

Incentive Program Descriptions and Stakeholder Feedback

Program Type	Description	Stakeholder Feedback and Administration Considerations
Per-Door Incentive	<p>A fixed dollar value paid per net new residential unit provided by a development.</p> <p>Example: Edmonton’s Downtown Housing Reinvestment Program (2000)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentially distortionary - might incentivize developers to maximize unit count by minimizing unit size. • Runs counter to efforts to provide a more diverse range of unit sizes, including units suitable for families.
Per-Square Foot Incentive	<p>Calculated by multiplying the square footage provided by a new development by a predetermined “per-square-foot” amount.</p> <p>Different ‘per-square-foot’ rates could be applied to different uses, etc.</p> <p>Example: Downtown Calgary Development Incentive Program (for office conversions)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to understand and calculate impact on a development. • Effectiveness depends on the dollar value available. • If available early in the development process, reduces upfront capital requirements.
Tax Freeze Incentive	<p>An annual grant payment is made for a set number of years that is equivalent to the uplift in municipal property tax generated by the new development.</p> <p>Example: 2001 Edmonton Economic Recovery Construction Grant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness depends on the present value of the incentive amount. • Not an effective incentive for office-to-residential conversions, as the change in tax class means there is less tax uplift. • Lenders do not recognize “tax freeze” programs in their calculations in the same way as direct grants. • Doesn’t reduce upfront capital requirements. • Ongoing administrative requirements to monitor and process annual payments.