**Agenda - Executive Policy Committee – July 10, 2013**

Moved by Councillor

That Rule 10(3) of The Procedure By-law No. 50/2007 be suspended in order that the following item, which was received less than 96 hours preceding the committee meeting, be considered by Committee.

**Report - Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management – July 8, 2013**

**Item No. 1 Digital Sign Regulations and Complete Communities Downtown Zoning By-Law Alignment**

STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

On July 8, 2013, the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management concurred in the recommendation of the Winnipeg Public Service and submitted the following to Council:

1. That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to prepare the omnibus set of amendments to the Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law 100/2004 regarding the following, as detailed in Appendix "B":

    A. Allowing residential development in more areas without requiring a conditional use;

    B. Eliminating yard setback requirements for residential conversions;

    C. Increasing the maximum size for restaurants in the Character Sector;

    D. Requiring discretionary approval for drinking establishment patios over 1000 square feet in the Character Sector;

    E. Requiring minimum building heights for Downtown development;

    F. Reducing maximum building heights South of Broadway, west of Donald Street;

    G. Clarifying expectations around the creation of vacant land by demolition;

    H. Establishing new design standards for parking (landscaping, lighting, fencing, universal accessibility);

    I. Establishing new limits to sizes and locations for new parking areas;

J. Updating sign definitions, including provisions for third-party sponsor's content;

K. Setting performance standards for digital signs and clarifying where they would be permitted;

L. Requiring oversight of window signs and window wraps/stickers that exceed 50% coverage of a window;

M. Prohibiting new freestanding signs (pylons signs) except for ground-oriented signs;

N. Increasing size allowance for construction signs, but limiting them to the duration of the construction project; and

O. Various errors and omissions.

2. That the proper officers of the City of Winnipeg be directed to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

**Agenda - Executive Policy Committee – July 10, 2013**

**Report - Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management – July 8, 2013**

DECISION MAKING HISTORY:

STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

On July 8, 2013, the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management concurred in the recommendation of the Winnipeg Public Service and submitted the matter to the Executive Policy Committee and Council.

Lisa Richards, Winnipeg Regional Health Authority, submitted a communication dated July 5, 2013, in support of Digital Sign Regulations and Complete Communities Downtown Zoning By-Law Alignment.

On June 24, 2013, the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management granted a further extension of time of up to 30 days to enable the Winnipeg Public Service to work further with Downtown stakeholders to prepare regulatory options pertaining to Advertising Signs and Electronic Message Centres in conjunction with the broader OurWinnipeg Complete Community Zoning By-Law alignment review for Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 100/2004.

On May 27, 2013, the Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management concurred in the recommendation of the Winnipeg Public Service, that an extension of time of one month be granted to enable the Public Service to work further with Downtown stakeholders to prepare regulatory options pertaining to Advertising Signs and Electronic Message Centres in conjunction with the broader OurWinnipeg Complete Community Zoning By-Law alignment review for Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-Law No. 100/2004.

# ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

**Title:** **Digital Sign Regulations and Complete Communities Downtown Zoning By-Law Alignment**

**Critical Path:** Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management

## AUTHORIZATION

| Author | Department Head | CFO | CAO |
|---|---|---|---|
| B. Smith | B. Thorgrimson | N/A | D. Joshi<br>COO |

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**1.0** That the Winnipeg Public Service be directed to prepare the omnibus set of amendments to the Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law 100/2004 regarding the following, as detailed in Appendix "B":

1) Allowing residential development in more areas without requiring a conditional use;
2) Eliminating yard setback requirements for residential conversions;
3) Increasing the maximum size for restaurants in the Character Sector;
4) Requiring discretionary approval for drinking establishment patios over 1000 square feet in the Character Sector;
5) Requiring minimum building heights for Downtown development;
6) Reducing maximum building heights South of Broadway, west of Donald Street;
7) Clarifying expectations around the creation of vacant land by demolition;
8) Establishing new design standards for parking (landscaping, lighting, fencing, universal accessibility);
9) Establishing new limits to sizes and locations for new parking areas;
10) Updating sign definitions, including provisions for third-party sponsor's content;
11) Setting performance standards for digital signs and clarifying where they would be permitted;
12) Requiring oversight of window signs and window wraps/stickers that exceed 50% coverage of a window;
13) Prohibiting new freestanding signs (pylons signs) except for ground-oriented signs;
14) Increasing size allowance for construction signs, but limiting them to the duration of the construction project; and
15) Various errors and omissions.

**2.0** That the proper officers of the City of Winnipeg be directed to do all things necessary to implement the intent of the foregoing.

## REASON FOR THE REPORT

On December 12, 2012, Council directed the Public Service to “work further with Downtown stakeholders to prepare regulatory options pertaining to Advertising Signs, Electronic Message Centres signs, Electronic Message Centres as 'Advertising Signs’ and Electronic Message Centres as 'Event Signs' regarding the Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-Law”, within 180 days.”

At the same time, the Winnipeg Public Service has been moving forward on a zoning by-law alignment review per the OurWinnipeg Implementation Plan.

Both of the above initiatives are combined in this report and detailed in Appendix “A” and Appendix “B”.

## IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Following Council endorsement of the Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-Law changes, the Winnipeg Public Service will prepare the corresponding amendments and advertise them in accordance with statutory requirements for a public hearing to be held at Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management.

## FINANCIAL IMPACT

## Financial Impact Statement Date: May 29, 2013

## Project Name:

Digital Sign Regulations and Complete Communities Downtown Zoning By-Law Alignment

**COMMENTS:**

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

*"Original Signed By"*
Mike McGinn, CA
Manager of Finance

## CONSULTATION

**In preparing this report there was consultation with:**

### Internal Consultation

Water & Waste
Public Works
Community Services
Police Services

### External Consultation

Downtown Council
Downtown Winnipeg BIZ Board
Impark
MLCC
Sign Industry Representatives
Public Open House

## SUBMITTED BY

| | |
|---|---|
| Department | Planning, Property & Development |
| Division | Urban Planning |
| Prepared by: | Kurtis Kowalke |
| Date: | June 19, 2013 |
| File No. | O:\Reports Directive\Planning and Land Use\Urban Planning Reports\2013 Reports\RIS Downtown Zoning By-Law.doc |

**List of Schedules and Attachments**

1. Appendix ‘A’ Planning Discussion
2. Appendix ‘B’ Detailed table of proposed amendments
3. Appendix ‘C’ Public Consultation

UD2013-057

**APPENDIX 'A'**

## Planning Discussion
## Introduction

The Winnipeg Public Service has undertaken to review its Downtown and city-wide zoning to better reflect the vision of OurWinnipeg and the Complete Communities Direction Strategy. This initiative is part of the OurWinnipeg Implementation Plan, which guides the City of Winnipeg in helping to ensure that OurWinnipeg policies are implemented. This project is intended to be text amendments, or small adjustments, to zoning regulations, rather than a comprehensive review. There will be no zoning map changes. Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-Law 100/2004 was a product of Plan Winnipeg 2020 and has never been reviewed since its adoption.

The Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-Law was designed to be permissive and streamlined in order to encourage and facilitate Downtown development. It has arguably the most permissive and streamlined regulations found in any major city in Canada. Some opportunities have been identified to further reduce the need for variance and conditional use applications associated with desired forms of development. In some case, additional oversight is recommended to ensure that new development will be consistent with adopted Council policy.

The Public Service recommends the following changes to its Downtown zoning (detailed in Appendix "B"), which have been reviewed with through stakeholder consultations (detailed in Appendix "C").

### Purpose of the Report

The purpose of this report is to identify potential changes to Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-Law 100/2004 in general terms for consideration by Council for both improving alignment with OurWinnipeg and updating digital sign regulations in alignment with best practices across Canada. The omnibus set of recommendations detailed in Appendix B also addresses errors and omissions that have been identified through the course of this review. Changes endorsed by Council will be drafted as a by-law amendment and advertised in accordance with statutory requirements for a public hearing to be held at Standing Policy Committee on Downtown Development, Heritage and Riverbank Management.

### Residential Development

Although the existing zoning by-law allows for residential in all sectors except for Riverbanks, many locations require discretionary review by way of a Condition Use application. Residential uses at grade (on the first floor) are conditional throughout the Multiple Use and Character Sectors, and residential is also conditional for sites along Portage Avenue, Main Street, Graham Avenue, Osborne Street, Memorial Boulevard and Broadway. At the time, it was believed that the commercial concentration of the Downtown needed to be protected, and that introducing residential would potentially be source of conflict.

Today, we acknowledge that there is a niche in the residential market that desires to be in the centre of a vibrant and dynamic urban environment. Those residents, in turn, help sustain that vibrancy into the evenings and weekends by frequenting downtown restaurants and entertainment venues.

The zoning by-law includes setbacks for residential development to ensure a separation distance between residential windows. This makes converting buildings to residential use a challenge. Adaptive reuse of buildings, especially historical buildings, for residential is a priority under the Complete Communities Direction Strategy, and therefore the requirement for yard setback is proposed to be eliminated for residential conversions.

### Commercial Uses

Numerous conditional use applications have been approved for restaurants in the Character Sector exceeding the 3000 square foot size limit. The intent for the Character Sector continues to support a fine-grained mix of businesses; however, larger restaurants have not compromised this intent. In fact,

very few restaurants opening these days are smaller than 3000 square feet. Based on applications supported to date, it is proposed that the limit be changed to 10,000 square feet.

Drinking Establishments would remain limited to 3000 square feet in the Character Sector in order to minimize conflict with residential uses. Additionally, it is proposed that outdoor patios for drinking establishments be limited to 1000 square feet in order to provide further protection of neighbourhood liveability. Most downtown patios are under 1000 square feet, but there is concern about the potential for outdoor night club areas adjacent to residential properties. This amendment would not affect restaurant patios or patios situated on the public sidewalk.

Consistent with the Complete Communities concept, the Downtown would continue to be the part of the City that can accommodate the widest variety of commercial activity, with the Multiple-Use Sector being the most permissive.

**Building Heights**

It is recommended that a minimum building height be introduced in order to discourage template chain store buildings and other pre-fab architecture and encourage a scale of development appropriate to the existing level of services and infrastructure. 25 feet (approximately two storeys) is proposed across the Downtown, except on Broadway, Portage Avenue and Main Street where the minimum would be 35 feet (approximately three storeys) in respect of the scale of these wider streets.

An adjustment to maximum building heights is proposed for certain streets within the Broadway – Assiniboine Neighbourhood to better reflect the established character of that area. The proposed amendment would affect properties south of Broadway fronting on Kennedy Street, Edmonton Street, Carlton Street, Hargrave Street, and the south side of Assiniboine Avenue west of Donald Street. Revised maximum building height would be 60 feet except on corner lots where the maximum height would be 100 feet. The current 8 F.A.R. size limit can accommodate buildings over 20 storeys. Complete Communities talks about appropriate goals and targets for intensification. It also emphasizes a variety of housing types to enhance choice. Many areas of the Downtown are prioritized for high rise development, while some are more conducive to mid-rise or low-rise multi-family development.

Given renewed interest in Downtown high rise development in the last couple years, it may be timely to assess how well this by-law accommodates tall buildings. There may be opportunities to better accommodate this form of development in suitable locations. The City of Toronto recently completed a Tall Buildings Study that helped clarify expectation for tall buildings in their city. This level of effort was beyond the scope of our zoning by-law alignment exercise, but could be considered as a future project.

**Vacant Land**

In areas outside the Downtown, the demolition of a multi-family building without plans for redevelopment is discretionary and subject to a public hearing under the Demolition Permits in Residential Areas By-Law. The purpose of this review is to prevent the creation of vacant land where a vacant site would create a visual detriment to the adjacent area or would create or increase pressures for new land uses that would not otherwise be supported. Although such applications are already subject to Downtown Urban Design Review, it is recommended that wording similar to that in the Demolition Permits by-law be introduced into the Urban Design section of the Downtown zoning by-law as criteria for when a building (residential or non-residential) may be demolished. (Heritage Buildings would continue to be subject to the process laid out in the Historical Buildings By-Law.) The additional text for the zoning by-law would also explain expectations around landscape remediation for cases where demolition is supported.

**Parking**

Accessibility standards for parking are proposed to be updated to reflect the current City of Winnipeg Accessibility Design Standards. Tree planting and lighting standards for parking lots are proposed to be updated to match those found in Zoning By-Law 200/2006. Edge treatment should be of a quality urban standard with decorative metal or brick fencing. Surface parking occupies a vast amount of land in our Downtown. The quality of these parking facilities reflects on the image of our Downtown and our city. The City's recently adopted Downtown Parking Strategy sets higher expectations for the design of

surface parking with the acknowledgement that most of them will continue to be part of our transportation infrastructure for many years to come. The Public Service will continue to explore the merits of an incentive to address surface parking lots. That could take any number of forms, including a waiver on application fees or assistance in the form of design services, etc.

The Public Service proposes limitations on the locations and the sizes of *new* surface parking areas, notably on Portage Avenue, Main Street and Graham Avenue. The same restrictions would apply to structured parking on the main floor of buildings. Policy direction in Complete Communities Direction Strategy and the recently adopted Downtown Parking Strategy emphasizes the expectation that the majority of new parking being created Downtown should be either below grade, behind buildings, or in mixed-use structures.

There was significant stakeholder interest on the issue of bike parking (Downtown and City-wide). A comprehensive bicycle facilities study would be a follow-up action for the Public Service.

**Digital Signs**

The review of digital signs for the Downtown was rolled into the Zoning By-Law Alignment project in order to maximize available resources for stakeholder consultation. Building on best practice research and the work already completed for Zoning By-Law 200/2006, the following amendments are being proposed:

- Establish operational standards for brightness, dimming, etc., per Zoning By-Law 200/2006
- Continue to allow digital signs (digital static copy and digital moving copy) in most Downtown areas, but prohibit them in Downtown Living and Riverbank Sectors, on heritage buildings and along Broadway. In Character Sectors, limit their use to Event Signs.
- Simplify the Event Sign definition and allow for 10% third party sponsor's content

These changes generally reflect the direction that Historical Buildings Committee and Urban Design Review have been taking on past applications. The operational standards do not include a requirement for static copy or a requirement for minimum separation from signalized intersections. All signs are already subject to discretionary review in the Downtown. Given the pace of movement Downtown and the close proximity of traffic signals, restrictions will only be applied where there is a clear issue of visual interference in respect of transportation safety.

There was some discussion among the Public Service and stakeholders about the amount of signage being allowed and the moratorium on stand-alone billboards. It was generally felt that signage should be pedestrian-oriented and secondary to the architecture Downtown, and therefore no significant change is being proposed in that regard. Allowing more bright flashing signage could inhibit the viability of residential infill. It may also dilute or negate the efforts to implement an architectural lighting strategy for Portage Avenue and elsewhere in the Downtown. Existing non-conforming Downtown billboards may remain and will be subject to the amended Advertising Sign Business Tax.

As CentreVenture rolls out the S.H.E.D. master plan in the coming months and new development applications come forward, there may be opportunities to do something unique and exciting related to signage. Currently, it is unclear what that might be and what properties would be involved. As S.H.E.D. evolves in the coming years, there may be a need to vary the zoning by-law to support a particular project, or additional zoning by-law text amendments could be brought forward, likely in conjunction with design guidelines for signage in S.H.E.D.

**Other Sign Forms**

Signs within a window frame, either on the interior or exterior, are not currently subject to review by the City. Large window signs significantly affect the overall appearance of buildings and reduce the transparency between the interior of building and the street, reducing vibrancy and potentially increasing safety concerns. It is proposed that signs, stickers or vinyl wraps that cover over 50% of a window surface area would be subject to review. This change would also allow the City to impose the same performance standards for digital signs within windows as applied elsewhere.

Projection signs are an emerging technology where a device on one building is used to project an image onto the wall of another building. It is proposed that performance standards be the same as for other digital signs. It is recommended that these be limited to Event Signs, given the nature of the technology (primarily for night viewing) and to allow the Public Service to review these on a pilot basis in the short term.

Large pylon signs are typically suburban in character and are not suited to a street with large buildings that come right up to the sidewalk. It is proposed that only ground-oriented freestanding signs be permitted, to maximum height of four feet. The premise behind Downtown sign regulations is that the Downtown is a pedestrian oriented environment, and signage should respect the human scale.

Vinyl fascia banners are a temporary sign form frequently used as Event Signs because they are inexpensive to produce and install. It is recommended that these be listed as a sign form and defined as temporary (to be approved for a set period of time and then removed). In order to improve consistency in dealing with these, it is recommended that banners be limited to 120 days, except for banners associated with new construction or site redevelopment, as well as for banners of a non-commercial nature (art murals or civic campaigns) which could be approved for up to two years. Although these changes should improve consistency and predictability, there may still be a need for enforcement measures to ensure they come down before they become an eyesore.

Construction signs are currently limited to 80 square feet per frontage. Since these signs are temporary and to minimize the need for variances, it is proposed that the maximum size be increased to 200 square feet per frontage. Since the intent is that these signs are temporary, an additional provision is proposed so that the sign may only be up for the duration of construction activity on the site.

## Appendix ‘B’ – Proposed Amendments



summary table May 28 2013.xls

**Appendix 'C' – Public Consultation**

The Complete Communities Zoning By-Law Alignment project is part of OurWinnipeg implementation, and as such, builds on the comprehensive engagement that was part of the development of the Complete Communities Direction Strategy through SpeakUpWinnipeg.

- ➔ Between April 2009 and June 2010, SpeakUpWinnipeg connected with more than 42,000 Winnipeggers and combined online resources, face-to-face engagement opportunities, real-time updates and major events.
- ➔ Face to face engagement opportunities included roundtables, focused neighbourhood conversations, stakeholder workshops, invitations to speak to groups or at events, the SpeakUp Squad, major public events
- ➔ SpeakUpWinnipeg.com attracted 8,796,255 hits. It included videos, resources, events calendars, user submissions, questions of the day, coordinated activity on Facebook and Twitter.

**Approach**

The engagement process for the Complete Communities Zoning By-Law Alignment project combined online resources and face-to-face engagement opportunities.

Stakeholder meetings were held from January to May, including the Downtown Council and CentreVenture (Part 1 below), the Downtown BIZ board, MLCC, Imperial Parking, and sign industry representatives (Part 2 below).

Invitations to participate in a public open house and at speakupwinnipeg.com were published in the Winnipeg Free Press and the Metro on May 7, 2013. That open house was held on May 15 from 3 to 7 p.m. at the Forks Market. Approximately 75 people attended. There were presentation boards on displays and opportunities to speak with staff and write note comments on specific boards. There was also an exit survey to capture general comments about the project (17 surveys received to date). Feedback is detailed in Part 3 below.

Email invitations to participate in the public open house and speakupwinnipeg.com were sent to all OurWinnipeg stakeholders including the development community, Business Improvement Zones, community organizations and many other groups and individuals via email, Facebook and Twitter:

OurWinnipeg Stakeholder Emails
- 615 groups and individuals

OurWinnipeg Emails (list serve)
- 283 groups and individuals

Facebook
- 846 members

Twitter
- 1740 followers

SpeakUpWinnipeg.com

Who: Winnipeggers/various
What: Moderated discussion (blog), survey, email, detailed information
When: May 1 – May 27, 2013
Activity:
- 4,507 page views
- 2,435 visits
- 1,959 unique visitors
- Of the visitors, 66% were from within the city of Winnipeg
- 18 comments received through the blog

**1. <u>CentreVenture meeting notes – January 31, 2013</u>**

| Message | Response |
|---|---|
| Re: limits on surface parking - needs to be clear that structured parking at grade would also be subject the same rules (need for active uses at street level) | That is the intent in drafting the by-law amendments. |
| Re: minimum building heights - provide the option of two storeys or number of feet. Consider a greater minimum, such as four storeys, for key streets. | Broadway, Portage Avenue and Main Street are our three wide Downtown boulevards. We are recommending a 35 foot minimum building height in respect of the scale of these streets. |
| Re: drinking establishment sizes - can we distinguish between pubs, cabarets and night clubs? | MLCC is actually consolidating categories, so this is challenging. Recommendation will be to not increase the maximum size for Drinking Establishments in the Character Sector. |
| Re: drinking patios - can they be regulated near residential only? | One of the proposed by-law changes is to make residential permitted in more locations, so this is difficult. We will suggest that patio restrictions not apply in the "M" zoned areas (which includes SHED), but would apply in Character Sector areas, like the Exchange. |
| Re: elimination of floor area ratios (FAR) - they do have some value because they offer flexibility. | Agreement to keep FAR as a primary measure of building height for most areas. One exception will be specific parts of the Broadway-Assiniboine Neighbourhood where reductions are proposed. |
| Re: reduction in height limits south of Broadway. It is acknowledged that this is a "pseudo-downtown" area that warrants a different scale than north of Broadway. | A survey of comparable areas in other Canadian cities shows that we permit far greater height without requiring variances or bonusing provisions than most jurisdictions (even compared to similar areas in Vancouver and Toronto). |
| Re: sponsor content on digital signs - a limit of one sponsor per event may be problematic since events typically have multiple sponsors. | We will recommend deleting that restriction, but keep a 10% limit. |
| Re: Vinyl banners - these have value for promoting new businesses and new developments such as Union Tower, but should be permitted on a shorter time limit – like 120 days. | We will recommend 120 days as the standard, but a longer time period for new development projects. |
| Re: backlit box signs – these tend to look cheap. Should they be prohibited? | Within the Exchange District, the Commemorative Integrity Statement and the Urban Design Review process have been effective in discouraging them. Outside the Exchange, they constitute probably 80% of signage. Sometimes they are done well (e.g. Manitoba Hydro). SHED design guidelines might be a tool we need to address this issue. |

**2. <u>Sign stakeholder meeting notes – May 1, 2013</u>**

- Kurtis Kowalke reviewed background – aligns with zoning review project, small tweaks
- Want to have consultation wrapped up by end of May
- SPC review in June; by-law amendment public hearing in the fall
- Kurtis Kowalke handed out the notes from the consultation from last year
- Report will deal with land use, dimensions etc.
- Kurtis Kowalke went through the subject areas related to potential changes

Feedback from stakeholders:

- Zero Din– is it actually safer downtown because traffic goes slower? It sounds like an opinion, needs confirmation – not scientific.
- MANSA – is the position aesthetics, or making downtown an exciting place? Do we need to push a more liberal approach? Or no?
- Kurtis Kowalke - we do have urban design guidelines downtown; don't know if it's more liberal. Excitement is still what it's all about in certain parts of the downtown
- Pattison Outdoor – would event sign include third party?
- Kurtis Kowalke – we are suggesting that event signs could have third party content but it might be around 10%, plus would be allowed without a variance.
- Several stakeholders – it is all over the map in terms of what amount of third party content is included on various downtown signs.
- Window signs – if it covers more than 50% of window pane would be regulated.
- Window signs at grade – loss of visibility between inside and outside – the feeling of safety is diminished
- Blue Sky Digital and Exchange District BIZ – does it really promote safety? Never heard of this - eyes on the street from inside the building.
- Kurtis Kowalke – The literature goes into this.
- Postime – no matter what happens in this room, it almost doesn't matter because Urban Design Review pretty much has carte blanche
- Kurtis Kowalke – they've been involved so far, even though they are not in this meeting. The proposed changes are intended to provide more clarity, consistency, and predictability about what signs will be approved and where.
- Exchange District BIZ – any thought on time limits on vinyl murals– graffiti gallery? A year or 2 years? Should be, so that the tattered ones comedown.
- MANSA – it's relative – if you're using good quality, they can last 5 years.
- Kurtis Kowalke – Should the City be looking for certain specs to determine whether the product will be good quality and long-lasting?
- MANSA – That could be quite challenging – it varies.
- Pattison Outdoor – it's a big issue – third party on vinyl banners or murals. Should it be allowed?
- Pattison Outdoor – can construction signs go up 6 months before?
- Kurtis Kowalke – difficult to regulate – sometimes 6 months turns into a year. At what point is it just a promotional billboard rather than a construction sign? Could be tied to a permit application.
- Cumulative frontage doesn't meet the intent of the regulations. We would like to eliminate the ability to do cumulative.

- SHED – many meetings with Centre Venture already. Difficult to make regulations at this stage, it's a moving target. But we could customize regulations for that area a bit later.
- Pattison Outdoor – Barry said you can't vary something if it's not permitted
- Andrew if something is prohibited, you can't vary it. Martin Grady is a good person to confirm with
- MANSA – my only experience with not being allowed to vary something is when there's a PDO
- Postime – who makes decisions around SHED?
- Kurtis Kowalke – there is talk of putting together a management board

Kurtis Kowalke outlined next steps including: open house, BIZ consultations, interim report end of May, Standing Policy Committee review on June 24, amendments drafted over the summer, public hearing in the fall.

- Zero Din– how can you do all this if you don't know what the SHED district is?
- Kurtis Kowalke - We might have to make the other changes, and do variances in line with SHED vision until a development vision is solidified
- Pattison Outdoor – How will third party content fit into that?
- Kurtis Kowalke – we are only contemplating that sponsorship content piece on event signs. We haven't heard from Council that we want to reverse existing standards.
- Pattison Outdoor – agree with comment on how difficult without knowing what SHED is going to be – world of possibilities of what we CAN do, with technology. The whole variance process we would like to see opened up to see what can be produced by a company to match what the vision is for SHED. It's all about third party at Yonge & Dundas. There's just not that many events – so we'd like to see permissiveness in the SHED to allow industry to see what they can develop.
- Kurtis Kowalke – need to nail down the constraints – how far away from MTS Centre etc.
- Pattison Outdoor – Yonge & Dundas – from what we understand, third party advertisers are not making much money; it's the landowners. Toronto is different.
- Blue Sky Digital – what about street furniture, bus shelters, and LED bus shelters?
- Kurtis Kowalke – the zoning by-law can only regulate things outside the public ROW, including sidewalks
- Pattison Outdoor - CBS is only contracted until 2017 with bus shelters – what happens then, when there is new technology and players?
- Blue Sky Digital – who regulates bus shelters?
- Kurtis Kowalke – Winnipeg Transit
- Blue Sky Digital – what about conversions of billboards to digital? We see this as discriminating a larger # of ads on a sign
- Kurtis Kowalke – it loses non-conforming rights if it's a different sign
- Pattison Outdoor – the permit was issued on the basis of the structural drawing and you're changing it. You have to get conditional use.
- Pattison Outdoor - Concerns with light trespass on residential.
- Kurtis Kowalke – will use same performance standards as outside downtown. There is residential popping up everywhere in the downtown.
- Pattison Outdoor – should you be reviewing traffic decision locations? Wouldn't they be different downtown?
- Kurtis Kowalke – I think it should be different. You'd never get a sign approved downtown otherwise.
- Zero Din– Isn't it dangerous to do that?
- Kurtis Kowalke – Our transportation folks at Public Works will have to review that

Kurtis Kowalke asked, is there anything people expected to hear, or want to bring up?

- Pattison Outdoor – could you just repeal the by-law?
- Kurtis Kowalke – that's been mentioned. Our downtown zoning is among the most liberal in Canada. Changes we are proposing will make some aspects even more permissive. In other cases, it is an opportunity to have some oversight, where it was lacking.
- Pattison Outdoor – we WANT that oversight- including urban design review, because we want to be part of the game. And we have some novel ideas. Not your poster billboard.
- Pattison Outdoor – signs that would fit in with things. But not your typical signs.
- Kurtis Kowalke – pass along any examples/illustrations to us for consideration
- Pattison Outdoor – sure, will do.
- Postime – is this the extent of the sign consultation?
- Kurtis Kowalke – we have a tight timeline, we can circulate comments. We will have the open house
- Postime – we will need some time to review and digest this and the timelines is very aggressive.
- Kurtis Kowalke – we will do what we can in getting something to Council – if some things are left outstanding. We can email everyone here, and provide comments if you can in a timely fashion. Do as much as we can before the report goes in.
- Zero Din– what happens to existing signs downtown?
- Andrew – will ask Martin to check in with industry as to whether accessory signs must meet the new regulations and how that would be dealt with
- Pattison Outdoor – very nice of you to invite us here on May Day

In attendance:
Chuck Chappell
Ken Devine
Doug Forsyth
Peter Maconachie
John Hoeschen
Jeff Pinchin
Glenn Tinley
Brian Timmerman
Scott Baird
Matt Voth

**3. Common themes combined from surveys, open house, and blog**

**Key Messages: 'What We Heard'**

| Message | Response |
|---|---|
| **Parking requirements** are excessive and should be further reduced and/or extended to the whole city. | Analysis was done and it was found that because lot sizes in Mature Communities are often smaller and often contain less available space for parking, that a small adjustment, within the scope of this project, would be to focus on Mature Communities. |
| Need to increase **bike parking** minimums for all developments. | Bike parking minimums are a complex metric and require more in depth analysis than is feasible through this project. |
| **Halt suburban development**. | The city's growth strategy is beyond the scope of this project, aside from some small measures to support infill development. |
| Need more robust regulations for the provision on **parking for people with disabilities**. | Parking for vans that provide transportation for people with disabilities is included in this project. It is proposed that regulations be adjusted to ensure van accessible parking spaces are provided more frequently. |
| More attention to creating a pedestrian city. **Walkable city** should be promoted more vigorously. | Some of the proposed adjustments in this project support a pedestrian friendly environment including pedestrian connections, residential development above commercial in some districts, and support for infill development on two-family lots. |
| **Landscaping specifications and installation requirements** should be clearer and enforced. | Analysis was done and it was found that presently, the most pressing need regarding landscaping may be encouraging current by-law standards to be met upon site redevelopment. This small adjustment fits within the scope of this project. |
| There should be an **increase in density** goal for downtown. ( Need to allow dense downtown) | There is a great deal of infill capacity in the Downtown (supported by the existing zoning) that has yet to be realized. Other tools for achieving our Downtown infill goals are discussed in the Downtown Residential Development Strategy |

**Detailed Comments**

| Complete Communities/ Zoning By-Law Alignment Project | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SOURCE | DATE | AUTHOR | FEEDBACK | KEY THEMES |
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 7/5/13 | Mike Falk | a) The above are somewhat vague and don't necessarily describe what actual goals of civic development are being sought. The black and white image at the top is great, but not nearly enough. Specify what neighbourhoods, what areas, what are the new standards. b) NO MORE STRIP MALLS (especially in urban neighbourhoods like Corydon, West End or St. Boniface.) c) Each neighborhoods should have housing density goals. And there should be a complimentary goal for the entire city. If you want to get aggressive: No fringe suburban development should be allowed unless density goals within the city are met. Density goals should be almost twice the current density. d) Finally, I want to offer this: Value small. Value a city that offers many small, creative, interesting moments. Plan for a dense downtown, but allow for the natural chaos that makes cities interesting. The little chaos that has stores off of alleys, tiny pubs or bars in weird places, small stores and buildings rammed up against each other and seemingly climbing over each other. It's the activity that happens in the "secondary" spaces that makes a city interesting. | No more strip malls, Housing density goals, no fringe suburban development, density downtown and allow natural chaos. |
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 7/5/13 | Lawrence | These are great. Require the same strategies for suburban development (if it is allowed at all) as are called for in existing neighbourhoods. If these priorities are desirable for the existing urban fabric, they should be desirables for the suburbs too. | Require same strategies for suburban development |
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 7/5/13 | Monica Giesbrecht | It is unfortunate your event is on May 15h. A lot of Winnipeg's planners, landscape architects, urban designers, developers, suppliers, architects, and associated city building professionals who would have come to contribute to the session will be at 'connections cafe' an annual networking event between the design and building industry that night. Have you given thought to having a second date? | Date conflict |
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 7/5/13 | Chris Wilcot | I live in Edmonton now but I still love Winnipeg. I'm one of the young people who moved away in search of greener pastures. Since you're revisiting the bylaw, I'd like to offer my thoughts. I think that the current parking requirements, city wide, are seriously excessive. It's almost like the requirement is double what is actually needed – the current minimums should be the maximums. Giving up too much space to surface parking makes things farther apart which makes walking less attractive and driving more attractive…and more expensive. In reality, parking should really depend on three variables: density, mix of land uses, as well as access to, and | Parking requirements are excessive, Removing barriers to residential development above commercial is excellent, build to line, frontage limit, fused-grid policy, ban temporary signs for commercial purposes |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | frequency of, public transit. Removing barriers to residential development above commercial areas is an excellent initiative. Winnipeg's older pedestrian-oriented commercial strips would benefit greatly from a lot of added residential density. Who wouldn't want to rent a flat (buy a condo) above a shop? This would increase the market-population for an area's businesses and would also be of benefit to public transit in terms of ridership. I would also like to suggest instituting a build-to line in certain areas to prevent the further spread of strip-malls in the historic urban part of the city as Mike Falk stated. I would also advocate for frontage limits to ensure a fine-grain of businesses continues to exist in the older areas. Large format commercial in the inner-city can be built on the second story of a building in the future. In terms of pedestrian connectivity in new suburban developments, I suggest instituting a fused-grid policy. This policy would provide for a convenient pedestrian grid to encourage walking within a suburban road regime. I would also suggest that arterial and collector roads are aligned into such a way that buses can be routed in a straight-ish manner. It's very frustrating to be on a bus in the suburbs that takes a circuitous route to its final destination – it takes way longer and makes transit even less attractive to those who have the option to drive. For Downtown, I'd like to see more multi-story parkades with retail at street level and fewer surface parking lots. I'm totally against the further demolition of the urban fabric to create more surface parking. I would also strongly advocate for greater protection for any building constructed before World War II. Those buildings are such an opportunity for the City and they need more support. The historic buildings give Winnipeg its character, without them, Winnipeg is like any other place in western North America. If Winnipeg's historic buildings were restored and reused, they would be an excellent selling feature to the hipster/creative class that cities around the world are competing for. You know, Richard Florida's bit. Finally, I think Winnipeg should look to ban Temporary Signs for commercial purposes. Those stupid signs can really make a city look like crap and Winnipeg doesn't have too many – protect yourselves while you still can… I kind of got all ranty and I apologize for that but I think SpeakUp Winnipeg is great! Thanks for taking the time to read my thoughts. | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 8/5/13 | Hazel Borys | Glad to see the City taking steps to implement the Complete Communities Direction Strategy articulated in OurWinnipeg. During this process, the most important item to capture — from my perspective — is neighbourhood character. What does and does not belong within each older neighbourhood in order to stay in character or what is required to be added in the newer neighbourhoods to become complete. Items on your list are a great start for moving in this direction. Once what's in or out of character can be articulated across the rural-to-urban spectrum of Winnipeg, it's much easier to enable it within the zoning bylaw. No strip malls or snout houses anywhere is probably not an achievable goal for the 20-year planning horizon, so then it's key to establish an A-Grid where streets are more bikeable and walkable, and a B-Grid, which is more auto centric and service-oriented. The more nodal connections we have throughout the A-Grid across the City, the more walkable and bikeable we become. Good luck, and keep up the good work! | Maintaining neighborhood character, establish A-Grid streets( where streets are more walkable and bikeable) and B-Grid streets (where streets are more autocentric and service oriented) |
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 8/5/13 | Matthew Fitzgerald | Thanks for this opportunity to comment on proposed changes. Andrew, is it possible to see that actual text amendments to each by-law in advance of the open house? | Request for information |
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 8/5/13 | Mike Balshaw | There is an urgent need to allow for so-called "Granny Suites" i.e. pre-engineered or pre-fab or mobile home units up to maybe 800 sq. ft.. or to20%? of the undeveloped land space on any suburban lot subject to approved temporary sewer, water and hydro tie-ins to an existing residence on the same lot. | Allow Granny/secondary suites, pre-engineered/pre-fabricated, up to 800sq ft. or 20% of Undevelopable land, approved temporary sewer, water, and hydro in suburban lot. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 8/5/13 | Calvin Polet | By 2050 three quarters of the world population will live in large cities. In the face of political, social, economic, and technological challenges, architects and urban planners have to find new ways to work. As the discussion on the future of built environment continues in every major Canadian city and as a top priority for all developed countries, it's the provocative, flexible solutions (adopted in Vancouver) that will provide the blueprint for tomorrow's urban spaces. But can we (Winnipeg) adapt fast enough to answer and provide development at a competitive pace? Or we may have to remain complaisant to the "pioneer life-style" calling it "character"? There's reason why people talk to their cars, some say because they were used talking with their horses, before cars were invented. However, as much as we love horses, as a conventional source of transportation, the horse became obsolete, so the barns inside the city-limits. It is not only necessary to evolve, but is also fun and interesting to become more attractive to visitors and tourists. To enjoy living by becoming self-sustainable, self-sufficient and allocate more time and energy towards functionality, efficiency and innovation consistent with 21st. century. To allow our children and future generations to be prosperous, driven by creativity and responsible manners. Density goals within the city-limits must be reviewed with present subjectivity and the infrastructure capacity used efficiently. We can't keep on building hospitals, fire stations and police facilities designed for urban capacity and use, while located in areas with rural density and rural occupancy, yet inside city-limits. The livability brand of a major city should be contemplated from a competitive stand-point. If Vancouver is "unaffordable", would that be because is desirable? One should never ignore the fact that Vancouver is the only North American city in the top ten list of most livable cities in the world. (World's#6). Bern Germany, World's number one city for livability, is not anywhere near an ocean and has a cold climate, however well ahead of Vancouver. This is what, a city like Bern Germany, should inspire our architects and urban planners to move our city's development strategy. | Flexible solutions, development at competitive pace, dynamics in urban evolution, self-sustaining, self-sufficient, efficiency and innovation consistent with 21st Century, density goal must be reviewed, infrastructure capacity used, development strategy geared towards livable city e.g. Bern, Germany and Switzerland. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 8/5/13 | | I like what I'm seeing in the proposed changes, especially the reductions in minimum parking and the emphasis on tying into pedestrian connectivity. How new developments get built currently with no connection to the pedestrian grid really baffles me. The one proposed change that concerns me is the increased landscaping. In an effort to have a more beautiful and livable city it seems that with respect to landscaping, the goal is sought through simply increasing the amount of plantings required. This is in some cases, making the amount of plantings very high for new developments. The thing that concerns me is that there does not seem to be sufficient consideration given to the long-term prospects of the landscaping. Good landscaping should change and grow over time as the plants grow, however, if they are installed poorly or not given the proper infrastructure, the plantings will fail and the landscaping will detract from the property and neighbourhood in a few short years. Rather than increasing the amounts of plants required, I'd rather see tighter specs for the installation such as mandated soil or root ball depth for new plantings or irrigation requirements. Properly installed landscaping should look better three years after its planted, not worse. Thanks for soliciting the feedback and good luck with the process. | Reductions in minimum parking are good, pedestrian connectivity, increased landscaping concern, tighter landscaping specification and installation |
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 9/5/13 | Ted | Can you explain a little further what "Increasing support for urban agriculture by limiting other land uses on agricultural lands" entails? | Request for clarification |
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 10/5/13 | Kevin Miller | Almost all of the proposed changes appear to be very positive. Almost all of the 17 responses prior to mine appear to be very positive | Changes are positive. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 11/5/13 | Jason | The only way to evaluate a text review is to see a side-by-side of the old version next to a draft of the new version. There are too many gaps in this summary and too many implications, loopholes or other problems that may be unforeseen for the public unless the draft changes are able to be seen. Similarly, the word “small” is misleading. There is nothing small about having new rules about how tall building may be made next to existing homes or park areas. The new apartment complexes on Assiniboine are examples that may turn river land/bank/walks into tunnels. There is nothing “small” about a text revision that limits downtown parking. When supply is limited, price goes up. Depending on one’s point of view – car-centric or bus/active transport (AT) centric – this $ increase may or may not be beneficial. For AT, parking costs are the easiest forgone expense or saving to calculate and remember when a person does a cost/benefit for AT alternatives. There is nothing “small” about the construction opportunities that will be made available by making more land available for development, which is an implication of these changes. Yet there is not requirement for interim land use or designated detour routes, created by the site crews, when construction season is in full swing. It is useless to require bike parking when the routes to the location are terrifying for cyclists. Road fear is the #1 impediment to cycling in the downtown, especially given the prevalence of fatalities in the downtown area over the years. Yet there are no changes in these rules about such routes, lanes or access ease and safety to buildings. Finally, there are no changes here to save or preserve river property. With each river development, we become even farther behind Saskatoon, Calgary and Edmonton that recognized decades ago the beauty and opportunity given to their cities. Zoning rules, especially in the dowtown, should designate significant set backs from the river before development is permitted. | Interpretation and clarification of "small" as it relates to text and changes to the zoning by-law. Significant setback from river property around the downtown area |
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 11/5/13 | Phil Geisel | It’s hard to believe that the City of Winnipeg will take our concerns seriously. The Lindsay Silos is one example where zoning regulations were ignored at the request of business. Most development proceeds to enable developers to get what they want, and the city benefits from the increased tax base. Input that I have given to Our Winnipeg has been belittled or trivialized. The odour problems in District 6, at both the Brady Road Landfill and the Wilkes Ave sewage pumping station are good examples of this. It seemed like I was being told about “The Emperor’s New Clothes”. | Concern about comments taken seriously |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 12/5/13 | Tom | It is difficult to offer specific comments on the proposed changes without more details. It seems as though the proposed changes are moving in the right direction. Re: cycling: the greater the density of the population downtown, the more cycling there will be. The more cycling there is, the safer cycling is (studies in Europe have shown), encouraging even more people to cycle. It is virtuous win-win circle. Bike parking is great; lighting is great; but the most important things for cycling are density and separated bike paths that actually connect into downtown. Re: car parking. Free street parking is an enormous subsidy to businesses and car drivers. It is very, very costly. And it tends to discourage cycling and public transit. | Changes moving in the right direction, encourage cycling in downtown, bike parking is great, separated bike paths and discourage free-street parking. |
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 12/5/13 | The Analyst | Halt new suburban developments (like Ridgewood South) until existing urban density hits significant levels. We can't afford the fiscal drag of supplying new neighbourhoods with roads, pipes, etc. with our current tax base – it only aggravates the infrastructure deficit. Develop urban housing stock & try to assist the development of new cooperative housing. Get serious about BRT. | Halt suburban development - it aggravates infrastructure deficit, increase urban density, develop urban housing stock and get serious with BRT. |
| SpeakUpWinnipeg | 13/5/13 | Judy Herscovitch | Whatever you do, keep in mind that there are many people who require handicap parking spots. Do not make life more difficult by limiting accessible parking. | Support parking for people with disabilities |
| Twitter | 8/5/13 | | Wish the city of Winnipeg would let the citizens grow food everywhere, how green our City would be. Maybe it's time to get rid of those by-laws if the action doesn't harm general public. | Grow food everywhere, creates a green city, relax by-laws for this great |
| Twitter | 8/5/13 | | Neighborhood livability by-law says you can't plant on Blvd but not fruits/veggies. Don't know why not allowed. | Fruits/vegetables on boulevards |
| Formal Submission | 16/5/13 | Matt Glavin For Terracon Development Ltd | Terracon Development Ltd. is pleased that the City of Winnipeg is moving forward with a series of text amendment to the City of Winnipeg Zoning By-Law #200/2006 so as to better reflect the vision of OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities Direction Strategy. Terracon requests that the City of Winnipeg consider additional text amendments to the "MMU"– Manufacturing Mixed usezoneand"M3"Manufacturing Heavy District. Please note the attached schedules to this document which detail the repeated history of these requests. It is imperative that amendments are made to the City of Winnipeg Zoning By-Law #200/2006 to properly align with the guiding principles of OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities Direction Strategy. Terracon would like to be involved in the City of Winnipeg Zoning By-Law #200/2006 amendment process and hereby requests that the Zoning Advisory Committee be re-instated and proper consultation takes place with industry professionals. Complete Communities Direction Strategy states: "OurWinnipeg…facilitates a broader range of uses within Employment Lands, providing | -Request text amendments to "MMU" Manufacturing Mixed-use zone and "M3" - Manufacturing Heavy Districts. - Call for zoning advisory committee to be re-instated. - Call for proper consultation with industry professionals. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | flexibility, adaptability and responsiveness to the market plan" (Page 92). | |
| Open House Survey | 15/5/13 | | I am interested in mechanisms to deal with existing structures/ parking lots rather than for only new developments such that they deal with items like – mandatory cyclist parking, landscaping. I am interested in whether building code is changing i.e. to mandate showers for those employees who cycle. | Mandatory bike parking, is building code changing? |
| Open House Survey | 15/5/13 | | Maintained public spaces in down town, rooftop green strategy and more options for parking. | Public spaces, rooftop greenery, parking |
| Open House Survey | 15/5/13 | | Great idea, Need more design guidelines and need bike parking at all commercial sites. | Need design guidelines, bike parking commercial |
| Open House Survey | 15/5/13 | | Demolition application for commercial and dilapidated buildings are ok but not for commercial. Landscape plan should be submitted during site plan process reviewed by a Landscape architect. Update zoning by-law to accommodate infill development. | Landscape plan should be reviewed by a Landscape Architect, support infill |
| Open House Survey | 15/5/13 | | Mostly good and important. Many of the changes do not go far in creating dense and walkable city but it's a good start. | Further support density and walkability |
| Open House Survey | 15/5/13 | | Brighter walkways give the illusion of a safer environment. | Walkway lighting |
| Open House Survey | 15/5/13 | | Streamlining variance process for infill. Lots of steps in the right direction. | Remove barriers to infill |
| Open House Survey | 15/5/13 | | Emphasize improvements to pedestrian facilities | Improve pedestrian facilities |
| Open House Survey | 15/5/13 | | Parking reduction should be reduced further. | Further reduce parking requirements |
| Open House Survey | 15/5/13 | | Discussion on transit and active transportation issues. Transit and active transportation. Issues about affordable housing | Transit, Active Transportation, affordable housing |
| Open House Survey | 15/5/13 | | Should consider urban design and not just written laws. Discussed parking with staff | Urban Design approach |
| Open House Survey | 15/5/13 | | More attention to landscaping | Landscaping |
| Open House Survey | 15/5/13 | | Height restriction in down town residential buildings, population density needed for a vital neighborhood. | Height restriction, encourage density |
| Open House Survey | 15/5/13 | | More bike paths | Bike paths |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Open House | 15/5/13 | | Extend parking reduction to the rest of the city, Car sharing is good and make bike parking mandatory, complete design of pedestrian facilities, North end to be part of urban infill area and parking maximum should be looked into. | Parking reduction for entire city, mandatory bike parking, bike facilities, parking maximums |
| Open House | 15/5/13 | | Subdivision should be even less restrictive and compatibility with existing neighborhood character. | Make lot subdivisions even easier, maintain neighbourhood character |
| Open House | 15/5/13 | | Reduced lot area in “R2” to 2,500 sq. ft. is a significant improvement and makes development easier. | Changes to R2 lot dimension is an improvement |
| Open House | 15/5/13 | | Pedestrian main connection is essential | Ped connection proposal is good |
| Open House | 15/5/13 | | Allowing personal services in “M2” up to 5,000sq. ft. as a conditional use, is good. | Changes to M2 uses is good |
| Open House | 15/5/13 | | Car share is excellent. Also, parking off the lane is a good idea. | Car share and parking off the lane are good. |
| Open House | 15/5/13 | | Need to enforce landscaping by-law requirement. | Enforce landscaping by-law |
| Online survey | 16/5/13 | | I hope that sometime in the near future the zoning by-law gets a complete overhaul, but for the time being some of the proposed changes are an improvement. | Complete overhaul of zoning by-law in future, proposed changes - good |
| Online survey | 21/5/13 | | More needs to be done about the complete streets and new urbanism movement. Complete streets (ones that take into account all forms of transportation) are a waste of developable land and promotes unsustainable development patterns. Further, they actually decrease safety by actually widening the street, making the street less hospitable for pedestrians. | Complete Streets waste land, decrease safety for pedestrians |