TO: CHAIR AND MEMBERS - PLANNING COMMITTEE

FROM: R. W. PANZER
    GENERAL MANAGER OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: PLACEMAKING DEMONSTRATION PROJECT
            PART II – REDESIGNING SUMMERSIDE EAST:
            A CASE STUDY AND COMPARISON OF A CONVENTIONAL PLAN
            VERSUS A PLACEMAKING PLAN

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 2007
    7:00 PM

RECOMMENDATION

That, on the recommendation of the General Manager of Planning and Development:

1. The following information report relating to London’s Placemaking Demonstration Project be received for information, it being noted that the conclusion of this project does not represent the end of the placemaking discussion, but rather the beginning of an ongoing discussion and integration of design issues into the planning process in the future;

2. Staff be directed to:
   i. Recognizing best practices in other communities, establish new context-based standards for road allowance widths, where Placemaking community designs are proposed.
   ii. Review the Z.-1 Zoning By-law to establish new context-based front yard set-backs, where Placemaking community designs are proposed.
   iii. Prepare a report which explores the opportunity for supporting rear lane development in London. At a minimum, this report should consider public vs. private ownership, mechanisms to ensure ongoing maintenance and financing of such maintenance, and laneway design criteria, where it is relevant to the Public interest.
   iv. Prepare a report which describes how new forms of parks, such as parkettes, commons areas, and urban parks may be incorporated into new communities in London. At a minimum, this report should consider the costs of such park spaces (both capital and operating) and describe how such parks could impact municipal budgets relating to parks operations.
   v. Prepare a report on mixed use and live-work development, identify any regulatory barriers to such development that currently exist, and recommend Official Plan and/or zoning changes that would be required to allow for such uses to be developed.
   vi. Prepare a report on the possibilities of allowing for secondary suites within new development, excluding infill development projects within established areas. The report should consider secondary suites within the primary dwelling or an accessory building where the structure is designed for this purpose. Recommendations should be provided relating to Official Plan and/or zoning changes that would be required, if any, to allow for such uses to be developed.
vii. Prepare a report which investigates opportunities and costs of enhancing the public realm in new communities – including widened boulevards, planted medians, enhanced landscaping, decorative street lighting, community entry features, gazebos, hard surface plazas, decorative street crossings, street furniture and other amenities. The report should consider these features, and others, and evaluate the potential costs and benefits of each as well as considering innovative means for assigning such costs.

PREVIOUS REPORTS PERTINENT TO THIS MATTER

May 10, 2004 Report to Planning Committee – This report provided an overview of Smart Growth and Placemaking, and indicated that the feasibility of these concepts could be best determined by initiating a local demonstration project with participation by local developers, municipal officials, design consultants and review agencies.

March 21, 2005 – Sunningdale North Area Plan – This report recommended adoption of the Sunningdale North Area Plan with provision for a mixed land use district, a pedestrian-oriented commercial streetscape, minimum densities and a community focal point. The concept, which was approved by Council, included several smart growth and placemaking design elements which are not standard in suburban locations.

July 18, 2005 Report on Placemaking Demonstration Project – This report recommended that Civic Administration undertake a placemaking demonstration project. The goal of this project would be to allow those involved in the design and development of London’s neighbourhoods to consider alternatives that might be employed to create more livable and healthy residential communities that offer a stronger sense of identity and community. The report also established a partnership with Z-Group to utilize the Summerside East area (southeast of Jackson Road and Commissioners Road East) as a focal point for discussion on how communities may be designed for placemaking. Finally, the report directed Staff to work with Peter Sergautis who expressed interest in pursuing an alternative community design for his lands in Uplands North at the northwest corner of Adelaide Street and Sunningdale Road.

September 24, 2007 – Old Victoria Area Plan and Design Guidelines – This report recommended adoption of the Old Victoria Area Plan and design guidelines which embodied several placemaking design principles. A design concept and design guidelines were developed following a charette at the “front-end” of the area plan process. The design concept, developed utilizing the draft Placemaking Principles as a resource document, provided guidance for the subsequent preparation of the area plan.

November 12, 2007 – Placemaking Demonstration Project – Part 1 – Placemaking Design Guidelines – This report defined placemaking, identified placemaking barriers, explained the placemaking project and progress to date, and proposed Placemaking Design Guidelines for consideration circulation and feedback.

Background

Since July of 2005, the City of London has been engaged in a Placemaking Demonstration project. The intent of the project is to change the culture of development in the City of London, such that Placemaking design becomes a fundamental part of the discussion and process for all parties involved.

This report is the second in a three-part series on the subject of Placemaking in London, Ontario. The series stems from a multi-year Placemaking Demonstration Project being led by the Department of Planning and Development. The first report, brought to Planning Committee on November 12th, defined Placemaking, described barriers to placemaking, and explained the significant progress that has been made on the Placemaking Demonstration
Project to date – including the evidence that Placemaking design concepts are beginning to make its way into the culture of the many stakeholders that are involved in developing London’s communities. The report also included a guideline document, entitled “City of London Placemaking Guidelines”, which are now being circulated for feedback and comments.

This second report takes the next step to:

- Explain the process that was undertaken to redesign a proposed plan for the Z-Group lands east of Jackson Road and south of Commissioners Road East – an area referred to as Summerside East.
- Describe the “Placemaking plan”, in detail, and how the Placemaking design guidelines were applied to create a new plan that represents a community (not just a subdivision).
- Compare the Conventional plan with the Placemaking plan from a number of different perspectives.
- Identify lessons learned that we can collectively build upon as we move forward to apply Placemaking concepts in London.

**What is Placemaking?**
Placemaking is an urban design process aimed at creating communities that offer a distinct character, a strong sense of community and a context for healthy lifestyles and a high quality of life.

- Placemaking rejects the subdivision of land without a clear community vision.
- Placemaking embraces the integration of existing topography and natural features into a neighbourhood wherever possible – rather than clearing and grading lands to begin with a “clean slate”.
- Placemaking places an emphasis on pedestrians, rather than automobiles, and designs public and private components of communities to support walking.
- Placemaking offers physical environments within communities that offer opportunities for social interaction and community building.
- Placemaking rejects homogeneity and “sameness” and seeks out variety and diversity.
- Placemaking leads to high quality public spaces that are comfortable, useable and functional.
- Placemaking provides a design context for developing private lands that support the community vision and “give back” to the public realm.

**The Placemaking Re-design Process**
As described in the November 12th, 2007 report, the Placemaking Demonstration Project has focused on education, discussion, and exploration in an effort to change the way that stakeholders in the development process think about new communities in London. Through
presentations, facilitated discussion, brainstorming session, bus trips to other communities, and workshops, stakeholders had the opportunity to talk about Placemaking concepts outside of the usual forums of conversation – namely, development review processes for specific projects.

Facilitated by the Planning Staff and Urban Designer Michael Hannay, of Zelinka Priamo, a one day charette (a collaborative, intensive design session) was held on July 12, 2006. The session included participants relating to the subject of neighbourhood development from many different perspectives as shown on the adjacent table.

The intent of the charette was to re-design an area of land known as Summerside East, using the DRAFT Placemaking Design Guidelines, to create an alternative to the conventional plan that had been conceived by Z-Group for these lands. The Charette day was structured as follows:

**Module #1: Creating a Vision – 1st Round (Opportunities)**
- What is unique/distinctive about this area?
- What is the nature of the topography/terrain?
- What natural features present opportunities for enhancing the character of the area?
- What viewsheds/vistas exist?
- What built features in the area provide context? Any opportunities?
- What economic opportunities exist? What economic constraints exist?

**Module #2: Creating a Vision – 2nd Round (Defining the community through goals/objectives)**
- Desirable features
- Undesirable – what this community will not be
- Any common threads/themes that should be emphasized throughout?

**Module #3: Creating the Plan – Design Concept**
- Map out the opportunities that you want to seize on
- Identify functional areas of land use
  - Focal points
  - Key components of the public realm
  - Activity nodes
  - Community support spaces
  - What mix of densities do you propose? How? Where?
  - What mix of building scale will occur?
  - Will there be a mix of commercial/residential?
    - How? Where?
- Identify linkages
  - Pedestrian
  - Cycling
  - Auto
  - Origins and destinations expected; reasonable and useful routes; safety
  - Consider hierarchy of roads and intentions/functions

**Module #4: Design Plan**
• What are the design objectives to be achieved through the design?
  o Design objectives for Public realm
  o Design objectives for Private realm
• Consider design objectives for key locations in plan, including:
  o Corners
  o Gateways
  o Streetscapes
  o Key buildings – individual buildings or groupings
  o Specific building forms
  o More clarity on the form of development within a mix
  o More clarity around lot fabric strategies (eg. wide/shallow; rear lane; conventional; single loaded roads; etc.)
  o Public spaces
  o Conceptual detail regarding focal points
  o Passive recreational areas – small scale?
  o Specific road cross section, paving treatments, traffic calming concepts
  o Consider details such as sidewalks, fencing, street furniture, signage, SWM facilities, etc.

All of this information was turned over to the lead Urban Designer for the Placemaking Demonstration Project, Zelinka Priamo, so that they could prepare a plan that best embodied the results of the charrette.

### Preparation of the Placemaking Plan – Plan Summary

Appendix A to this report is a document entitled “Placemaking Demonstration Plan Summary”. This document provides a detailed summary of the Placemaking Plan, describing:

- study site
- study assumptions
- community vision and design objectives
- community structure
- and the community elements

A full range of graphics are provided to illustrate the design concepts described in the text. The summary clearly outlines how the Placemaking plan embodies the principles put forward by the Placemaking Design Guidelines. It is suggested that the reader review Appendix A as important background and context for the remaining portions of this report which compares the Conventional plan to the Placemaking Plan.
Comparison of Two Plans – Conventional vs. Placemaking

Key Contextual Qualifiers
The City’s Placemaking partners, Z-Group, have worked with City staff to allow for the comparison of their previously submitted draft plan for the Summerside East lands. As context for the Placemaking project, the following must be understood:

1. The Placemaking plan is intended to “push the envelope” on community design. It has not been designed to minimize risk for the developer, the municipality, or other stakeholders in the development of these lands – but rather has been designed to challenge the status quo in London.

2. Z-Group and the City agreed, up front, that the plan ultimately prepared for this project may not be implemented by Z-Group. Given #1, above, this is entirely expected.

3. This project acknowledges that discussions between stakeholders which lead to an understanding of placemaking concepts, discussing placemaking options, and seeing alternatives in other communities, is more important than having the final product ultimately developed on these lands.

4. It is acknowledged that some may suggest that the Placemaking Plan is too dense. They may suggest that the percentage of units that are devoted to medium and high density residential is too high and, thereby, unrealistic. On this issue, two points are noteworthy: (i) the medium-rise apartment buildings on this plan can be replaced by village townhomes, stacked townhouses, or street townhouses - the size of the blocks that support the mid-rise apartments allows for this flexibility; and (ii) aging of the baby-boomers, the cost of energy, the potential for higher costs of financing and the advent of a very high quality form of mid-rise buildings and townhouses could lead to a shift in demand from single detached housing to medium density housing in the London market.

5. Z-Group submitted the original conventional plan for their lands only. Staff extended a conventional building form on the remainder of the lands, replicating components of the Summerside community that exists to the west and the typical suburban form in most new residential areas of the City. This was done so that a Conventional and Placemaking plans could be considered for an entire community planning area, rather than only a single subdivision.

6. The conventional and preferred plans do not, in any way, imply consent, support or approval by the City of London. For example, in each plan a woodlot area has been assumed based on the plan initially submitted by Z-Group. However, through a separate planning process the delineation and preservation requirements relating to this woodlot are still being considered. Another example relates to the amount of office space which was considered in the Placemaking plan. Official Plan policies would not support such an extensive amount of office space outside of the Downtown. The Placemaking Demonstration project should be considered an illustration of Placemaking principles, and not a plan being considered for approval at this time.
Comparison of Two Communities

The following analysis is intended to provide a reasonable comparison of the two alternative communities from a number of different perspectives. Consistent with the objectives of the Placemaking Demonstration Project, these results are intended to spark discussion amongst stakeholders in the community development process to challenge conventional thinking and consider alternatives that might lead to more positive built neighbourhoods in the future.

The measures below have been structured according to a variety of categories. It is recognized that there are many more categories that could be added – some more specific to a stakeholder’s perspective than others. However, the following is a reasonable sample of variables that can help to understand what each of the plans offers by way of pro’s and con’s.

Under each category a goal statement has been given to provide a context for the given measurements. This is followed by text explaining why this goal is important. Then, a number of qualitative and quantitative measures are listed. Where a measure is quantitative, the number is shown. Where a measure is qualitative, a blank has been left where a number would otherwise be shown. Under each measure, and relative to each alternative Plan, a dot has been used to illustrate the rating of the plan for that specific measure:

- An empty dot ( ) indicates that the plan rated as “poor” under this specific measure;
- A grey dot ( ) indicates that the plan rated as “fair” under this specific measure; and
- A black dot ( ) indicates that the plan rated as “good” under this specific measure.

It is important to note that these ratings are somewhat subjective, as there is no statistical measure which establishes an average or standard. However, the dots do a good visual illustration of the relative strengths of each of the plans and how they “stack up” against one another.

Efficiency of Land Use

Goal
To utilize land efficiently by developing urban communities that are dense, compact and not sprawling.

Why Desired
- To effectively utilize municipal infrastructure.
- To reduce land consumption and the need to expand into further agricultural areas.
- To create viability and efficiency for transit and other municipal services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Conventional Plan</th>
<th>Placemaking Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential unit count</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>2,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (retail, office and live-work) floor area</td>
<td>6,000 sq.m.</td>
<td>20,000+ sq.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park space</td>
<td>4.5ha</td>
<td>11.8ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross residential density</td>
<td>20 uph</td>
<td>34 uph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>4,375</td>
<td>6,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of land for road right-of-ways</td>
<td>20.8 ha</td>
<td>24.8ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:
- A larger percentage (7 percentage points) of the Conventional plan was devoted to commercial and residential land uses (slightly larger developable land area).
- However, the Placemaking plan is designed to develop out with 50% more residential units, in total, due to the higher residential densities.
Similarly, the Placemaking plan yielded more commercial floor space – including office space above retail units and a range of live-work units at various locations in the plan (live-work space amounted to over 6,600 sq.m. of potential commercial space at grade).

Park space was more than 100% greater in the Placemaking plan.

From a land use efficiency point of view, the Placemaking plan was far superior, generating gross residential densities 70% higher than those of the Conventional plan and a residential population 50% higher than the Conventional plan counterpart. This is achieved, despite the fact that more land in the Placemaking plan is held out for parks, widened boulevards, greenways, etc.

The Conventional Plan consumed 16% less land for road right-of-ways; this was a direct result of the significant entrance boulevards offered in the Placemaking plan and the presence of more landscaped turning circles in this plan.

## Choice of Housing Type

### Goal
To allow for a broad range of housing types within a single community.

### Why Desired
- To avoid monotony and homogeneity.
- To encourage community diversity.
- To allow for community residents to “age in place” so that they can maintain their social infrastructure by remaining in their community if they wish to do so.
- To allow for a complete community.
- To provide for choices that support affordability.

### Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Conventional Plan</th>
<th>Placemaking Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of residential structure type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single detached</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row housing</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-rise apartment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-rise apartment</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-work units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage single detached</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of lot sizes for single detached units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability of housing prices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commentary
- The Placemaking plan has a much wider range of housing choices to offer.
- There will be questions relating to the marketability of the numerous units that are outside of the single detached housing category. It is noteworthy though that:
  - Many of the blocks within the Placemaking plan are adaptable to changes, so that row and apartment units could be substituted with other housing forms.
  - Z-Group has indicated that there has been a substantial demand for the street townhouse units they have recently built in Summerside.
  - The aging of the baby boom, a rise in housing prices, and the potential for an increase in financing costs all point to higher future demand for alternative forms of housing to single detached units that have traditionally represented a significant portion of the new housing market.
- The Placemaking plan and the Conventional plan both offer a range of lot sizes. However, neither plan ventures into wide-shallow lots or other non-conventional forms that could offer other interesting opportunities.
Given the wider range of housing types, the Placemaking plan offers much more opportunity for a diversity of housing prices.

Walkability

Goal
To design a community that supports walking as a viable means of transportation and enjoyable form of physical activity.

Why Desired
- To support greater transit usage.
- To offer other viable alternatives to the use of an automobile which can conserve energy and reduce greenhouse gases
- To promote healthy lifestyles that includes physical activity for children and adults.
- To encourage informal social interaction that occurs when neighbours walk within their neighbourhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Conventional Plan</th>
<th>Placemaking Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of sidewalk</td>
<td>10.2 km</td>
<td>25.6 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of sidewalk not intersected by driveways</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land area covered by 2 minute walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Example 1 (see next page)</td>
<td>17ha</td>
<td>25ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Example 2 (see next page)</td>
<td>18ha</td>
<td>39ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average length of block – shorter = greater walkability</td>
<td>200m</td>
<td>150m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of intersections – higher = greater walkability</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescents and cul-de-sacs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced road-allowance widths – framed streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houses close to sidewalk – framed streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of projecting garages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary
- The Placemaking plan is much more supportive of walking than the Conventional plan. Based on a grid pattern, rather than a collector street pattern, the Placemaking Plan offers 2.5 times more sidewalks than the Conventional plan does and also offers much more sidewalk that is uninterrupted by driveways (making for outstanding pedestrian streetscapes).
- Reduced road allowance widths, combined with reduced setbacks of the houses, provides for a well “framed” streetscape that gives a comfortable walking environment. These factors also serve to provide traffic calming – leading to even more attractive and walkable streets.
- The Placemaking plan incorporates very few crescents and no cul-de-sacs, thus avoiding streets that are disconnected or “dead ends” for pedestrians.
- The walkability of the Placemaking plan is further enhanced by architectural styles that provide for a human interface between the private and public realm – vs. the automobile-oriented interface that is offered by the conventional plan (widespread presence of driveways, projecting garages, and recessed living areas).
- The narrower streets, building close to the road and large windows and porches on the front of homes provides for “eyes on the street” which provides for safety and can also promote social interaction between neighbours.
- Based on a network analysis prepared at the University of Western Ontario’s Urban Development Program lab, a two minute walk is illustrated on a portion of each plan in the two diagrams shown below. They clearly illustrate, that a much broader area can be covered with a two minute walk in the Placemaking plan than could be covered in the Conventional plan.
Example 1 – two minute walk

Example 2 – two minute walk
Below are photographs which represent the difference in streetscape that would be offered by each plan – the auto-oriented streetscape of the Conventional plan (single detached shown) and the pedestrian-oriented streetscape of the Placemaking plan (street townhouse shown).

Clearly, the Placemaking plan would support transit usage much more effectively than the Conventional plan – offering quality walking environments, a connected street pattern, higher residential densities, and commercial uses at entryways that can service transit riders.

Mix of Land Uses

Goal
To design for a functionally supportive range of land uses within a community.

Why Desired
- To support walking to work.
- To support walking within the community for every-day goods and services.
- To support a diversity of activities within a community.
- To improve the economic viability of neighbourhood services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Conventional Plan</th>
<th>Placemaking Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land area devoted to non-residential uses (retail, office, live-work, school)</td>
<td>5.1 ha</td>
<td>9.5 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live-work opportunities</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>98 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office space opportunities</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>10,000+ sq.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal point created with integration of commercial/office/institutional uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary:
- The Placemaking plan provides for a much wider range of uses within the community.
- A focal point of commercial and other non-residential uses is established around the northern park to create a functional and pleasant destination that community residents can walk to.
- The live work opportunities can provide for goods and services that community residents may desire, within an engaging walking environment and a community commercial setting. Many of these uses may not be able to financially support traditional commercial spaces in plazas and office buildings, but would be able to support a space that is incorporated within a living unit.
The range of residential housing types provides for diversity of building form, massing and height which will add to the interest and identity of this community (and avoid a homogeneous low density landscape).

The Placemaking plan will provide for a variety of housing prices – highrise, mid-rise, street townhousing, and various single detached lot sizes.

The Placemaking plan gives a resident the opportunity to “age in place” with different forms of housing that support different ages of occupants.

### Environmental Sustainability

**Goal**
To design a community that promotes environmental sustainability.

**Why Desired**
- To reduce greenhouse gases – reduce impact on climate change.
- To reduce energy consumption.
- To reduce stormwater run-off.
- To reduce impact of development on the natural environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Conventional Plan</th>
<th>Placemaking Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paved surface area</td>
<td>16.6ha</td>
<td>16.9ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped land area as %age of total area</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkability</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit supportive land use</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to reduce/eliminate travel to work</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of street trees planted</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for transit ridership</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**
- It is acknowledged that the above is a very limited view of sustainability.
- Much greater detail on this subject will be provided in the third report to Council on the Placemaking project – the focus of which will be sustainability.
- The Placemaking Plan has slightly greater paved surface – this analysis considered the paved area of internal driveways in high density projects as well as private drives for individual homes. However, as has been done in many other communities, impervious paving treatments could be applied to counter the surface paving area of the Placemaking Plan. Note that the difference between the two plans is minimal.
- Less of the Placemaking plan is developed – leaving more area for parks and amenity areas (including a greenway). This means that there is more opportunity for stormwater to perculate into the ground, rather than running off of roofs, patios and other hard surfaces.
- The Placemaking plan offers many more opportunities for tree planting as a result of drive-way free boulevards and widened entrance boulevards that are to be heavily landscaped.
- Walkability (and the support for other alternative modes of transportation) are key to many sustainability measures. As such, the comparative strength of the Placemaking plan on this one indicator has significant impact on the value of the Placemaking plan from a sustainability point of view.
- The Placemaking plan provides for a community that is connected, offers quality walking environments, and supports higher density development. Meanwhile, the Conventional plan includes noisewalls, sterile walking environments and relatively low residential densities.
Aesthetics and Sense of Place

Goal
To design a community that offers aesthetic beauty, comfort and a sense of place.

Why Desired
- To create communities that are attractive – each community is a building block for the development of the City as a whole and attractive communities make for an attractive City overall.
- To offer a higher quality of life in our neighbourhoods and promote community pride.
- To attract a high quality labour force in the future – through the attraction of strong, attractive and complete communities.
- To encourage walking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Conventional Plan</th>
<th>Placemaking Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of noise attenuation walls</td>
<td>3.45km</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting and beautiful park spaces</td>
<td>4.5ha</td>
<td>11.8ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-loaded roads onto natural heritage features</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement of stormwater management ponds</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong gateway features</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planted medians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gateway green spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strong terminal views as entering neighb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visually attractive streetscapes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscapes without driveways, garages, or cars</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive architecture at key locations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commentary
- The Placemaking plan has been designed with a focused vision on creating an aesthetically pleasing community, with attractive streetscapes, outstanding park spaces, dramatic entrances, and public realm features that create a strong amenity.
- The Placemaking plan is designed to establish a community that will bring a sense of pride to its residents. This type of built form can establish a strong social capital in a community – the trip to Cornell provided a clear illustration of this sense of community attachment, pride and belonging.
- Zelinka Priamo has provided computer-generated images that give a good sense of the difference between the two plans from an aesthetic point of view. These graphics have been generated, to scale, from the Placemaking plan – so they are accurate representations of built form.

A good example is the view that residents would have when they enter the community from the major entryway from Jackson Road. The streetscape would be lined with quality townhouse units that have no front driveways; these units would frame the street, making for a very walkable environment. The boulevard would be heavily planted with street trees and a substantial median would be heavily landscaped as well. Progressing eastward, the resident would see enhanced street lighting and high quality mid-rise apartments (see below graphic). At the end of the street the resident would see a dense woodlot that interfaces the streetscape for a broad expanse.
Placemaking Plan - Commercial/Office Building
Facing North Park

Placemaking Plan – School Site
Across from North Park
Placemaking Plan - Mid-rise Apartments
On East-West Entry Street

Placemaking Plan - Mid-rise Apartments
On East-West Entry Street
Conventional Plan – East-west Entry Street

Conventional Plan – East-west Entry Street as Approaching Woodlot
Capital, Operating and Lifecycle Costs

Goal
To strike a financially healthy balance between municipal costs and revenues – initial capital, lifecycle capital and ongoing operating perspectives.

Why Desired
• To establish communities that are financially sustainable over the long-term.
• To allow for municipal services that residents value.
• To ensure that proposed community amenities are viable.

Methodology
• It should be acknowledged that the financial analysis applied through the Placemaking Demonstration Project is a “high level” analysis and is for comparative illustration only. It is acknowledged that various gross assumptions have been made. Without understanding the assumptions that have been made and the high level nature of the results presented herein, this information should not be used for other analyses that may consider the costs of development.
• The results do, though, provide a basis for discussion on the relative costs of the Conventional and Placemaking plans so that the tradeoffs between community form and capital, lifecycle and operating costs can be considered.
• The Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) has developed a software “Tool for Costing Sustainable Community Planning”. The tool allows for the input of more than 250 variables relating to a community design, including:
  o Hard infrastructure capital and operating costs
  o Municipal services capital and operating costs
  o Private home occupant costs
  o Infrastructure replacement rates and costs
  o Municipal revenues – development charges and property taxes
  o Land use and community design characteristics
  o Cost allocation
• The CMHC tool then generates information on:
  o Initial capital costs
  o Annual operating costs
  o Annualized lifecycle costs
  o Initial revenues and annual revenues
• Staff are continuing to fine-tune this analysis and are preparing an alternative analysis using Infracycle software – another community costing analysis tool. The results presented below should be considered preliminary at the time of the writing of this report. Using the Placemaking web site, more information will be generated and communicated on the financing of Placemaking in the near future.
• It is noteworthy that the below analysis assumes that rear laneways are privately owned and maintained. If these laneways were publicly owned, additional road construction costs would be in the order of $1M.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (from cost perspective only)</th>
<th>Conventional Plan</th>
<th>Placemaking Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Capital Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local roads</td>
<td>$10.1 M</td>
<td>$13.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Park development</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>$957,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total infrastructure (excl. schools)</td>
<td>$29.5 M</td>
<td>$33.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Average infrastructure cost per household</td>
<td>$18,527</td>
<td>$13,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key municipal services</td>
<td>$361,000</td>
<td>$542,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Noise walls</td>
<td>$3.4 million</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Window streets – additional landscaping</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Commentary**

- Overall, for the same land area, the Placemaking plan is generally more expensive than the conventional plan counterpart. However, the opposite is true when considering costs per household. Because the unit yield is significantly higher for the Placemaking plan than it is for the Conventional plan, the cost per household is considerably lower (both the initial capital costs and the annual lifecycle costs). Operating costs are very similar, but slightly higher for the Placemaking plan due mainly to the costs of park and landscape maintenance.

- There are many interesting trade-offs that become apparent when considering the economic analysis data. For example:

  **Parks**
  
  - The park spaces added to the Placemaking project are vital pieces of the community fabric. The two “urban” parks are to be built to very high design standards such that they offer a quality urban meeting place for the community (particularly the park to the north). Park amenities in the stormwater management ponds include a walking bridge. This all comes at a cost of just under $1 million in capital costs and a maintenance cost in the order of $50,000 per year.

  **Noise walls**
  
  - The Conventional plan includes noise walls – similar to those that current exist on Commissioners Road and Jackson Road to the west. In total, these walls come at a cost of approximately $3.4 million. Significant lifecycle replacement costs come with such walls as well.
  
  - The Placemaking plan utilizes housing with rear laneways and window streets along major arterial roads such that there is no need for extensive noise walls. Furthermore, the plan calls for enhanced landscaping along these major streets, leading to a much more pedestrian friendly environment. This enhanced landscaping comes at a cost of $350,000.

  **Road allowances**
  
  - Widened boulevards with enhanced landscaping, planted medians and planted traffic circles in the Placemaking plan cost in the order of $238,000.
However, reduced road allowances to 18m and 16.5m resulted in a land savings in the order of $312,000 – more than compensating for the amenities provided in the right-of-way.

Rear lanes

- Public rear laneways would cost in the order of $1 million to construct beyond the costs that have been identified in the above analysis.

### Revenue Generation

**Goal**
To strike a financially healthy balance between municipal costs and revenues – initial capital, lifecycle and ongoing operating perspectives.

**Why Desired**
- To establish communities that are financially sustainable over the long-term.
- To allow for municipal services that residents value.
- To ensure that proposed community amenities are viable.

**Methodology**
- Using the CMHC costing model, revenues were calculated for each of the scenarios.
- Discussions with the City of London Realty Services office, Z-Group and others familiar with the local and provincial real estate market were consulted on real estate values associated with properties of various qualities.
- CMHC data was also consulted to understand average new home sales prices.
- Lots in each plan were assessed for their potential to garner a premium sales value (to the end user – the home buyer).
- A 5% premium was also added to the homes in the Placemaking plan, given the enhanced public amenities, walkability, sense of community, and aesthetic offered by the community. Discussions with representatives from other municipalities suggest, anecdotally, that this premium is likely to be low, but represents a reasonable starting point for illustration.
- Commercial assessment was not included in the equation, but would have a very significant positive influence on the revenues generated by the Placemaking plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure (from revenue perspective only)</th>
<th>Conventional Plan</th>
<th>Placemaking Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development charge revenues for residential development only</td>
<td>$23.4 M</td>
<td>$31.3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual taxes from residential uses only</td>
<td>$5.8 M</td>
<td>$8.6 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commentary**
- The Placemaking plan is far superior to the Conventional Plan in terms of one-time development charge revenues and ongoing property tax revenues.
- Development charges generated by the Placemaking Plan are 35% higher.
- Property taxes generated by the Placemaking plan are almost 50% higher.
- Neither of these analyses consider the significantly higher revenues that would be yielded by the live-work units and the commercial floor area which is offered in the Placemaking plan – this could be in the $4 million range.
- It is noteworthy that the roughly $3 million in additional taxes generated by the residential uses in the Placemaking plan (vs. the Conventional plan) outstrips the higher maintenance costs associated with enhanced amenities in parks, boulevards and other public spaces by more than 10 times.

### Lessons Learned
This exercise of redesigning a conventional plan of subdivision has accomplished much. It has allowed those involved in the planning, design, regulation, development and servicing of new communities to work together to explore new ways of thinking about our communities. It is clear that there has been a shift in culture as it relates to placemaking and the broader issue of urban design in London, and a new perspective is now clearly “on the table” as new plans for development come forward. However, there is still much progress that needs to be made.

Through this process of redesigning Summerside East there have been several lessons learned that are noteworthy here:

1. The Placemaking plan was superior in almost every measure put forward in this analysis:
   a. Efficiency of land use
   b. Offering a choice of housing type
   c. Walkability
   d. Mix of land uses
   e. Environmental sustainability
   f. Aesthetics and sense of place
   g. Capital, operating and lifecycle costs (on balance, the Placemaking plan was superior from an average cost per household perspective)
   h. Revenue generation

2. Placemaking can allow for significant densities on a property (even within a suburban context), while still providing for a community that is walkable, beautiful, and having a strong sense of community.

3. There are some very encouraging tradeoffs offered by the Placemaking plan. For example:
   a. densities are higher in the Placemaking plan, but there is more park space
   b. there are more roads, but they are enhanced by planted medians, widened boulevards offering a sense of arrival, landscaped traffic circles, etc.
   c. planted medians come with a significant capital cost, but the reduced road allowance widths that create human scale streetscapes in the Placemaking plan offer land savings that can entirely compensate for these costs.
   d. total capital costs associated with the Placemaking plan are higher, but the higher densities in the plan mean these capital costs are lower per household.
   e. development charge revenues are much higher in the Placemaking plan – far outstripping the additional capital costs of the plan compared with the Conventional plan.
   f. the difference between tax revenues generated by the Placemaking plan versus the Conventional plan is approximately ten times the difference in total operating costs (with the Placemaking plan having a higher operating cost).
   g. the higher costs for the developer of building infrastructure in the Placemaking plan appear to be more than compensated for by the increased revenue generation possibilities offered by the Placemaking plan.

4. Walkability is key to many facets of placemaking.
   - Progressing through the process of redesigning the conventional plan, it was very apparent that many of the goals relating to placemaking relate to creating walkable environments. This does not only mean creating environments that are aesthetically pleasing, human scale and comfortable for walking. It also means designing for origins and destinations that encourage this form of transportation – eg. commercial destinations, transit destinations, recreational opportunities, meeting places, multiple park spaces allowing for stops along the way, etc.
   - It also became very apparent that designing communities for people, not cars, can achieve many objectives, including:
     a. Reducing fossil fuel consumption.
     b. Reducing air emissions.
     c. Creating an environment that older seniors can thrive in without feeling stranded when they can no longer drive.
5. Reduced road allowance widths continue to be a controversial issue that needs to be addressed definitively. Individual utilities companies are very reluctant to agree to reduce road allowances as it is easier to deal with their own utilities in their own separate trench within the road allowance. However, Council should recognize that this public road allowance plays a large role in establishing quality walking environments. A key urban design principle relating to placemaking is to reduce road allowance widths and bring buildings close to the street to create an appropriate relationship between street width and building height.

6. The role of rear lanes also needs to be definitively addressed. It is important that a person or entity has clear and legal responsibility for the long term maintenance, repair, and ultimate replacement of each rear lane that is built in the future and the infrastructure that goes with them (so that the problems that have been experienced with London’s historic rear lanes are not replicated). The benefits of rear lanes in contributing to outstanding streetscapes are undeniable. The Placemaking plan incorporates these lanes strategically at key streetscapes. The best examples of placemaking that Staff have witnessed have included rear lanes to varying degrees.

There has been much discussion about rear lanes with specific developers and amongst staff, but no definitive action has been taken. The following questions need to be addressed soon, so that the development community is clear about the possibilities for adding rear lanes to their plans:

- When will rear lanes be supported by the City, and, if so, under what conditions and specifications?
- Will the City own rear lanes and be responsible for their ongoing maintenance or will they be required to have private ownership?
- What innovative opportunities exist for tying rear lanes to privately owned lands if the City will not assume rear lanes (e.g., common elements condominiums and licensing agreements)?

7. The City should support a variety of new, smaller park styles that currently aren’t supported and parks operations budgets should be modified to recognize the additional costs imposed by these new parks as they are developed. These new forms of parks should include small parkettes, commons areas, small gathering spaces, intensely landscaped spaces (hard and soft landscaping), street furniture, public art and other features that can create a sense of urbanity, identity and community. As identified in the Placemaking plan, these spaces are vital to placemaking design; furthermore, the above analysis shows that such parks economically viable in that other factors in a placemaking plan can more than compensate for the increased costs of maintenance that such amenities bring.

8. Window roads can eliminate noise walls. There are multiple benefits to eliminating noise walls – aesthetically, functionally, and economically, and Council’s current policy of avoiding noise walls wherever possible should be strongly supported.

9. Mixed use development should be supported in both Official Plan policy and the City’s zoning by-law. There should be strong support for the development of live-work units, within the context of a carefully planned live work environment. Design parameters are key to making such units successful.

10. The possibility of allowing for granny flats within new communities should be explored. It is understood that the City-wide allowance of these units would be very problematic, but designing these units into new communities in an appropriate way could be very positive. There are many examples of new communities which have successfully incorporated these units that can offer many benefits.
11. Zoning set-backs need to be reviewed. How can they be tied to street classification and design parameters so that residential buildings may be brought closer to the street to create a positive pedestrian environment.

12. Parameters should be developed to allow for enhanced street lighting, street furniture, community entry features, and other amenities within the public realm. While it is recognized that it may be more expensive to maintain these features over time, these “details” can play an important role in creating communities that are distinctive and have a clear sense of place. As shown in the above analysis, such amenities in the public realm can create an amenity that generates significant tax revenues.

13. On-street parking can be an important feature of new communities. Such parking better utilizes the street, reduces the need for widened driveways, can support a pedestrian environment where parked cars slow down traffic and can provide a barrier between the pedestrian and moving vehicles in the traveled portion of the road. While it is recognized that this is a difficult issue to address relative to areas around the Downtown and the University and College, further work should be done to consider what options might exist to identify areas in the City that could allow for 24 hour on-street parking.

14. Stormwater management ponds should be considered strong physical features within the community design process. Options to integrate these uses within the community by adding park space, enhanced landscaping, walking bridges, lookouts and other features should be considered such that storm ponds can act as key visual focal points and positive features for the community.

15. Supporting a mix of higher densities is key to allowing for a Placemaking project to become successful – both functionally and financially. It is recognized that the London market has not traditionally supported significant proportions of medium and high density development within communities. However, all opportunities to create housing that is an attractive alternative to single detached development should be explored through the design process for new communities.

16. While the emphasis has not been on the developer’s cost/revenue perspective in this project, it is instructive that the above cost analysis demonstrates that developer costs relating to the infrastructure are reasonably similar, despite the fact that the Placemaking Plan provides for more units and a significantly higher final real estate value (ie. total sales value of real estate generated by the Plan).

The table shown below is from a report prepared by the Urban Land Institute in Washington, D.C. entitled “The New Shape of Suburbia – Trends in Residential Development”. The table shows the comparative costs of developing new urbanist vs. conventional subdivisions. While London’s Placemaking Demonstration Project cannot be considered a “new urbanist” community, it does reflect many similarities (ie. use of rear lanes in strategic locations, grid-based road network, mix of housing types, clear focal points for the community, etc.). The below table corroborates that the cost of building communities in a non-conventional way is relatively similar, and actually lower per lot, or per unit, when considering the higher densities that are yielded with a non-conventional plan.
Next Steps

It is important to continue the discussion about Placemaking and design. Such discussion can now occur within the growing context of an urban design structure that is being developed. The City's new Urban Designer, the creation of the Urban Design Steering Committee, the Placemaking Design Guidelines, new infill policies and other projects that support a raised bar on urban design are positive evidence that London is raising the bar on urban design.

The issues listed above on lessons learned should be addressed through formal direction by Council so that conclusion can be brought to these issues, making new Placemaking proposals more attractive to the development community. Specifically, it is recommended that the following be addressed as soon as possible to move forward on the issue of Placemaking in London:

viii. Staff from EESD and Planning should be requested to establish new context-based standards for road allowance widths, where Placemaking community designs are proposed.

ix. The Zoning By-law should be reviewed to establish new context-based front yard setbacks, where Placemaking community designs are proposed.

x. Staff from EESD and Planning should be requested to prepare a report which explores the opportunity for supporting rear lane development in London. At a minimum, this report should consider public vs. private ownership, mechanisms to ensure ongoing

---

### Comparing the Costs of New Urbanist and Conventional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Item</th>
<th>New Urbanist Development</th>
<th>Conventional Suburban Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>Cost per Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>$16,600</td>
<td>$78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>629,782</td>
<td>2,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthwork</td>
<td>496,820</td>
<td>2,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary</td>
<td>472,971</td>
<td>2,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>391,338</td>
<td>1,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, irrigation</td>
<td>1,029,930</td>
<td>4,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets, alleys</td>
<td>1,302,365</td>
<td>6,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private utilities</td>
<td>1,033,980</td>
<td>4,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>590,103</td>
<td>2,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>171,235</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes, insurance</td>
<td>54,003</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>1,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest, loan fees</td>
<td>431,020</td>
<td>2,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,504,138</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,567</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Yield of 132 units: 183 single-family units and 29 townhouses.
b. Yield of 175 units: 143 single-family units and 29 townhouses.
maintenance and financing of such maintenance, and laneway design criteria, where it is relevant to the Public interest.

xi. Staff from Planning and EESD should be requested to prepare a report which describes how new forms of parks, such as parkettes, commons areas, and urban parks may be incorporated into new communities in London. At a minimum, this report should consider the costs of such park spaces (both capital and operating) and describe how such parks could impact municipal budgets relating to parks operations.

xii. Planning Staff should be asked to prepare a report on mixed use and live-work development, identify regulatory barriers to such development, and recommend Official Plan and/or zoning changes that would be required, if any, to allow for such uses to be developed.

xiii. Planning Staff should be asked to prepare a report on the possibilities of allowing for granny flats within new development, excluding infill development projects within established areas. Recommendations should be provided relating to Official Plan and/or zoning changes that would be required, if any, to allow for such uses to be developed.

xiv. Staff from Planning and EESD should be asked to prepare a report which investigates opportunities and costs of enhancing the public realm in new communities – including widened boulevards, planted medians, enhanced landscaping, decorative street lighting, community entry features, gazebos, hard surface plazas, decorative street crossings, street furniture and other amenities. The report should consider these features, and others, and evaluate the potential costs and benefits of each as well as considering innovative means for assigning such costs.
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