

DRAFT DOWNTOWN WINNIPEG ZONING BY-LAW PUBLIC FORUM FEEDBACK RESPONSE:

2 all-day workshops

What?

Workshops are intended both to shed light on the draft *Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-Law* presented to Downtown Stakeholders in November/02 and to assist revision of the draft prior to public hearing at Standing Policy Committee on Property & Development.

How?

Urban Planning Branch staff will facilitate a decision-oriented exercise, culminating in a shared view on draft zoning by-law revisions.

Who?

Select Planning, Property, & Development Department staff, CentreVenture staff, and CentreVenture consultant team members (Landmark Planning & Design and LM Architectural Group).

When?

March 7/03 (Friday) and March 11/03 (Tuesday), 9:00am – 4:00pm each day, with 1 hour lunch break. Snacks and beverages will be provided – not lunch!

Where?

Winnipeg Housing & Homelessness Initiative boardroom, 361 Hargrave Street (east side, north of Ellice Avenue).

Agenda

Based on the “Draft Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-Law – Key Considerations” paper distributed by the consultant team on February 3/03 (start-up meeting at CentreVenture offices), the workshop session will focus on the following items:

Day 1

- 1 Rationale & Background
- 2 Sector / Sub-sector Boundaries
- 3 Land Use Regulations
- 4 Bulk Regulations

Day 2

- 1 Parking & Loading Regulations
- 2 Design Guidelines
- 3 Illustrations & Definitions
- 4 Other Business

Workshop process

Brainstorm - Select - Analyze - Decide - Move on

Workshop ground rules

Facilitate means: literally “to make easy”

Brainstorm means: don't critique – free your mind, explore

Decision model: following the workshops, a shared view determines the strategy to advance a revised zoning by-law

**DRAFT DOWNTOWN WINNIPEG ZONING BY-LAW REVISIONS
BASED ON MARCH 7/03 & 11/03 WORKSHOP DIRECTION:**

Sectors

Direction: agreed to eliminate Sub-sectors

Pros: simpler to understand

Cons: blunter instrument; more difficult to incorporate local area plan-inspired regulations

Direction: agreed to add Riverbank Sector

Pros: consistent regulations for (virtually) all riverbank lands in downtown

Cons: no relationship with adjacent neighbourhoods

Direction: agreed to strengthen Intent Statements for each Sector

Pros: better understanding of Sector function; improves understanding of Sector regulations

Cons: unknown

Direction: agreed to determine different Sector names

Pros: simpler; eliminate perceived stigmas

Cons: depending on how the names are changed, may eliminate valued geographic/historic associations

Land Use

Direction: agreed to attempt a permissive/prescriptive hybrid Land Use approach

Pros: potential for best of both worlds

Cons: may not be possible

Direction: agreed to change name of Restricted Use land use category

Pros: reduce confusion

Cons: unknown

Direction: agreed to change wording of Prohibited Uses section

Pros: simpler to understand

Cons: unknown

Direction: agreed to improve Use Categories section

Pros: simpler to understand; ties in with hybrid Land Use approach

Cons: unknown

Bulk/Built Form

- Direction: agreed to refine minimum height restrictions
Pros: less prescriptive built form regulations; only where necessary
Cons: unknown
- Direction: agreed that elimination of Sub-sectors may result in Bulk sub-sets
Pros: retains opportunity for more specific built form regulations
Cons: less explicit presentation than the Sub-sector approach
- Direction: agreed to reduce minimum/maximum front yard requirements
Pros: less prescriptive; more accommodating of a range of built forms
Cons: shifts burden to design review
- Direction: agreed to consider minimum side/rear yard requirements out of consideration for residential uses
Pros: explicitly specifies desired building separation from living areas
Cons: may detract from desired built form
- Direction: agreed to refine Riverbank bulk regulations
Pros: provides opportunity to specify building separation for public access, view corridors, etc
Cons: unknown
- Direction: agreed to provide explicit cross-reference to Legislative Building height restriction radius
Pros: provides upfront indication of additional regulatory restriction
Cons: unknown
- Direction: agreed to eliminate Residential Recreation Space requirements
Pros: less restrictions on and impediments to downtown residential development
Cons: downtown open space and recreation provision will only be voluntarily provided by developers or funded out of general revenues

Signs

- Direction: agreed to investigate revised Building Identification regulations, to specify maximum 1 Bldg i.d. sign/building wall
Pros: ample opportunity for prime tenant; assists orientation from many directions
Cons: unknown

Direction: agreed to investigate revised Use Identification regulations, to limit location of Use i.d. signs to street level
Pros: emphasizes street level as focus for Use i.d. signs
Cons: unknown

Parking

Direction: agreed to eliminate parking space-to-use ratio requirements for new and reuse developments
Pros: reduced impediment to downtown development
Cons: downtown parking spaces will only be voluntarily provided by developers or funded out of general revenues; no mechanism for contribution to shared parking facilities

Direction: agreed to concentrate on improved parking area development standards, instead of on minimum parking space requirements
Pros: focus on look/function potentially improves voluntary parking facilities
Cons: unknown

Direction: agreed to treat parking as a use of land (accessory/non-accessory)
Pros: explicit that parking facilities are subject to development standards and design review
Cons: unknown

Direction: agreed to explore different parking standards for different Sectors
Pros: opportunity for closer reflection of built form distinctions
Cons: may complicate the regulations

Loading

Direction: agreed to treat loading as a use of land (accessory/non-accessory, including on-street)
Pros: explicit that loading facilities are subject to development standards and design review
Cons: unknown

Direction: agreed that #4800/88 loading regulations work well, but require modest tweaking
Pros: simple to implement; easy for developers and regulators
Cons: unknown

Direction: agreed to specify garbage receptacle standards
Pros: makes requirements explicit, rather than an afterthought component of design review process
Cons: unknown

Urban Design

Direction: agreed to push for non-Council member design board
Pros: focus of design review becomes more quality-related, less politically motivated; design board membership could emphasize related expertise
Cons: legislation may not allow for non-Council membership for anything beyond advisory capacity

Direction: agreed to recommend design review procedures that ensure consistency, equity, timeliness, and predictability
Pros: win-win
Cons: unknown

Direction: agreed to recommend design review process so that proponent/administration collaborate in reviewing proposal for consistency with Key Considerations – if proponent/administration agree, proposal is approved; if disagree, engage design board/peer review process
Pros: win-win – especially if there is the option for the proponent to go directly to design board/peer review, if he chooses
Cons: unknown

Direction: agreed to investigate providing minimum development standards that must be met (e.g. signs, parking areas, other modest developments) – meet them and proposal is approved administratively (i.e. no formal design review process)
Pros: simple, clear expectations
Cons: may be difficult to determine such minimum standards, especially one that would apply throughout our diverse downtown

Definitions/Illustrations/Format

Direction: agreed to provide/improve definitions, where beneficial
Pros: enhances understanding
Cons: unknown

Direction: agreed to provide illustrations, where beneficial (e.g. built form)
Pros: enhances understanding
Cons: must determine whether they are best integral or appended

Direction: agreed to produce by-law in binder-with-tabs format
Pros: easy to use; simple to update
Cons: unknown

Direction: agreed to produce electronic version, accessible via City internet site
Pros: easy to use; convenient
Cons: unknown