

City of Spruce Grove City Centre



Area Redevelopment Plan

What We Heard Report

A Summary of “Urban Living” Precinct Community Open House - November 28th

December 10th, 2019



Table of Contents

1.0	What We Heard	1
1.1	What We Did	1
1.2	Who Attended	2
1.3	Community Sentiment & Summary	2

APPENDICES UNDER SEPARATE COVER

1.0 What We Heard

1.1 What We Did

At the direction of Council after a Public Hearing on May 27th, and a follow up Committee of the Whole Session on September 16th, City Administration and the Planning Consulting held an Open House to present an update on the envisioned density and redevelopment of the City Centre, and in particular the “Urban Living” precinct, whereby the community and in particular the residents of the ARP boundary could provide their input on the changes to proposed land use and densities. The Open House was on November 28th from 7:00 pm to 8:30 pm at the Pioneer Centre, located at 301 Jespersen Avenue.

This Open House’s primary focus was to gather feedback from residents living in the “Urban Living” precinct as defined in the ARP Draft, particularly around the topics of single family dwelling and density, and the implications thereof on residents and the ARP.

The Open House was formatted as a drop-in session with material provided in a series of 3ft x 4ft poster boards showing the following:

- Summary of the Initial What We Heard Report, from the Open Houses held on June 26th and 27th.
- Existing Urban Living Precinct Multi-Unit Densities
- Proposed Urban Living Land Use Densities & Evaluation Matrix
- Representative Imagery of Density Formats

“What We Heard” - Summary

Key Findings:

1. Residents support the ARP and the City Centre area, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
2. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
3. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
4. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
5. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
6. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
7. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
8. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
9. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
10. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
11. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
12. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
13. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
14. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
15. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
16. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
17. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
18. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
19. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.
20. Residents support the proposed density and zoning changes, but are concerned about the impact of the ARP on the surrounding area.

Urban Living Proposed Density & Zoning

Urban Living Precinct Evaluation Matrix

Category	2015	2016	2017
Appropriate density of residential	High	High	High
Land use mix and diversity	High	High	High
Walkability and transit access	High	High	High
Transit access to City Centre	High	High	High
Access to public transit	High	High	High
Quality of urban environment in City Centre	High	High	High
Benefits to citizens, businesses and visitors in City Centre	High	High	High
Integration with surrounding areas	High	High	High
Overall	High	High	High

Existing Urban Living Multi-Unit Densities

ARP Study Area Existing Multi-Unit Densities

1 - 312 Caswell Place	170 dwellings
2 - Spruce Street	35 dwellings
3 - 127 30th Street	58 dwellings
4 - Windsor Terrace	80 dwellings
5 - 442 Mar Street	100 dwellings
6 - 402 Caswell Road	150 dwellings
7 - King Street on the Park	174 dwellings
8 - 302 Queen Street	46 dwellings
9 - 217 Queen Street	117 dwellings
10 - 302 Queen Street	100 dwellings
11 - 224 Oswald Drive	38 dwellings
12 - 302 Oswald Drive	124 dwellings
13 - 112 Queen Street	130 dwellings
14 - 217 Queen Street	80 dwellings
15 - 112 Queen Street	114 dwellings

1.2 Who Attended

Prior to the Open House, local ARP residents were provided a letter advising them of the event's date, time and location. Additionally, an advertisement was posted in the local newspaper as well as advertised through City of Spruce Grove and City Centre Business Association Social Media accounts (facebook and twitter).

At the day of each event, attendees were asked to sign in and each attendee (refer to **Appendix A**). The visual depiction of the attendees is shown in **Figure 1**, which also includes a visual representation of the visitors that participated in the previous June 26th and 27th Workshops. The diagram uses red dots to show those that came for the initial Workshops or the Open House, while the blue dots show those that came to both the Workshops and the Open House. The Open House was open to any resident of Spruce Grove, however only those who lived in or represented a business or homeowner have been mapped in **Figure 1**.

The workshops clearly revealed strong attendance and participation from residents in the central and older single family area within the Urban Living precinct of the ARP, but overall the Urban Living precinct was well represented by residents of the ARP.

In addition to those that attended, feedback was also provided by way of comment forms and follow up letters of correspondence/emails, which have been provided in **Appendix B** of this summary.

1.3 Community Sentiment & Summary

At the various stations, staff from the City and the Planning Consulting Team were made available to help facilitate conversations and respond to questions or gauge overall resident sentiment regarding the changes to future density in the ARP Urban Living precinct and how this could or should evolve with respect to the current residential forms. From these discussions, the following sentiments were observed:

- Density in the overall City Centre is supported, while the new density directions proposed in the Urban Living Precinct are much more appealing to existing residents.
- Residents in areas that are currently in R-2, but exempt are realistic about the future transition of their lands and generally supportive of the transition to greater density along Church Road and Calahoo Road.
- Some residents have concerns about density increases and the implications on on-street parking.
- Some concern voiced regarding loss of parallel parking spaces along McLeod Ave.
- Suggestions regarding the flow of traffic in the area were provided (e.g. Queen St & Hwy 16A, opening Mohr Ave to Calahoo Rd, intersection of Queen St & Church Rd).

Specific observations as noted in Comment Sheets and follow up correspondence include:

“I am quite happy with the new research. It will not interfere with our present way of living.”

“This whole revitalization will cause headaches for many, many years....I am relieved that my area is now designated as low to medium density residential.”

“Thank you for listening and coming up with a plan that works for residents and the business community.”

“My concerns are parking...”

“I am strongly in favour of the new plan with the allowance to keep...the single family home area within the City Centre ARP on Mohr, McPherson and Jespersen.”

FIGURE 1: Open House (Nov 28th and Workshop Attendees June 26th & 27th) – Origin by Residence or Business

