2024 | BARNES & DUNCAN:
SURVEYING, ENGINEERING, PLANNING



Consolidated Community Engagement Report

[1444 Ravelston Avenue West • Winnipeg, Manitoba]

Consolidated Community Engagement Report

1444 Ravelston Ave. W. • Winnipeg, Manitoba

Prepared By:

Barnes & Duncan: Surveying, Engineering, Planning
6 Donald Street, Winnipeg, MB R3L 0K6
Jennifer Lim RPP MCIP, Director of Planning
E-mail: JenniferL@BarnesDuncan.com
Phone: 204-284-5999 ext. 2024
Toll Free: 1-800-665-6609

Date: February 26, 2024

Professional Qualifications

The Consultant, Jennifer Lim of Barnes & Duncan, is a Registered Professional Planner ("RPP") since July 10, 2014 and is a full-member in good standing with the Canadian Institute of Planners ("CIP") under the Manitoba Professional Planners Institute ("MPPI").

Project Name: 1444 Ravelston Ave. W. Re-Development

Introduction

1444 Ravelston Ave. W. (the "Subject Property") is in Winnipeg's Peguis Neighbourhood and is developed with a single-family dwelling on lands currently zoned "R1-L" and "RR-5" under the City of Winnipeg's Zoning By-law 200/2006 (the "ZBL"). The property owner wants to re-develop the property and cannot rebuild without adhering to the current zoning unless a re-zoning is sought. With the need for housing, the client is interested in building four (4) townhouse buildings with a total of 23 semi-detached suites, 3-storeys (~35 ft) in height. This concept requires a re-zoning to "RMF-S" (the "DASZ"). As this process is subject to representation from the public, the property owner has contracted Jennifer Lim (the "Consultant") of Barnes & Duncan to conduct a public engagement. The objective of the public engagement was to notify area residents of the concept for redevelopment and seek their feedback in advance of formal DASZ application to the Public Service.

Background Information

Peguis Neighbourhood Context (Regional)

The Peguis neighbourhood ("Peguis") in the Transcona Ward has an overall population of around 3,683 persons, or 1,004 persons per square kilometre, making it nearly as populous as Winnipeg, overall, per square kilometer. The median age is 36.6 and the ratio for men and women is 1:1. 80% of residents are married couples and almost 60% are families with kids at home. Nearly 89% speak only English and 0.2% speak only French. Peguis is not given a high ranking in terms of amenities, but is very well-scored for commute, cost of living, and employment. The area where the Subject Property is located is family-friendly with numerous residents and their children walking and playing in the streets and on sidewalks. Yards are generally well-kept with some older properties that have fallen into disrepair. The vast majority, including the long-standing homes tend to display evident pride-of-place. Neighbours are friendly and from observations tend to enjoy recreating on the local public reserves and rights-of-way. Traffic is observed as being generally light with peaks during heavy commute hours. Perceptions of safety are generally good and will likely improve as construction of new residences is completed. There is an evolving and strong sense of community.

Prairie Crocus Context (Neighbourhood)

There are remnant large-lot residential developments and the Sumka Brothers Greenhouses that originated local development pre-Prairie Crocus; however, the Prairie Crocus subdivisions and subsequent infill developments have substantially changed the local character of this neighbourhood.

Prairie Crocus is a community of residential and residential-related use types typically with shallow front yards to provide a greater sense of community. The setback of the homes gives the feel of a European village, where residents are welcome on the streets.

The local area is generally bound by the train tracks along Concordia Avenue to the North, Peguis Street to the east, Reenders Drive to the south and Lagimodiere Boulevard to the west. There are regional commercial nodes in proximity with industrial use types slightly further afield.

Ravelston Avenue West Context (Local)

The Subject Property is located on Ravelston Avenue West in proximity to Philip Lee Drive. The next closest intersection is Art Miki Way. Each of these intersections is a three-way stop, with Ravelston Avenue West connecting the local area through to Peguis Street. The nearest road connecting the Peguis and East Elmwood neighbourhoods is either Concordia Avenue via Peguis Street or Almey Avenue via El Tassi Drive connecting at Art Miki Way.

This area contains three (3) municipal parks (Ray Klassen Park, Tom Nesby Park, and White Spruce Park) and a greenway system that provides some interconnectivity with area residences. Ravelston Avenue West has sidewalks on both sides of the road for most of the length of the avenue between Art Miki Way to Peguis Street. The northside sidewalk appears to truncate in and around #1339 Ravelston Avenue West; the southside sidewalk appears to truncate at #1294 Ravelston Avenue West. Residents walking to Kildonan Place would have a healthy 30-minute walk each way, 6-minute bike ride, 18-minute bus-ride, or 5-minute drive by vehicle.

Nestor Gylywoychuck Park is located at the north-west corner of the intersection of Peguis Street and Ravelston Avenue West. There are three (3) transit stops located at this intersection. The first is for northbound Peguis Street (Stop #40891); the second is for southbound Peguis Street (Stop #40769); and the third is for eastbound Transcona Boulevard (Stop #40911).

These three stops generally offer the #44 Grey (~5:00 A.M.to ~2:00 A.M., M-SAT, ~5:00 A.M.to ~12:00 A.M., SUN), the #48 McMeans Express (~5:45 A.M. to ~6:00 P.M., M-F), and the #89 North Transcona – Kildonan Place (~8:30 A.M.to ~4:00 P.M., M-F, ~11:00 A.M.to ~6:30 P.M., SUN). Maps of each route are provided under Appendix "1".

Subject Property (Site Specific Context)

Ravelston Avenue West is located along the Subject Property's north site line. The Subject Property has 150 ft. frontage for sewer and water and is under the following influences:

- Commercial Adjacent
- Internal Corner

To the east from the Subject Property, along Ravelston Avenue West, is a mixture of newer two-storey duplex residences, townhouse residences and long-standing single-family dwelling development. To the north along Philip Lee Drive is a mixture of 4-storey apartments and single-family dwellings on lots that generally conform to the "R1-M" zoning district. The adjacent property to the east (#1430) is a property developed with a single-family residence. #1422 and #1418 are similarly developed. #1402 Ravelston Avenue West is developed with 3-storey 2- and 3-bedroom townhouses.

To the west, Ravelston continues westward roughly ½ -city-block past the intersection of Art Miki Way to a back lane located along the west side of Art Miki Way. At that point, Ravelston Avenue West dead ends and does not cross Lagimodiere Boulevard to connect with Callsbeck Avenue. The adjacent property to the west (#1454) is a freehold title, recently re-zoned to "RMF-S" to facilitate a re-development of the property from single-family to multi-family townhouse development.

The adjacent properties to the south are properties with direct access to Bill Dance Drive, zoned and developed for 2-family dwelling development (side-by-sides). There are a total of 6 units

along the rear lot line. #125 Bill dance Drive has been developed with townhouses. The City of Winnipeg Property Map showing an air photo is provided under Appendix "2". Please note the air photo is dated and does not show existing development on Bill Dance Drive.

Current Development of Subject Property

The property was developed with a 2,292 sq. ft. single-family dwelling in and around 1980, as indicated by Assessment and Taxation. There are several detached accessory buildings and an inground pool on the property to the rear of the home. There are some mature trees generally located near the shared property lines with a few trees situated in behind the home.

Current Assessment of Subject Property

The property is assessed as being 47,993 sq. ft. in site area. For taxation purposes, the property is under the property use code: RESSD - Detached Single Dwelling.

Current Zoning of Subject Property

Under the ZBL, the property is zoned "R1-L" – Residential Single-Family Large Lot and "RR-5" Rural Residential – 5. The City of Winnipeg Property Map showing the Winnipeg Zoning layer is provided under Appendix "3".

The "R1-L" Residential Single-Family – Large Lot zoning district is intended "to accommodate primarily single-family development in lower density areas" (ZBL, pg. 51). The "RR-5" Rural Residential – 5 zoning district is intended "to provide areas for large-lot rural residential development, along with limited agricultural uses." (ZBL, pg. 51).

Single-Family detached development is the predominant permitted use type under each of these zoning categories. These zones also give some provision for care homes, a variety of Public and Institutional use types, and a variety of related accessory use types.

Proposed Housing Re-Development

Initial Concept – 32 Unit Townhouse

The owner of the property had prepared a concept of development that initially sought 32-units and vetted this proposal with the Public Service through a preliminary application review. After some revision to account for necessary site considerations, the proposal became 29 townhouse units. Based on the revised proposal, the Public Service came back with a response: "The site plan looks like it would be supportable at this point. Granted the changes that have been proposed, I recommend you touch base with Water and Waste, and with Public Works, to confirm they have no concerns." Both departments responded to the proposal with no concerns.

Revised Concept #1– 29 Unit Townhouse

The property owner submitted a DASZ application to the Public Service in and around August 2023, however, said application was formally placed on-hold to conduct a limited community engagement from September 1-26, 2023 (Community Engagement #1). The purpose of Community Engagement #1 was to determine if area residents would generally support a 29-unit townhouse development and what, if any concerns might be raised. The property owner had a high-level concept for the redevelopment that was part of the engagement flyer. A copy of the engagement flyer for Community Engagement #1 can be found under Appendix "4".

Community Engagement #1

Information for Community Engagement #1 was delivered door-to-door for residents that resided generally within 200 metres of the Subject Property. One hundred twenty-one (121) residences received the flyer along with a pre-stamped return envelope asking for their response within 2-weeks of the drop-off date. The Consultant also provided e-mail and telephone contact information and allowed an additional 10-days for all mail to be returned from the deadline, prior to composing an initial Community Engagement Report. A list of addresses that received a flyer are under Community Engagement #1 found under Appendix "5".

Engagement Strategy

Our engagement strategy was to identify the people and groups who would most likely be affected by our proposal to re-develop and ensure that they had an opportunity to participate. As such, we distributed flyers to homes generally within 200 m of the Subject Property, including homes along Art Miki Way, Ravelston Avenue West, Philip Lee Drive, Golden Boy Land and Carol Fletcher Way.

While anyone within 1,000 m can object to the re-zoning, the property owner relied on the Consultant to identify who would be most affected and to engage them in a meaningful way. Door-to-door engagement was part of the strategy to seek independent feedback on the proposal to develop the 29-unit townhouse development.

Using this method would empower underrepresented groups to get involved without influence from potential "stronger voices" that *may* reside in the neighbourhood. It would also personalize the experience, so that residents could communicate 1:1. Door-to-door made the public participation opportunity accessible as the flyer contained a variety of ways to communicate plus it offered a return-mail pre-stamped envelope. The questionnaire on the back of the flyer was simple and offered a large area (nearly half the page) for resident feedback and or questions.

Feedback

Feedback on Community engagement #1 was received from three (3) persons – 2.5% feedback. We did not receive any letters in support. Two (2) were in objection. One (1) sought further information.

The community's top concern was the traffic volumes on the local street system. Importantly, we heard from the neighbour directly to the east, who owns a single-family dwelling and had concerns over the changes in neighbourhood character. The neighbour had concerns with density, traffic, height, and wanted the overall concept to be more in-keeping with what exists.

This owner made clear that they would object to the proposal. The owner did appreciate that the concept for the internal road and common parking area was not located along the shared property line, plus they appreciated that there are no windows on the buildings facing east.

These owners did not want a development impacting their sense of privacy. They felt concerned over reduced views to the skyline (sunsets) from your residence, as the townhouses are ~35' in height (3-storey).

We did discuss that if the proposed re-development were to be approved that we would like the neighbour's inputs on elements of the design that might improve your concerns.

Examples might be:

- Did you prefer a certain fence style on the shared property line?
- Did you want a certain tree type to be planted on our lot to be planted close to the shared lot line?
- Did you want or not want the buildings to be a certain exterior colour?

We asked for these inputs with the intention of sharing them with the property owner and offering that the property owner's consideration can be given to what elements the neighbour to the east might prefer. We did not hear back from this neighbour under Community Engagement #1. Such feedback from this neighbour was received under Community Engagement #2.

Next Steps

Based on the level of engagement and type of feedback received, the Consultant recommended a meeting with the City to discuss the results. We continued to refine our proposal based on feedback. We reduce the number of units and provided additional greenspace; further recommendation was made to work with an Architect to produce a sophisticated, timeless aesthetic.

Revised Concept #2– 23 Unit Townhouse

The property owner hired Size Architecture to produce drawings that would better meet with guidance provided and increased the overall aesthetic and value of the development. The proposal was reduced to 22-23 units, side yards were increased, additional greenspace was provided, and the aesthetic reflected a Scandinavian/Nordic development. A copy of the Architectural Drawings can be found under Appendix "6".

Community Engagement #2

A secondary community engagement ran from January 19-February 20, 2024 (Community Engagement #2). The purpose of Community Engagement #2 was to determine if area residents would generally support a 23-unit townhouse development and what, if any concerns might be raised. A copy of the engagement flyer for Community Engagement #2 can be found under Appendix "7".

Information for Community Engagement #2 was delivered via Canada Post (mail) for twelve (12) select residents that received the flyer along with a pre-stamped return envelope asking for their response within 2-weeks of January 19, 2024. One mailer was returned, unopened and two (2) resident's emails, in objection, were received – 13.3% feedback. A list of addresses that received a flyer under Community engagement #2 are found under Appendix "8".

Extension was granted to the neighbours at #1430 Ravelston Avenue West who sought further information and detail. Select revisions were made to the architectural drawings based on their feedback.

Engagement Strategy

Our engagement strategy was to conduct a select engagement of the people and groups who would most immediately affected by our proposal to re-develop and ensure that they had an opportunity to participate. As such, we mailed flyers to twelve (12) homes. Eleven (11) were located on the north side of Bill Dance Drive and one (1) was #1430 Ravelston Avenue West. Individually mailed engagement was part of the strategy to seek independent feedback on the proposal to develop the 23-unit townhouse development.

As with Community Engagement #1, we felt that using this method would empower underrepresented groups to get involved without influence from potential "stronger voices" that *may* reside in the neighbourhood. It would also personalize the experience, so that residents could communicate 1:1. Mailers made the public participation opportunity accessible as the flyer contained a variety of ways to communicate plus it offered a return-mail pre-stamped envelope. The questionnaire on the back of the flyer was simple and offered a large area (nearly half the page) for resident feedback and or questions.

Feedback

Feedback on Community engagement #2 was received from two (2) persons – 13.33% feedback. We did not receive any letters in support. Two (2) were in objection, including the residents at 171 Bill Dance Drive and 1430 Ravelston Avenue West. A copy of the feedback is found under Appendix "9".

The residents at 171 Bill Dance Drive had three (3) concerns. They included that:

1. Having a townhouse behind their house would decrease their property value.
2. They would be left without privacy.
3. The traffic would increase, and they had fears for the safety of their child.

The residents at #1430 Ravelston Avenue West had concerns. They included that:

1. Development should be limited to two-storey.
2. Existing mature bushes and trees on their property may be negatively impacted by the proposed development.
3. A walkway beside their property is intrusive.
4. Privacy issues.
5. Three-point turn areas will greatly affect their use and enjoyment of our deck and patio area with vehicle headlights and exhaust fumes.
6. Would like to see a 6.5 fence between our properties with stronger, dense materials considered. Using the 6"x 6" posts and 1"x6" boards.
7. The position and type of lighting to be used and proposed species of trees is also a concern. They are hopeful that fast growing trees and bushes will be considered.
8. The exterior palette and design, in our opinion, is dark and appears institutional. They would like to suggest consideration be given to incorporate a burgundy tone in place of dark gray.

Response to Feedback

The Consultant forwarded the results of Community Engagement #2 to the property owner for review and comment. Based on that review we came up with a list of ten (10) responses to resident concerns:

1. Property Values

Regarding the concerns brought forward by property owners, the Consultant was not able to produce a resolve for the fear that property value would decrease for the residence on Bill Dance Gate. From anecdotal accounts, residential property values tend to increase due to enhanced residential development of adjacent property.

2. Privacy Reduction

Regarding a fear for a reduction in privacy, typical means to address concerns for privacy when adjacent lands cannot be purchased include tree-planting, fencing, screening, and window treatment(s) on the concerned resident's property.

3. Street Safety

The concern for the safety of streets tends to be more an issue of how motorists behave; how the streetscape can be designed to improve pedestrian safety; and how we understand our rights and responsibilities in public spaces and how those spaces are regulated and enforced.

4. Height Concerns

Restricting the development to two-storey would place an injurious restriction on the property that is not held elsewhere. In all other non-multi-family residential zones, the maximum height is 35'0". While one-storey could be built to this height, it is generally understood that a house with 9-foot ceilings and 1-foot floor on a basement with walls projecting 4-5-feet above grade could result in a three-storey flat-roofed home. As 35'0" is permitted as-of-right under the zoning by-law and as there are no further restrictions for adjacent development to adhere to the heights of existing development, the proposal is in-keeping with zoning provisions.

5. Impact to Existing Trees on Neighbouring Property

In terms of the concerns for mature trees in proximity to the property line, the developer will hire contractors that will construct with best-practices in-mind. While there is no guarantee of zero negative impacts, efforts will be made to preserve trees and their root systems, should they encroach onto the Subject Property.

One impact we cannot avoid is that the approved post-development drainage design, which must adhere to City By-laws, must not drain onto adjacent property. Therefore, if the Subject Property currently drains onto the adjacent property, this drainage will be restricted post-development. Equally, if the adjacent property currently drains onto the Subject Property, this drainage will be restricted post-development, meaning surface water may begin to pool at the shared property line.

As such, post-development of the Subject property, the neighbour at #1430 Ravelston Avenue West *may* need to irrigate their trees/shrubs to ensure they do not suffer drought, or *may* need to introduce internal drainage on the lot to ensure the trees/shrubs do not suffer localized flooding or cause damage to the fence.

6. Location of Private Shared Walkway (nearest east site line)

In terms of the walkway along the east side of the Subject Property, a shared walkway leading from each doorstep to the public sidewalk on Ravelston Avenue West is a requirement of the by-laws. There is a winding walkway on the west side, however the private drive interrupts this internal pedestrian corridor, as such we have provided one on the east side of the development for safety and additional means of access. Green space and a fence are placed between the shared walkway and the east site line. The shared walkway is situated closer to the townhouses than to the east site line to afford additional separation from #1430 Ravelston Avenue West.

7. Location of 3-Point Turn (nearest east site line)

As the private access point on Ravelston Avenue West is limited in location, we cannot "flip" the design to have the private driveway located along the east side line with the three-point turn arounds on the west site line.

The 3-point turns are both a functional and safety requirement under regulations administered by the Public Service. While the typical homeowner will most-likely use their private driveway for turnaround, weekly garbage and recycling pick-up vehicles will need a three-point turn around to safely navigate the proposed development; additionally, EMS and fire rescue vehicles will require a 3-point turn around to safety navigate the complex. The three point is not restricted in its use and could be used by residents and visitors, despite the likelihood homeowners will turn around in their own private driveway.

8. Fence Height and Construction (east site line only)

In response to the request for a 6.5-foot-high wooden fence along the shared property line, the property owner agreed to this revision. The architectural firm updated the site plan, accordingly, ensuring that the fence meets with specifications of a 6.5 foot high fence built with 6x6 posts and 1x6 boarding placed along the property line.

9. Lighting Location and Tree Species

Regarding the lighting, the zoning by-law will prevent the development from lighting the private walkways and residential buildings in a manner that directs light onto adjacent properties.

Regarding the selection of tree species, we will follow the city's approved list, however, we will request species not listed to meet with the requests of the adjacent resident who wanted fast growing, tall trees. This could include columnar poplar and/or eastern cedar trees. This is not shown on the proposed site plan, but under the development permit will be designed by a related professional.

10. Exterior Palette

In terms of the exterior color palette, we noted the suggestion of incorporating a burgundy tone and forwarded this to the Architect for review and comment. Professional architect, Alden Neufeld, provided that burgundy is not typical of the Nordic/Scandinavian exterior colour palette and tends to be a colour that becomes outdated/dated. Neufeld also warned of altering the architectural design to meet with the aesthetic desires of area resident(s). In general, this type of public participation leads to projects being piecemealed when the investment is being made by the property owner to create a professionally designed development.

Next Steps

After Community Engagement #2 was complete, based on the level of public participation (13.33% is typically considered a reasonable / "good" level of engagement) and based on the requests for additional information, the Consultant recommends the proposal for a 23-unit townhouse development designed by Size Architecture with revision to include a 6.5 foot high fence along the east site line and commitment to address tree plantings on the east site line at the Development Permit stage be remitted to the Public Service with direction to re-start the DASZ.

As per the City of Winnipeg website, an application can take six to 18 months to complete. Once the City of Winnipeg has determined an application is complete for circulation, it will be sent to the Land Development Branch to process and review.

Applications are reviewed for conformity to adopted plans and zoning bylaws.

- If an application does not conform to an adopted plan, an amendment to that plan will be required before [the application] can be referred for approval.
- A Zoning Development Officer determines if a proposal conforms to relevant zoning regulations.
- If a variance of the zoning regulations is required, it would have to be approved.
- The District Planner provides planning advice on the application, including changes that might be recommended as desirable or necessary to gain approval.

An application is then circulated to concerned stakeholders, such as public utilities and other City departments, for review and comment regarding what conditions may be necessary for approval of a [rezoning]. Required conditions may include:

- To allow development to take place on proposed lots, the public street or lane bordering the property may require a widening, upgrading or underground services may need to be extended, upgraded or installed to accommodate a proposed development.
- New public streets and/or lanes within a proposed [development] must be constructed to current City standards.
- [The developer/property owner] may be responsible for all or part of those costs.
- If a proposed development includes existing structures and/or buildings, [the developer/property owner] may need to engage the services of a Manitoba Land Surveyor to prepare a Surveyor's Building Location Certificate for Proposed Subdivision to assist the Plan Examination Branch's review for Spatial Separation compliance under the Manitoba Building Code.

An application may be reviewed by a committee of City officials, known as the Administrative Coordinating Group (ACG). They may recommend amendments to the plan, conditions to be set on the approval, or reject the proposal.

- [Developers/ Applicants] can discuss ACG recommendations with appropriate City staff members. After considering recommendations made by the ACG and/or District Planner, you have the opportunity to request your application be withdrawn or be further processed.
- If [Developers/ Applicants] wish to proceed with an application, a proposed [rezoning] would be advertised for a public hearing before the applicable Community Committee. The application must be advertised by publishing the proposal once in two daily newspapers with a general circulation in the City and site posters, 14 days clear of the day of the public hearing. [Developers/ Applicants] are responsible for advertising costs.
- The chairperson of the ACG and the District Planner each prepare a report with recommendations, submitted to the applicable Community Committee for consideration, at which time [the developer] or [developer's] representative may wish to appear to speak on behalf of [the] proposal and answer any related questions. It is important to note that there are no further public representations after the public hearing.

Hearing dates are selected by the Land Development Branch once the application review process is complete. The Branch manages and coordinates the application's review and approval processes through to completion.

Once a Public Hearing date is set, the Consultant will advise the property owner of the Subject Land and any of their professionals. The regulatory notification process will notify area residents; however, the Consultant has committed to notifying the owners of #1430 Ravelston Avenue West and will do-so by way of e-mail seeking confirmation they have received the notification.

Final Conclusions

The re-development of 1444 Ravelston Avenue West into a 23-unit townhouse development is supported, in principle, by the Public Service after preliminary review, and through communication with other city departments, it is apparent there is capacity for the development to occur. A rezoning to RMF-S is suitable to support the proposed development.

A strip of land along the property's frontage will be acquired by the City as part of the re-development, to allow for future improvements to the Ravelston Avenue West Public Right of Way. No further improvements to the public street system is required as a result of the proposed development.

The 23-unit townhouse will provide housing options for the community. The overall density has been reduced to 23-units to afford greater greenspace. Size Architecture has prepared the final drawings based on a Nordic / Scandinavian architectural aesthetic, characterized by simplicity, functionality, and a deep connection to nature.

Designs with this aesthetic prioritize clean lines, minimalist designs, and neutral color palettes, utilizing wood, stone, and glass. The proposed design seeks to create harmonious environments that blend seamlessly with the surrounding landscapes, fostering a sense of tranquility and coziness known as "hygge", (pronounced "hoo-gah").

The decision to build with such an aesthetic will make the development timeless and will add-value to the neighbourhood as it continues to evolve and infill.

We are committed to ensuring that the final design aligns with both regulatory standards and, within reason, take into consideration the impacts to adjacent landowners and the local neighbourhood. This is the result of the two (2) community engagements and guidance sought from the Ward Office. It is our hope that the DASZ application to rezone the Subject Property will be approved.

Regards,

Jennifer Lim RPP
Director of Planning
Barnes and Duncan – Surveying, Engineering, Planning