



## ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

### *Corridor Planning Program: New Corridor Zoning Districts*

#### **Description**

To implement the corridor land use designations in the Official Community Plan and to meet the vision laid out in the Corridor Transformation Plan, new zoning districts are being proposed as amendments to [Bylaw No. 8770, Zoning Bylaw, 2009](#) (Zoning Bylaw).

Four zoning districts have been created: Corridor Residential 1 and Corridor Residential 2 under the Corridor Residential land use designation, Corridor Mixed Use 1 under the Corridor Mixed Use land use designation and Corridor Station Mixed Use 1 under the Station Mixed Use land use designation.

In the future, as each Corridor Plan proceeds area-specific zoning regulations may be identified to suit the needs of specific Corridor Plan areas. Any such regulations to emerge from Corridor Plans would require a future Zoning Bylaw amendment.

#### **What We Did**

Three broad engagement activities were conducted by the project team. The purpose of engaging with each group differed, depending on project needs. Internal City Stakeholders were engaged to help identify needs and scope, as well as receive relevant comments from other civic departments' perspectives. Secondly, a technical industry focus group was established to deliberate on detailed zoning standards and to work through draft iterations of the districts. Finally, a broader group of industry members and general-interest stakeholders were contacted in order to educate and inform them about the project, particularly the connection to existing policy and ongoing Corridor Planning projects and to provide the opportunity for high-level feedback on the proposed districts. In-depth engagement with the chance for significant impact on project details was not intended for this group.

Time	Participants	Objective	Activities
Q4 2020 – Q1 2023	Internal City Stakeholders (Planning and Development, Solicitors, Building Standards, Transportation, Saskatoon Land)	Identify needs, define scope, discuss methods and receive relevant input.*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular team meetings</li> <li>• One-off collaboration meetings</li> <li>• Email and group chat communications</li> </ul>

Time	Participants	Objective	Activities
Q3 2021 – Q4 2022	Technical industry focus group (members of the architecture, construction and building industry)	Discuss technical details of proposed development standards, identify red flags/non-starters as they relate to construction or development feasibility and confirm technical implementation of existing policy direction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four virtual meetings</li> <li>• Email communications</li> </ul>
Q4 2022 – Q1 2023	Broader industry members and general-interest stakeholders	Inform regarding the role and impact of the proposed zoning districts, the connection to existing policy and provide opportunity for high-level feedback on proposed zoning districts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Email communications</li> <li>• Sharing of visual project summary materials</li> <li>• Online survey</li> <li>• Engage page</li> </ul>

\* Note: No comments were received from Internal City Stakeholders that would preclude the zoning districts from proceeding.

**What We Heard – Industry Focus Group**

This group was established through direct contact of well-known industry members, who either participated directly or delegated a representative. In total, eight members of the architecture, design, construction and building industries participated in the focus group. The project team held four virtual meetings with the group to discuss potential zoning standards in depth. The project team received written communication and feedback via emails.

Meeting #1: October 19, 2021

At the first focus group meeting, a brief introduction to the project was provided, and the project team decided to immediately begin discussions of individual development standards rather than begin with an overview of the project. Feedback received later from the group made it clear this was not the ideal approach for conducting these meetings, and as a result, subsequent meetings took a more holistic approach to discussing the overall project components. The development standard first introduced was one to regulate building height using an angular plane, something that had not been used in Saskatoon before. Participants made it clear this regulation was not an effective option for the Saskatoon development industry, and so it was removed from further consideration.

The remainder of the discussion during the first meeting centred on the overall project approach and various aspects of zoning regulations with significant impacts on development viability. The project team received clear feedback that administrative procedures, such as development appeals, discretionary use applications, minor variances and even rezoning applications, in some cases, are best avoided, when possible, in the interest of streamlining positive development activity. In addition, strict regulations on development can often hinder creativity in the design and building process.

Meeting #2: March 29, 2022

The second meeting of the industry focus group adapted to the feedback received from the first meeting and began with a more holistic discussion of the overall project objectives and proposals, followed by a more detailed discussion of the first two zoning districts. Various options for development regulation were discussed and compared and the merits of certain options over others were discovered and recommended to the project team.

An example of an option discussed was the number of units in a multiple-unit dwelling. Regarding this issue, the project team learned that in the modern era, packaging of dwelling units within a multi-unit residential project can take many forms—and regulating unit density on quantity alone could limit creative development of multiple-unit dwellings, which may incorporate more units per area than would otherwise be conventionally expected. Alternative methods of density regulation, such as site area, were noted to be preferable, compared to unit quantity.

Several more options for development regulation were discussed based on their effectiveness and ease of use. Some options, as presented by the project team, were deemed appropriate and effective (such as conventional standards for site measurements and yard setbacks), while others were noted for having potential issues or may require some follow-up discussion (such as typical minimum parking requirements).

Another regulation introduced at this meeting was the requirement for residential development in the mixed-use zoning districts. Concerns about the feasibility of this requirement were expressed, but clear alignment with the City of Saskatoon's (City) general goals of increased residential development in the Corridor Growth Area was acknowledged and supported by the focus group.

#### Meeting #3: May 25, 2022

The third industry focus group meeting presented the zoning district changes that were discussed at the previous meeting and led into a discussion of the remaining two districts.

During this meeting, the project team heard processes such as discretionary use approvals, which present a significant barrier to development, shouldn't be used as a primary tool for development regulation. This aligned with previous feedback received about these sorts of administrative procedures. The project team took this feedback into consideration and advised the discretionary use approval process, as well as other land use regulation tools, are an important part of local government administration. While the project will not be doing away entirely with these procedures, the project team will work to minimize the number of situations where discretionary use approvals, zoning agreements and the like would be required.

Another confirmed issue was the proposed regulation to restrict development density based on number of dwelling units in a multiple-unit dwelling. Additional comments received on this topic related to trends such as micro-housing, co-housing and the like, which could be unnecessarily restricted by such regulation.

Parking standards were also a major topic of discussion at this meeting. The proposal presented by the project team, to include slightly reduced minimum parking requirements, as compared to existing requirements for the same and similar uses, was accepted and appreciated. However, it was noted that it would be preferable for minimum parking requirements to be even lower than presented, as minimum parking requirements can often present a barrier to development in the form of cost of construction, as well as physical space on site.

As a result of this discussion and further deliberation by the project team and internal partners, changes were made to the proposed multiple-unit dwelling parking standards in the corridor zoning districts, to further reduce them in the highest density district.

#### Meeting #4: November 16, 2022

The fourth and final meeting of the industry focus group began with summarizing and confirming all previous feedback received from the group and changes made as a result of those discussions. Secondly, the focus was on the remaining development standards being proposed for the corridor zoning districts that had yet to be discussed. Topics such as minimum glazing requirements, minimum door spacing, drop-off areas in front yards, maximum slope in front yards, amenity space requirements and building height were all discussed.

Standards proposed by the project team, noted as potentially problematic, included an amenity space requirement that was too high for dense urban environments and a maximum building height that may be too low for modern construction methods. After deliberation, the amenity space requirement was reduced to be more practical and reflect the development density, while the maximum building height was modestly increased to allow for taller buildings to be constructed, without increasing the number of storeys.

Finally, the next steps in the project were outlined for the group. This included sharing the material that was to be shared with the broader development industry and other stakeholders and the path forward leading ultimately to the Zoning Bylaw amendment required to adopt the corridor districts. Members of the focus group were informed how to keep involved and when the next stages in the bylaw adoption process were planned to occur, pending any final changes to be made and the results of the next phase of engagement.

#### **What We Heard – Broader Industry Members & General-Interest Stakeholders**

Members of the development industry and general-interest stakeholders were contacted via email. This group of stakeholders is the same broad group that has been involved in the Corridor Planning engagement efforts throughout the duration of the Corridor Planning Program. Added to this group were identified building, development and architecture industry organizations and representatives who were not part of the existing Corridor Planning engagement group.

The objectives for communicating with this group were to inform and educate about project details, including the approved land use policy of which the project is based on and the technical nature of the project as a step toward the implementation of that policy and to provide the opportunity for high-level feedback. The future opportunity to influence the area-specific modifications to the districts during the Corridor Planning process was also highlighted.

This group was informed about project details, directed to the [saskatoon.ca/engage](https://saskatoon.ca/engage) page, and sent an online survey. A visual summary of the proposed new corridor districts was included, which outlined each district's main points and key development standards, including visuals of potential allowable building massing.

The online survey on the proposed districts was open for approximately one month. Feedback was also invited via email and on the Engage page directly, although no feedback was received from these. To encourage survey responses, the survey was ultimately extended by two weeks.

Online Survey: December 5, 2022 – January 13, 2023

The goal for the survey was to obtain feedback on whether the proposed options for the zoning districts sufficiently support the objectives of the Corridor Land Use Designations, as adopted in the Official Community Plan. The survey was broken down by zoning district and each Land Use Designation was outlined at the beginning of each section corresponding zoning district to inform participants of its purpose. Inviting open-ended feedback on the details of the proposed zoning districts was not an objective for this phase of engagement or these stakeholder groups, as this had already been completed using expertise of the technical-focused industry focus group.

Geographically Specific Questions

A secondary goal of the survey was to begin the process of determining geographically specific needs within specific Corridor Plan Areas that may required amendments to the zoning districts during the development of Corridor Plans. The results of these questions are not detailed in this report. This feedback will be saved for more fulsome use during the Corridor Planning process for each Corridor Plan Area. However, a summary of the most common themes to these responses follows below:

- Examples of existing development seen as a positive example for the corridor zoning districts (e.g. City Perks coffeeshop in the neighbourhood of City Park);
- Examples of areas which would benefit from greater allowed density (e.g. Woodlawn neighbourhood near Idylwyld Drive);
- Concerns about the environment in general (not specific to any Corridor Plan Area);
- Parking concerns in general, such as street parking pressures (not specific to any Corridor Plan Area);
- Reiterated comments from other questions in the survey; and
- Commentary on the survey itself.

In total, 24 responses to the survey were received. The responses to the quantitative questions are summarized in the following table.

Question	1 – Not at all	2	3	4	5 – Yes, very
1. Does the proposed <b>CR1</b> district, as shown above support the objectives of the <b>Corridor Residential</b> land use designation?	8.7%	8.7%	17.4%	43.5%	21.7%
3. Does the proposed <b>CR2</b> district, as shown above support the objectives of the <b>Corridor Residential</b> land use designation?	4.8%	9.5%	23.8%	42.9%	19.0%
5. Does the proposed <b>CM1</b> district, as shown above support the objectives of the <b>Corridor Mixed Use</b> land use designation?	4.8%	4.8%	23.8%	52.4%	14.3%
7. Does the proposed <b>CS1</b> district, as shown above support the objectives of the <b>Station Mixed Use</b> land use designation?	0.0%	0.0%	22.2%	38.9%	38.9%

As shown by the results above, the majority of participants reported that the proposed zoning districts appear to support the objectives of the corridor land use designations. The percentage of participants responding with either **4** or **5** on a 5-point scale of agreement was **65%** for the CR1 district, **62%** for the CR2 district, **67%** for the CM1 district and **78%** for the CS1 district.

The responses received for the written questions are organized into general themes and summarized in the tables below. *Note: The language below is not verbatim commentary provided by stakeholders.*

**1. Does the proposed CR1 district, as shown above, support the objectives of the Corridor Residential land use designation?**  
**2. If no, why not? (12/24 responses received)**

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Building scale and density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some participants remarked that the allowable density (building height/number of storeys) should be greater.</li> <li>Others cautioned against adding too much density in areas bordering existing low-density residential or ecologically sensitive areas.</li> <li>One participant commented that the “next increment” of development density should be allowed everywhere in Saskatoon.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Responses in this theme were mixed and most survey participants generally agreed that the proposed district supports the objectives of the land use designation.</li> <li>These results suggest general support for the building scale and density as proposed in the CR1 district.</li> <li>Making changes to City-wide zoning standards is not in the scope of this project. However, it is worth noting that the CR1 and CR2 districts do generally permit the “next increment” of development density on typical residential sites.</li> </ul>
Land use mix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One participant encouraged the district to contain only permitted land uses over discretionary.</li> <li>Others encouraged that basic services and commercial amenities be located nearby or within mixed-use buildings.</li> <li>One participant remarked that new zoning districts aren’t necessary, as there is sufficient existing City policy to support densification of development in corridor areas.</li> <li>Another participant asked for more information on the “limited neighbourhood-supportive” uses allowed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most uses in the CR1 district are listed as permitted. The only discretionary uses included are those that are discretionary in existing residential districts. Making these uses permitted would be a departure from current City policy.</li> <li>The CR1 district does not propose any mixed uses (e.g., commercial), but the CR2 district does. Further, the CR1 district will only ever be used within the Corridor Growth Area, an area that will or already does contain services and amenities within a short walking distance.</li> <li>A review of existing zoning districts early on in the project showed that while several districts came close to accommodating the kind of development envisioned, none were fully sufficient in meeting the specific development goals of the Corridor Planning Program.</li> <li>These limited neighbourhood-supportive uses were not listed in the survey to save space. They include uses such as parks and accessory buildings which are typical to all existing residential zoning districts.</li> </ul>

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Yard setback requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One participant remarked that the proposed minimum front and rear yard sizes were too small for adequate green space.</li> <li>• Another commented that the front yard requirement is too large for adequate density.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responses in this theme were mixed and most survey participants generally agreed that the proposed district supports the objectives of the land use designation. These results suggest general support for the yard setbacks as proposed in the CR1 district.</li> <li>• Yard setback requirements proposed are consistent with most existing residential zoning districts, including a provision allowing for a lesser setback in specific conditions.</li> </ul>
Environmental impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some participants cautioned against developmental impact to ecologically sensitive areas in general.</li> <li>• One participant questioned sunlight accessibility and whether tall buildings would cause shading.</li> <li>• Other comments in this theme were unrelated to the project, such as pesticide bans.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CR1 district does not inherently have any greater impact to the environment than other residential zoning districts. Further, the CR1 district is mostly expected for use in infill development, which could be seen as more environmentally friendly in general than greenfield development.</li> <li>• Sunlight access was a key determinant in the development of the building height standards in all corridor zoning districts. The maximum building height in the CR1 district is consistent with typical low-density established neighbourhoods and is not expected to have a significant impact on shading or sunlight access.</li> </ul>
Parking requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One participant remarked that “the parking minimums will be a problem” and commented on the existing parking challenges in some established neighbourhood areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For most uses in the CR1 district, the minimum parking requirements remain consistent with similar existing residential districts. For multiple-unit dwellings, the minimum parking requirement is slightly lower. This change is intended to reflect the location where the CR1 district will be used: within a short walk of transit services and other amenities in established, walkable neighbourhoods. Further, developers of multiple-unit dwellings are free to provide more than the minimum parking required based on market demand.</li> </ul>
Commentary on the survey itself	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some participants remarked that not enough information was provided.</li> <li>• Others were confused by the map used as reference for a different question of the survey.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any future engagement efforts will take these comments into consideration and strive to provide more and easier to understand information.</li> </ul>

3. Does the proposed **CR2** district, as shown above, support the objectives of the Corridor Residential land use designation?

4. **If no, why not?** (15/24 responses received)

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Building scale/density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some participants questioned why the allowable density isn't greater.</li> <li>One participant suggested a different site configuration to allow greater height but wider frontages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The allowable density for multiple-unit dwellings in CR2 has been increased slightly for appropriate development sites, as the feedback received in this survey aligned with previous feedback received from the industry focus group and some internal City groups. This was accomplished through a slight increase to the maximum building height (not affecting the number of storeys) and slight reduction to setbacks for certain site conditions (e.g., corner sites).</li> </ul>
Land use mix	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some participants encouraged a mix of services and commercial amenities nearby or within mixed-use buildings.</li> <li>One participant remarked that new zoning districts aren't necessary, as there is sufficient existing City policy to support densification of development in corridor areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CR2 district contains a small number of non-residential uses allowed on a discretionary basis. This provides for the neighbourhood-friendly mix of uses encouraged. Further, the CR2 district will almost always be located directly adjacent to an existing commercial or mixed-use zoning district.</li> <li>A review of existing zoning districts early on in the project showed that while several districts came close to accommodating the kind of development envisioned, none were fully sufficient in meeting the specific development goals of the Corridor Planning Program.</li> </ul>
Environmental impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some participants cautioned against developmental impact to ecologically sensitive areas in general.</li> <li>One participant commented that there appeared to be very little greenery in the images shown.</li> <li>Other comments in this theme were unrelated to the project, such as wildlife crossing of major roadways.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CR2 district does not inherently have any greater impact to the environment than other residential zoning districts. Further, the CR2 district is mostly expected for use in infill development, which could be seen as more environmentally friendly in general than greenfield development.</li> <li>The images shown were examples of the kind of development that would be allowed under the CR2 district, as well as a 3D rendering. The CR2 district contains the same yard and landscaping requirements as other comparable existing residential districts.</li> </ul>



Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Parking requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One participant encouraged removing all minimum parking requirements.</li> <li>• Another participant remarked that the CR2 district doesn't seem to address parking.</li> <li>• One participant raised concerns regarding short-term accommodations and the need for off-street parking for those uses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removing all minimum parking requirements from the CR2 district would constitute a significant shift in policy direction for the City. However, the parking requirements for multiple-unit dwellings in the CR2 district are markedly lower than in other comparable existing districts and lower than in CR1 as well. This is intended to reflect the nature of the CR2 district as a higher-density, higher-activity residential and mixed-use district in very close proximity to transit services and to other commercial and institutional services and amenities. The parking requirements proposed are intended to make efforts toward less car dependency and more affordable development costs, while still helping to alleviate on-street parking pressure in neighbourhoods.</li> <li>• Ultimately, feedback on the issue of minimum parking requirements has been mixed. The project team has heard support at both extreme ends of the spectrum (i.e., remove parking minimums entirely; include more or increase parking minimums). The proposed CR2 district, as all corridor districts, is intended to strike a reasonable balance between these options.</li> <li>• Short-term accommodations have a minimum off-street parking requirement in the CR2 district which is consistent with comparable existing districts.</li> </ul>
Commentary on the survey itself	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some participants remarked that not enough information was provided.</li> <li>• Others were confused by the map used as reference for a different question of the survey.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any future engagement efforts will take these comments into consideration and strive to provide more and easier to understand information.</li> </ul>

5. Does the proposed **CM1** district, as shown above, support the objectives of the Corridor Mixed-Use land use designation?

6. **If no, why not? (12/24 responses received)**

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Building scale/density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One participant encouraged a greater number of allowable storeys and taller buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The building heights in the CM1 and CS1 districts have been set based on approved policy direction in the Corridor Mixed Use and Station Mixed Use land use designations in the Official Community Plan. These were based on projections done to determine density levels necessary to meet Corridor Growth development targets in the City's Plan for Growth and were included in various stages of public engagement for the Corridor Planning Program. Including different maximum building heights in the zoning districts corresponding to those land use designations would be a departure from approved policy.</li> </ul>
Location and land use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One participant encouraged a mix of services and commercial amenities nearby or within mixed-use buildings.</li> <li>One participant remarked that the CM1 district should be located along main thoroughfares only.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CM1 district is inherently a mixed-use district and contains a wide range of permitted residential, commercial, and institutional land uses. A mix of services and amenities is one of the key goals of the CM1 district.</li> <li>The CM1 district will only be used in areas designated as Corridor Mixed Use under the Official Community Plan. This land use designation is intended for use along main thoroughfares – mostly rapid transit routes and the major connectors to those routes.</li> </ul>
Environmental impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some participants cautioned against developmental impact to ecologically sensitive areas in general.</li> <li>Some participants commented that there appeared to be very little greenery in the images shown and encouraged as much green space as possible.</li> <li>Other comments in this theme were unrelated to the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CM1 district does not inherently have any greater impact to the environment than other mixed-use zoning districts. Further, the CM1 district is mostly expected for use in infill development, which could be seen as more environmentally friendly in general than greenfield development.</li> <li>The images shown were examples of the kind of development that would be allowed under CM1, as well as a 3D rendering. While the CM1 district does contain yard and landscaping requirements, this will not always guarantee greenery on private property. However, each Corridor Planning process will include a public realm and streetscaping design component, which is intended to enhance the public realm in areas surrounding CM1 districts, including the provision of street trees, landscaping and other greenery.</li> </ul>

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Parking requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One participant encouraged removing all minimum parking requirements.</li> <li>• Another participant remarked that parking will be a problem.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removing all minimum parking requirements from the CM1 district would constitute a significant shift in policy direction for the City. However, the parking requirements for most uses in the CM1 district are markedly lower than those uses in existing districts. This is intended to reflect the nature of the CM1 district as a higher-density transit-oriented district, with direct connection to transit services. The parking requirements proposed are intended to make efforts toward less car dependency, greater transit usage and more affordable development costs, while still providing options for a range of transportation choices, including driving and parking.</li> <li>• Ultimately, feedback on the issue of minimum parking requirements has been mixed. The project team has heard support at both extreme ends of the spectrum (i.e., remove parking minimums entirely; include more or increase parking minimums). The proposed CM1 district, as all corridor districts, is intended to strike a reasonable balance between these options.</li> </ul>
Commentary on the survey itself	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some participants remarked that not enough information was provided.</li> <li>• Others were confused by the map used as reference for a different question of the survey and other elements of the survey.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any future engagement efforts will take these comments into consideration and strive to provide more and easier to understand information.</li> </ul>

7. Does the proposed **CS1** district, as shown above, support the objectives of the Station Mixed-Use land use designation?

8. **If no, why not?** (8/24 responses received)

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Building scale/density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One participant encouraged a greater number of allowable storeys and taller buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The building heights in the CM1 and CS1 districts have been set based on approved policy direction in the Corridor Mixed Use and Station Mixed Use land use designations in the Official Community Plan. These were based on projections done to determine density levels necessary to meet Corridor Growth development targets in the City's Plan for Growth and were included in various stages of public engagement for the Corridor Planning Program. Including different maximum building heights in the zoning districts corresponding to those land use designations would be a departure from approved policy.</li> </ul>
Location and land use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One participant encouraged a mix of services and commercial amenities nearby or within mixed-use buildings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CS1 district is inherently a mixed-use district and contains a wide range of permitted residential, commercial and institutional land uses. A mix of services and amenities is one of the key goals of the CS1 district.</li> </ul>
Environmental impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some participants cautioned against developmental impact to ecologically sensitive areas in general.</li> <li>Some participants commented that there appeared to be very little greenery in the images shown and encouraged as much green space as possible.</li> <li>Other comments in this theme were unrelated to the project, such as wetland conservation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CS1 district does not inherently have any greater impact to the environment than other mixed-use zoning districts. Further, the CS1 district is mostly expected for use in infill development, which could be seen as more environmentally friendly in general than greenfield development.</li> <li>The images shown were examples of the kind of development that would be allowed under CS1, as well as a 3D rendering. While the CS1 district does contain yard and landscaping requirements, this will not always guarantee greenery on private property. However, each Corridor Planning process will include a public realm and streetscaping design component, which is intended to enhance the public realm in areas surrounding CM1 districts, including the provision of street trees, landscaping and other greenery.</li> </ul>

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One participant remarked that Saskatoon would thrive with an easier, less intrusive and demanding permit system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changes to the City's building and development permitting system is beyond the scope of this project.</li> </ul>
Parking requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One participant remarked that Saskatoon needs to be drivable and parking minimums are a must.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A change has been made to the minimum parking requirements in the CS1 district. As originally proposed, as part of this engagement, the CS1 district was to have no minimum parking requirements for most non-residential uses. The change made was introducing minimum parking requirements to the CS1 district. The parking requirements introduced are significantly lower than CM1 or any other existing mixed-use zoning district that requires parking. However, while most non-residential uses now have a minimum parking requirement, the requirement for residential uses has been lowered. This change has been made in response not only to these engagement efforts, but to other discussions with internal City groups.</li> <li>The newly introduced parking requirements in the CS1 district are significantly lower than in nearly any other district. This is intended to reflect the nature of the CS1 district as a high-density, high-activity, transit-oriented district, immediately adjacent to transit services. The parking requirements proposed are intended to make efforts toward less car dependency, greater transit usage and more affordable development costs, while still providing options for a range of transportation choices, including driving and parking.</li> <li>Ultimately, feedback on the issue of minimum parking requirements has been mixed. The project team has heard support at both extreme ends of the spectrum (i.e., remove parking minimums entirely; include more or increase parking minimums). The proposed CS1 district, as all corridor districts, is intended to strike a reasonable balance between these options.</li> </ul>
Commentary on the survey itself	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One participant remarked that not enough information was provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any future engagement efforts will take these comments into consideration and strive to provide more and easier to understand information.</li> </ul>

**9. Finally, do you have any additional thoughts on the new Corridor Zoning Districts as a whole? (14/24 responses received)**

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Positive feedback/ agreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several participants commented that they were impressed, encouraged or that they liked the ideas presented.</li> <li>• Another commented, “good work” and remarked on the positive benefits of density and infill.</li> <li>• One participant remarked that they like the idea of varying density levels and building forms in an area, commenting on the ability to age in place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These responses suggest general support for the project.</li> </ul>
Neutral feedback/ suggestions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One participant cautioned against being too prescriptive in development regulation, which can hinder development activity.</li> <li>• Some participants remarked on the environmental impact, cautioning against the effects development can have on ecosystems in general, as well as topics unrelated to the project, such as xeric planting.</li> <li>• Some participants expressed hope that the new districts will integrate neighbourhoods so they are more walkable, as well as integrate with public transit in an effort to discourage car dependency.</li> <li>• Another commented that new zoning districts shouldn't be necessary, as existing districts should all be modified to achieve the same goals City-wide.</li> <li>• One participant suggested eliminating all parking minimums and making sure “missing middle” housing is permitted in the lowest density residential districts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the goals of this project was to avoid over-regulation of development standards. The version of districts proposed are the result of several iterative efforts made to streamline the regulations and remove any unnecessary content with the help of the industry focus group and internal City stakeholders. Earlier versions of the draft districts would likely have been seen as more prescriptive than the versions as proposed.</li> <li>• The proposed zoning districts do not inherently have any greater impact to the environment than existing zoning districts. Further, the corridor districts are mostly expected for use in infill development, which could be seen as more environmentally friendly in general than greenfield development.</li> <li>• One of the key intentions of the corridor zoning districts is to integrate into existing, established neighbourhoods and support public transit services.</li> <li>• Modifying several or all existing zoning districts in an attempt to achieve the Corridor Growth infill development goals would likely have many unintended consequences. Further, the goals for Corridor Growth are highly targeted to a specific geographic area of the City. New land use designations and zoning districts applying only to this area is the most straightforward way to achieve these goals.</li> <li>• Eliminating all minimum parking requirements would constitute a significant shift in policy direction for the City. The forms of housing often referred to as “missing middle” are all permitted uses in the CR1 and CR2 districts.</li> </ul>

Time	Summarized Concerns	Responses
Negative feedback/criticism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One participant expressed concern that this level of development density will harm the urban forest and reduce green space.</li> <li>Another participant commented that there seems to be an “agenda” being pushed regarding rider uptake on a very limited bus service and that Saskatoon and Saskatchewan are very car-dependent.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed zoning districts do not inherently have any greater impact to the environment than existing zoning districts. However, the importance of green space in neighbourhoods is a key component of the Corridor Planning Program. Corridor Planning exercises will make efforts to preserve and enhance existing greenspaces and provide opportunities for more greenspaces in areas where needs are identified.</li> <li>One of the key goals of the Corridor Planning Program and the corridor zoning districts is to contribute to a gradual transportation mode shift in Saskatoon away from dependency on private automobiles and toward other modes, such as transit, walking and cycling. This goal is clearly stated in the City’s Strategic Plan, Official Community Plan, Plan for Growth and other official civic policy documents.</li> </ul>
Commentary on the survey itself	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One participant remarked that the survey was “not helpful.”</li> <li>Another commented that it was difficult to understand the survey.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any future engagement efforts will take these comments into consideration and strive to provide clearer information.</li> </ul>

### Survey Evaluation

Survey participants were asked to provide their feedback on the survey itself. Those results are summarized in the table below.

Statement	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
The information was presented clearly.	39%	39%	22%
I understand how my feedback will be used.	28%	39%	33%
I was able to provide my feedback fully.	39%	33%	28%
This survey was a good use of my time.	50%	44%	6%

Participants were also asked a series of demographic/professional identification questions. Those results are summarized in the table below.

Answer Choices	Responses
None / General Interest	33.33%
Urban Planning / Community Planning	16.67%
Non-Profit	12.50%
Property Management or Landlord	12.50%
Construction & Building	8.33%

Answer Choices	Responses
GIS - Geographic Information Systems	4.17%
Real Estate	4.17%
Architecture & Design	0.00%
Engineering	0.00%
Land Development	0.00%
Surveyor	0.00%
Other (please specify) * * 3 of these responses were “education”, 1 was “wholesale”, 1 was “resident”	20.83%

### What Went Well

- The industry focus group was an effective way to review and discuss technical details of zoning standards with experts who work with them every day. The small size of this group enabled good discussion and candid feedback. Most of the technical details of the proposed districts were crafted through several iterations with the help of this focus group. Members of the group were also able to provide thoughtful feedback on their own time, in writing, in addition to the time spent in live discussion.
- Connecting with existing Corridor Planning stakeholders helped to tie this project to overall Corridor Growth goals.
- The information package and survey sent to stakeholders was received with generally positive results, although with some areas for improvement.

### What We Can Do Better

- Deliberation with some internal City working groups would have benefitted by being done earlier in the process.
- Some survey participants remarked that the survey itself was difficult to understand. A more robust survey with greater details and clearer presentation of information might have helped some participants with understanding the materials better. Providing a better link between the survey and the detailed information provided on the Engage page would likely have helped with clarity of information.
- Challenges related to virtual engagement may have impacted the project team’s ability to reach all stakeholders and receive complete feedback.

### What’s Next

- The Corridor Planning Program will use the new corridor zoning districts as part of the Corridor Plan community consultation process.
- Community members and other stakeholders will have the chance to provide input during the development of each Corridor Plan.