



UDI Planning Committee Summary

Meeting Date & Time : Nov 13, 2018 , 3:30pm – 5:00pm

Location : UDI-Edmonton Region Boardroom (#324, 10113 -104 Street)

Attendees: Michaela Davis (Chair) Salima Kheraj, Laurie Scott, Louise Gibson, Brian Murray, Chris Nicholas, Courtney Jensen, Nola Kilmartin, Russell Dauk, Omar Abdel-Jabbar,

Regrets: Bard Golightly, Blaydon Dibben, Shane Gerein

Item	Discussion/Action
<p>1) Edmonton Design Committee (EDC) (Brief Presentation) City of Edmonton Peter Spearey Phone 780.508.9503</p>	<p>Discussion: Information from Nola at Drop in Session</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They have received negative feedback about the length of time it takes to get on the EDC agenda and/or go back to present, if necessary. • One challenge they face is the increasing number of applications coming before them as the city grows, compounded by City Council/Administration/ Public demanding more applications go before them for review. • They are looking for our thoughts on how to reasonably scale back on the geographic areas they are required to review as per the bylaw so they have time to review more impactful projects. • Basically, should they spend time on a 4-unit row housing project in central McCauley and deep south on Calgary Trail, or direct time and attention to a high intensity development at a highly visible location/intersection/LRT station. <p>Peter from Edmonton Design Committee (EDC). The Edmonton Design Committee reviews and provides recommendations to applicants and the City regarding development applications.</p> <p>EDC covers only certain higher profile areas of Edmonton including Downtown, Whyte Ave, 109 St, 99st, Calgary trail and TOD Sites at zoning.</p> <p>Key Issues identified that are shaping this review:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are the comments relevant (ie, questions about energy code, are their questions valid, timelines are too long) 2. Is the geographical boundary appropriate 3. Are the right projects coming to EDC (Small 4-plex in Queen Mary vs. Downtown high rise)

Timelines are long - currently 3 months out to get in front of EDC

Who is on the designs committee: Reps from AAA, Alberta Association of Landscape Architects, APPI, APEGGA, UofA, Art council, Adam Zep (civil engineer), Marcelo (last 2 represent the development industry) (It was noted by the committee that perhaps they should approach UDI for representatives of the development industry.)

EDA currently allows informal pre-approval meetings to provide feedback and direction. Typically this process reduces overall approval timelines but adds to their file load.

Nola commented that Planning is looking for overly detailed Design Briefs for DC2 LDA apps, which are coming close to a formal EDC presentation package. Some examples of recent 'briefs' the City is referencing are upwards of 40+ pages long with photorealistic renderings. The Design Briefs do not have a defined scope/TOR and the asks are expanding with every application. EDC, Urban Design and Planning Coordination need to set a standard that fulfills the intent of the requirement, which is to allow for the urban design elements of a development to be evaluated. ie: examining opportunities/constraints of a site and providing context-sensitive solutions that respond to policy/city goals and objectives.

It was discussed that EDC approval timelines still need to fit within what is legislated under the MGA and that currently they are not. This leaves the committee and therefore the City open to deemed refusals and SDAB.

There are 4 principles of urban design they are supposed to follow URBANISM, DESIGN EXCELLENCE, SCALE, CONNECTIONS + CONTEXT https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/documents/EDCBrochure-SinglePages.pdf

Louise spoke of a situation where a hotel chain was frustrated bringing their project to the committee and it had to be reviewed 3 times even though their design was constrained by corporate design specs. The feedback the applicant received provided little to know direction in what the committee thought should change adding to the frustration and inability to respond.

In an effort to ensure application packages are complete and approval timelines are reduced, Peter provides a checklist of required items/reports eg. Shadow studies, specific lighting package information.

The members of the committee try to ask dialogue about the project and try to avoid personal preference.

	<p>There are areas of subjectivity and the EDC is constantly being reminded of – they cannot use their personal preference and must be consistent in their decisions. Anecdotally, it would appear they often fail in this regard.</p> <p>One suggestion made by the planning committee was to encourage the EDC to consider site and development constraints when making their recommendations. I.e. Wanting fruit trees and extensive landscaping in an affordable complex with low maintenance costs.</p> <p>Peter indicated that Council values the input of EDC and the many communities where redevelopment is active specifically request the committees support even when it doesn't fall into their portfolio.</p>
<p>Action: At this time, EDC is looking for feedback to ensure the relevancy of projects, if the current boundaries should change, if different projects should be reviewed and potentially if the principles overarching committee principles should be revised. Peter said he will keep in touch with us for future items but encouraged ongoing industry comments, both formally and informally. UDI Planning committee will stay in the loop and look at expanding our representation on the EDC committee. One suggestion was to have additional members of the committee and only require 3 to 5 members at any one meeting. Perhaps they could run more meetings concurrently thereby speeding up the time commitment, putting less of a burden on the committee members and perhaps getting broader perspectives. The SDAB set up was mentioned as a model.</p> <p>Everyone should do the questionnaire Edmonton.ca/ https://www.edmontoninsightcommunity.ca/c/a/6PJy6C9jNMOB4lokI2qY43</p>	
<p>2) EMRB Density Targets / Planned Densities Research</p>	<p>Discussion: Blaydon to provide update from DCM meeting Ongoing Discussions with Livia</p> <p>Blaydon was away, Michaela provided update on DCM meeting. As of the last DCM meeting, the City indicated that they understood our desire to use as-built information to prove plan density however were not able to use it in avoiding EMRB for density changes on plan amendments as per EMRB ref.</p> <p>City is updating their Terms of Reference with new as-built numbers.</p> <p>City/EMRB now removing the requirement for decimals on density calculations, which provides some overall relaxation.</p> <p>Further, Chris has met with Livia and Holly at the City and they confirmed that the City is on board, looking to change the process. Chris spoke to Patrick and BILD about taking this issue to Minister. *** Deanna & Rick to talk to Patrick about who at BILD he was talking to. Looking to talk to minister about clause 4G</p>

	<p>It was discussed that committee members were seeing other municipalities expressing concerns about penalties for not complying with the EMRB.</p>
<p>Action: Nov 15/18 - Deanna and Rick have talked to Patrick and he is not aware of what was mentioned – to be discussed with Scott from BILD Deanna contacted Scott Fash Nov 16/18</p>	
<p>3) Urban Form Business Transformation</p>	<p>Discussion: Blaydon, Shane and Kate attended the session. Session was shorter than expected. However additional sessions prior to Christmas holidays may be required. No significant takeaways.</p>
<p>Action: To be discussed further at the next committee meeting and after further sessions.</p>	
<p>4) The City Plan</p>	<p>Discussion: New City Plan Meeting with Kalen Oct 29/18 to discuss the current state of the plan and how the plan with progress.</p> <p>The New City Plan umbrellas the TMP, MDP, and all of “The Ways” and will plan for 2 million people and/or 50 years. This plan will be much more flexible, nimble and smaller than the current plans and hopes to be much less prescriptive.</p> <p>City planning has recently finished their second of five phases in this planning process, which has more or less developed the framework and objectives for The City Plan going forward.</p> <p>Phase 2 went to UPC on Tuesday, November 13. Phase 3 will include more engagement and will go to UPC in February 2019. Phase 5 of the plan is expected to go to Public Hearing in June 2019.</p> <p>Rick, Salima and Michaela attended an industry Engagement Session on November 5. The session encouraged the participants to envision and replicate what they hoped the city would resemble with 2 million people, mostly by placing density and identifying transportation corridors. The session was too “high-level” to get into any issues that will need to be discussed at a later date. Didn’t articulate anything in terms of employment, transportation etc.</p> <p>To date, most of the discussion surrounding the “meat and potatoes” of the plan has been surrounding “nodes and corridors”.</p>
<p>Action:</p> <p>***Frame and Articulate Issues and Problems - Frame Solutions***</p> <p>Frame and articulate some issues and problems that our industry sees in designing the city in the long term. Ex: different employment nodes outside of downtown.</p> <p>Planning committee to develop a small list and expand on these issues and problems.</p>	

Michaela to approach Kalen on setting up a joint UDI/City session to discuss these identified issues, timing on this session etc. Brian to work on this with Michaela. This session may be something that is expanded to include other industry groups such as NAIOP.

5) Additional Items	Russ – looking for clarification on why Epcor is requiring registered utility ROWs in granting showhome permits, despite this being difficult to achieve in that typically showhome permits are granted prior to registration. Discussion continued with regards to clarifying Epcor’s jurisdiction and ability to request items contrary to standard city process and outside of Development Coordination and signed development agreements and drawings. Further discussion with Clarence Wong was suggested. Ex, EPCOR needs some rules of engagement – they can’t just shut down a site.
6) Next Meeting	December 11, 2018