

-----Original Message-----

From: Tim Archer [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, August 7, 2024 8:29 AM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: 8640 St Lawrence

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.

As a 24 yr resident of Vista Ridge drive I completely reject this proposal. When there is another road other than St Lawrence or Southridge to move traffic off this hillside then I would be much more open to a proposal like this. Tim Archer Sent from my iPhone

-----Original Message-----

From: Tyler Foxcroft [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, August 7, 2024 6:37 PM

To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>

Cc: Most Amazing Woman In The world Foxcroft [REDACTED] Sotirios Korogonas

Subject: Bylaw 8383

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.

Hello,

I am writing to express my concern on proposed rezoning property 8640 St Lawrence and 2800 Vista Ridge as we do not have the infrastructure to support the volume of traffic we currently have let alone add significantly more vehicles.

Downtown needs the revitalization of multi family units, start focusing there. It is bad enough that the city is looking to make a massive change to McGill by adding Complex-Care housing near children's parks.

How does our community vote no on this proposal? And vote no to shut down the McGill Complex-Care?

Thanks,

Sent from my iPhone

From: Trent Gibson; DMC Chartered Professional Accountants [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2024 9:02 AM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Ridgecrest Development Group Inc. - Rezoning

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.

Please see below our concerns and comments emailed to L&M Engineering regarding the subject property 8640 St Lawrence Avenue / 2800 Vista Ridge Drive.

Regards,

Trent
7699 Grayshell Rd

From: Trent Gibson; DMC Chartered Professional Accountants
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2024 12:45 PM
To: planningcentre@lmengineering.bc.ca
Subject: Ridgecrest Development Group Inc. - Rezoning

My wife and I attended the open house on June 5th to review the plans for the rezoning behind our house (7699 Grayshell Rd).

Our comments and concerns are mainly around the traffic that this new zoning will bring, since St. Lawrence Avenue is the only access in or out for the proposed development.

☒ There is already a traffic issue at the corner of St. Lawrence Avenue and Southridge Ave, which is a dangerous intersection due to people not realising that it is only a two way stop and not a four way stop. In addition, there are lots of children that have to cross that intersection on their way to and from school. The additional volume of traffic from a multi residential development will only make this intersection worse.

☒ Concern regarding the need to potentially evacuate the area in the case of a forest fire. As it is now, there is only one way for people to get out of the area.

☒ Ospica extension – from discussions at the open house, it appears that this road will not be open for the foreseeable future. If a portion of this road was developed so people in the proposed development area could enter and exit using this road that connects to Marleau, that would help reduce the traffic on St. Lawrence.

We believe that having the road infrastructure in place before any multi residential development goes ahead would be a reasonable approach.

Regards,



Trent Gibson, CPA, CA
Partner
P. 250.564.2660 F. 250.563.3281
TF. 877.278.9977 E. trent@dmca.bc.ca
696 Brunswick Street Prince George BC V2L 2C1
www.dmca.bc.ca
Follow us on [Instagram](#), [Facebook](#) & [LinkedIn](#)

The information contained in this email is confidential information and is intended only for the addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return email, delete this email and destroy any copies.

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

Amending Bylaws	10.13	RM5: Multiple Residential	RM5
--------------------	--------------	----------------------------------	------------

10.13.1 Purpose

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.

Bylaw 9466	10.13.2	<p>Principal Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • community care facility, major • community care facility, minor • housing, apartment • housing, congregate • housing, four-plex • housing, row • housing, stacked row • housing, supportive only on Lot 6, District Lot 343, Cariboo District, Plan 18815 • housing, two-unit • religious assembly only on sites less than 1.0 ha. 	Bylaw 9466	10.13.3	<p>Secondary Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • club • health service, minor • home business 1 • retail, convenience • retail, general only on Lot 6, District Lot 343, Cariboo District, Plan 18815 • secondary suite • service, massage therapy • service, personal
------------	----------------	--	------------	----------------	---

10.13.4 Subdivision Regulations

1. The minimum lot width is 22.0 m.
2. The minimum lot area is 1,200 m².

10.13.5 Regulations for Principal Development

1. The maximum density is 125 dwellings/ha.
2. The maximum site coverage is 55%.
3. The maximum height is 15.0 m.
4. The maximum number of storeys is 4.
5. The minimum front yard is 4.5 m.

Bylaw 8256	6.	The minimum interior side yard is 3.0 m, except it is not required for a common wall for attached housing.
------------	----	--

Bylaw 8256	7.	The minimum exterior side yard is 3.0 m
------------	----	---

Bylaw 8256	8.	The minimum rear yard is 6.0 m.
------------	----	---------------------------------

Bylaw 8256	9.	The minimum setback between principal buildings is 6.0 m.
------------	----	---

10.13.6 Regulations for Accessory Development

1. The maximum height is 5.0 m.
2. The minimum front yard is 15.0m.

Bylaw 8256	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.

10.13.7 Other Regulations

Bylaw 8256	<p>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 m². The maximum total combined gross floor area of all service, retail, and health service uses shall not exceed the lesser of 260 m² or 10% of the gross floor area of all principal buildings on the site.</p>
	<p>2. Note: 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.</p>

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 m² and no single retail space exceeding 700 m²; 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 5th;

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 4th.

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


Vista Ridge Drive

From: Colin Beyer [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2024 2:08 PM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Request for Public Comment: 8640 St Lawrence Ave / 2800 Vista Ridge Drive

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.

Hello, this letter is concerning a Request for Public Comment for a land re-designation application in my neighbourhood. The application details are:

Applicant: L&M Engineering Ltd

Proposal: To amend Schedule B-6: Future Land Use of City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 8383, 2011, to facilitate Multiple Unit Residential Development on the subject property.

Subject Property: 8640 St Lawrence Avenue / 2800 Vista Ridge Drive, Lot 1 District Lot 1605 Cariboo District Plan 30863, Except Plans 34562, PGP38585, PGP41824, PGP46265, PGP46269, BCP25534, BCP36464, EPP41947, EPP131558

I am a resident at 8566 St. Lawrence Avenue, so the subject property is in my neighbourhood. I am employed in Prince George and am a father of two. My children attend the local school, Southridge Elementary. I have two concerns with the re-designation of the subject property:

- 1st: Southridge Elementary is already over-capacity. If the subject property is re-designated to facilitate medium to high-density residential development, where are the families who live in this development going to send their children to school? There is already major housing construction taking place at the end of Southridge Drive, Vista Ridge Drive, and St Lawrence Avenue. I hope the city has a plan for the extra school capacity required when all of this construction, including the medium to high-density construction at the subject property, is complete.

- 2nd: Traffic is already badly bottlenecked on Southridge Avenue. Southridge is the only reasonable way to get onto the highway for residents living south of Marleau Road and west of Domano Boulevard. Traffic is especially busy and dangerous during rush hour in the mornings when students are arriving at Southridge Elementary. With all of the residential development, I hope the city has plans to handle traffic in this area.

Thank you

-Colin Beyer

From: [devserv](#)
To: [Pritchard, Melissa](#)
Subject: FW: Request for Public Comment re: rezoning St. Lawrence/Vista Ridge Dr.
Date: Monday, August 26, 2024 8:21:20 AM
Attachments: [image.png](#)
[image.png](#)
[image.png](#)
[image001.png](#)

For you

Thank you and please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.



Lori Devereux
Development Services Coordinator 2
1100 Patricia Boulevard, Prince George, B.C. V2L 3V9
Phone: 250-561-7662
www.princegeorge.ca

I respectfully acknowledge the unceded ancestral lands of the Lheidli T'enneh, on whose lands I live, work, and play. This email is subject to the [Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act](#). If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me immediately by return email, delete this email and do not copy, use, or disclose it.

From: Inder Manhas [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, August 23, 2024 9:28 PM
To: devserv <devserv@princegeorge.ca>
Subject: Request for Public Comment re: rezoning St. Lawrence/Vista Ridge Dr.

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.

August 24, 2024

RE: Rezoning Subject Property 8640 St. Lawrence Ave/2800 Vista Ridge Dr.

To: Development Services, City of Prince George:

We are strongly opposed to the proposed rezoning application of 8640 St. Lawrence Ave/2800 Vista Ridge Dr.

The request to rezone to a Neighbourhood Corridor would increase the density of housing units to 125 units per hectare (an increase from 22 units per hectare), as well as allow for a mix of commercial and residential buildings that could potentially increase demands on water/sewer, increased traffic and parking needs.

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'.

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 m² and no single retail space exceeding 700 m²; 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.

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

have been addressed (L&M Neighbourhood Open House Summary Report; June 5th, 2024)

- 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.
- Inadequate representation of the current development already occurring in the area, 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 4th.)

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.

As well, the previous actions and conduct of the Developer has raised many concerns in the neighbourhood. There is a complete lack of trust in the Developer to follow the bylaws, permitting processes. In addition, there are also concerns about the City’s response to complaints and concerns in regards 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.**

In conclusion, we continue to be strongly opposed to the proposed rezoning application of 8640 St. Lawrence Ave/2800 Vista Ridge Dr. due to the potential concerns that come with rezoning to an RM5, inadequate responses from L&M Engineering in regards to concerns presented by residents, as well as concerns about with how the City has responded to complaints about the Developer.

Regards,

Sandeep & Inder Manhas

Vista Ridge Drive

RMS		10.13 RM5: Multiple Residential		RMS	
Amending Bylaws					
10.13.1 Purpose					
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.					
Bylaw 9466	10.13.2 Principal Uses	Bylaw 9466	10.13.3 Secondary Uses		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • community care facility, major • community care facility, minor • housing, apartment • housing, congregate • housing, four-plex • housing, row • housing, stacked row • housing, supportive only on Lot 6, District Lot 343, Cariboo District, Plan 18815 • housing, two-unit • religious assembly only on sites less than 1.0 ha. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • club • health service, minor • home business 1 • retail, convenience • retail, general only on Lot 6, District Lot 343, Cariboo District, Plan 18815 • secondary suite • service, massage therapy • service, personal 		
10.13.4 Subdivision Regulations					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The minimum lot width is 22.0 m. 2. The minimum lot area is 1,200 m². 					
10.13.5 Regulations for Principal Development					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The maximum density is 125 dwellings/ha. 2. The maximum site coverage is 55%. 3. The maximum height is 15.0 m. 4. The maximum number of storeys is 4. 5. The minimum front yard is 4.5 m. 6. The minimum interior side yard is 3.0 m, except it is not required for a common wall for attached housing. 					
Bylaw 8256				7. The minimum exterior side yard is 3.0 m	
Bylaw 8256				8. The minimum rear yard is 6.0 m.	
Bylaw 8256				9. The minimum setback between principal buildings is 6.0 m.	
10.13.6 Regulations for Accessory Development					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The maximum height is 5.0 m. 2. The minimum front yard is 15.0m. 					
Bylaw 8256				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.	
10.13.7 Other Regulations					

Bylaw 8256		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 m². The maximum total combined gross floor area of all service, retail, and health service uses shall not exceed the lesser of 260 m² or 10% of the gross floor area of all principal buildings on the site. 2. Note: 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.
------------	--	--

Public comment on 8640st Lawrence/2800 Vista Ridge

Rationale to Oppose the Amendment to the Official Community Plan

1. Outdated Official Community Plan (OCP): The current Official Community Plan (OCP) has not been updated to reflect the recent changes in British Columbia's building regulations. These changes, which are significant in terms of safety, sustainability, and urban planning, should be integrated into the OCP before any amendments are considered. Amending the OCP to rezone a property from neighborhood residential to neighborhood corridor without incorporating these critical updates would be premature and potentially harmful to the community's long-term development goals.

2. Existing Development Providing Affordable Housing: The expansion of apartments near Walmart is already addressing the need for affordable housing within the community. These developments are strategically located to provide residents with easy access to amenities and services, contributing to a balanced and well-planned urban environment. Further medium to high-density developments in other parts of the town, especially without a cohesive strategy, could undermine these efforts by diluting the impact of existing affordable housing initiatives.

3. Recent Developments and Neighborhood Character: The introduction of new condos near city hall has already begun altering the neighborhood's character. This shift highlights the need for careful consideration and planning in future developments. Allowing ad hoc amendments to the OCP that do not take into account the preservation of neighborhood character could result in a fragmented urban landscape that lacks cohesion and identity.

4. Development Driven by Developers, Not Community Needs: There is a growing concern that development within the town is being driven by developers rather than by the needs and desires of the community. This amendment appears to be another instance where a developer's interests are being prioritized over thoughtful, community-centered planning. Such an approach can lead to a disjointed urban environment that fails to serve the long-term interests of residents.

5. Risk of Ad Hoc Development: Allowing this amendment without a comprehensive update to the OCP sets a precedent for ad hoc development, which could lead to a town that resembles a northern community without a cohesive plan. This kind of piecemeal development threatens the overall vision and strategic planning efforts that are essential for creating a well-organized, aesthetically pleasing, and functional urban space.

6. Prioritizing Community Voices Over Developer Interests: City Council has a crucial role in ensuring that the voices of the

residents are prioritized over those of developers. The proposed amendment to the OCP should not move forward without first engaging in a thorough consultation process with the people who live in the affected neighborhood. These residents have a deep understanding of the character and needs of their community, and their input is invaluable in shaping the future of the town.

By prioritizing the concerns and suggestions of the neighborhood, City Council can ensure that any changes to the OCP truly reflect the community's desires and long-term goals. This approach will not only preserve the unique character of the neighborhood but also foster trust between residents and local government, reinforcing the idea that urban planning should be a collaborative effort between the city and its citizens.

Moreover, empowering residents to have a meaningful say in the planning process will help prevent the town from becoming a patchwork of developer-driven projects that may not align with the broader vision for the community. It is essential that City Council listens to the people who will be most affected by these changes, rather than allowing external developers to dictate the town's growth and character.

Conclusion:

Opposing the amendment at this stage, without an updated OCP and thorough community consultation, is not just about preserving the current state of the neighborhood; it's about ensuring that the future development of the town is guided by the needs and desires

of its residents. City Council should be empowered and encouraged to listen to the people, ensuring that any changes made are in the best interest of the community as a whole.

For these reasons, it is prudent to oppose the amendment to the OCP until the necessary updates are made to reflect recent changes in British Columbia's building regulations. This will ensure that future developments are aligned with the community's long-term vision, maintain neighborhood character, and are driven by a balanced approach that considers both the needs of current residents and the potential benefits of new development. Impacts to switching to multi family dwelling from single family should not be considered until the official community plan is updated to address the recent changes to British Columbia's building regulations represent a significant shift towards increasing housing density, particularly on single-family lots.

With the new lot density changes the following issues cannot be properly addressed.

Community Character

Change from single-family to multi-family residential need to consider several implications:

1. **Traffic and Congestion:** Increased density often leads to more traffic, potentially exacerbating congestion on local roads, increasing commute times, and raising the risk of accidents.
2. **Strain on Infrastructure:** Higher population density can strain existing infrastructure such as water, sewage, and public transportation systems, which might not be designed to accommodate the increased load.
3. **Impact on Public Services:** More residents can put pressure on public services such as schools, healthcare facilities, and emergency services, potentially reducing the quality and availability of these services.
4. **Loss of Community Character:** Single-family neighborhoods often have a distinct character and sense of community that might be diluted or lost with higher-density developments.

5. **Environmental Concerns:** Multi-family developments might lead to the loss of green spaces, increased pollution, and greater environmental degradation if not managed properly.
6. **Property Values:** Some residents might fear that a shift to multi-family housing could negatively impact property values, potentially leading to economic losses for current homeowners.
7. **Noise and Privacy:** Higher density can result in increased noise levels and reduced privacy, which can be significant concerns for current residents.
8. **Parking Issues:** Multi-family developments typically require more parking spaces, which might lead to parking shortages and disputes in neighborhoods primarily designed for single-family homes.
9. **Aesthetic Changes:** Architectural styles and building heights typical of multi-family housing can significantly alter the visual appeal of a single-family neighborhood.
10. **Potential for Overdevelopment:** Concerns that initial multi-family developments might lead to further rezoning and overdevelopment, fundamentally altering the community's landscape and quality of life.

Developers need to emphasize the importance of maintaining the existing community structure and addressing potential negative impacts on residents' quality of life.

Piece Meal Approach to Planning

The proposed change from single-family to multi-family residential zoning also need to address concerns about a piece meal approach to planning. This approach can have several detrimental effects:

1. **Lack of Cohesion:** Incremental changes without a comprehensive plan can lead to a disjointed community layout, where new developments do not integrate seamlessly with existing structures and amenities.
2. **Inconsistent Infrastructure Development:** A piece meal approach can result in infrastructure that fails to meet the needs of all residents. For example, staggered or isolated developments may lead to inconsistencies in road quality, public transportation availability, and utility services.
3. **Cumulative Impact:** While a single development might seem manageable, the cumulative effect of multiple small changes can be significant, potentially overwhelming local resources and infrastructure over time.
4. **Planning and Resource Allocation:** Effective urban planning requires a holistic view to allocate resources efficiently. A piece meal approach can lead to inefficient use of funds, with repeated modifications and upgrades needed to accommodate ad-hoc developments.
5. **Community Involvement:** Comprehensive planning often involves extensive community consultation and involvement, ensuring that residents' voices are heard and their needs are met. Piece meal changes might bypass this important process, leading to decisions that do not reflect the community's desires.

6. **Long-term Vision:** Strategic, long-term planning provides a clear vision for the community's growth and development. A piece meal approach lacks this foresight, potentially resulting in a haphazard and unsustainable urban landscape.
7. **Economic Impact:** Inconsistent planning can deter investment and reduce property values, as potential buyers and businesses might perceive the area as unstable or poorly managed.
8. **Environmental Sustainability:** Sustainable development requires coordinated efforts to minimize environmental impact. Piece meal planning can lead to fragmented green spaces, increased pollution, and inefficient energy use, undermining environmental sustainability goals.

The piece meal approach to planning underscores the importance of maintaining a cohesive, well-considered community plan that benefits all residents and preserves the community's character and quality of life.

Developers Influencing Pace and Scale

Another critical point in consideration of the change from single-family to multi-family residential zoning is the community concern that developers, rather than the city, are determining the pace and scale of multifamily developments based on their economic interests. This can have several adverse effects:

1. **Economic Motivations vs. Community Needs:** Developers often prioritize projects that maximize their profits, which may not align with the community's long-term needs or desires. This profit-driven approach can lead to developments that are out of scale or character with the existing neighborhood.
2. **Imbalance in Densification:** When developers drive the pace of multi-family housing, there is a risk of densification occurring too rapidly and unevenly. This can result in overburdened infrastructure and public services, as the city may not be able to upgrade facilities and services quickly enough to keep pace with the new developments.
3. **Premature Densification:** Densification driven by developers might occur before the necessary infrastructure, such as major thoroughfares, public transportation, and emergency services, is adequately developed. This can lead to significant challenges, particularly in terms of traffic congestion and accessibility.
4. **Emergency Evacuation Concerns:** In the context of climate change, it's crucial to have well-planned evacuation routes and emergency services. Rapid and unplanned densification can complicate emergency evacuation plans, making it harder for residents to evacuate quickly and safely during natural disasters or other emergencies.

5. **Undermining Long-term Planning:** Allowing developers to dictate the pace and scale of multi-family dwellings can undermine the city's long-term community plans. These plans are typically developed with extensive public input and a focus on sustainable growth, balanced development, and the overall well-being of residents. Developer-driven projects might disregard these carefully laid plans.
6. **Loss of Community Trust:** When residents perceive that developers are exerting undue influence over urban planning decisions, it can erode trust in local government and planning processes. This distrust can lead to increased opposition to future projects, even those that might be beneficial.
7. **Quality of Life:** Developer-driven densification can negatively impact the quality of life for current residents. Increased noise, reduced green spaces, and higher traffic volumes can all contribute to a less pleasant living environment.
8. **Environmental Impact:** Rapid, developer-led growth can lead to environmental degradation, as projects might prioritize quick returns over sustainable practices. This can include insufficient green spaces, poor stormwater management, and increased pollution.

The city needs to retain greater control over the pace and scale of multi-family housing developments, ensuring that growth is managed in a way that prioritizes the community's long-term interests, safety, and quality of life.

Closing thoughts

- No changes from single family to multi family until a proper plan to address new lot density rules from unit to 4-6 is completed by the city and its residents.
- Mitigation
 - Require Build the Ospika extension to serve as emergency egress in the event of community wildfire evacuation. Addressed current issue with intersection at st Lawrence and south ridge.
 - Build soccer fields in Kode gravel pit or simply lay grass.

Anthony Giannotti

Request for Public Comment - Official Community Plan Amendment Application No. CP100205 (Bylaw No. 9445)

Please accept this as our written comments for the amendment application. We live directly across the street from this proposed subject parcel and will be directly impacted.

REASON FOR ZONING CHANGE

Our main concern with this proposed rezoning application from RS2 to RM5 is that L&M Engineering Ltd has been unable to publicly state what they intend to do with the proposed rezoned parcel of land. When we attended L&M Engineering's open house the number one question we had along with every other attendee was what did the developer intend to build? There was no clear answer provided. We were told the developer had no intention of building on the property but rather they were applying to have the parcel rezoned and then sold. There are different implications for the neighbourhood if lower-density townhomes are built, versus a large, dense apartment building. We do not understand how the City of Prince George can make an informed decision about granting this application without being told what is going to be built on the parcel of land.

OFFICIAL COMMUNITY PLAN(OCP)

The OCP states the zoning bylaws must be consistent with the City's OCP. How is a change from RS2 to RM5 consistent with the OCP? Having one of the least dense zonings changed to one of the most dense zonings is a drastic change that needs careful consideration. The Staff Report to Council dated June 28, 2024 notes that this proposed rezoning would be in line with other rezoning applications which the City of Prince George approved along St Anne Crs, Southridge Ave, and Marleau Rd. This rezoning on those streets was to RM3 which is much less dense than RM5. Furthermore those developments are not at the top of a steep hill and are much closer to amenities, including the grocery store, Walmart, banks etc. They are along bus routes and are in a walkable part of the neighbourhood. This application and the approved RM3 applications on those streets are not comparable. The closest RM5 zoned land we could find near the St. Lawrence parcel is the apartments located directly behind Walmart. That location is not comparable to the St. Lawrence parcel location— those apartments are located on a flat street, directly beside multiple amenities, they are separated from single-family dwellings, and they are located near a major bus station. To walk to Walmart, or the grocery store from the top of St. Lawrence takes 25 minutes at a good pace – it is not a walkable location, and won't be even once Ospika is extended.

LOCATION

RM5 zoning does not fit with the form and character of the neighbourhood. All of the existing houses are single family, on large lots (many with suites). The people who live in the area purchased there, at high cost, because of the current setup of the neighbourhood and the desire to live in single-family neighbourhoods. The proposed parcel is located at the very top of St. Lawrence Ave. A four-story apartment building in this location does not make any sense and does not match the character of the neighbourhood at all. There's no side walk on south side of

the street, no cross walk, and it's an 8-10 minute walk down the steep hill to the closest bus stop. This is a long steep windy hill with only a single way to leave – along St. Lawrence Ave. We are concerned about snow removal in this location, especially at the top where we live and the proposed re-zoning is. Often the snow plows come up St. Lawrence, and turn on to Eastview, not coming all the way to the top of the street. In addition, all of the snow is piled on the south side of the street – where the proposed parcel for rezoning is. How would emergency services access this area in a disaster. How would an evacuation work in this location if an additional 200 dwellings are added?

TRAFFIC STUDY

Has an updated traffic study been completed? The most recent traffic study we were able to locate for this neighbourhood was completed in March 16, 2021. This study was done at the intersection of Southridge Ave and St. Lawrence Ave. The busiest time at this intersection is during the morning drop off at Southridge Elementary. This study appears to have been completed during COVID and at Spring Break. We therefore don't believe that this study is an accurate reflection of the amount of traffic at this intersection. The Staff Report dated June 28, 2024 notes that this application should not move to a public hearing until an update traffic study has been received. Has the City of Prince George received this updated study and when was the study completed?

REZONING JULY 2021

Ridgecrest Development Group Inc had a rezoning application approved in July 2021 (Application No. CP100169/RZ100694). As a result of this approved application the neighbourhood lost valuable green space and instead had a large area at the end of Eastview street completely clear cut and no houses have been built yet. There does not appear to be any requirement on developers to keep greenspace or plant trees when developing neighbourhoods. The beauty of the neighbourhood has already suffered from approved rezoning. If this application were to be approved this would be another blow to the neighbourhood. We have no parks within reasonable walking distance; two plots of land have been earmarked as parks but the city has yet to install any park equipment (Glen Lyon Park and St. Lawrence park – both are mapped on Google, but do not exist. The closest park for kids is at Southridge Elementary). There's no trail system that other new neighbourhoods in Prince George enjoy. This application is essentially an amendment/expansion to the application which was granted in March 2021. Many concerns that were raised during the hearings for that application, remain and have not been addressed. None of the houses from that application have yet to be completed and built – therefore the effects of that added density haven't yet been realized. Council should carefully consider allowing more dense development in the neighbourhood when there are already over 200 approved lots to be built, but the population hasn't yet increased. Southridge Elementary and the other schools in College Heights are already very full – it is unclear where the added students would fit.

Kate Witherly and Chris Watson

Pritchard, Melissa

From: Robert Jeffers [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 3, 2024 2:37 PM
To: Pritchard, Melissa
Cc: [REDACTED]; Anthony Giannotti; Carla Paulson; Kate Witherly; [REDACTED] Alicia Hugill; Sandi Toor-Mann; Christa Senger
Subject: Comments - request for public comment mail out

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.

Hi Melissa

Thanks for your email. I've prepared some comments and objections on the RM5 proposal for the Ridgecrest Development Group. Thanks also for offering to pass this along to the Mayor and Council. I

understand the **Public Hearing is slated for Sept. 25th at 7:00 pm**

First...we received an envelope from the city with **IMPORTANT NEIGHBOURHOOD NOTICE**. Reading the enclosed leaflet 'request for public comment'... it advises a notice of public hearing will only be mailed to those within 30 metres of the subject property?
There are no fewer than 40 houses along St Lawrence to Southridge....all who will be impacted in some way by this application. Others along Eastview, Grayshell and Vista View/Ridge also deserve to be notified of any proceedings connected to it.

Next...the paradox...requesting comments or input from residents who have no idea what the applicant intends to build. We need to know what ...and how many? This lends no consideration for residents who...in good faith...have made their biggest life investment in a neighbourhood where they wanted to live. Other than profit the developer has no skin in the game...so the outcome of the rezoning is extrinsic for how it will affect residents and their lives. Taxes are based on our assessments for which views, character of a neighbourhood and location are factors. This should be a strong consideration when approving zoning applications 15-20 years later.

Even the Provincial Bill 44 regarding an increase in density and infill suggests developments 'nestle' into existing neighbourhoods.

Below are points we are requesting the City consider regarding the RM5 scale of this development.....there is a huge difference between duplexes and multi story apartment buildings with the amount of traffic they increase in an existing subdivision.

1 🏠 There are 28 lots nearing completion at the top of St Lawrence on Eastview between St Lawrence and Vista Ridge Drive. Assuming half of 28 houses to be built on those lots could have basement suites = 45 residences x 2 cars = 90 cars per day on 180 trips up and down.

2 🏠 St Lawrence is a steep slope street with several curves. That includes the winter which will appear further along.

3 🏠 There is no transit serving the area meaning kids are walking...unless they are bring driven to and from school. There are no crosswalks for people to cross the street to access the sidewalk, including during the winter and in the dark. There isn't a playground or park for kids or adults, including seniors in the entire area.

4 🏠 there is no green space or trees buffers for noise reduction or aesthetics.

5 🏠 Because of the topography and steep uphill (especially for return trips)...the walkability changes what one could expect on level terrain. The distance to grocery stores, restaurants and other commerce almost always requires use of a vehicle.

6 🏠 There are loud, unlicensed dirt bikes racing up and down the street, usually doing wheelies on the back tire for hundreds of feet. One resident who was driving home in his car...chased the biker to the top of St Lawrence and, after veiled threats he regained his composure and drove back down the street. The past few weeks there are also quads now travelling up and down the street

🚦!! 🚶🚶🚶. If there is an emergency, mass evacuation....all roads funnel down to Southridge. This would create bedlam for vehicles trying to exit...and impeding access for emergency vehicles such as police, fire trucks and ambulances.

When we lived in Kamloops 3 years ago...we were evacuated after a lightning strike started a fire. It was 10:00 pm on July 1st...and we had less than one hour to get out. The traffic was gridlock with police driving over medians and people cutting off other drivers.

WINTER ❄️❄️❄️ I will include a few pictures

The biggest issue for people living on the south (non-sidewalk) side of St Lawrence is the city's practice of piling all snow on one side...despite there being several long boulevards on the right side of the sidewalk where a loader bucket reach can place some snow. This policy creates dangerous driving conditions for the traffic and also for residents trying to get out of their driveway. We've been here for 2 winters. When I questioned neighbours they shrug and say "that's just the way they do it".

Again....there are residences with basement suites who own one or more cars. Most homeowners also have at least 2 vehicles. This places a strain on short driveways so cars spill out onto the street to park as well as visitors parking. Even people living in cul-de-sacs use the street for parking. This can create a problem for snow removal.

Residents trying to back out of their driveway...with snow piles flanking it...plus vehicles parked on the street...means they have to back across the downhill lane and even into part of the uphill lane to turn their vehicle. We have had near misses more than once. There will be increased traffic from the new lots coming on stream. If the city is considering increasing the threshold centimetres of snow before plowing AND not clearing windrows....this problem will only get worse increasing the likelihood of an accident or a pedestrian is hit by a vehicle doing donuts on the hill.

This pile rivals the Matterhorn. We had shovelled our driveway and this is what we deal with.



You can see the difficulty....trying to back onto the street to turn up or down the street.



This shows the condition of snow and blind corners for people walking dogs, kids to and from school and pedestrians in general who need to cross the street to get onto the sidewalk, mailboxes etc.



CLOSING THOUGHTS

Our taxes are based on our assessments for which views, location and character of a neighbourhood are factors included in it. That should be a serious consideration when approving applications for rezoning 15 to 20 years after development. The difference is huge between 10 duplexes and multi-story apartments and sight lines. For land values and traffic.

Residents have experienced 2 years of 3-season construction, sometimes 7 days per week. Clicking excavators, constant beeping of backup signals, loaders, bobcats and some dump trucks with banging tailgates like gunshots when they dump their load. Incredible amounts of dust and dirt accumulated on vehicles, siding, patios, windows and infiltration into our homes. Low beds and dump trucks up and down the street...at times as many as 40+ per hour up or down the hill. They carry dirt, mud and gravel in tire treads. Open dump boxes dump some contents onto the street so there is also dust from traffic.

Loaded Dump trucks carrying 10,000+ kg of fill should NOT be driving... even at legal speeds on residential streets designed for regular vehicles. Some use jake brakes occasionally to slow down. I've only seen one occasion where there was a police car with a dump truck pulled over. The pavement has deteriorated significantly since we moved here a few months before the construction started. In fairness to the contractor they did clean up huge clumps of mud thrown off the trucks on first few blocks of pavement.

So this ends my submission, with respect to the process, and hoping for some serious compromise with decisions to be made about the ghost of RM5.

Loretta Jeffers

Sent from my iPad