Background

Residential infill is new housing in established neighbourhoods. New housing can be single-family, two-family, townhouse, or multi-family. The goal for this project is to advance a shared vision for residential infill that helps address demand for new housing while preserving neighbourhood quality, character, and liveability. The Residential Infill Strategy (the Strategy) will address, at a minimum, built form, design features, lot width and size, yards, landscape standards, density, and zoning.

Despite its potential benefits, infill development can sometimes be a source of tension and conflict. A number of recent infill proposals in Winnipeg have demonstrated a lack of consensus on how and where different forms of infill should occur. The City’s public engagement strategy aims to identify common areas of concern across stakeholder groups, and involve the public in prioritizing opportunities for improving the approach to infill development through our final strategy.

Engagement

To begin the process, stakeholders were invited to five focus group meetings between June 14 and June 22, 2017. A stakeholder workshop was held on June 29, 2017 to determine key issues to focus on in residential infill strategy development. To find out more about the engagement planning process, access the focus group and workshop meeting notes.

Following the first workshop, an online survey was posted from October 3 to December 1, 2017. Manitoba Realtors also hosted a workshop on September 12, 2017 in the same format as our stakeholder workshop, overseen by the project team. Additional outreach through public pop-ups between October 26 and October 30, 2017 supplemented these activities, and the Infill Housing Speaker Series event held on November 18, 2017 provided a public forum for further discussion on infill priorities from a number of perspectives.

Promotion & Outreach

What we’ve done so far:

- Focus group sessions [June 14, 15, 21, 22]
- Stakeholder workshop [June 29]
- Realtors workshop [September 12]
- Pop-ups [October 26, 27, 30]
- Surveys - 68 online surveys completed, 76 survey cards submitted: [October 3 - December 1]
- Infill Housing Speaker Series event [November 18]

Community group events attended to promote the Strategy:

- Spence – Daniel McIntyre Community Barbeque [August 26]
- William Whyte Neighbourhood Association [October 11]
- River East Neighbourhood Network [October 25]
- Spence Neighbourhood Association [November 7]
- South Osborne Residents’ Group [November 22]
Next Steps

This document offers a summary of the public engagement activities undertaken so far. Key findings gathered to date are organized below, and will be presented at the public workshop on January 27, 2018 for further discussion and refinement. This feedback will then be used to draft the initial Strategy, which will be presented for public input in spring 2018.

Infill Stakeholder Feedback: Resident and Developer Focus Groups

As part of the consultation program for the Strategy, the Public Service met with various stakeholder groups to obtain their feedback. The summary below pertains to information collected at focus group meetings with residents and infill developers that took place in June 2017. There were a total of five separate meetings; two were with residents of mature communities, and three were with individuals who affiliated themselves with the infill development industry.

Introduction

More than 300 comments recorded from stakeholder focus groups were consolidated and coded within 20 topic areas. Some of the comments were relevant to more than one topic area and were coded in more than one category as needed. All topic areas have been arranged into three broad categories to align with Council’s direction for the Strategy: To develop a Policy Framework, Planning and Design Guidelines, and a Communication Plan. This will help frame discussions for future consultation. Consistency with Council direction will also help when reporting back to Council with recommendations.

Policy Framework:
- Development Approval Process
- Data
- Implementation
- Fees
- Incentives
- Permit Process
- Housing Types and Affordability
- Sustainability
- Rehabilitation of Existing Housing Stock versus Demolition

Planning and Design Guidelines:
- Development Considerations
- Design Guidelines and Community Context
- Parking
- Natural Features

Communication Plan:
- Resident/Community Involvement
- Trust and the Need for Relationship Building
- Infill Project Scope
- Construction Practices
- NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard)
- Public Education/Awareness
- Building Code

The following attempts to synthesize the main points of each documented topic area. The analysis of responses at this stage of the Infill Strategy is related to issue identification and attempts to include all of the topic areas identified in the responses.
Development Approval Process (66)

With respect to comments related to the “Development Approval Process” respondents felt there were some large issues and that these range from the content of the public notification posters themselves to the way decisions are made. Public notification postings were criticized as being too difficult to understand (written in 'legalese'), that not enough notice is provided, and that the hearing times are often inconvenient. Respondents also felt that the amount of information available about a development proposal is very limited (no images of the development for example). The public hearing process was noted as an adversarial situation which can invite conflict. Respondents also criticized the approval process for being inconsistent and non-transparent in terms of how decisions are made, and that decisions are inconsistent throughout the city because of political and administrative influence/differences in different areas of the city. There was concern that decisions made do not align with neighbourhood vision. It was also noted that approving authorities require a better understanding of applicable by-laws, polices and the limits of their power. Specifically, members of Council are seen to be much too involved in Plan Approval applications given their general lack of expertise in the area of design. In this regard, suggestions like bringing back a planning commission or establishing a resident review committee were offered as potential solutions. Uncertainty in the approval process was documented by developers and residents alike.

Development Considerations (62)

Comments coded as “Development Considerations” pertained to specific aspects of development such as density, scale, quality, locational considerations, disaster mitigation, land use type, privacy, traffic, wind effect, and lot size. Most of the issues coded within this category are related to site specific aspects of development, but also include more generalized considerations like infrastructure capacity.

Resident/Community Involvement (39)

Comments pertaining to “Resident/Community Involvement” expressed interest in a more collaborative, engaging process for infill development proposals, and that this should occur much earlier in the process and in advance of a public hearing being scheduled or posted. Generally, respondents felt that infill development proposals should be more responsive to community needs and in tune with a neighbourhood’s vision. It was acknowledged that each community has different needs as well as existing community-based knowledge that is currently not being tapped into. Respondents said that a more broad representation of community needs and interests is important. In formalizing ideas for such a process, respondents pointed to resident associations as well as the potential for steering committees to play a role in the process. Some respondents also felt that the planning department and Office of Public Engagement should play a more active role in advocating on behalf of the community, who often feel disadvantaged at public hearings.

Design Guidelines and Community Context (33)

Another common response from respondents was the need for design guidelines. Though this topic is related to “Development Considerations,” it is placed as its own category, because it represents a more specific planning tool. Respondents commented generally that design guidelines could be useful by setting appropriate parameters for infill development, and clearly stating the rules. It is felt that guidelines should not be discretionary. Respondents feel that the policy context already exists through OurWinnipeg to establish guidelines, but the approval process does not. As a result, residents often feel disappointed that projects don’t suit neighbourhood. An expectation for design guidelines is that they would be formulated with community input.

Trust and the need for Relationship Building (19)

Related to the development approval process, but coded as its own topic area, is the topic of “Trust and Relationship Building.” Respondents said that the lack of trust felt between residents and developers as well as residents and the City affects the approval process.
Natural Features (14)

Comments coded as "Natural Features" were largely concerned with protecting features such as riverbanks and the urban forest. Respondents identified that natural features are under pressure from infill development. Respondents expressed that natural features are seen as part of Winnipeg's heritage, contributing aesthetic and environmental benefits to communities, and helping with issues like local temperature moderation and runoff filtration.

Through the comments, a question was raised as to what happens with land dedication funds from rezoning applications, in terms of enhancing natural features.

Housing Types and Affordability (13)

Comments associated to this topic include a desire to see more housing options in neighbourhoods with an emphasis on affordable and non-market housing. One respondent suggests that more mixed use zoning should be accommodated in neighbourhoods. Respondents said that options for unique types of housing such as co-housing, tiny homes, and intergenerational housing opportunities should be explored. The strategy itself, it was noted, should include policy with respect to affordable housing. Specific infill development projects should consider the affordability of residents in the neighbourhoods they are building in.

Infill Project Scope (10)

Many of the comments provided in some way relate to project scope. Key comments under this topic relate more to the need for a shared understanding of what the strategy will entail (i.e. – "what's in, what's out"). To this end, suggestions confirm the need for a detailed terms of reference document. Respondents expressed a desire to have more clarity on language used in the strategy, with specific attention to terms like "stakeholder", "liveability" and "infill".

Data (9)

Respondents expressed a desire, both in developing the infill strategy and while considering specific infill proposals, to understand how information will be used to inform decisions. Comments falling under this topic area relate to the need for information on specific things like housing and infrastructure capacity, as well as a more general inquiry into how data can be used for the project. Some suggestions included developing an inventory and analysis of best practices on things like design guidelines, an inventory of local infill examples to frame discussions, and a case study on the effect of infill on the Osborne Village neighbourhood because it has experienced more infill development than any other neighbourhood in the City (some residents feel infill development has impacted the character of the neighbourhood in a negative way).

Implementation (8)

There are many comments coded to other topic areas that relate to the topic of implementation. Comments coded as "Implementation" identified a need for a clear implementation plan that will demonstrate how the components of a strategy will be regulated and enforced. Respondents felt that existing by-laws and policies are not being followed and are concerned that specific tools like design guidelines, for example, could be ignored by decision makers. Implementation of strategy components must ‘have teeth.’

Incentives (8)

Some responses coded under this topic indicated that grants and incentives should be part of the infill strategy discussion and that currently there is a lack of clarity around incentives. Respondents said that greater clarity is needed around how incentives (such as density bonusing, where greater development density is allowed as a tradeoff for providing public benefits such as affordable housing or public space amenities) are implemented, and that such incentives could be related to a set of indicators or criteria, for consistency.
Rehabilitation of Existing Housing Stock versus Demolition (7)

Many of the comments associated with rehabilitating existing housing stock were also coded under the previous sustainability section for the purposes described in that section. Rehabilitating the existing stock was noted to have advantages with respect to retaining neighbourhood character. Some comments acknowledged the fact that some of the housing stock is run down and needs to be replaced, and that refurbishment can be more costly than rebuilding. Respondents were interested in how to distinguish between good houses and derelict ones. Some residents felt that perfectly good homes come to be demolished because of the impacts of neglect, and they didn’t want to see character homes lost.

Fees (6)

Those who provided responses about fees felt that planning and development fees have been increasing. Respondents also felt that the newly legislated growth fee should not apply to infill development, and that while Mature Communities are currently exempt from the fee this is only until 2019. One comment suggested that because of the growth fee small scale infill developers are experiencing more competition from greenfield developers turning their attention to infill. It was also noted by residents that obtaining variances seems a more common practice than it ought to be and that increasing the cost of variances may discourage the practice.

Public Education/Awareness (4)

Comments about the need for public awareness were based on the notion that the general public is uninformed with respect to development, and that public awareness should be part of the Strategy. It was suggested that the City needs to develop a communication strategy for neighbourhood consultation for infill development to educate, discuss matters of process, purpose and expectations of builders/developers.

Parking (4)

Comments dealing with parking suggest a better understanding of the impacts of traffic are generally needed. Some respondents feel that parking provisions of many infill development projects are not adequate, while others (typically those on the developer side) feel that reductions in parking would increase the industry’s appetite for infill.

Sustainability (4)

These responses indicated that good development should be sustainable. Responses in this category recognized that demolishing buildings and sending the material to the landfill is not sustainable.

Construction Practices (3)

Comments coded as “Construction Practices” identified a need to develop guidelines for construction management with the aim of requiring construction sites to be safe and ‘family friendly.’

NIMBY (‘Not In My Back Yard’) (3)

“NIMBY” is a term that came up in a few comments. On one side of the equation it was noted that NIMBY is a term that residents take exception too, because of its negative connotation. On the other side, some developers feel that the public often hold perceptions that are unfounded and that this is a huge obstacle. Some go so far as to say that some of the “NIMBY” attitudes constitute human rights violations such as attitudes expressed toward renters.

Permit Process (3)

Comments about the City’s current building permit process expressed personal accounts of frustration over a lengthy process with an unclear path and timelines. Such developers felt they have to spend a lot of time tracking down members
of the Public Service and that small builders just don’t have the time for this. Builders would like to have better understanding of time lines and key decision points, and a timely mechanism for the City to communicate with applicants when issues arise so they can be addressed expediently. Respondents involved in development were concerned that a lengthy process adds cost to projects and ties up capital.

**Building Code (3)**

Comments with respect to building codes were made in the context of rehabilitating old existing homes. Respondents seeking to upgrade their homes were concerned with high costs associated with building upgrades to meet current code requirements.
Residential Infill Strategy - Survey Results

Survey data was collected online and at various events between October 3 and December 1, 2017. Survey questions were written to understand current sentiments towards infill development, and gather additional feedback to inform the Strategy. Coded data represents a combination of both online and in-person survey data.

Please see the appendices for full survey text and survey card examples.

Summary of survey results:

- Online surveys received: 68
- Paper surveys received: 76
- Total number of surveys received: 144

Summary of coded responses:

- Responses categorized by council directed codes (Planning and Design Guidelines, Communication Plan and Policy Framework) and sub-codes:
  - **Planning and Design Guidelines**: 129 responses
    - Building Dimension / scale: 67
    - Landscaping and greenspace: 17
    - Character / aesthetic: 30
  - **Communication Plan**: 28 responses
    - Process and participation: 28 responses
  - **Policy Framework**: 217 responses
    - Preservation: 5
    - Neighbourhood reinvestment: 43
    - Construction protocol: 9
    - Housing options: 73
    - Affordability: 45
    - Municipal sustainability: 42
  - **Other**: 46 responses
Question 3: How has new / recent development contributed to your neighbourhood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>36.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>19.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4: How has new / recent development contributed to the city overall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4: How has new / recent development contributed to the city overall?

- N/A: 0%
- Positive: 30%
- Neutral: 20%
- Negative: 10%

Question 5: In your neighbourhood, do you feel there is enough variety of housing options?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residential Infill Strategy - Survey Results

Note: Categories listed below were drawn from public survey results, including online and paper-based surveys. They are also arranged in descending order of frequency, with the most frequently mentioned categories at the top. The number to the right of each heading indicates the number of responses that were coded under that heading. Details below each heading are provided for discussion purposes only, and do not necessarily indicate the relative prevalence of a perspective. Please note that responses may be coded under multiple categories.

Housing options (73)
Responses in this category typically fell into two categories – either more housing options were desired, or housing options were seen to be adequate. Responses in favour of more housing options indicated more are required to better accommodate a broad spectrum of housing needs, including additional housing for single parent families, people with disabilities, older adults (visitible housing), rooming houses, tiny homes etc. Tenure was also an important consideration for respondents, so too were rental options. Some respondents indicated their support for establishing a mix of housing options as it leads to more complete communities. Others indicated they prefer to live in single family areas with other housing types including apartments and townhouses closer to higher intensity corridors.

Building dimensions/scale (67)
Comments related to building dimensions and scale were primarily concerned with the relative scale of infill developments and the positioning of buildings on infill lots. Lot coverage was a recurring concern, specifically when developments were seen to be ‘maxing out’ their building footprints, reducing side yards and presenting ‘wall-like’ conditions to adjacent neighbours. Respondents expressed concern that the subdivision of existing lots, and the provision of new and smaller lot sizes, in the context of existing dimensional standards, can lead to the perception that new buildings are ‘out of scale’ with the surrounding neighbourhood.

Affordability (45)
Housing affordability was a concern for many respondents, and that the provision of high quality, safe, low income housing, especially where it would replace vacant lots or derelict buildings, would be an asset. Similar to comments coded under Housing options, respondents indicated that affordable housing options in all neighbourhoods contribute to the establishment of more complete communities. In some areas, respondents indicated rapid condominium conversions or construction can result in a decrease of affordable housing options.

Neighbourhood reinvestment (43)
Neighbourhood reinvestment comments typically categorized infill development as an opportunity for improving housing stock and contributing positively to perceptions of neighbourhood reinvestment. Redevelopment of vacant properties or derelict buildings was seen as an opportunity to increase density and bring new families to the area. Since reinvestment could raise property values in an area, respondents expressed that this should be balanced with the provision of affordable housing units.

Municipal sustainability (42)
Support for infill housing frequently stemmed from a desire to maximize efficiency and best use existing municipal infrastructure. Respondents stated higher density development should occur near rapid transit infrastructure and that community centres, local businesses and other amenities thrive when there is higher residential density to support them. Infill development was also cited as a way to increase diversity in existing neighbourhoods, which was described as a positive attribute. Respondents cited infill development as a way to maximize tax dollars and revitalize older neighbourhoods. Densification through infill development was also cited as a way to improve transit efficiency and reduce urban sprawl. Respondents stated that sustainability practices such as energy efficient building techniques, local
food production and the preservation and improvement of existing structures should be supported as part of infill policy. Lastly, respondents indicated that if infill development is going to continue, that improvements to existing infrastructure must be undertaken to support this kind of development (sewer, roads etc.).

Characters and aesthetic (30)

Given that infill development occurs within an existing built environment, new buildings are being constructed next to buildings of earlier architectural styles. Concerns included a loss of history and character as older homes are replaced with new homes (specifically when new homes are built with lower quality materials), issues with contextually inappropriate intensification, and a need to develop with respect for existing neighbourhood character. Specifically, respondents indicated that lots splits, where long, narrow “trailer” houses are being established are particularly detrimental to the existing character of some mature neighbourhoods.

Process and Participation (28)

Some comments from existing homeowners expressed apprehension towards infill development, uncertain that their concerns would be properly addressed by City Planning staff and councilors. The approval of amendments to planning policy to support infill development was also expressed as a concern. Comments about the development application process, specifically, included the need for a more expedient, less expensive process to obtain permits, and the development of materials to help explain and clarify the permit process to potential developers. Public notification of details related to infill development was identified as an area for improvement. The revision of public notices displayed on properties where development applications have been applied for could be improved, for the purpose of clarity. Generally, further dialogue between residents and developers was seen as a positive goal, serving to improve development projects, increase public understanding of development projects, and potentially reduce opposition to infill.

Landscaping and greenspace (17)

Similar to comments about building dimensions/scale, concerns around landscaping and greenspace typically focused on infill on undeveloped properties, and increased lot coverage on developed properties. Reduced setbacks and increased lot coverage associated with infill development can be seen to reduce the amount of private greenspace in some mature neighbourhoods.

Transportation (15)

Respondents indicated that when infill development occurs in a neighbourhood, there should be services in place which maximize infill development’s benefits. Suggestions included locating infill developments near transit facilities, ensuring sidewalks are established, supporting the establishment of car share parking spaces, improving bus service and reducing minimum parking requirements.

Construction protocol (9)

Construction related concerns included impacts associated with truck and traffic noise, the need for clear construction timelines and communication with neighbours, and the fear of unfinished buildings becoming ‘eyesores.’ Comments also included the desire for new developments to incorporate ‘age friendly’ building designs, and construction standards incentivizing energy efficient design and construction.

Preservation (5)

Responses coded under ‘preservation’ were primarily those expressing the desire to preserve and maintain existing homes and structures. Rationale for these perspectives varied, from the desire to reduce urban sprawl through the adaptive reuse of existing structures, to the preservation of single family home neighbourhood structure.

Other (46)

For comments which fall outside of the above codes, please see Appendix G.
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Appendix A – Focus group notes
Overview

The goal of this meeting was to connect with residents and resident associations to pre-consult on how we should conduct engagement for the infill strategy project.

The focus group discussions were based on the following questions:

- Who should we be talking to?
- What information should we be providing?
- What formats for engagement should we be using?

- This event was meant to inform the Urban Planning Division about who should be consulted, what information should be shared, and how information should be communicated when the infill strategy consultation process begins in the fall of 2017.

- The meeting began with introductions, followed by a 5-10 minute presentation by the Urban Planning Division. Once the presentation was completed the floor was opened up for discussions focused around the three questions. One member of the Urban Planning Division captured notes on a flip chart throughout the discussions.
At the end of the meeting it was communicated to the group that the notes would be typed up and sent out to participants for their record and to ensure that points were captured accurately. Further, the participants were encouraged to provide feedback following the meeting, either to elaborate, provide clarity, or further explore ideas related to the conversation.

- Meeting notes include comments from the initial meeting (in black) and additional feedback from attendees (in blue).

Who should be engaged in this process?

- Start with Resident Associations
- People who have been affected by infill
- People who understand legality of infill

Additional feedback:

  - There are thousands of residents knowledgeable about zoning, by-laws and even PDAs (as a result of widespread inappropriate developments over the past dozen years). Planning could benefit from this community expertise.

What information should we be providing?

- Don’t make assumptions.

Additional feedback:

  - Under ‘What Information Should We be Providing,’ it says “don’t make assumptions.” What was really conveyed in its entirety was to not make assumptions about what residents and communities know. The knowledge they have along with the collective understanding of the neighbourhood and its history is far reaching, and needs to be honoured. There is much for you to learn from them, as opposed to focusing on what they need to learn from you. In addition, this point is also extremely important related to what forms of engagement you should be using. Those formats should be those that emphasize the process of the City learning from communities, not vice-versa.

- When talking with residents about infill we should use examples of developments in the community for reference as a starting point for discussions.

- Will housing data be made available throughout the process?

- Need to understand how current data can inform this project.

Additional feedback:

  - Show transparency by not editing public engagement results. Keep an open portal somewhere to show all feedback received as it comes in.
What formats for engagement should we be using?

- “Kitchen Parties” meaning that Planning will come to where Organizations or Resident Associations meet.
- BBQ’s and other community gatherings
- Go to residents in their own community
- Brunch at Sunshine House
- Resident Associations host the meetings
- Some resident associations have limited capacity for information sharing. What are other ways that information can be shared?
- Strategic events that take place within the community

Additional feedback:

- Planning should gather info from residents in person first (via kitchen meetings, resident group workshops etc), instead of asking us to fill out workbooks or surveys at open houses.

Other points raised in meeting:

- Changes are needed to the variance and conditional use signs (the yellow signs). Currently they are too legal sounding. Don’t provide images of proposed plans, etc.

Additional feedback:

- Ban those yellow re-zoning signs as they are now.

- There needs to be better connections between developers and residents.

Additional feedback:

- When Planning asks residents groups to defend themselves, under the guise of “Developers need to hear what you’re telling us”, you’re creating a pressured climate that stresses out residents.

- Decision-making needs to be rooted in evidence.

Additional feedback:

- Developers know they have nothing to lose. They have Planning’s support as well as strong regulatory advantages. They haven’t needed to deal in community-based evidence that citizen groups offer.

- Relationships and trust need to be improved between residents, City and developers. Lack of trust regarding money to be made from the proposed development.

Additional feedback:
The key issue that came out strongly was the issue of trust between residents, the city and developers. I would recommend you put that at the top in terms like; “Trust between residents, the city and developers is the biggest issue which will affect consultations about infill.

There remains a legacy of unfairness that will likely manifest itself in your July 29th stakeholder event. If you want a productive trustworthy dialogue, you'll have to orchestrate it very carefully.

As residents pointed out to you last week, it is Planning that should advocate on behalf of community needs – in collaboration with residents groups.

Without Planning’s support, residents’ role has little definition or legitimacy to the profit-minded.

As residents pointed out to you last week, it is Planning that should advocate on behalf of community needs – in collaboration with residents groups.

There is zero trust of Planning. It hasn’t used facts or local evidence to make decisions. It has appeared deceitful and has supported developers’ untruths. It uses projections and conjecture. Honesty was a big topic for everyone.

To build trust, Planning should study community needs and slow down its approval of developers. It should begin collaborative two-way dialogue with residents (instead of “informing” or “sharing”).

To build trust, Planning could show everyone it is working to enshrine resident groups’ role within its decision-making structure, like other cities do.

“Relationships and trust need to be improved between residents, City and developers.” This does not go hard enough in capturing what was said, which is that without some serious relationship building between the City and its communities, this initiative, along with any others related to the development approval process, will be of absolutely no value. Nothing is more important at this point. Every action that is taken by the City should have, in the background, an intent to make a positive contribution to relationship building.

The culture within Planning has to change. It has to slow down land development approvals to accommodate community needs.

A steering committee of stakeholders that includes resident groups should be established, that may also include professional architects, planners, developers, etc.

Additional feedback:

“A steering committee of stakeholders…should be established.” More fully, this steering committee should oversee this entire process, so that it is truly community led. At present, it is an old-style, technocrat driven process. As part of this is the next point, which was that the first undertaking of this steering committee would be to confirm the terms of reference for this project.

Establish a stakeholder steering committee for Planning to serve. PPD: “Infill Guidelines won’t really address greenspace…”

Currently there is no meaningful role legislated for resident groups.

The project needs to confirm a terms of reference

Terms need to be defined
• The term “stakeholder” needs to be defined.

  Additional feedback:
  
  o I had noted; “Only residents are stakeholders, developers are vendors and beneficiaries of decisions.”
  o Your notes say that the term “stakeholder” needs to be defined. My sense was that there was much input given by all in attendance as to how to define stakeholders.
  o The only stakeholder should be residents. Don’t ask residents to fight developers without having Planning’s support (eg. Community needs assessments).
  o Residents must be the first and last decision-makers about projects in their communities.

• The term “liveability” needs to be defined.

• Need to question and understand who is benefiting from the proposed development. Is the community benefiting? Is it the developer that is benefiting?

  Additional feedback:
  
  o Condo projects are not about increasing housing or taxes. They are about profiteering: developers sell chunks to large realtors who sell to medium realtors who sell to smaller realtors. Condos keep turning over, esp near trains.

• Need to bridge neighbourhood vision with decision making

  Additional feedback:
  
  o Rather than “Need to bridge the neighbourhood vision with decision making” I had noted; “Have to understand the residents’ vision for their neighbourhood v. the City’s vision for that neighbourhood.”
  o Each community has different needs and its context must define its projects.

• Consider how resident associations can be included in the regulatory decision making process.

• Be honest about how proposals will impact residents and list common criticisms.

• Infill guidelines cannot be discretionary – they should apply consistently to all infill.

  Additional feedback:
  
  o Finally, my last comment would be that one of many issues to be discussed during this initiative is the process through which infill guidelines will be assessed and applied. I would say that, to date, the design approval process under our neighbourhood plan has been extremely disappointing, after many promises were made about it.
  o Infill guidelines should apply everywhere (Planning has some dungeons & dragons rules about exceptions, even though it is all infill). PPD: “We’re excluding BRT corridors because they’re not really residential areas” (I pointed out Lord Roberts is one, and is being wrecked by BRT infill. PPD: “Lord Roberts is a Major Transformation Area...” (I said “That taxonomy just makes residents crazy because we had no role in it and we’re in shock”)
• There is a fiction that the Bus Rapid Transit in Winnipeg is Transit Oriented Development, when it is developer oriented development.

  Additional feedback:
  
  o  Rather than “developer oriented development”, I had noted “developer oriented transit”
  o  Stop the Developer-oriented Transit projects.

• Population projections need to be based in fact.

• We should be comparing population growth with development growth (e.g. single family housing starts and multi-family housing starts).

• Targets should be established for the percentage of resident stakeholders consulted.

• There needs to be discussion about heritage designation and infill development.

• Contentious development plans should be put on hold until infill strategy is complete.

• When considering infill development there should be an understanding of what neighbourhood amenities exist (e.g. parks)

• An implementation plan should be incorporated into the infill strategy.

  Additional feedback:
  
  o  I had noted; “How much population increase can the existing infrastructure (including sewage) handle?”

• City decision makers and Planning should be using this project as an opportunity to build trust with residents.

  Additional feedback:
  
  o  I had noted; “Residents disappointed design execution of projects did not suit neighbourhood as promised.”

• Open houses should be banned.
Residential Infill Strategy:
Focus Group Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday June 15, 2017
Time: 7:30 – 9:00 PM
Location: 4th floor, 10 Fort Street
Attendees: 5 people in attendance

Organizations*:
- City of Winnipeg Urban Planning and Office of Public Engagement
- Richmond West Neighbourhood (RW)
- Osborne Village West (OV)
- Point Douglas (PtD)
- South St. Boniface (SSB)

*Acronyms indicate attribution of quotes, below.

Overview

The goal of this meeting was to connect with residents and resident associations to pre-consult on how we should conduct engagement for the infill strategy project.

The focus group discussions were based on the following questions:

  o Who should we be talking to?
  o What information should we be providing?
  o What formats for engagement should we be using?

- This event was meant to inform the Urban Planning Division about who should be consulted, what information should be shared, and how information should be communicated when the infill strategy consultation process begins in the fall of 2017.

- The meeting began with introductions, followed by a 5-10 minute Powerpoint presentation by the Urban Planning Division. Once the presentation was complete the floor was opened up for discussions focused around the 3 questions. One member of the Urban Planning Division captured notes on a flip chart throughout the discussions. At the end of the meeting it was communicated to the group that the notes would be typed up and sent out to
participants for their record and to ensure that points were captured accurately. Further, the participants were encouraged to provide feedback, either to elaborate, provide clarity, or further explore ideas related to the conversation. The meeting notes provided within this sheet include comments from the initial meeting (in black) and subsequent feedback (in blue).

**Who should be engaged in this process?**

- Seniors Groups
- Builders Association
- Manitoba Housing
- Property Management Companies
- Other professional organizations (engineers, architects, etc.)
- Talk to other jurisdictions (e.g. Edmonton)

**Additional feedback:**

- Planner said that they were looking at what other cities were doing for infill. OV suggested that Edmonton was an excellent example and that as far as OV was concerned, we could just take Edmonton’s guidelines and adapt them to suit Winnipeg, and we would be done. Planner admitted that Edmonton had the best infill guidelines in the country. (post-meeting OV comment: the Edmonton Infill Guidelines can be found here: [https://www.edmonton.ca/business_economy/documents/PDF/Residential_Infill_Guidelines_Sept_2009.pdf](https://www.edmonton.ca/business_economy/documents/PDF/Residential_Infill_Guidelines_Sept_2009.pdf))

- With regard to who they should talk to, PiD mentioned seniors groups, property managers, Manitoba Housing. RW mentioned Habitat for Humanities, builders assoc.

**What information should we be providing?**

**Additional feedback:**

- I stumbled upon this article about densification in New York and I figure that, if anyone knows a thing or two about the ramifications of densification, it would likely be folks in New York. Perhaps it can help with the question of “What information should we be providing?” as well as ”Who Should be Engaged in this Process?” I would think that councillors could also benefit from this perspective.  

**What formats for engagement should we be using?**

- Meetings should be held at various times of the day to accommodate peoples schedules
- Small groups and informal gatherings
- With regard to formats for engagement, OV mentioned that a number of informal round table discussions like we were having tonight were the best way to proceed.
Other points raised in the meeting

- Getting developers to engage with residents. Consultation should be with more than just immediate neighbours.

  Additional feedback:
  - Has the potential to save both city, developers and residents time and money
  - A common theme expressed by each community was the need to consult with the community well before new developments ever proceed to public hearing. RW said the slow process involved with setting up good consultation is time well-spent.
  - RW said that more than just the adjacent neighbours need to be informed; the entire street and even entire neighbourhoods need to be informed. RW cited the construction a new cell tower in their neighbourhood as an example of the need to inform more than just adjacent residents.

- How does disaster management fit into infill planning (with reference to example of speedway and St. Boniface area)

  Additional feedback:
  - Cosmetic buffers are not acceptable and can actually increase chance of risk and harm
  - SSB said that planning needs to include disaster management. SSB cited a few projects in South St. B where the local residents had local knowledge about disaster risks that was not sought and was being ignored when the community tried to raise their concerns. SSB also mentioned 825 Tache and the distance between the proposed building and railway line as an example of the City not doing the necessary consultations concerning disaster management. Cosmetic buffers that are used for industrial in current planning with reference to the disaster management, do not factor in health or physical harm to residents. This was brought up by SSB early on in its opposition to Marion.

- Consideration needs to be given on keeping neighbourhoods ‘family friendly’

  Additional feedback:
  - To assist in promoting “safe” environments.
  - OurWinnipeg addresses the character of neighbourhoods, which is all too often is not a consideration in the planning or approval process. With specific reference to design and size.
  - SSB said that infill needs to keep neighbourhoods “family friendly”. If not, families will be forced to the suburbs and infill will fail.

- More consideration about parks for the neighbourhood

- Where does dedication money go?

  Additional feedback:
  - OV said that many of the OV developments with their variances have had to pay the city 10% land use dedication fees when providing less greenspace than would otherwise be required. OV said that that money should go back into the given neighbourhood to provide greenspace elsewhere in the community.
OV asked: Where is that money going? Into some kind of general slush fund? Is it being spent in the suburbs? Made a note asking where Land Use Dedication money is being spent.

- How will guidelines be applied? And how will they related to other policy regulations in place such as the Zoning By-law and Secondary Plans?

  Additional feedback:
  
  o Our concern is that the infill guidelines will be interpreted, applied when convenient, and even ignored, as is happening today with our neighbourhood plans. We have neighbourhood plans and a zoning by-law now that are not being respected today. The zoning by-law is being modified habitually through variances, and neighbourhood plans are being treated as policy; provisions are cherry-picked or out-right ignored; loop holes are being exploited—all to maximise density and developer’s profits. Why should we expect the infill guidelines to be treated any better? Since the infill guidelines will be just that… guidelines, and not law…. there will be no means of enforcement or grounds for appeal. What measures can/will the City put in place with this initiative to assure the public that the infill guidelines will in fact be respected, upheld and applied consistently in our neighbourhoods?

  o OV used the Roslyn Crescent house situation as an example of their neighbourhood’s concern that the City has neighbourhood plans and zoning by-law that are not being upheld now; therefore, why should OV expect the infill guidelines to be upheld any better? (post-meeting OV comment: “Our concern is that the infill guidelines will be interpreted, applied when convenient, and even ignored, as is happening today with our neighbourhood plans. We have neighbourhood plans and a zoning by-law now that are not being respected today. The zoning by-law is being modified habitually through variances, and neighbourhood plans are being treated as policy; provisions are cherry-picked or out-right ignored; loop holes are being exploited—all to maximise density and developer’s profits. Why should we expect the infill guidelines to be treated any better? Since the infill guidelines will be just that… guidelines, and not law…. there will be no means of enforcement or grounds for appeal. What measures can/will the City put in place with this initiative to assure the public that the infill guidelines will in fact be respected, upheld and applied consistently in our neighbourhoods?)

- There is a current lack of trust between residents and developers and City

  Additional feedback:

  o SSB - I apologize for belabouring these points but I think it’s important to note the reasons why distrust might exist rather than simply noting that it does. If we can get to the root of these issues, we then have a chance to address the problems and collectively choose more appropriate solutions. It might also help us with the development of the needed guidelines.

- How do we know if there is sufficient infrastructure capacity for development?

  Additional feedback:

  o SSB raised concerns about infrastructure capacity with infill development (eg. sewer overflow into the rivers) with common sewers in the mature neighbourhoods and over-development.

- Transparency is key

- A culture shift is needed

  Additional feedback:
Lack of trust, lack of respect, and need for public consultation came up many times. A need for a change in culture was also expressed.

- Need to look at construction guidelines management
- Need better enforcement of development standards and impacts on neighbourhood during construction.
- Need a riverbank development strategy that protects the riverbanks and natural features

Additional feedback:

- OV also mentioned that Edmonton considers its rivers and river banks as natural heritage to be conserved. OV read the following extract from Edmonton:

  "Natural areas indeed are part of our heritage. [...] In the absence of any effective programs to protect and conserve remaining natural areas, many of our most significant natural sites have been lost to development. We may be at a crossroads that will determine the future character of the city. Either we must move quickly to protect the natural features that we cherish and take for granted within the City of Edmonton or we will see the remaining fragments of our natural heritage lost forever."

- (post-meeting comment: This extract is from 2.2.4 Natural Heritage found in the Technical Report for Edmonton’s "CONSERVING EDMONTON’S NATURAL AREAS - A Framework for Conservation Planning in an Urban Landscape"
https://www.edmonton.ca/city_government/environmental_stewardship/parkland-conservation.aspx )

- OV said that we are at the same crossroads here in Winnipeg; our riverbanks, in the most mature neighbourhoods (under the most infill pressure), are all getting the biggest developments with no public access or public green space along the river banks.

- Need to look at "gentle density" and how to transition between high density and low density residential uses

Additional feedback:

- Common concerns were "maxing out" lots and too many variances. SSB said that conditional uses not only max out land usage, but some outright fly in the face of prohibited uses in the city’s own by-laws. SSB mentioned that 3 new modern houses are going up on a street with post-war houses. They do not fit the scale or character of the street/ neighbourhood. They also fail to respect the adjacent homeowners whose greatest investments are likely in their own properties. OV said they have the same situation on Roslyn Crescent.

- SSB also mentioned the need to avoid sudden change from low to high density, to buffer the transition more to keep both desirable, and to provide more of a staggered effect from low to medium to high, as high density right beside low density could have adverse effects on low density single family homes.

- SSB said that the city thought urban sprawl was the way to go for a while; that was a mistake; so now they are going completely the other way with high density; another mistake; SSB asked: isn’t there a happy medium somewhere between the two extremes?

- Just to add to what [Person X] said, a point that really needs to be noted is that densification can be done badly. There’s a saying that “a little knowledge is dangerous” and I think that applies well here. Understandably, city councillors cannot be fully informed on all potential developments/projects.
throughout the entire city however, they must nonetheless vote on accepting or rejecting them with whatever information they do have. The tendency seems to be to rely on little bits of info which includes their colleagues' information on which to base their vote decision. If a fellow councillor has adopted the latest buzz words like urbanism and densification with a surface knowledge as the single answer to the city's problems and, thinking that any and all densification is good densification, there is the potential for a host of new problems waiting to happen in voting to accept all proposed developments.

OV brought to light a perfect example of what too much of a “good thing” can do to an area. Osborne Village seems to be the poster child for overdone densification. Just a few short years ago, that area was exactly what we would want urban design to accomplish; there was always pedestrian traffic and it was one of “the” spots to go in Winnipeg. In the last few years, that has changed. Natural features like forest, which contribute so much to aesthetics and healthy living, was virtually obliterated. Parking is ridiculous. The riverbank is choked off by high-rises and its’ beautiful views are no longer accessible to the general public. The merchants are feeling the decline and businesses are folding. An analysis of what went wrong with this neighbourhood needs to be done to figure out what the tipping point is that turns an area from an organically vibrant one that everyone would want to visit or live in to one that is now to be basically avoided.

OV spoke about the situation in Osborne Village. OV said that it was an example of how not to do infill. OV mentioned that they used to have a village with character, but the character is gone now, stores are closing, they have many store vacancies on Osborne, inadequate parking, etc. SSB agreed saying that OV was a village with character once that has been killed, so now, the City wants to make a village in the Parker Wetlands...

- Need to protect Urban Forest

Additional feedback:

- Strategic planning of Trees in design – Better understanding required in planning for their impact for cooling and reducing heat islands, benefits to infrastructure, improved air quality, aesthetic value, cost benefits, benefit to runoff and water quality. A good link to start [https://www.epa.gov/heat-islands/using-trees-and-vegetation-reduce-heat-islands](https://www.epa.gov/heat-islands/using-trees-and-vegetation-reduce-heat-islands)

- OV also said that our urban forest needs to be protected in infill areas and that it is being decimated in Osborne Village. SSB said that trees are beneficial for water runoff, heat effect, and filtering pollution and have some really overlooked cost/benefit impacts.

- The Parker Wetland and Forest seem to be an example of unfortunate planning. In an effort to create "walkable neighbourhoods," the city is destroying a perfectly sound natural feature that contributes to a healthy and beautiful environment. Instead of working with what already exists on Pembina Highway which is just a short walk away, the city chose to locate a BRT in a place where it will not be seen, thus not encouraging its use by everyone seeing it whip past clogged traffic and where there may be somewhat of a safety issue for those waiting for it in a remote location. In order to now turn it into a transit-oriented development, I understand that new housing and a new mall of some kind will be added by developers. With yet another new mall having just opened near Ikea, it’s hard to imagine that the city needs another one. Will it be a destination in and of itself or is it meant to cater to local residents? I can’t help but think of Portage Place and its unintended effect on Portage Ave.

- In reference to parks and wooded areas, understanding that they can have a very positive impact on increased property values and can make areas more desirable to live in.
• Parking needs to be better understood – impacts of traffic, lack of parking, etc.

Additional feedback:
  - OV also said that infill needs to include adequate parking.
  - Impact to existing clientele and potential restriction for access, will the neighbourhood density be enough to support these businesses?

• Wind studies should be factored into high rise development planning.

Additional feedback:
  - OV also mentioned that wind analysis needs to done. During the 1960s when many of the high rises in OV were built, architects and planners did not know about wind effects. However, now wind effects are known and should be properly analysed for new infill.
  - In planning of new industrial areas or businesses, wind direction also needs to be applied in planning to better understand potential impact on nearby existing or potential new areas. IE. potential Canada Packers site may have higher exposure to pollution from nearby intensified industry due to the most common wind directions.

• Need to consider healthy communities

Additional feedback:
  - When planning active transportation in large infill areas, particulate matter needs to understood in planning and which areas have higher concentrations as well as it potential impact on human health.

• Work to find balance of development with community needs/wants

Additional feedback:
  - Representatives approving projects need to know the bylaws, and not approve conditional uses or variances that go directly against prohibited uses.
  - Finally, regarding zoning bylaws and variances, as has already been mentioned, secondary plans and the zoning bylaws seem to be simply a suggestion that is easily over-ridden. There are at least a couple of problems developing from this. Firstly, if we simply disregard these plans, we risk losing complete sight of a long-term vision for the city and ending up with a hodge-podge of capricious developments. Secondly, it removes any chance of authentic citizen participation from the process since the “rules of the game” are subject to change at any given moment and at the whim of decision-makers. Solid trusting relationships are not built on such foundations. As a resident on Sargeant Ave. essentially asked while going against a development that would have a serious impact on his property, what good are zoning bylaws if multiple variances can be arbitrarily added in order to unreasonably max-out neighbouring properties by developers? As it turns out, the development was unanimously approved by the committee. Thus, resident-opposition is viewed as a necessary evil that must be tolerated rather than really considered.
  - Lack of citizen engagement risks increased numbers fleeing to bedroom communities, as they will be viewed as the “safer option”.

Additional Comments
- Encouraging walkable neighbourhoods, not large roadways. There are many articles on why catering only to cars, will fail.

- The Marion-Widening issue is an example of a city planning contradiction. Putting in a freeway to cater to outlying suburbs and bedroom communities while expropriating affordable housing and businesses in an already-walkable neighbourhood would have flown in the face of urbanism and densification. It likely would have served to encourage urban sprawl at the expense of a vibrant and valuable piece of core area land while at the same time not solving the traffic issues for which it was conceived since the traffic jam occurs due to all the south and southeast traffic heading to a single bridge, ie. Norwood Bridge.

- OV said that these infill guidelines are probably too late to save Osborne Village, but hopefully they will protect other neighbourhoods from the same fate.

- PtD said that they welcomed infill development in their area; any development there lifts the entire neighbourhood.
Residential Infill Strategy: Focus Group Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday June 21, 2017
Time: 9 a.m. – 10 a.m.
Location: 4th floor, 65 Garry St., Winnipeg, MB
Attendees: 8 people in attendance
Organizations*:

- City of Winnipeg Urban Planning and Office of Public Engagement
- Winnipeg Realtors
- Paragon Design Build
- Ventura Developers
- Sunstone Group

*Please note: not all attendees provided their organization or affiliation when signing in.

Overview

- The goal of this meeting was to connect with people in the development industry to discuss how we should conduct engagement for the infill strategy project.

- The focus group discussions were based on the following questions:
  
  - Who should we be talking to?
  - What information should we be providing?
  - What formats for engagement should we be using?

- This event was meant to inform the Urban Planning Division about consultation that is to begin in the fall of 2017.

- The meeting began with introductions, followed by a 5-10 minute PowerPoint presentation by the Urban Planning Division. Once the presentation was complete the floor was opened up for discussions focused around the three questions. One member of the Urban Planning Division captured notes on a flip chart throughout the discussions. At the end of the meeting, it was communicated to the group that the notes would be typed up and sent out to participants for their record and to ensure that points were captured accurately. Further, the participants were encouraged to provide feedback following the meeting, either to elaborate, provide clarity, or further explore ideas related to the conversation. No further comments were provided by participants.
Who should be engaged in this process?

- Need to talk to public about things like smart growth, sustainability, and how infill can be a catalyst.

What information should we be providing?

- Good examples of development will help foster public buy in. Need to set precedent in this regard. Quality!
- Need research to educate the public and politicians and dispel myths. Eg. - Demonstrate that infill development does not decrease property values but actually lifts them. Evidence based policy.

What formats for engagement should we be using?

Other points raised in meeting:

- NIMBY is a problem. The public holds perceptions that come out at public hearings which are myths. Eg. Impacts on property values. ‘Person X’ is a good resource with respect to this topic. She shows how to get ahead of it (some of the NIMBY arguments can even be grounds for human rights violations – eg. Renters).
- Scale of development is important. People don’t seem to get upset about 3 story buildings on corridors. Also single and two-family dwellings are palatable.
- Infill development has a direct tie to transportation.
- Design is very important. Context should be a basic consideration. Most developers have own design guidelines. So do non-profit organizations like Housing Opportunity Partnership.
- Consistency is very important.
- Agent/owner concerns:
  - There is too much uncertainty.
  - A lot of time developers don’t get to the first stage because there is too much RISK.
- Need to set appropriate entitlements.
- Need to remove small scale development from the public hearing process. As a trade-off need to have a robust set of guidelines to ensure good development.
- 25’ lots: Often a perception that they are too small, but they can be developed in an appropriate fashion.
- In terms of consultation an important consideration is advance notice. Can always adjust schedules if have enough lead time. Mornings preferred.
- Infill should not be an either/or with respect to other areas where development is happening (eg. Corridors, downtown, greenfield). All have their place.
- Growth fees should not apply to infill.
• There are areas of the City where infill is happening in a good way (eg. Area 2C of the MLS). Might be that people are choosing to live in neighbourhoods closer to downtown because of traffic.

• Resident Association pre-consultation in development goes a long way.

• Political support is needed. Politicians need to see that everyone is on the same page. Not ‘fractious.’

• Noted that infill development in Calgary has higher property values than greenfield. This is because infill is more desirable. Things like existing trees, services, culture, etc.

• Should use Winnipeg Landmarks in/near the downtown to promote infill. People want to live near things like the Canadian Museum of Human Rights, baseball stadium, etc. People like ‘view sheds’ to the downtown.
Residential Infill Strategy:
Focus Group Meeting Notes

Date: Wednesday June 21, 2017
Time: 2 p.m. – 3 p.m.
Location: 4th floor, 65 Garry St., Winnipeg, MB
Attendees: 4 people in attendance
Organizations:
- City of Winnipeg Urban Planning and Office of Public Engagement
- Character Homes Ltd.
- University of Winnipeg Community Renewal Corporation (UWCRC)
- Habitat for Humanity

Overview

The goal of this meeting was to connect with people in the development industry to discuss how we should conduct engagement for the infill strategy project.

The focus group discussions were based on the following questions:

- Who should we be talking to?
- What information should we be providing?
- What formats for engagement should we be using?

- This event was meant to inform the Urban Planning Division about consultation that is to begin in the fall of 2017.
- The meeting began with introductions, followed by a 5-10 minute PowerPoint presentation by the Urban Planning Division. Once the presentation was complete the floor was opened up for discussions focused around the three questions. One member of the Urban Planning Division captured notes on a flip chart throughout the discussions. At the end of the meeting it was communicated to the group that the notes would be typed up and sent out to participants for their record and to ensure that points were captured accurately. Further, the participants were encouraged to provide feedback, either to elaborate, provide clarity, or further explore ideas related to the conversation following the meeting. No further comments were provided by participants.

Who should be engaged in this process?

- ‘Legitimate’ stakeholders, and/or silent majority
• Capital Region
• Young people staying? Reach university students
• Speak to appraisers as part of zoning change recommendations; otherwise development goes to greenfield – fewer restrictions
• Baby boomers – needs/wants?
• Trade and industry associations
• Materiality – more up-front clarity – consult architects and developers on this
• Invite media? Allow them to hear story
• All city dwellers have a stake in key neighbourhoods

What information should we be providing?
• Bring/show precedents from other cities – successes, challenges
• Simple communication tools – regular language
• Look to other cities – density in zoning districts – update with view to greater allowances
• PR strategy with key messaging
• Data – market analysis for owners, renters – guide allowable densities and other factors

What formats for engagement should we be using?
• Mix of engagement techniques – online, target stakeholders who know the building and financing business
• Continue the collaboration with these groups throughout, bounce off ideas

Other points raised in meeting:
• Reduce height caps in strategic areas to promote density and walkability.
• Parking reductions and density increases will stimulate appetite for infill.
• Fees: keep going up – cost charges – one building pays, next door doesn’t
• Building and fire code changes
• Planning fees
• Appraised values – properties/streets with high values may need higher density to see change
• Ensure the strategy is tied to guiding framework.
  o City-wide policy
  o OurWinnipeg
  o Complete Communities
• How will incentives play into the strategy?
• Current lack of clarity on incentives
• Less focus on greenfield
• Plug-in infrastructure may assist with complete neighbourhoods
• Density bonusing and incentives – tied to indicators – sustainable, affordable development
• Manitoba Hydro – incentives?
Residential Infill Strategy: 
Focus Group Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday June 22, 2017
Time: 2 p.m. – 3 p.m.
Location: 4th floor, 65 Garry St., Winnipeg, MB
Attendees: 7 people in attendance

Organizations*:
- City of Winnipeg Urban Planning and Office of Public Engagement
- JSU Properties Ltd.
- Carrington Homes
- Winnipeg Housing Renewal Corporation (WHRC)

*Please note: not all attendees provided their organization or affiliation when signing in.

Overview

The goal of this meeting was to connect with people in the development industry to discuss how we should conduct engagement for the infill strategy project.

The focus group discussions were based on the following questions:

- Who should we be talking to?
- What information should we be providing?
- What formats for engagement should we be using?

- This event was meant to inform the Urban Planning Division about consultation that is to begin in the fall of 2017.

- The meeting began with introductions, followed by a 5-10 minute PowerPoint presentation by the Urban Planning Division. Once the presentation was complete the floor was opened up for discussions focused around the three questions. One member of the Urban Planning Division captured notes on a flip chart throughout the discussions. At the end of the meeting it was communicated to the group that the notes would be typed up and sent out to participants for their record and to ensure that points were captured accurately. Further, the participants were encouraged to provide feedback following the meeting, either to elaborate, provide clarity, or further explore ideas related to the conversation. No further comments were provided by participants.
Who should be engaged in this process?

- Need to engage City Council – Council Seminar

What information should we be providing?

n/a

What formats for engagement should we be using?

- What about use of surveys? One issue is that only people interested in infill will fill them out. A good approach might be to involve resident associations early and then have them be involved in engaging residents.

Other points raised in meeting:

- As a developer, public consultation goes a long way:
  - Allows residents to be engaged in a development.
  - How to promote open houses?
  - Helps with future public hearing process and process in general.
  - The venue is very important – somewhere in the neighbourhood.
  - Door-to-door canvassing does not work well.
  - Has improved every single project (i.e. modified design, even lay out of units based on feedback).

- Not everyone likes infill development but it is needed.

- The public has a false notion that infill development will result in a decrease of neighbouring property values. This needs to be dispelled.

- The public often has a perception that a development will increase traffic within the area. However, the public may not understand that the level of service (l.o.s.) in terms of vehicle trips per day is often far below the capacity a street can handle.

- Sometimes when people see large scale plans showing large areas appropriate for density it can shock people (e.g., North St. Boniface). Might be better to prioritize specific corridors or segments of rather than shading in large areas.

- What does infill mean? Need to distinguish between what is modest change in density and what is intensification.

- Need out of the box thinking. Why can't a smaller lot be created on a street where all the lots are large? This is outdated thinking. And why can subdivisions only be supported where there are already examples on that street? How does this generate variation?

- Need public education. The public is very uninformed when it comes to development.

- NIMBY(ism) is a huge obstacle.
• The current approval process results in different rules/landscape for different areas of the city.

• Even lot splits, very minor development, which will create two houses where there was one face controversy.

• Should be more like Toronto. They have much more of an open mind to density.

• Planners in the City have different views of development in different areas. Not consistent. May be pandering to Councillor attitudes toward development.

• City Councillors are way too involved in the design of development (e.g. – Plan Approval). However, these councilors have no expertise, background to make these decisions. There was an account where a planner had to explain to a Councillor who was deliberating over a plan approval what a cantilever is. Some developers feel that Councillors get personal in the process.

• Need guidelines for form/ character.

• Length of process:
  o Permits are a huge hold-up and a huge source of frustration. Builders, developers have to spend a lot of time chasing down members of the Public Service.
  o Accounts of processes taking 18 months to achieve permits (one case 3 years). In neighbouring planning districts permits have been issued in as little as 2 days.
  o Small builders don’t have the time/capacity to keep chasing down the Public Service for answers. And, if you are not your own advocate then things will just sit.
  o It would at least be good to know up front how long the process will take and what the key decision points are.
  o There needs to be a clear timeline to communicate to the applicant what the deficiencies are with their proposal, or what information is missing so they can address this. This is what other cities/ municipalities do.
  o Length of process adds cost to projects. Ties up capital. Developer has to pay property taxes and interest while things sit in limbo.
  o Consistency, predictability will save developers time, effort and will reduce risk.

• Some developers have noted increased competition in the infill market from large developers and think this might have to do with the growth fees, i.e. these developers may be shifting to infill where the fees don’t currently apply.

• Growth fees expected to apply to Mature Communities in 2019. This is a problem.

• The goal should be that we are trying to increase the amount of infill development. Need tools for how. Fast track approval process, stream line. Langford BC cited as a good example. They created design guidelines, set parameters and then opened up lands for intensification. Therefore, proposed development can be tailored to the rules, which are clear and transparent.

• With regards to a strategy, we need to find common ground, mutual interests.

• Development approval process:
o Shouldn’t need to go to a public hearing if a development meets policies. Regulations should address this.

o Should bring back a Planning Commission where the experts are making the decisions.
Appendix B – Stakeholder workshop notes
Residential Infill Strategy: Workshop Notes

Date: Thursday June 29, 2017

Time: 7 p.m. – 9 p.m.

Location: 4th Floor Auditorium, Millennium Library, Winnipeg, MB

Attendees:

15 people in attendance

Organizations*:

- City of Winnipeg Urban Planning and Office of Public Engagement
- Paragon Design
- Winnipeg Realtors
- Osborne Village West Residents
- JSU Properties
- UWCRC
- Corydon Osborne Community Voice

*Please note: not all attendees provided their organization or affiliation when signing in

Overview

- The goal of this meeting was to bring residents and those associated with resident associations together with people from the development community to engage in discussion about infill development.

- The meeting began with a 5 minute presentation by the Urban Planning Division. The presentation concluded with two prompt questions:
  
  - With regard to infill – What factors are most important to consider?
  
  - What is ‘good’ infill?

- Participants were asked to gather at two separate tables and begin the ‘card storming’ exercise, using the prompt questions as a starting point.

- Members of the Urban Planning Division sat in on the conversations and were available to help facilitate discussions if needed. Two members of the Urban Planning Division captured notes from discussions that were taking place. After approximately half an hour of discussions and writing ideas on Post-it notes, groups were asked to organize the comments into categories that held a common theme. These cards were posted up on the wall for others to see. Once organized, each group assigned a representative to speak to the discussions that
took place and encourage further discussion about the themes or specific points that were identified. Participants then had an additional 30 minutes to discuss further before the session concluded.

Notes from card storming exercise

Participants were asked to answer the prompting questions:

- With regard to infill – What factors are most important to consider?
- What is ‘good’ infill?

As participants answered the questions, they wrote their ideas on Post-it notes. The answers were then arranged into themes or categories by participants. Each of the cells in the tables below represents one Post-it note. The first table describing the categories generated by Group 1, and the second table showing theme categories generated by Group 2. Group 2 chose to label the themes they had generated.

Group 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1</th>
<th>Theme 2</th>
<th>Theme 3</th>
<th>Theme 4</th>
<th>Theme 5</th>
<th>Theme 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rules Clear Projects move forward automatically</td>
<td>Derelict buildings vs. good buildings</td>
<td>What – How Show design in greater transparency Early – online maybe</td>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>Corridor densification not happening</td>
<td>Lessons learned – OV and Corydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No political influence</td>
<td>Liveable, walkable (not destroyed)</td>
<td>Collaborative practice Engaging community</td>
<td>Sustainable</td>
<td>Proper densification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined criteria to consider (from planning)</td>
<td>Bring value to neighbourhood</td>
<td>Collaboration before signs go up</td>
<td>Character of neighbourhood Consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule consistency Neighbourhood development</td>
<td>Value to community</td>
<td>Involvement, Collaboration Consultation and participation with neighbourhood in advance</td>
<td>Scale (max area, max height)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules need to be clear and consistent for all involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is “good” development. Should be “sustainable” Not automatic demolition of good homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden density</td>
<td>Design within the characteristics of the neighbourhood</td>
<td>Infill, good infill needs proper transportation modes</td>
<td>Min % low income/RGI</td>
<td>Face to face</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invisible density – secondary suite</td>
<td>No cookie cutter 1 offs</td>
<td>Proper transportation to live where you live</td>
<td>Min % affordable</td>
<td>Holding developers liable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentle density – midrise</td>
<td>Landscaping projects properly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable</td>
<td>Neighbourhood engagement with developer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill to be absorbable in timely period</td>
<td>Infill: Fit in the area Don’t stand out.</td>
<td>Build to where infrastructure allows</td>
<td>Infill that adds back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize land/density bot not intrusive</td>
<td>Specific infill strategy for each area</td>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage engagement with Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laneway housing</td>
<td>Consider disaster management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Where should density go?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-unit to increase density in neighbourhoods that need it</td>
<td>Proper buffers to support infill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to create multi-family rental</td>
<td>Good infill = good building materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>What is a stakeholder? Who?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create co-housing options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to introduce Culturally appropriate housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to increase number of accessible units in a community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smaller sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process to distinguish infill from new &quot;large development&quot; in mature areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to create more non-market options. Non-profit, co-op, social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes from general discussions

- Good infill should be sustainable infill. Sending lots of building materials to landfills for a new building.
- Reuse of buildings retains character of buildings.
- Refurbishing can be very difficult and costly. It is easier to demo than to refurbish.
- NIMBY ("not in my backyard") is a negative term that residents take exception to.
- Replacing 100 year old buildings with modern design that is out of context and over built.
- Overpriced vacant buildings (in Corydon area) e.g. $600,000 condo not selling.
- Information not available for developments on variance signs. Need information further in advance of public hearing.
- Good infill is consistent with the character of the neighbourhood.
- More emphasis on process.
- Can development be assessed by the values of the neighbourhood? Used in density bonusing.
  - Urban Planning Division comment for clarification: Density bonusing is a tool that creates incentive for developers to provide public amenities in exchange for greater density levels than allowed under existing zoning.
- Death of the corner store.
  - Urban Planning Division comment for clarification: Understood this thought to be tied to the notion that fine grain, unique, community oriented commercial stores are less viable today and that with the decline of these stores, the sense of a tightly knit community has also declined.
- Upgrades to older homes need to meet current building code requirements.
- Density is not happening where it should. Low density areas rather than corridors.
- Some housing stock is run down and should be replaced.
- Scale is important: “losing right to light.”
- What if there was a community level urban design approval by residents?
- Rules on development need to be clear for all parties and need to be consistent.
- What grants are available? What incentives?
- Themes: Density, design, infrastructure, affordability, engagement.
- Can infill policy include affordable housing policy?
- Demolition by neglect.
• Costs for variances should be higher.
• Density bonusing.
• Natural features – how do they get protected? Trees, riverbanks, etc.
• What does consultation look like?
• Need a residential review committee.
• Either you’re in support or opposition at a public hearing.
• How do we get a broad representation of what the neighbourhood wants?
• How does OPE align with community/developer needs?
• **Value of old housing stock vs. value of new housing:**
  - Should viable old houses be demolished for new development?
  - Residents less concerned about demolition of old dangerous or dilapidated houses, but don’t want to see good character houses lost.
  - Developers talked about how code and accessibility can be issues even in ‘good’ character houses.
Appendix C – Realtors workshop notes
Residential Infill Strategy: Workshop Notes

Date: Tuesday, September 12, 2017

Time: 10 a.m. – 12 p.m.

Location: 1240 Portage Ave., Winnipeg, MB

Attendees:
25 people in attendance from the Winnipeg Realtors Association

Overview

- The City of Winnipeg Infill Project Team was invited to the Winnipeg Realtors Association to help lead an infill workshop. The goal of this workshop was to provide some background on the Residential Infill Strategy project and to hear the views and experiences of those in the real estate industry.

- The meeting began with a five minute presentation by the Urban Planning Division. The presentation concluded with two prompt questions:
  
  o With regard to infill – What factors are most important to consider?
  
  o What is ‘good’ infill?

- Participants were asked to separate into three groups and begin the 'card storming' exercise, using the prompting questions as a starting point.

- Members of the City staff sat in on the conversation and were available to help facilitate discussion if needed. After approximately half an hour of discussions and writing ideas on Post-it notes, groups were asked to organize the comments into categories that held a common theme. These cards were posted up on the wall for others to see. Once organized, each group assigned a representative to speak to the discussions that took place and encourage further discussion about the themes or specific points that were identified. Participants then had an additional 30 minutes to discuss further before the session concluded.

Notes from card storming exercise

Participants were asked to answer the prompting questions:

  o With regard to infill – What factors are most important to consider?
  
  o What is ‘good’ infill?

As participants answered the questions, they wrote their ideas on sticky notes. The sticky note answers were then arranged into themes or categories by participants. Each of the cells in the tables below represents one sticky note.
## Group 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1</th>
<th>Theme 2</th>
<th>Theme 3</th>
<th>Theme 4</th>
<th>Theme 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure single family infill is NOT subject to growth fees</td>
<td>Case manager assigned to take the entire process from start to end</td>
<td>Consistency – always follow Plan Winnipeg</td>
<td>Level the playing field during the application process for multi-unit developments</td>
<td>Developer frustration when projects are quashed after much time and money has been spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-departmental communication (City)</td>
<td>Consistency (architectural) to “fit” within existing neighbourhood</td>
<td>Emphasis or preference to infill with secondary suites</td>
<td>Don’t allow affected ward councillor to vote on the project – consult only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve communication between CoW departments i.e. Zoning, Water &amp; Waste</td>
<td>Clear guidelines (preliminary standards)</td>
<td>Consider “aging in place” when approving infill projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same home inspector for each infill housing project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public notification EARLY in the process – avoids issues later on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Theme 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Theme 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Theme 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Theme 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary suites</td>
<td>-uncertainty in process</td>
<td>Costs. Split vs. subdivide</td>
<td>CofW task force for infill approvals</td>
<td>Trust of residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good infill</td>
<td>-maximize lot</td>
<td>Lot split maps</td>
<td>Get area residents on board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-variety</td>
<td>Grants for infill</td>
<td>-communicate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-take existing street...consider it</td>
<td></td>
<td>-gain trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoW aesthetic guidelines</td>
<td>Re-zoning pre-app ideas</td>
<td>Simplified variance process</td>
<td>-overcome resistance to change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doc to support approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blends in with community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good infill:</td>
<td>Simplified variance process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-complete landscaping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-maximize lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create construction site that is neighbour friendly</td>
<td>Planning – 90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public engagement – residents to be able to make suggestions about aesthetics</td>
<td>Councillors – 5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public engagement – residents to be able to make suggestions about aesthetics</td>
<td>Public – 5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider affordability of residents (lower income in older neighbourhoods)</td>
<td>Process of subdividing lots in mature areas very risky for investors- not knowing whether a lot could be subdivided before they decide to purchase it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer a complete product (i.e. complete landscaping)</td>
<td></td>
<td>City to give a timeline for builders to start &amp; finish the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of build</td>
<td>City to develop a communication strat on all media platforms for neighbourhood consult for infill development educate, discuss process, purpose &amp; expectation building/developer input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamline variance process. Clear process for lot split vs. short form subdivision one standard fee scale, e.g.: 50 ft into two 25 ft lots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Group 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1</th>
<th>Theme 2</th>
<th>Theme 3</th>
<th>Theme 4</th>
<th>Theme 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiny home concept – where can we put them? (600 or 700 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>Better planning for infrastructure capacity for infill development 6 inch to 10 inch line</td>
<td>Intergenerational infill development – mixed income</td>
<td>Large scale infill development e.g. East Village Calgary</td>
<td>Step-up zoning and step-up dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show appraisals of infill to prove they do not devalue property</td>
<td>Detailed infrastructure plan for all mature neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Be sensitive to age demographic e.g. millennials</td>
<td>Make intensive infill on transit corridors e.g. seniors</td>
<td>Allow or encourage more mixed use infill buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be sensitive to preserving privacy of existing residents</td>
<td>Encourage mixed use zoning in more neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Educate owners on repurpose opportunities</td>
<td>Cost effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic engineering is important</td>
<td>Secondary suites</td>
<td>Staging of intensity of infill development</td>
<td>Incentives (selective)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>Repurposing mature neighbourhoods e.g. subdividing larger lots</td>
<td>Scale up on major restaurant corridor streets e.g. Corydon, Provencher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes from card storming exercise and general discussions

After the idea cards were posted on the wall, groups shared some highlights of their discussions.

**Group 1**

- Concern about impact fees being applied to infill
- Opportunities to improve application process and inspection process
- Need to do consultation early
- Need for clear guidelines/standards (but not too technical)
- Opportunities for aging in place
- Challenges with political interference leading to a lack of predictability
Group 2

- Discussed factors that constitute good infill
- Politics often complicates development approvals
- Variances are expensive – why should all infill require variances?
- Create an infill task force
- Address trust and quality

Group 3

- Need for small lot / small home options
- Desire for more factual evidence
- Opportunity for transitional infill: corridors → multi-family → duplex → single-family; building heights should also be transitional in the same way
- Opportunity to focus infill around centres, hubs and nodes
- Challenges with not having infrastructure capacity in place
- Major redevelopment sites could be a focus for infill
- Consider orientation of balconies with multi-family infill near single-family
Appendix D – Email invitations
Greetings!

The City of Winnipeg is pleased to offer the next session in the Housing Speaker Series, an interactive panel discussion that will focus on infill housing development. This important approach to development maximizes use of existing infrastructure, increases density and housing variety that supports local businesses and services, and often creates better opportunity to access a variety of transportation options. Infill development can also pose challenges for developers and requires that careful consideration be given to neighbourhood dynamics. For more information on the Speaker Series and past session, see: http://www.winnipeg.ca/ppd/PublicEngagement/HousingSpeakerSeries/default.htm.

This session will explore the benefits and challenges of infill development, as well as experiences of those who have engaged in this process. It will be of interest to individuals and builders considering infill development, housing advocates, and the general public. Speakers will discuss the following topics:

- Infill development from a planning perspective and how it can benefit the city
- Infill development from a neighbourhood and community perspective
- Infill development from a homeowner perspective
- Infill development from a developer’s perspective
- Processes to follow for gaining approvals from the City for an infill development

Refreshments will be provided and seating is limited.

Registration Information:

**Title:** Infill Housing Panel Discussion
**Date:** Saturday, November 18, 2017
**Time:** 1:00 – 3:00 pm
**Location:** Millennium Library (251 Donald Street), 2\textsuperscript{nd} Floor – Carol Shields Auditorium  
**Cost:** Free

Because space is limited, interested participants are invited to register by phone or by email no later than November 15, 2017.

**Phone:** 204-986-2636

**Email:** speakerseries@winnipeg.ca

Registrants who require a sign language interpreter to participate, please advise us by Wednesday, November 15, 2017.
Public Engagement on Residential Infill

Let’s talk infill in your community!
The City is seeking feedback from the general public on residential infill, as part of the “Public Consultation” phase of the City’s Residential Infill Strategy.
We invite you to come out to one of our ‘pop-up’ engagement sessions, as follows:

**October 26, 11 am – 1 pm**
Grant Park Shopping Centre
1120 Grant Avenue

**October 26, 6 – 8 pm**
Garden City Shopping Centre
2305 McPhillips Street

**October 27, 11 am – 1 pm**
St. Vital Shopping Centre
1225 St Mary’s Road

**October 30, 11 am – 1 pm**
Kildonan Place Shopping Centre
1555 Regent Avenue West

At the pop-ups, City staff will be seeking your input and ideas on residential infill development, and will be sharing information on other upcoming engagement opportunities to inform the Strategy such as a Housing Speakers Series forum. The survey from the engagement session is also available at: [www.winnipeg.ca/infillstrategy](http://www.winnipeg.ca/infillstrategy).

Thank-you,
City of Winnipeg Infill Strategy Team

---

Le public est également invité à se joindre à l’une de nos cinq activités éclair :

**Le 26 octobre, de 11 à 13 heures**
Centre commercial de Grant Park
1120, avenue Grant

**Le 26 octobre, de 18 à 20 heures**
Centre commercial de Garden City
2305, rue McPhillips

**Le 27 octobre, de 11 à 13 heures**
Centre commercial de Saint-Vital
1225, chemin St. Mary’s
Le 30 octobre, de 11 à 13 heures
Centre commercial Kildonan Place
1555, avenue Regent Ouest

Merci!
http://www.winnipeg.ca/francais/PPD/PublicEngagement/InfillStrategy
Residential Infill Strategy

Have your say!

What Is Residential Infill?
Residential infill is new housing in established neighbourhoods. New housing can be single-family, two-family, townhouse, or multi-family. The goal for this project is to advance a shared vision for residential infill that helps address demand for new housing while preserving neighbourhood quality, character, and liveability.

winnipeg.ca/infillstrategy

Our Winnipeg
Residential Infill Strategy

Have your say!

WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU!

Name ___________________________ Organization ___________________________
(If applicable) Postal Code ___________________________ (First 3 characters)

Have you experienced new/recent development in your neighbourhood? Yes No

How has new/recent development contributed to your neighbourhood? (positively / neutral / negatively)
Please explain: ___________________________

How has new/recent development contributed to the city overall? (positively / neutral / negatively)
Please explain: ___________________________

In your neighbourhood, do you feel there is enough variety of housing options? Yes No
(for example - single family, duplexes, townhouses, secondary suites, apartments, etc.) Please explain: ___________________________

What do you think the City should consider in an infill strategy? (for example - building design, locations, construction practices, landscaping, etc.)

winnipeg.ca/infillstrategy
QU'ENTEND-ON PAR « LOGEMENTS INTERCALAIRES »?

Les logements intercalaires sont des maisons qui sont construites dans des quartiers déjà établis. Il peut s'agir d'habitations unifamiliales, bifamiliales ou multifamiliales, ou de maisons en bande. Le but de ce projet est de dégager une vision commune par rapport à la question des logements intercalaires afin d'aider à offrir les nouveaux logements recherchés tout en préservant la qualité, le style et l'habitabilité des quartiers.
Appendix F – Online Survey Questions
Residential Infill Strategy

This survey is also available in French./Ce sondage est également disponible en français.

Residential infill is new housing in established neighbourhoods. New housing can be single-family, two-family, townhouse, or multi-family. The goal for this project is to advance a shared vision for residential infill that helps address demand for new housing while preserving neighbourhood quality, character, and livability. The Residential Infill Strategy (the Strategy) will address, at a minimum, built form, design features, lot width and size, yards, landscape standards, density, and zoning.

This survey is part of a public engagement program that will reach out to neighbourhood residents, builders, homebuyers, and the public. More information can be found here.

The survey will take approximately 10 minutes of your time. The survey will be collecting feedback until December 1, 2017.

1. **Personal Information** – This information will help us ensure we are reaching all Winnipeggers. If you would like to receive project updates, please include your email address.

   Name

   Organization (if applicable)

   Postal Code (first three characters)

   Email Address

2. **Have you experienced new/recent development in your neighbourhood?**

   Yes

   No

3. **In your opinion, how has new/recent development contributed to your neighbourhood?**

   Positively

   Neutral

   Negatively

   Please explain:

4. **In your opinion, how has new/recent development contributed to the city as a whole?**
Positively
Neutral
Negatively
Please explain:

5. In your neighbourhood, do you feel there is enough variety of housing options? (for example – single family, duplexes, townhouses, secondary suites, apartments, etc.)
Yes
Somewhat
No
Not sure
Please explain:

6. What is most important to consider as the city develops a residential infill strategy? (for example – designing to fit local context, early public notification, clarifying the development application process, minimizing negative impacts from construction, etc.)
Thank you for providing your input. A summary of the results from this survey will be posted online and incorporated into the project deliberation processes. Your time is appreciated!

For more information, please visit: winnipeg.ca/infillstrategy

Your personal information is being collected under the authority of 36(1)(b) of The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. This information will be used to contact you with project updates if you wish and will not be used or disclosed for any other purposes, except as authorized by law. Your contact information will not be made public. If you have any questions about the collection or use of this information, contact the Corporate FIPPA Coordinator by mail to City Clerk’s Department, Administration Building, 510 Main Street, Winnipeg MB, R3B 1B9, or by telephone at 311.
Appendix G – Survey “Other” Responses
Note: The “other” category represents outlier responses which did not logically fall under one of the 11 codes that emerged from the survey analysis. Responses designated “other” fall into one of three categories described below.

There are 46 responses which have been designated “other.”

1.) Fragmented responses: These responses seemed to be linked to statements made as part of previous responses in the survey questionnaires. When undertaking qualitative analysis by question, these responses did not provide standalone explanations of thoughts expressed, resulting in a difficulty to assign these statements to established codes. Responses included:
- Positively: the developer was great
- Negatively: not new housing, just road work - am worried about school bus routing
- n/a: Commitment of community to ask improvements.
- Positively: I am commonly the one proposing it and others do not see the benefits
- Positively: Pride of ownership of a new building
- Positively: new families.
- Neutral: There hasn't been much new or recent development in my neighborhood.
- Neutral: It isn't finished yet.
- Positively: If they have proper zoning and new road.
- Negatively: It is ruining the old neighbourhoods
- Positively: I like the infill projects downtown
- Neutral: I can't speak to how this has affected other parts of the city
- Neutral: For this survey, I am limiting comments to my neighborhood
- I’m sure city planners understand all considerations and strive to maximize them all

2.) Outside scope: These responses made reference to broader issues that seem to be outside the scope of the Strategy mandate and did not directly respond to the question posed. Responses included:
- n/a: These condos are right along the busy Stafford corridor; not a particularly nice place for people to live long term; people will presumably use these as stepping stones; not building long term community, or an attraction to living closer to downtown.
- Neutral: There is still issues with crime levels in West Broadway
- Neutral: New business contribute to tax revenue for city
- Positively: New comer family has a cute home
- Neutral: pretty buildings, same social problems
- Neutral: Taxes might be higher, as this home is much bigger than what there before.
- Yes: some of it is good, but there's not enough oversight on suites set in houses/
- Not sure: My neighbours settled in their homes for a long time; not really looking for other real estate options
- Somewhat: We have a wide range of options in my inner city neighborhood. Unfortunately many of them are of slum quality. The legal ones are over regulated on non-safety issues (parking, sound barriers), while the real problems are ignored because the slumlords carefully avoid any interaction with the City.
- More community spaces, community centres like DMSMCA and Cindy Klassen
- Keeping the price of ‘tear down’ houses at a low enough level to encourage new infills. Maybe raise taxes on the garbage houses so people will be less likely to hang on to houses that are falling over.
- Regulations on how to destroy a building. People should be allowed to destroy the building and have 1-2 years to build (get plans ready). I heard they only have a month, so people leave the buildings to fall apart - which leads to vermin and safety issues (homeless people or drug users using the house). Simplify the process. Charge a reasonable price for permits, etc. Rebates for re-using or donating parts (i.e. Habitat for Humanity) of the old house if in good condition to decrease load on the landfill. In our neighborhood, I think they should encourage detached garages because that is what everyone on the street has in their backyard. It is important to fit into the character of the street. Construction companies should clean up the mud and dust (and coffee cups) they leave behind. Communication with the neighbours would be amazing! We want to encourage revitalization but not at the cost of the people who live there and within reason to the neighbouring houses.
- Everyone should have the right to build what they want on their land
- Have some mechanism to keep foreign investors from speculatively buying up residential housing stock
- Building more daycare centres
3.) **Incomplete responses:** These responses represent incomplete answers to questions posed. Responses in this category were difficult to interpret as written and did not logically fall into one of the 11 codes which emerged from the survey analysis.

- **n/a:** will be positive
- **n/a:** don't know
- **n/a:** shows positive growth
- **n/a:** have not noticed one way or the other
- **n/a:** some are good
- **n/a:** some are good
- blocks
- **No:** Check out the occupancy rate in core area houses. 1 ¼ persons per house??
- **Yes:** I think it is good
- **No:** two empty buildings on the same St. for years
- **No:** two apartment blocks sit empty for 4+ years
- **No:** Too many houses boarded up
- Portable shipping container to turn into single dwelling
- A variety of locations, socio-economic demographics
- Economic and social mix
- Remembering the social issues
- **Should encourage more infill.**