



## ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

### Zoning Bylaw Comprehensive Review Project *Proposed Amendments to Sections 2, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9 (Appendix 2)*

#### Description

A Comprehensive Review of the Zoning Bylaw Project (Project) is being undertaken to align the Zoning Bylaw with identified strategic priorities, current trends, changes to provincial legislation and to make minor amendments. This report is the fourth package of proposed amendments being undertaken as part of the Project. The proposed amendments address a range of topics identified during the information gathering phase of the Project.

#### Using What We Learn

Stakeholders offered valuable feedback which is included in this report. There was also feedback that was specific to amendments not captured within this package of amendments. This feedback has not been included in this report; however, it will be shared with the relevant groups for consideration in future reviews where appropriate.

#### What We Did

Who we had conversations with	How we gathered input
Internal City Stakeholders (Planning and Development, Transportation, Parks, Solicitors, Building Standards, Communications and Engagement)	Relevant internal divisions were contacted for review and comment for proposed amendments. No comments were received that would preclude these amendments from proceeding.
Utility Providers, Landscape Architects, Developers and Parks, Transportation and Planning and Development Departments	<p>A virtual workshop was held with the utility providers, landscape architects, Parks and Transportation Departments and developers on October 27, 2021, to discuss an approach to manage conflicts between utilities and landscaping requirements.</p> <p>A follow up virtual information session was held on May 4, 2022. Participants were provided a project update email and advised of the information on the Engage Page on May 19, 2022.</p>

Who we had conversations with	How we gathered input
General Public	<p>Information was provided on the Zoning Bylaw Review Engage Page starting on May 19, 2022. Visitors to the website were able to provide a comment on the Engage Page. Contact information for the Project Team was also included on the Engage Page. Promotion of the information on the website was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The North Saskatoon Business Association (NSBA) and the Saskatoon &amp; Region Home Builders' Association (SRHBA) were advised of the information on the Engage Page on May 19, 2022.</li> <li>• Information about the Engage Page was shared with Community Associations via the Community Consultants the week of May 23, 2022.</li> <li>• An e-newsletter was used to promote the information on May 24 and June 1, 2022.</li> <li>• Twitter and Facebook were used to promote the information on May 31, June 1 and June 2, 2022.</li> </ul>

**What We Heard – Comments Specific to Utility / Landscaped Strip Conflicts**

We organized what we heard into themes and summaries below. These comments were received through the workshop and information session. *Note: The language below is not word for word comments provided by stakeholders.*

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Process needs to be clear	Needs to be clear information of who to contact and what is required for developers who may not go through this process regularly.	Process and contact information will be available in the supplementary Landscape Guidelines.
Trees may need to be removed later if land is redeveloped	The number of trees required is consistent with current Zoning Bylaw requirements and helps the City meet the goals of the Official Community Plan, Urban Forestry Management Plan, and other City plans.	Comments noted.

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Support for Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flexibility appreciated to assist in addressing utility constraints. Support for options (e.g., planting in the boulevard if approved by Parks, somewhere else on the site, etc.).</li> <li>• Challenging to meet the requirements for utilities and landscaping (e.g., tree requirements) and other site constraints.</li> <li>• Landscaping and utilities can share an area except those areas that are prohibited between all utilities.</li> </ul>	Comments noted.
In some cases, shrubs may not be appropriate	A conflict may exist between a required landscaped strip and an above or below ground utility preventing trees <i>and shrubs</i> plantings.	Allowing for shrubs and ornamental grasses to be substituted for tree plantings is consistent with the current approach in the Zoning Bylaw.
Landscaping Requirements	Concern that additional area on the site would be needed for landscaping which would reduce the amount of developable area on the site.	Additional landscaping area is not being required. This approach is to provide alternate options for where tree plantings can be accommodated.
Flexibility	More flexibility is needed on where trees can be planted on site (referring to previous language that they needed to be “visible from the street”).	The proposed amendments allow for trees to be planted in the required setback area to provide clarity in how the regulation will be applied. Concerns were raised with the option for trees to be “visible from the street” because of the potential to be subjective and may cause misinterpretation and inconsistent application of the proposed amendments.

No comments were received for proposed amendments to Sections 2, 4, 5, 8 and 9 of the Zoning Bylaw.

### What Went Well

- Trying different engagement tactics such as surveys to gain feedback. Virtual workshops were well attended and different engagement tactics such as Mentimeter and Slido were used to engage participants in the discussion.
- Working with industry and targeted stakeholders with experience specific to landscape / utility constraints provided insight into their perspectives on the proposed regulations.

### **What We Can Do Better**

- A short turn around on engagement was required in order to meet reporting deadlines. Updates to the Engage Page showing the proposed amendments were not available for a long period of time prior to completion of this report.
- The results from engagement are comments specific to utility / landscaped strip conflicts. No comments were received on the proposed amendments to Sections 2, 4, 5, 8 and 9 of the Zoning Bylaw.
- Information about the proposed amendments in the M3 and M4 Districts to remove the use “day cares and preschools accessory to a to a place of worship, elementary and high schools, community” was not shared on the Engage Page because this amendment is a clean up item to remove a duplicated use from the use tables.
- Information about the proposed amendment in the R2 District to add two-unit dwellings and semi-detached dwellings to the Notes to Development Standards for front yard setback requirements was not shared on the Engage Page because this amendment is to correct an error from Bylaw No. 9818.

### **What's Next**

- Additional amendments to the Zoning Bylaw will be brought forward through in future amendment packagements or through separate topic specific reports.

