I must protest these changes to a previous agreement from 2017 with community residents, fought and compromised over years, only to have its ugly head rear again.

Unsustainable Growth

At the time of previous agreement, the total homes in the community were 1626, this mega development, approved for 1200 units is now surprisingly projected to 1650, which more than doubles the density of this neighbourhood. Since the original approval, two more multi-unit buildings have been built/approved in this neighbourhood adding an additional 110 units, plus the addition of several split lot developments in the area. This amounts to an increase of 50% above what was originally approved for this area, not just 38%, and it more than doubles the housing density over a short timespan.

Although increased urban density has benefits, I contest that this current plan is excessive in its approach, ignores community concerns, and aging infrastructure and is not a reasonable or safe approach to development. The developers should be held accountable to uphold the original amount of units as was decided after extensive consultations with the community. This amounts to bait-and-switch tactics that are entirely unethical.

I would also like to acknowledge the failed development plans like Strathearn Heights, and having never been started despite causing considerable disruption for the residents of those units. It is clear that developers repeatedly try to apply business models to our City that simply do not fit and it makes our city look like a shambles in the process. The City's long view is to see ahead of developers short term gains.

The city government should be taking a much stronger lead in urban planning and development to ensure that we have sustainable and logical growth evenly distributed throughout for decades to come.

Parking & Crime

The new Open Option Parking Policy used here with reduced on-site parking will result in our streets full of tenant and their visitors parking. The LRT will not stop the use of cars. The increase in theft, vandalism and collisions with bikers, walkers etc. will increase by at least 3 fold as most current residents have their own spaces. This is a *green* community with lots of trees and pedestrians just as your Forerunners designed it to be.

Ending Homelessness

This original site accommodated low income families for over 6 decades, but this new development is giving little consideration to that worthy cause. Ending homelessness is a clear mandate of this City council, and yet this plan has failed to clearly address how it is part of the solution. They can hardly use rising costs as reason against higher real estate prices in this past year. Maximum density with little

regard to the needs of lower income families is antithetical to the plans of this city to reduce homelessness to zero. More expensive density will not have the desired result with a broken community.

I know our representative, Councillor Ben Henderson, is on his way out but he was elected to stand up for us as is the rest of Council. As Holyrood goes; so goes their communities as well. I implore city council to make the right choice for this neighborhood, and the city at large, and say no to reckless and greedy development.

Yours faithfully,

Ms. Lynn Rayner

Edmonton, AB

**Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 ASHTON**

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 12:09 PM

To: [REDACTED]

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

From: **Chandra Ashton** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Sun, May 2, 2021 at 8:19 PM

Subject: File # LDA20-0229 - Holyrood Gardens Re-Development Plan

To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Cc: Ben Henderson <ben.henderson@edmonton.ca>, <andrew.knack@edmonton.ca>, <bev.esslinger@edmonton.ca>, <jon.dziadyk@edmonton.ca>, <aaron.paquette@edmonton.ca>, <sarah.hamilton@edmonton.ca>, <scott.mckeen@edmonton.ca>, <tony.caterina@edmonton.ca>, <tim.cartmell@edmonton.ca>, <michael.walters@edmonton.ca>, <mike.nickel@edmonton.ca>, <mohinder.banga@edmonton.ca>

Dear City Clerk and Council Members,

When I received the notice that this developer was planning again to request more units and changes to the plan that already took HOURS and MONTHS of negotiations that all but fell on deaf ears, I was dumbfounded.

I am not a city planner. I am not the city treasurer or a City Councilor. I am not the developer. As a resident of this neighbourhood, one block from the current construction and proposed development, I stand to gain nothing in the approval of these requests. Instead, not only do these 450 new units plan to take away what little green space was left on their plan, but it means months more construction, and many more cars, and many more people on my front lawn.

The saddest thing is that I almost didn't write this email. Because, honestly, I do not trust that it even matters. My neighbours and I spent so much time and lost sleep the last time the city asked for our opinion - to write eloquent letters outlining the various ways in which these plans do not conform to bylaws for new community development, clash with existing structures and purposes of our neighbourhood, increase traffic, decrease sun on our gardens, all while adding SO little value to anyone other than the people looking to get rich off these new monstrosities - and still I hear that the city councillors plan to approve this.

So, my exhausted, disillusioned suggestion is this, if you aren't actually going to listen to our opinions, please don't keep asking for them.

A concerned Holyrood resident,
Dr. Chandra Ashton



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 THEERIEN

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 11:52 AM

To: [Redacted]

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

From: **MARY JOHNSTON THERRIEN** <[Redacted]>
Date: Sun, May 2, 2021 at 8:00 PM
Subject: May 4 Public Hearing
To: city clerk <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Good afternoon,

Reference: May 4 Public Hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681 - To Allow for Mixed Use, High Density, Transit Oriented Development Holyrood

We are residents of Holyrood.

My husband and I are not in favour of higher density than had already been agreed upon.

This development needs to be beneficial for the community.

The developer continues to push for increases in unit density, an increase of the height of the buildings and rezoning adjustments that have been approved by the City of Edmonton, the developer and the Community Development Committee, decisions which were mutually agreed upon already.

When are agreements reached with the city and all concerned, honoured by this developer?

Please consider proposals that are improvements to the sites, and not higher density and related design changes.

As a community, Holyrood has compromised believing that there were beneficial trade offs for the community. At this time, I am not certain that was a wise decision but will abide by the previous agreement.

I hope that the city will listen to the concerns of people within the community and reject these proposals under consideration for Holyrood Gardens.

Enough is enough.

Holyrood Development Committee has stated their opposition to the proposed changes and we agree with this consensus.. A 38% increase in units, increased heights of previously agreed upon buildings, and losing open spaces is not acceptable. The city's Open Option Parking policy remains to be seen if it will mean less traffic to our area.

Sincerely,

Mary and Hector Therrien



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 TONY

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 9:41 AM

To: [REDACTED]

>

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

From: **Kath Tony** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Fri, Apr 30, 2021 at 4:26 PM

Subject: Re: May 4 public hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681 - To allow for mixed use, high density, transit oriented development Holyrood

To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

I'm writing to express my concerns about the proposal being made by Regency Developments to significantly increase the number of units in their Holyrood Gardens development.

The proposed changes are dismaying to current residents of this community, many of whom worked closely with the City and the developer for years to create a reasonable plan for this development. The re-zoning that was approved in 2018 seemed to take at least some community concerns into consideration. Now the developer proposes to increase the number of units in this property by 38% with absolutely no increase in what could be considered family friendly housing, there is no planning for community safety and traffic impacts, the proposed revisions will result in significant over-development of this site.

To achieve this 38% increase in units, the developer's proposal contravenes the City's own infill guidelines. This is a concern for Holyrood but it also sets a terrible precedent for other infill projects. Add to this the proposed height increases of the 2-storey and 4-storey buildings AND the encroachment of a 4-storey wing into what was once to be open space is all very concerning.

It seems that this developer is being given carte blanche to maximize their revenues by ignoring City guidelines, neighbourhood consultations, and having no regard for quality of life of those who live near this expanding development.

It is disheartening to see City Council considering agreeing to this proposal.

Regards,

Katherine Irwin

[REDACTED]
Edmonton, AB

**Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 THOMPSON**

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 1:44 PM

To: [REDACTED]

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

From: <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, May 3, 2021 at 11:46 AM
Subject: May 4 public hearing - Holyrood Development
To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Dear City Council,

As a 20 + year resident of Holyrood (and Bonnie Doon) I have concerns with the re-design of the Holyrood Gardens project. I call on City Council to reject the proposed increase in density and the related design changes.

It appears that the many changes to the design, overall, effectively undo most of the previous compromises made by the developer that led to the approval of the existing plan. The 38% increase in units, does not proportionally increase family friend housing. Also, the increase of the previously proposed 4 storey buildings to 6 storeys, and the increase in the two 12-14 storey towers floorplans to 800 square meters – exceeding City's guidelines for towers - is concerning.

Please consider the proposal based on the history, compromises and extensive community involvement that happened before the 2018 approved zoning. Also, the Edmonton Design Council did not support the design of the current project, and recommended that there should be a fundamental redesign of this project, and this should be taken into consideration.

The attraction of this area of the city is the fact that it isn't over developed, and that it is family-friendly. Please help keep this area keep its attraction, while also continuing do its part in increasing density. This can be accomplished, but should not be done in the way proposed by this proposal.

I call on City Council to reject the current proposed increase in density and the related design changes for Holyrood Gardens.

Yours truly,

Kara

Kara Thompson, BA LLB

5/3/2021

City of Edmonton Mail - Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 THOMPSON

Barrister and Solicitor

Facilitator & Owner

Three E Training Inc.



"We bring life to learning and learning to life."

May 3, 2021

To: Edmonton City Council
Re: Public Hearing for Holyrood Gardens, May 4, 2021
Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681

Sirs and Madams;

As a 31-year resident of the Holyrood community I vehemently protest changes to a previous agreement from 2017 with community residents, fought and compromised over years, only to have its ugly head rear again.

Unsustainable Growth

At the time of previous agreement, the total homes in the community were 1626, this mega development, approved for 1200 units is now surprisingly projected to 1650. Since the original approval, we've had a 12 unit apartment built on a SINGLE FAMILY LOT, a FOURPLEX on a SINGLE FAMILY LOT, a 90 unit complex built across from a school, plus the addition of several split lot developments in the area.

Although increased urban density has benefits, I contest that this current plan is excessive in its approach, ignores community concerns, and aging infrastructure and is not a reasonable or safe approach to development. The developers should be held accountable to uphold the original number of units as was decided **after extensive consultations** with the community. This amounts to bait-and-switch tactics that are entirely unethical. It's appalling.

The traffic studies have shown a **GRADE F along an Elementary School Zone!** And even with current construction alone in the area we have noticed increased traffic along 83 St. This quiet residential road is becoming a rush-hour cut through for nonlocals to get around the outer perimeter traffic.

I would also like to acknowledge the failed development plans like Strathearn Heights and having never been started despite causing considerable disruption for the residents of those units. Developers repeatedly try to apply business models to our City that simply do not fit and City processes allow for this to happen. Not to mention the exorbitant number of units that will likely materialize there one day adding further to the excessiveness currently being asked for.

The city government should be taking a much stronger lead in urban planning and development to ensure that we have sustainable and logical growth evenly distributed throughout for decades to come. It **MUST** look beyond a project-by-project assessment to all that is proposed or possible in the area in the immediate and longer term. Please note that BONNIE DOON MALL area development will also add an excessive amount of new traffic. This repeated and manipulated processes demonstrate weakness in administration and council which underlies the distrust and apathy from taxpayers.

Parking, Public Transit & Crime

The new Open Option Parking Policy proposed in the Holyrood Gardens project with reduced on-site parking will result in our streets full of tenant and their visitors parking. To think people in these new

developments will not need or have cars is naïve. LRT will not stop the use of cars. In fact, transit users I know personally have had their ability to use transit diminished because of the recent transit changes. And although the LRT will soon pass their homes, they have much further to walk in order to use the LRT. With buses less accessible, I know one family personally that is forced to MOVE AWAY FROM THE AREA because of limitations now imposed by an LRT line and reduced/changed bus routes.

This is a green community with lots of trees and pedestrians. This is what your Forerunners designed it to be. The increase in theft, vandalism and collisions with bikers, walkers, etc. will increase substantially as most current residents have their own spaces. It is a well known fact, substantiated by discussions with members of EPS, that crime increases along LRT lines. I was personally advised by an EPS member to invest in more security cameras on our property. It would help them as well with what's coming.

Ending Homelessness

This original site accommodated low-income families for over 6 decades, but this new development is giving little consideration to that worthy cause. Ending homelessness is a clear mandate of this City council, and yet this plan has failed to clearly address how it is part of the solution. Maximum density with little regard to the needs of lower income families is antithetical to the plans of this city to reduce homelessness to zero. More expensive density will not have the desired result with a broken community.

I know our representative, Councillor Ben Henderson, is on his way out but he was elected to stand up for us to his last day - as is the rest of Council. I implore city council to make the right choice for this neighborhood, and the city at large, and say no to reckless and greedy development – particularly in MATURE OLDER NEIGHBORHOODS where people have invested their time, money and energy because they are MATURE OLD NEIGHBORHOODS.

Frustrated with the repeated effort to have our agreements respected,





Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 MOORE

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 12:41 PM

To: [REDACTED]

>

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

From: **Sylvia Moore** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, May 3, 2021 at 12:05 AM

Subject: May 4 public hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681-to allow for mixed use, high density, transit oriented development Holyrood

To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Dear City Council,

My husband and I have lived in the Holyrood area for over 30 years and are opposed to this recent change being proposed by the developer.

A 38% increase is quite substantial in the already very dense development that was approved with no proportional increase to family friendly housing which is a priority for this neighborhood.

The design was another major issue as we wanted something that was somewhat attractive and varying heights as these tall buildings will constantly shadow many of the residential homes in the area. It does not look well designed or resemble an improvement of any kind. It is also our understanding that the increase in the towers exceeds the residential infill guidelines. This will also reduce the greenspace originally planned in the development which doesn't benefit the community at all.

We went to many meeting to have input and agree to a plan that would appeal to the community as a whole. Now it seems a little furtive on the developer's part to try and get these changes less than 3 years after rezoning and during a pandemic when the community can't meet as a group.

We ask that city council reject the proposed increase in density and related design changes.

Sincerely,
Sylvia Moore
David Lesik



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 MCKEDDIE

1 message

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

Wed, Apr 28, 2021 at 8:29 AM

To: [REDACTED] >

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

From: **Laura McKeddie** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Tue, Apr 27, 2021 at 4:29 PM
Subject: Proposed Charter Bylaw 19681
To: city.clerk@edmonton.ca <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Dear Madam/Sir,

I understand that there will be a public meeting to consider changes to zoning restrictions regarding the Holyrood Gardens redevelopment.

It appears that the developer wants the number of units increased from 1200 to 1650 which increases the number of units by 450 with only 1/3 of that number, 150, being family friendly (two bedrooms or more). There are also changes to the height of buildings of two buildings on the north side of 93 Avenue, and a change in the size of the floor plate for two of the towers. In addition to all of this the failure to provide adequate parking for the buildings is intended to reduce the number of cars used by making parking impossible or difficult for everybody in the area.

Concerns were raised by the Holyrood Development Committee about the original design seen in 2017. The site was re-zoned in July, 2018 to allow for the present development plan, a plan which is yet of grave concern to the neighborhood. This new proposal does nothing to answer the flaws in the original design, rather it promotes an extension of the problems the Holyrood development committee brought to the attention of the City in 2018.

I am painfully disappointed in the value system supported by this development.

Taking down the old Holyrood Gardens townhouses represents a serious loss of affordable and family friendly housing in this city.

It makes me sorry to be an Edmontonian when we continue to put basic housing needs outside of the reach of lower income people.

I attended the public meetings about this development.

I asked the question about what was to be done to rehouse those who would lose their homes when the site was redeveloped.

I was told that they could just buy a smaller unit.

What a great comfort to a single parent working two jobs just to pay the rent!

I absolutely do not approve of the rezoning.

It's bad enough as it is!

I think there should be a basic redesign, one that includes a more common sense approach.

We need a design that acknowledges real people, real life!

Sincerely,
Laura McKeddie





Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 KIMURA

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 1:27 PM

To: [Redacted]

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

From: **Pat Kimura** <[Redacted]>
Date: Mon, May 3, 2021 at 10:45 AM
Subject: May 04 public hearing Item 3.25 Bylaw 19681
To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Members of Edmonton City Council...

In reference to: Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681

As a long time resident of the Holyrood community, we have been following and providing feedback to Council regarding the redevelopment of Holyrood Gardens for some time now.

We VEHEMENTLY OPPOSE the proposed changes!! The developer seeks to further increase the density of its project, without consideration being given to the lack of parking, traffic impact on the neighborhood - or the lack of units suitable for family housing.

Thoughtful densification of mature neighborhoods hopefully would support our local schools, recreation infrastructure and businesses - but a 38% increase in units is nothing but an effort to squeeze more profits from a project that already pushed the limits of community acceptability. Expansion does nothing to benefit the neighborhood, but does much to negatively impact it: pushing project parking needs out onto neighbouring streets, greatly increasing the amount of traffic on roads surrounding the project, limiting affordable housing for families, etc.

We urge Council to deny any changes to the original project.

Regards,
Pat Kimura and Dennis Humphrey



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 MCGINNIS

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 1:22 PM

To: [REDACTED]

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

From: **Leopold McGinnis** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, May 3, 2021 at 10:30 AM

Subject: Opposition to application - May 4 public hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681

To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Cc: Ben Henderson <ben.henderson@edmonton.ca>

Hello,

I would like to write in opposition to the proposed changes regarding the May 4 public hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681 - To allow for mixed use, high density, transit oriented development Holyrood.

The community of Holyrood, and a large number of its residents, have been providing feedback on this development for a LONG, long time. As I'm sure you've heard elsewhere, that this application came up AGAIN after all the hard work, compromises and efforts on the part of the community and the city has been a real slap in the face for a lot of us, not to mention a waste of time and money for the citizens of Holyrood and city staff. It seems the processes are really stacked in favour of the developer, with community members needing to jump through hoop after hoop to be heard. This is probably the fourth time I've had to write in voicing my concerns and opposition. I have attached one of my other letters to the bottom of this email for your reference.

The initial proposals for the development were a classic example of overbuilding, and a developer more interested in maximizing profits off their space than tying in with the community and providing value, design or otherwise to the project. The community had to fight hard and for a long time to have its voice heard on this, after the developer seemed to be only going through the motions as part of the community consultations.

As the city moves towards more transit-oriented development locations like these become a draw to developers, but these developments should support the communities and the TOD vision, rather than looking to draw as much profit at TOD and the community's expense. The developers self-interested and uncompromising focus, from day one, has been reflected in the proposal's poor and unappealing design, its massive scale, their constant pushing of zoning boundaries and processes and, finally, trying to sneak changes back to their original proposal after the fact with this latest appeal.

This isn't just my opinion: this has been echoed by the community through the community league, this project was rejected by the city's own EEDC and the developers were FORCED, only after media and public backlash, to come back to the table and find a solution with the community. It was only after this that a compromised was reached - one that the community still did not love, but accepted as part of the process. This latest appeal threatens not only all that work, but the community's faith and satisfaction that the city's processes are workable and equitable and that the community has any input into development in their communities.

I ask that you vote against this proposal. As a long time resident of Holyrood and Edmonton, I ask you to consider the impact this proposal will make on the community--not only due to the overbuilding and monolithic design of this building that nearly doubles the size of the community--but in terms of the signal it sends to Edmontonians and other communities along the line in terms of the equity of its processes. If Edmonton truly believes in transit-oriented-development, it needs to stand behind fair and equitable process that lead to development that supports and bolsters that vision, it needs to support projects that contribute to that vision, rather than to projects that draw against it, serving little but their own interests as the expense of community, equity and our transit vision.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Leopold McGinnis

Good morning Ms. Cindy DerPack and Mr. Robert Huber,

I recently received your letter regarding a rezoning application for Holyrood Gardens. I appreciate you reaching out to outline the requested changes, however it was with some surprise and a good amount of disappointment that I reviewed the request.

A significant amount of work and involvement from the Holyrood community, the Holyrood Community League and the city preceded the current zoning, which was arrived at after much effort and collaboration from the community, the city and the developer. You may remember it, as the controversy made the newspapers and media several times.

I have to say, during that process, that it often seemed like the developer held their own interest in maximizing the value of the development over the suitability of the scale or design with the general community. I know, as a long time resident and property owner in Holyrood, and as someone who was actively engaged in the initial consultations, that many people felt the proposal was too big, too tall and, frankly, greedy. The units proposed would effectively double the population of Holyrood, and little consideration had been given to parking and other detrimental impacts on the community.

The final zoning was hard fought and reluctantly given. You may recall that even Edmonton's own Design Community did not approve of the design and it was only through some last-minute negotiation and good-will on the part of the city that approvals were made to have some work started before LRT construction.

While I would say most Holyrood residents were still not satisfied with the final zoning, most Holyrood residents, including myself, have long wanted to see some development in the community, and in that spot in particular, and accepted the compromise and process behind it. To receive this proposal now, after such a long and hard fought effort to arrive at consensus, is disappointing and, frankly, resurfaces a lot of the accusations and frustrations of a developer not acting in good faith.

It is my opinion that Regency Developments was lucky to have been granted the zoning they got and re-opening this now is not only self-serving, but disrespectful to the efforts of the community, the community league, residents of Holyrood and the city's processes.

I do not support the changes proposed. Regency needs to respect the decision of its collaboration with the city and Holyrood residents and build what it was approved for only a short while ago, or at least get in place the current phase of development and measure its impacts and needs before re-opening this contentious issue.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Leopold McGinnis

**Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 KEIRSTEAD**

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 1:02 PM

To: [REDACTED]

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

From: **Katherine** [REDACTED] >

Date: Mon, May 3, 2021 at 9:43 AM

Subject: Regency Development Comments

To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

> Hi

>

> I am writing to express our concerns over the Regency Development and the application for increasing number of dwellings. The continued applications to change and increase floors and units, is unacceptable and we do not support this application.

>

> We reside at property [REDACTED] NW and are directly effected by this development.

>

> Here is a list of concerns:

>

> 1. This development literally feels like it is in our back yard. The high rise was suppose to be closer to 85 street leaving more space between our property and the high rise with green space as well. Applications to make changes to the layout were approved and now this is not the case, only the lane separates our property and the high rise, hence giving the feeling like the high rise is right in our backyard.

>

> 2. We have been faced with three years of construction noise already and expect another 3 years even with no changes to the project. The constant noise is exhausting.

>

> 3. There is construction parking overflow in front of our house and often we have troubles accessing our garage; and this is without the project being completed.

>

> 4. The proposal to increase units, only exacerbates already existing issues, traffic, parking, access, noise etc.

>

> 5. Since this development has started our property value has vastly decreased. We tried to sell our property and no one wants to buy it and we were forced to take it off the market. We feel like our property has been hugely devalued and yet we continue to have a huge property tax bill.

>

> We are trying our best to see the positives in this development but are already struggling with it and simply don't want to see it expanded further.

>

> Thank you, Katherine and James Keirstead



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 KARCHA

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 12:57 PM

To: [Redacted]

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

From: **Foster Karcha** <[Redacted]>
Date: Mon, May 3, 2021 at 9:41 AM
Subject: May 4 public hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681 - To allow for mixed use, high density, transit oriented development Holyrood
To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>
Cc: Ben Henderson <ben.henderson@edmonton.ca>, [Redacted], Jaime [Redacted]
[Redacted]

Good morning,

I am opposed to the developer's application to change this zoning, which is 1 block from my house. The application was made in bad faith, after the current zoning was negotiated and agreed to by multiple stakeholders.

While I understand that City Administration is required to only evaluate the technical merits of a zoning application, the City Council must look at this application holistically - including the community's, the developer's, and the Council's work on the previous zoning. That developers can go through this process with stakeholders, and then again attempt to revise it in the future, puts all future community consultation in danger.

Sincerely,

Foster Karcha
Holyrood, Edmonton, AB



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 INNES

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 1:20 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Dear City Clerk and Council Members,

While I support the City's efforts to densify and support transit oriented development, as a resident of Holyrood, I am writing to ask you to **vote against Recency Development's rezoning application** for Holyrood Gardens. This is an opportunity for City Council to demonstrate that developers must demonstrate integrity by honoring commitments in previously approved zoning applications.

Holyrood residents have endured more than four years of Regency Developments "playing the system" to circumvent city planning guidelines, and dodge design principles recommended by the Edmonton Design Committee. Regency Developments bent the rules of parliamentary procedure by engineering approval for infrastructure upgrades prior to approval of their rezoning application. Now they are gaming the system again, counting on the passage of time to cloud people's memories, and allow their change in scope to fly under City Council's radar.

Holyrood Gardens is not a traditional site for planning purposes. This site is several blocks long and only one half-block wide. The site's built form, massing, transition and integration with the community presented many challenges. After Recency Developments less than satisfactory participation in the public engagement process, an application that included tradeoffs to benefit Holyrood was settled upon, and approved by City Council. Now Regency Developments wants to change the terms of their application, take away the tradeoffs, and pull back from their commitments to our community.

This proposal decreases the amount of green space; does not follow the city's residential infill guidelines; and expands the number of key transportation corridors receiving a failing grade (according to the latest traffic impact study).

This application from Regency Developments cannot be accepted as "fait accompli". Given the drawbacks of this rezoning application outweigh the benefits, please show you care about Holyrood by **voting against to this rezoning application**.

Trina Innes  

[REDACTED]

**Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 FARIA**

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 12:45 PM

To: [REDACTED]

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

From: [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, May 3, 2021 at 9:20 AM
Subject: Response to May 4 public hearing. Rezoning 8310 & 8311- 93 Ave
To: city.clerk@edmonton.ca <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Good morning,

I want to express my opposition and concern for the site-specific changes being proposed for 8310 & 8311 93 Ave. The hearing is to take place tomorrow, May 4th.

The community has previously expressed major concerns for the large number of dwellings being added to this site in this proposal. The community has previously rejected proposals like this with such high dwelling numbers.

I am opposed to the increased height of the building and the increased number of dwellings.

This will add way to many people to the area! There isn't enough space in the area for the increased traffic and vehicles that this increase will cause.

I don't believe these families will be vehicle-less. Where will they all park?

I don't like the added height proposed. I don't live right next to this project, but I am quite close. I feel badly for the people who live right next door to this big monstrosity.

One of the reasons I like owning in this area was the lack of apartment and walk up buildings. I prefer single family dwellings.

I'm frustrates me to see that change. The parking and vehicle traffic will be a nightmare. The over flow will take up the neighborhood.

The community has previously spoken up and rejected these proposed height and volume changes. Please respect the voices of the community who own and live in the neighborhood. These changes are not welcomed.

Thank you,
celina faria

at [REDACTED]

Sent from my LG Mobile



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 GRAD

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 1:04 PM

To: [REDACTED]

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

From: **Tim Grad** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, May 3, 2021 at 9:46 AM

Subject: May 4 public hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681 - To allow for mixed use, high density, transit oriented development Holyrood

To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

To the members of the City Council of Edmonton, regarding:

May 4 public hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681 - To allow for mixed use, high density, transit oriented development Holyrood.

As a 33-year resident and homeowner in Holyrood, I have the following comments:

The proposed zoning amendments for the Holyrood Gardens re-development should be denied. The experts at the Holyrood Gardens Design Committee (HGDC) have determined that the changes are detrimental to the quality of the development and represent an overdevelopment of the site, including building floor plates for two 12-14 storey towers that exceed the City's residential infill guidelines for towers.

Further to the findings of the HGDC, the proposed changes are offensive for the following reasons:

- Increasing the height of the towers puts the properties along 83 Street in even larger shadows in the afternoon & evening, and likely does the same for properties on the west side of 85 Street in the morning.
- Despite the HGDC support for the proposal for reduced parking on-site under the Open Option Parking Policy, the dreamers who think no cars will visit the site are wrong, and streets of southwest Holyrood will be flooded with cars of owners of this property and their visitors. The developer should not benefit from the Open Option Parking Policy.
- The developer has been very disrespectful of area residents in the past applications and community consultations. This application to amend the zoning permit is another snub to area residents in its attempt to claw back the concessions made in the last zoning approval, while developer also would benefit from the Open Option Parking Policy.
- Granting these amendments renders community consultation meaningless.
- It is my belief, given past behavior of the developer, that further zoning amendments will be requested after the 2021 civic election.

5/3/2021

City of Edmonton Mail - Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 GRAD

All proposed amendments should be rejected.

Sincerely,

Tim Grad





Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 DUSHINSKI

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 10:50 AM

To: [Redacted] >

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

From: **Karen Dushinski** <[Redacted]>
Date: Sun, May 2, 2021 at 6:07 PM
Subject: Regency Developments Application for Alterations
To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Hello

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed changes to the agreed upon plan for the re-development of Holyrood Gardens. I was born and raised in Edmonton and the one thing that I think makes our city different from other larger urban centres, is the sense of community and collaboration that exists here. Unfortunately, the latest changes proposed by Regency demonstrate that collaboration is no longer important. By altering the already agreed upon plan, my concern is that the city will be supporting a less than transparent process, and damaging the desire of its citizens to participate in what has been termed, "collaboration". Regency appears to be driven by greed with little adherence to ethical negotiations. To approach the city in the middle of a global pandemic when cities are struggling for revenue and citizens are otherwise distracted, has tarnished my already negative view of this company. This development is already too large an addition to an established community, and the proposed changes just add further congestion while not addressing the original intent of transit oriented developments.

I would appreciate it if the City of Edmonton and its planner stick to the original agreement made with its citizens and more importantly, the people that already live and pay taxes in Holyrood.

Yours truly,

Dr. Karen Dushinski

--



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 GURBA

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 1:17 PM

To: [REDACTED]

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

From: **KAREN GURBA** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, May 3, 2021 at 10:23 AM

Subject: May 4 public hearing - Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681 - to allow for mixed use, high density, transit oriented development Holyrood

To: city clerk <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Dear City Council members,

Enough is enough! I've pretty much had it with Raj and Regency Development's tactics to increase their profit margin and further ruin Holyrood. I live one block away from this new development (and your future LRT station) and the latest attempt to rezone YET AGAIN is enraging me and the community. The earliest models of this development was pushed as far as Raj could go - the HDC pushed back time and time again but made concessions to enable this project to move forward but once again, Raj is pushing to rezone it again so he can get MORE units, MORE buildings, MORE floor plate size and LESS open space, LESS parking. You see where I'm going...

The Open Option parking means there will be residents parking in front of my house but I guess I have no choice in that matter. Edmonton is a car city and no matter that the new LRT will be right beside this development, residents will still own cars. There have not been enough parking spots allocated for the residents.

What I DO HAVE A CHOICE in is asking is **City Council to reject Regency Development's proposal to increase their density and design change YET AGAIN**. We are sooo tired of Raj pushing and pushing to get more, make more money and decrease the livability of this community. I've been here 24 years and am not sure how much longer I want to stay - it will depend on what happens with this development. It's bad enough to quadruple the amount of people in this narrow strip of land (and doubling the amount of people in Holyrood itself) but **Regency is trying to push their agenda even after everything was agreed upon**. You cannot trust Regency Developments as they are in the bad books for not having cleaned up other operations. Don't let this man and his company have their way!!!

Karen Gur4ba
[REDACTED]



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 BHATNAGAR

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 2:05 PM

To: [REDACTED]

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

From: **Rakesh Bhatnagar** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, May 3, 2021 at 1:17 PM
Subject: Item 3.25 Charter ByLaw 19681
To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Ref: May 4 public hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681 - To allow for mixed use, high density, transit oriented development Holyrood,

May 3, 2021

Holyrood is a lovely community. I provided assistance to my daughter to purchase a small house in Holyrood in 2019. When I saw that Regency Developments was building at the western edge, my wife and I considered looking into condominiums. Regency Developments has a good reputation for quality developments, like the new Pearl Tower, and the older, nearby, Madison on Whyte. We were surprised that all 1200 approved dwellings were to be rental apartments.

I am opposed to the addition of 450 more rental apartments. And even more surprised to see that their use has changed from apartment housing to apartment hotel. If this means a large number of short-term rentals, this is even a more transient population than people living in an apartment on a one-year lease, as compared to ownership.

No matter how much you may hope that people living beside a transit stop will stop using cars, cars in Alberta are a basic need. Many people living in SE Edmonton have strong ties to Sherwood Park, Ardrossan and Camrose. Kids are involved in soccer and hockey leagues that are very difficult to access without a car. If young adults live in these apartments, the City should have recreational programs to help young adults mix, without relying on the bar scene.

Thank you for your consideration. I am absolutely opposed to this increase.

Rakesh Bhatnagar



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 CORDINGLEY

1 message

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

Tue, Apr 27, 2021 at 12:27 PM

To: [REDACTED]

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

From: **Peter Cordingley** [REDACTED]

Date: Tue, Apr 27, 2021 at 11:18 AM

Subject: May 4 public hearing item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681 Holyrood

To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>, <ben.henderson@edmonton.ca>

To: Edmonton City Council:

Re: May 4 public hearing item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681 - To allow for mixed use, high density, transit oriented development Holyrood

Please **reject** the proposed changes to this development.

While I support development at this site, the latest proposed changes are a slap in the face to the Holyrood Development Committee and the City of Edmonton. The developer is not acting in good faith. This project has been ongoing for many years (original design proposed in 2017), with active community input and review by our City. At this last moment, the developer has once again put forward changes which ignore the concerns of the community, and do not follow the city's infill guidelines for towers. The changes drastically increase the number of units, but does not proportionately increase family friendly units.

The developer is not listening to the community and appears to be ignoring the city. Don't give in to this unethical behaviour. Please **reject** the proposed changes.

sincerely

Peter Cordingley
[REDACTED]



Correspondence: May 4, 2021 CCPH Item 3.25 WANG

1 message

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

Mon, May 3, 2021 at 1:35 PM

To: [REDACTED]

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

From: **Nina Ching Wang** <[REDACTED]>

Date: Mon, May 3, 2021 at 11:23 AM

Subject: May 4 Public Hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681 - To Allow for Mixed Use, High Density, Transit Oriented Development Holyrood

To: <city.clerk@edmonton.ca>

Dear City Council:

I am writing to you regarding the Holyrood Development for the May 4 Public Hearing, Item 3.25 Charter Bylaw 19681 - To allow for mixed use, high density, transit oriented development Holyrood. **I urge the Council to REJECT the proposed increase in density and related design changes.**

The reasons / rationales for the **REJECTION** are the following:

- 1) Inadequate consultation and engagement with the residents;
- 2) Holyrood Development Committee is against the proposal;
- 3) The design-related changes fail to honor the compromises that resulted in the 2018 approved zoning; and
- 4) The proposed changes do not consider quality of life that will impact the current and future residents regarding the traffic, noise, and potential social impacts (e.g., parking), in which would bring to the Holyrood community and surrounding neighbourhoods.

Sincerely,

Nina Ching Y. Wang
Holyrood resident