Bold Moves

The table below provides a high-level description of the bold moves in play with the proposed amendments described in *Attachment 2 - Select Amendments - Markup and Rationale*, as well as a description of the potential opportunities and trade-offs of each.

| Key | Moves | Opportunities | Trade-Offs |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| H, BB, DD | Incorporate the land use elements of the temporary outdoor patio and retail space program into the Zoning Bylaw. Change Section 90, as well as the General Purpose and Development Regulations of the Whyte Avenue Commercial Overlay. These amendments only impact those developments off of road right-of-way consistent with the extent of the powers of the Zoning Bylaw. However, Administration is exploring opportunities to also continue those developments which are on right-of-way and are allowed by the temporary program. | Increases opportunities for patio development on Whyte Avenue. Supports local businesses with reduced barriers to outdoor expansion. To date, patios allowed under the temporary program have generated very few complaints or compliance actions. | Reduced land use oversight of some patio and retail development. Amendment would result in intensification of Whyte Avenue in terms of outdoor nightlife on patios. Council has in the past, specifically directed that this type of development be limited through the Whyte Avenue Commercial Overlay. |
| O | Grant the right to a permit holder request a one-time extension of Development Permit expiration by no more than 2 years. | Supports property owners and developers who may wish to temporarily postpone a development due to market conditions. | Reduces certainty of the timing of new developments for communities. |

Page 1 of 6 Report: CR_8487

| СС | Expand the maximum duration of a Special Event to 45 days before the Use is considered Discretionary. Under the current bylaw, events up to 30 days in duration are approved as Class-A permits, those approved for longer duration are considered Class-B permits, which are open to an appeal period and require public notification. | Expands opportunities for businesses and community groups to hold longer events. | This amendment proposes extending the duration of events that would be approved as Class-A permits to 45 days, a 15 day increase. This means that there would be fewer notifications and less opportunity to appeal when a special event permit is approved. |
|---------------------------------|--|---|---|
| G, I, J, K, L, S, V | Expand the number of instances where Development Permits or variances are not required for low risk and low impact developments. | Allows Administration to refocus resources on the basis of relative risk and impact of the development. Reduce regulatory barriers to businesses, event organizers, and residents. | By expanding the developments exempt from permits, there is reduced oversight by Development Officers on: - basement interior developments, - change of Use, - short-term special events, - platform structures (eg. decks), - accessory buildings (eg. sheds), - air conditioner units, - signs, and - landscaping |
| U | Update the regulations governing the provision of minimum amounts of barrier-free parking to align with the intent of Open Option Parking. | 'Right-sizing' the regulations governing minimum-parking to align with current practices, this amendment corrects an oversight from the implementation of Open Option Parking. | The minimum barrier free parking requirements of various Uses is intended to be similar or better to what had been the minimum overall parking requirements of the bylaw prior to the implementation of Open Option Parking (OOP). The education Uses proposed for amendment in Table 54.2.3 of this omnibus were inaccurately assigned to a tier in the bylaw which enabled OOP; this proposed amendment aligns the current |

Page 2 of 6 Report: CR_8487

requirements with the pre-OOP requirements. In addition to the oversight described above, the Natural Science Exhibits and Public Libraries and Cultural Exhibits Uses previously had high overall parking requirements that drove the need for variances to minimum parking requirements. In conjunction with variances to overall parking requirements, the barrier free requirements in these developments would be similarly reduced.

Page 3 of 6 Report: CR_8487

The current Zoning Bylaw requires that an applicant demonstrate hardship or practical difficulties in order for their development to be considered for a variance.

In effect, this means that where there are neither practical difficulties nor hardship, that a variance cannot be considered or granted, even if that variance would more closely align the development outcome of the decision with the city building outcomes described in The City Plan.

Expanding the limitation on variance beyond instances of practical difficulties and hardship does not fix all of the issues that arise from working with a dated bylaw, and there remains important work to be done to develop the future Zoning Bylaw.

The choice is:

Preserve the status quo of development outcomes and wait until 2022 when the bylaw is replaced entirely,

or

Make this move now and allow Administration the ability to consider and grant variances that will advance some of The City Plan's objectives right away.

Administration will be able to make more decisions on development outcomes that advance the objectives of the City Plan right now.

This proposed amendment does not give Administration 'free reign' to make variances, but rather lessens the relative weight of hardship in the decision making process. Where a variance is granted it must be justified with a strong planning rationale related to design outcomes. This rationale is informed by analysis of the impact of the proposed development and consideration of the direction provided by other plans and policies, such as the City Plan.

The Zoning Bylaw Renewal Initiative will continue to examine variances in advance of the implementation of the new bylaw in 2022. Should this amendment advance, it will give an opportunity to study the 'real world' development outcomes that would result from lessening the relative weight of hardship in the calculation of decision making.

This proposed amendment otherwise retains the regulations and limitations on variances of the current bylaw. This includes those regulations which require a Development Officer to consider the impact of a proposed development on other properties and the overall neighbourhood.

This change comes prior to the completion of the Zoning Bylaw Renewal Initiative, which is examining how variances may be applied in the future Zoning Bylaw.

F

Page 4 of 6 Report: CR_8487

| | | This amendment also retains the prohibition on variances to maximum allowable height, Floor Area Ratio, and density | |
|----------------|---|--|--|
| M, N, P | Eliminate the requirement to use the newspaper to advertise certain public notifications. Eliminate the requirement to mail out Class A notifications to neighbours adjacent to small-scale infill projects. A previous amendment, Charter Bylaw 18826, already allows for the use of alternative methods for advertising, however there remain parts of the bylaw which still restrict communication options to newspaper advertising in many circumstances. | Reduces overhead expenses and increases flexibility to select public communication methods. Removing the requirement for newspaper advertisements allows Administration to use alternative advertisements, including electronic notifications. In 2019 approximately \$70,000 of the Planning & Development Reserve was spent on these newspaper advertisements. | This change comes prior to the completion of the Zoning Bylaw Renewal Initiative which is examining how notifications may be used in the future Zoning Bylaw. A preferred, long-term alternative means of communication has not yet been determined, however Administration is committed to identifying appropriate interim alternatives before ending newspaper advertising. |
| W, Y, AA | Allow for Major Home Based Businesses on sites with Secondary Suites and Garage Suites. Allow for Child Care Services on sites with a Secondary Suite | Expands economic opportunities and mix of uses in residential areas. | Slight intensification of activity in residential areas. |
| B, C | Allow for the conversion of existing buildings to Duplex Housing and Semi-detached Housing. | Increases opportunities for 'gentle densification' in existing areas. | Intensification. May increase traffic, demand for utilities and infrastructure. Even when allowed through the bylaw, utility capacity, emergency services access, building and fire codes requirements could constrain many instances of this kind of development. |

Page 5 of 6 Report: CR_8487

| D, X, Z | Allow for Garden Suites and Secondary Suites where there is either Semi-detached Housing or Multi-unit Housing in the form of row housing, Remove parking requirement from Garden Suite Use. | Increases opportunities for Garden Suites development. | Intensification. May increase traffic, demand for utilities and infrastructure. Even when allowed through the bylaw, utility capacity, emergency services access, building and fire codes requirements could constrain many instances of this kind of development. |
|------------|---|--|---|
| E | Amend the definition of the Multi-unit Housing Use to allow it to be used in conjunction with Commercial Uses. | Increases opportunities for small and medium-scale mixed-use development, primarily in commercial areas. | Intensification. May increase traffic, demand for utilities and infrastructure. Even when allowed through the bylaw, utility capacity, emergency services access, building and fire codes requirements could constrain many instances of this kind of development. |
| Q | Stop doing Development Permit Inspections of row housing development in greenfield areas. | Refocus resources based on risk and impact. Have the option to not inspect developments with exceptional pass rates. Fewer process barriers for builders of medium density housing, primarily in suburban areas. | Accepting that rare instances of compliance issues related to Development may not be identified immediately. |
| A, R, T | Expand development opportunities related to accessory buildings (eg. sheds, garages) in residential zones. Allow for increased functional site coverage by exempting uncovered decks up to 1.8 m in height from site coverage calculations. Relax design regulations on residential lots. | Increases flexibility in overall development design, reducing regulatory barriers for businesses and residents. Allows Administration to refocus resources on the basis of relative risk and impact of the development. | Intensification of residential sites through: - modest increases in site coverage - allowing for projecting architectural features and accessory buildings to be slightly closer to the property line. |

Page 6 of 6 Report: CR_8487