

**From:** [Karen Richert](#)  
**To:** [City Clerk](#)  
**Subject:** Concerns regarding Bylaw 1199-2024  
**Date:** Thursday, April 24, 2025 12:12:22 PM  
**Attachments:** [reply to bylaw urban city of leduc.docx - Google Docs.pdf](#)

---

**Caution:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments. When in doubt, please contact our Service Desk.

Please find some of my concerns attached as a pdf. I submit and would like to speak to the council at the public Hearing May 12 2025.

The claims listed - Slow Economic Growth, Changes in Consumer Habits, Lack of Residential Density, Shifts in Transportation and Mobility, Aging Municipal Assets – are refuted.

- \* The solution to boom and bust cycles is better budget discipline, not a less volatile economy

- \* the idea that economic diversification is inherently good ignores the benefits of economic specialization - people love what our unique urban downtown experience offers – a contrast to big corporate and online shopping. Just look at the support local wave we are experiencing now. Consumer desire choices are varied and not static. The cities job is to facilitate local citizen's desire NOT hinder that choice

- \*Rather than focus on top-down efforts at diversification, the city should instead focus on creating the desired urban downtown shopping experience that citizens who live here and visit here want. Who is driving the idea that we need; densification, diversification, large corporate online shopping, public transit instead of places to park downtown etc. Meeting the expectations of which consumer? The ones who live in Leduc and area and shop downtown or some other consumer?

- \*"The cost of maintaining...these assets (roads and utilities) can be prohibitive for both municipalities and private owners." City owned infrastructure is an ongoing budget item and is being used as a red herring argument. The city needs to maintain all of its infrastructure regardless of where it is, if the city cannot manage this we need new management. Aging infrastructure that is privately owned responds well to market demands not city directives.

My daily experience interacting with consumers does not support the city's rationale for the proposed redevelopment. This is not to say that changes are not needed – it simply means the changes should be reflected in the wishes of the local community NOT outside directives from larger influences.

Some areas of concern;

#### Page 2 Enhancing Safety

In many areas of this redesign the city wishes to develop walking, seating, recreational, etc space. If the city will not implement and enforce bylaws that will prohibit vagrancy, public disturbance, panhandling, camping, encampments, etc., there will be no point in building these areas. Prove to the citizens that the city will focus on safety before you implement any of this.

If the city desires to create safe neighborhoods they need to remove the discretionary use for a homeless shelter in these areas. The recent experience with the homeless shelter in downtown Leduc is well documented and this is a common sense change.

#### Page 7 Residential Neighbourhoods

"the target density for this area is 100 dwelling units per net residential hectare, in 2024 the density of the Urban Centre was approximately 40 dwelling units per net residential hectare."

**WHO decided this was the target density? Did the local citizens of Leduc ask you to more than double the number of units per net residential hectare? Did they even realize this is what you are proposing? Where did this target number come from - was it from an outside influence?**

Page 11, 14, 18 Transportation – Parking?

“Active Transportation: Modes of transportation that rely on human power, such as walking, cycling, and using public transit.”

“Enhance modal choice and improve connectivity to and through the plan area.”

“The objectives prioritize pedestrian-friendly environments, active transportation, mixed-use development, and accessible public spaces, fostering a dynamic and livable urban core.”

“a. Parking and event space: Strategically locate parking to reduce traffic on Main Street while providing flexibility for the plaza to serve as an event space.”

“. Require publicly accessible active modes parking throughout the Urban Centre and within all new street designs as per the Development Authority.”

**There is a lot of mention regarding alternative modes of transportation instead of traditional vehicle use. I do not see any requirement to maintain existing parking lots. We cannot allow the redevelopment of parking lots in favor of other uses. The city must remember we serve a greater rural area and these people travel to Leduc for shopping and services in vehicles. We rely on their support. As well, many people choose to drive their own vehicles for many reasons. Do the citizens of Leduc want less parking in the downtown area? If the citizens are not asking for this, who is?**

Page 54 - “Require ground floor commercial development along Active Frontages.”

The definition of commercial “Commercial Businesses that provide goods, services, entertainment, and/or food and beverage offerings, including retail stores, offices, restaurants, and entertainment venues.”

This is problematic. In the historic main street area we now have daycares and offices that are not appointment based businesses on the ground floor active frontage main street. This does not lend itself to developing a desirable shopping, dining entertainment district. If the city is serious about developing this area in a way that supports the goal it will need to amend discretionary use categories in the main street district. The current problems the city has allowed to develop will take time to correct – but no grandfathering of these discretionary uses would be a start. A clear definition of office will need to be drafted as well. To suggest the city cannot do this is without merit, the city tells property owners through zoning the uses allowed all the time.