

Argyll Master Plan Public Consultation #2
December 14, 2006 - 7:00 - 9:00 p.m.
Edmonton Chinese Christian Church

Update #3
Feb 8/07

Background:

- City Council approved the development of a park master plan for Argyll Park due to the heavy usage of the park.
- Generally, three public consultations are held as part of this process.

Introduction:

- The first of three public consultations was held on Thursday, September 28, 2006 at the Argyll Community Centre. The December 14th meeting was the second public consultation.
- The purpose of the meeting was to review two concept plans which were drawn up based on the feedback received at the first public meeting.
- Notification for the meeting was distributed door-to-door to every household in Argyll (336 houses) and approximately 250 homes in Hazeldean. Three portable signs advertizing the meeting were located on 66th Avenue/90th Street, 86th Street/Argyll Road, and 76th Avenue/91st Street from approximately Dec 7th-14th. An ad was placed in the Zone 3 Edmonton Examiner (Argyll, Hazeldean, Ritchie, Avonmore and King Edward Park) and ran for two weeks – December 6th and 13th. Notices were also sent through the students at five schools (Hazeldean Elementary, Mill Creek Elementary, Avonmore Elementary, Donnan Elementary and Saint James Catholic).
- 85 people attended.
- David Embury with the Velodrome Association provided a short update on the proposed Velodrome project.
- Susan Coward, Director of Community Building South, with the City of Edmonton provided an update on the status of the surplus school site. The City sent a letter to the Edmonton Public School Board dated December 14, 2006, expressing interest in acquiring the open space portion of the surplus school site and not the building portion.
- Jim Black, Landscape Architect, presented the two concept drawings and answered questions.
- Attendees were asked to participate in facilitated discussions around their preferred concept drawing. Two groups discussed Concept #1 and two groups discussed Concept #2. Anyone who preferred to talk about the surplus school issue was invited to join Susan Coward and Debi Anderson with the City. Approximately 40 people participated in that discussion.
- The third and final public consultation to review and comment on a 'final' concept drawing will be held later in 2007 (approximate date is unknown at this time).

Summary of Group Discussions:

Concept #1 Preferred:

Two groups participated in discussions – 18 people in total.

Gradients of Agreement Scale Results (both groups combined):

5 – Endorse
6 voted

4 – Agree but have some concerns
12 voted

3 – Abstain
0 voted

2 – Don't really like it but could change my mind if some changes were made
0 voted

1 – Oppose
0 voted

Comments regarding Gradient 5 – Endorse:

- BMX would be moving.
- Parking space would increase.
- Location on west side for parking would be good.
- Like that there would be fewer cars by the playground.
- Great to have a new soccer field.
- Signage on the road stating “no parking” will not work.
- Mulch is preferred on the trails - less upkeep and cost.
- Washrooms in the middle of the park would be good.
- Traffic would be reduced.
- Eliminate parking on both sides of 88th Street and allow parking on only one side.
- 88th Street is dangerous to cross.
- Parking lots that are close to the activity are a good idea – carrying supplies will be easier.
- The trail system is good.
- People supported the idea of the parking lot on the southern end of the park because of children using the playground and wanting to reduce the cars through the area as much as possible.
- The concept seems to accommodate all groups.
- The park is on a bus route.
- Very little green space would be lost with Concept #1.
- The proposed new parking is just a dumping area now anyway. A parking lot would clean up this area.
- Like the trail idea, especially from the bus stop to the park.
- Like two parking lots because that would stop 60 cars from driving right into the community (that's more than just 60 cars over the course of a day).
- Like the east parking lot idea – it eases congestion.

Comments regarding *Gradient 4 – Agree but have some concerns:*

- Object to developing a trail on the east side.
- Object to new internal trails.
- Object to adding a new entry to the parking lot at the Velodrome. Three properties across from the proposed new entry have front drives and no alley. This will make it difficult to exit these properties.
- Would like to have the skating rink by the community league building.
- There is a concern with amenities being too close to the bank of the ravine.
- Asphalt trails around the park and benches for resting would be good.
- Don't like the bathroom in the middle because it spoils the visual integrity of the park space.
- Don't like the diamonds fenced.
- Add indigenous plants in parking area.
- Would prefer paved paths (could also be used for rollerblading).
- Could develop a summer and fall baseball program for 5-18 year olds if the facilities were available.
- Generally, people suggested camouflaging as many structures as possible with natural ideas e.g. trees around the parking lot. Make the bathrooms visually appealing.
- Some concern about adding the second entrance/exit at the north end of 88th Street to the Velodrome parking lot.
 - Access might be too fast (it comes fairly straight off the roadway. Drivers could zip right in, especially those that are late).
 - Although it could facilitate in and out traffic (in one way, and out the other).
- Some concern for pedestrians and bus users regarding the proposed parking lot in the southwest area along 66th Avenue. It is felt that safety elements would be required i.e. a crosswalk. With the parking lot exit right on the corner, the safety issues need to be addressed. Exiting traffic from the main parking lot and the roadway, even if parking is allowed only on one side, will be moving faster and making exiting from the southwest parking lot more difficult.
- Very in favor of eliminating parking on one side of 88th Street:
 - Positive comment - it would open the street.
 - Negative comment - there are some concerns about increases in speed.
- There was a discussion about residential parking restrictions along the main thoroughfare. The group raised the issue that the parking would go further into the neighbourhood.
- This concept better defines the passive park space from the sports fields due to the planting of trees around the fields.
- Locate the porta-pottie closer to playground and community league hall.
- It was suggested that the porta-potties not be located too far from the sports fields (the ball diamonds especially) because if they are too far, people will not use them (especially during tournaments because of the short turnaround time between games).
- Females are also using the ravine as a porta-pottie along the ravine top of bank. One resident who did Capital City clean-up picked up a lot of tissue and other female products.
- What will become of the "mystery space" behind Velodrome after the Velodrome is developed? Could it become hang out area?
- The current parking lot attracts crime.
- Like the passive areas - develop them to be more than just green spaces. Put in picnic tables and benches.

Additional Discussion:

South East Edmonton Baseball Association:

- This user group would need 2 diamonds with pitching mounds.
- Parking at the west end would be great.

Continuous Path:

- Loves it – access for all.
- Be very cautious of the bank – there is an unstable area (close to the creek). This comment was made by a number of residents.
- Maintain a green space buffer between the bank and the trail.
- Like inter-connecting trails and the idea of linking all the trails.

Velodrome Concept:

- There is not another community/neighbourhood like Argyll that has a major facility similar to the Velodrome within its borders. The main road into the district park goes through the neighbourhood.
- Concerned about the new driveway on the corner of 88th Street and 69th Avenue. City would need to address safety concerns because of its location.
- Will the new Velodrome increase traffic?
- Should implement a free or reduced rate to residents of Argyll to use the amenities at the Velodrome.
- Who will be the potential users of the Velodrome once it is redeveloped? Will more people be coming into the neighbourhood?

Residential Parking Program Along the Streets:

- Like the southwest parking lot idea.
- The key to the Argyll Park redevelopment would be a new parking lot in the southwest end.

Toilet Facilities and Other Comments:

- Like the proposed location of the washroom.
- Porta-potties need to be camouflaged with trees or other vegetation so that residents do not have to look directly at a porta-pottie.
- Locate the washrooms by the playground.
- Need visible porta-potties for the ball players.
- Could use two porta-potties perhaps (one by the southwest parking lot). If people park there more, they will be more apt to use it rather than go to the trees/ravine.
- Love the passive areas - keep them and add more like the one by the school in Concept #2.
- The proposed passive areas are great.

Concerns:

- There are no bathroom facilities in the park.
- There is no water in the area.
- Object to porta-potties – need real bathrooms instead.
- Want a home base program for League teams.
- One resident said he really likes the idea of diamonds because it supports kids' baseball and getting the neighbourhood kids involved.
- It's difficult to give feedback without the current plan to view the existing configurations.

Concept #2 Discussion:

Items that the group liked from Concept #2 even though they preferred Concept #1:

- Permanent washrooms including ball equipment storage, a concession, etc. like the facility at Rundle Park.
- Like permanent washrooms supported financially by the City. Suggest that this be attached to community league hall but financed by the City.
- Is it possible to include a larger parking lot by the school in Concept #1?

Concept #2 Preferred:

Two groups participated in discussions – 11 people in total (one person was not there for the Gradients of Agreement exercise).

Gradients of Agreement Scale Results (both groups combined):

5 – Endorse

0 voted

4 – Agree but have some concerns

9 voted

3 – Abstain

0 voted

2 – Don't really like it but could change my mind if some changes were made

1 voted

1 – Oppose

0 voted

Comments regarding Gradient 4 – Agree but have some concerns:

- There was a major concern regarding traffic congestion and parking lots. There was group consensus that this was the primary concern.
- Residential parking permits would be a good idea.
- Natural trails from parking lots to park areas.
- There were some vandalism concerns regarding the porta-potties. Jim Black addressed the issue by stating that vandalism has been reduced with porta-potties structures.
- Have faith in the city landscape architects to do everything well except for the parking and traffic issue. A concern was raised that the issues of parking and traffic were not being dealt with by the LA.
- Traffic could be dispersed if signage was added stating that there are other convenient accesses to the park (ie. along 86th Street to 69th Avenue and into the proposed new entry to the Velodrome parking lot).
- Reduce the road speed by adding speed bumps.
- Speed of bikers would be reduced by utilizing shale rather than asphalt on the trails.
- Angle parking is not desirable.
- Allowing parking on one side is a good idea. The preference would be along the house side with passes issued to the residents.
- Do not like fencing around the ball diamonds.
- Prefer Option A for porta-pottie location - safer and closer to the playground (as per the note written within Diamond #5 on the concept).
- No Velodrome redevelopment.
- Concern about the possibility of an increase in traffic.
- Find a better location in the city for the Velodrome.
- The Velodrome does not fit according to city policy on major facilities.
- Multi-use trail by transportation - is it being incorporated in this plan and to connect to other communities?
- Don't close in too much with high trees – don't want an obstructed view.
- Logistically, not sure if people will park further away and walk.

- East side of 88th Street – could be residential parking only – would need permit stickers.
- Suggestion for a multi-use trail to connect to the park (from Hazeldean) along 68th Avenue and move through park from east to west.
- Traffic is only a problem along 88th Street when ball games on. Support no parking along the west side of 88th Street.
- Group wants the minimum amount of parking on parkland.
- Suggestion to build a bridge to connect the park to Hazeldean.
- Look at extending the 15 minute peak transit services later into the evening to coincide with the ball field bookings.
- Like the idea of benches, not fussy about tables especially at the far end of the park as it seems far from houses. It could become a “hangout” eg. east of school.
- Don’t build fire pits in the park. There are two fire pits at end of toboggan hill east of the school that have poor visibility.
- Still want site lines kept open for security reasons.
- Don’t want powerful lighting to light the fields.
- Do want trail lighting.
- Have the transit service add a route that goes further into the Argyll community.

Comments regarding *Gradient 2* – *Don’t really like it but could change my mind if some changes were made:*

- Amount of space between the ravine and the sports fields is currently too small.
- The school property is too close to the tree line of the ravine.
- Maintain larger boundaries between the sports fields and the Velodrome (eg. west side of baseball Diamond #4).
- Consider redesigning the park.
- Construct a dedicated road that loops within the park site (access off 66th Avenue and/or Argyll Road).
- Move Velodrome to the south side of the park.
- Don’t make the Velodrome building higher than it is – concerns about sight and sound.
- There are no bylaw officers working after 5:00 pm. Need more patrolling after hours. (Police have come through; the groups leave and then come back.)
- The west edge of the Velodrome parking lot is too close to the ravine.

General Comments:

- Retention of the walking trails on the east side is good.
- Feel that the extra driveway to the Velodrome parking lot would be a positive addition to the concept.
- Ball diamond alignment is good.
- Like the passive area instead of a parking lot at the southwest end of the park.
- The larger passive area at the northeast section of the park is good.
- The trail along 88th Street to the Velodrome is wonderful.
- Like the landscaping/trees.
- Like that parking is not along 66th Avenue.
- Pleased to see more trails.
- Like the current location of the Velodrome – there is little impact on site lines.
- Like the addition of trees.

Additional Discussion:

Concept #2, Option 3 (Elements for consideration in final concept or to add to a new Concept #3):

- Like the extra parking lot because it could potentially alleviate parking congestion on the streets.
- Purchase school site to build a parking lot.

Concept #1 Discussion:

Items that the group liked from Concept #1 even though they preferred Concept #2:

- City should buy the school surplus land (recommendation).
- Add a washroom facility at school site.
- Land transfer from one park to another park.
- Do not like the south parking lot (blind spots, safety, aesthetics reasons).
- Have a fundamental opposition to concrete (ie. parking lot) on parkland.
- Don't like ball Diamond #3 in this concept plan.
- Re-orientation of the ball diamonds to squeeze in parking lot is a negative thing.
- The visual of the Velodrome (ie. two stories) is a negative thing.
- Can you confirm if the fields in both Concept #1 and Concept #2 will be shale fields?
- There must be a parking lot separate from the Velodrome parking lot.
- You cannot have everyone driving down the narrow 88th Street to get to one parking lot and then expect them to walk back to their ball fields, etc.

Other Options for Concept #1:

- Look at best orientation for the baseball diamonds to prevent broken windows and improve safety zones.
- More and more park users are creating a safety concern – if one ball field was eliminated, there would be more space between all of the activities occurring in the park.
- Look at the plan of the District Park and differentiate between district level park and community level (neighbourhood) park space.
- Want to identify neighbourhood level park space.
- Consider school site as parking lot.
- Like the bike path around the park.

Other Comments:

- The timeline of Council having six months to notify the school board of their decision is too short a time period to make an educated decision.

General Information:

Contact List:

Community Services is continuing to add names to the Argyll mailing lists (email and regular mail). If you know of someone who would like to receive information on the progress of the two city-lead projects (Master Plan and Surplus School), please encourage them to contact Lynn Horbasenko. (Email: Lynn.Horbasenko@edmonton.ca . If they would like to be on the mailing list, they can call Lynn at 496-5927 with their complete mailing address [including postal code]).

City Contacts for the Three Argyll Projects:

Master Plan	Jim Black	496-4834
Surplus School	Lynn Horbasenko	496-5927
Velodrome	Elaine Betchinski	496-4919