

Date: June 24, 2025

To: **Mayor and Council**

Name and title: Deanna Wasnik, Director of Planning and Development

Subject: Response to Council Resolutions: Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525

Attachment(s): Schedule "A"

## Recommendation(s):

That Council RECEIVES FOR INFORMATION the report dated June 24, 2025 from the Director of Planning and Development, titled "Response to Council Resolutions: Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525".

## Purpose:

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with a response to the resolutions passed at the April 9 and 16, 2025 Special Council Meetings.

## Strategic Priorities:

The Official Community Plan Review Project has been identified within Council's Strategic Plan 2023-2026 to build a strong foundation for growth for the community.

## Background:

### Regular Council Meeting on March 19, 2025

- Commencement of the Public Hearing for Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025 and City of Prince George Zoning Bylaw No. 7850, 2007, Amendment Bylaw No. 9526, 2025.

### Regular Council Meeting on April 9, 2025

- Continuation and closure of Public Hearing for Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025 and City of Prince George Zoning Bylaw No. 7850, 2007, Amendment Bylaw No. 9526, 2025.
- Council deliberated the proposed 2025 OCP and passed resolutions for Administration to respond to at a future Regular Council Meeting.

### Special Council Meeting on April 16, 2025

- Continuation of Council deliberations of the proposed 2025 OCP and resolutions passed for Administration at a future Regular Council Meeting.

Administration has prepared a response to all thirty-three (33) Council resolutions passed at the April 9, 2025 Regular Council Meeting and the April 16, 2025 Special Council Meeting which are included in Schedule “A” to this report.

### Discussion:

### **Schedule “A”**

The format of the enclosed Schedule “A” is as follows:

1. Resolution: Each resolution passed by Council at the April 9, 2025 Regular Council Meeting and the April 16, 2025 Special Council Meeting is provided at the top of each page of Schedule A in the order they were passed by Council.
2. Discussion: provides Administration’s response to the resolution with an indication of the consequence of the resolution (when applicable), OCP policy direction that is provided in the 2025 OCP that may address the resolution, and Administration’s recommendation of next steps.
3. Options: recommendations provided to Council for direction on the resolution. The Options will include a recommendation(s) for Council’s consideration that directs Administration to take a certain action, and one that recommends no action. The approach will allow Council the ability to action the resolution further, or receive the response as provided.
4. Action: confirms direction Administration will take to address the resolution.

Throughout the responses in Schedule “A”, the 2011 OCP and 2025 OCP are referred to. For clarity, “2011 OCP” means current Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 8383, 2011 and “2025 OCP” means proposed Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025.

Upon Council addressing the resolutions in Schedule “A” with “Options”, Administration will update the proposed 2025 OCP accordingly and, additionally, will include any updates resulting from the “Actions” of the resolutions in Schedule “A”. These amendments will be returned to Council in the future to make an amending motion to the 2025 OCP Bylaw.

Once the 2025 OCP is updated to reflect the changes informed by Schedule “A”, a Public Hearing will need to be held to provide the opportunity for the public to comment on the amended version of the 2025 OCP. When Administration returns the amended 2025 OCP Bylaw for an amending motion, Administration will seek Council’s direction on scheduling a meeting for this Public Hearing.

### Alternatives:

Administration provides the following recommended alternatives for Council's consideration:

1. Approve the 2025 OCP in its current form, and proceed with Final Reading;
2. Refuse the bylaw, and direct Administration to update the current 2011 OCP with the Provincial Housing mandates. This will consist of a new bylaw and Report to Council for 1 and 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading; or
3. Defer or otherwise deal with the bylaw at a future meeting should Council require another information report.

### Summary and conclusion:

Administration recommends that Council receive this report for information.

### Respectfully submitted:

Deanna Wasnik, Director of Planning and Development

Prepared by: Mandy Jones, Manager, Development Services

### Approved:

Walter Babicz, City Manager

Meeting date: 2025/07/14

# Schedule “A”

## Resolution 1

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council on how to rezone the city-owned property north of Moore’s Meadow from AF: Agriculture and Forestry to P1: Parks and Recreation.***

***\*Please note this resolution is separate from the 2025 OCP adoption process.***

### **Discussion:**

Moore’s Meadow Park is designated as “Park and Open Space” in the 2011 OCP and the 2025 OCP. The park is city-owned and zoned P1: Parks and Open Space (60.8 ha), AG: Greenbelt (0.2 ha) and AF: Agriculture and Forestry (4.4 ha). The 4.4 ha portion that is zoned as AF is an undeveloped area comprised of gravel-type soil located along the perimeter of Moore’s Meadow Park. This site presents a strong opportunity for residential infill that aligns with the existing zoning and surrounding development patterns. While there are no immediate plans for development, any future proposals would include public engagement as part of the process. There are no plans for infill development within the meadow or significant slopes of Moore’s Meadow Park, as the area is intended to remain as park.

Should Council direct Administration to proceed with the rezoning of the 4.4 ha portion of Moore’s Meadow Park currently zoned AF, this action would impact the potential developable land for future phases of the Heritage area.

In accordance with standard procedures, a City-initiated rezoning application to rezone the subject area from AF: Agriculture and Forestry to P1: Parks and Recreation should be prepared for Council’s consideration.

### **Options:**

1. THAT Council DIRECTS Administration to submit a rezoning application to rezone the 4.4 ha portion of Moore’s Meadow Park currently zoned AF: Agriculture and Forestry to P1: Parks and Recreation; or
2. Council takes no action on this resolution (no resolution from Council required)

## Resolution 2

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council outlining the consequences and options by removing the right-of-way and redesignating the portion of land between 18th Avenue and 22nd Avenue and between Massey Drive and Ferry Avenue to Park and Open Space on Schedule 12: Future Land Use in the “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025.”***

***\*Please note this resolution is separate from the 2025 OCP adoption process.***

\*\*Please note Resolution 2 should be considered in conjunction with Resolution 3

### **Discussion:**

Ginter's Meadow, specifically the path from 18th Avenue to Ferry Avenue, including the off-leash area, is a public area and is technically road dedication. Road dedication is not a parcel of land and therefore does not have a legal description or property title. The City holds ownership rights for municipal road dedication within city boundaries. Since a portion of Ginter's Meadow is road dedication, an OCP designation is not applied to it.

The land surrounding the road dedication is a mix of City of Prince George owned lands, Crown lands, and privately owned lands. These lands are designated under proposed 2025 OCP Schedule 12 – Future Land Use Plan with City owned lands being “Park & Open Space” and the remainder predominantly “Rural Resource”. There are no plans to develop Ginter's Meadow and the City continues to maintain trail and washroom access.

During the final phase of engagement, the City heard how important it is to maintain Ginter's Meadow and removed the future road connection between 18<sup>th</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenues from proposed 2025 OCP Schedule 5 – Road Network.

Removing the road dedication in Ginter's Meadow involves several legal and administrative considerations. Under the *Community Charter*, a formal road closure process is required, which includes public notification. As part of a road closure process, the land would need to be surveyed, subdivided, and registered with the Land Title Office to create a titled parcel.

From a land use and planning perspective, once the road dedication is removed and the land is titled, it could be redesignated in the OCP as “Park & Open Space.” This would bring the designation into alignment with adjacent City-owned lands and reflect the current use of the area. Operationally, the City would continue to maintain the area as it currently does, with no significant changes anticipated in terms of access or upkeep.

The process of road closure and land titling will involve financial and staff resource commitments. Costs will include legal fees, surveying, and administrative work, as well as staff time to manage the process and update relevant planning documents. These resource implications should be evaluated alongside the area's current use, the absence of development plans, and carefully balanced against the long-term advantages of formalizing its designation and function.

### **Options:**

1. THAT Council directs Administration to submit a road closure application for the portions of road dedication that are located between 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 22<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and between Massey Drive and Ferry Avenue and to submit a subsequent Official Community Plan Amendment Application for the area subject to the road closure to designate the area as “Park and Open Space” on the Future Land Use schedule of the OCP.
2. Council takes no action on this resolution (no resolution from Council required).

## Resolution 3

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council outlining the consequences and options of rezoning the portion of land between 18th Avenue and 22nd Avenue and Massey Drive and Ferry Avenue to P1: Parks and Recreation in the “City of Prince George Zoning Bylaw No. 7850, 2007.”***

***\*Please note this resolution is separate from the 2025 OCP adoption process.***

\*\*Please note Resolution 3 should be considered in conjunction with Resolution 2

### **Discussion:**

As discussed under Resolution 2, the path that runs from 18th Avenue to Ferry Avenue is a public area and is technically road dedication. Again, road dedication is not a parcel of land and therefore does not have a legal description, property title, an OCP designation, or zone.

Once a road dedication is closed it takes on the zone of the lands that surround it. The parcels that are within Ginter’s Meadow that surround the road dedication area consist of a variety of rural, greenbelt, and park zones.

Should a road closure application and OCP Amendment application be directed under Resolution 2, Council would consider the applicable bylaws concurrently. Should Council support the road closure bylaw and OCP amendment bylaw, the areas subject to the road closure would take on the zone that is adjacent to it. As such, it is possible that no rezoning application is needed for the lands subject to the road dedication taking on a zone. Should Council wish to zone the land subject to the road closure bylaw as P1: Parks and Recreation, Administration would seek the direction to do so.

### **Options:**

1. THAT Council directs Administration, following Council’s approval of a road closure bylaw for the portions of road dedication located between 18th Avenue and 22nd Avenue, and between Massey Drive and Ferry Avenue, as well as approval of the associated Official Community Plan amendment bylaw to designate the closed road portions as “Park and Open Space” on the Future Land Use Schedule, to proceed with rezoning the closed road portions to P1: Parks and Recreation.
2. Council takes no action on this resolution (no resolution from Council required).

## Resolution 4

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council outlining the consequences and options by removing the two properties (PID: 015 070 531 and PID: 015 069 815) adjacent to Ginter's from the Urban Containment Boundary on Schedule 1: Growth Management in the "City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025."***

### **Discussion:**

The Urban Containment Boundary concept is directly related to the Growth Management objectives, policies and schedules within the current and proposed OCP. In the current 2011 OCP the urban containment boundary is called "Urban Area" and is shown on Schedule B-4: Growth Management. In the proposed 2025 OCP the urban containment boundary is called "Urban Containment Boundary" and shown on Schedule 1.

The two properties identified as PID: 015-070-531 and PID: 015-069-851 (corrected PID number from the one provided in the Council resolution) were partially included in the 2011 OCP "Urban Area". The mapping of the urban containment boundary in the 2025 OCP has been adjusted from the 2011 OCP by following parcel boundaries, rather than geographical features, like contours. This mapping format, therefore, included the properties in their entirety in the urban containment boundary in the 2025 OCP.

It is important to note that removal of urban containment boundary designation does not prohibit development to occur on a property. Should lands located outside the urban containment boundary be proposed for development and require a zoning change, the policies of the OCP would be reviewed to ensure the zoning aligns with the OCP. Should the zoning not align with OCP policy direction, an applicant may apply for an OCP amendment. Both the OCP amendment and zoning bylaws would be considered by Council for approval.

### **Options:**

1. THAT Council directs Administration to redesignate properties identified as PID: 015-070-531 and 015-069-851 from "Urban Containment Boundary" and "Future Development" to "Rural" on Schedule 1: Growth Management Map of the proposed 2025 OCP; or
2. THAT Council direct Administration to amend the "Urban Containment Boundary" on Schedule 1: Growth Management of the proposed 2025 OCP to reflect the "Urban Area" of the current 2011 OCP for the properties known as PID: 015-070-531 and 015-069-851; or
3. Council takes no action on this resolution (no resolution from Council required).

## Resolution 5

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council outlining the consequences and options by removing the Future Development (yellow) from Schedule 1: Growth Management in the “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025” along Tyner Boulevard and the escarpment with exception to the small portion of Endowment Lands for the purpose of building student housing by University of Northern British Columbia.***

### Discussion:

Administration understands the area described in Resolution 5 to include the following properties:

PID:	Owner:	Fronting Road:	2011 OCP Urban Area (Y/N)	Note:
023-384-697	UNBC	Tyner Blvd	Y	
023-318-660	Private	Tyner Blvd	Y	
029-002-770	Private	Tyner Blvd	Y (small portion not in boundary)	
030-754-810	Private	Tyner Blvd	Y	
023-318-651	Private	Tyner Blvd	Y	
023-384-697	UNBC	Tyner Blvd and University Way	Y	Resolution 5 excludes
016-576-683	UNBC	University Way	Y (partially)	
015-070-531	Private	University Way (lot straddles)	Y (partially)	Discussed in Resolution 4

**Table 1: Parcels Subject to Resolution 5**

As outlined in Resolution 4, the Urban Containment Boundary is a key component of the Growth Management framework. It is intended to guide sustainable development by supporting the efficient use of infrastructure and services. The concept aligns with the objectives, policies, and schedules of the current and proposed OCP.

In the current 2011 OCP the urban containment boundary is called “Urban Area” and is shown on Schedule B-4: Growth Management. In the proposed 2025 OCP the urban containment boundary is called “Urban Containment Boundary” and shown on Schedule 1: Growth Management.

As previously stated, the mapping of the urban containment boundary in the 2025 OCP has been adjusted from the 2011 OCP by following parcel boundaries, rather than geographical features. This means the properties noted in the above table as being partially designated in the 2011 OCP “Urban Area” have been fully included in the urban containment boundary in the 2025 OCP.

Schedule 1: Growth Management of the 2025 OCP indicates the Urban Containment Boundary, Growth Priority area, Future Development area, and Rural area. Policies within the 2025 OCP provide guidance respecting each of these growth management areas.

The policies that inform the category of growth management area differ somewhat, but ultimately inform the phasing of how development should occur with consideration of factors such as infrastructure (community services, housing, parks, utility servicing, transit).

Removing the “Future Development” designation from the parcels listed in Table 1 does not preclude development from occurring on those properties. However, doing so would introduce inconsistencies within the Growth Management Map by designating “Rural” areas within a broader context identified as a growth priority. This may lead to conflicting policy interpretations when referencing other OCP policies and schedules intended to guide growth and development.

**Options:**

1. THAT Council directs Administration to redesignate specific properties identified in Table 1: Parcels Subject to Resolution 5 from “Urban Containment Boundary” and “Future Development” to “Rural” on Schedule 1: Growth Management Map of the proposed 2025 OCP; or
2. Council takes no action on this resolution (no resolution from Council required).

## Resolution 6

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to report back addressing the consequences and options of amending Schedule 1: Growth Management in the “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025”, incorporating the Urban Containment Boundaries outlined as “Urban Area” in Schedule B-4: Growth Management in the “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 8383, 2011.”***

### **Discussion:**

The Urban Containment Boundary delineates predominantly rural areas from the City’s existing urban neighbourhoods and future development areas. The Urban Containment Boundary is used as a growth management tool to protect agricultural land, natural areas, and rural character while focusing public and private investment on community services, parks, housing, transit and other forms of sustainable infrastructure within Growth Priority Areas.

One of the key themes that emerged throughout the OCP’s public consultation and community engagement process is the importance of carefully managing the City’s growth. In response, the proposed OCP includes a smaller Urban Containment Boundary, with a focus on supporting our existing neighbourhoods and infrastructure. Changes of note in Schedule 1: Growth Management in the 2025 OCP include the removal of the Blackburn/Giscome Area, Blueberry Hill, and industrial areas along PG Pulpmill and Northwood Pulpmill Roads. This reduction in the Urban Containment Boundary is intended to help the City better support its existing infrastructure in fully serviced, urban neighbourhoods, rather than extending infrastructure further into unserved rural or agricultural areas of our community.

Reverting to the previous Urban Containment Boundary known as “Urban Area” on Schedule B-4: Growth Management in the 2011 OCP means providing policy direction for predominantly greenfield development and sprawl to occur in the Blackburn/Giscome Area and Blueberry Hill Area that is:

- Not infrastructure ready (i.e., there are no existing city services available to accommodate development).
- Where minimal or no development activities are occurring.
- Where housing development remains at a low density.
- Where limited or no access to a range of daily needs exist (i.e., childcare, grocery stores, hospitals, libraries, parks and open space, commercial services and schools).
- Where limited access to transportation exists (i.e., transit stops, transportation connectivity, and active transportation routes like cycling infrastructure and sidewalks).

This would also mean that OCP policy may now inversely support sprawl to occur in these areas away from existing municipal infrastructure and services.

### **Options:**

1. THAT Council DIRECT Administration to amend the “Urban Containment Boundary” of Schedule 1: Growth Management of the 2025 OCP to reflect the “Urban Area” of the 2011 OCP; or
2. Council takes no action on this resolution (no resolution from Council required).

## Resolution 7

***That Council DIRECTS Admin to report back addressing the consequences and options of section 18.14.1 section 8.5.19 from 2012 OCP which reads “The city recognizes the importance of the Aeronautics Act and should endeavour to advise land use applicants of the airport master plan recommendations. This includes considerations to no new residential development and other sensitive land uses in areas near the airport.”***

### **Discussion:**

In response to Council Resolution 7, regarding Section 18.14.1 of the 2025 OCP and Section 8.5.19 of the 2012 OCP, which states:

*“The City recognizes the importance of the Aeronautics Act and should endeavour to advise land use applicants of the Airport Master Plan recommendations. This includes considerations to no new residential development and other sensitive land uses in areas near the airport.”*

Administration has reviewed the implications of this policy and can confirm that no adverse consequences are anticipated as a result of its inclusion in the 2025 OCP. The policy is advisory in nature and aligns with federal legislation under the Aeronautics Act, as well as best practices in land use planning near airports. It serves to inform applicants of potential constraints and considerations, rather than impose regulatory prohibitions.

Furthermore, the policy supports sound planning principles by promoting compatibility between land use and airport operations, thereby reducing potential conflicts related to noise, safety, and long-term airport viability.

Administration will continue to monitor development activity in proximity to the airport and ensure that applicants are appropriately informed of the Airport Master Plan recommendations during the land use application process.

### **Action:**

Administration will add new policy 18.14.1 j to the 2025 OCP as follows:

*“The City recognizes the importance of the Aeronautics Act and should endeavor to advise land use applicants of the Airport Master Plan recommendations. This includes consideration to no new residential development and other sensitive land uses in areas near the airport about 30 Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) as set out in the 2023 NEF maps (and as revised from time to time) within the Airport Master Plan’s Figure 12-3.”*

## Resolution 8

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council on the consequences and options to add the Cowart Malaspina expansion into the Official Community Plan.***

**Response:**

The Cowart Malaspina expansion is identified on Schedule 5: Road Network of the 2025 OCP as a 10-20 year road development horizon.

Administration believes the intent of Resolution 8 is adequately addressed in the 2025 OCP.

## Resolution 9

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council on the consequences and options addressing the Urban Containment Boundary (UCB) for transparency and flexibility that includes:***

- 1. Providing a clear and publicly accessible rationale for the delineation of the Urban Containment Boundary, including technical criteria (e.g., servicing limits, infrastructure capacity, walkability, land use compatibility).***
- 2. Proposing a framework for periodic review and amendment of the UCB, tied to development triggers such as school closures, infrastructure lifecycle, or economic opportunity.***
- 3. Ensuring the UCB is not interpreted as a binary “support development / do not support development” tool, but rather as a flexible guide to prioritize investment and planning focus-enabling context-sensitive decision-making where appropriate.***

### **Discussion:**

#### **1. Delineation of the Urban Containment Boundary**

The Urban Containment Boundary delineates predominantly rural areas from the City's existing urban neighbourhoods and future development areas identified through prior neighbourhood planning processes.

The [Complete Community Assessment](#) was simultaneously conducted with the review of the OCP which allowed the City to supplement the analysis and engagement for its OCP with more in-depth, evidence-based data. The Complete Community Assessment project summary was presented to Council at the January 13, 2025 Regular Council Meeting.

The Executive Summary of the Prince George Complete Community Assessment provides the intent of the assessment is to guide the City in accommodating growth and addressing critical housing needs while prioritizing existing infrastructure and making the best use of future capital investments. The assessment also considers the market viability of different development types, supported by extensive engagement with the local development community and detailed financial analysis.

The Prince George Complete Community Assessment entailed extensive spatial analysis of community data obtained from a range of sources, including municipal and provincial datasets, Statistics Canada and BC Assessment. Multiple indicators were analyzed to assess overall community completeness:

- Existing housing density.
- Development trends and activity.
- Proximity to daily needs (i.e., childcare, grocery stores, hospitals, libraries, parks and open space, commercial services and schools).
- Proximity to transportation (i.e., transit stops, transportation connectivity, and active transportation routes like cycling infrastructure and sidewalks).
- Infrastructure readiness (i.e., existing and future infrastructure required to deliver services such as water, sanitary and fire flow to accommodate additional development).

Engagement with community members, local developers, and City staff helped validate trends identified through spatial analysis, which highlighted priority areas for development to support community completeness and OCP goals.

#### **2. Review of the Urban Containment Boundary**

The 2025 OCP indicates that regular review and updates are recommended to ensure goals and objectives of the OCP are achieved. Administration is committed to reviewing the OCP on a regular basis and would like to highlight Section 19 of the 2025 OCP which provides policy direction to facilitate the ongoing monitoring, review, and update of the OCP. The policies provided help inform Council's Strategic Priority Goals, the Corporate Work Plan, and divisional work plans.

**Action:**

Administration will include review of the Urban Containment Boundary when the OCP is reviewed every 5 years as per OCP policy 19.1.2 c.

3. Flexible Urban Containment Boundary

The “Urban Containment Boundary” manages growth by promoting infill development and supporting our existing urban neighbourhoods to minimize the need for new infrastructure and ensure fiscal responsibility. The “Urban Containment Boundary” is intended to be a growth management tool to protect agricultural and rural lands, and natural areas while also focusing public and private investment on community services, parks, housing, transit and sustainable infrastructure.

An OCP does not commit local governments to proceed with any work or projects that are mentioned in the Plan. The OCP is intended to be responsive and adaptable through monitoring and regular updates.

The 2025 OCP currently includes policy that “supports growth and development within the Urban Containment Boundary where existing municipal infrastructure and services are located” and “discourages further intensification of urban uses and densities ... outside of the Urban Containment Boundary”. General policy language such as “support” or “discourage” allows Administration the opportunity to assess nuances and make decisions that are in line with the broader goals of the OCP and adapt in the face of changing demographics, socio-economic conditions, or environmental factors.

## Resolution 10

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council on the consequences and options addressing the Urban Containment Boundary (UCB) for transparency and flexibility that includes conducting targeted engagement with affected stakeholders and landowners representing the properties of:***

- ***505 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue***
- ***2913 Silvercrest Road***
- ***2000 Central Street***
- ***Cranbrook Hill Road (PID: 013-713-485)***
- ***4729 Shamrock Road***

### **Discussion:**

Administration conducted an extensive review of the 2025 OCP, which was complimented by public consultation and engagement efforts spanning 2023-2025. A key theme that emerged throughout this process was the importance of carefully managing the City's growth. Taking this into account, the 2025 OCP features a smaller "Urban Containment Boundary" and emphasizes support for our existing neighborhoods and infrastructure.

In October 2024, Administration released a draft of the proposed 2025 OCP to the public to collect feedback on the document through a survey and written submissions. The feedback provided through this phase of engagement was used to finalize the proposed 2025 OCP before Council's consideration of First Reading on February 3, 2025. Following the *Local Government Act*, since more than 10 parcels owned by 10 or more persons may be impacted by the proposed OCP, mailed-out notices of the public process were not required. Instead, Administration notified residents and property owners via the OCP's project webpage, social media, print newspaper, radio advertisements, and e-newsletters.

With respect to the specific properties identified in Resolution 10, Administration provides the following response:

#### ***505 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue – City owned lands***

The property located at 505 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue is currently identified within the "Urban Area" on Schedule B-4: Growth Management in the 2011 OCP, and will be maintained within the "Urban Containment Boundary" on Schedule 1: Growth Management in the 2025 OCP. As such, targeted engagement addressing the "Urban Containment Boundary" is not necessary as the site is City-owned and there is no change from the 2011 OCP.

#### ***2913 Silvercrest Road***

The property located at 2913 Silvercrest Road was previously identified within the "Urban Area" on Schedule B-4: Growth Management in the 2011 OCP. Within proposed Schedule 1: Growth Management in the 2025 OCP this property is not included within the "Urban Containment Boundary" and is designated as "Rural". This mapping change was done in response to a key theme that emerged throughout the OCP's public consultation processes in favor of reducing sprawl and carefully managing the City's growth.

Removal of 2913 Silvercrest Road from the "Urban Containment Boundary", along with the Blueberry Hill area, is intended to help the City better support its existing infrastructure in fully serviced, urban neighbourhoods, rather than extending infrastructure further into unserved rural, undeveloped areas of our community.

In January 2025, the property owner of 2913 Silvercrest Road contacted Administration through email to identify concerns with the proposed OCP amendments. These concerns were shared again with Council for consideration during the Public Hearing process for 2025 OCP.

### **2000 Central Street**

The property located at 2000 Central Street is currently identified within the “Urban Area” on Schedule B-4: Growth Management in the 2011 OCP, and is still proposed within the “Urban Containment Boundary” on Schedule 1: Growth Management in the 2025 OCP. No change has been proposed to the “Urban Containment Boundary” in this area.

In August 2024, the property owner of 2000 Central Street initiated discussions with Administration for an OCP amendment and Zoning Bylaw amendment application to support a mixed-use development. The 2025 OCP is supportive of the proposed mixed-use development and as such the applicant initially agreed to postpone consideration of their application until Council had considered 2025 OCP.

To expedite consideration of the mixed-use development application, Administration and the applicant have agreed to proceed with an OCP amendment for Council’s consideration under the 2011 OCP.

### **Cranbrook Hill Road (PID: 013-713-485)**

The property located at Cranbrook Hill Road (PID: 013-713-485) is currently identified outside of the “Urban Area” on Schedule B-4: Growth Management in the 2011 OCP, and remains outside of the “Urban Containment Boundary” on Schedule 1: Growth Management in the 2025 OCP. No change has been proposed to the “Urban Containment Boundary” in this area. As such, targeted engagement addressing the “Urban Containment Boundary” is not necessary as there is no change from the 2011 OCP.

### **4729 Shamrock Road**

The property located at 4729 Shamrock Road is identified within the “Urban Area” on Schedule B-4: Growth Management in the 2011 OCP. Within proposed Schedule 1: Growth Management in the 2025 OCP this property has been removed from the Urban Containment Boundary and is designated as “Rural” in response to a key theme that emerged throughout the OCP’s public consultation and community engagement processes in favor of reducing sprawl and carefully managing the City’s growth.

Removal of this property from the Urban Containment Boundary, along with the Blueberry Hill area, is intended to help the City better support its existing infrastructure in fully serviced, urban neighbourhoods, rather than extending infrastructure further into unserved rural, undeveloped areas of our community.

In December 2024, the property owner of 4729 Shamrock Road contacted Administration to identify concerns with the proposed OCP amendments. These concerns were shared again with Council for consideration during the Public Hearing process for the 2025 OCP.

Administration is confident the properties identified in Resolution 10 were properly notified and were responded to when feedback was provided.

Administration believes no further engagement is needed as the comments seem to be related to property inclusion, or not, in the Urban Containment Boundary. Throughout this document Administration has thoroughly explained how the Urban Containment Boundary was informed and what it represents in the current and proposed OCP.

### **Options:**

1. If Council wishes for targeted engagement to be undertaken, Council will need to engage which property owners, format, and funding source for this additional engagement.

Sample Motion:

THAT Council DIRECTS Administration to conduct targeted engagement with the landowners of <indicate property> taking the format of <engagement format> with the costs associated to be paid from <funding source>.

2. Council takes no action on this resolution (no resolution from Council required).

## Resolution 11

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council outlining the implications and options for shifting the identity of our community from a winter city to a year-round destination in policy section 10.0 in the "City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025."***

### **Discussion:**

City of Prince George as a winter city is identified in the 2011 OCP and was carried forward into the 2025 OCP.

Section 10.1.5 of the 2025 OCP provides the objective "Prince George's identity as a winter city is showcased through its infrastructure, design, events and economy". Section 10.1.6 of the 2025 OCP provides the policies that would help achieve the objective state in Section 10.1.5.

It is possible to amend the wording of the objective under Section 10.1.5 of the 2025 OCP to state Prince George's identity as a year round destination; however, amendments to the policies under Section 10.1.6 would also need to occur to ensure consistency with the newly worded objective.

### **Options:**

1. THAT Council DIRECTS Administration to replace Section 10.1.5 of the 2025 OCP that reads, "Prince George's identity as a winter city is showcased through its infrastructure, design, events and economy" with "Prince George's identity as a year round destination is showcased through its infrastructure, design, events and economy"; and to amend the policies in Section 10.1.6 of the 2025 OCP to reflect the replacement wording of Section 10.1.5.
2. Council takes no action on this resolution (no resolution from Council required).

## Resolution 12

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council with additional direction to enhance safety by mitigating wildfires in the City of Prince George. This new work should include but not be limited to addressing advocating the planting of less flammable tree species in areas owned by the City of Prince George, along riparian zones and rivers, and Crown Land.***

***\*Please note this resolution is separate from the 2025 OCP adoption process.***

### **Discussion:**

Section 20.3.4 of the 2025 OCP provides the objective and guidelines for the Wildfire Hazard Designation Development Permit Area. The current 2011 OCP includes the Wildfire Hazard Development Permit Area and the guidelines for this development permit area are embedded in the Zoning Bylaw 7850, 2007. The guidelines for the existing and proposed development permit area rely on the expertise of a qualified professional to undertake an assessment of a property within the development permit area to determine the fire hazard(s) and the mitigation steps to reduce the risk of wildfire negatively impacting a development. Mitigation recommendations may also be informed by the British Columbia HomeOwners FireSmart Manual.

The City of Prince George can support the use of less flammable tree species on municipally owned lands through its operational practices. For areas along riparian zones and rivers, appropriate species selection is guided by the Riparian Protection Development Permit Area guidelines. However, the City does not have jurisdiction over Crown Land and therefore cannot determine the species of trees planted in those areas.

### **Action:**

The Zoning Bylaw and the Development Permit Guidelines are intended to be reviewed following adoption of the 2025 OCP. The proposed policy section will be explored and considered for any future updates to the Wildfire Hazard Development Permit Guidelines.

## Resolution 13

*That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council on consequences and options regarding a city-wide infrastructure renewal strategy that includes:*

- *Develop a comprehensive infrastructure renewal strategy for all neighborhoods, including low-density and legacy areas outside growth priority zones.*
- *Explore funding models (e.g., senior government grants, cost-sharing mechanisms) for replacing aging infrastructure from the 1960s–70s era.*
- *Where appropriate, assess options for right-sizing, looping, or selectively decommissioning underused systems while maintaining service equity.”*

*\*Please note this resolution is separate from the 2025 OCP adoption process.*

### **Discussion:**

The 2025 OCP is a long-term planning document to guide decisions on land use, development, infrastructure, and community services. The detail provided in Resolution 13 would not be appropriate for inclusion in the OCP. The objectives and policies of the 2025 OCP (i.e. 11.1.1 and 11.1.2) provide direction to update infrastructure master plans. The priority of these types of projects are determined at divisional work plan level but can also be highlighted through Council's Strategic Plan and the Corporate Work Plan.

Administration is aware of the long-term infrastructure plans that require updating and makes every effort to incorporate the review of such plans into ongoing divisional work planning. Notably, work is already underway on the update to the Sanitary Sewer Master Plan.

### **Action:**

Administration will continue to incorporate the review of infrastructure master plans into divisional work plans.

## Resolution 14

*That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council outlining the implications and options for amending the “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025” by:*

- *adding spaces to help promote food security as a priority in Section 14.0;*
- *adding the words “intent to harvest” immediately following the words “and vegetation” in Section 16.1.4 (c); and*
- *adding policies 7.3.7 through to 7.3.15 from the “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 8383, 2011” within Sections 7.3.3 and 7.3.4 of Bylaw No. 9525, 2025.”*

### **Discussion:**

The 2025 OCP has several sections that provide policy support for agricultural initiatives. Section 7.3 indicates support for agricultural initiatives to supplement the local food system. Further to this, section 14.0 provides policy support for social health and wellbeing through programs, services and urban design for social prosperity in our community. Although the 2011 OCP included its food security policy within the “Health and Wellness” section, the proposed 2025 OCP has included this policy direction within the policies for Growth Management for rural areas (i.e. Section 7).

### **Action:**

To address Resolution 14, Administration will undertake the following actions:

- Reword Section 14.1.4 (a) from “Integrate social planning and land use planning to better address the social health, wellbeing needs of the community” to “Integrate social planning and land use planning to better address the social health, wellbeing and food security needs of the community”.
- Reword Section 16.1.4 (c) from “discourage planting of fruit bearing trees and vegetation” to “discourage planting of fruit bearing trees and vegetation where there is no intent to harvest”.
- Adding policies 7.3.7 through to 7.3.15 from the 2011 OCP within Sections 7.3.3 and 7.3.4 of the 2025 OCP.

## Resolution 15

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report on amending the language of section 7.2.2 d) in the “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025” by replacing the word ‘shall’ with the word ‘must.’***

**Action:**

Administration will amend policy section 7.2.2 d. from “infrastructure required to support new development in Future Development Areas shall be fully funded by the developer” to “infrastructure required to support new development in Future Development Areas must be fully funded by the developer”.

## Resolution 16

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report on amending the language of section 15.1.3 in the “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025” by deleting the existing language and replacing with ‘Climate change adaptation and mitigation minimizes negative climate-related impacts on human safety, health, and wellbeing.’***

### **Discussion:**

Changing Objective 15.1.3 from “climate change mitigation measures reduce greenhouse gas emissions” to “climate change adaptation and mitigation minimizes negative climate-related impacts on human safety, health and well-being” results in policy direction under Section 15.1.4 that is inconsistent with the proposed new objective. Further, the proposed new wording of 15.1.3 seems **incorporate** Objective 15.1.1. The proposed wording of the new objective will create challenges with interpretation and implementation of the applicable OCP policies, therefore, Administration recommends the objectives stated under Section 15.1.1 and 15.1.3 remain as presented in the 2025 OCP.

Administration is confident that the climate action and resilience objectives and policies outlined in the 2025 OCP adequately address the topic.

Should Council wish to pursue this text amendment, review of the policies in Section 15 of the 2025 OCP should also be reviewed in their entirety.

### **Options:**

1. THAT Council DIRECTS Administration to replace Section 15.1.3 of the 2025 OCP that reads, “climate change mitigation measures reduce greenhouse gas emissions” with “climate change adaptation and mitigation minimizes negative climate-related impacts on human safety, health and well-being” and to amend the policies in Section 15.0 of the 2025 OCP to reflect the replacement wording of Section 15.1.3 and to review all other policies in Section 15 of the 2025 OCP to ensure consistency with other applicable objectives and policies in the 2025 OCP.
2. Council takes no action on this resolution (no resolution from Council required).

## Resolution 17

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council outlining the consequences and options of removing Moore's Meadow in its entirety, including the city-owned property current zoned AF: Agriculture and Forestry at the north end of the meadow. from the Urban Containment Boundary on Schedule 1: Growth Management in the "City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025."***

### **Discussion:**

As discussed previously in this document, the "Urban Containment Boundary" is intended to be a growth management tool, ensuring that infrastructure and services are efficiently used and that development is sustainable. In the current 2011 OCP the urban containment boundary is called "Urban Area" and is shown on Schedule B-4: Growth Management. In the proposed 2025 OCP the urban containment boundary is called "Urban Containment Boundary" and shown on Schedule 1.

Moore's Meadow Park is city-owned, is included in the "Urban Area" of the 2011 OCP, and is designated "Park and Open Space" Future Land Use designation map in both the 2011 and 2025 OCP. This designation is intended to provide access to nature, protect and enhance parks and open space, and accommodate a network of well-connected trails for our community in an otherwise built environment.

Similar to other city-owned parcels and parkland, Moore's Meadow Park is located within the City's urban area and the Urban Containment Boundary. Administration believes that the existing future land use policy for "Parks and Open Space" is suitable for the protection of Moore's Meadow and other parks and open spaces throughout our community.

Removal of Moore's Meadow from the "Urban Containment Boundary" will create an isolated area within the surrounding urban area. This change would introduce inconsistencies in how the Growth Priority policies are applied to other parks and open spaces throughout the community. This may lead to conflicting policy interpretations when referencing other OCP policies and schedules intended to guide growth and development. Please note Section 18.7.1 e. of the 2025 OCP, which is also discussed in Resolution 18.

Resolution 1 speaks to the 4.4ha AF zoned portion of the parcel which presents a strong opportunity for residential infill that aligns with the existing zoning and surrounding development patterns. As previously stated, there are no plans for infill development within the meadow or significant slopes of Moore's Meadow Park, as the area is intended to remain as park.

Administration recommends Moore's Meadow Park remain as presented on Schedule 1: Growth Management of the 2025 OCP to ensure consistency in policy interpretation and implementation.

### **Options:**

1. That Council DIRECTS Administration to redesignate Moore's Meadow Park identified as PID: 024-214-922 from "Urban Containment Boundary" and "Growth Priority" to "Rural" on Schedule 1: Growth Management Map of the proposed 2025 OCP.
2. Council takes no action on this resolution (no resolution from Council required).

## Resolution 18

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council outlining the consequences and options for amending Section 18.7(e) in the “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025, by adding the words “and in underserved areas” immediately following the words “Growth Priority Areas”.***

**Action:**

Administration will amend section 18.7.1 e. from “prioritize parks and open spaces in Growth Priority Areas” to “prioritize parks and open spaces in Growth Priority Areas and in underserved areas”.

## Resolution 19

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council on consequences and options regarding the incorporation of strategic flexibility for development outside the Urban Containment Boundary which includes:***

- *Creating policy and evaluation criteria for strategic exceptions to the UCB, where developments offer public benefit or economic value (e.g., major employers, affordable housing, neighbourhood stabilization).*
- *Requiring a Comprehensive Neighbourhood Plan for any such proposals, ensuring coordination with infrastructure, environment, and transportation planning.*
- *Identifying and mapping “Potential Future Urban Reserve Areas” to allow flexible growth scenarios beyond the current planning horizon (e.g., post-2040), without immediate servicing obligations.*

### **Discussion:**

The “Urban Containment Boundary” manages growth by promoting infill development and supporting our existing urban neighbourhoods to minimize the need for new infrastructure and ensure fiscal responsibility. The “Urban Containment Boundary” is intended to be a growth management tool to protect agricultural and rural lands, and natural areas while also focusing public and private investment on community services, parks, housing, transit and sustainable infrastructure.

### Exemptions

As outlined in Section 1.0, an OCP is a statement of objectives and policies intended to guide decisions on planning and land use management. Section 1.2.1 provides the following list of criteria to help determine whether a proposed development is consistent with the OCP.

*Where a property is only partially within a land use designation, or a development proposal conflicts with the existing OCP land use designation or specific OCP policies, the Authorized Person may require an OCP amendment for consistency with the goals, objectives and policies of the Plan. The Authorized Person may consider the following criteria to determine whether an OCP amendment is required:*

- *Lot location and size;*
- *Surrounding land uses, adjacent land use designations, or potential land use impacts;*
- *Road classifications, traffic, and parking;*
- *Topography or other natural features; and/or*
- *Development size, massing, and quality of design.*

Since the criteria above can be used to determine whether “a development proposal conflicts with the existing OCP land use designation or specific OCP policies,” this can be interpreted to apply to policy related to the “Urban Containment Boundary”.

### Comprehensive Neighbourhood Plans

Neighbourhood plans are created to guide development for specific areas of the city that are either intended to accommodate redevelopment, or to create a new neighbourhood. Neighbourhood plans typically provide a greater level of detail for land use, density, form, character and the phasing of development than an OCP; however, they must remain consistent with an OCP’s policies and objectives.

Within Section 7.2, the intent of this growth management designation is to guide and phase growth based on required servicing and with preference to locations adjacent to existing Growth Priority Areas. New development in these areas are to be accompanied by a neighbourhood planning process.

The draft OCP currently includes the following policies in favour of neighbourhood planning processes:

- Plan for development in Growth Priority Areas by updating and/or creating neighbourhood plans (section 7.1.4 c.).
- Encourage a comprehensive neighbourhood planning process including lifecycle costing of infrastructure requirements for new development in Future Development Areas (section 7.2.2 c.).
- Complete a comprehensive neighbourhood planning process before considering expansive development in Rural Areas (section 7.3.2 e.)
- Consider the most recent master servicing plans, and neighbourhood plans and studies when reviewing land use and development applications to confirm infrastructure needs and priorities (parks, transportation, transit, active transportation networks, community facilities, etc.) that may be required (section 11.1.4 d.).

Section 19.0, also identifies the review and update of existing neighbourhood plans to ensure consistency between existing plans and the proposed OCP's objectives and policies.

#### Potential Future Urban Reserve Areas

Future Development Areas have been identified in the draft OCP, in yellow on Schedule 1: Growth Management. Future Development Areas were identified through completed neighbourhood planning processes and have been designated for future, gradual expansion within the "Urban Containment Boundary". The City shall phase and guide growth within these areas based on required servicing and with preference to locations adjacent to existing "Growth Priority Areas". New development in these areas are intended to be accompanied by a neighbourhood planning process that would include technical information related to infrastructure requirement. Infrastructure that is constructed through development (i.e., roads, sewer, storm, water, sidewalks, lighting) are funded by the developer.

## Resolution 20

*That Council DIRECTS Administration to incorporate the following into the Corporate Workplan following adoption of the City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025 regarding communications and accessibility of the Official Community Plan which includes:*

- *Producing a plain-language summary and visual guide to accompany the OCP, making key concepts, land designations, and planning impacts accessible to the public.*
- *Ensuring the Urban Containment Boundary and land use maps are clearly explained as planning tools, not rigid development limits.*
- *Exploring an interactive, digital version of the OCP with layered mapping, search tools, and dynamic updates.*

**Action:**

Administration will add this item to the Corporate Workplan following the adoption of the 2025 OCP.

## Resolution 21

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council outlining the implications and options for including access to public washrooms where possible when considering facilities as outlined in Section 14 and specifically 14.1.2 in the “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No 9525, 2025.”***

**Discussion:**

The 2025 OCP is a long-term planning document used to guide decisions on land use, development, infrastructure, and community services. The inclusion and access to public washrooms is operational and could be addressed through Council’s Strategic Plan, the Corporate Work Plan, and the Capital Project Plan.

**Action:**

Administration takes into consideration access to public washroom facilities when evaluating and planning relevant projects.

## Resolution 22

*That Council DIRECTS administration to include policy language in Section 16.1.4 that clearly supports the protection of urban tree canopy and the equitable replacement of significant tree loss on both private and public development sites. Policy direction should consider the potential for mandatory replanting, developer contributions toward reforestation or urban greening initiatives, and other scalable offset mechanisms that provide benefit within the vicinity of the removal. This direction should align with the intent and application of Tree Protection Bylaw No. 6343 and inform future implementation tools.*

**\*Please note this resolution is separate from the 2025 OCP adoption process**

### **Discussion:**

The City of Prince George Tree Protection Bylaw No. 6343 is identified in Section 19.1.4 as a bylaw to be updated following adoption of the 2025 OCP. Through the review of the Tree Protection Bylaw, the items summarized in Resolution 22 will be addressed.

### **Action:**

Administration will note Resolution 22 for consideration through the review of the City of Prince George Tree Protection Bylaw No. 6343.

## Resolution 23

*That Council DIRECTS administration to include policy language in Section 9.1.6 that supports the growth of local innovation and creative sector development. including opportunities related to technology start-ups, clean tech, entrepreneurial work, remote/freelance/independent work infrastructure, and creative industries, to reflect Prince George's potential in emerging economic sectors. This direction should reflect Prince George's growing potential in emerging sectors, reinforce Council's commitment to youth and young family retention, economic diversification, and long-term community resilience and reflecting our status as a recognized College and University centre.*

### Discussion:

#### Sector-Specific Language

In the case of the economy and the sectors to be focused on by the City's economic development division, opportunities and challenges can arise quickly and be unforeseen. Strategy and staff procedure-level policies can be created to focus resources efficiently while leaving opportunity for change to respond to changing economic conditions in a way that benefits the community.

Prescriptive language in OCP policies is recommended to be strictly avoided and rather included at divisional strategy or even workplan levels to avoid missed opportunities in other sectors to ensure operational efficiency is enabled and maximum economic benefit to the community is reached. For example, since innovation and creative sector development is the only sector-specific language directed to be included in the OCP, all non-innovative or non-creative sector development would not be supported by staff; opportunities and developments in pre-existing technologies and well-established outcomes could not be supported by staff without Council intervention each time, reducing divisional efficiency considerably and increasing potential for missed opportunity.

Likewise, the meanings and definitions in policy language should be well-defined and kept broad at the OCP level to avoid unintentionally excluding direction. For example, innovation and creative sector development is not standard language. Further elaborated upon, the direction includes two vastly different sectors: "clean [technology]" (defined in Canada as goods or services designed with the primary purpose of contributing to remediating or preventing any type of environmental damage or is less polluting or more resource efficient than equivalent normal products that furnish a similar utility) and "creative industries" (which may fall under the NAICS 51 – Information and Cultural Industries, NAICS 71 – Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation, or other more granular NAICS).

By retaining the current language around economic diversity, the current policy meets the stated direction, supporting development of the aforementioned sectors without restricting the City from other unforeseen opportunities that may arise.

#### Retention- and Workforce-Related Language

Contained within this direction has a spirit of retaining youth and young families, as well as references to the College of New Caledonia (CNC) and the University of Northern British Columbia (UNBC). This section currently includes policies that support satisfying needs of residents, creating local jobs that employ residents and support local families, attracting key positions to Prince George that add to our community, and investments that help enable the above. What could be further clarified is the importance of retaining the jobs and therefore the families, as well as language that links the City's work to the work of local institutions (such as CNC and UNBC) that create a workforce that enables progressive economic development and diversification in Prince George.

### Action:

To address Resolution 23, Administration will undertake the following actions:

- amend Section 9.1.6 a. from "attract new investment that will enhance and support local businesses and create local jobs" to "attract new investment that will enhance and support local businesses and create and retain local, family-supporting jobs".

- amend Section 9.1.6 b. from “support existing businesses to diversify, and enter new sectors” to “support existing businesses to grow, diversify, and enter new sectors and markets”.
- amend Section 9.1.6 c. from “continue to support employers by attracting key occupations to Prince George” to “continue to support local employers in their efforts to attract and retain key occupations”.
- Amend Section 9.1.6 d. from “leverage foreign direct investment initiatives to support local key sector businesses in exporting their goods and services to key markets” to “leverage foreign direct investment initiatives to support local key sector businesses”.
- Add Section 9.1.6 e. support the development of a local workforce that meets near-term demand and is prepared for emerging sectors.

## Resolution 24

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council outlining the implications and options for incorporating a strategy for large regional, provincial, national, and international events as a tool for driving economic development in policy section 9.0 in the “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No 9525, 2025.”***

### **Discussion:**

Prince George currently has a 10-year Sport Tourism Strategy that was a partnership between the City and Tourism Prince George. Since its creation, Tourism Prince George and the City have worked together to actively pursue events and have successfully attracted many different types of events, not solely in sport. Additionally, Tourism Prince George’s 5-Year Strategy specifically targets attraction of sporting events, city-wide conferences, and other events that extend overnight stays and contribute to local economic growth and diversification.

Since Tourism Prince George is the community’s Destination Management Organization (DMO), is actively focused on event tourism, currently partners with the City to support attracting and optimizing inbound events, and events are a tourist-focused activity, it is recommended that the most appropriate organization to continue leading the pursuit of regional, provincial, national, and international events be Tourism Prince George, and it is recommended that the City continue its role as an active partner in support of such pursuits.

The City’s Civic Facilities and Events department is the organization’s department that most often interfaces with Tourism Prince George and inbound events. Policy under section 10.1.2, 10.1.4, and 10.1.6 all have language that support the involvement of the City in the support of event tourism, but not as the leading agency.

Since the OCP is a long-term, high-level guiding document, the development of a strategy is recommended to be led by a different agency, and language within the current draft of the OCP supports such involvement, no change is recommended.

### **Action:**

Language in the OCP directing City staff to lead the development of an event tourism strategy to attract regional, provincial, national, and international events to Prince George would infringe upon the historical and current efforts of Tourism Prince George, potentially risking damaged relationships and limiting partnerships. Instead, it’s recommended to recognize existing language within the OCP as enabling City staff of both Civic Facilities and Events and Economic Development to take a supporting role to Tourism Prince George.

## Resolution 25

*To ensure that the Prince George Airport Authority's role is more formally recognized and that the development around the airport reflects both the City's vision for growth and the operational needs of the airport, which is vital for the region's future development, that Council DIRECTS Administration to incorporate the following in the City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025:*

- *The Prince George Airport (YXS) is a member of the National Airports System (NAS), is regulated under federal laws and governed by the Prince George Airport Authority (PGAA). The transfer agreement and ground lease signed between Transport Canada and the PGAA grant the Authority the responsibility for operation, management and development of YXS. With respect to land development, PGAA approves a Land Use Plan and Master Plan for land included in the OCP's airport land use designation.*
- *Airport expansion and aircraft and airport associated facilities are to be confined primarily to the airport land use designation. Non-airport related uses are to be discouraged in this area.*
- *Planning in and around the airport should occur in partnership between the City and the Prince George Airport Authority.*
- *OCP implementation through municipal plans and by-laws (as defined in 19.1.4 ) for the airport land use designation will be done in partnership with the PGAA.*
- *The City recognizes the importance of the Aeronautics Act and should endeavor to advise land use applicants of the Airport Master Plan recommendations.*

### Discussion:

Administration will add the above-mentioned policies within Section 18.14.1. of the 2025 OCP.

### Action:

The following policies will be added to Section 18.14.1 of the 2025 OCP:

- The Prince George Airport (YXS) is a member of the National Airports System (NAS), is regulated under federal laws and governed by the Prince George Airport Authority (PGAA). The transfer agreement and ground lease signed between Transport Canada and the PGAA grant the Authority the responsibility for operation, management and development of YXS. With respect to land development, PGAA approves a Land Use Plan and Master Plan for land included in the OCP's airport land use designation.
- Airport expansion and aircraft and airport associated facilities are to be confined primarily to the airport land use designation. Non-airport related uses are to be discouraged in this area.
- Planning in and around the airport should occur in partnership between the City and the Prince George Airport Authority.
- OCP implementation through municipal plans and bylaws (as defined in 19.1.4) for the airport land use designation will be done in partnership with the PGAA.
- The City recognizes the importance of the Aeronautics Act and should endeavor to advise land use applicants of the Airport Master Plan recommendations.

## Resolution 26

*That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council outlining the consequences and options for amending the indicator in Goal 4 of Section 19.1.3(a) in the “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025, by adding a business diversification snapshot from Statistics Canada and amending the indicator in Goal 1 of Section 19.1.3(a) by adding the BC Division’s Vital Statistics estimates.*

**Discussion:**

Section 19.0 Implementation of the 2025 OCP will be amended as described in Resolution 26.

**Action:**

Administration will amend Section 19.1.3 a. as follows:

- add “BC Division's Vital Statistics” as an indicator to Goal 1; and
- add “business diversification snapshot from Statistics Canada” as an indicator to Goal 4.

## Resolution 27

*That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council outlining the consequences and options for amending Section 21.0 in the “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025, by adding a definition for the terms “land use designation” and “zoning”.*

### Discussion:

Section 21.0 Definitions of the 2025 OCP will be amended as outlined in Resolution 27.

### Action:

Administration will add the following terms to Section 21.0 Definitions of the 2025 OCP:

- **Land Use Designation:** a land use planning tool that influences the zoning regulations. The designation identifies types of development and activities supported within a designated area.
- **Zone:** a land use tool that identifies the regulation of the use of land and buildings.

## Resolution 28

**That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report outlining implications and options for amending Section 9.0 'Economic Development' of the Official Community Plan to include:**

- **Positioning Prince George as a gateway to the north and Continental America and Asia, boosting Canada's economic resilience via partnerships, per Strategic Plan 2023-2026 (p. 1);**
- **Supporting forestry, energy development and corridors, mining and logistics with targeted growth partnerships;**
- **Realizing Prince George Airport as an Asia-Pacific intermodal trade hub with federal/provincial support;**
- **Business inquiries representing over \$5 million required to be presented to Mayor and Council;**
- **Residential development inquiries over 99 homes required to be presented to Mayor and Council.**
- **Take every opportunity to develop consequential relationships that build the northern economy with our regional district, municipal and First Nation neighbours.**

### Discussion:

#### Points 1, 2, and 3 of Resolution 28

The long-term nature of the OCP should be considered when creating policies; in the case of the economy and the sectors to be focused on by the City's economic development division, opportunities and challenges can arise quickly and be unforeseen. Strategy and staff procedure level policies can be created to focus resources efficiently while leaving opportunity for change to respond to changing economic conditions in a way that benefits the community.

- Terms like "positioning" refer to community marketing, which is a strategy-level concept.
- Supporting specific sectors is a strategy-level concept.
- Leveraging specific assets, like the airport, towards attracting investment from specific geographies, like the Asia-Pacific region, is a strategy-level concept.

The 2025 OCP policies 9.1.2, 9.1.4, and 9.1.6 address the above points.

#### Points 4 and 5 of Resolution 28

Firstly, the definition of "business inquiry" needs further clarification and the reference to \$5 million needs to be defined (it is unclear whether this amount refers to capital expenditure, wages, local spend, total, or any other metric). Prior to permit, many business inquiries representing \$5M in value, job growth, or other monetary metric come with a variety of complications or reasons not to present to Council:

- **Commercial sensitivity:** by relinquishing information publicly, this may impact the business interests of a third party, directly contravening the Freedom of Information and Privacy Protection Act.
- **Relevance or reliability:** and **operational efficiency:** many business inquiries do not result in final investment decision (FID) and often start at the exploratory phase with many factors outside of the City's control being determining factors. Bringing every development that presents itself to City staff before Council would be administratively burdensome, with little benefit to the community, and would require a significant increase in capacity to maintain the same level of service to interested proponents to ensure the best possibility of reaching positive FID.
- **Burden or barrier:** if there was a standard of information set by Council for what is presented about these business inquiries, the level of detail required may be seen as a deterrent for the project proponent and either leave necessary details out or causing proponents to go to other jurisdictions that don't require this level of scrutiny until later stages of the project.

Additionally, residential, institutional, industrial, and commercial developments are captured through various means, most notably through development and building permits. At time of building permit, most (but not all) developments have received positive FID, awareness of the project is past the point of commercial sensitivity, and most details of

the project are clearly defined, making this a reliable method of presenting developments to Council regardless of value. The standard of information in these permits is already clearly defined and therefore meets this expectation. No change is recommended.

Point 6 of Resolution 28

Prescriptive language such as “take every opportunity” may lead to cost overruns and requirements for additional capacity at the staff level in times where the number of opportunities lie beyond existing capacity and resources. Support for regional economic development is included in current policy language within the 2025 OCP and therefore currently enables staff to satisfy this point in spirit, and the extent to which “every opportunity” is taken can be further defined at strategy and divisional workplan levels.

Administration is of the view that the policy direction outlined in the 2025 OCP is high-level in nature, yet sufficiently clear to provide meaningful guidance for the development of Council's Strategic Plan, the Corporate Plan, and divisional work plans.

**Options:**

1. If Council wishes to amend Section 9.0, Council will need to define the language to be included in this section.  
Sample Motion:  
THAT Council DIRECT Administration to amend Section 9.0 of the 2025 OCP, as outlined in Resolution 28, with the following language:  
<insert language>
2. Council takes no action on this resolution (no resolution from Council required).

## Resolution 29

***That Council DIRECTS administration to include policy language in Section 8.1.2 that strengthens support for aging in place by encouraging neighbourhood planning and housing design that accommodates residents across all stages of life. This should include a variety of ground-oriented and accessible housing types such as single-level homes, adaptable units, and secondary suites, as well as proximity to transit, healthcare, and essential services to ensure livability and independence for older adults and those with mobility challenges.***

### **Discussion:**

Section 8.1.2 has policy language that has housing for universal design features and principles to create options for people of all ages and abilities, including those aging in place. Further to this, the section encourages a variety of housing forms and tenures to accommodate seniors in all abilities and stages of life and supports the Housing Needs Report to anticipate projected housing needs for the community. The future land use plan designations would provide focused housing forms based on the site.

Administration believes the existing housing policies contained within the 2025 OCP adequately address the intent of Resolution 29.

## Resolution 30

*That Council DIRECTS administration to include policy language that supports Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles in the planning of parks, public spaces, and new developments including lighting, and design features that enhance real and perceived safety.*

### **Discussion:**

Section 14.1.8 of the 2025 OCP addresses Resolution 30. Additionally, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles are identified within the Development Permit Guidelines in the City of Prince George Zoning Bylaw 7850, 2007.

Administration believes the existing policies contained within the 2025 OCP adequately address the intent of Resolution 30.

## Resolution 31

***That Council DIRECTS administration to include policy language in Section 9.1.4 that supports the modernization or adaptive re-use and redevelopment of underutilized commercial properties, such as dated or under occupied retail plazas, oversized surface parking areas, or low-density commercial corridors into mixed use developments that integrate housing, local services, and employment opportunities.***

### **Discussion:**

The 2025 OCP Section 9.1.4 b. states, “encourage new businesses to occupy vacant underutilized property in the Urban Containment Boundary to make efficient use of existing infrastructure and facilitate complete communities.”

Administration believes this policy adequately addresses the intent of Resolution 31.

## Resolution 32

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council on the implications and options to amend the Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 9525, 2025 or Zoning Bylaw No. 7850, 2007, that further diversifies land use within the Carter Light Industrial area.***

**Discussion:**

Cartier Light Industrial area has a Light Industrial designation in the 2025 OCP. The intent of the Light Industrial designation is to provide a “diverse employment base by facilitating industrial conversion areas offering a mix of business, office and light industrial uses suited to the surrounding area ...” The existing designation is suitable to accommodate both light industrial uses and a mix of other uses as a transition into the surrounding area.

City of Prince George Zoning Bylaw No. 7850, 2007 is identified in Section 19.1.4 of the 2025 OCP as a bylaw to be updated following adoption of the 2025 OCP. Through the review of the Zoning Bylaw, the implementation of a zone that reflects Resolution 32 will be prepared.

**Action:**

Administration will note Resolution 32 for implementation through the review of the City of Prince George Zoning Bylaw No. 7850.

## Resolution 33

***That Council DIRECTS Administration to return a report to Council on the implications and options to amend the OCP Bylaw 9525, 2025 that redesignates the land east of Queensway bound by 1st Avenue and Lower Patricia Boulevard from Light Industrial to new designation Light Industrial/Transition on Schedule 12: Future Land Use.***

### **Discussion:**

The 2025 OCP has designated the area bound by 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Lower Patricia and the lands east of Queensway (“Queensway East”) as Light Industrial. The intent of the Light Industrial designation is to provide a “diverse employment base by facilitating industrial conversion areas offering a mix of business, office and light industrial uses suited to the surrounding area ...” The existing designation is suitable to accommodate both light industrial uses and a mix of other uses as a transition into the surrounding area.

Administration believes the policies for the light industrial designation adequately addresses the intent of Resolution 33.