

Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review – Amendment Package Three

APPLICATION SUMMARY

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 third 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.

RECOMMENDATION

That a copy of this report be submitted to City Council recommending that at the time of the public hearing, City Council consider Administration's recommendation that the proposed amendments to Bylaw No. 8770, Zoning Bylaw, 2009, as outlined in this report, be approved.

BACKGROUND

The general scope of the Project will, through new and amended regulations, bring Bylaw No. 8770, Zoning Bylaw, 2009 (Zoning Bylaw) into alignment with relevant City of Saskatoon (City) strategies and plans to reflect and balance community values, industry needs and to support and manage city growth. The proposed Zoning Bylaw amendments are being managed through a series of amendment packages staged out over the course of the Project. At its May 25, 2020 and April 26, 2021 meetings respectively, City Council approved amendment packages one and two. Additionally, a new Development Applications Fee Bylaw and amendments for the Architectural Control Districts Design Review Committee have been approved through this Project. A project update is provided in Appendix 1.

DISCUSSION

Proposed amendments of the Zoning Bylaw in this package include:

- A comprehensive update to the Landscaping Provisions;
- Amendments to the General Administration, General Provisions and Required Parking, Loading and Vehicular Circulation Sections of the Bylaw; and
- Amendments to specific zoning districts.

These proposed amendments, if adopted, will achieve several outcomes which are supportive of approved strategies and plans and the City's strategic goals, including:

- 1) Implement sustainable development practices including allowing for alternative landscaping options as well as permeable pavement options;
- 2) Implement policies and recommendations from the Official Community Plan and City Centre Plan;

Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review – Amendment Package Three

- 3) Reduce the number of applications requiring consideration by City Council by delegating approval to Administration where the basis for approval is based on technical factors;
- 4) Delegate approval of applications to Administration in Regional Commercial Direct Control Districts; and
- 5) Addressing matters within the General Provisions and specific zoning districts which will improve consistency of interpretation and application.

Proposed Amendments to Zoning Bylaw – Landscaping Provisions

A thorough revision to the provisions regulating landscaping is being proposed, including changes to the regulations in the Zoning Bylaw as well as supporting Landscaping Guidelines. The Official Community Plan, Low Emissions Community Plan and Green Infrastructure Strategy provide direction to develop requirements which address sustainable practices including providing for low water landscaping options. Proposed regulations and rationale for the landscaping provisions are contained in Appendix 2.

Additional supporting information regarding landscaping regulations is being developed through a re-write of the Landscaping Guidelines. The Guidelines are a companion to the Zoning Bylaw regulations and will be available to the public to support implementation of the landscaping regulations.

Proposed Amendments to Definitions, General Administration, General Provisions and Parking and Loading

Amendments are proposed for Sections 2, 4, 5 and 6 of the Zoning Bylaw including:

- 1) Definitions for balcony and site coverage;
- 2) Developments not requiring a development permit;
- 3) Discretionary uses;
- 4) Detached Accessory Buildings and Structures;
- 5) Permitted Obstructions in Required Yards;
- 6) Fence Height in the Downtown Commercial (B6) District;
- 7) Clarify the materials which may be used for a parking space for a Secondary Suite;
- 8) Remove the requirement for hard surfaced parking for Home Based Businesses and Garden and Garage Suites to align with the approach for Secondary Suites;
- 9) Clarify the requirement for the location of the main entrance for Garden and Garage Suites;
- 10) Add a new section for Development in Proximity to a Rail Line;
- 11) Add a new section for screening including provisions for privacy screens ;
- 12) Clarify that the hard surfacing requirement can include both permeable and impermeable options;
- 13) Parking separation from outer edge of balcony;

Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review – Amendment Package Three

- 14) Allow for remote parking in MX1 (Mixed Use), B5B (Broadway) and B5C (Riversdale) Districts; and
- 15) Consistent with the City Centre Plan, clarify there are no off-street parking requirements in the Downtown Commercial (B6) District.

These amendments were put forward by stakeholders or were identified by Administration and are intended to address policy gaps, improve flexibility and remove inconsistencies from the above-mentioned sections in the Zoning Bylaw. Details of the proposed amendments and rationale are outlined in Appendix 3.

Proposed Amendments to Zoning Districts

Proposed amendments to Zoning Districts are intended to address gaps, improve flexibility, and remove inconsistencies. Explanations of proposed amendments and the rationale for each District are outlined in Appendix 4.

Residential Zoning Districts

Amendments are proposed to the Residential Zoning Districts as follows:

- Allow Garden and Garage Suites as a permitted use where they are currently discretionary;
- Add Ambulance Stations as a discretionary use in the RM5 (High Density Multiple-Unit) District; and
- Allow for a Gross Floor Space Ratio of 1.5:1 in the RM4 District in all areas of the city subject to a review of servicing capacity.

A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was formed in February 2020, to provide industry advice to Administration on potential amendments to the Zoning Bylaw for the RMTN / RMTN1 Districts. The committee consists of builders, land developers, designers and architects, as well as the Saskatoon & Region Home Builders' Association. Administration has concluded meetings with the TAC as the review of the RMTN and RMTN1 Districts has been completed. Amendments to these Districts have also been included in previous amendment packages.

Amendments proposed to the RMTN and RMTN1 (Townhouse) Districts in this package are as follows:

- 1) Reduce the side yard setback for semi-detached dwellings;
- 2) Allow for street-facing units within a dwelling group to have a reduced front or side yard setback;
- 3) Allow Street Townhouses to have front driveway access where there is a rear lane, provided acceptable landscaping is developed. Currently, where there is a lane, front driveway access is not permitted;
- 4) Add one-and two-unit dwellings as a permitted use;
- 5) Add ambulance stations as a discretionary use; and
- 6) Other amendments required for clarity and consistency for these Districts.

Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review – Amendment Package Three

Places of worship will also be added to the RMTN1 District as a discretionary use for consistency with the RMTN district.

In addition to proposed amendments, Administration undertook a proactive review to investigate the potential for rezoning sites from RMTN to RMTN1 in certain circumstances. This change would allow for an increase in height and density for applicable sites. This review included developing criteria, identifying potential sites and undertaking a technical review of sites for which the Administration would support rezoning to RMTN1. The criteria for rezonings of this nature are:

1. Sites must be located on a collector or arterial street; and
2. Sites must not share a property line with a low-density residential zoning district.

While the Administration has identified criteria and sites for which rezoning from RMTN to RMTN1 would be supported, developers would be required to go through the rezoning process for these sites, including any required community consultation.

Institutional Zoning Districts

Amendments are proposed to add parking stations as a permitted use in the M4 (Core Area Institutional Service) District.

Commercial Zoning Districts

Amendments are proposed to the Commercial Zoning Districts as follows:

- Allowing larger retail / restaurant development in B1B (Neighbourhood Commercial – Mixed Use) District subject to certain requirements;
- Clarification amendments in B5B (Broadway) District;
- Amendments to B6 (Downtown) District consistent with the City Centre Plan.

Direct Control Districts

Amendments are also proposed to the Regional Commercial Direct Control Districts to delegate approval to Administration (DCD3 – Preston Crossing, DCD5 - Stonebridge and DCD6 - Blairmore).

Policy Review

Proposed amendments in this report conform to Bylaw No. 9700, The Official Community Plan, 2020 (OCP) policies as required by *The Planning and Development Act, 2007*.

Comments from other Departments

Proposed amendments were circulated to affected departments through an internal review process and no concerns were raised.

COMMUNICATIONS AND ENGAGEMENT

The Public Engagement Summary for the proposed amendments for landscaping are found in Appendix 5. The Public Engagement Summary for the remaining proposed

Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review – Amendment Package Three

amendments can be found in Appendix 6. Communications will be developed to communicate changes to all affected stakeholders.

PUBLIC NOTICE

Public notice is required for consideration of this matter, pursuant to Section 11(a) of Policy No. C01-021, Public Notice Policy.

Once this application has been considered by the Municipal Planning Commission, it will be advertised in accordance with Policy No. C01-021, Public Notice Policy and a date for a public hearing will be set. A notice will be placed in The StarPhoenix two weeks prior to the public hearing.

APPENDICES

1. Zoning Bylaw Review Project Update
2. Proposed Amendments to Landscaping Provisions
3. Amendments to Definitions, General Administration, General Provisions and Required Parking, Loading and Vehicular Circulation Provisions Sections
4. Proposed Amendments to Zoning Districts
5. Public Engagement Summary – Summary for Appendix 2
6. Public Engagement Summary – Summary for Appendix 3 and 4

REPORT APPROVAL

Written by: Christine Gutmann, Senior Project Planner, Planning and Development
Paula Kotasek-Toth, Senior Planner, Planning and Development
Chantel Riou, Planner, Planning and Development

Reviewed by: Chris Schulz, Manager, Planning Project Services
Darryl Dawson, Manager, Development Review
Lesley Anderson, Director of Planning and Development

Approved by: Lynne Lacroix, General Manager, Community Services

SP/2021/PD/MPC/Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw Review – Amendment Package Three/pg

Zoning Bylaw Review

Official Community Plan
Zoning Bylaw Review



Project Overview

Information Gathering Phase (Spring – Fall 2019)

The purpose of this phase was to gather input regarding the topics that should be included in the Comprehensive Review of the Zoning Bylaw Project (Project). An [information report](#) was provided to the Standing Policy Committee on Planning, Development and Community Services (PDCS) on November 5, 2019.

Amendment Phase (September 2019 – 2022)

The purpose of this phase is to undertake amendments to the Zoning Bylaw through a series of amendment packages staged over the course of the Project. Each topic will involve an appropriate level of engagement for the topic being considered with stakeholders and the community.

Working groups consisting of industry experts and community members may be formed to assist with the development of amendments to address issues. Two groups have been formed thus far:

- In February 2020, a Technical Advisory Committee for the review of the RMTN / RMTN1 Districts.
- In March 2021, a focus group for the review of Neighbourhood Level Infill regulations.

Project Milestones

The following have been completed as part of the Project:

- [Amendment package one](#) was approved by City Council in May 2020.
- The [Development Applications Fee Bylaw](#) was approved by City Council in November 2020.
- [Amendment package two](#) was approved by City Council in April 2021.
- [Amendments to the Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw](#) for Architectural Control Districts Design Review Committee was approved by City Council in September 2021.
- Amendment package three is being considered by City Council in December 2021.

Repeal and Replace (2022)

To repeal Zoning Bylaw No. 8770 and replace the Bylaw. When this occurs, the new Bylaw will replace the existing Zoning Bylaw No. 8770 with final review and revisions of the full document taking place during the final stage of the Project.

Project Topics

Several topics have already been addressed with amendment packages one, two and three. Topics that are still under review and will be addressed in future amendment packages are outlined in this report.

New items added to the Project since the last update or items that will no longer be addressed through the Project are identified in the next section. We will continue to identify new items in future updates to ensure transparency.

General Updates to the Zoning Bylaw

General updates to the Zoning Bylaw will be undertaken to ensure consistency with the applicable Provincial legislation, the Official Community Plan, and other relevant City policies and practices. The Zoning Bylaw will also be updated to correct spelling and grammatical errors, clarify definitions where appropriate, provide clarification where needed and review the Bylaw for repetition and consistency.

General updating of the Bylaw will be undertaken throughout the Project.

Updates to the Bylaw

Topics still under review and to be addressed in future amendment packages include:

- Ensuring consistency with accessibility standards;
- Review of regulations for residential care homes and child care facilities to ensure consistency with provincial regulations;
- Review and clarify building height regulations;
- Clarification of regulations as they relate to grade;
- Consideration of school site zoning regulations;
- Review and clarify amenity space requirements;
- Review requirements for Site Plan Control; and,
- Review setbacks in residential and commercial districts to ensure consistency.

In addition, updates to various zoning districts and sections of the Bylaw will be undertaken including but not limited to the MX1 District, Industrial Districts and the South Downtown Local Area Design Plan.



In-depth Review of Topics

Parking – Parking will be reviewed to address specific regulations identified during stakeholder consultations. This includes:

- Review of parking standards for specific uses identified during stakeholder consultations;
- Review of options for payment in lieu of required parking facilities; and,
- Location of parking requirements in the B5 (restrict front yard parking).

Neighbourhood Level Infill – A review of the Neighbourhood Level Infill Regulations is under way. A [report](#) was presented to the Standing Committee on Planning, Development and Community Services on January 12, 2021, detailing the topics to be considered during this review.

Environmental Initiatives – Amendments will be proposed to address environmental/sustainability recommendations provided during stakeholder consultations. This includes:

- Review of bonusing options for environmental initiatives;
- Incorporating options for green roofs; and,
- Review of potential provisions for net zero buildings.

Digital Zoning Bylaw – A user friendly digital version of the Zoning Bylaw will be developed to provide residents an easier way to find information in the Bylaw.



Other Topics Evaluated

After a review, it has been determined that the topics below are either not within the scope of the project, are better managed by others, or that no changes are needed to them. This table includes items that have been brought forward for consideration since the last update.

Topic	Reason
<p>Parking Requirements for Shopping Centres</p>	<p>At its September 13, 2021 meeting, the Standing Policy Committee on Planning, Development and Community Services received correspondence regarding the parking rates for shopping centres.</p> <p>Parking requirements for shopping centres do not have the same requirements as individual stand alone uses because the uses within a shopping centre share parking. Further, parking requirements are based on industry standards and not on how successful a business may be.</p> <p>It is Administration's opinion that the current practice adequately addresses needs and that no further review is required.</p>
<p>Review of small car parking requirements</p>	<p>The Zoning Bylaw regulates the size and number of small car parking spaces. Small car spaces are 2.43 metres by 4.9 metres vs all other parking spaces, with the exception of accessible parking spaces, are 2.7 metres by 6 metres. Small car parking stalls are permitted for multiple unit dwellings and dwelling groups (maximum 15% of required spaces).</p> <p>In a scan of other Canadian municipalities, the approach for small car parking requirements is varied. Based on this scan and a review of the City's current approach, it is Administration's opinion that the current practice adequately addresses needs and that no further review is required.</p>
<p>Review of electric vehicle parking options</p>	<p>A business option for a strategy for electric vehicles is being considered by Council during the 2022-2023 budget deliberations. Electric vehicle parking options would be considered as part of this strategy.</p> <p>Should the electric vehicle strategy business option not be approved by Council, the Zoning Bylaw Review project will consider this item.</p>

Proposed Amendments to Landscaping Provisions

A comprehensive review of the landscaping regulations which apply to private property for commercial, institutional, industrial, mixed use and multi-family developments has been undertaken. Proposed amendments focus on addressing feedback from stakeholders, as well as supporting the objectives and policies of the [Official Community Plan](#), the [Green Infrastructure Strategy](#), and the [Low Emissions Community Plan](#), including low impact development practices.

Note: The Zoning Bylaw does not regulate landscaping for one-unit, two-unit, and semi-detached dwellings, therefore landscaping requirements for these uses are not included in this review.

The proposed regulations will:

1. Update definitions (Section 2.0) to add definitions for ‘artificial turf’, ‘xeriscaping’, ‘landscaped area’ and update the definition for ‘landscaping’.
2. Update General Administration (Section 4.0) to clarify that one-unit, two-unit, semi-detached dwellings or any accessory use to a dwelling unit are exempt from requiring landscaping plans.
3. Update requirements of a landscaping plan to include the location of utilities and easements.
4. Redesign the Landscaping Section (Section 7.0) to include all regulations pertaining to landscaping, provide clarity and remove redundancies. This involves restructuring the general landscaping provisions, as well as adding tables with landscaping requirements for each zoning district and/or specific uses. Landscaping requirements currently located in each zoning district are repealed, except for specific circumstances. Where necessary, zoning districts are reorganized to accommodate this change.
5. Add landscaping regulations to the Zoning Bylaw for artificial turf in industrial districts, hard/soft landscaping and organic mulch. Currently these topics are listed in the Landscape Guidelines only; however, they need to be included in the Zoning Bylaw as regulations.
6. Provide flexibility for tree planting requirements where development is adjacent to boulevard trees with large canopies by allowing for the tree requirement to be replaced by other appropriate landscaping options. This change would be appropriate in situations where a new tree would not survive due to the existing large canopy.
7. Clarify the tree planting requirements in rear yards where landscaping requirements apply.
8. For sites with constraints to provide the required tree plantings, allow shrubs or ornamental grasses to be planted in lieu of trees.

9. Allow for alternative landscaping practices including xeriscaping, rain gardens and bioswales. Alternative landscaping options are consistent with the City of Saskatoon's (City's) [Low Impact Development Guidelines](#). Where an applicant is proposing to address their landscaping requirements using an alternative landscaping option, the proposal must be endorsed by a Saskatchewan Landscape Architect Association member. Tree planting requirements will apply for alternative landscaping options.
10. Provide additional flexibility for non-conforming sites in Established Neighbourhoods, the C.N. Industrial Area and the Airport Business Area (i.e., change of use, additions) to allow for the landscaping requirements on these sites to be reduced and be consistent with nearby properties. Allow the use of permanent planter boxes to meet soft landscaping and planting requirements.
11. For flexible site design in Commercial (B), Industrial (I), Institutional (M) and Mixed Use (MX) districts, add spacing requirements from the curb for local streets, collector streets and arterial streets.
12. Amend the growing season in the Zoning Bylaw to align with the City's Parks Department growing season.
13. Clarify that required landscaping does not apply to one-unit dwellings, two-unit dwellings, semi-detached dwellings or any accessory use to a dwelling unit.
14. Add a requirement that fencing shall be located behind the required landscaped areas along street frontage and flankage.
15. In the RMTN/RMTN1 districts, add required landscaping for street townhouses with front driveway access.
16. In the B1B and B4MX districts, add language that necessary pedestrian access to the building entrances is not counted towards hard landscaping. Also, in the B4MX district, add language that outdoor patios and seating areas are not counted towards hard landscaping.
17. In the B5, B5B, B5C, B6 and MX2 districts, add language that surface parking areas shall be adequately screened from front streets and flanking streets.
18. Additional edits required for clarity and consistency.

The Landscape Guidelines, a companion document to the Zoning Bylaw, has also been updated to reflect changes to the landscaping regulations in the Zoning Bylaw and provide additional clarity. The Guidelines will be available on the City's website.

Amendments to Definitions (Section 2), General Administration (Section 4), General Provisions (Section 5) and Required Parking, Loading and Vehicular Circulation Provisions (Section 6)

Section 2: Definitions			
Definition	Current Provision	Proposed Change	Rationale
“balcony”	means a platform, projecting from the face of a wall, cantilevered or supported by columns or brackets and usually surrounded by a balustrade or railing.	Amend the definition to include posts.	To provide clarity.
“site coverage”	means that percentage of the site covered by buildings above grade level exclusive of marquees, canopies, balconies and eaves.	Amend the definition to include cantilevered structures.	To provide clarity.

Section 4: General Administration			
Section	Current Provision	Proposed Change	Rationale
Developments Not Requiring a Development Permit Section 4.3.2 (c)	This section identifies the types of development which do not require a Development Permit including the erection of any fence or gate.	Add screen to this list.	For consistency as screens are similar in nature to fences, which do not require a Development Permit.

Section 4: General Administration			
<p>Discretionary Use Application Process</p> <p>Section 4.7</p>	<p>This section identifies the process and types of discretionary uses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarifying that all discretionary uses that are delegated to Administration for approval are considered as “Standard” applications; - Add the following to the list of uses which are delegated to Administration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Agricultural Research Stations o In the IB (Industrial Business) District - Convenience Stores in conjunction with service stations and car washes o In the FUD (Future Urban Development) District - Recreational vehicle and equipment storage and passenger vehicle storage o In the RMTN and RMTN1 (Townhouse) Districts – Places of Worship o In the MX1 (Mixed Use) District - One- and two-unit and semi-detached dwellings - Edits required for clarity and consistency for the discretionary use process. 	<p>Amend this section to provide clarity and to add the listed uses to the types of uses which will be considered by Administration.</p>

Section 5: General Provisions			
Section	Current Provision	Proposed Change	Rationale
Detached Accessory Buildings Section 5.7 (3)	This section provides provisions for detached accessory buildings in any R or M district, or in any B1, B1A, B1B, B2 District or the DCD4 District.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend the regulation regarding total floor area to ensure that the area of all detached accessory buildings on the site is accounted for. - Clarify the side yard setback for detached accessory buildings on corner sites. 	Amend this section to provide clarity.
Permitted Obstructions in Required Yards Section 5.8	This section provides provisions for permitted obstructions in required yards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add a provision for a landing of a maximum of 2.5m²; - Add accessibility ramps and wheelchair lifts to be located in all required yards; - Increase the height in the front yard above grade for raised patios and decks to 0.6m from 0.4m; - Clarify that canopies and balconies refers to cantilevered balconies; and, - Edits required for clarity and consistency. 	<p>Amend this section to provide clarity and consistency with other sections of the Zoning Bylaw.</p> <p>Add a provision to structures required for access for persons with disabilities.</p>
Fences Section 5.13 (3)	This section states the districts in which the provisions regarding fences do not apply.	Remove the Downtown Commercial (B6) District.	This amendment would require that development in the Downtown Commercial (B6) District meet the requirements for fences. This would prevent incompatible fence structures that could create aesthetic and safety concerns and aligns with the Zoning Bylaw definition of “active frontage” which discourages high fences.
Home Based Businesses Section 5.29	This section outlines the required parking for home based businesses.	Amend this section to clarify that required parking shall be located on a surfaced parking area consisting of gravel, asphalt or concrete to the satisfaction of the Development Officer.	This amendment will mirror the language for the parking requirement for secondary suites.

Section 5: General Provisions			
Secondary Suites Section 5.30	This section outlines the required parking for secondary suites.	Amend this section to clarify that required parking shall be located on a surfaced parking area consisting of gravel, asphalt or concrete to the satisfaction of the Development Officer.	Clarification regarding materials for parking space requirements.
Garden and Garage Suites Section 5.43	<p>This section requires hard surfacing for required parking spaces.</p> <p>This section states that the preferred location of the main entrance is directly accessible and visible from the lane where a lane exists.</p>	<p>Amend this section to clarify that required parking shall be located on a surfaced parking area consisting of gravel, asphalt or concrete to the satisfaction of the Development Officer.</p> <p>Amend this section to require the main entrance to be directly accessible and visible from the lane where a lane exists and when suitable.</p>	<p>This amendment will mirror the language for the parking requirement for secondary suites.</p> <p>This amendment will clarify the requirements for the location of the main entrance.</p>
Screening New Section	None	<p>This amendment will consolidate and clarify screening requirements into one section of the Zoning Bylaw including provisions currently within the Building Height (Section 5.11) and Landscaping (Section 7.0) sections of the Zoning Bylaw.</p> <p>In addition, this amendment will require privacy screens or similar structures in a rear yard to meet the height and yard requirements as if it were a detached accessory building. This amendment would also require privacy screens or similar structures located outside of a required front or side yard to comply with the height requirements of the relevant district.</p>	<p>This amendment will provide for easier administration and understanding of screening requirements.</p> <p>This amendment will also add provisions for privacy screens.</p>

Section 5: General Provisions

Development in Proximity to Rail Lines	None	This amendment will add a new section that development in proximity to rail yards or rail lines should be consistent with the Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations prepared for the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Railway Association of Canada.	This new section will mirror the language in the Official Community Plan that development in proximity to a rail line should be consistent with the Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations prepared for the Federation of Canadian Municipalities and the Railway Association of Canada.
New Section			A process guide to support developments which are required to meet these guidelines is being developed and will be posted on the City's website.

Section 6: Parking			
Section	Current Provision	Proposed Change	Rationale
Remote Parking Section 6.1 (4) and 6.4 (1)	This section requires that all required parking must be located on the same site as the principal building or use except in certain districts.	Add the Broadway Commercial (B5B), Riversdale Commercial (B5C) and Mixed Use (MX1) Districts to the list of districts where remote parking may be used to meet the parking requirement.	Remote parking is permitted in the B5 District. This amendment will align the remote parking option with B5 for the B5B and B5C Districts. It will also provide flexibility for the parking requirement in the MX1 District.
Permeable Pavement Section 6.2(2) (a)	This section requires that all required parking and loading facilities shall be hard surfaced with asphalt, concrete or similar pavement.	This amendment will allow for permeable (or porous) pavements capable of withstanding vehicle loads including but not limited to porous asphalt, porous concrete, permeable unit pavers, and open grid pavers. Permeable pavement would not be permitted for gas bars, service stations, garages, trucking terminals and similar uses which may cause ground contamination or in heavy industrial districts.	This amendment would provide for sustainable options to hard surfacing in line with the City's Low Impact Development Design Guide .
Parking Space Separation from Balcony Edge or Window Section 6.3.1 (2) and 6.3.2 (2)	This provision requires that surface parking and loading spaces shall be located at least 3m from any part of a building entrance or outer edge of a balcony or window.	This amendment would remove the requirement for surface parking and loading spaces to be 3m from an outer edge of a balcony.	Industry stakeholders have advised that this requirement can be a challenge to meet. The intent of this regulation is to ensure that vehicle exhaust is not in a location which may cause harm. As the balcony is an external structure, the vehicle exhaust is not directly entering the residence.
Parking for Commercial Districts Section 6.3.3	Some uses in the Downtown Commercial (B6) District have parking requirements.	Clarify that there are no parking requirements in the Downtown Commercial (B6) District and remove any remaining parking requirements for uses which may have them.	Clarification that there are no parking requirements in the Downtown Commercial (B6) District consistent with the City Centre Plan.

Proposed Amendments to Zoning Districts

Section 2: Definitions			
Definition	Current Provision	Proposed Change	Rationale
“townhouse, street facing”	None	Add a new definition for townhouse, street facing.	This amendment will support the proposed amendments to the RMTN and RMTN1 Districts for street-facing units within a dwelling group to have a reduced front yard setback.

Section 8: Residential Districts				
District	Subsection	Current Provision	Proposed Change	Rationale
R1 R1A R1B R2 R2A	8.1.3 8.2.3 8.3.3 8.4.3 8.5.3	Garden and Garage Suites are a discretionary use, with approval delegated to Administration.	Garden and Garage Suites be a permitted use.	<p>At its December 17 2018 meeting, City Council approved amendments to the Garden and Garage Suites regulations (link). The report stated that Garden and Garage Suites are discretionary due to the required drainage plan and servicing plan and that this would be evaluated when the new Drainage Bylaw is in place. The new Drainage Bylaw was approved on July 26, 2021 and includes a requirement for a drainage plan for Garage and Garage Suites.</p> <p>As a result of the approval of the Drainage Bylaw, it is recommended Garden and Garage Suites be permitted. The servicing plan requirement will be managed at the permit stage.</p>
RMTN RMTN1	8.8 8.9	These districts allow for multiple-unit dwellings in the form of townhouses, dwelling groups, and other building forms, as well as related community uses.	<p>- In the Townhouse Residential (RMTN) District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Clarify that the maximum height for a semi-detached dwelling and private schools in an Established Neighbourhood is 8.5 m; 	As part of Amendment Package Two, information about the RMTN / RMTN1 Districts Review was provided (link). The amendments proposed in this report are a continuation of the amendments being considered for the RMTN and RMTN1 Districts and will improve flexibility and clarity while retaining the general characteristics of the Districts.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the Medium Density Townhouse Residential District 1 (RMTN1): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Add Place of Worship as a discretionary use; - In both Districts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reduce the side yard setback for semi-detached dwellings; o Allow for street-facing units within a dwelling group to have a reduced front or side yard setback; o Allow Street Townhouses to have front driveway access where there is a rear lane, provided acceptable landscaping is developed. Currently, where there is a lane, front driveway access is not permitted; o Add one- and two-unit dwellings as a permitted use; o Add ambulance stations as a discretionary use; and, o Other amendments required for clarity and consistency for these districts. 	
RM4	8.13	The gross floor space ratio shall not exceed 1:1, provided, however, that within the area bounded on the north by 33rd Street, on the west by Avenue W, on the south by 11th Street West and 7th Street East, and on the east by Cumberland Avenue, the	<p>Increase gross floor space ratio to 1.5:1 for all areas of the City, subject to addressing servicing requirements that may limit the size of the building.</p> <p>Additionally, provisions like those in the Broadway Commercial (B5B) District which address how the gross floor space ratio is calculated for underground parking will be added to this section.</p>	<p>During the scoping process, stakeholders provided feedback that the current gross floor space ratio can make it economically challenging to develop these sites.</p> <p>The City has undergone changes to the way it approaches City growth. Allowing for a gross floor space ratio of 1.5:1 in all areas of the City is appropriate, subject to addressing any servicing constraints.</p>

		gross floor space ratio shall not exceed 1.5:1.		
RM5	8.14.3	None	Add “ambulance stations” to discretionary uses.	Align with similar districts to allow for ambulance stations.

Section 9: Institutional Districts

District	Subsection	Current Provision	Proposed Change	Rationale
M4	9.4.2	None	Add “parking station” to permitted uses.	Added to provide consistency with the parking and loading section of the Zoning Bylaw.

Section 10: Commercial Districts

District	Subsection	Current Provision	Proposed Change	Rationale
B1B	10.2.4 (2)	The maximum building floor area of each restaurant or retail store on a site shall not exceed 325m ² .	Allow for restaurant or retail uses up to 465m ² provided there is a second storey and the building is mixed use.	<p>The proposed change will increase flexibility in the size of restaurants and retail uses in this District while ensuring building form meets the intent of the District. This change is in response to a request from Developers to provide for more flexibility for restaurant and retail size as the current restriction makes it challenging to find tenants for these properties.</p> <p>In a survey of greenfield residents, the majority (more than 50%) of respondents felt the current size (325m²) of retail / restaurant permitted in this District is appropriate. Approximately 35% of respondents felt the size should be increased to 465m² or that there should be no restriction. More than 75% of respondents were somewhat or strongly supportive of vertical mixed-use building forms (main floor commercial / office and</p>

				residential / office above). Results of the survey can be found in Appendix 6.
B5B	10.8A.2 (27 and 32)	Commercial parking lots and parking stations currently do not have a front yard setback.	Amend the front yard setback requirement for commercial parking lots and parking stations to 3m.	A front yard setback is required for commercial parking lots and parking stations in the B5B District to accommodate the 3m landscaped strip. This amendment will align the setback requirement with the B5 and B5C Districts.
B5B	10.8A.7 (4)	This section outlines the gross floor space ratio for development in the B5B District.	It is proposed this section be amended to provide clarifying language.	To provide clarification.
B6	10.9.5 (2 and 3)	This section provides for minimum site width and site area for rooming units, hotel or motel units and sites with more than one dwelling unit.	It is proposed these sections be removed.	There are few sites which meet the site width and area requirements. Further, keeping these requirements may hinder development on existing sites.

Section 13: Direct Control Districts				
Section	Subsection	Current Provision	Proposed Change	Rationale
DCD3 DCD5 DCD6	13.3 13.5 13.6	These sections are Direct Control Districts for regional commercial development including Preston Crossing, Stonebridge and Blairmore.	It is proposed these sections be amended to delegate approval of development within these DCDs to Administration.	<p>Delegating approving authority to the Development Officer is consistent with how some other DCDs are managed in the Zoning Bylaw – specifically DCD1, DCD7 and DCD8. Approval of development within DCD3, DCD5 and DCD6 will be required to be consistent with the Council approved Concept Plan and regulations.</p> <p>This amendment will support industry’s recommendation to reduce the number of applications that must go to City Council and help to streamline the approvals process for development within these DCDs.</p>



ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Zoning Bylaw Comprehensive Review Project *Proposed Amendments to Landscaping Provisions (Appendix 2)*

Description

A review of landscaping provisions was undertaken to address feedback and concerns raised by stakeholders during the information-gathering phase of the Zoning Bylaw Comprehensive Review Project.

Using What We Learn

Stakeholders offered valuable feedback which is included in this report. Feedback provided by stakeholders helped to frame discussion and did influence some of the proposed amendments going forward.

Scope of the Review

During the initial phase of the Zoning Bylaw Review, project-scoping workshops were held with stakeholders. During these workshops, stakeholders provided recommendations on what should be reviewed specific to landscaping. These recommendations included:

- Concerns raised about the cost of water. More energy efficient materials and alternative options should be considered, including xeriscaping and storm water retention.
- Consider allowing the use of alternative materials (e.g., aggregate rock material, decorative boulders, rubber mulch).
- Add more flexibility to landscaping requirements.
- Define the relationship between the Zoning Bylaw and Landscape Guidelines including adopting specific guidelines into the Zoning Bylaw (e.g., hard/soft landscaping requirement, standards for wood mulch, use of artificial turf in industrial areas, shrubs used in lieu of trees) to remove inconsistencies and redundancies.
- Clarify intent of the tree planting requirement (ratio / spacing).
- Concerns regarding healthy tree growth for new infill developments (e.g., issues with lack of spacing, lack of sunlight).
- Review definitions for landscaping.
- Consistency with other city standards, policies and bylaws.
- Growing season in Zoning Bylaw is different than that of the City of Saskatoon Parks Department.
- Look at options for non-conforming sites with concrete and limited area to landscape and meet soft landscaping requirements (e.g., permanent planter boxes).

- Address issues for developments with site constraints (e.g., on site conflicts between utility easements and required landscaped strip).
- Have a Saskatchewan Association of Landscape Architects member sign-off on landscaping plans.

What We Did

Who we had conversations with	How we gathered input
Internal City Stakeholders (Planning and Development, Community Standards, Parks, Transportation, Saskatoon Water, Solicitors, Communications and Engagement)	Relevant internal Departments were contacted for review and comment for proposed amendments. No comments were received that would preclude these amendments from proceeding.
Saskatoon & Region Home Builders' Association (SRHBA)	Information about topics being considered for the review of landscaping was shared with the Builders Industry Liaison Committee on August 18, 2021, and the Certified Builders Group on September 23, 2021.
The North Saskatoon Business Association (NSBA)	Detailed information was shared with the NSBA at a virtual meeting on September 15, 2021.
RMTN/RMTN1 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	Detailed information was shared with the RMTN/RMTN1 Technical Advisory Committee at a virtual meeting on August 12, 2021.
Targeted Stakeholders (Landscape Architects, Planners, Developers, Designers)	Detailed information was shared with targeted stakeholders at a virtual session on September 28, 2021. Approximately sixty stakeholders were invited to the session through an e-invite. The e-invite also included information about the proposed landscaping amendments. Two stakeholders attended, both of which were Landscape Architects. An additional session was held on October 7, 2021 for two stakeholders who were not able to attend the first session.
General Public	<p>Using two approaches for soliciting input (Insightrix and the Community Advisory Panel), a survey was undertaken in Spring 2021 to ask residents from greenfield neighbourhoods their perspectives on alternative landscaping options such as xeriscaping vs trees and shrubs only.</p> <p>Information was provided on the Zoning Bylaw Review Engage Page starting on October 4, 2021. Visitors to the website were able to provide a comment on the Engage Page. Contact information for the Project Team was also included on the Engage Page. Promotion of the information on the website was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NSBA and the SRHBA were advised of the information on the Engage Page on October 4, 2021.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information about the Engage Page was shared with Community Associations via the Community Consultants the week of October 11, 2021. An e-newsletter was used to promote the information on October 6, 2021. Twitter and Facebook were used to promote the information on October 6, 2021 and October 21, 2021.
--	---

What We Heard – Survey Results

Using two methods for soliciting input (Insightrix and the Community Advisory Panel), a survey was undertaken in Spring 2021 to ask residents from greenfield neighbourhoods their perspectives on various topics including alternative landscaping options. Survey results for alternative landscaping are included below. Complete survey results can be found [here](#).

We organized what we heard into the summary below. Note: The language below is not verbatim from comments provided by stakeholders.

Survey respondents were asked their landscaping preference for commercial, industrial, mixed use and higher density development.

- 30% of Insightrix and 40% of the Community Advisory Panel respondents preferred trees/shrubs only. Reasons were:
 - Preference / other options do not look nice;
 - Trees add character / fits in better / uniformity;
 - There aren't enough trees;
 - Better option for our climate / other options not appropriate for Saskatoon;
 - Environmental / health benefit; and
 - Provides for a quality of life.
- Closer to 50% of respondents for both surveys preferred allowing other options such as xeriscaping. Reasons were:
 - Provides options for neighbourhoods / creativity / variety / diversity;
 - Environmentally friendly / natural;
 - Should be personal choice;
 - Less maintenance;
 - Reduces watering needs; and
 - Preference for no trees.

What We Heard

We organized what we heard into themes and summaries below. Note: The language below is not verbatim from comments provided by stakeholders.

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Artificial Turf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May see the use of artificial turf increase over time as the product evolves (e.g., 	Administration is proposing artificial turf only in industrial areas, consistent with the

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
	<p>rainwater harvesting, value in commercial areas, etc.).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The product needs to act appropriately in terms of water retention. May require technical requirements. 	<p>current approach. It is not proposed in other districts for sustainability reasons (e.g., heat island effect).</p>
Tree Caliper	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce size of tree caliper as there is currently a supply shortage (due to Covid) and smaller caliper can grow faster. 	<p>No change is proposed as the current tree caliper requirement is intended to meet the intent of landscaping immediately once construction and landscape development are completed.</p>
Fence Height	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider a relaxation of fence height. 	<p>Review of fence heights not in scope of the landscaping review. Comments will be considered with future amendment packages.</p>
Flexibility for Site Constraints	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Flexibility welcome to assist in addressing site constraints. Support for options (e.g., planting in the boulevard if approved by Parks, somewhere else on the site, etc.). Challenging to meet the requirements for utilities and landscaping (e.g., tree requirements) and other site constraints. Language needs to shift to consider landscaping as part of the infrastructure, rather than an aesthetic aspect. 	<p>Administration is developing options to provide flexibility for situations with site constraints. Any amendments to the Zoning Bylaw would be managed in future amendment packages.</p>
Alternative Landscaping Options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed options are appropriate and need to be allowed for. Expansion from current status quo of “this has to be grass” makes sense. Developers will likely only use rain garden option if they can use it to offset storm water calculations. 	<p>Proposed amendments provide for alternative landscaping options including xeriscaping, rain gardens and bioswales. Alternative landscaping options are in line with the City’s Low Impact Development Guidelines.</p>
Required Number of Tree Plantings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The regulation that prescribes the number of tree plantings is intended to be a ratio, not spacing and often is taken as a spacing. Tree species should have different spacing requirements. 	<p>It is proposed this section of the Zoning Bylaw be amended to clarify the required number of trees is a ratio. Landscape Guidelines will provide information on spacing for tree species.</p>
Landscaping Requirements in Industrial Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendation to remove landscaping requirements in industrial areas as the space is better used for parking. Landscaping requirements are expensive and onerous, and it is not necessary for industrial areas. 	<p>Administration is not recommending the removal of required landscaping in industrial areas. City Council may provide direction to Administration should City</p>

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
		<p>Council wish Administration to review this option.</p> <p>Alternative landscaping options have been included in the proposed amendments to provide flexibility in how landscaping is applied to a development site.</p> <p>Also included in the proposed amendments is additional flexibility for non-conforming sites in Established Neighbourhoods, the C.N. Industrial Area and the Airport Business Area (e.g., change of use, additions) to allow for the landscaping requirements on these sites to be reduced and be consistent with nearby properties. Administration is proposing to allow for the use of permanent planter boxes.</p>
Maintenance of Landscaping	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure landscaping requirements are met for the long-term and the survival of vegetation. 	<p>The Zoning Bylaw has requirements that all required and approved landscaping be maintained at all times.</p> <p>Administration is not proposing amendments to this section of the bylaw.</p>

What Went Well

- Working with industry and targeted stakeholders with experience specific to landscape development provided insight into their perspectives on the current regulations.
- Trying different engagement tactics such as workshops to gain feedback.
- Working to make our engagement report more accessible.

What We Can Do Better

- Engaging virtually, because of COVID-19, made it difficult to follow best practices for inclusive, accessible engagement.

What's Next

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



ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Zoning Bylaw Comprehensive Review Project

Proposed Amendments to Sections 2, 4, 5, 6 and Zoning Districts (Appendices 3 and 4)

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 third package of proposed amendments being undertaken as part of the Project. The proposed amendments address a range of topics identified during the information-gathering phase of the Project.

Using What We Learn

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

What We Did

Who we had conversations with	How we gathered input
Internal City Stakeholders (Planning and Development, Community Standards, Building Standards, Transportation, Saskatoon Water, Solicitors, Communications and Engagement)	Relevant internal Departments were contacted for review and comment for proposed amendments. No comments were received that would preclude these amendments from proceeding.
Saskatoon & Region Home Builders' Association (SRHBA)	Information about topics being considered for Amendment Package Three was shared with the Builders Industry Liaison Committee on August 18, 2021, and the Builders Group on September 23, 2021.
Broadway, Riversdale and Downtown Business Improvement Districts	A virtual meeting was held with the Broadway Business Improvement District Board on October 20, 2021 to discuss proposed amendments specific to the Broadway Commercial (B5B) District. Information about the proposed Downtown Commercial (B6) District amendments was shared with the Downtown Business

	<p>Improvement District Executive Director the week of September 27, 2021.</p> <p>Information about the proposed amendments was shared by email with the Riversdale Business Improvement District Executive Director on October 18, 2021.</p>
RMTN/RMTN1 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	Detailed information was shared with the RMTN/RMTN1 TAC at virtual meetings on August 12, 2021 and October 28, 2021.
General Public	<p>Using two approaches for soliciting input (Insightrix and the Community Advisory Panel) a survey was undertaken in Spring 2021 to ask residents from greenfield neighbourhoods their perspectives.</p> <p>Information was provided on the Zoning Bylaw Review Engage Page starting on October 4, 2021. Visitors to the website were able to provide a comment on the Engage Page. Contact information for the Project Team was also included on the Engage Page. Promotion of the information on the website was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The North Saskatoon Business Association (NSBA) and the SRHBA were advised of the information on the Engage Page on October 4, 2021. • Information about the Engage Page was shared with Community Associations via the Community Consultants the week of October 11, 2021. • An e-newsletter was used to promote the information on October 6, 2021. • Twitter and Facebook were used to promote the information on October 6, 2021 and October 21, 2021.

What We Heard – Survey Results

Using two approaches for soliciting input (Insightrix and the Community Advisory Panel), a survey was undertaken in Spring 2021 to ask residents from greenfield neighbourhoods their perspectives on various topics including amendments to the Neighbourhood Commercial Mixed Use (B1B) District and the Townhouse (RMTN, RMTN1) Districts. Survey results for topics related to amendments contained in this package are included below. Complete survey results can be found [here](#).

We organized what we heard into the summary below. Note: The language below is not word for word comments provided by stakeholders.

Neighbourhood Commercial Mixed Use (B1B) District

Survey respondents were asked their preferred size of retail / restaurant business as well as the building form (vertical mixed use, horizontal mixed use).

- The majority (more than 50%) of respondents felt that the current size (325m²) of retail/restaurant permitted in this District is appropriate. Approximately 35% of respondents felt that the size should be increased to 465m² or that there should be no restriction.
- More than 75% of respondents were somewhat or strongly supportive of vertical mixed use building forms (main floor commercial/office and residential/office above).
- While still supportive of the concept of horizontal mixed use building forms (main floor with a mix of commercial/office/residential), there was less support for this building form than the vertical mixed use building form.
- When asked what types of businesses would be appropriate in this District, respondents recommended uses like those currently permitted or discretionary.

Townhouse (RMTN/RMTN1) Districts

Survey respondents were asked their preferences for various items related to townhouse development including driveway location and building height when adjacent to properties that are a different height.

- Respondents were asked if they had a preference if a driveway should be permitted in the front yard where there is access to a lane. More than 40% of respondents were indifferent on where the driveway is located and around 20% felt the driveway should be permitted to be built off the front street.
- The majority (more than 50%) of the respondents felt buildings that are different heights should have a buffer of some sort such as a street, land or required greenspace buffer).

What We Heard – Comments

We organized what we heard into themes and summaries below. Note: The language below is not word for word comments provided by stakeholders.

Theme	Summarized Comments	Response
Other Amendments for the RMTN/RMTN1 Districts Should Be Considered	<p>RMTN/RMTN1 Technical Advisory Committee members recommended additional amendments should be included for the RMTN and RMTN1 District review such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing for front driveways in dwelling groups. • Providing for discretion from the Development Officer to allow for front driveways and reducing front yard / side yard setbacks on Collector streets. Currently, these amendments are being considered for local streets only, consistent with how street townhouses are managed in the Zoning Bylaw. 	<p>These recommendations have been evaluated by Administration. Correspondence has been provided to the Technical Advisory Committee advising them of the reasons for the approach being considered.</p> <p>Administration will consider the requests to allow front yard driveways and reduce front yard / side yard setbacks on Collector streets at a later phase.</p>
Garden and Garage Suites as a permitted use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garden and Garage Suites should remain discretionary. • Support for Garden and Garage Suites to become permitted. 	<p>At its December 17, 2018 meeting, City Council approved amendments to the Garden and Garage Suites regulations. The report included industry feedback including information about the requirement for Garden and Garage Suites to be discretionary due to the required drainage plan and servicing plan. The report stated that when the new Drainage Bylaw is in place, Administration would evaluate the discretionary nature of Garden and Garage Suites. The new Drainage Bylaw was approved on July 26, 2021 and includes a requirement for a drainage plan for Garden and Garage Suites.</p> <p>As a result of the approval of the Drainage Bylaw, it is recommended Garden and Garage Suites be permitted. Further, the servicing plan requirement can be managed at the permit stage.</p>
Screening of surface parking	Support for the addition of screening for surface parking.	The proposed amendment would require within B5, B5B, B5C, B6 Districts, surface parking areas to be adequately screened from front streets and flanking streets.

Remote Parking in B5B District	Question about where parking standards are relaxed.	The proposed amendment would allow for required parking to be located on a remote parking site in the B5B, B5C and MX1 Districts. Parking may be relaxed by way of an agreement or where the Zoning Bylaw otherwise permits parking requirements to be relaxed.
Commercial Parking Lots and Parking Stations in B5B District	Question about how many sites impacted by proposed amendment.	The proposed amendment would provide for a front yard setback in the B5B District to accommodate the 3m landscaped strip. This amendment will align the setback requirement with the B5 and B5C Districts. There are no sites currently that would be affected.
Horizontal Mixed Use in the B1B District	Questions about why horizontal mixed use in the B1B District is not included in this amendment package.	Horizontal mixed use in the B1B District has not been considered with this amendment package as there are outstanding concerns regarding this proposed amendment. Administration will continue to work with stakeholders to address this requested amendment.

What Went Well

- For the RMTN/RMTN1 TAC, working with industry representatives with experience specific to the types of development typical for these Districts provided insight into their perspectives on the current regulations.
- Trying different engagement tactics such as surveys to gain feedback.
- Working to make our engagement report more accessible.

What We Can Do Better

- Engaging virtually, because of COVID-19, made it difficult to follow best practices for inclusive, accessible engagement.
- Some proposed amendments were added after the initial Engage Page went live. As such, it may be possible some individuals did not have the ability to comment on the proposed amendment. These were:
 - Amending the paved parking space requirement for home based businesses and garden and garage suites to allow for alternative materials for the parking space.
 - Additional amendments to the RMTN/RMTN1 Districts as a result of on-going discussions with SRHBA and the RMTN/RMTN1 TAC.
 - Adding semi-detached dwellings as a discretionary use which is delegated to Administration in the MX1 District.

What's Next

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