Land Use, Incentives, Revitalization

Adam Shamchuk RPP

On Commercial Land Use

Vision

Imagine a thriving and vibrant central district. Row after row of storefronts are occupied by cafes, restaurants, independent retailers, craftspeople, hair salons, art galleries, and daycares. It all spills out on to a beautifully designed and maintained street, full of individuals, families, and visitors walking, biking, and shopping. It's a dynamic scene indicative of a healthy community with a thriving economy.





Vision

- To help realize this vision of a bustling metropolis, Council passed bylaws and plans that call for ground floor commercial uses throughout the core.
- While an admirable goal, this requirement of development has had negative and unintended consequences.

Reality

- Edmonton has an over abundance of retail square footage.
- There is an ongoing global disruption in commercial real estate that has dramatically accelerated in the last 3 years.
- Real estate is "sticky" and responds slowly due to the costs and time involved with (re)development - the market cannot *immediately* respond to imbalance and will resist devaluing assets in the short term.
- The market imbalance persists and is made worse because specific bylaws and plans demand ever more ground floor commercial square footage.

Fox Tower 1 (104 St - 102 Ave) Completed in 2015



The Hat (102 Ave - 95 St) Completed in 2020



Capital (108 St - 100 Ave) Completed in 2020



Impacts

- Edmonton continues to require ground floor commercial in the core despite persistent vacancies and the resulting impacts to vibrancy.
- This favors large-scale developments and discourages mid-density and small-scale projects from proceeding because they cannot afford to cashflow a loss on high-vacancy retail space.
- Stifles creative and adaptive re-use of buildings.
- Serves as a disincentive for development of new housing.

Links

- Edmonton has a vacancy problem because of a market imbalance in terms of a relative overabundance of commercial real estate.
- Edmonton has a **vibrancy problem** due to the vacancy problem.
- Plans and bylaws contributes to the market imbalance and vacancy problem by ignoring market realities.

Recommendation

- Amend the downtown and core plans and bylaws (12800 and DCs) that will;
- Remove any requirements for developing ground floor commercial uses in downtown and greater core in residential buildings.
- Variations to Consider:
 - Continue to require the *form* of a commercial space (in terms of base building and systems), retaining the potential for ground-floor commercial over the long term.
 - Amend 12.2 No Development Permit Required of 12800 to exempt conversion of existing ground-floor commercial into ground-floor multi-unit (and for groundfloor multi-unit to ground-floor commercial)

Summary

- Too much commercial = high vacancy
- High vacancy = \otimes + no vibrancy
- Eliminate requirement for ground floor commercial
- Right amount of commercial = lower vacancy
- ► Lower vacancy = ⁽¹⁾ + vibrancy

On Development Incentives

Attraction vs Reallocation

- When a city provides incentives for residential development they are not attracting / catalyzing new growth, they are only intervening to cause a shift in where supply meets demand within the market.
- For the city to incentivize development in one area it means creating a relative disincentive elsewhere by enhancing the value proposition of one area over the rest. In other words...
- When a new tower is built in the Quarters as a result of incentives, there has been no net increase in number of units in the city, only an intervention to reallocate where units may have been provided.

Limits of Demand

- Imagine that there are 1,000 potential buyers / tenants in the Edmonton real estate market every month.
- You cannot further attract these 1,000 buyers because they are already determined to live here.
- The market competes for a share of those 1,000 buyers by making value propositions for the various residences on offer.
- A value proposition includes a price point, amenities, and location.
- Price point can be made more attractive through discounts (like incentives).

Consideration

- Development incentives do not attract new investment, they only shift where investment occurs.
- You can intervene more or less in the market, but the more you incentivize, the less efficient the market becomes at meeting demand.

Recommendations

- There should be a limited number of incentives at a time to minimize selfcompetition and confounding monitoring efforts.
- Incentives should demonstrate a cause-effect relationship for the cash on offer as it relates to achieving particular outcomes directed by Council.
- Sensitivity analyses and open-books should be used to screen projects and monitor impacts to the bottom line of benefiting investments
- Incentives should be audited for their effectiveness in realizing their stated purpose on an annual basis.

Summary

- Residential incentives = no net new growth
- Incentives shift growth from one location to another
- Incentives are competitive, even within the same city

Thank You