

STAFF REPORT TO COUNCIL

1100 Patricia Blvd. | Prince George, BC, Canada V2L 3V9 | www.princegeorge.ca

DATE: July 7, 2021

TO: MAYOR AND COUNCIL

NAME AND TITLE: Deanna Wasnik, Acting Director of Planning and Development Services

SUBJECT: Official Community Plan Amendment Application No. CP100172 (Bylaw No. 9197) and Rezoning Amendment Application No. RZ100701 (Bylaw No. 9198)

APPLICANT: EDS Group Inc. for Kidd Real Estate Holdings Ltd., Inc. No. BC0821509

LOCATION: 8700 Sparwood Road and 4922 Chief Lake Road

ATTACHMENT(S): Location and Existing Zoning Map
Appendix "A" to Bylaw No. 9197
Appendix "A" to Bylaw No. 9198
Exhibit "A" to Application No. CP100172
Supporting Documents

RECOMMENDATION(S):

That Council:

1. DENIES FIRST AND SECOND READING to "City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 8383, 2011, Amendment Bylaw No. 9197, 2021";
2. DENIES FIRST AND SECOND READING to "City of Prince George Zoning Bylaw No. 7850, 2007, Amendment Bylaw No. 9198, 2021"; and

PURPOSE:

The applicant is proposing to amend the Official Community Plan (OCP) and Zoning Bylaw to facilitate development of three, three-story apartment buildings with a total of 120 units at 8700 Sparwood Road and 4922 Chief Lake Road ("Subject Area").

In order to facilitate the proposed land use, the applicant has applied to amend the OCP from Neighbourhood Residential to Neighbourhood Corridor; and rezone the Subject Area from RS1m: Suburban Residential and AR3m: Rural Residential to RM3: Multiple Residential.

The applicant has provided a drawing package that includes a rendering of the proposed development and a summary of comments from consultation the applicant led (attached as supporting documents).

Administration does not support the applicant's proposed OCP amendment and rezoning as the proposal does not meet the policy direction of the OCP.

Site Characteristics

Location	8700 Sparwood Road	4922 Chief Lake Road
Legal Description	Lot 1, District Lot 2424, Cariboo District, Plan 33278	Lot 2, District Lot 2424, Cariboo District, Plan 33278
Current Use	Vacant Land	Vacant Land
Site Area	2.7 ha (6.6 acres)	4.0 ha (10.0 acres)
Growth Management Class	Infill	Infill
Servicing	<i>Services Available</i>	<i>Services Available</i>

Official Community Plan – Future Land Use (see Appendix “A” to Bylaw No. 9197)

Location	8700 Sparwood Road	4922 Chief Lake Road
Current Designation	Neighbourhood Residential	Neighbourhood Residential
Proposed Designation	Neighbourhood Corridor	Neighbourhood Corridor

Zoning (see Appendix “A” to Bylaw No. 9198)

Location	8700 Sparwood Road	4922 Chief Lake Road
Current Zoning	AR3m: Rural Residential	RS1m: Suburban Residential
Proposed Zoning	RM3: Multiple Residential	RM3: Multiple Residential

Surrounding Land Use Table

North	Rural Residential; Greenwood Street
South	Rural Residential; Chief Lake Road
East	Residential; Peter Road
West	Sparwood Street; Rural Residential

POLICY / REGULATORY ANALYSIS:

Intent of the Official Community Plan

As identified in Section 1.2 of the OCP (Intent, Application, and Interpretation), the *Local Government Act* explains that all bylaws enacted or works undertaken by Council after adoption of the OCP must be consistent. An OCP, however, is not intended to be a static document, but should adapt to new trends within society and respond to changing circumstances. As such, following appropriate public consultation and careful consideration by Council, policies and land use designations in an OCP may be revised by an amending bylaw pursuant to provisions outlined within the *Local Government Act*.

Official Community Plan

Future Land Use

The Subject Area is designated as Neighbourhood Residential in Schedule B-6: Future Land Use of the OCP. This designation is intended to maintain a similar scale of housing typical to existing neighbourhoods, having a density of less than 22 units per hectare, and limiting the size of new buildings (Policy 8.3.58 and 8.3.59).

In order to facilitate the proposed multi-family housing development, the applicant would like to amend the future land use designation from Neighbourhood Residential to Neighbourhood Corridor. The Neighbourhood Corridor designation encourages a number of multi-family housing types on collector and arterial streets where development considers potential community impacts such as traffic, noise and visual impacts (Policy 8.3.57). The purpose of the distinction between Neighbourhood Residential and Neighbourhood Corridor is intended to buffer negative land use impacts such as noise on main streets from residential areas, and situate multi-family close to transit and nearby amenities (Section 8.3 D).

The Subject Area is encompassed predominately by a single-family neighbourhood. The proposed apartment buildings are larger in scale than those typical to the existing neighbourhood. The applicant is proposing to

construct three, three-story apartment buildings with access to both Chief Lake Road and Sparwood Road. Chief Lake Road is classified as an arterial road and Sparwood Road is classified as a local road. The Subject Area is also outside of the City's transit catchment area with no pedestrian connections to existing transit services (Policy 8.7.23). As such, Administration does not support the proposed amendments to the OCP to facilitate a multi-family housing development.

Growth Management

The Subject Area is designated as Infill in Schedule B-4: Growth Management of the OCP. The intent of this designation is to prioritize infill development and encourage utilization of vacant sites (Policy 8.1.1).

Although OCP Policy encourages infill, the proposed density, form, and potential impacts of the intended development must be considered. The proposed density coupled with the massing of the proposed building form is not compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood. Furthermore, the location/siting of the proposed development is not consistent with the policy direction of the OCP. Administration does not support the proposed amendments to the OCP.

Zoning Bylaw

The Subject Area is currently zoned RS1m: Suburban Residential and AR3m: Rural Residential. The RS1m zone is intended to foster a suburban lifestyle on properties larger than 845 m² and allow complementary residential uses compatible with the residential character of the area. The AR3m zone is intended to foster a suburban lifestyle primarily on properties larger than 0.4 ha and allow complementary residential related uses compatible with the rural character of the area.

The applicant is proposing to rezone the Subject Area from RS1m: Suburban Residential and AR3m: Rural Residential to RM3: Multiple Residential. The RM3 zone is intended to provide multi-family housing to a maximum density of 60 dwellings per hectare. Table 1 below provides a comparison of the current and proposed zoning development regulations.

Table 1	RS1m: Suburban Residential	AR3m: Rural Residential	Proposed RM3: Multiple Residential
Principal Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Care Facility, Minor • Housing, Manufactured • Housing, Single Detached 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Care Facility, Minor • Housing, Manufactured • Housing, Single Detached 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Care Facility, Major • Community Care Facility, Minor • Housing, Apartment • Housing, Congregate • Housing, Four-Plex • Housing, Row • Housing, Single Detached
Max. density	1 principal dwelling per lot	1 principal dwelling per lot	60 dwellings/ha
Max. site coverage	30%	30%	55%
Max. height	10.0 m	10.0 m	12.0 m
Min. front yard	4.5 m	4.5 m	6.0 m
Min. interior side yard	1.2 m	1.2 m	3.0 m
Min. rear yard	6.0 m	6.0 m	6.0 m
Min. between principal buildings	---	---	4.5 m

As shown in Table 1, the existing RS1m: Suburban Residential and AR3m: Rural Residential zones have the same development regulations in regards to land use, site coverage and setbacks. Whereas the proposed RM3: Multiple Residential zone allows a number of larger building forms, such as apartments, and a maximum density of 60 dwellings per hectare. The RM3 building regulations in regards to height and setbacks are larger to facilitate greater separation from neighbouring lots.

The Subject Area is 6.7 ha (16.6 acres) in size, the maximum density permitted under the RM3 zone will allow up to 402 dwelling units. Based on the drawing package received, the applicant is proposing 120 dwelling units (18 dwellings per hectare).

Properties surrounding the Subject Area include single-detached homes to the north (Greenwood Street), south (Chief Lake Road), east (Peter Road) and west (Sparwood Road). The nearest multi-family developments are approximately 2.0 kilometres south of the Subject Area. The Subject Area is also located approximately 2.2 kilometres north of the nearest shopping center.

As previously indicated, the Subject Area is outside of the City's transit catchment area with no pedestrian connections to existing transit services and not within walking distance of daily needs amenities. The proposed development will be required to provide vehicle parking stalls to accommodate residents. Based on the rendering submitted, the applicant is proposing surface parking with access from both Chief Lake Road and Sparwood Road. It is not clear the extent of the impacts the proposed development will have on traffic volumes, and access to Chief Lake Road and Sparwood Road.

OCP Policy encourages infill and redevelopment of existing vacant and underused sites, with an emphasis on enhancing the pedestrian experience (Policy 8.3.31). Due to the location of the Subject Area, there is no pedestrian connectivity to transit services or daily needs amenities. The proposal is inconsistent in scale and density from the surrounding neighbourhood. The proposed RM3 zone permits a scale of development inappropriate for the Subject Area as per OCP policy outlined above. In keeping with the rationale provided above, Administration does not support this application.

Council Procedures during COVID-19 Pandemic

As per the requirements set out in the *Local Government Act* and "City of Prince George Development Procedures Bylaw No. 7635, 2005", the City of Prince George will mail or otherwise deliver a notice to adjacent property owners and tenants whose interests may be affected by these applications. Members of the public may provide comment by written submission, telephone or in person. Written submissions received in response to the public notice for these applications will be provided to Council for their consideration during the public hearing and prior to third reading of the proposed bylaws. Residents who wish to speak in person can do so during the Public Hearing in Council Chambers. The City of Prince George follows the guidelines of the Provincial Health Officer as measures have been put in place to ensure the safety of members of the public attending the Public Hearing to provide comments. Additional information on methods to provide comments to Council can be found on the [City's website](#).

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Approve the bylaw
2. Approve the bylaw as amended
3. Refuse the bylaw
4. Defer or otherwise deal with the bylaw

Administration recommends that Bylaw No. 9197, 2021 and Bylaw No. 9198, 2021 be denied.

Should Council support this application, the following recommendations are provided:

THAT Council:

1. GIVES FIRST READING to "City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 8383, 2011, Amendment Bylaw No. 9197, 2021".
2. CONSIDERS "City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 8383, 2011, Amendment Bylaw No. 9197, 2021", in conjunction with the current Financial Plan and confirm there are no issues.

3. CONSIDERS “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 8383, 2011, Amendment Bylaw No. 9197, 2021”, in conjunction with the current Regional District of Fraser Fort-George Solid Waste Management Plan and confirm there are no issues.
4. CONSIDERS “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 8383, 2011, Amendment Bylaw No. 9197, 2021”, in conjunction with City of Prince George Strategic Framework for a Sustainable Prince George and confirm there are no issues.
5. GIVES SECOND READING to “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 8383, 2011, Amendment Bylaw No. 9197, 2021”.
6. APPROVES the following public consultation process to fulfill the requirements of Section 475 of the *Local Government Act*:
 - a. Two (2) Citywide Newspaper advertisements requesting written comment;
 - b. Request for written comment from properties identified on Exhibit “A” to CP100172; and
 - c. One (1) Public Meeting.
7. EXPANDS, from 30 metres distance to the notification area shown on Exhibit ‘A’ to CP100172, as required in the “City of Prince George Development Procedures Bylaw No. 7635, 2005,” for the mailing of notice of the public hearing for the “City of Prince George Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 8383, 2011, Amendment Bylaw No. 9197, 2021” and “City of Prince George Zoning Bylaw No. 7580, 2007, Amendment Bylaw No. 9197, 2021”.
8. GIVES FIRST AND SECOND READING to “City of Prince George Zoning Bylaw No. 7850, 2007, Amendment Bylaw No. 9198, 2021”.
9. PERMITS the Public Hearing for proposed Bylaw No. 9197 and Bylaw No. 9198 BE WITHHELD until the following requirements have been met to the satisfaction of Administration:
 - a. Receipt of a complete Development Permit Application;
 - b. Receipt of a Servicing Brief; and
 - c. Receipt of a Traffic Impact Study.
10. PERMITS that consideration of Final Reading of proposed Bylaw No. 9197 and Bylaw No. 9198 BE WITHHELD until the following requirements have been met to the satisfaction of Administration:
 - a. Receipt of a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant that restricts density to 120 units total, in the form of three, three-story apartment buildings on the Subject Area; and
 - b. Consolidation of the Subject Area.

In addition, any recommendations presented in the preceding items must be addressed to the satisfaction of the Acting Director of Planning and Development Services.

DISCUSSION OF ITEMS FOR RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT:

Development Permit

Section 488 of the *Local Government Act* gives municipalities the authority to designate development permit areas for specific purposes including the establishment of objectives for the form and character of multi-family developments. Once a development permit area has been designated, a development permit must be obtained prior to development.

Should Council support this application, the Subject Area will be identified within a Multiple Residential Form and Character Development Permit Area. The Multiple Residential Form and Character Development Permit Area

is intended to diversify housing stock options that provide for an appropriate level of design and site layout compatible with and complementary to adjacent uses; considers the human-scale; and provides the City with the ability to tailor new multiple residential developments to local site conditions (Policy 8.2.10). Through the development permit process, the City will evaluate that the proposed development by location; lot size; site access; volume of site usage and traffic; parking; landscaping and screening; development size, massing and quality of design (Policy 8.3.7).

The applicant has provided a drawing package which has been included as additional information for Council consideration (attached as Supporting Documents). Should Council approve the First Two Readings of Bylaw No. 9197, 2021, and Bylaw No. 9198, 2021, Administration recommends that the Public Hearing of Bylaw No. 9197 and Bylaw No. 9198, be withheld until a complete Multiple Residential Form and Character Development Permit application has been submitted to satisfaction of Administration.

Servicing Brief

A Servicing Brief prepared and sealed by a Professional Engineer registered in the Province of British Columbia is required to address technical issues related to water supply, sanitary sewer collection and storm drainage system designs.

Should Council support this application, Administration recommends that the Public Hearing of Bylaw No. 9197 and Bylaw No. 9198, be withheld until a Servicing Brief has been prepared and submitted to the satisfaction of Administration.

Traffic Impact Study

A Traffic Impact Study prepared and sealed by a Professional Engineer registered in the Province of British Columbia is required to address technical issues related to traffic for the proposed development (e.g. access to and from the Subject Area and adjacent intersections, trip generation information, and recommendations to reduce the impacts associated with traffic).

Should Council support this application, Administration recommends that Public Hearing of Bylaw No. 9197 and Bylaw No. 9198, be withheld until a Traffic Impact Study has been prepared and submitted to the satisfaction of Administration.

Section 219 Covenant

In order to ensure the proposed density on the Subject Area (i.e. 120 units or 18 units/ha), the applicant has offered to register a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant on title of the Subject Area prior to Final Reading of Bylaw No. 9197 and Bylaw No. 9198. This covenant would restrict density permitted in the proposed RM3: Multiple Residential zone to 120 units total, in the form of three, three-story apartment buildings.

Should Council support this application, Administration recommends that Final Reading of Bylaw No. 9197 and Bylaw No. 9198, be withheld until a Section 219 Restrictive Covenant that restricts density and form is provided to Administration's satisfaction, and is registered on the title of the Subject Area.

Lot Consolidation

Currently, the Subject Area is two legal parcels. In order to accommodate the proposed multi-family development, the Subject Area must be consolidated.

Should Council support this application, Administration recommends that Final Reading of Bylaw No. 9197 and Bylaw No. 9198, be withheld until confirmation of the lot consolidation is received to the satisfaction of Administration.

Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure

As per Section 52 of the *Transportation Act*, Bylaw No. 9197 and Bylaw No. 9198 requires the Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure's approval prior to Final Reading of the bylaws.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION:

The applicant has proposed to amend the OCP and Zoning Bylaw to facilitate a multi-family housing development with a maximum density of 60 dwellings per hectare on the Subject Area. Administration does not support the proposed amendments due to the proposed density, building form, location and limited connectivity to transit services and daily needs amenities, and inconsistency with OCP policy. Administration recommends that Council deny the application for the reasons outlined in this report.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Deanna Wasnik, Acting Director of Planning and Development Services

PREPARED BY: Kali Holahan, Planner

APPROVED:

Walter Babicz, City Manager

Meeting Date: 2021/07/26