



## ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Zoning Bylaw Comprehensive Review Project

***Proposed Amendments to Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and Appendix C***

### 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 fifth 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.

### What We Did

The table below outlines the engagement process, including who was solicited for feedback and how we gathered the feedback.

Table 1 Engagement Process

Who we had conversations with	How we gathered input
Internal City Stakeholders (Planning and Development, Transportation, Parks, Solicitors, Building Standards, Community Standards, Sustainability, Water and Waste Operations, Saskatoon Land, Communications and Engagement)	Relevant internal departments were contacted for input on, review and comment for proposed amendments. No comments were received that would preclude these amendments from proceeding.
Saskatoon & Region Homebuilders' Association (SRHBA)	The topics being considered for Amendment Package Five was shared with the Builders Industry Liaison Committee of SRHBA on October 27, 2022.
Riversdale and Downtown Business Improvement Districts	The Riversdale Business Improvement District (BID) was provided with the amendments to the MX1 District and provided feedback for Appendix C updates. The Downtown BID provided feedback for Appendix C and was provided with the amendments for the home-based business regulations.

Who we had conversations with	How we gathered input
Combined Business Group	The Combined Business Group consists of the Greater Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce, Saskatoon Regional Economic Development Authority, Riversdale BID, Sutherland BID, 33 <sup>rd</sup> Street BID, Broadway BID, Downtown Saskatoon, Saskatoon Construction Association, North Saskatoon Business Association, SRHBA, Tourism Saskatoon and the Saskatoon Realtors Association and was provided with information for all amendments included in Amendment Package Five.
Greater Saskatoon Chamber of Commerce	Information on the review of the Industrial districts was shared by email to Chamber staff in November 2022.
North Saskatoon Business Association	Information on the review of the Industrial districts was shared by an in-person meeting, to an internal committee, as well as by e-newsletter to the membership in November 2022.
Saskatchewan Realtors Associations	Information on the review of the Industrial districts was shared by email in August and October 2022.
Community Associations	<p>The City Park, Riversdale, Caswell Hill and Pleasant Hill Community Associations were contacted regarding the amendments to the MX1 District. Staff were able to meet with the Caswell Hill and Pleasant Hill Community Associations regarding the changes to the MX1 District.</p> <p>30 Community Associations that abut the Industrial Districts were provided information on the proposed amendments to the Industrial Districts.</p>
Saskatoon Accessibility Advisory Committee (SAAC)	A report was submitted to the SPC on Transportation in October 2022 to referral to the SAAC for their input on the amendments for parking for persons with a disability.
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission, Elmwood Residences and Inclusion Saskatchewan	Information on the review of accessible parking was provided in September 2022 and meetings were held with staff from these organizations in October 2022 to discuss proposed amendments and potential design guidelines.
Private landowners with large holdings in the Industrial Districts	Information on the review of the Industrial districts was shared by email in November 2022.
First Nations with land holdings in the Industrial Districts	Kahkewistahaw First Nation, Muskeg Lake First Nation, Pelican Lake First Nation, and Red Pheasant Cree Nation were contacted by phone and provided further information by email in November 2022.
Private Waste Collection Providers	Private waste haulers were sent a questionnaire in March 2022. Five responses were received that helped to inform the regulations.
Canadian Federation of Independent Business (CFIB)	A meeting was held in September 2022 and further information provided on proposed amendments to the Industrial districts in October 2022 to the CFIB.
Meewasin	Meewasin staff participated in external stakeholder meetings to provide feedback on the updates to Appendix C.
Prior members of the City of Saskatoon River Landing Architectural Design Review Committee	Previous Architectural Design Review Committee members participated in stakeholder meetings to provide feedback on their experience using the design guidelines and on the proposed updates to Appendix C.

Who we had conversations with	How we gathered input
Property owners of sites in the MX1 District	Property owners were sent information on the proposed amendments to the MX1 District in August 2022.
General Public	<p>Information was provided on the Zoning Bylaw Review Engage Page. 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. The following is a summary of updates that were made to the Engage Page:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix C</li> <li>• On-site Waste Spaces</li> <li>• Industrial Districts</li> <li>• MX1 – Mixed use 1 District</li> <li>• Parking for People with a Disability</li> <li>• Home Based Businesses, Short-Term Accommodations</li> <li>• Housekeeping Items</li> </ul> <p>An e-newsletter was used to promote the information on November 29, 2022. Twitter, Facebook and Next Door were used to promote the information in December 2022.</p>

**What We Heard – Appendix C**

Comments have been organized into themes and summaries below. These comments were received through stakeholder meetings and online questionnaire for stakeholders. *Note: The language below is not word for word comments provided by stakeholders.*

Table 2: Appendix C Feedback Summary and Response

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Image and Map Updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Plan area map and the superimposed character zone map do not align with the format of other Zoning Bylaw maps.</li> <li>• The existing photo examples of various design features are outdated, poor quality, and offer too narrow of an idea of what type of design is acceptable in the Plan area.</li> <li>• The photos of the existing conditions in the Plan area are outdated and not reflective of the more recent development.</li> </ul>	<p>These maps have been redrawn to align with the format of other Zoning Bylaw maps.</p> <p>It is recommended to remove outdated reference photos.</p> <p>Context photos taken in July 2022 of the Plan area are recommended to replace the existing photos.</p>

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Reorganization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plan is long and difficult to follow.</li> <li>There is overlap between sections that could be simplified.</li> <li>The structure of the Plan is repetitive making it not user friendly.</li> <li>There are many redundancies in the Plan (categories that are very similar, overlapping intention statements).</li> </ul>	<p>To address these concerns, the Plan has been reviewed and the proposed amendments ensure guidelines are located under the correct headings, repetition has been reduced, the intention statements are updated to apply more broadly to each design guideline, and similar design categories are consolidated for ease of use (i.e., fenestration, and windows and glazing).</p>
Language and Clarity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instruction and requirements are not always clear.</li> <li>The Plan uses negative language to describe what is not permitted, rather than explaining what is permitted.</li> <li>This Plan is a guideline intended to provide design direction for development in the Plan area. The language used should reflect that the guidelines are suggestions and not requirements.</li> <li>Request from internal stakeholders to update the DCD1 Use Tables for clarity.</li> </ul>	<p>Administration has reviewed each design guideline and made edits for conciseness and clarity where needed. This includes using positive language to communicate more clearly what design guidelines are encouraged.</p> <p>Proposing to remove “shall” and reword sentences appropriately.</p> <p>Updates to the Direct Control District 1 is beyond the scope of this project.</p>
Nautical Theme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggestions to remove references to a nautical theme.</li> </ul>	<p>Recommendation to remove nautical theme requirement, and instead focus on quality design without a specific theme.</p>
Alignment with Other Guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request to review other City and related government agency documents to ensure there is alignment between this Plan and other policies.</li> <li>Request to incorporate new green/sustainable policies into the Plan.</li> </ul>	<p>Administration conducted a review that included the Heritage Plan, City Centre Plan, and the Meewasin Development Guidelines. Some minor updates were made, specifically related to wind mitigation and grade-level active frontage.</p> <p>Adding new content is beyond the scope of this project.</p>

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Current Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders expressed agreement that the Plan needs to be updated.</li> <li>Concerns that the Plan does not reference the significant amount of development that has been built in River Landing.</li> </ul>	Administration reviewed the Plan and made edits where references to the current built environment was appropriate.
Design Guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions about the massing and scaling of buildings and how to address wind mitigation.</li> <li>Concerns about the restrictive nature of the guidelines, specifically about cladding guidelines and colour.</li> <li>Differing opinions were expressed about the reflective coating guidelines during the stakeholder engagement. Some participants wanted to remove prohibition on reflective coating, and others wanted to keep the guideline in the Plan.</li> <li>Concerns expressed by stakeholders about the accessibility of brick pavers, a material that is suggested to be used in the Plan area.</li> <li>Stakeholders identified the existing lighting requirements as unrealistic to include due to lighting generally being one of the final components of a plan, well after the committee has reviewed the plans.</li> <li>Staff highlighted previous challenges with encouraging ground level entrances in the Plan area.</li> <li>Request to consider increasing building heights in the Plan area.</li> <li>Questions about how to make developments more inviting for pedestrians.</li> </ul>	<p>Recommending to include reference to wind mitigation studies, which would align with the City Centre Plan.</p> <p>The cladding and the colour guidelines were reviewed and edits are recommended to allow for design flexibility. To balance the opposing views about reflective coating, recommended edits to this design guideline would allow reflective coating in a limited capacity.</p> <p>The proposed amendment does not require brick pavers, but instead encourages the use of a high-quality material that complements the existing pavers.</p> <p>Recommending to amend the lighting design guidelines to reflect that lighting plans are completed at a later date.</p> <p>Proposing to clarify that main entrances should be at grade.</p> <p>Significant changes, such as increasing building height limits is beyond the scope of the project.</p> <p>Proposed amendments encourage an inviting pedestrian environment.</p>

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Specific Locations Within the Plan Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns expressed by stakeholders that the development standards will differ on the east and west sides of Sid Buckwold Bridge.</li> <li>Request to increase the commercial opportunities in the Riverbank Park Character Zone.</li> <li>Stakeholders expressed disappointment that the Farmer's Market is no longer operating within the Plan area.</li> <li>Install park furniture that is easy to maintain</li> </ul>	<p>Administration reviewed the Plan and is proposing to add references to Riversdale BID where previously only the Downtown BID was listed and refer to Avenue A extension when the Plan discusses continuity of brick pavers, where previously only the 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue extension was listed.</p> <p>Both reviewing commercial opportunities and regulating park furniture is beyond the scope of the project.</p>
Flexibility and Creative Freedom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholders expressed interest in making the guidelines more general to allow for flexibility and creative freedom.</li> </ul>	<p>Recommendation to update guidelines throughout the Plan to be more general to allow for design flexibility and creativity.</p>

### What We Heard – Industrial Districts

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

Table 3 Industrial Districts Feedback Summary and Response

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Landscaping Regulations	It is unfair that my property requires full landscaping if it's the only property on the block with landscaping.	Flexible landscaping could be expanded to include more established areas where landscaping could be reduced to meet the standards of the surrounding environment, provided the remaining landscaping is more intensively developed.
Interface between Industrial and Residential	Periodically receive feedback on noise, odour or dust concerns from industrial uses affecting residential.	In light industrial districts, nuisance conditions are not permitted beyond the boundary of the site. Issues can be addressed through Bylaw Compliance. Heavy Industrial Districts permit nuisance conditions beyond the boundary of a site, which may impact surrounding land uses, including residential. The Industrial-Residential Interface Study is being undertaken by the City to determine if there are ways to address existing nuisances where residential areas are impacted by heavy industrial businesses.

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Lack of Amenities in Industrial Areas	Commercial businesses in industrial areas are frustrated at not having the same amenities as commercial areas such as 8 <sup>th</sup> Street.	Public amenities such as sidewalks and street furniture are not regulated by the Zoning Bylaw.
Redevelopment	Concerns with not being able to re-develop a property because of new higher standards for landscaping, parking, etc. that were not required in the past.	Flexible landscaping could be expanded to include more established areas where landscaping could be reduced to meet the standards of the surrounding environment, provided the remaining landscaping is more intensively developed.
Compliance with New Standards	Concern with costs of any new development standards, and preference for education and assistance rather than punitive measures for non-compliance. Plenty of notice to conform to new standards.	Communications will be developed to communicate changes to all affected stakeholders. New development standards will apply to new development, to significant re-development of a property or to a change of use.
Public Safety	Interested in seeing a definition of 'public assembly' and 'public gathering' in the Zoning Bylaw, and that appropriate consultation be done with the chemical plants and the general public before implementation.	Further work is being undertaken in 2023 in relation to the zoning districts that relate to hazardous substance facilities, including chemical manufacturing facilities. This will include consideration for a definition for 'public assembly' in the Zoning Bylaw, and further engagement. A definition for 'public gathering' is not being considered as part of the review of the Zoning Bylaw, as it does not regulate temporary events.

### What We Heard – Parking for People with a Disability

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.*

Table 4: Parking for People with a Disability Feedback Summary and Response

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Obstructions / Pathway from vehicle to building	<p>Snow clearing can be a big concern for people using a wheelchair in paid parking lots. Other issues include the height of the pay station and the slope or change in grade of the parking lot.</p> <p>The accessible pathway should be as close as it can be to the entrance with the least amount of traffic and barriers.</p>	<p>Snow clearing and other temporary environments are not covered by the Zoning Bylaw. A design guide may be useful to communicate these types of issues that may not be covered by zoning regulations.</p> <p>An access path between the parking space and building entrance will be required to be shown on development site plans which should improve consideration for this path.</p>

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Number of parking spaces designated for people with a disability	<p>We are interested in standards that are modern and current and meet the needs of the aging population and disabled population.</p> <p>Rather than being among the average, we have a desire to be a leader in accessibility.</p>	Based on a review of other Canadian municipalities and balancing the cost to require a higher standard, it is being recommended that the number of designated parking spaces for people with a disability be raised to align Saskatoon with the requirement of other Canadian cities.
Types of facilities provided	There are a variety of types of parking facilities that should be provided including accessible spots, limited mobility spots, and van accessible, with a wide range of standards being applied	We are recommending one larger size for designated parking spaces rather than a variety that includes smaller sizes to simplify the process while meeting a higher standard in some cases.
Signage	Great to require mounted signage when now is covering the ground. Have seen cases where there is digital signage at entrances to a parking lot about availability of spaces and locating of accessible spaces. Plain language should be used for signage to promote greater inclusivity.	Above ground signage is being proposed to be required. The International Symbol of Access will be used for clarity.

### What We Heard – Other Amendments

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.*

Table 5: Other Amendments Feedback Summary and Response

Amendment	Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Home-Based Businesses	Expand permitted businesses and allow for limited retail sales.	Expanded regulations may negatively affect established business areas.	Proposed amendments allow for additional personal service trades.
On-site Waste Spaces	Allocation of spaces on the site.	It may not be able to provide a space of the specified size but could allocate the area elsewhere on the site.	May be considered when regulations are drafts.
Amendments to the MX1 District	Residential sites.	Removal of discretionary uses requirement is positive.	No further response

### What Went Well



- Trying different engagement tactics such as surveys to gain feedback.
- Working to make the engagement report more accessible including the use of surveys.
- Staff were able to meet with stakeholders in-person.

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

- Engaging virtually because of COVID-19 made it difficult to follow best practices for inclusive, accessible engagement as some groups prefer in-person engagement.
- Existing engagement methods may not be reaching stakeholders as few responses were received from emails. Our current practices include looping back to stakeholders, once engagement is completed, with the recommendations.

### **What's Next**

- Additional amendments to the Zoning Bylaw will be brought forward through in future amendment packages or through separate topic specific reports. Work is currently underway on the final phases of the project that will result in a new bylaw.
- Newsletters are sent out with updated information regarding meeting dates and important information on upcoming amendments.
- The project website and Engage Page are continually being updated with current information and all correspondence provides links to these pages.

