

---

**Subject:**

RE: Webform submission from: Written Comments Submission Form

---

**From:** City of Prince George <[noreply@princegeorge.ca](mailto:noreply@princegeorge.ca)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, September 18, 2024 7:58 AM

**To:** cityclerk <[cityclerk@princegeorge.ca](mailto:cityclerk@princegeorge.ca)>

**Subject:** Webform submission from: Written Comments Submission Form

**This email originated from outside the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize and trust the sender and know the content is safe.**



# Written Comments Submission Form

Submitted on Wed, 09/18/2024 - 07:57

## Contact Info

### Contact Info

Lisa Sjostrom  
2818 Vista Ridge Drive  
Prince George

REDACTED

REDACTED

## Comments

### For which application would you like to provide comments? (One form per application)

CP100205/RZ100808 - Bylaw 9445/BL9446 - (8640 St. Lawrence Avenue and 2800 Vista Ridge Drive) -  
Meeting Date: September 25, 2024

### Comments

1. What has been done to address the concerns and questions contained in the L&M report written after the original community consultation in June 2024?

How is the City addressing its citizen's concerns captured in the report? If they are not addressing them, why?

2.

a. Will the City do a "rate of conversion" calculation for the Ospika South Neighborhood Plan area,

including all of the new subdivision lots developed, and approved to be developed, in the area?

\*\* including the potential of the requested RM5 zoning increasing the density from 22 units/ha to 125 units/ ha in the area being discussed today.

b. If the City has not, or is not, going to do the calculation for "rate of conversion" to fully understand the impact on existing infrastructure (water, sewer, roads, schools, etc), why?

And what is the justification for not doing this study?

3. Has a traffic study been done on the neighborhood with the consideration of the impact of allowing for an increase of density up to 125 dwellings per/ha and the amendment to the OCP of a Neighbourhood Corridor, which allows for mixed commercial and residential uses?

4. Why did the City decide to not act on the reports of misconduct by the Developer in the Vista Ridge area over the past few months?

\*\*For example, the Developer's total disregard for the City's Tree Removal permitting process, and the destruction of greenspace and forest with no repercussions even after reporting it numerous times to the subdivision development department?

5. You have been elected by us the people of Prince George to be our voice and advocate for our issues and concerns I trust that you will listen and address our concerns in regard to these matters and the re zoning of our neighborhood.

## Supporting Documents

- [Development Services.docx](#)

▪

**August 20, 2024**

**To: Development Services, City of Prince George:**

In regard to the Subject Property 8640 St Lawrence Avenue/2800 Vista Ridge Drive re zoning I'm strongly opposed to this. Please see below points to consider.

**Points to Consider for Feedback to City**

The request is to rezone (from currently zoned mix of AF: Agriculture and Forestry, AG: Greenbelt, RS2: Single Residential, and RM3) to RM5, requiring an amendment to the OCP of Neighbourhood Residential to Neighbourhood Corridor. Items to consider with RM5:

- The density of units allowed is up to 125 units per hectare; Up from a current 22units/ha of Neighbourhood Residential.
- This type of zoning allows for a mix of commercial and residential buildings; potentially increasing demand on water/sewer, increased traffic, parking needs.

**RM5**

<b>Amending Bylaws</b>	<b>10.13</b>	<b>RM5: Multiple Residential</b>		<b>RM5</b>	
	<b>10.13.1</b>	<p><b>Purpose</b> The purpose of this zone is to provide for multiple housing with a maximum density of 125 dwellings/ha for areas defined by the OCP as suitable for higher density housing.</p>			
<b>Bylaw 9466</b>	<b>10.13.2</b>	<p><b>Principal Uses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• community care facility, major</li> <li>• community care facility, minor</li> <li>• housing, apartment</li> <li>• housing, congregate</li> <li>• housing, four-plex</li> <li>• housing, row</li> <li>• housing, stacked row</li> <li>• housing, supportive only on Lot 6, District Lot 343, Cariboo District, Plan 18815</li> <li>• housing, two-unit</li> <li>• religious assembly only on sites less than 1.0 ha.</li> </ul>	<b>Bylaw 9466</b>	<b>10.13.3</b>	<p><b>Secondary Uses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• club</li> <li>• health service, minor</li> <li>• home business 1</li> <li>• retail, convenience</li> <li>• retail, general only on Lot 6, District Lot 343, Cariboo District, Plan 18815</li> <li>• secondary suite</li> <li>• service, massage therapy</li> <li>• service, personal</li> </ul>
	<b>10.13.4</b>	<p><b>Subdivision Regulations</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The minimum lot width is 22.0 m.</li> <li>2. The minimum lot area is 1,200 m<sup>2</sup>.</li> </ol>			
	<b>10.13.5</b>	<p><b>Regulations for Principal Development</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The maximum density is 125 dwellings/ha.</li> <li>2. The maximum site coverage is 55%.</li> <li>3. The maximum height is 15.0 m.</li> <li>4. The maximum number of storeys is 4.</li> <li>5. The minimum front yard is 4.5 m.</li> </ol>			
<b>Bylaw 8256</b>		6. The minimum interior side yard is 3.0 m, except it is not required for a common wall for attached housing.			
<b>Bylaw 8256</b>		7. The minimum exterior side yard is 3.0 m			
		8. The minimum rear yard is 6.0 m.			
<b>Bylaw 8256</b>		9. The minimum setback between principal buildings is 6.0 m.			
	<b>10.13.6</b>	<p><b>Regulations for Accessory Development</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The maximum height is 5.0 m.</li> <li>2. The minimum front yard is 15.0m.</li> </ol>			
<b>Bylaw 8256</b>		3. The minimum interior side yard is 1.2 m and the minimum exterior side yard is 3.0 m.			
		4. The minimum rear yard is 1.2 m.			
	<b>10.13.7</b>	<b>Other Regulations</b>			

Bylaw 8256	1. Service, retail, and health service uses shall not be in any freestanding building separate from a building containing a residential use. The maximum gross leasable floor area of any service, retail, or health service use in one tenancy is 150 m <sup>2</sup> . The maximum total combined gross floor area of all service, retail, and health service uses shall not exceed the lesser of 260 m <sup>2</sup> or 10% of the gross floor area of all principal buildings on the site.
	2. <b>Note:</b> In addition to the regulations listed above, other regulations may apply. These include the general development regulations of Section 4, the specific use regulations of Section 5, the landscaping and screening provisions of Section 6, the parking and loading regulations of Section 7, and the development permit guidelines of Section 8.

The request to change the zoning would also mean that an amendment to the Official Community Plan (OCP) would also have to be made.

**There are several points as to why the zoning change from a mix of AF: Agriculture and Forestry, AG: Greenbelt, RS2: Single Residential, and RM3, to RM5 should not be done.**

8.3 D. *Neighbourhoods are primarily residential in nature, with associated schools and parks within them. They are typically small-scale, dominated by single-family and similar sized buildings. However, along collector and arterial streets, higher densities may be appropriate. These help to protect quiet residential areas from noise on main streets, and place more residents close to transit and nearby amenities. - the subject property is not on a collector or arterial street.*

Policy 8.3.45, *The City should support infill and redevelopment in existing neighbourhoods. - This is a greenfield area and was originally consider greenbelt in the Ospika South Neighbourhood Plan. Development should be directed to brownfield or infill locations. Currently a mix of greenbelt, agricultural and low-density residential.*

Policy 8.3.52, *Where development in a neighbourhood exceeds a rate of 5% conversion of existing lots per year, the City should assess the impacts of change on neighbourhood transportation, amenities and other matters of concern to the community, and identify any actions needed to improve management of such change.-The city should provide a calculation of 'rate of conversion' considering the new South Ridge subdivision and others in the Ospika South Neighbourhood Plan BEFORE more development happens in the area.*

Policy 8.3.48, *The City should encourage incremental, small-scale redevelopment whose immediate impacts are relatively minor. – The increase from 22units/ha to a max of 125 units/ha plus the potential for commercial use is not 'incremental'.*

#### Request to Amend to Neighbourhood Corridor

There are several policies in the OCP in direct contradiction to the subject property being amended to a Neighbourhood Corridor.

Policy 8.3.54, *The City should permit local commercial nodes at intersections of collector and arterial streets. At these nodes:*

*The subject property is not at an intersection of collector and arterial street.*

- *The City should permit retail, personal services, service-oriented office uses (insurance, real estate, medical/dental, travel), and food & beverage establishments intended to draw residents from surrounding neighbourhoods; - without a traffic study done, “drawing” more traffic into the neighbourhood may not be a wise decision due to existing congestion and lack of parking; concerns already expressed by neighbourhood.*
- *The scale and design of the building and site should suit the surrounding neighbourhoods, with total gross floor area of all retail developments in the node not to exceed 2000 m<sup>2</sup> and no single retail space exceeding 700 m<sup>2</sup>; the surrounding area is all single-family dwellings and virgin greenspace. A commercial/retail area would change the neighbourhood dynamics.*
- *The City should support where feasible on-street parking in front of local commercial developments in lieu of off-street parking; if off-street parking is proposed, parking should not be in front of the businesses in ‘strip mall’ type layout; How does the City justify the loss of forest and greenspace to create more street parking or surface parking?*
- *The City should encourage buildings to be built on or near the front property line; and, The City may consider expansion of local commercial uses within existing neighbourhoods where the proposed use meets criteria within this policy and does not contribute to intrusive vehicular traffic to local roads in the area.- Due to there being one main way into and out of the development, St Lawrence Ave, the traffic would be intrusive to the local roads.*

#### **Traffic Concerns from L&M Neighbourhood Public Hearing, June 5<sup>th</sup>;**

Before further work is allowed, the neighbourhood should be informed as to how their previous concerns have been addressed.

- Concerns with the potential impact of additional traffic from the proposed development on the Southridge Ave/St Lawrence Avenue intersection and that additional traffic could exacerbate current issues (i.e. speeding, current 2-way stop, no 4-way).
- Residents would like the section of Future Ospika Boulevard, between St. Lawrence Avenue and Marleau Road to be built as soon as possible. This is to provide the neighbourhood with a secondary access in case of emergency, and for the potential additional traffic.
- Residents noted concerns with the current use of street parking along St. Lawrence Avenue. There appear to be several homeowners with vehicles and there is no space on the road.

The presented picture for consideration does not represent what is currently happening in the neighbourhood, as described in an email for the Neighbourhood Public Hearing;

*“I would like to attend this event and voice my disapproval with the development. One important item to note is the picture of the neighborhood that was posted with the invitation is not an accurate representation. There are already other developments that have greatly reduced the forested area and this proposed development would make it even worse. With that said, I am hugely opposed to more clearcut decimation in my neighborhood”*

Davey and Christa Senger, June 4<sup>th</sup>.

The proposed development area is shown in the image below, located at the end of St Lawrence Avenue.



- Blue area is the proposed development as per L&M report.
- Red area has already been completely cleared of all trees by the Developer.
- Yellow area has recently been developed into a subdivision and is in full construction.
- Orange area is an unpermitted roadway created by the Developer without a tree Removal Permit.
- Green area is the “walking trail” cleared by Developer without a Tree Removal Permit.

## Concerns about Developer's Actions and Behaviours

The previous actions and conduct of the Developer have raised many concerns in the neighbourhood. There is a complete lack of trust in the Developer to follow the bylaws, permitting processes.

There are also concerns about the City responding to complaints and concerns in regard to the Developer's actions and work process.

The orange is the road the developer built between the two building sites without proper environmental permits or tree removal permit in 2023 --- **The Developer did not follow the required Tree Protection Bylaw. There was a complaint filed with the City in 2023, as well as with RAPP in regard to the destruction of trees and damage to stream/waterway.**

The light green is the "walking trail" the developer built in spring of 2024 without the proper work permit or tree removal permit. **This complaint was filed with the subdivision department and the response was that there was "nothing they could do about it", even though the acknowledged the Developer has conducted work for days before filing for the proper tree removal permits.**

The Developer used the non-permitted roadway (orange) to drive machinery from the yellow area to the red area during the clearing of the red area. - **Further damaging the area that was created without proper process.**

The red area has been completed cleared and being prepared for services. The Developer has had extensive trucks and equipment using Vista Ridge Drive during this work. - **The street is often dirty and construction supplies are often stacked at the end of the street.**

There is a concern that the Developer will continue to use Vista Ridge Drive to access the blue area by travelling through the red area - **Vista Ridge is already extremely narrow with full street parking on each side of the street.**

Regards,

Lisa Sjostrom

**REDACTED**

Vista Ridge Drive