Date: October 28, 2019
Location: Millennium Library
Attendees: 10 members

Growth Scenarios

Mike Pyl and Michael Robinson provided an update on the Residential Growth Study scenarios as it relates to the *Complete Communities Direction Strategy (CCDS) review*. The following discussion occurred.

- A member asked for clarification on if rental versus ownership data was integrated into this study or just housing types. Tenure is not within the scope of the scenarios.
- There is interest in ensuring alignment with ongoing planning process such as the Transit Master Plan and the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region (WMR) October 31 report launch. It was confirmed that opportunities on transit corridors will be explored in *Complete Communities* and the WMR report will be reviewed.
- A member asked if there is precedent from other cities to compare infill and greenfield targets as it is difficult to know which scenario is forward thinking. Every city is quite different and therefore it is not a helpful tool. For example, Calgary and Edmonton are closer to 25% infill because they have already utilized a lot of the opportunities. Whereas Winnipeg is a slower growth city, currently at 45% infill with additional infill capacity.
- A member asked about the City's confidence in the Conference Board of Canada growth forecast that is the base of the growth scenarios. The member highlighted changing trends including increases in multi-family development and the needs of newcomers who are a significant proportion of Winnipeg's growth. Constant monitoring is needed and the City anticipates redoing the forecast every four to five years to see how the market has changed. Depending if Winnipeg sees near future growth in multi-family or single family units will predict if the more infill focused scenarios are possible to achieve. An important question is the City's level of commitment and what they are prepared to do to support infill to occur.
- More detail on zoning and process enhancements will be shared through the forthcoming review of the CCDS informed by the Infill Strategy. A member highlighted that more policy and implementation strength and incentives will be needed for CCDS.
- A challenge identified was that the City can't capture the costs of infrastructure upgrades unless the developer requests a zoning change.
- The growth scenarios do not explore how to best develop greenfield land but it could be a direction for future work. Potentially denying multi-family in greenfield locations doesn't mean that that development will relocate to ideal infill locations.
- A member asked about how the scenarios would mitigate ex-urban development increased transportation both into and out of the city. A suggestion included introducing commuter fees.
- A few members expressed the challenge of absorbing all of the presentation information for the first time. It may be difficult for the public to understand what the scenarios could mean for their neighborhoods and quality of day-to-day life, when they may have never experienced a

complete community. If they did understand complete communities, how would that influence market preferences? Single family housing on greenfield land may not be as desirable. Better understand market preferences by listening to people and share ideas from other cities.

- A member asked presenters to consider the language used to describe the growth scenarios as it relates to innovation and equity. Another asked to consider the health and police implications of how we grow downstream.
- When considering public engagement, members liked the idea of a game to engage participants but the City may not learn if Scenario 1, 2 or 3 is better due to level of public understanding. It might be more useful to test what people think is true.
- A member suggested having two people sharing diverse perspectives and debate their positions with attendees learning about the various points of view with discussion to follow about tradeoffs and how evidence can clash.

OurWinnipeg
Laura Rempel and Gary Holmes provided updates on OurWinnipeg timelines, process to date, policy intent, and public engagement plans. The following discussion occurred.

- A member agreed that it is important for both the community and City departments to see themselves reflected in the policy.
- A member suggested that a review of the model for land classifications could be a useful action that flows from local food policy.
- A member shared the need for a robust set of data and indicators and that we must look beyond the PEG Community Indicators with increased data stratification. An example of the type of data desired is point of origin/destination data for transportation use.
- A member suggested a better way to communicate the goal alignment circles in the indicators table.
- Public Engagement
  - A member expressed concerns about not leaving enough time for partners to get the information out for end of November public engagement.
  - Members thought that only people already involved in policy conversations would attend engagement sessions rather than the general public.
  - Consider focusing on the organizational level for engagement rather than residents at large because of high level and complex nature of the policy. It is important to connect content to be tangible, practical and relatable. What does quality of life look like?
  - A member suggested going to events or places people already gather.
  - A member suggested highlighting an equity conversation through the visual of 3 people of different heights standing on boxes trying to look over a fence. Equality is where they all have the same height box but some people still can't see over the fence. Equity is when the shortest person gets the tallest box so they can all see over the fence.
- Members requested the City define what participation from the OurWinnipeg Community Advisory Committee is needed going forward to determine if they would like to continue to support the OurWinnipeg process as we transition into the priority action planning stage and implementation.