

Planning and Development Committee Meeting



It's Finally Warm Enough to Go Outside, Edmonton. [Source](#).

February 24, 2021 @ 6:00 PM

Remote Meeting

Prepared by Stephanie Kovach

Voting Members: Troy Aardema (D), Stephen Poole (E), Stephen Raitz (I), Dave Sutherland (J), Suzanne MacKinnon (L)

Volunteers: Vesna Farnden (F), Elaine Solez (I)

Guests: Residential Infill Working Group: Bev Zubot (Parkallen), Jan Hardstaff (Parkallen), Simon MacIntosh (Parkallen), Cassandra Haraba (Grovenor), Colin Johnson (Deputy Executive Director, EFCL)

Minutes: Angelika Matson

Vacancies: A, C, G, H, K

2.0 - Agenda

2.1 - Approval of Agenda

Item 2.1

1.0 Call to Order

- 1.1 Welcome and Introductions

2.0 Agenda

- 2.1 Approval of Agenda (pg. 2)

3.0 Approval of PDC Meeting Minutes

- 3.1 January 27, 2021 Meeting Minutes (pgs. 3-15)
- 3.2 Review of Action Items from the January 27 Meeting (pg. 16)

4.0 Calendar

- 4.1 Important Upcoming Dates (pg. 17)

5.0 Discussion Items

- 5.1 EXTERNAL - RIWG Presentation (pg. 18) (6:05pm-6:50pm)
- 5.2 Zoning Bylaw Renewal (UPDATE) + Software (pg. 19) (6:50pm-7:30pm)
- 5.3 Zoning Bylaw Omnibus (UPDATE) (pg. 20) (7:30pm-7:40pm)
- 5.4 Vision Zero Street Labs (UPDATE) (pg. 21) (7:40-8:00pm)

6.0 Reports (pg. 28) (8:00-8:30 pm) (pg. 23)

- 6.1 Update from EFCL Executive Director
- 6.2 District News

3.0 - Approval of January 27 Meeting Minutes

3.1 - January 27 Meeting Minutes

Item 3.1

January 27, 2021

Planning and Development Committee January 2021 Meeting Minutes

January 27th, 2021

Prepared by: Angelika Matson

Attendance:

Members in attendance: Stephen Poole (E), Dave Sutherland (J), Stephen Raitz (I), Suzanne MacKinnon (L)

Volunteers in attendance: Elaine Solez (I), Vesna Farnden (F)

EFCL staff in attendance: Stephanie Kovach (CPA)

Guests in attendance: Angelika Matson (Minutes), City of Edmonton: Anne Huizinga, Kim Petrin, Shauna Kiper, Sanchari Quader

Regrets: Hassaan Zuberi (L), Troy Aardema (D), Vesna Farnden (F)

1.0 Call to Order

1.1 Welcome and Introductions

2.0 Agenda

2.1 Approval of Agenda was skipped in the interest of time.

3.0 Approval of PDC Meeting Minutes

3.1 November 27, P&DC Meeting Minutes

- E. Solez had an amendment on page 10 toward the bottom about neighbourhood park being on the list of historic parks. Take out the word “expand”. Additionally add the 109 st ARP and specify that “we” is the community league not the district.

S. Mackinnon moves to approve amended minutes, seconded by D. Sutherland.
Motion APPROVED.

3.2 Review of Action Items from the November 27 Meeting

- Action regarding the Safe Mobility Strategy: in addition to Community Leagues, we need to ensure that the CoE is consulting with other neighbourhood stakeholders in the Vision Zero Street Labs process.
- Action regarding the Zoning Bylaw Omnibus: S. Kovach will forward comments and questions to A. Shamchuck.

4.0 Calendar

4.1 Important Upcoming Dates (pg. 12)

- January 19th: Infill Compliance Team Annual Report at Urban Planning Committee
- January 27th: PDC Meeting
- February 2: City Plan Implementation report, Zoning Bylaw Renewal Phase 1
- February 3: Alternative Financing Report at CSPC
- February 9: Zoning Bylaw Omnibus at Public Hearing
- February 24: PDC Meeting
- March 31: PDC Meeting

-D. Sutherland brought up that the safe mobility strategy went to UPC, do we know when it is going to council?

S. Raitz answered that it got redirected to a different committee in March because of funding and was rescheduled sometime around March. Funding Strategies for community traffic safety infrastructure will go to UPC on March 2, 2021. Safe Mobility Strategy, to his understanding, has received all appropriate approval for it to be used to guide administration's work.

-E. Solez was wondering if S. Kovach is planning to attend the February 2nd meeting?

S. Kovach responded yes, but at this point we don't have any comments to forward.

Item #1A - City Planning Framework

The City of Edmonton (CoE) presented on the City Planning Framework, which includes cleaning up the library of planning documents. They will ask these questions:

- 1) What do they do with the plans they have right now?
 - 2) What do they do with the plans they decide to keep?
 - 3) How do they build new plans into the framework?
- The goal of the initial repeals of land-use policies will be to remove policy that has fulfilled its purpose and is no longer needed.
 - - The project will be completed in phases: reviewing current land use plans and tools, developing a process to keep plans up-to-date, and repealing plans that have fulfilled their purpose.

- Through Evolving Infill the CoE heard from over 1000 people. They heard that what they were missing was a holistic review with the repeal of outdated ARPs, and the CoE needed to better respond to changing community demographics. There was significant support for the original draft Action M (“Develop a process to review, retire, and update select land use plans that may be out of date”); final Action 15 was created which blended actions “to develop a process to review and update/retire old policies to bring them in line with current policies.”
- -The City Plan engagement found that scope inconsistency creates redundancy and conflict, there was a high volume of plans that made it difficult to understand all requirements and how the plans relate to one another. There were a lot of stale-dated plans applying policy that is outdated. They lacked prioritization - making it difficult to balance goals across 200+ plans, resulting in inconsistent trade offs. Lastly, there were implementation deficiencies as plans were not funded which eroded confidence in the plan.
- The approach to reviewing the plans was a triage approach. The triage was an iterative process that validated questions, tested methods, and chose group discussions. The steps to the triage process were:
 - 1) Gathering a complete list of tools
 - 2) Completing triage
 - 3) Circulating the initial list for repeal
 - 4) Refining the list
 - 5) Producing a final draft list for LDA (February 2021)
- The triage highlighted the relevant info that helped determine which plans they needed to focus on. The CoE used the following criteria: plans are no longer advancing their purpose, plans informed other plans, plans no longer fit with planning best practices, plans are no longer the primary guiding document, and plans are beyond their intended lifecycle. All plans considered for repeal are 15+ years old.
- The CoE is now in the implementation phase of the City Plan. The work is going to set groundwork for other parts of City Plan implementation. Completing the work now will help to focus constrained resources to better serve clients. It will create clarity for communities. It will also reduce barriers for participating in future rezonings.
- Anticipated timeline
 - Feb 2021: Land Development Application (LDA) submitted
 - Feb 2021: Notifications and information sharing
 - Feb - Mar 2021: Circulation of LDA, collection of feedback
 - May 2021: Notification for public hearing
 - June 2021: Public hearing
- Some benefits to community leagues are: clearer policy reduces barriers to good development, policy clean-up reduces engagement fatigue, this will improve alignment with growth expectations, this will move Edmonton towards creating an ongoing review process, this will clarify the role in the land development application process, it will

create more inclusive and compassionate communities, and lastly, it makes planning and development more accessible for all Edmontonians.

- -The CoE provided a series of questions that P&DC members may expect from their leagues:
 - -How would a plan repeal impact my neighbourhood?
 - -What will guide planning in my neighbourhood if there is no plan?
 - -How were plans selected for repeal?
 - -What should be considered when responding to this application?
 - -Why not engage on the decision to repeal plans?

- S. Kovach asked what they would say to a community member who asked what will guide planning in my neighbourhood if there is no longer a plan?

The CoE responded that there are dozens of neighbourhoods that have functioned without land-use plans. When the land-use plan is repealed, the zoning bylaw will continue to regulate every property within that neighbourhood. The existing process that is in place for rezoning applications would take hold, so there should be no immediate impact.

-E. Solez pointed out that there are older ARPs that people are still hoping will provide guidance to their area.

Answer: The CoE is not looking to repeal plans that haven't fulfilled their purpose. The COE is not looking to cause disruption and they feel confident that the plans will have completed their technical function as a planning tool. For example, the Garneau ARP is fairly recent and would not be removed as it is fulfilling its purpose.

-S. Kovach asked when can EFCL see the plans that will be repealed?

The answer is the beginning of March.

-E. Solez asked why there was no public consultation on this?

The CoE responded that they are leaning on engagement from Evolving Infill and City Plan engagement. This process is fulfilling an administrative function. They didn't have a process to determine when tools have fulfilled their part of their life cycle. Because no policy changes or shifts are made, this was the appropriate next step. It also required technical expertise rather than shaping policy.

-S. Raitz asked with the district planning process happening, how will they be applied on top of the plans that are kept? Will the plans that are kept be more closely followed? In areas where there are no plans will the district plan provide a strong direction as the remaining statutory plans will continue to provide in certain areas?

The CoE responded that it will be muddy at the beginning because there will be old and new stuff, but they are looking to put in a system where they are constantly checking in with the plans to ensure they are where they need to be. The District Plans will be focused on establishing the districts, their first priority is to establish that those districts exist, and then consolidate local ARPs. They may need to have some of the older plans in place for a longer period of time. Once this process is in place, every plan is being created with a lifespan and a goal or purpose in mind.

-E. Solez pointed out that there's an NSP that's still being built out. What if the NSP doesn't get you to a 15 minute district? What if it's all single-family houses?

The CoE responded that when they're reviewing the plans we will be reviewing with a City Plan lens. If there is guidance that can be considered through that, they will try to do that. The district planning work is in its infancy, these are questions to grapple with.

-E. Solez asked if the district plans created by your team?

The CoE is working on the engagement plan.

-S. Kovach asked when the rollout date is set?

The Coe is aiming for 1.25 million population threshold and aligning the timeline as much as possible with zoning bylaw. The other reason the CoE chose 1.25 is they realized they have developable land set out already for 1.25 million. This represents consolidation of all the information that we have today. One of the key exercises in district planning will be mapping so we can provide that guidance for future rezonings. The CoE wants to work with their city-building partners but they are working with the data and info that they already have.

-S. Mackinnon: are you consulting with us because you think neighbourhood structure and identities are important to us? Is there a concern that you have, can we help you address it? Are community boundaries at risk in district thinking?

The CoE answered that they're coming to share info. They anticipate concern because they know there is emotional attachment to these plans. They've heard through infill engagement that their system and planning hierarchy is hard to navigate and understand. It is cluttered with plans that they don't honor and they need to archive this work. They are looking for insight on how we can communicate this info.

S. Mackinnon responded that she doesn't think regular people cling to the plans, people that are highly engaged may have concerns, whereas others will not. An automatic reaction might be that the neighbourhood is being threatened. If there was a commitment that districts would respect community lines, it may amalgamate the fear.

E. Solez thinks that communities would feel better if they knew something about what was happening with district planning before taking the plans away.

The CoE answered that at UPC on Feb 2, they will be introducing work.

E. Solez: Will a report be available on Thursday?

CoE answered yes. The Zoning Bylaw Renewal project will be giving an update on the same agenda.

-S. Raitz asked if there will be an archive of the plans?

The CoE answered yes. They will still be easy to find on the website as well.

- S. Raitz would like an understanding of how district plans will align with transportation planning. It would be nice to see that relationship firmed up.

They will be pulling the bike network plans into the district planning.

-The CoE pointed out that at edmonton.ca/cityplanningframework you can email them at cityplanningframework@edmonton.ca if you have comments, concerns, or questions. They are looking to provide EFCL with tools to have conversations with community leagues about this.

Item #1B District Planning

- For the flow of discussion, item 5.1 was moved up on the agenda.
- S. Kovach asked what stood out from the CoE presentation they just heard? How can the EFCL support league involvement, particularly in the district planning process?
- E. Solez responded that updating the plans and consolidating them is a rational thing that people may react irrationally to. It's hard to know how to help leagues with this when it seems like there is nothing concrete yet. The reports coming later in the week may provide more info.

Action Item: S. Kovach to update the committee on Thursday UPC meeting.

- S. Raitz said there an equity issue that comes out of some communities being able to advocate for themselves and other communities not being able to advocate for themselves having nothing or ending up with a plan from 30 years ago. It may impact how the district plans get applied. What would be fairest would be for district plans to be more impactful than what is in place right now.
- E. Solez agreed with the equity idea. Some of the equity problem lies with CoE where they may not do ARPs because they don't have resources. Moving to the district plan will ensure that no-one will lack a plan, which may help deal with an equity issue.
 - S. Raitz responded that it is consoling, but the sticking point will be certain areas may have their foot in the door of the old way of doing things and that's where the muddiness will still exist. Thinking about that now ensures we can better react to it in the future.
- S. Mackinnon is still struggling and hoping for clarity with more reports.
- S. Kovach thinks the neighbourhood identity piece is interesting. They didn't confirm or deny the neighbourhood boundaries. If we all have an opportunity to participate in District Planning, does it matter? Something to think about.
- E. Solez assumed that these clusters of communities follow community boundaries. Her community identifies with Scona district, but that district goes south of the Whitemud which aren't the neighbourhoods currently involved in the district and they may wonder why they are in that district. It may take some work to create a district identity and there may be neighbourhoods on the other side of the boundary that may be isolated.
- E. Solez added that the districts might create islands. There might be something going on in Dave's district that affects Scona district and no-one may hear about it. They may become walled cities within the city. What mechanism would there be to have those conversations?
- S. Raitz pointed out that in the repeal process people have an expectation that their neighbourhood will stay the same forever and this may be an opportunity for us to educate community members on the life stages of neighbourhoods.

- S. Mackinnon: there is some work on the typical life-cycles of communities and that may be interesting to explore.
- S. Poole thinks we can only share information at the moment, as we don't know much right now. It is important that the messages get out to the public. There is an opportunity to do positive messaging about this: life cycle of community, when it starts, etc. S. Poole is concerned with the planning department and if they think the life cycle is shorter than he does.
E. Solez concurred. Her neighbourhood was subdivided before WWI, and was mainly built post WWII. There's major redevelopment now because the housing stock is 70 years old.
S. Raitz added that the quality of housing, the kind of communities that afford to live there, continued investment in the neighbourhood are all factors that can affect the life cycle of a neighbourhood. It is less of a life cycle than an evolution. It is complex.
- S. Poole added that it is complex. Westmount has heritage houses and brand new redevelopment. It is based on what S. Raitz talked about: people being able to maintain and upgrade old homes, if you buy a new home and don't look after it, it can last 30-40 years.

Item #2 Infill Compliance Team Annual Report

- Infill Compliance Team Annual Report: every year the CoE does an annual report, but they recommended to cease the annual reporting and just do a memo to city council because they are developing a dashboard.
- Infill Compliance is directed by safety codes, CS Peace Officers, DP inspectors and DP Compliance officers, and lot grading enforcement. It is largely complaint-driven and it is not proactively done.
 - S. Poole commented that peace officers also enforce the Community Standards bylaw
 - E. Solez asked if they are doing this because they don't like our feedback on the annual report?
 - S. Poole's understanding was that city council directed administration to bring forward another report in 2022. It could contain two years of information because they are behind; the 2019 report was distributed, not the 2020 report. S. Poole's group hopes that they continue to do an annual report. The dashboard is hard to find info and cuts out detail. The annual report is a tool for public accountability that is needed.
- E. Solez asked if there was any discussion of the city collecting and recording complaints through 311 of damage to private property?
 - S. Kovach noted that 311 is recording complaints now, but the City still does not get involved in private property disputes.

- S. Poole pointed out that it is an unrepresentative picture because they had just started collecting the data.
- S. Kovach said that the jurisdiction of safety officers was focused on the most at that council meeting. Main issues discussed were: ongoing reports of damage to neighbouring property during infill (of most concern is excavation) and the potential tool of the compliance certificate including protection of neighbouring property (to be debated in Q1 of 2022). The second issue discussed was the inspection by Safety Codes Officers is complaint-driven due to limited resources. The potential tool was to schedule SCO inspection at demolition and excavation (Administration was directed to bring an unfunded service package to the spring supplemental budget).
 - S. Poole noted that the Residential Infill Working Group doesn't think it's a resource issue, they think it is a policy issue. When they do respond to a complaint and go and inspect, even when they issue an order to immediately remediate the issue, they don't enforce. There are no administrative penalties, no tickets. The actions have no real impact and are not protecting the public in the way that the legislation is intended. The CoE protects the builders rather than the public. It's not a resource issue, it's their policy and practice.
- S. Kovach asked do you think that getting them to inspect during demolition and excavation would help?
 - S. Poole responded that it would help if they did it properly. They have the jurisdiction to do it even though they are arguing that they do not.
- S. Kovach asked S. Poole from your perspective did it feel like the conversation is moving along?
 - S. Poole responded no, it seemed like red herrings.
- S. Kovach noted that one of the things discussed was that council could give themselves power to ensure the compliance certificate has more information.
 - S. Poole said that the city does have the power to enforce building code right now and they choose not to. The paper doesn't matter, the issue is action or inaction and right now they are choosing inaction. The remedy is for them to enforce the building code and protect the public and regulate the builders.
- At the meeting there was a motion for administration to provide an unfunded service package for consideration at Spring Supplemental Budget for resources for excavation inspections, enforcement, compliance. As well as provide a report on how to increase accountability (e.g. compliance certificates).
- Update from S. Poole on the Residential Infill Working Group:
 - The group is requesting a half an hour slot at the next P&DC meeting to give a presentation and they have sent out reading material.
 - The Neighbours of Infill survey: got 175 responses from 41 mature neighbourhoods. 79% of respondents indicated that they experienced damage from construction activity. He continued to update on survey results.
 - S. Kovach asked if the city were to relinquish their jurisdiction would it be enforced by the province?

- S. Poole responded that it is a provincial responsibility that can be delegated down in a number of ways. It's not the city's area of jurisdiction as a right, it is something that is granted to them as a privilege by the Minister of Public Affairs. The RIWG believes they are picking and choosing which parts they enforce.
- S. Kovach asked why they are picking and choosing which part they enforce?
 - S. Poole responded that the industry has told the CoE that it doesn't want to take on the expense of shoring for excavations. The RIWG believes the CoE has suffered regulator capture, where the building industry is telling the CoE what to do.
- S. Kovach asked if S. Poole thinks it would be rectified if the province took over and contracted with private companies or is it a question of a need to embed the need for shoring in the bylaw and policy?
 - S. Poole: The need for shoring is in the building code, they just don't enforce it. The RIWG has done engagement, they've told the CoE it is in their jurisdiction, and they don't seem prepared to change their behaviour. They feel they are at the end of the road.
- S. Mackinnon noted that when someone says that they aren't enforcing regulations, they usually pull the card that there aren't enough resources. Let's assume they don't have enough resources and let's get them the resources, and let's monitor, measure what they are doing with the resources. Is this a tool?
 - S. Poole responded that the tool is that they are supposed to be enforcing, but they are not.
- S. Mackinnon asked if S. Poole was suggesting that the data says that, but somehow the CoE is not seeing it?
 - S. Poole: Yes, and they don't see it because they don't want to see it, it's not because they don't know.
- S. Mackinnon so S. Poole is suggesting that it is not just regulatory failure but it has also impacted all of administration and council. How? And does it get changed?
 - S. Poole: we've been trying for 6 years to get things changed. We are regrouping right now. Next month we will be able to tell you what we think the next steps are. City Administration is not doing as city council directs.
- S. Mackinnon was quite struck by Table 5 which was missing the number of complaints. The site fencing is numbers are incredibly high, but the number of safety code acts issued is at a higher rate than all the other items, which are of higher risk.
 - S. Poole: an order is a written order to remediate the issue. With site fencing, a builder can usually fix it in a day. The 86 orders were probably mostly remediated the same day. It is not a very significant enforcement action.
- S. Mackinnon asked if there is data on the number of complaint types? Her guess is if there was that information, the lowest number of complaints is the site fencing, and the higher might be the excavation. Do proactive inspections mean not complaints?
 - S. Poole responded that S. Mackinnon is correct. There is something worth noting there; something that they aren't doing right. The biggest numbers are

done by the Community Standards Peace Officer which includes checking that they put a development permit sign.

- S. Mackinnon: I don't know how to help this situation. I think regulatory overtake is a significant allegation, but it's also possible. It can also happen without people recognizing that they're in it.
- S. Kovach asked what other committee members think about the compliance certificate idea? Should the EFCL pursue supporting additional dollars to be allocated to SCOS for proactive inspection? Why or why not should the CoE end reporting on compliance?
 - S. Raitz thinks that the compliance certificate is something and this is a really tricky situation.
 - E. Solez thinks the problem with the compliance certificate is that you will always get one unless there's something really wrong. She noted that there was a case where in the process of construction a tree fell onto the neighbour's roof. The excavation flooded their basement, and the builder did very little to remedy it. There's an extreme case that didn't make it to S. Poole's report because no-one responded to the survey about it. You'd think that all the disasters would come to someone's attention, but they aren't.
- S. Kovach said Councilor Henderson brought up that the numbers are not accurately capturing the experience across the city because he gets more complaints in his office about that one thing.
 - S. Poole: the RIWG does think that they're under-counting complaints: the two tables don't have consistent numbers. In the one table it said there were 90 safety code violations and in the other there was 104.
- S. Kovach noted that it doesn't seem the P&DC thinks the compliance certificate would be an effective tool.
 - E. Solez: I don't know the answer, but it does seem like it would be another box to check off. What can you do in some of these situations?
- S. Kovach asked if it was worth exploring more resourcing of CSPs.
 - S. Mackinnon said it would help if that's the problem.
 - S. Poole said that is the RIWG's fear: it's not the problem. The problem is that they're not enforcing certain things because the industry doesn't want them to.
 - S. Mackinnon says are there mechanisms to police the police?
 - S. Poole says they are at the point where they are thinking of directly approaching the minister.

Item #3 - Zoning Bylaw Renewal Philosophy (Refresher)

- S. Kovach presented the old bylaw that didn't support mixed-use development, keeps activities separated from each other, places administrative burden on businesses opening and growing in Edmonton, and can be used as an exclusionary tool.

- The new bylaw hopes to remedy issues with a hybrid bylaw that will be form based, performance based, incentive based, and use-based. This will result in fewer, more enabling and inclusive zones, expanding use classes, and removing regulations.
 - E. Solez pointed out since they are consolidating uses, there will be fewer uses.
- S. Kovach said the CoE is asking how the bylaw will regulate development. They will be looking for legal obligation, policy alignment, can they clearly define the scope, stakeholder and public input, measuring land use impact, enforceability, and alternative means of regulation.
- If they do decide to regulate they will ask “yes, to what degree?”.
- S. Kovach asked P&DC how they see the philosophy of the renewal benefitting the project, your neighbourhood, and the city? Are there elements missing that could benefit their neighbourhoods?
 - D. Sutherland I look forward to seeing the form-based code developments coming in.
 - E. Solez noted that the important thing is the alignment with the city plan, as it is one of the key implementation pieces of the city plan. If they do this, it will help get to the 15-minute community.
 - S. Raitz pointed out that he works in a municipality where this bylaw is in place. It is a lot easier to explain and interact with for the public. It does help us get to the 15-minute city. The philosophy part is good, we just have to go through a process to get there.
- S. Mackinnon thinks that it has a big disconnect with the majority of people who want the city to keep things just the way they are.
 - S. Raitz responded that those people probably want their taxes to go down, to get that piece (lower taxes) of what they want, their wants are going to need to be superseded.
 - S. Poole said the philosophy is a balancing act. We all want a set of city criteria that is easy to apply, and we will all be affected by that.
- E. Solez suggested that if S. Kovach says anything to city council, say that there’s nothing wrong with this but they will really have to sell it to people that won’t like the zoning bylaw changes.

Reports

Tripartite Amending Agreement

- S. Kovach noted that it has been completed. The current Tripartite Agreement (expires at the beginning of 2022) prohibits commercial activity. The amending agreement allows commercial activity with a recreation focus. The definition is “Recreation is the experience that results freely from chosen participation in physical, social, intellectual, creative, and spiritual pursuits that enhance individual and community wellbeing.” There’s a hope that this may open up revenue streams for them.

- E. Solez asked if they could have a coffee shop at their community league hall?
S. Kovach responded yes!
- S. Poole said his league used to run a ladies pampering night and that was done by businesses, so they had to quit. That will now be allowed.
- S. Kovach asked that if the P&DC have any questions they please forward them to Laura.

District News

- District E: S. Poole said his community is quiet. They're talking about open-air music things with distancing and perhaps doing that with other community leagues.
- District I: S. Raitz said there was one of the first tests of the Strathcona ARP with Archibald Block development, but they've been ordered to do a heritage assessment. There is a potential development at the intersection with Gateway and Whyte where there might be a redesignation of public parkland. There is renewal that is reinforcing what is already there, but it could be taking a bigger step in a positive direction. On Rollie Miles there's a report on Feb 3 that should be released about alternative financing opportunities to operate recreational facilities, so the community has been looking at presenting to city council options of alternative financing that have community support. If council directs CoE administration to look into alternative financing, one of the first opportunities to apply it might be Rollie Miles in the spring.
- District I: E. Solez's community league did get their park added to the city's inventory of historic resources. They have to be on the list before they can get designated, and when they're designated they're protected from development. They are pursuing designation. They have a deteriorating retaining wall and if we are designated we might be able to find better funding. They got permission to post the historic board's analysis of the park to the league's website, and the league will send this to S. Kovach.
 - **Action Item:** E. Solez to send the analysis of the park to S. Kovach
- Elaine's district has an ongoing development that was a DC2 that was to be built on a gas station site, and now a different developer owns it and they want to do something else with it. We are having an online open house and we will be doing Engage Edmonton engagement on it. The league has put forward several proposals that the CoE is interested in. There is nothing about the number of units, and the development committee wants family-oriented housing. They've calculated that they have to make a \$100 000 contribution, and that can go towards 3-bedroom units. \$100 000 only covers 3 3-bedroom units, which is a drop in the bucket, but they'll take whatever they can get. The league is using discussion papers on multi-family housing and mixed-use housing, it says for any building that has over 30 residential units, the average number of bedrooms per unit should be 2.25. The development is kitty corner to all the University residential buildings.
- District J: D. Sutherland said Holyrood Gardens was supposed to go to council but it was pushed back to March. Anita wanted to talk to trans-ed to get more community

league signage at the LRT stops at Avonmore, Holyrood, Strathern, etc. Trans-ed is planning another online roundtable in the spring.

- District L: S. Mackinnon is aware that this was going to be the year that the Valley Line opened. There has been a lot of work happening overnight and during the COVID-19 time. Rezoning of unutilized school land happened and got greater attention. It does appear to be going to a private school in a developed Millwoods neighbourhood that wasn't expecting to have another school. On the eastern edge of the district there is a lot of commercial development which is interesting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30pm

3.0 - Approval of November 27 Meeting Minutes

3.2 - Review of Action Items from November 27

Item 3.2

ACTION	<p><u>RE:</u> City Plan Implementation + Zoning Bylaw Renewal @ UPC S.Kovach to update committee on materials presented to UPC via email</p> <p>S.Kovach to submit comments to UPC regarding EFCL engagement on ZBR Discussion Papers (here)</p>	<p><i>Complete</i> ✓</p> <p><i>Complete</i> ✓</p>
ACTION	<p><u>RE:</u> Windsor Park Park added to Inventory of Historic Resources E.Solez to forward information to S.Kovach to forward to PDC</p>	<p><i>Complete</i> ✓</p>

**4.0 - EFCL Planning Committee Calendar
February, March, April**

4.1 - Important Upcoming Dates

Item 4.1

****A list of all Council meetings can be found [here](#)****

- To adhere to physical distancing practices, City Hall is only open to registered speakers at Council or Committee meetings
- The public may view in-progress meetings online at: [Council on the Web](#), [City Council's Youtube Channel](#)

February	
2	City Plan Implementation Report, Zoning Bylaw Renewal Phase 1 - Philosophy @ UPC
3	Alternative Financing Report @ CSPC
9	Zoning Bylaw Omnibus @ Public Hearing
24	PDC Meeting
March	
2	Funding Strategies for Community Traffic Safety Infrastructure @ UPC
31	PDC Meeting
April	
28	PDC Meeting

5.0 - Discussion Items

5.1 - External Presentation - Residential Infill Working Group

Item 5.1

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Residential Infill Working Group (RIWG) is a group of independent volunteers working toward improving outcomes for neighbours of infill in the City of Edmonton. They will be providing a brief presentation on their work to date, with time for discussion at the end.

Presentation outline:

- Who they are
- Their purpose
- Why they're doing this
- What they want to achieve
- What could go right in infill
- What could go wrong
- Why it should not go wrong
- How to prevent it from going wrong
- What the construction laws are and how to apply to a sit

5.0 - Discussion Items

5.2 - Zoning Bylaw Renewal (UPDATE)

Item 5.2

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

On February 2, 2021, the Zoning Bylaw Renewal team presented the Philosophy guiding the Zoning Bylaw Renewal to Urban Planning Committee. The EFCL submitted feedback outlining ([here](#)):

- The desire for digital signage on League licensed land
- The desire for additional opportunities for Leagues to generate revenue on their land
- The feedback from Leagues and the PDC on the series of Discussion Papers

NEW INFORMATION FROM MEETING WITH LIVIA BALONE (DIRECTOR, ZONING BYLAW RENEWAL) ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22

- **Have not started writing the new Bylaw**
 - 20-25 “hot topics” that require additional engagement
 - E.g. MNO - what will become of it?, Residential Zones - is there a need for a third zone? , Park Zones - is there a need for an additional zone?
 - They will further engage on these topics and then begin writing the Bylaw.
 - Target engagement period for these topics: May and June
 - They may soon begin drafting regulations for some “low-interest” pieces (e.g. Agricultural and Rural Zones)
- Consultants Hired:
 - Green Space Alliance and Opticos Design
 - Form Based Code consultants
 - Writing the Bylaw and offering insight on areas Form Based Codes are/not appropriate
 - POPULUS
 - Engagement consultant
- Next touch point at UPC on June 29, 2021, which will include:
 - Structure of the Bylaw
 - Any topics that they have drafted (e.g. Agricultural and Rural Zones)
 - Engagement summary for “hot topics”
- Following the June 29 presentation at UPC, restrictions for engagement activities begin July 1 in anticipation of the Municipal Election in October
 - Engagement activities can not resume until after the election
 - They are working with their legal team to determine if they can host anything online during the engagement pause (more info:
- From July to October, they will draft the new Bylaw

- Engagement for the new Bylaw is tentatively scheduled for November, December, January, February
-

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

1. We do not necessarily have the capacity to review the full Bylaw. What are the areas of most importance to Leagues?
2. Do members have interest in reviewing a section and presenting back to the committee?
3. Any thoughts for potential tools to engage with Leagues?
 - a. Online webinars (e.g. ZB DP online sessions)
 - b. Platform such [MURAL](#)

5.0 - Discussion Items

5.3 - Zoning Bylaw Omnibus (UPDATE)

Item 5.3

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

In October of 2020, City Administration circulated Omnibus amendments to the Zoning Bylaw. Please see the [November PDC Agenda](#) for a full list of the “Bold Moves” amendments (pgs. 20-23).

Summary of Actions Taken:

- 1) The EFCL forwarded comments to Urban Planning Committee requesting more time for Leagues and the public to be able to engage with the amendments ([here](#))
Result: the Public Hearing date was rescheduled from early December to February 9, 2021.
- 2) The EFCL circulated information related to the Bold Moves amendments to Community Leagues and encouraged them to submit comments to Administration, Council, and the EFCL ([here](#))
Result: the EFCL received communication from two Leagues regarding these amendments.
- 3) The EFCL’s Planning and Development Committee submitted comments to the planner working on the file and the Community Planning Advisor met with him to discuss the comments from the committee ([here](#))

OUTCOME

Amendments passed.

Subsequent motion:

“That Administration review possible tools, including the Community Standards Bylaw, to minimize the nuisance conditions on neighbours created by air conditioners and provide a report to committee in Q3 of 2021.”

5.0 - Discussion Items

5.4 - Vision Zero Street Labs

Item 5.4

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Placeholder for information gained at the stakeholder meeting on February 25. **Email will be sent to members of the committee following the meeting.

6.0 - Reports

- 6.1 Update from EFCL Executive Director, **Laura Cunningham-Shpeley**
- 6.2 District News