

*Transfer of Development Credits (TDCs) in Alberta:  
An Information Session and Application Workshop  
August 13-14, 2008, Red Deer County, Alberta*

Co-hosted by Red Deer County and the Miistakis Institute

**SUMMARY OF THE BREAK OUT GROUP FEEDBACK**

Report summary prepared by the Miistakis Institute



MIISTAKIS  
INSTITUTE

September 2008

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SENDING AREAS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
What makes a good sending area? .....	4
Who would you involve in determining sending sites? How would you involve them? .....	6
What reports, studies, etc. would you need to define sending areas? .....	8
Who would hold/manage the deed-restriction devices (e.g., conservation easements) on sending area parcels? .....	9
<b>RECEIVING AREAS .....</b>	<b>11</b>
What makes a good receiving area? .....	11
Who would you involve in determining receiving sites? How would you involve them? .....	13
What reports, studies, etc. would you need to define receiving areas? .....	15
How would you determine if there is a market for developments in the receiving area? .....	16
<b>CREDIT TRANSFER SYSTEMS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
What factors would affect a 'Sending' area landowner's willingness to offer credits for sale and/or accept an offer to purchase them? .....	17
What factors would affect a 'Receiving' area landowner's willingness to buy credits offered for sale? .....	19
How would you determine the number of credits/acre available in the 'Sending' area? .....	20
How would determine the number of credits needed to add additional building density in the 'Receiving' area? .....	21
Who would you involve in designing your credit transfer system? How would you involve them? .....	22
<b>BONUS QUESTIONS .....</b>	<b>24</b>
Would you delineate sending/receiving areas on the map, or create a list of criteria applicable to any parcel? Share your reasons/thinking .....	24
Should sending / receiving area opportunities be available to the whole municipality or only selected parts? .....	24
How could the province support municipalities in the task of defining sending and receiving areas? (Especially within the context of the <i>Draft Land-use Framework</i> .) .....	25
Could sending areas and receiving areas be located in different municipalities? .....	25
What non-financial incentives could be made available to receiving area developers? .....	26
What other 'bonusing' options could be used (i.e., to reduce the number of credits needed, yet still receive additional development density)? .....	26

## **Introduction**

---

On August 13 and 14, 2008, Red Deer County and the Miistakis Institute co-hosted a Transfer of Development Credits workshop at the Red Deer County offices entitled, *Transfer of Development Credits (TDCs) in Alberta: An Information Session and Application Workshop*. The first day was devoted to presentations about an overview of Transfer of Development Credits, the legal dimensions of the tool, American case studies, and Alberta efforts thus far.

The second day was broken into three workshop sessions, focused on Sending Areas, Receiving Areas, and Credit Transfer Systems. For each session, participants were broken into groups to discuss, and report back on, questions related to each topic. This document summarizes the breakout group feedback on those questions.

## SENDING AREAS

---

### What makes a good sending area?

- **Think about:**
  - **important agricultural characteristics**
  - **agricultural communities**
  - **zoning**
  - **important environmental features**
  - **ecological processes (water cycle, carbon cycle, etc.)**
  - **community acceptability**

### Group A

- rank preservation goals
- confirm desired growth objectives, plan needed, MDP
- set limits on amount and boundary of credits
- tracking system/integrity crucial
- inter-municipal cooperation regulated
- intergovernmental communication plan

### Group B

- finest agricultural land
- minimum parcel size, careful not to designate all of it
- class 1 and 2 soils
- rare ecosystems
- significant wetlands, riparian corridors, wildlife corridors
- areas of ecological significance
- community acceptability
- already there are too many people so no more needed
- the goal is hard to determine, not yet set

### Group C

- rare species/ecological communities (species at risk)
- wetlands
- prime agriculture (native grasslands)
- historical resources
- hazard lands (escarpment, landslides, floodplain)
- ESA's
- Viewsheds
- Rare plant communities
- Large contiguous parties
- Wildlife corridors

### Group D

- assets, such as preservation of food production sites for future generations
- something/areas of value and worth protecting
- areas of community value, that's wide open, environment, ecological
- historical, designated or undesignated

- watersheds, protection of resources such as water courses and drainage patterns, diversions
- wildlife corridors
- remember keep what need and transfer/sell rest , if desired to do that

#### Group E

- environmental areas withing or on agricultural land
- CFO's and setback area
- Soil quality
- Inventory
  - o Narrow down to each quarter
- preserving the right to farm with minimal interruption
- backs up sending areas
- wetlands
- riparian zones
- creeks
- streams
- forests
- priorities, where are they, what value does the community value primarily
- watershed areas
- native grasslands
- heritage sites
- cultural sites
- archaeological sites
- Buffer zones or green belts
  - o areas make good sending areas as agreed between rural and urban municipalities

#### Group F

- watersheds
- riparian areas vs. wetlands
- clarity around the current constraints, i.e. class 1 wetlands
- use of public consultation to assist in clarifying sending areas, landowner involvement
- undevelopable area under the MGA, 'environmental reserve'
- natural grasslands, reservation, natural fescue
- zoning, not so much , zoning can be changed
- wildlife area habitat
- Agricultural characteristics, good soils close to local market, class 1?

#### Group G

- connectivity of the conservation area to be a larger conservation zone
- absorption needs to match the sending capacity
- quality of soils by class
- quality of ecological aspects, habitats
- it's the interaction of these that counts
- GIS mapping and other mapping with help clarify sending and receiving areas
- Areas with growth pressure that threatens to fragment the land

#### Group H

- virgin grassland
- wildlife habitat
- watersheds
- wetlands
- riparian areas
- small towns
- wildlife corridors
- soils classes

## **Who would you involve in determining sending sites? How would you involve them?**

### Group A

- inclusive public engagement and consultation
- goal consensus
- need a public consultation policy
- involve other local gov't, MCA, key stakeholders

### Group B

- has to match goals of municipality: council
- process to involve public, they need to buy in
- set up a committee, steering or stakeholder
- public open houses, public hearings,
- newspaper
- educational workshop

### Group C

- ducks unlimited
- NCC
- Alberta Heritage Data Centre
- AB floodplain mapping
- ESA studies (municipal)
- Community (public input)
- McHarrigan biophysical inventories
- Land owner/local interest groups

### Group D

- developers, provide them an area that can be developed as well as areas "off limits", ie, preserved for agriculture
  - municipalities
  - the people, landowners, etc
  - farming community, the wheat board, balance prices across Canada
  - historical groups
  - community associations
  - NGO's
  - Land Trusts
  - Experts
- How

- stakeholder meeting
- open houses
- publications, etc

#### Group E

- could have an open house
- public stakeholders
- urban municipalities
- bankers
- planners
- accountants
- focus groups
- agricultural societies
- developers
- farmers
- provincial government
  - o buffer area? Crown land issues?

#### How?

- start with community vision, get inventory of what people want
- then go one on one
- linking people from sending areas/receiving areas
- maps
- contacts
- opportunity to link acreage owners with farmers

#### Group F

- landowners, city and rural
- level of scientific expertise, experts in the field, academia
- public consultation
- interest groups, NGO i.e. Ducks Unlimited
- realtors and financial organizations
- utility providers

#### Group G

- the municipality needs to be able to bring a mostly complete plan to the public
- land trust groups
- the province, to help fund easement maintenance
- the heritage fund people to help with above
- need to involve utilities providers who will need to access or use lands in TDC's
- natural resource access and development cannot be overridden by easements
- this is not feasible, so you need to involve resource extraction industries

#### Group H

- land owners
  - o farmers
  - o ranchers
  - o rural residents

- city
- ducks unlimited
- developers
- chamber of commerce
- experts, academics

### **What reports, studies, etc. would you need to define sending areas?**

#### Group A

- 3 pillars approach
- intra-regional scope

#### Group B

- environmentally significant areas
- soils classes
- population of area
- identified growth region
- trends
- agricultural types
- detailed inventory of historical, riparian activity, etc
- feasibility stud for development potential

#### Group C

- conservation targets setting
- visual preference survey
- environmental significant area studies
- value ranking (wildlife corridors ranked above agricultural lands)
- community values assessment
- rare species hotspots dataset
- viewshed analysis
- ASP
- Policy inventory
- Education campaigns

#### Group D

- an annexation strategies/studies
- maps of prime farm land w/ MD jurisdiction
- further development of development nodes/clusters
  - is this a good idea, problems w/ infrastructure etc
  - this is applicable to receiving areas as well
- environmental/ecological protections studies
  - including land management to protect groundwater
- topographical and water body ID maps
- historical reports
- market studies and trends

#### Group E

- inventories
  - o agricultural viability
  - o neighbourhood studies
  - o heritage/historical
  - o environmentally significant areas
  - o cultural
- other provincial studies
  - o wetlands
  - o water for life
  - o species at risk
- oil and gas industry studies
- forestry industry studies
- interest groups
  - o ducks unlimited
  - o nature conservancy of Canada
  - o fish and game

#### Group F

- soil reports
- agricultural viability studies
- growth studies
- quantifiable, independently identified
- watersheds, endangered species (multiSAR)
- historical resources, inventories
- long range plans
- ancient easements, hidden issues
- oil and gas locations
- economic model

#### Group G

- TUC studies
- Soil, mineral, aggregates studies
- The usual planning documents, growth studies

#### Group H

- soil classification
- historic and scientific
  - o ownership
  - o utility corridors
  - o mines
  - o oil and gas
  - o water
- market trends

**Who would hold/manage the deed-restriction devices (e.g., conservation easements) on sending area parcels?**

### Group A

- NGO's
- Provincial agency
- municipality

### Group B

Future cannot be known

If the goals change

- municipality/county
- third party?
- Land trust
- Held by choice of whomever

County must be involved

### Group C

- land trust, there are 11 in alberta
- environmental reserve (parks man)
- municipal land trust and bank
- local naturalist groups
- lobby provincial government to allow for agricultural easement

### Group D

- municipalities/counties
- land trusts
- province, as far as putting legalities in place
- NGO's such as NCC
- Experts in various fields, specialists

It should be a "body" that has ability/power to protect long into future and not just one group but rather a number of agencies to create a checks and balance situation, avoidance of single agenda.

### Group E

Hold

- municipality
- land trust
- Alberta Land Trust Alliance
- Provincial government umbrella

Manage/Collaborative Effort

- province
- land trust groups
- municipalities
  - o overseeing agriculture but not super management
- environmental groups
- neighbourhood

Not just about the land its about the relationships

### Group F

- municipality
- land owners
- conservation organizations (accredited)
- possibly county/municipality be the major holders, land trust
- TDR admin, group with deed restrictions filed with agency

### Group G

### Group H

- landowners
- county or municipalities
- conservation agencies
- work with province?

## **RECEIVING AREAS**

---

### **What makes a good receiving area?**

- **Think about:**
  - **available infrastructure**
  - **types of development**
  - **proximity to other land uses**
  - **new or existing areas**
  - **community acceptability**
  - **size**

### Group A

- feasibility
  - strategic, staged, prioritized
- transparent approval process, certainty

### Group B

- water, proper servicing
- around existing development
- fill in or expand existing hamlets
- small farming parcels
- cluster development on poor quality soils
- schools, transportation corridors
- areas of lower populations
- potential for work, commute must be reasonable
- appeal: work, mountains, environment for raising families
- options: lifestyles, acreage, towns, hamlets, affordability

### Group C

- somewhere near and urbanized area ( around existing hamlets)
- publicly acceptable

- disturbed areas
- near major roadways
- areas needing seniors and affordable housing
- nodes of development
- proximity to amenities
- available water/ suitable soils
- minimal ecological impact
- concentrated comprehensive communities

#### Group D

- already developed land/serviced areas
- lands that are no conducive for farming/ranching
- areas of community agreeance
- areas near transportation corridors
- attractive areas/aesthetic
- near schools, hospitals
- where there are places to work

#### Group E

- available infrastructure
  - o joint areas with urban areas
  - o existing infrastructure
  - o major transportation routes
  - o serviceable area
- types of development
  - o residential
  - o commercial
  - o industrial
- proximity to other land uses
- new or existing areas
  - o limit the size
- community acceptability
  - o important
- size
  - o work with economics
  - o gather an inventory first

#### Group F

- transportation corridors
- serviceability
- infrastructure availability
- community acceptability, particularly with respect to adjacent density
- concept of urban concentration around hamlets, etc, focused around smaller communities who have facilities to support growth
- community design, walkable communities town centre, a willingness and desire of the community to demand
- annexation boundary, small towns and hamlets

- development potential of area
- market demand

#### Group G

- depends on strategic plan
- transportation corridors
- simple infilling, doesn't have to be new development
- industrial receiving area as option, big companies want to buy their way in so why not charge them
- site specific, could be large lot, compact almost anything

#### Group H

- small towns and hamlets
- annexation
- development and market demand
- balance of zones

### **Who would you involve in determining receiving sites? How would you involve them?**

#### Group A

- owners
- key stakeholders, agencies
- public
- elected and appointed officials
- potentially intra-regional/municipal

#### Group B

- development community
- local community
- school board
- fire department
- MD, roads
- Planning, staffs
- Neighbouring communities

#### Group C

- public, open house consultation
- developers, same as above
- utilities, oil and gas
- provincial government
- HGO's
- Land Trusts
- Municipalities, for negotiations
- Department of transportation
- HOA/ legal interest groups
- Real estate community

#### Group D

- those in the area/community
- developers
- farming/tanching organizations
  - o compatibility
  - o rural/urban interface
- real estate companies
- municipalities(including adjacent)
- land trusts

#### Group E

##### Who

- gather the stakeholders
  - o developers
  - o bankers
  - o politicians
  - o planners
  - o municipalities
  - o neighbours

##### How

- ASP's
  - o Have these first then introduce TDU's
- invites
- media
- using visuals (slide shows, cartoons, 3D models)
  - o keep it simple
- ice cream socials and family events

#### Group F

- local land owner, community, community groups
- bordering municipalities
  - o infrastructure needs, recreational facilities
- transportation agencies, i.e. ministry of transportation, national, possibly railroads
- infrastructure companies
  - o power, cable, etc, availability vs. existing, how could this be serviced
- through normal planning
- via public hearings

#### Group G

- developers
- planners
- etc

#### Group H

- land owners
- bordering municipalities
- recreation

- Alberta transportation
- Rails
- Utility
- Public hearings (How)

### **What reports, studies, etc. would you need to define receiving areas?**

#### Group A

- social capacity

#### Group B

Depends on goals

- community plans and services
- kinds of housing, \$
- water studies
- overall infrastructure, traffic impact
- what kind of people, demographics
- hospitals, schools
- ASP
- Work or close proximity to work

#### Group C

- ASP's
- Environmental assessments
- Built out scenario
- Demographic analysis
- Employment/economic profile
- Traffic impact assessment
- Servicing strategy
- Policy frameworks (including surrounding communities)
- Carrying capacity analysts

#### Group D

- impact assessments
  - o carrying capacity
- soil/geotechnical information
- traffic studies
- water reports/availability
- servicing (water/sewage) investigation

#### Group E

- commercial/residential market study
- involve developers
  - o where do they see opportunity
- land qualifications
- impact studies
  - o schools, hospitals, etc

- environmental studies
- wildlife studies
- inventory of natural features for whole area
- natural resource informal
- aquifer information

#### Group F

- typical planning reports
  - o where are you getting power, water, infrastructure, etc
- population forecast for the area, demand, job availability
- intermunicipal agreements, particularly with adjoining municipality

#### Group G

- plan
- asp which indicates densities, may need ot market it, give it a name
- growth studies
- phasing strategy as part of ASP
- letters of credit

#### Group H

- Population report
- Water and watersheds, geotechnical
- Municipal agreement
- Joint ventures

### **How would you determine if there is a market for developments in the receiving area?**

#### Group A

- success models
- survey, UDI

#### Group B

- need the above to attract residents
- real estate industry, applications for subdivision
- market treands
- economic health of area
- ask the public, would you live here
- appeal

#### Group C

- development pressure
- downzoning, creating a market

#### Group D

- demographic analysis
- with TDC we are creating a market
- speaking with major inductrial employers

- vacancy rates, are there lots of few
- increased value of housing/affordability
- strategic planning documents/economic development
- an assessment of the market
- interjurisdictional discussions
- delineate only receiving parcels as per MDP, all rest in essence is sending
- allow entire MD, can't let select few

#### Group E

- market studies
- real estate trends
- developer/business plans
- growth projection info

#### Group F

- RFP, request for proposal
- Generally provide a MDP of a new area or community, and basic general service provider
  - o See who wants to do what send out for RFP, who wants what, where, how much and what's your offer
- Markey survey
- Proximity to major centers
- Maybe issue of scale
  - o Housing developments vs. couple of lots

#### Group G

- growth study

#### Group H

- master plan of market
- complete new development
  - o roads and infrastructure
  - o schools and community

### **CREDIT TRANSFER SYSTEMS**

---

**What factors would affect a 'Sending' area landowner's willingness to offer credits for sale and/or accept an offer to purchase them?**

#### Group A

- efficacy of process
- after scenario opportunities/ limitations
- buyer/seller motives
- benefits that accrue w/ TDC bought or sold
  - o non monetary

#### Group B

- future plans

- monetary: fair value
- peace of mind, agriculture forever
- confidence in system
- awareness of program education
- size of community that would be viable

### Group C

#### Monetary

- desire to keep farm withing family
- financial gain
- tax credit, income tax, municipal taxes

#### Conservation

- desire to preserve land
- ease to connect with sellers
- desire to protect agricultural land and rural values/character

- long term effect on future use of land, ie conservation easement

### Group D

- financial gain
- true desire to protect
- desire to keep land in natural state
- a rancher may want to sell his farm to retire on credits but sell to someone who would continue farming
- tax implications, provincial income tax, municipal, capital gains
- desire to keep agricultural pursuits in an area
- negative impact on land after transfer, long term effects after sale of credits

### Group E

- moral value vs. financial need
- trust of system
- credit value
- potential for future subdivisions
- bonus for environmental easements as well as agricultural easements on the quarter section
- make the desired outcome easier
- market demand
- "area" credits can be sold
- understanding of the system
- restrictions that would apply to the landowners holdings
- could tax credits work
- culturally acceptable or public respect and recognition

### Group F

- price, cash flow need, retirement program, profitability
- philosophical approach to preservation of land
- public pressure peer
- if it is easy, there would be greater buy in, process simplified

- if the result is visible
- fair system, flexibility
- recognition, legacy
- preservation of family lifestyle, values, passing the ranch down
- taxes, municipal tax break

#### Group G

- how much money they will make

#### Group H

- cash flow, profitability
- public pressure
- simplified process and results
- recognition, legacy
- keeping the existing lifestyle
- taxation issues'

### **What factors would affect a 'Receiving' area landowner's willingness to buy credits offered for sale?**

#### Group A

- value/supply
- efficacy of liquidation process
- portability and security of title
- benefits
- efficacy of process, time and cost
- cap on density w/ TDC or negotiable limit

#### Group B

- demand
- good planning document for receiving area
- cost of services that need to be put in place
- confidence
- compensation,\$
- realization that land is unsuitable for farming
- profit of development

#### Group C

- consider developer
- landowner working with developer
- market
- economic viability
- density provisions of LUB/zoning
- character of sending parcels
  - o environmental protection
  - o social gain
  - o watershed protection in catskills, NY

### Group D

- market, development potential
- is it economically viable, cost of credit
- density provisions in LUB, why buy credits if you don't need them

### Group E

- landowner\developer
- market demand
- financial rewards
- credits values
- incentives
  - o density bonus
- public recognition
  - o preserved times amount of agricultural land or environmental areas
- zoning restrictions
  - o must buy credits to go over and set a small number of lots per se

### Group F

- Profit for multiple sales
- Trust fund bursaries, to accumulate credits
- Philosophy believe in sustainability of community
- Easy factor, can it be trusted, value, simple math

### Group G

### Group H

- profit
- developers
- philosophical
- keep it simple
- development potential

## **How would you determine the number of credits/acre available in the 'Sending' area?**

### Group A

- evaluate capacity of area and build out potential in desired areas
- values affect benefits and borders
  - o rank priority
- mix of use would be required
  - o market based
- deviation option for the more desirable use/density
  - o social housing
  - o conservation
  - o heritage
  - o or no TDC needed where low cost housing provided

### Group B

- current regulations for sub-division
- last years market value
- minus current development
- it varies regarding goals
- public process, involvement
- fair across the board

### Group C

- carrying capacity as determining by what can be absorbed by receiving areas, matching of sending/receiving areas
- tied to goal/objective/ethic of TDC program
- determined whether to be based on per acre credit of development potential/density
- criteria system based on conservation features on site
- based on area structure plan

### Group D

- value of land preserving? Bonusing?
- What is the carrying capacity of receiving parcels, a comprehensive analysis is needed, how many credits are needed
- Determine whether credit is based on per acre or density potential
- s/b tied to goal

### Group E

- determine demand
  - o do a price demand survey, asking the farmer
- carrying capacity in the receiving areas
  - o end result desired, work backwards
- sending credits, based on acres
  - o receiving areas based on per structure or sq. footage
- may be different for commercial/industrial
- density would be a factor to bonus

### Group F

- certain block of continuous/contiguous acres, minimum parcel size
- productivity/sensitivity of land base, bonuses for environmental features

### Group G

### Group H

- balance
- bonuses

**How would determine the number of credits needed to add additional building density in the 'Receiving' area?**

### Group A

- capacity needed/evaluated against ultimate density or land use targets defined in an official plan proforma
- monitor and adjustment process needed for maintenance of program

#### Group B

- Water, sewer, wells, septic, other types of services
- Demand
- Not as many credits for building green

#### Group C

- tied to policy/goal/objective of the TDC program
- re-evaluation of credit system periodically
- based on growth needs, development and population pressures

#### Group D

- Tied to goal of TSD program
- Based on what development is expected/growth needs

#### Group E

- dependence on the community goals of what are the desired outcomes
- site specific
- per structure idea
- credit costs, speed of development desired
- market demand
- how many credits are available
- control specific sending areas targeted then move to a new area
- ask the public, involve stakeholders

#### Group F

- demand for development
- based on location and pressure

#### Group G

- need to determine a minimum base density
- current wealth is status quo but you can purchase credits to increase your wealth
- landowner will just develop whatever they can and not bother to go through the hassle/cost of buying more credits
- no first parcel out provision in the NGA

#### Group H

- balance

### **Who would you involve in designing your credit transfer system? How would you involve them?**

#### Group A

- key stakeholders/agencies

- elected officials
- local/regional courts
- GOA, land use framework
- Owners

#### How

- Focus groups
- Open house
- Outreach program
- Scenarios and strategies

#### Group B

- experts, using existing resources
- existing working systems

#### Group C

- council
- provincial government
- lawyers
- landowners
- public, advisory committee
- development community
- real estate industry
- academic community (think tank)

#### Group D

- provincial government to put in place ability to put program in
- MD's, ASP
- Lawyers
- Public, after determined for comments
- Developers
- Real estate
- landowners

#### Group E

- stakeholders
- farmers/ranchers
- developers
- general public
- interest groups
- municipalities
- planners
- industry
- politicians
- province
- financial experts/legal advisors
- researchers

Group F

Group G

Group H

- credit stays in credit area

## **BONUS QUESTIONS**

---

**Would you delineate sending/receiving areas on the map, or create a list of criteria applicable to any parcel? Share your reasons/thinking.**

Group A

Group B

Group C

- voluntary
  - o parcels willing to preserve farming between generation
- develop list of characteristics of value to community
- biophysical inventory
- voluntary based on established criteria
- receiving areas based on traditional planning and growth management principles

Group D

Group E

- you would need to do both
- need to recognize receiving areas for sure
- the sending areas in a county may need to be a list of criteria

Group F

Group G

Group H

**Should sending / receiving area opportunities be available to the whole municipality or only selected parts?**

Group A

Group B

Group C

Group D

Group E

- would want to restrict it at first, staging would be important

Group F

Group G

Group H

**How could the province support municipalities in the task of defining sending and receiving areas? (Especially within the context of the *Draft Land-use Framework*.)**

Group A

Group B

Group C

Group D

Group E

- to help create standards and criteria
  - o tax considerations to be an incentive
- land use framework could give some mapping that would help guide municipal decisions
- support for set up and maintenance of designated environmental areas

Group F

Group G

Group H

**Could sending areas and receiving areas be located in different municipalities ?**

Group A

Group B

Group C

Group D

Group E

- eventually
- also important to be reasonable

- proximity of each other which may cross municipal boundaries

Group F

Group G

Group H

**What non-financial incentives could be made available to receiving area developers?**

Group A

Group B

Group C

Group D

Group E

- public recognition
- density bonuses
- ease of the development process

Group F

Group G

Group H

**What other 'bonusing' options could be used (i.e., to reduce the number of credits needed, yet still receive additional development density)?**

- **affordable housing**
- **green technology**
- **non-residential development**
- **retirement or continuing care**

Group A

Group B

Group C

Group D

Group E

- all of the above
- community priorities could set this

- setting aside environment easement pathways
- soccer fields, ball diamonds

Group F

Group G

Group H