

OCP Workshop, Civic Centre

Oct 7 2010 9am-1pm

Growth Management Workshop

<u>Time</u>	<u>Item</u>
9:00	Welcome and Introduction
9:35	Community Goals and Growth Management
10:05	Growth Options Break-out Round 1
10:45	BREAK
11:00	Growth Options Break-out Round 2
11:45	LUNCH
11:55	Presentations, Preferences, and Discussion
12:45	Closing

Introduction

Participants were introduced to the workshop process, provided with information on the OCP process to date, and introduced to the four growth options.

General Starting Questions and Answers

At one time in urban planning (1970-80's) there was a disengagement of time related to growth. Why is there a return to more time-based planning rather than growth-based?

Reply: Some of the benefits I see of planning with a timescale is giving the benefit of using our limited resources and by prioritizing the limited resources we have.

There have been some rezonings that have been outside of the growth options mentioned, why aren't they included?

Reply: When we prepared these some of the applications had not been approved by council. Example. Golf Neighbourhood plan

Comparing centers versus corridors, which one would have the greater shift between the automobile/transit?

Reply: If you developed along corridors that will really help improve transit viability. Either or both will help. Options B and C lend themselves well to viable transit.

The descriptions of the options, if the base case is included and this hasn't worked in the past how does that make sense?

Reply: The direction in those last documents have been the same, by adding specific policy and actions will help implement this. The main difference between the options is the shift of growth. Options B and C will make it a bit more difficult for fringe development.

Do you have a map that shows number of houses or units per hectare? College Heights and Hart Hwy are relatively low dense, I am wondering with these nodes in the options, how are you going to cause these to development in an equitable manner or is the downtown going to remain dead?

Reply: No map today for the densities.

It shows the geography but can you explain residential, industrial, and commercial?

Reply: We focused on residential growth. In terms of commercial if you look at retail, typically retail will follow residential. We have looked at commercial capacity. There is a need of 47 acres of development. We have over and above the capacity that is needed.

For the industrial side there has been a very comprehensive analysis done and there is a need for growth in the airport light industrial plan area (64 hectares has been rezoned for this development)

Comment: In terms of base and option A, if we continue with either of these cases we would still continue to see growth.

Relating Community ICSP Goals with Growth Management

The table below lists the sustainability goals most relevant to growth management, and explores the relationship and related community concerns. In groups, workshop participants were asked to reflect and expand on three goals each. The final "comments" column reflects their feedback.

Goal	ICSP Goal Statement	Relationship to Growth Management	Community Concerns	Comments
Clear identity	Have a clear identity that the community can be proud of, with a strong downtown and connection to its rivers and natural surroundings.	Strong growth management will direct development close to downtown, supporting its renewal as the heart of the city. Concentrating growth in centres can help to enhance them and strengthen their unique character. Higher land values in older areas may support investment in heritage revitalization.	Downtown with a heartbeat A City I can be proud of (e.g. no potholes) Space for outdoor recreation equipment. Space for privacy Fit with neighbourhood character Protect and enhance heritage	Trees within neighbourhoods. Forested character is a part of our community. Natural features, rivers, hills, industry that is located downtown causes people not to go downtown. We already have a lot of pride, would like to see the phrasing that we BUILD on the pride that is already there.
Healthy and active	Be a community that encourages and supports health and wellness.	Concentrating growth in centres and along key corridors will make walking and cycling more viable ways of getting around.	Grow old in my own neighbourhood Easy access to parks and recreation	Be careful of what it looks like, safe sidewalks, not just planning for seniors and think of children as well - parks, recreation spaces, schools etc Transit wheelchair friendly – Accessibility – reducing barriers Open space and safety for kids to play in these denser areas Include programs like taxi savers
Clean air	Enjoy clean air.	With transit, walking and cycling are more attractive, per-capita use of vehicles can go down; smaller units also mean lower space heating emissions per person.	Make cycling, walking and transit good options Minimize traffic	Urban design for alternative transportation is an important aspect of this. Consider the dwellers will be taking more fumes from buses etc. Industrial zoning is quite important too Urban Forestry Programs – Idling Vehicle Emissions versus active transportation
Culturally Rich	Have a rich cultural life, with more events, facilities, education, and community involvement in the arts to support	Schools are located based on population; infill can help improve the viability of existing schools.	Avoid further school closures	Under relationship to growth management -Current nodes focused around shopping perhaps should be focused around schools as a community center

Goal	ICSP Goal Statement	Relationship to Growth Management	Community Concerns	Comments
	economic and social growth.			Keep the community spirit through our history , heritage designations Don't want to lose our history Ex. South Fort George like Millar Addition And infill needs to consider this
Reduce Carbon Emissions and Adapt to Climate Change	Reduce carbon emissions and dependence on fossil fuels, and be prepared for climate change	With transit, walking and cycling more attractive, per-capita use of vehicles can go down; smaller units also mean lower space heating emissions per person.	Be responsible global citizens	Under Community Concerns - It was a big lifestyle change because of the north, cycling and transit be expanded to all parts of the City and keep it safe.
Green city, green practices	Be a green city with healthy habitat and forests, and a strong environmental consciousness, led by government and local organizations that demonstrate sustainable practices.	There is less development pressure on valuable open spaces.	Enhance agriculture and local food Government should lead the way	Food security Expanding community gardens Preserve ALR Protecting green Space (common space, tot lots ex. Empty lot with trees is okay) Linkages to green space
Green energy	Be a leader in green energy.	Higher densities and mixed uses in centres support viable district energy systems.	Strengthen local bio-fuel industry	Focus on geo thermal Encourage private growth to utilize bio fuel Entice energy and showcase projects Education of the other forms of energy and alternative energy plans Removing barriers and selling back to the grid Reduction of industry will reduce viability of district heating system downtown Strengthen local bio fuels
Fiscal responsibility	Carefully budget to ensure effective and responsible	Lower servicing costs per capita when growth makes use of existing	Keep my taxes low Create an attractive tax	Perhaps there is a contradiction between developing areas around

Goal	ICSP Goal Statement	Relationship to Growth Management	Community Concerns	Comments
	use of financial resources.	infrastructure. Personal transportation costs are lower due to shorter distances and less expensive modes.	environment for new business Improve the viability of existing schools	schools versus the budgeting problems of the school district Focus growth to existing centers Better communication between jurisdictions Multi agencies or multi jurisdictional planning, making better use of everyone's money Lower infrastructure cost
Vibrant economy	Be a centre for vibrant economic growth in Northern BC, attracting newcomers and business and service choice.	Mixed use centres can be more attractive to businesses and immigrants used to urban settings. With significant growth, congestion is a potential risk.	Easy access to shopping Viability of developers and related businesses Preserving resource areas – sand and gravel; agriculture	Promotion of local businesses especially in the downtown Discouraging large franchise businesses. Ex. Books and Company rather than Chapters Incorporate arts and culture Ensure transportation routes to support and in close proximity to major centers and neighbourhoods Reallocating more business in the downtown
Job diversity & accessibility	Have many good jobs to suit the diversity and aspirations of people in Prince George, with programs that support developing the skills and knowledge needed to fill them.	Mixed use centres can be more attractive to businesses and immigrants used to urban settings.	Good jobs for all	Mixed use centers -Not only immigrants but consider the aging population Encourage new industries Seed support for new businesses Attracting corporate offices downtown- diversity Ex. Northern Health moving downtown
Safe community	Create an environment where all citizens feel safe.	Greater population density typically means more people keeping an eye on public spaces like streets, making them safer.	Protection from hazards such as floods and wildfires Concern about downtown safety	Needs to be design considerations to go with that, CPTED. Ex., lighting Crime prevention through Social Development Natural surveillance Clear delineation between private

Goal	ICSP Goal Statement	Relationship to Growth Management	Community Concerns	Comments
				and public property
Affordable, accessible housing	Offer accessible, affordable and safe housing for all, and eliminate homelessness.	Smaller units and more diverse housing are typical of infill and redevelopment; they are also in locations more accessible by transit, cycling and walking.	Importance of seniors' housing	More specific demographic. Who are we designing these units for? Smaller family units, empty nesters Keep in mind of visitors as well, for example accessibility, wheelchair access
Manage Neighbourhood Change	n/a	Distributed growth will affect more neighbourhoods, but will be less visible in any one of them; focused growth will affect fewer residents but in a more visible way	Ensure fit with neighbourhood character	Developing generalized urban design guidelines keeping community character Focus on Neighbourhood plans for existing neighbourhoods and built up areas

Growth Options Breakout Rounds 1 and 2

Again, in four groups of 6-8, participants were asked to dive deep on one growth option. After 45 minutes, participants changed tables and had a chance to deep dive on another growth option.

Questions – What do you like? What problems do you see/Didn't Like? What opportunities do you see?

Summaries from Facilitators

Summaries from Facilitators	Flipchart Notes
Option Base Case	
Like- recognizes prior commitments – investments already made Flexibility of variety of locations, vistas and lifestyles- source of pride Dispersed growth allows living outside of bad air quality areas Ownership variety	Like- Good for Solar Potential More room for gardens Smaller UCB Recognizes prior commitments Allows flexibility

<p>“It’s Prince George”, it’s easy and comfortable</p>	<p>Variety of vistas, locations, views and lifestyles Current OCP Clear on locational criteria (MF) Connecting to PRIDE Variety of ownership creates opportunity Affordable housing Chance for Choice Close to work Lot Sizes</p>
<p>Didn’t like- Too spread out and too expensive to maintain Not an option due to infrastructure costs Very difficult to achieve community goals when it is so spread out Precludes any downtown development – this is saying no to downtown Not strong enough – “without commitment to something more dramatic we will be having this same conversation in the near future”</p>	<p>Didn’t Like- Difficult to have clear impact and achieve community goals Difficult to have or achieve healthy, active Clean lifestyle Lacks focus for addressing incentives Density undermines Transportation Orient Development - \$\$\$ cars Too spread out Too expensive to maintain Downtown core- use it or lose it Neighbourhoods doesn’t always equal community pride Dispersed precludes aesthetics Not designed for pedestrians Not enough change Without commitment, will have this conversation again in a few years Unsustainable if we don’t address problems Commercial downtown, health services economic structure The illusion of Developable</p>
<p>Opportunities - Open canvass You may have opportunity to develop complete neighbourhoods from beginning Variety of bylaws that we could use encouraging more focus growth Ex. Phasing – if it was enforced Ex. Taxation Provides a variety of marketing choices. May attract different developers</p>	<p>Opportunities- Hard to do without core Other bylaws (phasing subdivisions) without eliminating other options Taxation incentives / disincentives – approach with caution Adhering to policy MU incentives downtown – money on the table Lost opportunities - infill redevelopment Improving MPB aesthetics / Beautification industry Open Canvass – opportunity to develop complete Neighbourhoods</p>

	<p>Less money than redevelopment Marketing choice Ex. Air Quality improved neighbourhoods Acquisition of undevelopable lands? Need to be integrated with other overall goods Meeting housing needs (baby boomers, accessibility, students)</p>
Option A	
<p>Like – Restricts some sprawl You don't see a deterioration of neighbourhoods – includes all neighbourhoods Transportation and parks and open space development is spread out Most affordable option Could be a good transition option Least risky and most viable There are existing investors now More opportunity to fresh start – energy grid, snow removal Encouraging the rural lifestyle people like here</p>	<p>Like- It still restricts sprawl more than the base case Hart area is not as isolated in Option C – like development up the Hart Hwy to Hart as connector Gives us MORE sell Give more rural lifestyle options Separating industrial out There is some downtown Discourages green field development a little and reduces financial support for securing outside boundary Spread transit investment throughout the City – Includes connection to industrial areas And Parks and open space investment Tax exemption is maintained downtown Expedites permits in built up areas Don't see deterioration of neighbourhoods (like you would if focused growth nodes) Most affordable, land retains lower cost per acre (because hard to pre-sell higher density right now) It's a good transition option- we can't just jump to option B & C Least risky and most politically viable More opportunity for a fresh start and more idealic development options. Ex. Road structure, energy grid There are existing investors for this and you can better attract more investors Suits current lifestyle Typical consumer</p>
<p>Didn't Like – Doesn't encourage focus downtown Upgrade costs Don't see change in this option</p>	<p>Didn't like- Doesn't encourage focus in downtown Continuation of urban sprawl Concern for infrastructure upgrade costs</p>

<p>Wishy washy Where's the Heart, Downtown Doesn't address future markets No examples of buildings that can transform the market No specificity of what would be in corridors "PG 1980" Doesn't address the environmental issues – clear air – transit – car travel</p>	<p>Citizens said they wanted change and this doesn't show that Doesn't encourage partnerships like the others could Ex. School district and neighbourhoods Don't see this option reducing barriers to poverty, again and physical ability (encouraging the existing policies) Is this really addressing the future market? If we are aging, then no Does not show examples of other living options that can transform the market Outside of this – all plans do not note UNBC as a key node Washed out- Where is the vibrancy? Wishy, Washy. Want to see stronger direction – could end up like Base Case Doesn't delineate from difficult urban forms – build residential on corridors the same as non-corridors Continuation of base case – loss concentrated Focus on change – Lack of cohesion PG 1980 Not enough civic resources to support that geography (spreads resources too thin) No local feel – no heart – downtown still suffers Doesn't address citizen's environmental concerns – district energy, clean air, car dependency Ignores Smart Growth on the Ground ideas Doesn't encourage active transportation</p>
<p>Opportunities Be careful what type of policies are strong Type of zoning – multi zoning Combining a bit more of option b into option A Different type of housing forms Be clear of what developers have access to Ex. If you want to develop there you may have to pay more if you don't build downtown. Anything can happen</p>	<p>Opportunities- Focus on option A (with continued loose policy) could keep us from eventually getting to C Need careful attention too loose policies Golf course should be yellow Need to see encouragement of multifamily in the bowl area (dcc reductions etc) Multi – Zones (secondary suites, carriage houses) Increase affordability Enriching Zones Need a little more colour downtown – density should still be a priority there UNBC in yellow – we should consider it a node – it is a cultural</p>

	<p>focal point Need more shrinkage in areas that will require a lot of infrastructure cost (ex. Water, sewer services needed at bottom of map) (shading should show major servicing requirements) Turn key operations for parks and trails – development paid (Final map can show where are the incentives from City, where are more servicing costs involved, where do I need to add parks) EX. Marketing downtown tax incentives An in between of Option A & B will allow for focus on nodes without forgetting about the rest of the City and their transit, public space, etc needs Impact more market based incentives to direct growth Anything can happen – market magic – it’s possible</p>
Option B	
<p>Like- Starting a concentration of core areas and building on existing infrastructure Encouraging infill Infill concentration on track Keeping an aesthetic component of infrastructure</p>	<p>Like – Starting of concentration of core areas and building on existing infrastructure Encouraging infill and corridors – good for transit Reducing off street parking requirements near transit and centers Policies towards infill and concentration are on the right track Better land use and mixed use will encourage better energy and more interesting communities Priority on City owned land – Very Important Aesthetic component of public infrastructure Having close centers to downtown and rest of the City Concentration increases livability (aging population) Keep options open and give incentives Growth patterns downtown Transit planners dream come true Developing plans for existing neighbourhoods</p>
<p>Didn’t like- Densification of core areas- there is a risk that the areas identified may have bad infrastructure. – Use the good existing infrastructure. Fire flow requirements – concern Tax Exemption doesn’t work No infill of existing and under used assets</p>	<p>Didn’t Like- Caution: densification of existing areas (influences a majority of identified sites) may lead to problems are with our existing infrastructure – may be at the end of its life. Keep in mind best use of good existing infrastructure. Ex. Fire Flow Infill of wide rights of way Tax exemption doesn’t work, get rid of DCC’s – to densify</p>

<p>Keep them as schools because we may need them once we densify the area</p> <p>Example - Kelowna, Vancouver – Model doesn't work– they like what they see there but the trend is people here are used to cheap housing. Can't expect the same amenities that Van/Kelowna pays for</p> <p>Fragmented land ownership</p>	<p>downtown, savings should be passed on to consumer, focus on residential</p> <p>No infill of existing under used green space</p> <p>Keep vacant schools for future</p> <p>Plan may be too generous for current market patterns- people are used to cheap land and not willing to pay for new tech</p> <p>Infill vacant lots as we density as we may need that land for future other uses</p> <p>City needs to ensure infrastructure will support development – no offsite for infill</p> <p>Fragmented land ownership</p> <p>Public opposition to densification</p> <p>Discouraging Greenfield development – vague</p> <p>Match charges to “node” patterns. Ex. Lower DCC's in nodes and Downtown</p> <p>Plans for existing neighbourhoods is \$\$\$ and ignores previous council decisions (over all plan and neighbourhood)</p> <p>Eroding viability of multi-family by scattering</p> <p>Nodes away from downtown instead of on peripheral of downtown</p> <p>Phasing of infrastructure not addressed</p> <p>Focus infill on existing corridors to achieve critical mass</p>
<p>Opportunities</p> <p>Downtown revitalization very popular</p> <p>Mixed use in neighbourhood areas</p> <p>Be clear what type of buildings get built on city lands</p> <p>Giving incentives</p> <p>Investing in the areas around those</p> <p>Increasing density - community gardens, recycling,</p>	<p>Opportunities-</p> <p>Downtown Revitalization (keep course) (vague)</p> <p>Using wide right of ways, transit, greening</p> <p>Lower level of densification in existing neighbourhoods – row houses, suites, duplex</p> <p>Characterizing development to the feel of Prince George – we are not Vancouver or Kelowna!</p> <p>Mixed use in neighbourhood centers</p> <p>City can be very clear on what type of buildings are built on City owned land</p> <p>Compact development allows taking money in other better things</p> <p>Growing City this way can better air quality and energy systems</p> <p>City can give incentives (free land?)</p> <p>Facilities within walking distances</p> <p>Invest in area to encourage development</p> <p>Long term: improved transit system</p>

	<p>Better opportunity for recycling etc. (community gardens and safety) Density = critical mass</p>
Option C	
<p>Like- Supports green development strategy Lower infrastructure costs New development in outside development. Could be cheaper Maintain an assortment of inventory Includes of transportation Makes services more accessible as a result of concentration Infill will help make a cultural community – galleries, music spaces Potential for the Money saved to go into the Social Planning Reinvestment</p>	<p>Like- Support of green development strategy. Clean air related to this Exploring potential for local area services Less infrastructure development = Cheap Inclusive downtown identity Assortment of inventory for residential options- Market response to discourage sprawl Concentrated – use of existing infrastructure Inclusion of transportation Firm Reducing parking spaces to encourage walking Very focused Increases density Makes services more accessible as a result of concentration Infill will help support cultural community – gallery, music spaces etc. Transfers affordability of priorities to Social Planning Reinvestment therefore Savings from Servicing – Transfers and other amenities as well ex. Green space Good Downtown Focus Limits sprawl Encouraging a change in development patterns Uses existing infrastructure Like Hart Inclusion Downtown includes areas Surrounding “core downtown” for concentrated of new growth as desire for redevelopment may already exist Good Ideas – Is there enough? College Heights, Hart, Downtown still all included Crescents walkability to amenities Concentration of downtown will increase air quality interest - improve agenda from more interested parties (including developers)</p>

<p>Didn't like-</p> <p>How will make sure the heart is connected to the other centers – zoning</p> <p>What is going to happen to the west bowl – schools- transportation?</p> <p>How to entice developers to give up developing green field or redeveloping an existing area (more public consultation – Challenges)</p> <p>Potentially ignores the heritage areas like the Millar Addition</p> <p>Lacks connectivity to unbc and 15th</p> <p>Is there enough density or population</p> <p>Site acquisition</p> <p>Way to encourage downtown revitalization – “wave the carrot”</p>	<p>Didn't Like-</p> <p>Need community consultation for park spaces in inner bowl, Hart, College Heights</p> <p>How will we ensure that Hart Highway corridor is connected to concentration of growth to Hart Center? Is the zoning in conflict?</p> <p>Plan needs to be inclusive of Hart</p> <p>Need some growth along corridor to connect</p> <p>Property tax downtown – should not be exempt?</p> <p>Also entices people downtown if exempt</p> <p>West bowl could lose out- What will happen to schools, transportation?</p> <p>Manipulating transit to centers from less dense areas</p> <p>Need to expedite residential permits in focus areas</p> <p>Increased housing costs could become a social justice issue concerning displacement of current residents</p> <p>It shuts out development. Needs to have innovative relationship strategy in conjunction with downtown buildings</p> <p>Acquisition of BF or Infill versus Greenfield very costly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in level of expertise needed Time is money, a longer process Lot consolidation <p>Need to lower risk at development stage</p> <p>Municipality needs to lead here</p> <p>Ignores heritage areas (Millar & Crescents)</p> <p>Character is important</p> <p>Conflict between Cancer center and maintaining Neighbourhood Character (crescents)</p> <p>City to assist in this conversation Ex. NP's</p> <p>Vehicle Dependency already a concern, densifying can exasperate on-street parking issues (snow removal concerns)</p> <p>More densified areas in downtown due to upcoming amenities.</p> <p>Ex. Cancer Center – Crescents Area</p> <p>Is there a Market Demand?</p> <p>Still Demand for Single Family</p> <p>Is infrastructure cost valid? Aging population therefore is it actually more costly? For upgrades.</p> <p>Lacks 15th connectivity to University and West Bowl Area</p> <p>Densification</p>
--	--

	<p>Hart – Does the concentration here conflict with the downtown? Need more incentives when infilling vs. Greenfield Development. Ex. Tax Holiday, Rebates Ex. Surrounding existing residential has more costs for developers</p>
<p>Opportunities- Lead the way and pay for cost associated in developing these areas Opportunity to be a Green City Neighbourhood conversations for those closely linked to outcomes More mixed use neighbourhoods – there may not have the level of growth to support the neighbourhoods</p>	<p>Opportunities- Need community consultation for park spaces in inner bowl, Hart, College Heights City needs to find ways to pay for infrastructure. Needs to LEAD. Ex. Rezoning. Queensway area is an opportunity dealing with flood plain All problems provide opportunity for further discussion Green City Neighbourhood level conversations for these decisions closely linked to outcomes Integrate uses, but a constraint is do we have the appropriate level of growth for it. Strict zoning and design guidelines Heritage Designations Conflict “culturally rich” Statement Strengthen OCP wording to ensure proposed Objectives and Policies occur. Pick up words that are double. Ex. Cluster housing and terraced housing</p>

Straw Poll

To round up the day and straw poll was taken on preferred options with all participants and discussion focused on improvements needed for the preferred option.

Option Base Case - 0

Option A - 5

Option B - 21

Option C – 4

Group Discussion

How would you improve option B?

- Be careful how we base urban development, need to focus development in corridors and we can reduce air quality and transportation patterns
- Focus Infill Development in certain corridors
- Phase the infill development and focus on areas first before spreading it
- Consideration of Population Decline?
- Would like to see the language that we are still going to pursue these policies even if we are not growing or declining.
- The changing lifestyles are going to be looking for different housing for examples the baby boomers.
- Should be a melding of “A” with opportunities of “B” that you might not want to encourage except for the downtown. Will enhance the idea that the existing schools will be supported by the housing. Values of the subdivisions could go out the window. Need to maintain the population in the existing areas. None of the options deal with negative growth and school closures. Housing units may be the same 3.4 down to 2.5 per household.
- Need to also consider the negative impacts
- Concern is, what is the policies and rules and incentives going to be to make this happen
- That the University Heights is not on any of these options. Deeply concerned that it wasn't on there
- Visual Image – What are the details? Ie. Policy
- Doesn't like that there is no growth highlighted around the UNBC areas
- Option B left out OSNP - remaining phase not shown
- LTN Land package within City limits- If successful on 2nd ratification vote will have significant impact on ALL options.
- On any of these scenarios should run a (option B-C) fairly high densities water, sewer and storm issues need to identified up front so offsite costs are minimized
- Plan must be consistent with infrastructure modeling
- I like between option b and c – City has also consulted with the Community in the MY PG and in that maybe they are saying to stop Option A of base case – Community needs to say we can't continue dispersed development.
- Concerned that although Neighbourhood Plan processes occurred, recent planning (myPG Sus. Plan) may be the community saying “No More”
- Infrastructure upgrades -concern – as long they maintain that (ex Blackburn- Logistics Park) if density needs to be changed then it needs to reflect those that already have an urban designation.
- Need to go to the property owners when reformatting lands – who would be impacted

- Further consultation within specified areas with individual residents and land owners. Work with to dovetail uses
- What will this decision mean for the 7th generation?
- We should feel obligated for our future generations- we see limited resources now....Planning for it sustainably
- All dependent on growth – caution that we don't want to go the opposite direction and underestimate. We can achieve our sustainability goals but we don't need to sacrifice growth opportunities.