

**CITY OF EDMONTON**  
**FIRST PLACE PROGRAM**

**Kirkness (3015 – 151 Ave NW) Consultation**

**Meeting #2**

**June 23, 2015**

**Clareview Community Rec Centre (Rm MP #2)**

**3804 – 139 Ave NW**



**AGENDA**

1. Opening comments.
2. Firm Up Site Layout per Meeting #1 Comments/Suggestions.
3. Present Building Elevations, Colors. Discussions.
4. Present Landscaping Concept. Discussions.
5. Geotechnical Report Overview.
6. City of Edmonton Drainage Management Strategy
7. Key Messages and Pictures to Post on City Web Site and Landmark Facebook Page to Inform Community of Meeting Progress.
8. Future Meeting Date.



# City of Edmonton First Place Program

## Kirkness Community Design Engagement #2 Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: June 23, 2015, 6:30 - 8:45 p.m.

Location: Clareview Recreation Centre

Attendees: City of Edmonton, Builder (Landmark Homes & WLA Landscape Architects), and Community Representatives\*

On the evening of June 23rd, the above representatives met to provide information and to solicit input into the City's Kirkness First Place Design Engagement Meeting #2. The following **Agenda Items** were discussed:

### 1. **Opening Comments, De Brief and Follow-up Items from First Engagement Meeting**

The City welcomed the residents to the second design engagement meeting and shared feedback received from 1) Transportation and 2) Fire Rescue Services on road safety, additional traffic, relocation of sports fields, and emergency evacuation on 151 Ave. The attached "*Transportation, Traffic, and Safety: Queries and Response*" was handed out at the meeting. The conclusions were:

- Transportation Planning indicated that the traffic generated from the First Place project will be significantly less than the school that was originally planned for,
- Sports fields on vacant building sites are intended to be temporary, to be removed when buildings are constructed.
- Fire Rescue is satisfied with the width of 151 Ave, loop provided west of 30 St.

### 2. **Site Layout Updates**

Landmark Homes refined their 14 options from the First Engagement Meeting to **two final option layouts** for discussion with the engagement participants, namely, 4f and 4g. Merits of both options were discussed. Participants favoured layout 4g to 4f because of:

- Maintained access alignment directly opposite 31 St as per Transportation requirements.
- Eliminated 2 units (73 total versus 75 allowable) to create greenscape and entrance vista opportunities.
- Layout 4g was preferred due to symmetry of 5-plexes facing 151 Ave, more visitors parking provided, more separation space from west property.
- One comment noted that there is an overabundance of visitor parking, therefore, can eliminate 2 at the east to provide more greenscape and connectivity opportunities and perhaps make one a handicap spot.
- Fire Rescue and Waste Management are okay with this layout.

### **3. Architectural Building Elevations**

Builder Presented 3 Different Architecture/Elevation Schemes, Renderings and 3D Perspectives for discussion (attached):

- Elevation 1 – Craftsman Style
- Elevation 2 – Urban Prairie
- Elevation 3 – Mountain Lodge Contemporary
- The Engagement Participants were leaning towards the 3<sup>rd</sup> Elevation as it would blend into the surrounding community better than the others but yet still be unique due to its architecture, colors, materials, warm richness feeling, and works well with stone retaining wall.
- One suggestion was to add some stone work to the front of Elevation 3.
- WLA Landscape Architect advised that adding extra stone/stone column may look overly busy and may throw out the lodge contemporary style after the stone retaining wall is installed.
- Participants shared suggestion on overly dark color. It is mostly due to the rendering and printing accuracy. Builder will present some real photos and colour samples at Meeting #3 for better visualization.

### **4. Landscape Design Concept:**

WLA presented a variety of selections of trees & shrubs that fits in this development based on the experience and understanding of the site. Participants suggested removing of two parking stalls on the east side to open up more green space for residents on the east side of the development. Existing trees (along the west side of First Place site) retention relocation strategy was discussed. Landscape designer will explore this opportunity with the City.

Some Landscaping features discussed:

- Curvilinear design.
- Concern shared about proposed landscaping along west boundary that may topple over the west property line upon maturity of the trees, however, landscaping proposed will grow more vertical than horizontal.
- Proposed fencing along property will be chain link. Preference for color is black and not just galvanized steel for the fence. There may be a requirement to have the fence at 1.8m high. Preference is to have it lowered so that it does not look like a compound. Builder will investigate at Development Permit stage.
- There is already an existing galvanized chain link fence along the apartment side (west side of this development).
- Central courtyard proposed to include raised planters for community garden, benches as a gathering place.
- Ample walkability and connectivity provided within the site.
- Gate can be provided to access the park from the east and the south property. Builder will explore this opportunity during the Development Permit stage.
- Stone elements will be utilized also (eg. for retaining) to offset any lack of stone work in the architecture.
- Landscape designer to examine if existing trees can be utilized for the development.
- Spring Snow Crabapple tree proposed will only flower and not bear fruit, as there was a concern about fruits falling on the ground, creating a mess.

## **5. Builder Provided Geotechnical Report Overview:**

The Engineering Geotechnical report noted:

- Site is conducive for building development.
- Topsoil depth ranged from 2 feet to 3.5 feet thick.
- Area has a low water table.

Builder shared an opportunity to participants on the excess top soil, which can be made available to the Community League to enhance existing park space and/or toboggan hill. However, Parkland process needs to be followed. This opportunity will be presented with Community league for further input.

## **6. City of Edmonton Storm Drainage Management Strategy:**

The City Drainage Dept. is in the process of investigating older neighbourhoods for flooding that may occur during major storm events. As such, the Drainage Dept. may utilize City excess lands to incorporate storm ponds for older neighbourhoods that may be prone to flooding.

For this development:

- Possible overland flood runoff location may go to the south west corner, and drain towards the park, as based on the topographic map.
- On-site storm water management will be designed as per City of Edmonton drainage standard and as per their satisfaction.
- However, we may have to design for a 1:100 year storm for this site (typical design is for a 1:5 year storm event, with anything greater to flow out onto the public streets) in order to not impact the existing infrastructure from this development.
- Engagement Participants noted that there is no recollection of flooding in the area but the storm pond to the east did rise during one major storm event.
- Layout 4g provides for an emergency overland outlet to the southwest should Drainage decide to construct a future storm pond in that area.

## **7. Key Messages, Follow Up items:**

1. City of Edmonton Transportation Operations Contact.
2. Investigate mixing of element from Elevation 1 (front stone) into Elevation 3.
3. Sharing of proposed materials and colour samples for Elevation 3 at next meeting.

Agenda, notes, layouts and elevations to be posted on City website and Landmark Facebook page.

***Next meeting date: July 20, 2015 – at Landmark Office (301, 1103 – 95 St. SW)***

*\*Individual representative names taken out for privacy reasons.*

## **Transportation, traffic, and Safety: Queries and response**

### **Safety of resident and children as 151 avenue is a residential road.**

Every development done under the First Place program complies with all planning and development requirement including safety of the road, intersection, and pedestrians movement including children.

### **Impact of additional traffic**

A traffic impact varies with different development. Transportation planning has indicated the First Place development will generate significantly less traffic than the public junior high school originally approved when the area developed.

### **Relocation of sports fields**

Sports fields located on any vacant building sites are intended to be **temporary** and to be removed when buildings are constructed. There will be loss of two temporary sports field when First Place development occurs. The loss of temporary sports filed will not impact the community needs as we have plenty of similar field in the area and in closed proximity.

### **151 ave west of 30 st is a dead end, thus in case of an emergency evacuation of the area it would we think hinder our Safety.**

Fire rescue services response:

The area north of the site (the dead-ended portion of the neighbourhood) is looped throughout, such that the only dead end portion is that stretching along 151 Ave from 30th street to 31st street (less than 100 m). In addition to the dead-end length (which is less than our guideline of 120 m) we use a dwelling density to estimate issues with emergency egress/evacuation, and our guideline is 500 dwellings before a second public access is required. From my rough estimate this area is well below this limit. Further, 151 Ave appears to be a collector roadway (greater than 11 m) which provides less risk for blockage.