

Summary of Discussions with the SRHBA

Item of Concern	Notes on Discussion	Action Items
Size of neighbourhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SRHBA expressed concern over the size of neighbourhoods and related concerns on school sizes, walking distance and the need for changes to neighbourhood Concept Plans throughout their buildout. - It was acknowledged that this discussion was outside of the scope of the OCP redesign project. - It was acknowledged that improvements to the Concept Plan process currently underway could address these issues. - It was acknowledged that there was common ground between the City, SRHBA, and the School Boards on some of these concerns. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - P&D to work with land developers and the SRHBA on refining the Concept Plan Guidelines and approval process. - Further discussions between the City and SRHBA on school sizes and design will occur at a future date.
Growth paying for growth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SRHBA expressed concern over specific wording in Section G6 – Funding Growth (Pg. 90). - It was acknowledged that some wording in this section could be interpreted differently than intended. - It was acknowledged that there is common ground between the City and SRHBA regarding the need for growth to pay for growth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wording G6.1(1)(b) and G6.2(e) has been updated and included in the Revised Schedule “A” to Bylaw No. 9700.
Development levy bylaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SRHBA requested a clear commitment to developing a Development Levy Bylaw included within the OCP. - It was acknowledged that this direction was outside of the scope of the OCP redesign project. - It was acknowledged that this reference [G6.1(2)(f)] could be updated when City Council provides direction that a Development Levy Bylaw be prepared. - It was acknowledged that direction to prepare a Development Levy Bylaw could be provided as part of the implementation plan for the Development Levies Review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The development of a Development Levy Bylaw should be considered as part of the implementation plan for the Development Levies Review.

Item of Concern	Notes on Discussion	Action Items
Pedestrian and cycling enhancements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SRHBA expressed concern that the policies included within H2.1 (Pg. 96) could be interpreted as suggesting infrastructure for active modes of transportation be enhanced at any cost. - It was acknowledged that policy regarding cost and level of services assessment in Section J7 would apply to all policies within the OCP, including those in H2.1, as would the City's Triple Bottom Line Policy. - SRHBA recommended inclusion of policy requiring cost-benefit analysis for transit, cycling, and pedestrian infrastructure. - SRHBA suggestions were reviewed with Transportation Division. No existing Council decision provides direction for cost-benefit analysis to be completed specifically for transit, cycling and pedestrian infrastructure. As a result, it was acknowledged that this direction was outside of the scope of the OCP redesign project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SRHBA to bring forward concerns regarding this section separate from the OCP redesign project.
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SRHBA expressed concern over the direction provided by Section H3 (Pg. 99), specifically with the implication that these policies support minimum parking requirements. - It was acknowledged that this direction was outside of the scope of the OCP redesign project. - It was acknowledged that there is common ground between the City and SRHBA regarding the need to review parking requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SRHBA to bring forward concerns regarding this section separate from the OCP redesign project.
Saskatoon Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SRHBA expressed concern over the inclusion of a reference to Saskatoon Land and the Saskatoon Land Bank in the introduction to Section I2.5 (Pg. 107). - It was acknowledged that this introduction was not policy, but was intended to provide context. - It was acknowledged that this introduction could be generalized. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wording for the introduction to Section I2.5 has been updated and included in the Revised Schedule "A" to Bylaw No. 9700.