OurWinnipeg™
Residential Growth Study

INTRODUCTION TO ASSESSMENT RESULTS

This information is being presented as background to the review of the Complete Communities Direction Strategy. It informed a number of proposed policies, including the proposed intensification target. The assessment criteria were applied to the following evaluations:

- Corridor evaluation
- Greenfield evaluation
- Major Redevelopment Sites evaluation

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The purpose of the Residential Growth Study is to consider how the City can best accommodate 200,000 new Winnipeggers over the next 20 years.

Its goals are:

a) To facilitate the responsible management of land within the City of Winnipeg.
b) To understand the opportunities and constraints of all potential residential and mixed-use growth areas.
c) To maximize the City's return on the investments it will need to make to accommodate growth over the next 20 years.
d) To leverage growth to achieve City-wide goals and objectives.
e) To ensure that the updated OurWinnipeg will be based on sound data and analysis.
f) To achieve cross-departmental integration.

This work consisted of three phases:

1. Development of assessment criteria
2. Assessment of all existing and potential Corridors, Major Redevelopment Sites, and greenfield areas.
3. Development of growth scenarios

This work was supported by consultants IBI Group Professional Services (Canada) Inc. and AECOM Canada Ltd. Results of this work were integrated into the updated OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities Direction Strategy.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The first part of the Residential Growth Study entailed developing criteria to measure how the development of individual study areas would promote complete communities principles. These criteria were development in consultation with applicable City departments and external stakeholders. The criteria that were used are described in the assessment result documents. Different sets of criteria were applied to the three different study categories.

Where it was challenging to capture valuable considerations using a quantitative metric, an opportunity was provided to comment in a more qualitative fashion under “Other strengths and weaknesses”.

Results should only be compared within categories, not between. Study area scores were weighted relative to other sites only within the same category.

SERVICING ASSESSMENTS

A critical part of these assessments was an analysis of the servicing requirements necessary to support site build out. This was done through outreach to various City departments, with a focus on capital costs borne by the City.

- This work compiled the best data available, of which there was a range. Some infrastructure projects are imminent City priorities, in which case a high level of project scoping and design has occurred, whereas other projects had not been contemplated as being within a 20 year time horizon, in which case high-level, order-of-magnitude estimates are the best that can be provided. This is an unavoidable reality of this work. Similarly, with study areas in various stages of planning, assumptions needed to be made with regards to development size, which may differ from what is eventually developed; moderate variations from what was applied should not appreciably change the results of this analysis.
- Verbiage regarding regional servicing is based on conceptual plans which are subject to change with additional studies and development context.
- This work only considered projects that helped prioritize one study area over another. Growth-related projects that will be needed regardless of the spatial distribution of growth (e.g. transit garages) were excluded.
- A project's growth-related costs were assigned to individual benefiting study areas based on total population at full build-out.
- Wastewater treatment plants for each study area were noted, reflecting differing capacities, planning stages for upgrades, and the nature of their operations.

- The location of Corridors and Major Redevelopment Sites within combined sewer areas was also noted. A new development in a combined sewer area must manage its total land drainage and wastewater outflows to the City's satisfaction, most notably to comply with its Environment Act license. This usually entails holding land drainage discharge in storage tanks until it can be released slowly, reducing the development's burden on the sewer system.
- It is easier to assess the need for City infrastructure in greenfield areas (and to a lesser extent, most Major Redevelopment Sites) than along Corridors, given their defined geographic boundaries and finite ability to absorb dwelling units. It is harder to assess the implications of infill development at this high level scale given the wider range of variables, namely where growth will occur and how much.
- Similarly, water and wastewater servicing challenges in existing areas are generally more localized in nature than servicing challenges in greenfield areas. In greenfield areas, these services are constrained by the extension of regional water feeder mains and wastewater interceptors. Since this regional network already exists in infill areas, constraints generally occur at a more local site or block level. Identifying these issues requires much finer-grained, resource-intensive assessment beyond what this project was able to address.
- Consequently, the results of the servicing analysis are much more fulsome for greenfield areas than for Corridors. The greenfield analysis is as comprehensive as one could undertake at this high level without knowing specifics about the development, the many variables which surrounding those specifics, and the fact that many of the assumptions could change as a result of other external factors. This comparatively detailed analysis should not be used to conclude that the servicing of greenfield areas is definitively more costly than infill areas; to arrive at such a conclusion requires more study of servicing capacities and requirements within infill areas.

In order to identify City-borne costs, the following questions were used:

Water and wastewater servicing: *What regional, City-funded infrastructure related to water and/or wastewater conveyance is required to allow for full builld-out of the study area?*

The first step of this assessment saw the Water and Waste Department review all study areas. This preliminary analysis was then supplemented and expanded upon by engineering subconsultant AECOM.

Major road projects: *Will full build-out of the study area create or enhance pressure to proceed with a planned major road project?*

Projects identified were derived from the Transportation Master Plan (2011). Project costs were derived from the Determination of Regulatory Fees to Finance Growth: Technical Report (2016), or where more updated information was available.

Community centres and libraries: *Will full build-out of the study area create or enhance pressure for the City to develop a new facility?*

Facility requirement estimates were provided by the Community Services Department based on level of service targets from the current Council-adopted Recreation, Leisure, and Library Facilities Policy. Facility cost estimates provided by the Community Services Department.

Fire and Paramedic Services: *Can sufficient fire coverage be provided to accommodate full build-out of the study area?*

Facility requirement estimates were provided by Fire and Paramedic Services and derived from NFPA 1710 response time standards. Facility cost estimates were provided by Fire and Paramedic Services.

HOW THE RESULTS ARE BEING USED

The Residential Growth Study assessments were compiled as background information to support the review of OurWinnipeg and the Complete Communities Direction Strategy. It was done to better understand development opportunities and constraints, the potential sequencing of future development and the infrastructure needed to enable and support it, and the scale of work needed to realize the vision for different geographies.

The results of these assessments have informed proposed Complete Communities policies in both specific and more general ways. Most pertinently, information compiled for the greenfield assessments were used to inform the greenfield phasing plan, while the Corridor results informed the creation of the Priority Corridor designation proposed in the Corridors section of the plan.

Apart from informing Complete Communities 2.0, it is hoped that this information may be broadly useful as a basic foundation of shared knowledge for all stakeholders with interests in land use and development in Winnipeg, including Council and the Public Service, the development industry, and members of the public.