

# TOWN OF Westlock

## Housing-Related Amendments

Land Use Bylaw 2022-12

Engagement Summary



# Highlights - Public Engagement

The Town of Westlock conducted a survey to gather feedback regarding proposed amendments to its Land Use Bylaw to address barriers to and encourage housing development. This report summarizes responses by question, identifying key themes, suggestions, and areas of support or concern.

## Key Findings

- **Housing Types:** Residents support encouraging infill development, basement suites, and additional multi-unit housing, while maintaining a mix of single-detached options.
- **Development Locations:** Areas near the hospital and in Southview were identified as priorities, with general openness to development throughout Westlock.
- **Lot Sizes:** Most respondents agreed with proposed lot widths and unit numbers but urged caution against excessively small lots.
- **Barriers:** Few major limitations were identified, though some concerns were raised about increased costs and the compatibility of multi-family rentals in existing neighborhoods.
- **Infill Development:** Residents supported character-sensitive infill but encouraged flexibility in architectural styles and design features.
- **Parking Requirements:** The majority found current parking standards sufficient and supported offering parking stall sizes to accommodate larger vehicles.
- **Rezoning Opportunities:** Suggestions included increasing R3 zoning and repurposing vacant commercial lands for housing developments.

## Summary of Responses by Question

### 1. Are there any housing types missing that we should be encouraging in Westlock?

- Several respondents suggested encouraging more infill development.
- A desire for single-family homes, basement suites, and additional housing units on existing properties was noted.
- Some suggested considering larger multi-unit developments or additional manufactured home parks similar to “Pioneer Place”.
- One comment recommended a clearer distinction between triplexes and fourplexes.

**Key Theme:** Encouragement of both traditional and alternative residential types, particularly suites and multi-family options, balanced with clarity in definitions.

### 2. Where should those housing types be developed?

- Several respondents recommended development near the hospital and in the Southview area.
- Flexibility was emphasized, with comments stating development should occur wherever feasible across Town.
- Concerns were raised about height near existing homes (suggesting developments over three stories be located closer to downtown or commercial areas).



**Key Theme:** Priority areas identified were Southview and near the hospital, but general openness to development across the Town with attention to context and scale.

### **3. Do the lot widths and number of units per parcel make sense for each Land Use District?**

- Some respondents agreed the lot widths and unit numbers were appropriate.
- Suggestions included adjusting minimum lot widths for certain districts to match existing lot widths (In R1 and R1-B).
- Some called for larger lot sizes to maintain neighborhood character.

**Key Theme:** General acceptance but a caution toward ensuring lot sizes are not reduced excessively.

### **4. Are there any limitations you foresee with building and development of your property as a result of these changes?**

- Most respondents indicated no major limitations.
- Concerns were raised about increased complexity and costs from stringent rules, and impact of multi-family rentals near single-family homes.

**Key Theme:** While many did not foresee issues, concerns around financial feasibility and neighborhood impact were noted.

### **5. Are there any other concerns with infill development not already addressed with the proposed regulations?**

- Strong support for matching character standards for infill.
- Requests for clearer rules and guidelines to avoid ambiguity.
- Opinions that flat roofs should not be discouraged and that flexibility in design styles is needed.
- Some concern that the regulations might be too cautious, potentially stifling innovation.

**Key Theme:** Support for character-sensitive infill but caution against over-regulating aesthetics.

### **6. Are the on-site parking requirements sufficient for each type of housing?**

- Majority of responses agreed that current parking requirements are sufficient.
- Some questions were raised about parking needs for one-bedroom units and the growing trend of reducing parking minimums in other municipalities.

**Key Theme:** Overall satisfaction but openness to reviewing parking needs for smaller unit types.

### **7. Should the Town allow for parking stalls of different sizes to cater to small or oversized vehicles?**

- Strong support for allowing varied parking stall sizes.
- Recognition that many residents drive larger vehicles (e.g., trucks) and accommodations are necessary.



- Some respondents emphasized consistency and clear requirements.

**Key Theme:** Acknowledgement of the need for larger stalls, given local vehicle types.

## 8. Are there any other specific lands in Town that should be rezoned to retain or encourage housing?

- Support for encouraging more R3 zoning in new subdivisions.
- Ideas to redevelop vacant or underused commercial sites, such as the Capri Mall site.
- Inspiration from innovative senior housing developments in other communities.

**Key Theme:** Interest in strategic rezoning to activate vacant lands and accommodate broader housing needs.

## Site Specific Redistrictings

In addition to the general public call for feedback, written notices were also sent to each impacted landowner regarding the site-specific redistrictings contemplated for the identified non-conforming developments. The table below summarizes the status of those notifications:

Address	Landowner Letter Mailed	Response Received?
10927 100A Avenue	April 1, 2025	Yes - no objections.
9832 106 Street	April 1, 2025	No response.
9848 106 Street	April 1, 2025	Yes - no objections.
10167 107 Street	April 1, 2025	Yes - no objections (1 owner) No written response from others.
10703 102 Street	April 1, 2025	No response.
10719 102 Street	April 1, 2025	No response.

