



Staff Report for Council Meeting

Date of Meeting: January 27, 2021

Report Number: SRPI.21.019

Department: Planning and Infrastructure

Division: Policy Planning

Subject: **SRPI.21.019 – Sustainability Metrics Update Project**

Purpose:

The purpose of this staff report is to recommend comprehensive updates to the City's Sustainability Metrics tool as an overall means for the City to achieve its sustainable development goals.

Recommendation(s):

- a) That Staff Report SRPI.21.019 be received;
- b) That the recommended updates to the City's Sustainability Metrics tool and threshold scoring as set out in SRPI.21.019 be approved in principle subject to further consultation with building industry stakeholders (refer to Appendix 1 and Appendix 3 respectively);
- c) That the recommendations set out in SRPI.21.019 to consider a three-pronged approach to incentives, consisting of: (1) financial, (2) awards & recognition and (3) capacity building be approved in principle, and that City Staff be directed to report back to Council with specific incentives and an implementation plan;
- d) That the recommended updates to the City's Key Performance Indicator (KPI) to establish a target of 30% of Site Plan and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications obtaining a score above "good" be approved, and that City Staff be directed to monitor this target for efficacy; and
- e) That upon the finalization of the update to the metrics tools and corresponding threshold scores, City Staff provide sufficient advance notice to stakeholders of the forthcoming application of the updated tools and threshold scores to new Site Plan and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications.

Contact Person:

Brian DeFreitas, Senior Planner, Policy, 905-771-5431

Christine Lee, Planning Researcher, Policy, 905-747-6428

Page 2

Report Approval:

Submitted by: Kelvin Kwan, Commissioner of Planning and Infrastructure

Approved by: Mary-Anne Dempster, City Manager

All reports are electronically reviewed and/or approved by the Division Director, Treasurer (as required), City Solicitor (as required), Commissioner, and City Manager. Details of the reports approval are attached.

Background:

In 2018, Council supported City Staff's recommendation to review the Sustainability Metrics tool and to also research the use of incentives to improve sustainability performance of new development. The City retained the consulting firm Morrison Hershfield to prepare the update and provide expertise in relation to sustainable development implementation and evaluation tools. The City reconstituted its partnership with the cities of Vaughan and Brampton to undertake the update and ensure continued collaboration, information sharing and consistency among the municipalities. This collaboration was augmented in April 2019 when the City of Markham joined the partnership. Furthermore, in support of this work, the City was awarded a grant from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) in partnership with the Government of Canada through its *Municipalities for Climate Innovation Program* (MCIP) to undertake the project update. The terms of the FCM grant requires that the City complete the updates to the Sustainability Metrics by February 2021.

Social, environmental and economic sustainability has become increasingly important in managing growth and improving health and well-being within cities. Concerns over public health, climate change, energy, and resource use have brought sustainability to the forefront for municipalities when planning, building, and managing growth. In response, Provincial legislation, plans, and policies direct for sustainable development to promote strong, livable and resilient communities. This is evident and clearly articulated through recent updates to the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS, 2020), the *Planning Act*, and the Growth Plan 2019, which the City must implement.

The City's Sustainability Metrics reflect the means through which the City implements its sustainability policies set out in the Official Plan, the Environment Strategy, and related City standards and guidelines. The metrics were developed in partnership with the City of Vaughan and City of Brampton, and have been in effect in all three municipalities since 2014. The Metrics address a range of matters that include sustainable built form, design elements that promote walkability, cycling and transit use, the use of alternative forms of energy, and targets that adapt to the effects of climate change. Accordingly, the metrics are one of the City's most effective tools to guide the sustainability performance of new planning applications, which are applicable at the Site Plan and Draft Plan of Subdivision scales of the planning process.

Page 3

The Tool: Applying the Sustainability Metrics

Richmond Hill’s Sustainability Metrics program uses an assessment tool to calculate a sustainability score and measure the sustainability performance of development. The tool is user-based, and requires applicants to fill out an on-line form¹ and submit it alongside the other prescribed studies and materials that form part of a complete application for Site Plan and Draft Plan of Subdivision approval.

Applicants can select from a menu of 50+ metrics within four different categories of sustainability: built environment, natural environment, mobility, and infrastructure and buildings. The online tool automatically calculates a sustainability score based on the answers provided by the applicant. The final sustainability score reflects the applicant’s level of commitment to provide sustainable measures within their proposed development in respect of the four categories.

Scoring: Measuring Sustainability Performance

In April 2014, Richmond Hill Council approved a minimum sustainability score for all Site Plan and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications. These scores are provided in Table 1.1, and represent a “threshold” scoring system whereby applicants must achieve a minimum score (i.e. performance level) in order for their respective Draft Plan of Subdivision or Site Plan application to be recommended for approval. For Richmond Hill, applicants must achieve at least a “Good” sustainability metrics score in order to receive approval, and this score represents the baseline performance level.

Table 1.1 – Sustainability Metrics Threshold Scores²

Performance Level	Threshold
GOOD	21-35 POINTS (Draft Plan) 32-45 POINTS (Site Plan)
VERY GOOD	36-55 POINTS (Draft Plan) 46-65 POINTS (Site Plan)
EXCELLENT	+56 POINTS (Draft Plan) +66 POINTS (Site Plan)

Staff note that the threshold scoring system (refer to Table 1.1) represents a tiered system which was created in direct response to development industry stakeholder feedback that sought flexibility and less prescriptiveness to be incorporated in the metrics tool during the development of the Sustainability Metrics program. The threshold scores were therefore derived to reflect a range of scoring that enables applicants to

¹ Sustainability Metrics Online Tool: <https://eservices.richmondhill.ca/sat/>

² Sustainability Metrics Threshold Scores: <https://www.richmondhill.ca/en/find-or-learn-about/sustainability-metrics.aspx>

Page 4

determine which metrics they wish to pursue and commit to, based on an applicant's individual development aspirations. In addition, the threshold scoring approach ensures applicants are free to strive for higher threshold performance levels, while allowing the City to ensure that new development is achieving a baseline level of sustainability performance. The "Very Good" and "Excellent" performance levels are voluntary, and applicants are encouraged, but not required, to achieve these levels of performance.

Purpose of the Update Project:

Key factors driving the decision to undertake a comprehensive update to the City's Sustainability Metrics include:

- *Changes to the Planning Act: Bill 73 (Smart Growth for Our Communities Act, 2015)* established provisions in the Planning Act to make built-form that is well designed, encourages a sense of place, provides for public places that are of high quality, safe accessible, attractive and vibrant as a matter of provincial interest;
- *Changes in Provincial legislation and Provincial Plans:* these changes require a number of the Metrics to be reviewed and updated. The Province's *Preserving and Protecting our Environment for Future Generations: A "Made -in- Ontario Environment Plan" (2018)* establishes Ontario's GHG reduction targets and set out actions designed to modify behavior to achieve these targets;
- *Updates to the Ontario Building Code (January 2017) regarding energy efficiency:* these updates have generally resulted in changes to energy efficiency requirements for new buildings to a level beyond what is set out in the Sustainability Metrics. This means that the energy efficiency Metrics approved by the three partner municipalities in 2013 are redundant and are not advancing energy efficiency in new development beyond the requirements of the Code
- *Council's Strategic Plan* for which Council recently re-emphasized its strategic priority to Balance Growth and Green that supports climate action initiatives alongside decisions that promote responsible economic intensification and prosperity (November 2020)

In addition to the foregoing, other key factors necessitating a need to review the metrics include the following:

- Approval of the CTC Source Water Protection Plan (December 2015) which requires low impact development techniques;
- Updates to the Growth Plan 2019 for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, and Greenbelt Plan which bring sustainability to the forefront in land use planning;
- Ontario Regulation O. Reg 588/17 requiring green infrastructure to be incorporated into asset management, and

Page 5

- Initiation of a Regional Climate Change Action Plan by York Region as part of its municipal comprehensive review process (draft released in March 2020)

Alignment with other Emerging Corporate Initiatives

The City is also developing its own Climate Change Framework and a Community Energy and Emissions Plan (CEEP). The Climate Change Framework was recently adopted by City Council on November 25, 2020, and will guide the City in addressing and combating climate change by applying a climate change lens to corporate governance, asset management and land use planning. The CEEP will chart a path to reduce community greenhouse gas reductions and explore related economic opportunities. As a result of these aforementioned legislative and policy changes, there is an unprecedented opportunity to review and revise the metrics to bring them in line with emerging trends and other corporate initiatives that aim to address matters of sustainability, resiliency and climate change mitigation and adaptation.

With the initiation of Regional and local climate change action projects, and the recent emphasis on climate change mitigation, there is an opportunity for the Sustainability Metrics to include a focus on Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions through new development. Accordingly, this project has investigated and recommends methods to improve the use of the Sustainability Metrics to address the impacts of carbon on built form, which in turn will contribute to the Province's GHG reduction targets. By updating the existing metrics and providing additional new metrics that are aimed at reducing GHG emissions, the City is helping to support economic development in emerging green building sectors, and align the metrics with its Climate Change Framework.

Project Objectives

By way of summary, the Sustainability Metrics Update Project set out to accomplish the following tasks in two phases:

Phase 1	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Undertake a comprehensive update to the inter-municipal Sustainability Metrics and point scoring in response to changes in legislation and Provincial planning policy since the metrics were approved by Council in 2013;2. Investigate adding new metrics that aim to reduce GHG emissions and aid the City in achieving its goal of becoming a more sustainable, energy efficient community over the long-term;
Phase 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none">3. Research the plausibility of developing and implementing a Green Roof By-law for the City;4. Research and investigate plausible incentives (financial and non-financial) that could be awarded to qualifying applicants to increase uptake of the metrics program, and which would serve to encourage

Page 6

	<p>developments within the City to implement sustainable designs that achieve higher than a minimum required sustainability score; and</p> <p>5. Develop an appropriate corporate performance indicator target as part of the City’s Strategic Plan monitoring, to report on the success and implementation of the metrics.</p>
--	---

City staff note that the aforementioned objectives have been completed with recommendations being brought forward to Council at this time. Additional details on each of the above-noted phases and objectives are provided below.

Project Phases:

The update to the metrics were completed in two parts between 2018 and 2020. Both parts involved background research and analyses, internal and external consultation with stakeholders, and concluded with separate final reports with recommendations which are appended to this staff report.

Phase 1 (Fall 2018 to Spring 2020)

Phase 1 of the project began in the Fall of 2018 and was completed in May 2020 and was undertaken in partnership with the partner municipalities and the lead consultant through the following stages:

1. Background Research and Analysis on Metric Updates

Background research and an analysis was completed to review the metrics that required updates based on changes to legislation and Provincial policy since 2013. The background research identified metrics that required updating due to current or emerging industry best practices and changes to reference documents that were updated since the inception of the metrics. The analysis was based on a review of over thirty (30) different documents.

2. Preparation of Draft new/revised Sustainability Metrics

A draft of new and revised metrics were prepared based on the research and background work undertaken. A workshop with City Staff and participants from the partner municipalities including the Technical Advisory Team took place in May 2019 to explore opportunities for alignment with sustainability programs and to garner preliminary feedback from participants on the objectives of the project. Following the workshop, a draft report was prepared identifying the suggested updates and revisions to the existing metrics including metrics to be removed, metrics to be revised, and opportunities for new metrics. These draft recommendations were then circulated to stakeholders for input.

Page 7

3. Stakeholder Consultation

Consultation was undertaken on the draft metrics through separate workshops which were held in January 2020. These workshops engaged with various stakeholders to garner input on the draft metrics and proposed changes, including members of the development industry, the Building Industry and Land Development Association (BILD), staff from York Region, Peel Region, Credit Valley Conservation and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, and participants from Clean Air Partnership, the Atmospheric Fund, and the Canadian Green Building Council. Feedback and submissions from the workshops were then reviewed, synthesized and considered to inform recommended updates to the metrics.

The project team also had a follow-up consultation session and meeting with members of BILD on December 2, 2020 and December 18, 2020 respectively, after having had a discussion regarding incentives (as noted below in the Phase 2 process). At the December 2, 2020 session, the project team provided an update on the project process and set out to respond to the initial feedback that was received from BILD at the initial workshops. At the meeting held on December 18, 2020, City Staff met with BILD to better understand the issues raised by BILD respecting timing and implementation of the metrics tool. The key comments and themes raised by BILD are highlighted in the subsequent sections of this report alongside responses by City Staff.

4. Sustainability Metrics Report

Based on the initial research and feedback received through the stakeholder consultation, a final report was prepared in May 2020 by the consultant outlining the recommended updates to the metrics for consideration and approval by Council. This report is appended to this staff report as Appendix 1.

Phase 2 (Summer 2020 to Fall/Winter 2020)

Phase 2 of the project began immediately following the completion of Part 1 in the summer of 2020 and was completed in the fall of this year. This part of the project focused primarily on researching possible incentives to be provided for applicants so as to encourage achievement of higher thresholds of sustainability through development. In addition, the project team also undertook research on Green Roofs as well as analyses to establish a target for the City's corporate Key Performance Indicator for the Sustainability Metrics program through the following stages:

1. Background Research and Analysis on Incentives

Background research and analysis was conducted to explore possible incentives to help increase and improve general uptake of the metrics. Over 60 programs were reviewed and included a jurisdictional scan of various municipalities across Canada and the United States. In addition, research on green roofs was also explored given

Page 8

that provisions under the *Municipal Act* enable local municipalities in Ontario to establish a Green Roof By-law.

2. Stakeholder Consultation

Two consultation sessions were held in October 2020 with City Staff to discuss the recommended incentive programs and obtain feedback from stakeholders. Both sessions were held virtually due to COVID-19 restrictions. The first session included staff and representatives from York Region and the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and took place on October 5, 2020. This session discussed opportunities for incentive programs and measures to be aligned with the City's Sustainability Metrics and also explored potential for alignment with new programs that may be proposed by the City. The second consultation session was held on October 15, 2020 with BILD members from both the York Region and Peel Region Chapters. Leading up to this session, the project team prepared an online survey requesting feedback from participants on a variety of different incentives. The BILD session also provided an opportunity for participants to expand on survey answers and ask questions to the project team.

3. Final Report – Sustainable Development Implementation Measures

Based on the background research and feedback from the consultation sessions and responses from the online survey, a final report was prepared outlining the recommended incentive programs and implementation measures the City should consider to encourage development to achieve higher sustainability threshold scores. The report outlines a framework for incentives that are geared towards fostering more sustainable development throughout the City. This report is appended to this staff report as Appendix 2.

4. KPI Target Development

Staff undertook an assessment of the City's Sustainability Metrics KPI in order to establish a target for the KPI. The City has reported on monitoring data related to the Sustainability Metrics tool through its Strategic Plan on an annual basis since 2015. The KPI highlights the percent of Draft Plan of Subdivision and Site Plan development applications that have achieved a threshold score above "good". Through the assessment, a methodology to establish a target for the KPI was developed by City Staff utilizing the City's historical monitoring data. This target and methodology was then vetted through the consultant for input to confirm its appropriateness and validity (refer to Appendix 4).

Key Sustainability Metrics Update Recommendations:

This section of the staff report summarizes the key recommendations related to the update of the Sustainability Metrics. There are a number of changes that are being recommended through the update. This includes recommendations to remove metrics

Page 9

as a result of them being out of date and no longer relevant, as well as recommendations to revise existing metrics and establish new metrics in order to reflect emerging industry trends, best practices in sustainability and changes in provincial legislation.

A full list of the comprehensive updates to the Sustainability Metrics is set out in the report and Guidebook attached to this staff report as Appendix 1. The Guidebook provides additional detail on the metric intent, requirements for each metric, corresponding point allocation and documenting compliance.

Metrics Recommended to be Removed

The following metrics are recommended to be removed from the Metrics tool:

Metric	Summary of Rationale for Removal
Floor Area Ratio/Floor Space Index	Metric requirements are redundant. Implementation of this metric is already covered by Official Plan and Zoning By-law
Persons and Jobs per Hectare	
Urban Tree Diversity	Metric requirements are redundant. Implementation of this metric is already covered by Municipal guidelines/standards
Surface parking	Metric requirements are difficult to enforce
Proximity to School	Metric requirements are difficult to implement. School locations and school site requirements are generally dictated by school boards, with minimal influence from the developer
Tree Canopy Enhancements	Metric requirements have been streamlined within metrics with similar intents and incorporated into other metrics with similar intent
Water Conserving Fixtures	Metric requirements are redundant given current requirements of the Ontario Building Code
Parking Garage Lighting	
Energy Conserving Lighting	
Material Reuse and recycled content	Industry is moving away from recycled content as a measure of sustainable materials. Alternatively, new metrics have been included which concentrate on embodied carbon of materials instead
Recycled/Reclaimed Materials	

The above-noted metrics are recommended for removal as a result of a number of factors. In particular, many of these metrics are redundant given that in the majority of cases their requirements are already covered by policies in the City's Official Plan, Zoning By-law, and/or by minimum requirements set out in the Ontario Building Code. In addition, some of the metrics are no longer relevant as a result of a shift in industry

Page 10

practices. Accordingly, some metric requirements were either incorporated into other existing metrics, or established as new metrics, where practicable.

Metrics to be Carried Forward with Minimal Changes

The following list of metrics are recommended to be carried forward with minor changes:

- Surface Parking Footprint
- Traffic Calming
- School Proximity to Transit Routes and Bikeways
- Intersection Density
- Distance to Public Transit
- Implementing Trails and Bike Paths
- Access to Public Parks
- Stormwater Quality
- Greywater Reuse
- Multi-purpose Stormwater Management
- Passive Solar Alignment

Each metric contains a unique intent which sets out the objectives of the metric. While the project team considered combining metrics with overlapping subject matter, maintaining a large menu of metric options has been a key objective of the project update, and is aligned with the feedback that has been consistently received from the development industry since 2013 to maintain variety and flexibility. On that basis, only minor revisions are recommended to the above-noted metrics. These revisions include necessary changes to rename a metric to align more accurately with the metric intent and/or its benefits, and to adjust the point allocations where necessary in response to feedback received, historically low uptake of the metric, and the desire to incentivize priority targets.

Metrics to be Carried Forward with Major Changes

Significant changes are being proposed and recommended for the remaining suite of metrics that form part of the tool. A full list of these changes are described in more detail in Appendix 1. The reason for most of these changes was to reflect the shifts in trends found in the building and development industry since the Metrics were first introduced, and also to align more closely with other key standards from other sustainability programs and documents, which are used by and familiar to the industry. These include: LEED, the Toronto Green Standard Version 3, One Planet Living, Standards and Conservation Guidelines of Historic Places in Canada, and Peel Region's Framework for Street Connectivity. Changes to Requirements within specific Metric Types and Point Allocations

Staff note that the historical uptake of individual metrics also played a critical role in identifying recommended updates. Generally, metric requirements are categorized

Page 11

based on a tiered system presently identified as “Mandatory, Minimum and/or Aspirational Targets.” Each performance level is awarded points that generally reflect the onerousness of requirements. In light of this, the project team set out to address metrics with a history of high or low uptake based on available monitoring data. This was done by adjusting requirements associated with a target and corresponding point allocations, and by adding additional clarity to metric requirements. In some cases, where metrics demonstrated a high uptake, more challenging targets were included, where appropriate, to achieve higher performance. Alternatively, for metrics that had a low uptake, targets were reviewed and simplified to align more realistically with today’s market and with the goal of increasing uptake over the long term.

Proposed New Metrics

Through the update process, 14 new metrics are proposed to be added. These new metrics seek to add variety to the City’s suite of metrics and represent avenues of best practices in sustainability that have gained traction since the program was introduced. The new metrics were identified through the review and consultation process as being important to add. One of the main reasons to include these new metrics is to heighten the focus on climate change mitigation and adaptation. In addition, many of these new Metrics align with City priorities and Council decisions to endorse strategies that improve our environment.

The following metrics are recommended to be added to the tool:

Proposed Metric	Summary of Rationale for Proposed New Metric
Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging Stations	Based on emerging trends in provincial and municipal sustainability and consumer trends towards adoption of electric vehicles
Embodied Carbon of Building Materials – General	Based on growing awareness on the importance of addressing carbon associated with building materials (embodied carbon) rather than relying on indirect measures such as recycled content. Embodied carbon is defined as the lifetime greenhouse gas emissions associated with material.
Embodied Carbon of Building Materials – Supplementary Cementitious Materials (SCMs)	
Embodied Carbon of Building Materials – Life Cycle Assessments (LCAs)	
Embodied Carbon of Building Materials – Material Efficient Framing	
Supporting Pollinators	Based on the objective of prioritizing habitat and survival of pollinator populations who play an important role in food production and

Page 12

Proposed Metric	Summary of Rationale for Proposed New Metric
	in response to the sharp decline of pollinators due to climate change, habitat loss and pesticide overexposure
Salt Management	Based on the objective of promoting salt reduction during winter maintenance activities so as to reduce the effects of salt on pavement life, corrosion on buildings, and impacts on terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems
Sub Metering of Thermal Energy and Water	Based on the objective of tracking water and energy usage to influence behavior and motivate building occupants to reduce their energy consumption
Back-up Power	Based on the objective to address climate change adaption by encouraging buildings to be more resilient to power outages through incorporation power backup generations and rough ins for auxiliary power supplies
Extreme Wind Protection	Based on the objective of addressing climate change adaptation by encouraging more resilient construction to prepare for increased and extreme wind events
Controlling Solar Gain	Based on the objective of promoting energy efficiency through passive solar design
Providing Mixed-Use Development	Based on the objective of encouraging more mixed use developments through a mix of uses on the development site, where it is not already required by City, Regional or Provincial policies
Intersection Density (metric existed in other municipalities' programs but it is new to Richmond Hill)	Based on the objective of increasing more connectivity within neighborhoods to increase permeability, walking and mobility
Innovation (new category and metric)	Based on the objective of encouraging true innovative design and “out of the box” thinking which results in real sustainability benefits and allowing applicants to present new ideas that are not already captured in the suites of the City’s Sustainability Metrics

City Staff note that several of the proposed new metrics that are recommended to be added support a number of Richmond Hill’s climate change resilience objectives. The Supporting Pollinators metric supports the City’s Pollinator Program to improve the

Page 13

health of the City's ecosystem³. The metric for Electric Vehicle (EV) charging stations was added to encourage the use of electric vehicles which can result in carbon savings and less air pollution. This metric also seeks to respond to Council's direction which seeks to promote EV charging stations through development. Applicants can implement this metric by providing charging stations to serve 10 to 50 percent or more of required parking spaces. Other metrics recommended to be added such as Extreme Wind Protection, Back-up Power, Thermal Energy, and Controlling Solar Gain encourage more resilient construction for extreme weather events and also help to reduce energy use.

Lastly, the project update proposes to add a new metric entitled "Innovation". Innovation points may be considered for sustainable measures not already identified in the City's menu of metric options. This metric is open-ended, and is being recommended to provide additional flexibility to the tool, recognizing that some applicants may choose to "think outside the box". To qualify, applicants would need to identify or establish a baseline of standard performance and compare that benchmark with the final design and provide a high-level concept of the proposed metric to be reviewed by the City. To implement this new metric, City Staff would review and evaluate the proposal before accepting the proposed metric. Point allocation is capped at a maximum of 10 points, and applicants must explain the benefits of the proposed innovation approach. As such, the new "Innovation" metric recognizes that the building industry is always improving how it can achieve sustainability; and, in order to not hamper that innovation and to provide a means to receive points for their innovation, this metric has been added to the list.

It should be noted that as a result of the update, there will be a total of 53 metrics with a total of 125 options from which points can be collected; whereas the 2014 metrics had a total of 51 metrics with a total of 86 options. This increase in options provides the development community with more flexibility in terms of how they can demonstrate their developments are meeting the City's sustainability goals, while meeting their development objectives as well.

Other Formatting Changes

The structure of the Sustainability Metrics Guidebook has been revised through the project update with the intent of streamlining the presentation of the tool, and to clarify point allocation, referencing, and how applicants should document compliance. The guidebook most closely resembles the guidebook currently used by the City of Brampton and is being recommended as a table format. The strategy for reorganizing the structure of the Guidebook included removing the glossary of terms from the 2014 guide. For documentation purposes, further descriptions were provided and notes have been added for clarity. These changes are recommended to make the metric targets and Guidebook more clear, intuitive and user-friendly.

³ <https://www.richmondhill.ca/en/pollinators.aspx>

Page 14

Other notable reformatting changes that are being recommended include:

- Renumbering of metrics to correspond to the four overarching categories of *Built Form, Mobility, Natural Environment and Open Space, and Infrastructure and Buildings* (for instance, metric “1.J.2” has been re-numbered to “BE-5” to correspond to the Built Environment category);
- Re-categorization of metrics to other categories to better match the metric intent;
- Colour-coding as a quick reference to ensure metrics are related to the overarching categories; and
- Renaming of metric target nomenclature. Currently, metric targets are labeled “mandatory”, “minimum”, and “aspirational”. However, based on the stakeholder feedback received these labels were found to be confusing. Through the project update, City Staff are recommending that “mandatory” targets be removed as they do not provide any points to applicants. In addition, it is recommended that the “minimum” and “aspirational” targets be renamed to “Good”, “Great”, and “Excellent”. This new nomenclature is intended to be intuitive for users so that they understand there is a gradual baseline of performance improvement. To that end, “Good” target reflects the baseline sustainability performance, the “Great” target reflects the enhanced performance, and the “Excellent” target reflects the best in class performance. All three new targets would have complementary points.

Recommended Updates to Threshold Scores:

When submitting development applications for Site Plan and Draft Plan of Subdivision approval, applicants are required to include a sustainability score and a summary report with their submission. As noted earlier, development applications must achieve a sustainability score that would result in, at a minimum, the achievement of a “Good” performance level rating for their development application to be considered for approval. As a result of the recommended changes to the metrics, City Staff undertook a review and analysis of the City’s existing threshold scores to ensure that the thresholds continue to be achievable after having updated the overall suite of metrics and their associated point allocations. Based on the preceding, there are two recommendations respecting threshold scoring that have emerged from Staff’s analysis of the scores:

Recommendation #1:

The existing performance levels of “Good”, “Very Good”, and “Excellent” should be renamed. These performance levels are recommended to be re-labeled to “Bronze”, “Silver”, and “Gold” respectively, as shown in Table 1.2.

This change is recommended to maintain consistency between the partner municipalities who presently use this nomenclature for its threshold scoring, and also to avoid confusion with the similarly labeled individual metric target names (recommended as “Good”, “Great”, and “Excellent” under the project update). These performance levels

Page 15

refer to the overall threshold score of the development and not the performance of an individual metric.

Recommendation #2:

The existing sustainability scores required to achieve each performance level should be revised. The recommended scores for each performance level is shown in Table 1.2.

Table 1.2 – Recommended threshold score table showing the recommended new sustainability scores to achieve each performance level

Performance Level: Existing (Recommended)	Draft Plan Threshold		Site Plan Threshold	
	Current	New Proposed	Current	New Proposed
GOOD ("BRONZE")	21-35 points	30 to 33 points	32-45 points	34 to 45 points
VERY GOOD ("SILVER")	36-55 points	34 to 39 points	46-65 points	46 to 65 points
EXCELLENT ("GOLD")	+56 points	+ 40 points	+66 points	+ 66 points

Supporting Rationale for Change:

This change is recommended based on a thorough review and testing analysis undertaken by City Staff. The threshold score analysis was undertaken methodologically and involved a number of steps including, among others: (1) re-classifying development type categories for Draft Plans and Site Plans; (2) selecting a sample of 20 applications to test in the analysis and which represent a similar proportion of submissions for each development type submitted since 2014; (3) establishing the minimum required scores based on Official Plan and by-law requirements (e.g. the light pollution by-law) that are applicable to most site plan and/or subdivision applications; and (4) establishing a baseline measure to compare how the sample applications scored in the 2014 suite of metrics versus how they would score under the updated 2020 version.

As Table 1.2 indicates, the key findings from the analysis recommend that the minimum required scores for both Site Plan and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications be increased based on the Official Plan and By-law requirements and the changes proposed in the metrics (i.e. revised point scores and addition of new/deletion of metrics). This is reflected in the "Good" (recommended to be renamed to "Bronze") performance level tier. It is also recommended that the minimums to achieve a "Silver" or "Gold" performance level for Draft Plans be decreased as the analysis found that it

Page 16

may be more difficult for these types of applications to achieve higher than a “Bronze” performance level. This is due in part to the fact that there are generally fewer metrics applicable to Draft Plans when compared to Site Plans. Staff note that with respect to Site Plans, all but the Bronze threshold scoring has not changed as these were found to still be appropriate scoring levels for Site Plan applications.

It is important to note that threshold scoring is very much context-specific and influenced by the unique characteristics of a municipality. While there may be merit and opportunity to make the threshold scores consistent between the partner municipalities, the analysis was approached in a holistic way that reflects the trends and needs of Richmond Hill. Accordingly, Staff note that there may be differences in the approach to threshold scoring for each municipality as the recommended updates are brought forward to the respective municipal Councils.

Recommended Updates to the City’s Corporate Key Performance Indicator:

The City’s Corporate Key Performance Indicator (KPI) program measures and compares how well a City program or service is meeting the City’s strategic and operational goals as set out in the City’s Strategic Plan. The goal of the KPI program is to inform decision-making and service improvement.

The KPI program has a number of different indicators and one of them is related to sustainable development in the City using relevant data from the Sustainability Metrics program. This KPI measures the percentage of development applications in process and/or approved within the reporting year that score above the “Good” performance level (i.e. how many applications achieved either a “Very Good” or “Excellent” sustainability score each year). However, while the City monitors and has reported on this key performance indicator annually since 2015, a specific target for this KPI has yet to be formally established and approved.

To establish an appropriate KPI target and understand key inputs, City Staff set out to assess the following:

- Review the average percentage of applications that scored above a “Good” tier each year between 2015 and 2019. The analysis found that on average, 22% of Draft Plans and 27% of Site Plans, with a combined average of 27.2%, achieved a threshold score above “Good”;
- Review changes to the threshold score performance levels (i.e. Bronze, Silver, Gold) and the likelihood of development applications achieving scores above Bronze;
- Consider the implications of having a higher or lower target than the average of what the City has been experiencing each year; and

Page 17

- Consider the implications of having a separate or combined target for Site Plan and Draft Plan applications.

Based on the analysis, the KPI target is recommended to be a combined target of 30% for all site plan and subdivision applications in process/approved within the reporting year. Having a combined target maintains consistency among the KPI data trends in the past and helps to simplify the complex nature of the monitoring and tracking data from the Metrics program to present achievements in a more reader-friendly way. Although there are differences between the past achievements for Draft Plans and Site Plans, the combined target is intended to be achievable for both types of applications based on historical data trends, while also setting a slightly higher goal than the historical average. Establishing a target of 30% of applications receiving a “silver” or “gold” threshold score will encourage staff to work with the development industry to identify means of improving their proposal’s sustainability score and ultimately result in more sustainable development in the City.

Based on the analysis to date, staff believe that 30% is an attainable threshold. Furthermore, the recommended target has been reviewed by the project consultant who concurs that the target is supportable, and the recommendation that Staff to continue detailed monitoring of the metrics program (refer to Appendix 4).

Staff note that opportunities for applicants to achieve higher metric scores will be possible through this update. As noted herein, additional points are being recommended to be added to the suite of metrics and the project update has also explored opportunities to further improve metric uptake through awarding of incentives. These incentive opportunities are explained in more detail below.

Recommended Incentive Programs and Implementation Measures:

The completion of the Sustainability Metrics form is required for all site plan and plan of subdivision applications, including those undertaken by the City, but not for single detached dwellings or minor site plan applications or amendments to existing site plans that require minor revisions to a registered agreement. Applications must achieve a minimum threshold score of “Good” as noted above in order to be approved. This threshold score is also required in order for the City to allocate water and wastewater servicing in accordance with criteria #5 of the City’s interim growth management strategy (IGMS). The City’s IGMS was approved by Council in March 2008 (refer to SRPD.08.032) and later refined in June 2009 in response to water and wastewater deficiencies in Regional infrastructure. As part of the IGMS, development applications are considered for water and wastewater servicing allocation based on their individual ability to meet specific criteria set out in the strategy, including criteria for the provision of sustainable design through development. The tie-in to servicing allocation is the impetus for requiring the completion of the Sustainability Assessment Tool as part of a complete application. The City’s approach to consider servicing allocation together with

Page 18

the provision of sustainable design measures has been successful in encouraging sustainable development, and continues to be implemented by Council.

As part of the Project Update, the consultant was also asked to make recommendations regarding opportunities to incentivize and/or regulate uptake and improve the implementation of sustainability measures. In support of creating an effective incentive framework, the review included an analysis of both financial and non-financial incentives as well as the use of regulatory tools. The goal of the incentives/regulations, would be to increase the number of applications that are scoring beyond the minimum “Good/Bronze” threshold and/or to improve the uptake of certain metrics that the City deems to be a priority.

Background Review on Incentives and Stakeholder Feedback

To establish a framework for an incentive program, the project consultant undertook background research. The research involved a jurisdictional scan of existing municipal sustainability measures in North America to gain a broad understanding of sustainability initiatives and trends that are happening in municipalities. In total, over 60 different programs were reviewed. The following section presents an overview of the incentive programs recommended for Richmond Hill to consider for implementation and which were brought forward to stakeholders for input.

The incentive types and measures are listed in Table 1.3 and are categorized as follows: (1) financial; (2) exemptions; (3) special treatment or services; (4) education and training; (5) recognition; and (6) mandatory requirements. As Table 1.3 illustrates, financial incentives were found to be the most desirable type of incentives among the stakeholders but there was support for other types as well. Additional detail on each incentive program is attached to this staff report as Appendix 2.

Table 1.3 – Background Review Findings on Possible Incentive Programs and Stakeholder Feedback

Type of Incentive / Implementation Measure	Description	Pros and Cons	External Stakeholder Feedback
(1) Financial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Property tax or development fee rebates: offers reduced property taxes or reduced development charges as an incentive – Monetary grants: offer cash incentives typically reflecting expected capital cost 	<p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – tend to be more flexible and customizable – can be focused on specific metrics – likely well received by developers <p>Cons:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Overall, financial incentives were the most desirable type of incentive program – Development fee rebates were the most

Page 19

Type of Incentive / Implementation Measure	Description	Pros and Cons	External Stakeholder Feedback
	increases to adopt sustainable design; and – Loans or loan guarantees: provides financial assistance to resolve perceived risk resulting from using unfamiliar or emerging materials, systems, or processes	– reduction in municipal revenue – requires a municipal revenue stream	preferred financial incentives – The most preferred time to pay out financial incentives was as the costs are incurred during the construction phase
(2) Exemptions	– provides an opportunity for applicants to deviate from certain requirements (e.g. permit increase in height or density from existing zoning)	Pros: – potential value to developers Cons: – may have limited ability to permit certain exemptions due to recent changes in the Planning Act (i.e. Section 37 Bonusing will no longer be available)	– Exemptions were identified by stakeholders as the second most desirable type of incentive programs after financial incentives
(3) Special Treatment or Technical Services	– offers special treatment such as technical expertise in sustainability and prioritizing application reviews to developers who wish to pursue more sustainable development	Pros: – offers lower cost to applicant and potentially removes barriers to more sustainable design Cons: – may not be of sufficient benefit to the developer to achieve significant results	– Expedited plan review process was the most preferred form of special treatment among stakeholders
(4) Education and/or Training	– provides education and/or training focused on specific sustainability aspects	Pros: – can be focused on specific metrics	– Not as desirable based on stakeholder feedback

Page 20

Type of Incentive / Implementation Measure	Description	Pros and Cons	External Stakeholder Feedback
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – can potentially remove barriers to adopting sustainable design – can potentially be out-sourced and/or aligned with programs offered by other public or private sectors (i.e. TRCA offers carrying out research through its Sustainable Technologies Evaluation Program (STEP)) <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – may not be of significant value to developers 	
(5) Recognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – offers awards and recognition for achieving sustainable designs 	<p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – flexible and customizable – could provide shared marketing opportunities by the City and developers – can be low cost <p>Cons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – may not have significant value to developers – may require a significant effort by the City 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Financial awards and social media promotion by the City were most preferred types of recognition
(6) Mandatory Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sustainability requirements are simply mandated through policy or regulatory means for new buildings or rezoning applications 	<p>Pros:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – may have lower costs and can provide opportunities for major changes – penalties for certain activities can 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Support of financial penalties for developments which do not meet the minimum

Page 21

Type of Incentive / Implementation Measure	Description	Pros and Cons	External Stakeholder Feedback
	(e.g. a green roof by-law) – By-laws are put in place that result in disincentives for certain activities that support metrics implementation	incentivize use of metrics to ensure those activities are avoided, Cons: – may not be permitted by legislation – Requires resources for enforcement – Could be viewed as a potential disincentive to build in Richmond Hill	sustainability requirements/ impose restrictions on activities were polarized among the stakeholder survey responses

Key Recommendations Respecting Incentives

There are a number of key factors that informed the selection of an incentive program. These key factors included consideration of the following:

- Reflecting municipal goals, strategies and plans related to sustainable development;
- Alignment of programs across multiple municipalities to simplify and allow for cost sharing opportunities;
- Stakeholder preference for financial and non-financial programs;
- Resolving historical performance issues to improve metric uptake; and
- Reasonable costs, where funding for the program is possible within the City’s budget

Based on these key factors, it is recommended that the City consider a multi-pronged approach to incentives and pursue the following initiatives to be tailored to the Sustainability Metrics:

1) Financial Incentives Initiative

This initiative can help to achieve higher point scores and/or incentivize the use of specific metrics that support specific City priorities such as the achievement of its Greenhouse Gas reduction target, and can potentially be funded through municipal revenue streams. The specific type of financial incentives, including monetary benefits, and potential sources of revenue have not been set out at this time. This level of detail would need to be explored further and reported back to Council.

Page 22

Accordingly, City Staff are recommending that financial incentives in the form of fee waivers or rebates, grants and loans be further investigated.

2) Awards and Recognition

This initiative involves the development of an awards program that would be offered in recognition for achieving requirements. This type of incentive may be of low cost to the City relative to other types of financial incentives, and has the advantage of also serving as promotional opportunities for both the City and the qualifying applicant. In addition, this type of incentive can be considered in addition to, or in combination with, other incentives as determined by the City. Generally, as a low cost alternative, an awards and recognition initiative would also provide assurance that new developments are meeting the City's sustainability targets set out in the metrics tool. City Staff are recommending that this initiative be explored further to determine whether it could be developed in partnership with the partner municipalities and/or combined with other existing awards (i.e. BILD, CaGBC, etc.)

3) Capacity Building

This initiative involves partnering with industry professionals to increase capacity building by providing access to subject matter experts and training resources related to sustainability, creating and improving guidance resources and reference materials, and through the delivery of education and training events. Generally, this initiative would offer the advantage of being low in cost to the City and the applicant and would help to remove select barriers to more sustainable design, however when viewed alone, this initiative may not be of sufficient benefit to the developer to achieve significant results. Despite this, City Staff believe that capacity building is necessary and helps to address barriers to the adoption of sustainable development. Accordingly, Staff are recommending that this initiative be explored further and reported back to Council.

Consideration of a Green Roof By-law and other Regulatory Tools

The update project also explored the plausibility of establishing a Green Roof By-law and program to mandate the installation of green roofs and cool roofs within the City. These roofs can help mitigate the effects of the urban heat island, reduce energy costs for development, capture stormwater runoff, improve air quality, and create habitat for pollinators, birds and other wildlife. Through the update project, the consultant recommended that Richmond Hill model a green roof initiative after the City of Toronto's Green Roof program (i.e. City of Toronto's Eco-Roof Incentive) which sets out a graduated requirement for green roofs for new development, or additions to buildings exceeding 2,000 square metres in gross floor area. The requirement ranges from 20-60% of the available roof space of a building to include a green roof or a cool roof. The City of Toronto also provides monetary grants as an incentive to support the installation of green roofs, which generally amount to up to \$100 per square metre of installed green roof, and up to \$2-5 per square metre of installed cool roof with a new membrane.

Page 23

City Staff explored whether a similar initiative could be implemented in Richmond Hill, and under what authority the City could mandate requirements for green roofs. Through that review, Staff found that presently there is no mechanism in which requirements for green roofs can be mandated throughout the City as applicable law under the building code. In addition, Provincial staff have advised that changes to the building code would be required to enable municipalities (other than the City of Toronto) within the Greater Toronto Area to pass an enforceable Green Roof By-law. The City of Toronto is an exception as it is also governed by its own legislation (The City of Toronto Act, 2006). Accordingly, Staff are not recommending that the City proceed with a Green Roof By-law initiative at this time.

The Consultant's report also noted that there are opportunities through the use of municipal by-laws that are seen as disincentives to measures that are considered unsustainable, for example, anti-idling by-laws that would penalize proponents of Drive-thru establishments. These punitive tools alone do not create greater sustainability unless the fines are so high that they truly discourage bad performance and/or fines are redirected towards the implementation of other sustainable measures to offset their bad performance. At this time, Staff are not recommending using these punitive tools, but would rather rely on the pro-sustainable measures provided in the Metrics tool.

Stakeholder Feedback and Response:

The feedback received from the development industry on the proposed updates to the Sustainability Metrics formed a key input to the update. As noted earlier, stakeholder engagement took place at various intervals of the project and included proponents of development with development experience in the City, and members of the Building Industry and Land Development association. Overall, the project update was well received; however, a number of comments were provided by BILD.

The following section outlines the main comments and themes on the recommended updates which were received on December 2, 2020 during a meeting among members of BILD and staff from the four partner municipalities and via a follow-up letter received from BILD dated December 11, 2020 (refer to Appendix 5). A summary of the key themes are set out below along with responses from City Staff. It should be noted that on December 18, 2020, City Staff met with representatives of BILD regarding their comments. Staff discussed the comments and generally provided the responses noted below. At the conclusion of the meeting, it was agreed that staff from the City, as well as the partner municipalities, continue to meet with BILD prior to finalizing the Updated Sustainability Metrics and its associated Guide Book to ensure that the Metrics are clear, measurable and implementable.

Comment Theme: Effectiveness of the Sustainability Metrics

The City's Sustainability Metrics have been successfully implemented over the last six years. Based on the City's annual monitoring of the tool, we are able to confirm that all site plan and subdivision development applications that were received after 2013, have achieved or exceeded the minimum point thresholds. The completion of the Metrics tool

Page 24

provide City Staff with a clear understanding of the efforts the developer has taken to ensure that sustainable development measures have been put in place. These measures include elements such as bicycle parking beyond minimum zoning requirements to facilitate active transportation, surface parking with low impact development elements such as bio swales to manage storm water and trees to minimize the heat island effect, and green roof to conserve energy and reduce storm water run-off.

Moving forward with the update to the Metrics aligns with Council's recent adoption of the City's Climate Change Action Framework, which will guide the City in addressing and combating climate change. Through the update to the metrics presented herein, the City is able to augment the usefulness and effectiveness of the tool by, among other matters, providing more choice and flexibility through the introduction of new metrics, addressing changes in provincial policies and other industry best practices, and by providing clarity on the intent of each metric. While applicants are required to ensure their Site Plan or Plan of Subdivision application meets the City's minimum threshold score in order to receive servicing allocation, applicants have the freedom to choose which metrics they wish to pursue based on their individual development aspirations and site context.

It is noted that City Staff are in agreement with BILD's comments which acknowledge that the metrics provide a mutually beneficial outcome for both the City and applicants. For the City, this is most evident in the positive social, environmental and economic benefits sustainable development provides and the improvements to the quality of life for Richmond Hill residents. For applicant's, the benefits of sustainable design are translated onto the development site by helping to make the development more resilient and, in some cases, more cost efficient over the long term.

Comment Theme: Implementation

Through the stakeholder consultation, City Staff heard that there may be some confusion respecting the role and implementation of the Sustainability Metrics tool, and whether the targets set out in the tool are mandatory. Of particular note was that some of the proposed metrics include requirements that go above and beyond the minimum set out under the Building Code. City Staff are aware that some metrics do in fact surpass the minimum requirements set out under the Building Code. By going beyond the requirements of the Building Code, further sustainability and resilience can be achieved. Notwithstanding this, applicants are free to choose which metrics they wish to pursue, and in no way are applicants mandated to implement specific metric requirements if they do not choose to apply that metric within their development proposal. Applicants are only obligated to ensure that they achieve a minimum sustainability threshold score in order to be approved by Council and receive water and wastewater servicing allocation. Through the building and other development permit approval processes, applicants are then required to ensure that the development proposal implements the sustainable measures as described in their approved conditions of site plan and/or subdivision agreement.

Page 25

With respect to the development application review process, City Staff have worked internally to establish a process whereby metrics are reviewed by City Staff with corresponding expertise in the subject matter covered by the metric as part of the normal application review process. For example, submissions which pursue the cultural heritage resources targets under the sustainability metrics tool are to be reviewed and evaluated by Heritage Planning Staff with subject matter expertise in heritage planning. Generally, this has not had negative effects on the processing of development applications.

With respect to providing examples for builders to identify how to best utilize the metrics on the ground, through the update the project team has attempted to outline resources that aim to help applicants with implementation and documenting compliance. The latest refinements to the guidebook and metric targets are reflected in Appendix 1 to this staff report, which have addressed stakeholder feedback since the draft metrics report was prepared by the consultant in May 2020. In addition, City Staff are open to the prospect of establishing a working group with members of the development industry with an objective to further refine the metrics and address the comments in an effort to assist applicants with any challenges that may be experienced during implementation.

Comment Theme: Affordability

Staff note that to address housing affordability, the City is currently in the process of undertaking an affordable housing strategy. Through that work, the City is looking at ways in which to address affordable housing needs. This Affordable Housing Strategy will be brought forward for Council's consideration in Q2 2022.

With respect to affordability in general, as noted above the City may consider the use of financial incentives, to assist with the cost of implementing the Metrics. Staff recognize that that incentives can provide a benefit and have a positive effect on the uptake of the metrics, as noted above, and may serve to partially offset some of the concerns raised respecting affordability. Notwithstanding these comments around the Metrics adding to the cost of development, staff are aware that many of today's homebuyers are indeed seeking greater sustainability features and such features can actually assist builders in their marketing efforts. Further to this, sustainability metrics that reduce operating costs and maintenance can save homeowners money and hence any premium in purchasing price can be considered worthwhile.

Financial/Staffing/Other Implications:

Phase 1 and 2 of the Sustainability Metrics Update Project was partially funded via a \$50,000 grant provided by the Municipalities for Climate Innovation Program (MCIP) and administered by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM). Additionally, the Cities of Brampton, Vaughan and Markham collectively contributed \$25,000 towards this initiative.

Page 26

Future incentive programs and measures that are implemented may require additional staffing resources and additional monetary funding to finance the recommended multi-pronged approach to incentive initiatives.

Relationship to the Strategic Plan:

The work undertaken on the Sustainability Metrics Update Project helps to achieve the four goals of the City's Strategic Plan, *A Plan for People, A Plan for Change* as follows:

Stronger Connections in Richmond Hill:

The updates to the metrics will encourage stronger connections by improving connections in the environment and strengthening physical connections in the community. Stronger connections are also being fostered through this project with the partner municipalities, governmental agencies, and the development industry through ongoing collaboration.

Better Choice in Richmond Hill:

The updates to the program will enhance access to transit facilities and pedestrian and cycling facilities, along with improving accessibility in the built environment.

A More Vibrant Richmond Hill:

The updates to the program will promote a more vibrant Richmond Hill by looking to the future and guiding change towards a more sustainable community. The Update Project initiates change through leadership and innovation in continuing to promote sustainability as part of the planning process through research and best practices.

Wise Management of Resources:

The updates to the program will promote wise management of resources in Richmond Hill by encouraging energy efficient buildings, renewable energy, water conservation, naturalization and planting, and local food production.

Next Steps:

Following Council's approval in-principle, staff recommend that through further discussion with BILD, the new suite of metrics be further clarified. The latest refinements to the guidebook and metric targets are reflected in Appendix 1 to this staff report which have addressed stakeholder feedback since the metrics report was prepared by the consultant in May 2020. Once the industry comments have generally been addressed, City Staff will need to take some time to update the City's online webform to host the updated Metrics, and to give time for the development industry to prepare to apply the updated system. Until that time, Staff recommend that applicants continue to utilize the 2014 iteration of the tool, and will inform users of when updates to the webform have occurred and are to be applied to new development applications.

Page 27

With respect to incentive programs, City Staff are recommending that Council direct Staff to consider a three-pronged approach and that Staff explore these initiatives in greater detail and report to Council once specific details and a work program have been established.

Conclusion:

The Sustainability Metrics Update Project aims to increase uptake of sustainable development in the City and improve the effectiveness of the tool. The recommended changes propose to revise existing metrics and add new metrics with corresponding changes to the City's threshold scoring. In addition, the project update recommends a Key Performance Indicator target whereby 30% of applications in process achieve a Sustainability Metrics overall score within the proposed "Silver" or "Gold" threshold performance levels each year. To that end, this report recommends that the City explore opportunities for the provision of incentives to increase uptake of the tool, and recommends the use of financial incentives, the creation of an Awards & Recognition Program, and provide capacity building options to staff and development proponents to aid in this objective. Overall, the updates proposed herein represent a comprehensive update to the City's sustainability metrics that align with the City's corporate priorities that support sustainable development. These priorities include the City's Strategic Plan, Official Plan, Environment Strategy, Corporate Energy Plan, Pedestrian and Cycling Master Plan, the Urban Forest Management Plan, and emerging initiatives that are currently underway such as the Community Energy and Emissions Plan. Collectively, these documents demonstrate the City's commitment to addressing climate change and promoting sustainable development.

Attachments:

The following attached documents may include scanned images of appendixes, maps and photographs. If you require an alternative format please call contact person listed in this document.

- Appendix 1: Phase 1 Final Report: Sustainability Metrics Update
- Appendix 2: Phase 2 Final Report: Sustainable Development Implementation Measures Report
- Appendix 3: Recommended Threshold Scores for Site Plans and Draft Plans of Subdivision
- Appendix 4: Morrison Hershfield Letter RE: Proposed Corporate Key Performance Indicator Target
- Appendix 5: Correspondence from Building Industry and Land Development Association dated December 11, 2020

Page 28

Report Approval Details

Document Title:	SRPI.21.019 - Sustainability Metrics Update Project.docx
Attachments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Appendix 1_Phase 1_UpdatedMetrics.pdf- Appendix 2_Phase 2_ImplementationMeasures.pdf- Appendix 3_Recommended Threshold Scores.pdf- Appendix 4_MH KPI letter 20201208.pdf- Appendix 5_BILD Letter_Dec2020.pdf
Final Approval Date:	Jan 7, 2021

This report and all of its attachments were approved and signed as outlined below:

Patrick Lee - Jan 5, 2021 - 3:39 PM

Task assigned to Kelvin Kwan was completed by delegate Paolo Masaro

Paolo Masaro on behalf of Kelvin Kwan - Jan 6, 2021 - 10:29 AM

MaryAnne Dempster - Jan 7, 2021 - 2:15 PM