Minutes - Executive Policy Committee – February 15, 2006

Minute No. 213
Report - Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development - January 31, 2006

Item No. 5 Subdivision and Rezoning - 1800 / 1810 Corydon Avenue
File DASZ 43/2005

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

The Executive Policy Committee concurred in the recommendation of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development and the City Centre Community Committee and submits to Council that the application for subdivision and rezoning under File DASZ 43/2005 not be proceeded with.

Minutes - Executive Policy Committee – February 15, 2006

Report - Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development – January 31, 2006

DECISION MAKING HISTORY:

Moved by Councillor De Smedt,
That the recommendation of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development and the City Centre Community Committee be concurred in and forwarded to Council.

Carried

STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

On January 31, 2006, the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development concurred in the recommendation of the City Centre Community Committee and submitted the matter to the Executive Policy Committee and Council.

COMMUNITY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

On January 3, 2006, the City Centre Community Committee did not concur in the administrative recommendation and submitted its recommendation to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development.

On December 6, 2005, the City Centre Community Committee adjourned the public hearing to its meeting on January 3, 2006, to allow the applicant to notify all area residents on Centennial Street (between Grosvenor and Grant Avenues) that a proposed change to a 3-storey height limit will be considered at that time and provide Community Committee with architectural renderings of the new proposal.

RE: **Subdivision and Rezoning – 1800 / 1810 Corydon Avenue**
File DASZ 43/2005 [c/r DAV 160831/2005D]

For submission to: **The Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development**

Prepared by: **Josie Marques, Clerk,**
City Centre Community Committee

Report date: **January 6, 2006**

COMMUNITY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

On January 3, 2006, the City Centre Community Committee did not concur in the administrative recommendation and recommends to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development that the application for subdivision and rezoning under File DASZ 43/2005 not be proceeded with.

The City Centre Community Committee provided the following supporting reason(s) for its recommendation:

1. The proposal is incompatible with the existing neighbourhood.

PUBLIC HEARING SUMMARY

File: DASZ 43/2005 [c/r DAV 160831/2005D]

Before: City Centre Community Committee
Councillor Gerbasi, Chairperson
Councillor Benham
Councillor Smith

Public Hearing: January 3, 2006, Council Chamber
December 6, 2005, West Committee Room
Council Building, 510 Main Street

Applicant: Stratfield Properties (Abe Friesen), ND Lea (Ross Mitchell)

Subject:



Premises Affected: 1800 / 1810 Corydon Avenue

Exhibits Filed:
1. Application dated October 11, 2005
2. Notification of Public Hearing dated November 9, 2005
3. Manitoba Status of Title 2027252

4. Letter of authorization dated September 19, 2005 from John Friesen Principal, 2862647 Manitoba Ltd., and Stratfield Properties to Ross Mitchell, ND Lea
5. Plans (7 pages)
6. Report from the Manager of Planning and Land Use dated November 29, 2005
7. Report from the Administrative Coordinating Group dated November 30, 2005
8. Inspection Report
9. Presentation, in support of the application, submitted by Ross Mitchell, ND Lea Engineers & Planners Inc., at the public hearing on December 6, 2005.
10. Presentation submitted by Winn Adair at the public hearing on December 6, 2005.
11. Presentation submitted by Joseph Remus at the public hearing on December 6, 2005.
12. Communication dated December 12, 2005, from Lynn Schellenberg in opposition to the application
13. Communication dated December 13, 2005, from Mario Falvo in opposition to the application.
14. Communication dated December 14, 2005, from Robert and Marni Wakefield in opposition to the application
15. Communication dated December, 2005, from Audrey Kryschuk in opposition to the application
16. Communication dated December 12, 2005, from Thomas and Linda Horn in opposition to the application
17. Communication dated December 20, 2005, from Dorothy M. J. Lawson in opposition to the application
18. Communication dated December, 2005, from Theresa Stasiuk in opposition to the application
19. Communication dated December, 2005, from Lynda Will in opposition to the application.
20. Communication dated December 20, 2005, from Rob Trachtenberg in opposition to the application
21. Communication dated December 20, 2005, from Buffie Macklin in opposition to the application
22. Communication dated December 20, 2005, from Shirley Funk in opposition to the application
23. Communication dated December, 2005, from Judy Hardy in opposition to the application
24. Communication dated December, 2005, from Rose Marie Prall-D'argis in opposition to the application
25. Communication dated December, 2005, from Larry T. D'Argis, in opposition to the application

26. Communication dated December, 2005, from John and Heather Elgert, in opposition to the application
27. Communication dated December 16, 2005, from Edith L. Davis, in opposition to the application
28. Communication dated December, 2005, from Raymond and Helena Wiebe, in opposition to the application
29. Communication dated December, 2005, from Frank and Mary Mak, in opposition to the application
30. Communication dated December 14, 2005, from Linda Cassell, in opposition to the application
31. Communication dated December, 2005, from David Wilson, in opposition to the application
32. Communication dated December, 2005, from Annick Basilevsky, in opposition to the application
33. Communication dated December, 2005, from Andrea and Stephen Norsworthy, in opposition to the application
34. Communication dated December 22, 2005, from Martina Hutchison, in opposition to the application
35. Communication dated December 13, 2005, from Denis Dupuis, in opposition to the application
36. Communication dated December, 2005, from Wulf and Wanda Tolboom, in opposition to the application
37. Communication dated December, 2005, from S. C. Suggett, in opposition to the application
38. Communication dated December 20, 2005, from Lise Baker, in opposition to the application
39. Communication dated December 20, 2005, from Calvin and Lois Hinch, in opposition to the application
40. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Rogelio Abad, in opposition to the application
41. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Maria Abad, in opposition to the application
42. Communication dated December, 2005, from Art and Doreen Beals, in opposition to the application
43. Communication dated December, 2005, from Denise Melnyk, in opposition to the application
44. Communication dated December, 2005, from G. E. and L. B. Brown, in opposition to the application
45. Communication dated December, 2005, from Reverend Dr. Atze Veldhuis, in opposition to the application
46. Communication dated December, 2005, from Oriole Velduis, in opposition to the application
47. Communication dated December, 2005, from Lori Blande, in opposition to the application

48. Communication dated December 23, 2005, from Carole Scott, in opposition to the application
49. Communication dated December, 2005, from Helen Nejmark, in opposition to the application
50. Communication dated December, 2005, from Chris and Linda Engel, in opposition to the application
51. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from T. L. Jackson-Bauer, in opposition to the application
52. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from E. G. Bauer, in opposition to the application
53. Communication dated December 21, 2005, from Sharon Dunphy, in opposition to the application
54. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Charlene Mitchell, in opposition to the application
55. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Greg Mitchell, in opposition to the application
56. Communication dated December 22, 2005, from Donald and Lorraine MacDonald, in opposition to the application
57. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Jason James, in opposition to the application
58. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Michelle Pennock, in opposition to the application
59. Communication dated December, 2005, from Natalya Babenko, in opposition to the application
60. Communication dated December, 2005, from V. Narynskyyi, in opposition to the application
61. Communication dated December, 2005, from Leo Narynskyyi, in opposition to the application
62. Communication dated December, 2005, from Viktor Narynskyyi, in opposition to the application
63. Communication dated December 23, 2005, from Robert Mintenko, in opposition to the application
64. Communication dated December 23, 2005, from Patricia Thomas, in opposition to the application
65. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from G. Roxburgh, in opposition to the application
66. Communication dated December 21, 2005, from Sean Ross, in opposition to the application
67. Communication dated December 21, 2005, from Gregory Clarke, in opposition to the application
68. Communication dated December 21, 2005, from George Jackimec, in opposition to the application
69. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Lucille Bisignano, in opposition to the application

70. Communication (undated) from Del Vincent, in opposition to the application
71. Communication dated December 21, 2005, from Marguerite Lavoie, in opposition to the application
72. Communication dated December 21, 2005, from Raymond Weiss, in opposition to the application
73. Communication dated December, 2005, from Linda and Dan Tysz, in opposition to the application
74. Communication dated December 30, 2005, from Leo Lemoine, in opposition to the application
75. Communication dated December 21, 2005, from Leo Lemoine, in opposition to the application
76. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Judy Abbott, in opposition to the application
77. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Jim Charles, in opposition to the application
78. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Carolyn Charles, in opposition to the application
79. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from L. Taylor-Gross, in opposition to the application
80. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Brett Watt, in opposition to the application
81. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Shauna Watt, in opposition to the application
82. Communication dated December 21, 2005, from Diana Rea, in opposition to the application
83. Communication dated December 21, 2005, from Kathryn Smith, in opposition to the application
84. Communication dated December 21, 2005, from Robert Parent, in opposition to the application
85. Communication dated December 29, 2005, from I. Salim, in opposition to the application
86. Communication dated December, 2005, from Mr. and Mrs. R. Maddison, in opposition to the application
87. Communication dated December, 2005, from Susan Rebbeck, in opposition to the application
88. Communication dated December, 2005, from Mrs. A. Johnstone, in opposition to the application
89. Communication dated December 28, 2005, from Ella and Kevin Donnelly, in opposition to the application
90. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Jill Francis, in opposition to the application
91. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Pat Garbutt, in opposition to the application

92. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Michele McMahon, in opposition to the application
93. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Mr. and Mrs. Raike, in opposition to the application
94. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from J. W. Hogg, in opposition to the application
95. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Michael Fernie, in opposition to the application
96. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Anna Marie Hogg, in opposition to the application
97. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Amber Fernie, in opposition to the application
98. Communication dated December 21, 2005, from Debbie Robertson, in opposition to the application
99. Communication dated December 21, 2005, from Harold Robertson, in opposition to the application
100. Communication dated December 28, 2005, from Katrina and Palma Nagy, in opposition to the application
101. Communication dated December 30, 2005, from Judy Phillips, in opposition the application
102. Communication dated December, 2005, from Waltraud Kampff, in opposition the application
103. Communication dated December, 2005, from Doreen McFadyen, in opposition the application
104. Communication dated December, 2005, from P. Henry, in opposition the application
105. Communication dated December, 2005, from Vera Sim, in opposition the application
106. Communication dated January 3, 2006, from Alessandro Trozzo, in opposition the application
107. Communication dated January 3, 2006, from Simon Havens, in opposition to the application
108. Communication dated December 21, 2005, from D. & K. McAdam, in opposition to the application
109 Communication dated December 21, 2005, from K. McAdam, in opposition to the application
110. Communication dated December, 2005, from Charles Kostelnick, in opposition to the application
111. Communication dated December, 2005, from Mrs. Kostelnick, in opposition to the application
112. Communication dated January 3, 2006, from Lori Glowacki, in opposition to the application
113. Communication dated January 3, 2006, from Chad Stanko, in opposition to the application

114. Communication dated December 19, 2005, from Joe H. Doran, in opposition to the application
115. Petition in opposition to the application, submitted by Deborah Lupien
116. Presentation submitted by Winn Adair at the public hearing on January 3, 2006
117. Presentation, in support of the application, submitted by Ross Mitchell, ND Lea Engineers & Planners Inc., at the public hearing on January 3, 2006

REPRESENTATIONS:

In Support:

Ross Mitchell, ND Lea Engineers & Planners Inc.
Abe Friesen, Stratfield Properties
John Friesen
Marlene Friesen
Willie Friesen
David Goyer
Bob and Judy Matias
Jerry Pilipowicz

In Opposition:

Rogelio and Maria Abad
Judy Abbott
Winn Adair
Alfonso Anania
Natalya Babenko
Lise Baker
Annick Basilevsky
T. Jackson-Bauer and E.G. Bauer
Art and Doreen Beals
Lucille Bisignano
Lori Blande
G.E. and L.B. Brown
Linda Cassell
Stephen Challis
Jimand Carolyn Charles
Raimondo Chilelli
Gregory Clark
J.B. Cuthbert
Rose-Marie Prall-D'Argis and Larry T. D'Argis

Jeff Davison
Garth Davies
Edith Davis
Victor Diduch
Ella and Kevin Donnelly
Joe and Phyllis Doran
Denis Dupuis
Sharon Dunphy
John and Heather Elgert
Chris and Linda Engel
Mario Falvo
Michael Fernie
Amber Fernie
Anna Foderaro
Jull Francis
Shirley Funk
Pat Garbutt
Cathie and Doug Geddies
Fred Gering
Dr. Jon Gerrard
Susan Gilmore
Lori Glowacki
L. Taylor-Gross
Howard Green
Judy Hardy
Fred and Murial Hastings
Simon Havens
Gail Henry
P. Henry
Calvin and Lois Hinch
J.W. Hogg
Anna Marie Hogg
Thomas and Linda Horn
Hugh Hull
Martina Hutchison
George Jackimec
Jason James
A. Johnstone
Waltraud Kampff
Canan Karamanoglou
Kal and Richard Kerger
Ken Klassen
Charles and Mrs. Kostelnick
Audry Kryschuk
James Ladd

Debbie Lavallee
Marguerite Lavoie
Dorothy Lawson
Leo Lemoine
Craig and Melanie Leonhardt
Marnie Loewen
Deborah Lupien
Buffie Macklin
Gail Mahler
N. MacFarlane
Donald and Lorraine MacDonald
Mr. and Mrs. R. Maddison
Frank and Mary Mak
D. and K. McAdam
Doreen McFadyen
Michele McMahon
Lucille Meisner
Esther Meleshko
Denise Melnyk
Brian Millar
Robert Mintenko
Charlene and Greg Mitchell
Fiora Moccia
Helena Mohammadlou
William and Joanne Morris
John Murphy
Katrina and Palma Nagy
V., Leo and Viktor Narynskyyi
Helen Nejmark
Randal Newman
Andrea and Stephen Norsworthy
Guy G. Ohlson
Jorge Orellana
Tony Paille
Robert Parent
Dorothy Pasowisty
Michelle Pennock
Jennifer and Harold Peters
Judy Phillips
Kerry Pihulak and Andrea Bacler
Mr. and Mrs. Raike
Diana Rea
Susan Rebbeck
Marie A. Regnier
Joseph Remus

Robert Richard
Debbieand Harold Robertson
Sean Ross
G. Roxburgh
Sid Rutman
Abdul Salim
I. Salim
Lynn Schellenberg
Walt Schoenhausen
Carole Scott
Mr. and Mrs. N.J. Shearer
Vera Sim
Dennis R. Simpson
Michael Smith
Brian Smith
Kathryn Smith
Chad Stanko
Theresa Stasiuk
Cam Stoesz
Margaret and Jayson Stoffman
Casper Stoski
S.C. Suggett
Patricia Thomas
Wulf and Wanda Tolboom
Rob Trachtenberg
Wilhelm Treidler
Alex Trozzo
Linda and Dan Tysz
Oriole and Reverend Dr. Atze Veldhuis
Del Vincent
Robert and Marni Wakefield
Dan Wachniak
Brett and Shauna Watt
Raymond Weiss
Lynda Will
David Wilson

For Information:

Robert Brotherton
Craig Loewen
Richard C. Robson
Raymond and Helena Wiebe

For the City:

Mr. M. Sandhurst, Senior Planner, Planning, Property and Development Department

SUMMARIZATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND SUBMISSIONS
MADE AT THE PUBLIC HEARING

December 6, 2005

The applicant, Ross Mitchell, ND Lea Engineers & Planners Inc., accompanied by David Goyer, appeared in support the application and read into the record a written presentation filed as Exhibit 9. In response to committee's questions, Mr. Mitchell stated that underground parking would be cost prohibited, the units would be approximately 1,160 square feet, and the sale price from $175,000 to $200,000. He also stated that in response to the two (2) open houses held for area residents he was now proposing a limit to 3 storeys for the buildings on the site with an adjustment to the space between the building.

David Goyer stated that he did not have new plans for the suggested change. Mr. Goyer requested committee to approve the plans in concept with the condition that the plans would have to be submitted to committee for approval.

The Senior Planner stated that the Planning, Property and Development Department, as professionals, had had enough time to consider the revisions, but there were concerns that the area residents had not.

Ken Klassen appeared in opposition to the application. Mr. Klassen stated concerns with the application not meeting Plan Winnipeg requirements and the lack of pedestrian and bike trails and transit a transit corridor.

Winn Adair appeared in opposition and read into the record a presentation filed as Exhibit 10.

Howard Green, appeared in opposition to the application. Mr. Green stated concerns with the site being too small for the development, the existing area consisting of bungalows, the lack of sidewalks in plan, pedestrian safety, and the lack of a proper study for servicing the area. He also stated his continued opposition even with the reduction to three (3) storys and the corresponding change in space between the buildings.

Joseph Remus appeared in opposition to the application and submitted a diagram showing properties with garages filed as Exhibit 11. Mr. Remus stated concerns with traffic, depreciation of value of properties, and the lack of a rapid transit system plan. He also stated that the development should be limited one (1) story.

Gail Henry, appeared in opposition to the application. Ms Henry stated concerns with traffic.

Abdul Salim appeared in opposition to the application. Mr. Salim stated that he did not received notification of the open houses the applicant had held. He also sated concerns with traffic. He further stated that there should not be any residential development on this site.

In rebuttal, Mr. Mitchell stated the proposal offered a "green" development for the city in making use of existing lands and infrastructure, increasing density of urban development, and providing housing variety on a site that has been abandoned. He also stated that two (2) informational open houses were held for area residents resulting in the proposal to downsize to 3-storey buildings. He further stated the existence of public sidewalks, that the Public Works Department or the Administrative Coordinating Group's report did not refer to any concerns with the servicing of the lands and that the development involved a private condominium street which should limit concerns with traffic. He further reiterated the request for approval in concept as the plan would have to come back to Community Committee for approval.

The Ward Councillor, Councillor Benham, River Heights - Fort Garry Ward, stated his intent to adjourn the public hearing to allow the area residents time to consider the proposal of a 3-storey height limit and requested that the applicant notify the area resident on both sides of Centennial Street between Grosvenor and Grant Avenues including the Carpathia Co-op of the new public hearing date. Further, Councillor Benham requested that the applicant have architectural renderings of the proposed change ready for the adjourned hearing date.

January 3, 2006

The applicant, Ross Mitchell, ND Lea Engineers & Planners Inc., accompanied by Jerry Pilipowicz, appeared in support the application and read into the record a written presentation filed as Exhibit 117. Mr. Mitchell stated they had complied with Community Committee's instructions of December 6, 2005.

Muriel Hastings appeared in opposition to the application. Ms Hasting stated concerns with traffic.

Howard Green appeared in opposition to the application. Mr. Green reiterated the concerns he had stated on December 6, 2005.

George Orellama appeared in opposition to the application. Mr. Orellama stated concerns with the added pressure on infrastructure and tax costs associated for the area residents.

Jeff Davidson appeared in opposition to the application. Mr. Davidson reiterated the concerns of the previous speakers and added concerns with privacy issues, the removal of trees affecting the character of neighbourhood, and shading that would be created by the proposed buildings.

Canan Karamanoglou appeared in opposition to the application and reiterated the concerns of the previous speakers.

Ken Klassen appeared in opposition of the application and reiterated the concerns of the previous speakers and added the concern of the lack of pedestrian and bicycle paths.

William Morris appeared in opposition to the application and reiterated the concerns of the previous speakers.

James Ladd appeared in opposition of the application and reiterated the concerns of the previous speakers and added the concern of the adverse affect on property values and snow clearing.

Gail Henry appeared in opposition to the application and reiterated the concerns of the previous speakers.

Winn Adhir appeared in opposition to the application and submitted a written presentation placed on file as Exhibit 116.

Doug Geddies appeared in opposition to the application and reiterated the concerns of the previous speakers.

Susan Gilmore appeared in opposition to the application and reiterated the concerns of the previous speakers.

Dorothy Passowissy appeared in opposition to the application and reiterated the concerns of the previous speakers.

Joe Reimus appeared in opposition to the application and reiterated the concerns of the previous speakers.

Walt Schdenhanseni appeared in opposition to the application and reiterated the concerns of the previous speakers.

Debora Lupien appeared in opposition to the application and reiterated the concerns of the previous speakers. Ms Lupien submitted a petition in opposition to the application filed as Exhibit 115.

Michael Smith appeared in opposition to the application and reiterated the concerns of the previous speakers.

Jon Gerard appeared in opposition to the application and reiterated the concerns of the previous speakers.

Hugh Hull appeared in opposition to the application. Mr. Hull stated concerns with the architectural style of building not complimenting the existing area

In response to committee's questions, the Senior Planner stated support for the development of the area as an "RM-1" Multiple-Family District (as per the administrative recommendation) and

clarified the difference between it, the “RM-2” Multiple-Family District (applicant’s current request), and “RM-3” Multiple-Family District (original application).

In rebuttal, the applicant, Mr. Mitchell, stated three open houses were held for the area residents resulting in a compromise for a reduction to a 3-storey height limit. He also stated that traffic issues were addressed in his presentation with studies by traffic engineers stating the development was not going to exceed the capacity of the area. He further stated that the proposed development is in-fill housing which is a priority and is supported by Plan Winnipeg, City engineers had reviewed the infrastructure requirements and no concerns had been noted, private condominiums have snow removal and garbage pick-up, the City had had an opportunity to acquire the land for greenspace and did not, the development would increase the tax base, in regards to privacy issues there were only four balconies per building, there was enough separation between buildings so shading would be minimized, and that the density of the proposal was suited to the area.

Exhibit "6" referred to in File DASZ 43/2005 [c/r DAV 160831/2005D]

Winnipeg

Planning, Property and Development Department Report

To the City Centre Community Committee

Date:	November 29, 2005
File:	**DASZ 43/05**
Related Files:	DAV 05-160831/D
Subject:	To subdivide the subject property into two lots: proposed Lot 1 is to be rezoned from "R1-4" Single-Family District, "R2" Two-Family District, and "RM-3" Multiple-Family District to "RM-3" Multiple-Family District; proposed Lot 2 is to be rezoned from "R1-4" Single-Family District, "RM-2" Multiple-Family District, and "C1" Commercial District to "C2" Commercial District
Location:	1810 Corydon Avenue (former CNR Oak Point railway right-of-way)
Legal Description:	Block 24, Plan 1532



5072

Applicant: Stratfield Properties, ND-Lea
Owner: 2862647 Manitoba Ltd.

Recommendation: *Approval of the subdivision and approval of rezoning to "RM-1" and "C1"*

Site Description

The subject site is a portion of the former CNR Oak Point railway right-of-way, located west of the north-south public lane that parallels Centennial Street, between Corydon Avenue (to the north) and John Brebeuf Place (to the south). To the east of the site are single-family dwellings fronting on Centennial Street (zoned "R1-4" Single-Family District). To the west is a housing cooperative (zoned "RM-3" Multiple-Family District).



Figure 1: subject site (aerial photo flown 2002)

Background

In Fall, 2002, City Centre Community Committee held public hearing for DASZ 7/02 (and related applications), concerning the redevelopment of the former CNR Oak Point railway line. DASZ 7/02 included a larger portion of the former railway line, from Academy Avenue to Taylor Avenue. Under DASZ 7/02, the portion from Corydon Avenue to John Brebeuf Place was proposed to be subdivided and rezoned to "R1-3.5" Single-Family District to accommodate approximately 23 lots for single-family development.

Although Planning & Land Use Division was supportive of "the principle of Residential Urban Infill", the division recommended the application be adjourned to accommodate further discussion regarding design options. Concerns at the time focused mainly on traffic access (proposed use of widened public lane for primary access to infill dwellings) and built form (inward-focused single-family dwellings, hidden behind privacy fences).

Description of the Proposed Development
The applicant proposes to subdivide and rezone the subject site to accommodate a multiple-family development and a commercial development. The multiple-family development comprises the majority of the site (2.13 acres), with the commercial component located adjacent to Corydon Avenue (0.27 acres).

60 dwelling units are proposed within three 4-storey buildings. The majority of tenant parking is to be located at-grade, within the 4-storey buildings (60 parking spaces). Additional tenant and visitor parking is indicated at-grade, between the buildings (35 parking spaces). Vehicular access to the dwelling units is via a 20 foot wide aisle that parallels the existing public lane, with connections to John Brebeuf Place and to Corydon Avenue (through the proposed commercial parking area).

At Corydon Avenue, a 1-storey, 3600 square foot commercial building is proposed. Accessory parking (14 parking spaces) and loading are indicated onsite, with vehicular access via private approach to Corydon Avenue.

Analysis
Consistent with the Planning & Land Use Division recommendation concerning the previous subdivision and rezoning application for this site and other portions of the former CNR Oak Point railway line, the division supports the establishment of residential infill at this location. The division also recognizes that the site's configuration (approximately 1166 feet long by 90 feet deep) and context (adjacent to established single-family dwellings) are challenging.

Multiple-Family Component
The proposed multiple-family layout resolves many of the concerns related to traffic circulation and access, primarily by introducing a private aisle that separates development-generated traffic from the existing public lane that serves properties located along the west side of Centennial Street. The indoor parking feature addresses aesthetic concerns. The proposed density and bulk, on the other hand, introduce new concerns.

The 60 dwelling unit density triples the density proposed under DASZ 7/02. In addition, the built form consists of three clusters of 4-storey buildings. The density and height are not characteristic of multiple-family developments that parallel single-family dwellings, especially in such close proximity.

The proposal's benefits regarding separation of traffic are balanced by density and building height that are out of scale given the site context. Although community committee (and, ultimately, Council) could restrict density and building height via zoning agreement clauses under the proposed "RM-3" Multiple-Family District zoning, Planning & Land Use Division recommends these matters be addressed by instead rezoning this portion of the subject site to "RM-1" Multiple-Family District. This approach is more forthright, since it limits density to 1 dwelling unit per 2000 square feet of lot area / 22 dwelling units per acre (compared to "RM-3" limit of 1 dwelling unit per 1000 square feet of lot area / 44 dwelling units per acre) and limits

building height to 30 feet (compared to "RM-3" limit of 45 feet). Under "RM-1" zoning, 46 dwelling units could be accommodated on the subject site—with building height consistent with "R1" Single-Family District and "R2" Two-Family District zoning.

Commercial Component
The size, location, and onsite amenities of the proposed commercial building are appropriate, given its proximity to a major thoroughfare (Corydon Avenue) and its context (next to an apartment building). The proposed "C2" Commercial District zoning, however, accommodates a range and intensity of commercial uses inconsistent with this portion of Corydon Avenue. Although community committee (and, ultimately, Council) could restrict uses via zoning agreement clauses under the proposed "C2" Commercial District zoning, Planning & Land Use Division recommends this matter be addressed by instead rezoning this portion of the subject site to "C1" Commercial District. This approach is more forthright, since it limits commercial uses to those characteristic of this portion of Corydon Avenue—and since no end-user is identified in the development application.

Recommendation

The Planning and Land Use Division recommends approval of the subdivision (to establish two lots) and rezoning (to "RM-1" Multiple-Family District and "C1" Commercial District) for the following reasons:

- Residential and commercial development are consistent with the "Neighbourhood" designation under *Plan Winnipeg*;
- Lower-density multiple-family residential ("RM-1") and local commercial development ("C1") at this location represent responsible redevelopment of lands surplus to railway needs and within an established predominantly single-family neighbourhood; and
- Proposed vehicular access and circulation successfully separates development-generated traffic from the public lane serving adjacent single-family properties.

Recommended Conditions of Approval

I. That the plan of subdivision proposed under File No. DASZ 43/05 be approved for preparation as a plan of subdivision by a Manitoba Land Surveyor in accordance with Schedule "A" for File No. DASZ 43/05, attached hereto and dated October 29, 2005, for registration in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office, subject to the following:

   A. That the Developer be required to enter into a Development Agreement with the City containing all the conditions outlined in the report of the Administrative Coordinating Group dated _____;

II. That the Director of Planning, Property and Development be authorized to certify any documents in connection therewith.

III That The Winnipeg Zoning By-Law No. 6400/94 be amended by rezoning the subject land as shown on Schedule "A" for File No. DASZ 43/05, attached hereto and dated

October 29, 2005, to an **"RM-1" Multiple-Family District** *where the schedule shows "RM-3"* and a **"C1" Commercial District** *where the schedule shows "C2"*, subject to the applicant entering into a Zoning Agreement with the City pursuant to Section 240 (1) of The City of Winnipeg Charter, to include the following conditions:

A. that for the development of any building, accessory parking area, or signage, plans shall be submitted showing the location and design of the proposed buildings, the location and design of accessory parking areas, private approaches, garbage enclosures, fencing, landscaping, and free-standing signage to City Centre Community Committee and the Director of Planning, Property, & Development for plan approval prior to the issuance of any building or development permit and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Property, & Development.

B. that vehicular access to and egress from the property be prohibited from the public lane paralleling Centennial Street;

C. that privacy fencing be constructed along the east side of the north-south aisle, with pedestrian access openings or gates provided and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Property, & Development;

D. that loading areas be screened to reduce impacts of loading activities to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Property, & Development;

E. that parking and loading area lighting be screened to reduce glare to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning, Property, & Development; and

F. that mobile and temporary signs be prohibited.

IV. That a ten (10) percent dedication be made by a payment of a sum of money to the City in lieu of the requirement for land dedication based on the increase in market value of the land and the creation of additional sites, (if applicable).

V. That, in the event the application is not proceeded with expeditiously and the by-law is not enacted within twenty-four (24) months after adoption of the report by Council, the matter shall be deemed to be concluded and shall not be proceeded with unless an extension of time is applied for prior to the expiry of this twenty-four (24) month period and the extension is subsequently approved by Council.

VI. That the City Solicitor/Manager of Legal Services be requested to prepare the necessary by-law in accordance with the above.

VII. That the subdivision section of the by-law shall come into force and effect upon execution by the City of Winnipeg of the Development Agreement.

VIII. That the zoning section of the by-law shall come into force and effect when the Plan of Subdivision has been registered in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office, and the Zoning Agreement has been filed by caveat in the Winnipeg Land Titles Office against those lands **provided that the said effective date occurs within twenty-four (24) months from the date that the said rezoning by-law is adopted by Council.**

IX. The Plan of Subdivision shall be approved and signed by the Director of Planning, Property and Development within two (2) years of the date of passage of the aforementioned by-law.

X. In the event that the necessary City of Winnipeg mylar approval signatures have not been secured within twenty-four (24) months after adoption of the by-law, the matter shall be deemed to be concluded and shall not be proceeded with unless Council extends that time.

XI. That the Proper Officers of the City are hereby authorized to execute said Zoning Agreement.

XII. That the City Solicitor/Manager of Legal Services be requested to do all things necessary for implementation in accordance with the terms of The City of Winnipeg Charter.

This Report Submitted by:
Planning, Property and Development Department
Planning and Land Use Division

Report Prepared by: M. Sandhurst
PPD File # DASZ 43/05

Schedule "A"

By-Law No. _____

File No. **DASZ 43/05**

Atlas Sheet No.

N

AD20 CITY CENTRE COMMUNITY

Explanation

An application for the approval of the plan of subdivision shown outlined below and for a proposed zoning change to By-law No. 6400/94 by rezoning the land located at 1800/1810 Corydon Avenue from an "R1-4" RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, an "R2" RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, an "RM-2" MULTIPLE-FAMILY DISTRICT, an "RM-3" MULTIPLE-FAMILY DISTRICT and a "C1" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT to an "RM-3" MULTIPLE-FAMILY DISTRICT and a "C2" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT as shown outlined below.



THIRD READING : _____ EFFECTIVE DATE : _____

ZONING AGREEMENT : YES ☐ NO ☐ CAVEAT No. _____

Schedule "A" to the report to City Centre Community Committee for file # DASZ 43/05 dated November 29, 2005.

5078

Exhibit "6" referred to in File DASZ 43/2005 [c/r DAV 160831/2005D]

Re: Proposed subdivision and rezoning on land located at 1800/1810 Corydon Avenue – DASZ 43/05

An application has been submitted by N.D. Lea and Associates to subdivide and rezone land located at 1800/1810 Corydon Avenue.

It is recommended that the Developer provide a servicing report prepared by a municipal engineer which will include fire flow analysis and land drainage storage requirements.

It is also recommended that approval of this application be subject to the Developer entering into a Servicing Agreement as follows:

1. a) The Developer shall at no expense to the City install all watermains and sewers required to serve the proposed development as indicated by a servicing report prepared by a municipal engineer to the satisfaction of the Director of Water and Waste.
   b) The Developer shall restrict land drainage run-off from the proposed development to pre-development levels to the satisfaction of the Director of Water and Waste.
   c) The Developer shall pay for the existing watermain and combined sewer in Corydon Avenue on the basis of prevailing local improvement rates therefor i.e. $36.00/ft. and $22.0/ft. respectively.
2. a) The Developer shall, at no expense to the City, construct portland cement concrete pavement, to a width and thickness consistent with the existing portland cement concrete pavement, to extend John Brebeuf Place from its terminus at the public lane west of Centennial Street to the west limit of the proposed private approach to the subject property and all related works all as determined by and to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.
   b) The appropriate cross-access easement agreement is to be put in place to guarantee access to the proposed "RM-3" lot across the proposed "C2" lot to and from the proposed approach serving the site to and from Corydon Avenue.
3. The Developer shall, at no expense to the City, construct a portland cement concrete sidewalk to a width of 1.5m by 100mm in thickness on the north side of John Brebeuf Place from Centennial Street to the proposed private approach to the subject property, all as determined by and to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.
4. The Developer shall, at no expense to the City, provide underground electrical and telephone services to serve the proposed subdivision and will pay the full cost to convert any existing overhead services within the proposed subdivision to underground.
5. The Developer is to pay all costs associated with the installation and/or relocation of street lights and other utilities made necessary as a result of or required to accommodate works, which are required by the Developer to serve the proposed subdivision, as determined by and to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.
6. The Developer shall be responsible to control and to initiate the clean up of litter and refuse from the contractors and builders for this development, both on-site and off-site, during the installation of services and construction of buildings, until substantial completion of all construction. The clean up of litter and refuse shall be done on a regular basis as determined by the Director of Public Works. This shall include initiating action and assuming any costs in remedying the situation to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.

7. The Developer shall ensure that construction traffic uses access routes as determined by the Director of Public Works. The Developer shall maintain, at no expense to the City, the access routes in a clean, dust free and safe condition, free of dropped and tracked-on mud, and shall undertake regular scraping and sweeping of streets until building construction, including landscaping is complete, all as determined by and to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.
8. The Developer shall pay the full cost of engineering services provided by or on behalf of the City in connection with the installation of services required to serve the proposed development.
9. The Developer shall pay $1,200.00/acre to defray the City's administration and related costs associated with the preparation and implementation of the servicing agreement.

THIS REPORT SUBMITTED BY:

Administrative Coordinating Group
File No. AG 43/05
November 29, 2005

"Original signed by E.L. Carrièreú
Land Development Engineer

"Original signed by R.J. Hartmann"
Public Works Department
Transportation Division

"Original signed by K.T. Raban"
Water and Waste Department