

ZONING BYLAW RENEWAL INITIATIVE

WHAT WE HEARD: DISCUSSION PAPERS

Edmonton

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Engagement Overview	3
1.1 Project Overview: Project Phase 1, Stage 2 of Engagement	3
1.2 Engagement Objectives	4
2. Audience	4
3. Engagement Strategy and Activities	5
4. Engaged Edmonton Platform and Data Collected	6
5. Next Steps	7
5.1 How this information has and will be used	7
5.2 Future engagement opportunities	7
6. Discussion Paper Engagement Summaries	7
1. Nodes and Corridors	8
2. Residential Zones	11
3. Commercial and Industrial Zones	15
4. Agricultural and Rural Zones	18
5. Open Space and Civic Services Zones	20
6. Special Area Zones	23
7. Direct Control Zones	26
8. Notifications and Variances	29
9. Overlays	32
10. Signs	34
11. Climate Resilience & Energy Transition	36
12. Economy: Supporting Small Business	39
Get Involved!	41



1. ENGAGEMENT OVERVIEW

The Zoning Bylaw Renewal Initiative is a multi-year comprehensive overhaul of Edmonton's Zoning Bylaw that includes **rethinking how, what and why the City regulates zoning and land development**. Renewing the bylaw provides the opportunity to align our city-building tools **from strategy to regulation** and ensure all Edmontonians and property owners have the **necessary tools** to build the city envisioned in ConnectEdmonton and as described in The City Plan.

Zoning allows City Council to set rules for where new buildings should go, their basic form, what types of buildings they can be, and what activities and businesses can happen there. Zoning guides **growth in an orderly way to minimize conflicts between different activities and can improve the safety, public health, and welfare of citizens and the environment**. The Zoning Bylaw is an important legal document that has the power to shape the physical form and how we live in and engage with our city.

1.1 Project Overview: Project Phase 1, Stage 2 of Engagement

Phase 1, Research and Foundations, sets the project up for success. Stage 1 of engagement for Phase 1 dates back to 2018. Through a series of public and stakeholder workshops, surveys, drop-in sessions and meetings, Administration collected information on a wide range of zoning topics, from what should and shouldn't be regulated, to how rezoning notices should be distributed. The feedback in Stage 1 helped refine the direction of the Zoning Bylaw Renewal Initiative and the philosophy and structure of the new Zoning Bylaw.

In Stage 2 of engagement for Phase 1 (spanning July – November 2020), Administration drafted 12 discussion papers that served as the basis for engagement. The papers explored various topics and zones, and provided the preliminary thinking and direction for the new Zoning Bylaw's regulatory framework, including a philosophy of the new bylaw informed by what we heard in Stage 1. The discussion papers were Administration's first attempt at reimagining the Zoning Bylaw and served as an entry point into the world of zoning, breaking zoning concepts out into understandable parts and allowing Edmontonians to select topics that interested them. They were posted on the City's website and Engaged Edmonton, the City's online engagement platform, along with a series of questions and surveys related to each discussion paper topic.

To supplement the discussion papers, Administration hosted digital engagement and information sessions related to specific papers to encourage discussion, solicit feedback and allow stakeholders the opportunity to ask questions. Feedback from the discussion papers and stakeholder information sessions will be reviewed and incorporated into the new Zoning Bylaw's first draft, which is scheduled to be completed by February 2022.

1.2 Engagement Objectives

Administration identified the following engagement objectives for the 12 discussion papers:

- + To help the project team refine approaches to the various topics in the new Zoning Bylaw
- + To invite stakeholders to engage in topics of their interest, at a level of their choice
- + To gather detailed feedback from subject matter experts and prime users of the Zoning Bylaw, including City of Edmonton staff
- + To invite feedback from members of the general public, targeting those who have signed up for the Zoning Bylaw Renewal newsletter online or during past engagement sessions

2. AUDIENCE

<p>General Public</p>	<p>Includes general public via social media, Engaged Edmonton promotions, and survey promotions</p> <p>Past participants who expressed interest in continuing to engage in the Zoning Bylaw Renewal Initiative (via newsletter sign-up)</p>
<p>Industry/Stakeholders</p>	<p>Industry stakeholders and organizations that have identified interest to engage on the new Zoning Bylaw.</p> <p>A Core Stakeholder Group of 80+ members, formed on the Integral City Model of engaging public institutions, business, and civil society (including community groups)</p>
<p>Internal City of Edmonton</p>	<p>Includes internal City of Edmonton staff who work in areas that will be affected by the new Zoning Bylaw, and those who work in areas and have subject matter expertise to inform the development of discussion papers.</p>

3. ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY AND ACTIVITIES

Pivoting to online engagement activities due to the COVID-19 pandemic, engagement on the discussion papers aimed **to create opportunities for the public and stakeholders to invest different amounts of time to engagement.** This involved providing different engagement options for participants to self-select the level of engagement they were able and willing to contribute to.

To build awareness of the discussion papers and communicate engagement opportunities, Administration:

- + Emailed stakeholders when discussion papers were released
- + Emailed internal audiences
- + Emailed newsletters to stakeholders regarding the release of discussion papers and asked stakeholders to visit the Engaged Edmonton platform
- + Conducted six stakeholder digital information sessions explaining the discussion paper and inviting questions about proposed directions for each topic
- + Attended approximately 15 various industry and community group meetings and presentations to share information and receive feedback on the discussion papers, including the Housing Coalition on Housing and Homelessness, the Central Area Committee of Community Leagues, the Executive Directors of Business Improvement Areas Associations, and the Edmonton Transition Climate Resilience Committee
- + Conducted monthly check-in meetings with key stakeholders, such as NAIOP Edmonton – Commercial Real Estate Development Association, Urban Development Institute – Edmonton Region, and Canadian Home Builders Association – Edmonton Region
- + Published social media posts to drive traffic to the Engaged Edmonton platform and the discussion papers
- + Published articles in the Building Edmonton Newsletter outlining discussion paper topics and driving audiences to Engaged Edmonton
- + Worked with industry partners and key stakeholders, such as the Edmonton Federation Community Leagues, to share information on the discussion papers with their membership, with each discussion paper release

Public engagement and the release of the discussion papers took place from **July to November 2020 in three batches**, as outlined in the table below.

Batch	Engagement Period	Discussion Paper Topics
1	July 13 – August 7, 2020	+ Agriculture and Rural Zones + Commercial and Industrial Zones + Direct Control Zones + Overlays
2	August 24 – September 18, 2020	+ Climate Resilience & Energy Transition + Economy: Supporting Small Business + Nodes and Corridors + Special Area Zones
3	October 19 – November 13, 2020	+ Open Space & Civic Services Zones + Residential Zones + Notifications and Variances + Signs

4. ENGAGED EDMONTON PLATFORM AND DATA COLLECTED

The Engaged Edmonton site hosts online engagement opportunities so that feedback **can help the City of Edmonton make decisions** on its policies, programs, projects, and services.

The Engaged Edmonton webpage for the Zoning Bylaw Renewal Initiative included links to the discussion papers and conversation starters for each paper available for download, as well as videos of the information session presentations. Additionally, a number of tools were available for participants, including:

- + **General question and answer page** to allow participants interested in the project, but not necessarily in a particular discussion paper to pose questions to the project team
- + **Short surveys** to allow interested participants to respond to questions about each discussion paper without having to create content for feedback on their own.
- + **Ideas and forum pages** to allow highly interested participants to engage at a deep level and provide detailed feedback and suggestions specific to each discussion paper. Each forum included a prompting question specific to the associated discussion paper and provided a transparent way for participants to view what others were contributing.

In addition to the feedback received through Engaged Edmonton, Administration also received **comments and feedback by email and in the information sessions.**

Total Number of Visitors



Description of Engaged Edmonton Visitor Types	
Aware	An aware visitor, or a visitor that we consider to be 'aware', has made one single visit to the page, but not clicked any further than the main page.
Informed	An informed visitor has taken the 'next step' from being aware and clicked on something. We now consider the visitor to be informed about the project. This is done because a click suggests interest in the project.
Engaged	Every visitor that contributes on the page, either by asking questions or leaving a comment, is considered to be 'engaged'.

Engaged and informed are subsets of aware. That means that every engaged visitor is also always informed AND aware. In other words, a visitor cannot be engaged without also being informed AND aware.

5. NEXT STEPS

5.1 How this information has and will be used

Feedback received through this phase will further inform the **drafting of the new Zoning Bylaw in the Phase 2** of the Zoning Bylaw Renewal Initiative, and will be referenced in the Implementation, Technology and Rezoning projects as they progress.

5.2 Future engagement opportunities

Public and stakeholder engagement **will continue throughout the Zoning Bylaw Renewal Initiative** (anticipated adoption of the new Zoning Bylaw in the later half of 2022).

6. DISCUSSION PAPER ENGAGEMENT SUMMARIES

Links to **engagement summaries** for the discussion papers:

1. Nodes and Corridors	8
2. Residential Zones	11
3. Commercial and Industrial Zones	15
4. Agricultural and Rural Zones	18
5. Open Space and Civic Services Zones	20
6. Special Area Zones	23
7. Direct Control Zones	26
8. Notifications and Variances	29
9. Overlays	32
10. Signs	34
11. Climate Resilience & Energy Transition	36
12. Economy: Supporting Small Business	39

NODES AND CORRIDORS

The Nodes and Corridors discussion paper proposes how the new Zoning Bylaw can implement The City Plan’s concept of the **15-minute city through a network of nodes and corridors that are integrated with mass transit and mobility hubs**. The paper proposes to support mixed use areas that enable a range of businesses, housing types and community amenities through **three new mixed use zones** that are contextually appropriate and enhance the pedestrian experience.

Through engagement the public was asked to provide **their thoughts on the proposed mixed use zones**, whether three zones are enough to create **vibrant mixed use streets and destinations** within Edmonton, how mixed use zones could regulate **transitions from high-rise development to mid and low-rise development**, and what aspects buildings are important to regulate in relation to **different street types**.

Engagement Activities

Public engagement on this paper was undertaken through the Engaged Edmonton platform between **August 24 and September 18, 2020**. In addition to collecting feedback on the City’s Engaged Edmonton platform, **several virtual information sessions** on the discussion paper were held in **September** with interested stakeholders.

Engaged Edmonton Data Collection



Note that 1 visitor may be associated with multiple visits

Survey Questions on Engaged Edmonton

There were 32 respondents that participated in the survey. There was general support for the proposed mixed use zones, but concern that the regulations would need to be flexible to respond to different contexts otherwise overlays or additional zones would be required. In order to ensure sensitive transitions from high to medium to low-rise development, participants felt that stepbacks are an important control factor in addition to setbacks. On building design by street typology, the requirement for active frontage design was seen as the most important factor to control as a means to make wider, faster streets more pedestrian friendly. There was general support for allowing horizontal mixed use and using context modifiers to create appropriate building heights, scale and built-form that respond to local areas. Street level pedestrian engagement was identified as important, as well as urban design to create unique buildings that can be active and attractive throughout the year, including during the winter months.

Forum / Ideas on Engaged Edmonton

Five ideas were submitted for the Nodes and Corridors discussion paper, including suggestions for active backstreets in denser areas and to activate backstreets with small storefronts; building regulations to mitigate noise and pollution into the zoning regulations and separating residential uses and pedestrians from traffic; increasing flexibility in the regulations to reduce reliance on Direct Control zones; and increasing bike connections to support commercial services provided by bike couriers and supporting bicycle commutes for residents.

Feedback Summary

In addition to the feedback received through the Engaged Edmonton platform, feedback was also received from information sessions and written responses from stakeholders on the Nodes and Corridors discussion paper. A summary of the feedback included:

- + Support for fewer and more streamlined zones and using context modifiers to provide nuanced direction for density and massing
- + Infrastructure costs and deficits need to be addressed and supported by City Administration in order to make the proposed development changes a reality. The cost is too great for the developer to bear alone
- + Suggestions for form-based regulations not extending beyond height, setbacks and site coverage and to not require commercial at-grade
- + Support for horizontal and vertical mixed use to support development in these areas
- + Concerns regarding stepback requirements that can harm a project financially and identifying that articulation and/or reducing building massing can be achieved through alternative measures
- + Suggestions to conduct further analysis on bonusing provisions to avoid negating potential benefits
- + Suggestions for design regulations to be clear (not subjective) to be able to implement and enforce
- + Concern for urban design brief and requirements for other special studies (wind, sun/shadow, parking impacts, etc) and questions regarding who will implement and review the studies and relationship to the Edmonton Design Committee review
- + Concern for commercial at-grade requirements and suggestions to focus on active frontage and flexible mixed use configurations to support human-scale development and pedestrian activity
- + Mixed opinions on the use of incentives, some noted concern for using height as an incentive in the node and corridor areas that will be encouraged to have higher densities, and others supported the use of building incentives into regulations to achieve other city-wide goals such as financing public goods and affordable housing

Quotes from the Feedback

"It really feels like there are not enough zones to cover the distinctions required for major, district and local nodes and primary and secondary corridors. It feels like we need a zone for existing residential along corridors and nodes not just commercial."

"I like the idea of three zones. It's nice and simple. I think it can be enough as long as the regulations are flexible to serve different contexts. Keep this in mind or we may end up with more Overlays."

"It is already identified in the discussion paper, but the need for context modifiers to ensure mixed use developments are appropriate and complement local site area."

"Solid urban design is important for building vibrant urban spaces. It is encouraging to see that this is a common theme in the Nodes and Corridors zone."

"Community amenity contributions should be handled via a separate policy, not in the zones, and the same standards should apply to both DC zones and conventional zones."

"Rethink requirements for building stepbacks and podium/tower configurations on small sites; stepbacks are very costly, especially for small to medium sized buildings on small sites. Need to explore other mechanisms to encourage transition and good design. Tower /podium configuration on small sites removes many slim building design possibilities unnecessarily."

"Reference to 'high quality, durable exterior finishing materials'--is this necessary or a holdover from an era of ugly buildings? Why do we need this--what are we specifically looking to accomplish or prevent?"

"1 - 3 story commercial should be allowed. We need to think of mixed used neighborhoods not just sites. Setbacks and stepbacks are expensive and should be given more than a floor bonus."

"The best way to design nodes is to meet the daily living needs of people with disabilities. I notice there is nothing about accessibility here which is not acceptable. If a small area can meet the needs of someone to be able to lead a rich and fulfilled life, this fine grain will work for everyone else. We espouse aging-in-place and yet rarely do our neighbourhoods accommodate aging needs or have adjacent amenities that work. Bring this lens to all the planning decisions and we might start having a decent city. Check the use of the ableist term: walkable."

RESIDENTIAL ZONES

The Residential Zones discussion paper represents Administration's **first attempt** at reimagining how the new Zoning Bylaw can serve our existing and future residents with housing options for those of different means and in different stages of life. The proposed approach will support the following **Big City Moves** from The City Plan:

- + To establish a **"Community of Communities"** by creating 15-minute districts where residents would have more access to businesses, services, and amenities within 15 minutes from where they live.
- + To become more **"Inclusive and Compassionate"** by providing more housing options in more neighbourhoods throughout the city to help ensure everyone has access to safe housing.
- + To become a **"Rebuildable City"** by supporting neighbourhoods as they grow and redevelop to adapt to the changing needs of Edmontonians.

The paper introduced several ideas about how residential neighbourhoods could be regulated differently in the new Zoning Bylaw in order **to provide more housing options and allow for more local services to be available closer to where people live**. Through public engagement, the public was asked to provide input about allowing more housing and more small businesses into neighbourhoods.

Engagement Activities

Public engagement on this paper was undertaken through the Engaged Edmonton platform from **October 20 to November 13, 2020**. Additionally, **5 information sessions** were conducted in **October and November** with various community and industry stakeholders.

Engaged Edmonton Data Collection



Note that 1 visitor may be associated with multiple visits

Survey Questions on Engaged Edmonton

Many respondents indicated that allowing for more housing options could provide them with more opportunities to age in-place within their neighbourhood and bring new people to the community. This could create the support necessary to bring more services and businesses into the neighbourhood, strengthen the local economy, and support schools and transit. Other respondents also recognized that this could mean replacing the aging housing stock in their neighbourhood. However, the survey also indicated that the greatest concern with introducing more housing is the loss of mature trees, followed by the loss of sunlight and concerns about the design of the new buildings. Additional concerns include construction practices causing damage to property. 33% of the respondents did not raise any concerns.

71% of respondents supported the idea of allowing small business storefronts to be located on a residential property either in the front of the site or facing the lane. 13% were not sure. Explanations for the responses varied greatly. There were indications of support for entrepreneurs and small businesses, but concerns were also raised about impacts due to noise and traffic, as well as whether City infrastructure could support the additional activity. Several respondents would want more specific information about how it would be regulated before they could make a judgment on the idea.

86% of respondents supported the idea of local nodes and having businesses and amenities within a neighbourhood. Reasons include supporting the idea of a walkable, vibrant community and that these businesses or amenities already exist where they live.

Finally, about half of respondents were interested in building additional units on their property, mainly for secondary suites and garden suites. Of those who were not interested, they were either not in a position to do so because they're renting, live in a high-rise building, unable to afford the cost of development, or they preferred the use of their existing yard space.

Forum / Ideas on Engaged Edmonton

One idea was submitted, indicating a preference that neighbourhoods provide rear lane access for vehicles in order to leave an uninterrupted sidewalk for pedestrians and to allow for boulevard trees.

Feedback Summary

In addition to the feedback received through the Engaged Edmonton platform, feedback was also received from information sessions and written responses from stakeholders on the Residential Zones discussion paper. A summary of the feedback included:

- + More information is wanted on how new development will be regulated through the new zones
- + Concerns and suggestions raised about how the height of buildings should be calculated and what the appropriate height should be for each proposed residential zone
- + Concerns about allowing more non-residential activity in residential neighbourhoods and whether these may create additional impacts or weaken demand for existing commercial areas
- + More clarity is needed around how non-residential uses will apply to this zone and where these can be located
- + Consider that more than two residential zones be used to accommodate and respect local neighbourhood culture and recognize locational context
- + Questions from industry stakeholders about the need to regulate and require common amenity area and units with more bedrooms
- + Comments about aligning development potential with servicing requirements being vital, such that understanding how drainage, water, electrical, and fire safety requirements will be calculated for new developments will determine how functional the proposed zones can allow for different housing options.

- + More clarity is wanted to understand how the 15-minute districts will be achieved and how the different land use mixes needed will be identified
- + There was some confusion around how the agricultural use would be applied differently between a rural and urban setting
- + There was a concern that barrier-free design requirements will add significant cost that may inhibit future development
- + A community league supported regulations mandating a minimum number of larger units in larger residential developments
- + If the Mature Neighbourhood Overlay was retired, a community was supportive of incorporating regulations from the overlay into the residential zone
- + Concerns that the proposed changes are deregulation without proper municipal oversight and enforcement on future development and redevelopment
- + Concerns about loss of sunlight, impacts on privacy, more noise
- + Some residents are interested in different housing forms: garden suites, live-work housing, co-housing
- + Questions were raised on why some residential areas won't be rezoned by the City to a higher density residential zone to align with The City Plan direction
- + There may be additional need to ensure regulations are enforced appropriately
- + Property assessment methods may need to change to reflect the changes to how land will be zoned in the city
- + Exploring ways the Zoning Bylaw could ensure appropriate electrical infrastructure is provided for future electrification of residential buildings to help meet climate goals

Quotes from the Feedback

"The need to replace residential buildings that are at or beyond their end of life is critical to neighbourhood renewal."

"The opportunity to have more housing options other than single family homes within my neighbourhood. I wish there were more low-rise and mid-rise apartment buildings on quiet roads."

"Any development that will activate alleys and "out of the way" places will be of value to build neighbourhood interest, convenience and safety while creating an economic development opportunity. Good design and management will be a critical component of any business plan that would have to be reviewed and assessed."

"The City should not promote an increase in pedestrian traffic in back alleys without first investing in the infrastructure and providing funding for enhancing the maintenance of what has historically been a utility/industrial corridor."

"This project can have huge implications on other parts of the City, but those implications may also be resoundingly positive."

"This is an opportunity for us to set the stage for future developments and put in place requirements that helps us achieve climate resilience goals at a residential level."

"It should be noted that limiting small apartment buildings to three storeys may not contribute to the equity piece the Zoning Bylaw Renewal seeks to accomplish as this housing form often does not include space for an elevator. Without an elevator, seniors or those with mobility aids may be precluded from accessing this housing form."

"The move to two residential zones is ambitious. While we support this move in theory, we believe it may lead to struggle in the real world (significant community opposition on a site-by-site basis), which will then lead to a reliance on direct control zones as a workaround."

"Limiting height to 10m makes it very difficult to develop certain product types that reflect market demand, such as three-storey skinny homes or drive-under townhomes."

"In communities that have front garage access even where a lane exists, the built form should shift to begin accommodating car access from the rear. This type of development immeasurably improves the pedestrian streetscape."

"Consider relaxing amenity area requirements especially where development is located near parks and other community amenities. Amenity area is another element that the market will dictate. For example, some consumers will choose to live in higher densities with less amenity area but near other amenities (parks, river valley, etc.). Other consumers will choose to live in single-detached products with more private amenity areas such as a backyard."

COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL ZONES

The Commercial and Industrial Zones discussion paper seeks to **simplify and streamline development regulations** for commercial and industrial development in Edmonton. The paper proposes to accomplish this by reducing the number of commercial zones from **seven to one**, and industrial zones from **five to three**. To further advance the City Plan’s policies related to the Non-residential Network, the discussion paper also proposes to:

- + Enhance **pedestrian safety** by ensuring new commercial development is walkable and well-designed.
- + Encourage **investment and redevelopment** with a broad range of opportunities in commercial and light industrial zones.
- + Maintain the **viability of industrial land** by limiting commercial opportunities in more intensive industrial zones.
- + Ensure **safe development** with zones that can minimize and buffer risk from intensive industrial activities.

Through public engagement, the public was asked their opinions on the proposed approach to Commercial and Industrial zones in the new Zoning Bylaw. Specifically, the **location of land uses** that require larger floor areas, like religious assemblies and community halls; and identifying factors that can contribute to **economic resilience** amongst changing market conditions.

Engagement Activities

Public engagement on this paper was undertaken through the Engaged Edmonton platform from **July 13 to August 7, 2020**. **Several online information sessions** were held for members of the commercial and industrial development industry and Business Improvement Areas on **August 5 and August 7, 2020**, respectively.

Engaged Edmonton Data Collection



Note that 1 visitor may be associated with multiple visits

Survey Questions on Engaged Edmonton

In asking participants their thoughts on what should be used to differentiate the proposed General Commercial Zone from the Business Employment Zone, 36% of participants indicated that building size, design, and proximity to sensitive land uses such as residential or educational settings are appropriate measures. In response to whether civic service activities should be allowed in the commercial and industrial zones, 39.4% of participants thought civic services should be allowed in the General Commercial, Business Employment and the General Industrial zones. In response to the question on how commercial and industrial zones can be more resilient to changing market conditions, participants highlighted the need for flexibility with nearly half (49%) of survey respondents indicating that “ensuring regulations for the lands are flexible and adaptable to allow for innovation and new industries”.

Respondents were asked if they'd like to provide the project team with information that they should know about. From the feedback, participants noted:

- + Flexibility is important to reduce reliance on Direct Control zones
- + Flexible uses are needed to accommodate a variety of business types and the bylaw should minimize location constraints for specific businesses
- + Regulations should focus on how the building interacts with the street and impacts adjacent residential development
- + In regards to the proposed General Commercial Zone:
 - Desire for more flexible or increased height limits and not limiting taller development to the nodes and corridors
 - A need for further analysis on the viability of different built forms to inform new regulations, in particular whether or not restricting development in the proposed General Commercial zone to three storeys is appropriate, and assessing the cost and benefits of imposing setback and stepback requirements
 - Desire for mixed use design standards and ensuring building connections to sidewalks for better on site circulation
- + In regards to the proposed industrial zones:
 - The importance of restricting commercial development and maintaining limited amounts of non-residential land for industrial activities

Forum / Ideas on Engaged Edmonton

One comment was submitted in the forum suggesting that a significant challenge to the bylaw is that a number of zones have arbitrary height restrictions for buildings where the height has no impact to neighbours. No ideas on the Commercial and Industrial Zones discussion paper were provided.

Feedback Summary

In addition to the feedback received through the Engaged Edmonton platform, feedback was also received from information sessions and written responses from stakeholders on the Commercial and Industrial Zones discussion paper. A summary of the feedback included:

- + The proposed reduction and simplification of Commercial and Industrial zones and use classes is a promising leap forward towards a rationalized Zoning Bylaw
- + A required 6 metre setback when abutting residential areas is an unnecessary barrier to small scale commercial infill and works to prevent a granular development pattern. Commercial infill often occurs on small sites, and 6 metre setbacks are very difficult to accommodate

- + The proposal to cap the height of neighbourhood commercial development at three storeys may be too restrictive, unless it will be complemented by a more flexible residential mixed-use zone
- + Concerns about including density restrictions for residential uses in commercial zones. Such regulations may be regressive and would go against the proposed philosophy and intent of the new Zoning Bylaw
- + There is a need for the process of re-evaluating current regulations for commercial/industrial zones and drafting new ones need to be consistent with the nature and expected urban form of mature areas, but also with the desire to create a higher level of integrated design performance in suburban areas

Quotes from the Feedback

"We live in an age where most industrial is not hazardous. So for the most part differentiating them is leading to more red tape that businesses in Edmonton are trying to survive. If it is not hazardous then maybe rethink why we are classifying that it needs to be away from everything else."

"Design requirements can make these uses appropriate in any zone. The question of risk seems more salient – is it safe to co-locate assembly uses in industrial areas where risks may be higher? If included in zones as conditional uses, what criteria will the [Development Officer] have to determine if appropriate?"

"The concentration and mix of heavy industry is a balance between economic synergy, public safety and environmental protection."

"I am concerned that control over some of the more contentious uses (adult stores, pawn stores, liquor stores, massage parlours, etc.) may be severely impeded in a more flexible, enabling environment with only one broadly defined zone."

"The inclusion of performance criteria into the proposed zone is integral and should be expanded to include characteristics of the development in how they distil in a principled way to the parcel use – such as how it relates to safety and articulation with neighbouring zones."

"Simplification of the commercial and industrial zones is appreciated. Allowing for cross-over use on a moderate basis I think is important to include so that services are readily available for workers in industrial areas and that light industry, such as brewing at somewhat larger volumes that currently allowed, can occur within commercial zones in the context of accompanying retail or food establishment basis."

"We have questions about what is meant by "compatibility" and to strongly encourage your team to reconsider the means by which it is achieved if indeed it is necessary. We strongly believe that small scale commercial uses are compatible with small scale residential, and is necessary as we grow into a city of 2 million people."

AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL ZONES

The Agriculture and Rural Zones discussion paper is Administration's **first attempt** to outline how Edmonton's agricultural and rural areas will be regulated in the new Zoning Bylaw.

The agricultural lands identified in The City Plan are intended to be used for **agricultural purposes** until such time that Edmonton's future growth requires these lands **to transition to another use**. Limited non-agricultural activity could also be contemplated in non-urban parts of Edmonton **to support agricultural activity** in these areas. The City Plan also provides direction to support and expand urban agricultural activity within the city in order to strengthen Edmonton's food system.

Through public engagement, the public was asked for their input on how **agricultural activities should be regulated** and how **non-residential development may occur** in rural parts of the city.

Engagement Activities

Public engagement on this paper was undertaken through the Engaged Edmonton platform from **July 13 to August 7, 2020**.

Engaged Edmonton Data Collection



Note that 1 visitor may be associated with multiple visits

Survey Questions on Engaged Edmonton

A majority of respondents were in favour of farms being allowed to operate other retail activity that could provide support to the farm's operations. A slim majority (53%) would allow food processing or storage facilities while only a few respondents supported other non-agricultural activity such as truck storage or gravel pits. Most respondents were in favour of allowing residents to grow and sell food on their property without a development permit. Written comments spoke of the need to preserve agricultural land with a greater commitment to infill development and to see more community gardens in neighbourhoods.

Forum Questions on Engaged Edmonton

Edmontonians were invited to respond to a forum question, "What should or should not be regulated in Edmonton's new Agricultural and Rural zones?" Two responses were received on the forum question. One comment supported agricultural land protection because of issues related to climate change and food security. The other comment supported urban farming but preferred that the activity continue to be regulated to address issues with noise, nuisances, and storage.

Feedback Summary

In addition to the feedback received through the Engaged Edmonton platform, feedback was also received in the form of written responses from stakeholders on the Agriculture and Rural Zone discussion paper. A summary of the feedback included:

- + Suggestions to mitigate risk of urban food production in commercial or industrial areas where there may be contamination from the land or in the air
- + Comments about protecting agricultural land by focusing on infill development
- + Suggestions to ensure agricultural land protection does not hinder urban development
- + Support for food production in the city and more indoor and outdoor community gardens
- + Comments calling for the protection of ecological features within agricultural land

Quotes from the Feedback

"We need to make food production as simple as possible for people and protect prime agricultural land."

"Allow for community leagues to start community gardens without a two-four year process...I don't have a green thumb but I would be down for some honey from a neighbour or to walk by some rhubarb that I could buy."

OPEN SPACE AND CIVIC SERVICES ZONES

The Open Space and Civic Services Zones discussion paper reflects Administration's **first attempt** to simplify the zoning framework for Edmonton's parks and open spaces, while ensuring alignment with the City's open space policies, which call for **a balance between preserving natural open spaces and providing access and amenities**.

Through public engagement, the public was asked about their thoughts on the proposal **to combine activities such as schools, parks and community leagues**, which are currently found in different zones, into one new Urban Parks and Services Zone. Participants were also asked what **elements of buildings are important to regulate** and their thoughts on the potential for **limited commercial activities** in neighbourhood parks.

Engagement Activities

Public engagement on this paper was undertaken through the Engaged Edmonton platform from **October 18 to November 13, 2020**. Additionally, **one information session** was conducted in **November** with industry stakeholders.

Engaged Edmonton Data Collection



Note that 1 visitor may be associated with multiple visits

Survey Questions on Engaged Edmonton

For the question on whether or not the zones that schools, parks and community league halls are located in should be consolidated, 77.8% of participants supported combining these types of activities in the same zone, the proposed Urban Parks and Services Zone. In response to the question on what elements are important to regulate for buildings in the proposed Urban Parks and Services Zone, the majority of participants identified that location, height, and the design of buildings are all important elements to regulate.

Participants were also asked if they'd like to provide the project team with information that they should know moving forward. From the feedback, participants noted:

- + The importance of keeping the regulations flexible for schools to ensure provincial design requirements can be met
- + Suggestions that combining the Public Parks (AP) and Urban Services (US) zones could create ambiguity around who is responsible for maintaining these spaces
- + One community league indicated they would support digital signage to be permitted on community league lands and that concerns around brightness, light pollution, and distraction could be addressed through regulations
- + The need to ensure Natural Area Management Plans are enforced
- + Activities proposed for the "Civic Services" use needs to be narrowed based on land use patterns of activity
- + A suggestion to zone civic service buildings in separate zones from parks and to focus development on surplus school sites
- + The need to preserve green spaces and limit development in parks, while others noted the need to streamline approvals for libraries, schools, and community leagues to add accessory buildings or other amenities

Forum / Ideas on Engaged Edmonton

The one idea submitted to the Engaged Edmonton platform inquired about the possibility of allowing for some limited commercial activities in neighbourhood parks such as a small cafe or convenience store.

Feedback Summary

In addition to the feedback received through the Engaged Edmonton platform, feedback was also received from an information session and through written responses from stakeholders on the Open Space and Civic Services discussion paper. Some highlights of the feedback included:

- + Support from community leagues to explore greater revenue generating activities and efficiencies in communicating to the wider communities, such as allowing for-profit activities to operate out of community league halls and for the development of electronic signage
- + Suggestions to explore ways to turn the Rollie Miles District Park into an open space destination including leasing land for residential development, expanding the recreation centre and permitting some commercial development to support the aforementioned uses
- + Questions on how energy transition and climate resilience strategies will impact the regulations of the proposed zones
- + Suggestion that split zoning for the Natural Areas Zone be limited to City owned lands
- + Concerns were expressed about the City Plan target to plant 2 million new urban trees and whether this will require developers to provide more trees through landscaping requirements
- + The development industry noted support for introducing a new way of calculating landscaping for school sites, for three zones to govern the city's open spaces, and the elimination of natural resource extraction within the River Valley

Quotes from the Feedback

"Overall the intentions are moving in a good direction and are developed in good spirit. It is interesting that the City is proposing twice as many open space zones as they are residential zones."

"It is somewhat difficult to comment on these zones as the regulations and standards are going to be quite important (i.e. Winter Cities, enhancements, developer funded parks, etc.). More meaningful feedback could be achieved with more information or at a later date when these documents are available."

"Reducing the number of zones is good. A grouping of related land uses in one zone is good. Simpler, clearer, and more efficient (less work to execute zonings, less red tape for planners, developers, builders and users."

"Public Parks should be restricted to park/recreational uses, and community gathering uses. Parks should have their own zone to protect the lands from other types of uses."

"Schools are expected to serve the community in a variety of ways beyond providing education. School site regulations need to be flexible to allow for compatible uses to exist within the school building. Indoor Sales and Services and Food, Culture, and Entertainment uses should be allowed as an accessory development to schools to allow the school to serve as a community gathering space."

"Green space is precious! When I hear people say "passive green space" I know that they don't think of parks and green space as the lungs of our community. Rec centres, arenas, libraries, and other civic buildings should be built on commercial or industrial land – where there is lots of room for the building AND its usually large parking lots! Once you build and pave over parks and green space – it is gone FOREVER!"

"While it may be expeditious for development officers to approve variances in these zones, allowing such could result in approval of projects which really should have gone to public consultation, particularly with respect to building enduring infrastructure in publicly owned land. Here delegation of such authority should be considered the exception rather than the norm."

"The development regulations should be flexible to allow for a variety of built forms. The size, shape and location of school sites vary greatly across the City. The context of the site must be considered for the construction of a school building. The need for variances when constructing a school building should be eliminated with the new conditional use and development regulations."

SPECIAL AREA ZONES

The Special Areas Zones discussion paper seeks to establish a **new approach** for how Special Areas are implemented in the new Zoning Bylaw. The Special Areas discussion paper proposes the following actions as part of the new approach to Special Area Zones:

- + **Align existing Special Area zones to the new Zoning Bylaw** by rezoning some Special Area zones to the closest equivalent zone.
- + **Retain key Special Area zones** as they fulfill a unique purpose.
- + **Amend existing Special Area zones** to ensure alignment with the relevant statutory plans and overall direction of the new Zoning Bylaw.

Through public engagement, the public was asked their opinions on the proposed approach to Special Area zones. Respondents had the opportunity to comment on their **level of comfort** with relying on standard zones rather than Special Area zoning, and provide feedback on any issues which may arise as a result of that direction.

Engagement Activities

Public engagement on this paper was undertaken through the Engaged Edmonton platform from **August 24 to September 18, 2020**.

Engaged Edmonton Data Collection



Note that 1 visitor may be associated with multiple visits

Survey Questions on Engaged Edmonton

Respondents are generally comfortable with the proposed approach to Special Areas with a slim majority of survey respondents (52%) indicating a high level of support for relying more on standard zones than Special Areas. Three respondents (15%) indicated either a low or no level of comfort. Generally, respondents were supportive of the change and did not foresee many issues with this proposed approach. Respondents noted the importance of appropriate notification to property owners prior to Special Areas being rezoned. Additionally, some respondents indicated that changing to an equivalent standard zone may result in the loss of some features of the current Special Area zone.

Respondents were asked to provide the project team with information that they should know about. From the feedback, participants noted:

- + A need for more flexible standards which incorporate the best aspects of the Special Area zones and include opportunities for small scale commercial uses within neighborhoods
- + Including rationale in the new Zoning Bylaw for why the retained Special Area zones are considered "special" or unique. Currently, it is difficult to determine the difference between Special Area and standard zoning
- + A reduction in the number of Special Area zones would be helpful but it is important to retain some as they do serve a useful purpose

Forum / Idea / Questions on Engaged Edmonton

Three ideas were submitted to the online Engaged Edmonton forum. These included creating more flexible standard zones to uphold the principles of The City Plan. One respondent suggested that more greenspace should be reserved in the city for recreational activities. Another suggested that the Zoning Bylaw should be supportive of Edmonton being carbon neutral by 2050. And finally, that the Zoning Bylaw should not require a Special Area zone for environmental features such as district energy sharing, or on-site water treatment.

Feedback Summary

In addition to the feedback received through the Engaged Edmonton platform, feedback was also received from written responses from stakeholders on the Special Area Zones discussion paper. Some highlights of the feedback included:

- + Creating new standard zones, which will be applied city-wide, will require future engagement with industry
- + There is a need to ensure that if unique built forms or ideas are desired, industry still has the tools supported by Administration to create these areas
- + The need for Special Areas will remain in the future and that the practice should not be abolished

Quotes from the Feedback

"The City has correctly identified that the need for Special Area Zones has increased complexity and barriers to development. However, it is important to recognize that most Special Area Zones are developer-sponsored, as a reaction to cumbersome City requirements. If the use of these are to be avoided in the future, the City must become highly responsive to industry when it is identified that standard zones need improving. A formal feedback, testing, and amending mechanism within the City to keep zones relevant should be established."

"Rezoning existing zones have an impact on current owners and residents and should be consulted."

"Broader standard zones should support this change."

"Should not be issues provided all stakeholders are properly notified in time so they can register to have a voice in the change process."

"When we create a special area zone we also need to complete the associated plan amendment to ensure conformance. Any rezoning or updates cause [sic] by this update to standard zones should be done closely with the affected developers and should be completed as administrative updates."

DIRECT CONTROL ZONES

Direct Control zones are currently used to allow development where it cannot be accommodated by a standard zone. The new Zoning Bylaw will allow **more flexibility within standard zones to support a reduction in the number of Direct Control zones that are required**, making it easier to grow Edmonton according to the goals and directions outlined in ConnectEdmonton and The City Plan.

Through public engagement, the public was asked about their **experience with Direct Control zones** in Edmonton’s current Zoning Bylaw, and in what **circumstances** they think a Direct Control zone should be used.

Engagement Activities

Public engagement on this paper was undertaken through the Engaged Edmonton platform from **July 13 to August 7, 2020**. Additionally, **three information sessions** focused on Direct Control zoning were conducted in **July and August** with various community and industry stakeholders.

Engaged Edmonton Data Collection



Note that 1 visitor may be associated with multiple visits

Survey Questions on Engaged Edmonton

A majority of survey respondents (72.5%) believe combining DC1 and DC2 zones and revising application criteria will help clarify the reasons for using a Direct Control zone, and have a medium to high level of comfort with relying more on standard zones than Direct Control zones when a property is rezoned (74.4%). Many respondents noted that a shift away from Direct Control zoning will only be successful if the standard zones support good development outcomes, with several respondents specifying that greater flexibility in the standard zones is required to support innovation and adaptability.

Respondents had a range of familiarity and opinions about Direct Control zoning. Some value the certainty that Direct Control zoning provides, while others find it to be too prescriptive and costly. Some respondents feel that Direct Control zones allow developers to build outside of current plans and community direction, and a significant percentage (30%) did not know what DC2 means.

Forum / Ideas on Engaged Edmonton

In addition to the feedback provided from the surveys, participants were asked about their experience with Direct Control Zones in the current bylaw and under what circumstances Direct Control Zones should be used.

Two responses were provided on the forum page. One participant shared their experience of a Direct Control rezoning in their community and how the public engagement required by this process was difficult but resulted in better outcomes for the community. This participant sees value in the decision-making control that Direct Control zoning provides Council, allowing for a more transparent process in which community interests are taken into consideration. Another participant noted that because Area Redevelopment Plans are seldom used, Direct Control zoning is particularly important for large site redevelopment to ensure integration with the surrounding context and consider public input.

Feedback Summary

In addition to the feedback received through the Engaged Edmonton platform, feedback was also received from written responses from stakeholders on the Direct Control Zones discussion paper. A summary of the feedback included:

- + Direct Control zoning is often used even when a standard zone could achieve the intended outcomes, in order to provide the community greater control over the process
- + A cultural shift is required within Administration to decrease the prevalence of Direct Control Zones. This change will be difficult as Direct Control rezoning provides a process to hear and accommodate community feedback
- + Innovation can be achieved without the need for a custom zone. Standard zones will need to be responsive to current and emerging trends. Direct Control zones should be reserved for truly unique developments
- + Concerns were expressed that while fewer Direct Control zones are a positive there is a chance the City will be less open to them in the future
- + Building adaptability into the new Zoning Bylaw is important to enable and facilitate a broader range of development and to support the long-term vision and goals of the new City Plan. Form-based and performance-based zoning should be the primary focus of the standard zones

- + Direct Controls could be better defined if the application criteria was more rigorous and applied to the following situations:
 - Proposed development exceeds the density or development intensity allowed in a standard zone
 - To pilot new development forms that are exceptional or innovative
 - Where the physical constraints of the site warrant special consideration
 - To implement the policies of The City Plan
 - To protect historical, cultural and environmentally sensitive areas
- + If using fewer Direct Control zones, a better understanding of how community contributions, affordable housing and other Direct Control-specific outcomes can be achieved in their absence

Quotes from the Feedback

"Our standard zones need to have much more flexibility so there is not a need to DC everything."

"I think this will only be successful if a lot of work goes into the standard zones to make people reasonably comfortable."

"Direct Control is a site specific zoning, with it own established protocols for public consultation. Clear criterion and the careful use of the zoning preserves public trust of the planning process."

"The direct control application criteria proposed in the Discussion Paper is far too broad and will not reduce the number of direct control zones."

"If a direct control is needed, that should be an indicator that zoning is not creative enough to capture the innovative ideas of developers and we get the same old same old. Zoning is too restrictive and prescriptive."

"In 2015 a developer proposed a DC2 Rezoning in my community. When asked what a DC2 meant, he replied, "it means I get to build whatever I want."

NOTIFICATIONS AND VARIANCES

The Notifications and Variances discussion paper represents Administration's **first attempt** at thinking about:

- + How residents may be better **notified about rezoning and development permit applications**; and
- + How to provide **clearer criteria** for how variances (which are requests for exceptions to zoning regulations that can't be met) may be considered.

Through public engagement, the public was asked about their thoughts on whether they would find **development application signage** useful, the type of development application they find **most important for a development notice**, and the level of **discretion City staff should have** in granting variances.

Engagement Activities

Public engagement on this paper was undertaken through the Engaged Edmonton platform from **October 19 to November 13, 2020**. Additionally, **two information sessions** were conducted in **October and November** with various community and industry stakeholders.

Engaged Edmonton Data Collection



Note that 1 visitor may be associated with multiple visits

Survey Questions on Engaged Edmonton

The majority of survey respondents (71%) preferred receiving email over text message as a method of notification about proposed developments. Respondents cited the ability to save the email, felt the amount and type of information that can be communicated is more suitable as an email, and felt email is more convenient. Some respondents still preferred mailed notices. The same number of respondents (71%) also indicated that they were likely or very likely to seek out more information about a proposed development project if they saw a sign installed on site. The survey also asked the type of information that the respondent would be interested in finding out through the sign or other forms of notification. Responses varied, but generally centered around the form and appearance of the development, including the height, the amount of parking provided, and any deviation from what's required through the Zoning Bylaw. Overall, there was no clear consensus on how notification should be improved or how variances should be considered; comments ranged from the opinion that there is too much notification to too little, and that variances should either be broadened or further restricted.

Feedback Summary

In addition to the feedback received through the Engaged Edmonton platform, feedback was also received from the information sessions and written responses from stakeholders on the Notifications and Variances discussion paper. Some highlights of the feedback included:

- + General support for the proposed criteria that could be used to determine whether a variance is appropriate
- + Comments about defining more clearly or providing examples of how the criteria will be used to determine whether a variance will be granted
- + Stakeholders were generally supportive of using more diverse tools, including more online tools, to inform residents about proposed developments
- + Some concerns, questions, and clarification needed about the types of development that would require a sign to be posted on site
- + Comments indicating the importance of ensuring that proposed development information is kept up-to-date, whether it is on a sign, a website, or other online tool

Quotes from the Feedback

"The level of detail in the development notice is better consumed on a computer screen than a mobile device, therefore, I think email is more appropriate. Most people have smartphones and they receive email as well as text so through email you get better penetration than text alone."

"I believe the City provides more than enough notification and opportunity for public feedback already. We live in a major city - it is wildly unreasonable for people to expect personal notifications and the ability to comment and contribute to every single new development around them. This is a very small-town mentality that a lot of residents hold on to, or weaponize to disrupt new development in the city."

"A platform where Leagues could opt into online notifications is attractive as many Leagues experience issues with mailed notifications including that the mail is not always checked in a timeline conducive to appeal periods."

"I do not support eliminating Class A letters yet. Before doing this I would like to see much improved online info as discussed above. If a phase out is done it should be strongly publicised with clear directions on how to access the information by the new alternate means."

"I'm of the opinion that the zoning reg shouldn't restrict density or FAR at all. These are not features of a building that affect how my neighbourhood works. Site width - which I'm reading as mandatory sideyard rules - is mostly restricted in the wrong direction by existing zoning, forcing neighbourhoods to have tons of wasted space between buildings... The opposite restriction - requiring buildings to use their available width - might be easier to justify."

"There needs to be a clear definition for "minor variance"; ie. up to 10% from design guidelines as set out in the bylaw, as exists in some provincial jurisdictions."

"Allow for more variances. Variances shouldn't be based just on demonstrated hardship or unique circumstances."

"Immediate neighbours that perceive they would be negatively affected by the granting of a variance are unlikely to be satisfied with a justification pointing to benefits to the broader community. Is the City comfortable with that possibility?"

OVERLAYS

The Overlays discussion paper seeks to explore **what overlays are** and identify **how they function as a zoning tool** by analyzing how they are applied in other jurisdictions and within the Edmonton context. The paper groups overlays into three broad categories: **risk reduction, controlling the built form, and preserving land for future, unknown uses**. To further advance The City Plan's policies and the project goals of the Zoning Bylaw Renewal, four key directions are proposed:

- + **Keep using overlays** as they have been in the current Zoning Bylaw, but modify and streamline the regulations to align with the functionality of the new bylaw
- + **Delete all existing overlays** in favour of a blanket approach that treats all lots within the city equally
- + **Keep the overlays that protect** the environment and reduce risk to the city's natural areas and private property
- + **Incorporate existing overlay regulations** into the applicable new zones

The purpose of engagement for this paper was to gauge how the public and key stakeholders felt about overlays and whether the City should continue to **employ them as a land use decision making tool**.

Engagement Activities

Public engagement on this paper was undertaken through the Engaged Edmonton platform between **July 13 and August 7, 2020**. In addition, it was presented at **three meetings** with community and industry stakeholders for feedback.

Engaged Edmonton Data Collection



Note that 1 visitor may be associated with multiple visits

Survey Questions on Engaged Edmonton

The feedback from Engaged Edmonton indicated that the majority of respondents (75%) believe that overlays are a useful tool and should be used in the new Zoning Bylaw to some extent. Of the 32 respondents to the survey, twelve respondents felt that all overlays should be carried forward, while ten respondents felt that overlays serve a purpose but should be applied with intent. Ten respondents felt that Administration should remove the existing overlays from the new Zoning Bylaw and incorporate relevant regulations into the underlying zones. When asked what characteristics should be considered when using overlays to control built form, the primary response was to protect against environmental risk. The second most popular response was to control for heritage and historical built form. Other important responses included protecting against industrial risk, supporting good urban design and attracting investment into specific areas.

Feedback Summary

In addition to the feedback received through the Engaged Edmonton platform, feedback was also received from information sessions and written responses from stakeholders was submitted to the project team in response to the Overlays discussion paper. Some highlights of the feedback included:

- + That existing overlays which control the built form should be removed and incorporated into the regulations of the underlying zone. Overlays like the Mature Neighbourhood Overlay (MNO) preserve the city's core in time and don't allow these neighbourhoods to evolve
- + Forced design through regulation (i.e. location of doorways, articulation) is not an effective way to achieve our city building outcomes. Any overlay should focus on density, function and reuse of housing stock (i.e. how many households, allowing for multi-generational use)
- + The MNO needs to be addressed specifically as its own element of Zoning Bylaw Renewal, as many communities feel their neighbourhoods would be in jeopardy if it was removed altogether
- + If overlays are retained, they should align with The City Plan's six guiding values
- + Risk mitigation overlays should be addressed in either higher level plans (Area Structure Plans) or within the special requirements section of the bylaw
- + EFCL provided an analysis of the regulations of the MNO they felt would be best suited to be retained should it be removed or adjusted in some way. These included the front setback, contextual regulations, the required 40% rear yard rule, height, and rear lane access

Quotes from the Feedback

"Yes, I support the use of overlays; however, the overlay should be cross referenced in the underlying zone so that the overlay cannot be "missed" by land owners wanting to develop or redevelop their land."

"No. I believe they add unnecessary regulatory layers which make approvals' processes more confusing, which take longer and cost the applicant more, generally lead to frustration. I think they reinforce the perception that Edmonton is not a city which is open for business."

"The question of whether or not to use overlays seems to me excessively focused on process instead of outcomes. An overlay is neither inherently good or bad, and can be effective or ineffective depending on how it's written."

"Overlays have historically been used in Edmonton as stifling tools to reduce development potential, but that need not be the case. Shift the philosophy--overlays could be an effective, organized mechanism to ensure good planning and design outcomes without resorting to DC1s and DC2s. Don't throw the baby out with the bathwater."

SIGNS

The Signs discussion paper introduces a **new, simplified approach to permanent signage regulations**, with minor updates to temporary signs. This proposed approach introduces regulations based on a **sign's location on a property and its level of illumination**.

Through public engagement, the public was asked their opinions on the proposed approach to **new signage regulations** in the new Zoning Bylaw. Questions asked include: gauging the **level of support** for this new approach, **level of concern** about potential proliferation of billboards throughout the city and determining **important factors** of sign design.

Engagement Activities

The Signs discussion paper was posted to the City's Engaged Edmonton public engagement website from **October 19 to November 13, 2020**. During this period, members of the public had the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the proposed approach to the new sign regulations.

An online information session was held for members of the sign industry on **August 5, 2020**.

Engaged Edmonton Data Collection



Note that 1 visitor may be associated with multiple visits

Survey Questions on Engaged Edmonton

During the October 19 to November 13, 2020, public review period, the online survey received 23 responses. Survey respondents were generally supportive of the approach for the three different sign types (on-building, projecting from a building and on-property). A majority (87%) indicated that they support this approach, while the remaining (13%) respondents indicated "maybe" in terms of supporting the approach. Less than half of respondents (43%) felt very concerned about the potential proliferation of billboards throughout the city. It was noted among respondents that it is important to balance the needs for businesses to ensure their business visibility and to mitigate impacts of visual clutter.

Feedback Summary

- + General support for categorizing sign types based on location on the property and by illumination level
- + Support for moving signage regulations into each land use zone, as opposed to individual schedules of the Zoning Bylaw
- + General considerations were suggested for this project, including the number of signs on a site, safety issues around signs near roadways and sign provisions for larger sites with multiple tenants
- + Alignment with Area Structure Plans (ASPs) needs to be considered as some ASPs have sign regulations of their own which can contradict the new Zoning Bylaw regulations or over-complicate matters

Quotes from the Feedback

"The idea of using more imagery/diagrams and colour coded tables is great. This will make navigating signage regulations much simpler and quicker. I'm happy to see the city moving in this direction."

"Consider whether in addition to regulating a maximum number of each type of sign, maximum total number of signs must be included. This is particularly important in commercial zones and direct control districts."

"It is sensible and reasonable to have zone specific sign regulations, it is good to keep the sign regulations within the zoning bylaw rather than in a separate bylaw. The rules as they are laid out are very clear and understandable."

"Kudos to the City on extending its simplification approach to the review of signs regulations contained in the Edmonton Zoning Bylaw. We agree that current signs regulations are among the least user-friendly in the Zoning Bylaw and seem somewhat disconnected from the design and urban form that the different zones are supposed to strive for."

"If Edmonton is to become a Light-Efficient Community, a program it has already started, then there must be bylaws which support that endeavour and enforcements which ensure that the bylaws are indeed being followed."

CLIMATE RESILIENCE & ENERGY TRANSITION

The City of Edmonton recognizes that climate change will have wide ranging effects on **the city, its residents, and its future prosperity and sustainability**. City Council has signaled through The City Plan, the Climate Emergency Declaration, the Getting to 1.5oC document, and other policy directions that **addressing climate change is a priority that requires a city-wide collaborative effort**.

The Climate Resilience and Energy Transition discussion paper outlines a proposed **strategy to implement regulations into the Zoning Bylaw** in order that will help residents and businesses become more **climate resilient**.

Through public engagement, the public was asked about their input on whether they felt that the proposed strategies to implement climate resilience zoning regulations **would be effective**.

Engagement Activities

Public engagement on this paper was undertaken through the Engaged Edmonton platform from **August 24 to September 18, 2020**. Additionally, **three information sessions** were conducted in **September 2020** with various community and industry stakeholders.

Engaged Edmonton Data Collection



Note that 1 visitor may be associated with multiple visits

Survey Questions on Engaged Edmonton

34 respondents participated in this survey. There was no clear preference for whether climate change zoning regulations should be implemented as a requirement, incentive, or both. When asked to rank the strategy most important to implement in the Zoning Bylaw, having buildings capable of charging electric vehicles was ranked the highest, followed by reducing floodwater risk, enabling rooftop solar panels, and reducing emissions on new buildings. Respondents indicated that the effectiveness of the zoning regulation in reducing climate impacts was the most important consideration, but many respondents also indicated strong preferences for considering cost and ease of implementation.

Ideas on Engaged Edmonton

There were 35 submissions on additional ideas to consider in addressing climate change through the Zoning Bylaw. Respondents suggested that building roofs should be required to be designed to be able to install solar panels, disincentivizing building demolition, designing new neighbourhoods to be electric-only (i.e. no natural gas lines), incentivizing diverse landscaping, and balancing the need for solar access.

Feedback Summary

In addition to the feedback received through the Engaged Edmonton platform, feedback was also received from information sessions and written responses from stakeholders on the Climate Resilience and Energy Transition discussion paper. A summary of the feedback included:

- + Concerns about climate resilience requirements creating costs that make development unaffordable if implemented all at once
- + Need to better understand city infrastructure requirements to support transition to increased electricity usage
- + Ensuring climate resilient regulations do not overlap with requirements under the Building Code
- + Concerns that using third-party certification for climate resilient projects will add cost and prolong review timelines
- + Climate resilient technologies should be incentivized, not regulated
- + Concern about regional coordination of climate actions to maintain competitive advantage
- + Concerns about added cost or time in order to comply with the proposed development permit point system
- + Support for increasing density across the city to reduce infrastructure costs and carbon emissions from transportation
- + Questions about whether climate change regulations belong in the Zoning Bylaw or in a separate bylaw
- + Incorporate Light Efficient Community directions into the Zoning Bylaw
- + Interest from multiple stakeholders in how the development permit point system could provide flexibility in achieving outcomes for developments

Quotes from the Feedback

"Starting with achievable measures to ease the community into these ideas and changes is important. While we need to move far and fast to mitigate and adapt to climate change, we don't want to alienate industry. Having a stepped approach should be considered (if possible)."

"Reduce Carbon emissions, get to net zero carbon ASAP, Become a leader in this, and we'll really be on the map."

"The climate crisis is a health crisis like COVID-19 and should be discussed that way. Also, requirements for net-zero new construction should be increased much more quickly because they represent at least a 30 year commitment to the carbon footprint of that building."

"The city is not taking responsibility to teach Edmontonians and Industry what the next wave will look and be like. They are requiring things before knowledge, experience, expertise and demand is there. First we need education then incentives then regulation."

"Creating regulations that are adaptive and flexible is key to stakeholder buy-in, and avoiding dedicating excessive resources to application review and approvals. A Development Permit Points system allows development and redevelopment to be creative and allows industry to adapt to different aspects of the regulations over time."

ECONOMY: SUPPORTING SMALL BUSINESS

The Economy: Supporting Small Businesses discussion paper presents Administration's **first attempt** at reimagining how the Zoning Bylaw can help support a **thriving local business economy**.

Potential small business owners experience many of the **same constraints and barriers** with the current Zoning Bylaw as other applicants and developers. However, adding to these challenges is that for a **first-time applicant**, the learning curve for the bylaw and permitting process **can be steep** and the applicant **may not have the resources** to get help navigating the process.

Through public engagement, the public was asked their **level of support** for consolidating use classes and allowing a greater range of businesses in a given location, and how a more flexible bylaw and streamlined permitting process would affect their **ability to open a business**.

Engagement Activities

Public engagement on this paper was undertaken through the Engaged Edmonton platform from **August 24, 2020 to September 18, 2020**. Additionally, **one information session** was conducted in **September** with the Urban Development Institute - Edmonton Region.

Engaged Edmonton Data Collection



Note that 1 visitor may be associated with multiple visits

Feedback Summary

The following includes feedback from Engaged Edmonton, the information session and written responses from stakeholders:

- + A majority of respondents (57.1%) fully support reducing as many barriers to business as possible and 42.9% of respondents partially agree that flexibility is good, but exceptions must be made for specific business types
- + A majority of respondents (61.9%) indicated that a more flexible Zoning Bylaw and streamlined permitting process would make a difference in their ability to open. For those that indicated it would affect them, over half (53.8%) said it would be the biggest factor behind whether they would be able to ever open at all

Ideas on Engaged Edmonton

One idea was submitted suggesting that the Zoning Bylaw should allow for accessory commercial units similar to laneway housing, but for a small business like a micro cafe, bakery, or craft store, that would bring vibrancy to Edmonton's communities.

Quotes from the Feedback

"The best time to start a new enterprise is at the bottom of an economic cycle, all orders of government must adopt policy to nurture the green shoots of the emerging new economy."

"Trust that businesses can operate and not affect their neighbours. There should not be a need for home based business permits now that we know we can all work from home just fine."

"Flexibility is good, but impact on neighbours and especially residential areas needs to be considered, and they need the opportunity to question the business."



GET INVOLVED!

- For further information to get involved visit engaged.edmonton.ca
- For more information about the initiative visit edmonton.ca/zoningbylawrenewal
- For all other ideas and feedback regarding Zoning Bylaw Renewal Initiative, please use the [General Feedback Form](#)
- Subscribe to our [newsletter](#)
- Contact us at zoningbylawrenewal@edmonton.ca



ZONING BYLAW RENEWAL INITIATIVE

Edmonton

