

Summer 2011 Engagement Report myPG OCP Review – *OCP Designing the Outcome*

Overview

In February 2010, Council approved an OCP Amendment Consultation Checklist which detailed who would be consulted throughout the OCP review process, by what methods, and how often consultation would occur. As a result, three stages of the public consultation have been completed. Summer 2010 consultation results were provided to Council on September 13th, 2010, and fall 2010 consultation results were provided to Council on November 15, 2010. A third round of public consultation occurred for two months following the June 2011 Committee of the Whole consideration of the draft OCP. Stakeholders were notified of the opportunity for comment, and a general public announcement was issued requesting written comments on the draft. Just as with the previous two rounds of consultation, the request for comment came with an offer to meet with any group that expresses an interest in the OCP. The Draft document was made available at city hall and at both public library branches in hard copy or to utilize the library computers to view it online and provide comments.

Results

1. *On-request Meetings:*

On-request meetings were made available again as the uptake of this style of meeting had been popular in the previous two public engagement periods. A total of 12 stakeholder organization meetings were held of which 159 individuals attended. These meetings consisted of presentations either of a general nature or on a specific topic requested by the groups and organizations, and a feedback period.

2. *Public Open House:*

A public open house meeting took place on July 27th 2011 in the afternoon and again in the evening to provide another avenue for the community to learn about the OCP and provide their feedback. Although this was widely advertised through both traditional means and social media, there was minimal involvement with 21 individuals in attendance. This smaller turnout did provide an excellent opportunity to have more detailed discussions regarding their feedback with those who attended.

3. *Individual submissions:*

A total of 20 individual responses were received, 17 on-line and 3 by correspondence. The limited number of respondents meant that information about them is necessarily general:

- The ages of the individual respondents varied from the 26-31 range to 55-64 range, with none dominating.
- Of 18 people who identified their gender, 12 were female and 6 male.

- Respondents live in a variety of neighbourhoods across much of the city.

Most people reviewed the Draft OCP with a particular interest in mind, and interests spanned the breadth of the OCP's content: no areas of focus were apparent among the respondents. With few exceptions, respondents were very positive about the draft. A number of respondents mentioned growth management, and those who did supported the policy or suggested a more aggressive stance. Balancing this were general concerns from some that the document may not support the economy as much as possible. Many other sections of the document were supported, notably energy, climate, housing, and heritage policy.

4. *Submissions from organizations:*

In addition, some organizations provided specific comments. Northern Health provided in-depth comments, in particular requesting a greater emphasis on air quality, attention to Prince George as a Winter City, and suggesting specific improvements to policy on a range of other topics. L&M Engineering identified some questions that helped guide enhancements in a number of areas. Canadian Home Builders Association – Northern BC responded following a presentation given at their request. They commended the City for softening the draft policy in response to concerns about growth management in neighbourhood plan areas, suggested more flexible and a more positive tone, and encouraged the City to minimize red tape and facilitate development as much as possible.

5. *Peer Review:*

In addition to the above-mentioned input, staff felt it appropriate and necessary to include a peer-review of the draft Official Community Plan. The peer review involved two local planning consulting firms where qualified professionals reviewed and provided comment on improvements to the end-user of the Plan. From this input, staff was able to adjust the Plan to provide an easier to read format and provide references to other relevant sections to guide the reader to other applicable objectives and policies.

6. *Overall :*

Comments on the draft were generally balanced overall. Many specific comments provided useful direction for draft revisions, and staff extends their appreciation for the time and effort taken by Prince George citizens and stakeholders to help improve the draft plan.