

OurWinnipeg Community Advisory Committee Meeting Summary

Date: May 17, 2018

Location: Millennium Library

Attendees: 7 members

Overview

Two members of IBI Group facilitated a workshop with committee members as part of the *OurWinnipeg* Residential Growth Study. The purpose of the workshop was to discuss how to best accommodate expected growth of 200,000 people over the next 20 years, and where and how this should happen. Is the best mix of new housing a combination of downtown, infill, and new suburban sites? What are the priorities in different areas? What criteria should the City use to determine the preferred growth scenario that will inform *OurWinnipeg* policy? The workshop included criteria prioritization and a mapping exercise to determine opportunities and constraints. In addition, over 500 surveys were completed online and in addition to the Community Advisory Committee workshop, IBI hosted workshops with land developers and the City's senior management team. The following is a summary of these discussions:

Criteria Prioritization

Five draft criteria were provided and defined for comment including: city investments, complete communities, development potential, mobility and proximity to destinations. Participants were asked to share thoughts on the proposed criteria and identify if there were additional criteria to consider.

Feedback included:

- Many greenfield precincts have already been designated through the *OurWinnipeg* urban structure map, with residential development underway (e.g. Ridgewood South, the northwest part of the city, Waverly West). Some participants thought this was a mistake and that prioritization should have occurred earlier.
- It was suggested the City works more with capital region municipalities to manage exurban growth that has leapfrogged development within City limits.
- Greenhouse gas emissions, health and well-being outcomes, long term planning, affordability and inclusion (e.g. ensure families aren't obligated to have two cars), and how to repopulate underpopulated areas are missing from the proposed criteria.
- There should be different weighting criteria for different types of development density and context (e.g. greenfield compared to infill or rural, compared to another "future residential" designation).
- There was a preference for revitalizing or building out existing neighbourhoods as opposed to starting new ones; for example, would there be a negative impact on existing neighbourhoods and what that might be if suburban growth was prioritized and funds allocated.
- Consider redevelopment of land or buildings close to the end of their life (e.g. Silver Heights School was demolished and is now a senior's community).
- Consider paying more upfront to repair existing infrastructure rather than pay for new. The City should ensure true life-cycle costs (e.g. health, community services, transit, land drainage) and benefits of suburban development infrastructure are accounted for and there is an equitable distribution of who pays.

- Demand ‘complete communities’ in greenfield developments with better pedestrian scale design. Too much development is subsidized toward single family homes and car culture.
- Establish clear rules for infill development. Consider how to reduce developer risk for infill as high land prices discourage development as does potential public opposition.
- Some members were interested in understanding the expectations of families or newcomers moving to new single family homes in the suburbs and how that relates to design and services. Is it convenience, affordability, perceptions of safety, public transit, active transportation connections, lifestyle satisfaction? Do the suburbs deliver on these needs and wants?
- Need to separate and distinguish between different industrial and residential uses better for public health. Light industrial uses can be compatible with residential uses.

Mapping Exercise

Suggested Development Opportunities

- Consider places that are walkable, “cluster developments” (e.g. Corydon, West Broadway), close to schools, grocery stores, restaurants, downtown, adjacent to or in existing complete or stable communities (e.g. South Osborne), close to hospitals and universities, close to regional parks (e.g. Assiniboine Park, St. Vital Park, Kildonan Park), mature trees, multi-generational housing and transit (e.g. Fort Rouge Yards).
- Consider ability to leverage existing infrastructure (e.g. Precinct L).
- Try to ‘complete’ existing communities (e.g. Downtown-Forks Railside and Exchange District, Selkirk Avenue, the West End. St. Boniface-Des Meurons, Lindenwoods).
- Partner with First Nations governments (e.g. Kapyong Barracks).
- Consider the affordability of housing, smaller single family homes, mid-rise form, mixed use, the needs of newcomers to Winnipeg, the needs of ethnic communities and the protection of greenspaces in all new developments.
- Consider development opportunities on city-owned land.
- Consider remediation of contaminated sites at important locations, close to downtown and rivers (e.g. South Point Douglas).
- Use development to reduce physical barriers between different parts of Winnipeg and reduce related infrastructure investments (i.e. bridge renewal over the CPR Rail Yards north of Sutherland Ave.) that may not be needed if a longer term strategy were enacted (e.g. relocation of rail yards).
- Focus development on transit corridor or nodes with clustered amenities (e.g. portions of Henderson Highway, Portage Avenue and Pembina Highway (affordable student rental housing), Eastern Rapid Transit Corridor), St. Mary’s.
- Redevelopment opportunities at shopping malls, big box stores or surface parking lots that reach the end of their life (e.g. Regent, Garden City Shopping Centre).

Suggested Development Restrictions

- Avoid isolated, less humane areas with limited community building capacity, services or programs, and poor connectivity to adjacent areas (e.g. rural areas, Tuxedo outlet malls, Tuxedo La Farge, Ness Avenue). Avoid car dominated infrastructure, noise issues and places without access to public transportation.
- Avoid places with uses that may be incompatible with residential growth such as industrial lands (e.g. portions of the Parker Lands).
- Avoid greenfield lands that have servicing issues (e.g. South Wilkes).