Minutes – Executive Policy Committee – February 17, 2016

Report – Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development – February 16, 2016

Item No. 15 Subdivision and Rezoning – 4820 Roblin Boulevard and 521 Dieppe Road (Charleswood - Tuxedo - Whyte Ridge Ward)
File DASZ 33/2015 [c/r DAV 154696/2015D]

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

The Executive Policy Committee concurred in the recommendation of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development and submitted to Council that the application for subdivision and rezoning under File DASZ 33/2015 [c/r DAV 154696/2015D] be rejected.

Report – Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development – February 16, 2016

DECISION MAKING HISTORY:

Moved by Councillor Orlikow,

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.

Carried

Moved by Councillor Orlikow,

That the recommendation of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development be concurred in and forwarded to Council.

Carried

STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

On February 16, 2016, the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development concurred in the recommendation of the Assiniboia Community Committee and submitted the matter to the Executive Policy Committee and Council.

COMMUNITY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

On February 9, 2016, the Assiniboia Community Committee concurred in the recommendation of the Winnipeg Public Service and recommended to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development that the application for subdivision and rezoning under File DASZ 33/2015 [c/r DAV 154696/2015D] be rejected.

On December 1, 2015, the Assiniboia Community Committee did not hear any representation on the application and adjourned the public hearing to its meeting on February 9, 2016 at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Building, 510 Main Street.

RE:	**Subdivision and Rezoning – 4820 Roblin Boulevard and 521 Dieppe Road** **File DASZ 33/2015 [c/r DAV 154696/2015D]**
For submission to:	**The Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development**
Prepared by:	**Destiny Watt, Senior Committee Clerk** **Assiniboia Community Committee**
Report date:	**February 10, 2016**

COMMUNITY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

On February 9, 2016, the Assiniboia Community Committee concurred in the recommendation of the Winnipeg Public Service and recommended to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage and Downtown Development:

1. That the subdivision and rezoning under File DASZ 33/2015 be rejected.

The Assiniboia Community Committee provided the following supporting reason for its recommendation:

1. Concur with the recommendations of the Planner's report.

PUBLIC HEARING SUMMARY

File:	DASZ 33/2015
Before:	Assiniboia Community Committee Councillor Gillingham, Chairperson Councillor Dobson Councillor Morantz
Public Hearing:	February 9, 2016 December 1, 2015 Council Building, 510 Main Street
Applicant:	GW Architecture Inc. (Bailey Wall)
Subject:	 **APPLICANT :** GW ARCHITECTURE INC. **FILE :** DASZ 33/15 **PROPOSAL :** An application for the approval of the plan of subdivision shown outlined above as may be determined by Council and for a proposed zoning change to By-law No. 200/2006 by rezoning the land shown outlined above from an "R1-L" RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY (LARGE) DISTRICT to an "RMF-S" RESIDENTIAL MULTI-FAMILY (SMALL) DISTRICT to allow for the construction of a multi-family dwelling. **For information, phone Mr. D. Clark, Planner, at 204-986-5684.**

Premises Affected: 4820 Roblin Boulevard and 521 Dieppe Road

Exhibits Filed:

1. Application dated September 25, 2015
2. Notification of Public Hearing October 14, 2015
3. Status of Titles 2335103/1 and 2635330/1

4a. Letter of authorization dated February 28, 2015 from Warren Thompson, Dorothy Tjaden, Margaret White and Doreen Barton to GW Architecture Inc. and/or Bill Palmer for 4820 Roblin Boulevard

4b. Letter of authorization dated March 20, 2015 from Rosaline Kozak to GW Architecture Inc. and/or Bill Palmer for 521 Dieppe Road

5. Surveyor's Building Location Certificate and sketch dated August 12, 2015

6a. Caveat 3702318

6b. Caveat 3702319

7. Plans (6 pages)
8. Communication dated November 13, 2015 from Mariana Zambrzycka, in opposition to the application
9. Communication dated November 16, 2015 from David D. McComber, in opposition to the application
10. Communication dated November 16, 2015 from Maureen Miller, in opposition to the application
11. Communications dated November 16, 2015 from Carol A. and Dale L. Coulson, in opposition to the application
12. Communication dated November 17, 2015 from Marcelo Speranza, in opposition to the application
13. Communication dated November 15, 2015 from William and Marie-Alice Grassick, in opposition to the application
14. Communication received November 18, 2015 from Marie-Alice Grassick, in opposition to the application
15. Communication received November 18, 2015 from William G. Grassick, in opposition to the application
16. Communication received November 18, 2015 from Ethel Ann Page, in opposition to the application
17. Communication dated November 17, 2015 from Wayne Lucas, in opposition to the application
18. Communication dated November 17, 2015 from Cindy Castillo, in opposition to the application
19. Communication dated November 18, 2015 from Allan Robbins and Dorothy Robbins, in opposition to the application

20. Communication dated November 18, 2015 from Gary Fee, in opposition to the application
21. Communication dated November 18, 2015 from Joel Masniuk, in opposition to the application
22. Communication dated November 19, 2015 from Steini Hibbert, in opposition to the application
23. Communication received November 20, 2015 from Bill Wallace, in opposition to the application
24. Communication received November 20, 2015 from Deborah Wallace, in opposition to the application
25. Communications dated November 20, 2015 from Nick Masniuk, in opposition to the application
26. Communication dated November 21, 2015 from Jennifer and Dave Mikolajek, in opposition to the application
27. Communication dated November 21, 2015 from Adrienne and Richard Marion, in opposition to the application
28. Communication dated November 21, 2015 from Norma Lucas, in opposition to the application
29. Communication dated November 21, 2015 from Ross Taylor, in opposition to the application
30. Communication dated November 22, 2015 from Rod Brown, Doreen Brown, David Mullins and Allison Mullins, in opposition to the application
31. Communication dated November 22, 2015 from Laurie L. Lywak, in opposition to the application
32. Communication dated November 22, 2015 from Brian R. Parker, in opposition to the application
33. Communication dated November 23, 2015 from Diego Zabalegui, in opposition to the application
34. Communication received November 23, 2015 from Mario Ali, in opposition to the application
35. Communication dated November 20, 2015 from Bruce Hembroff, in opposition to the application
36. Communication dated November 22, 2015 from Steini Hibbert, in opposition to the application
37. Communication dated November 23, 2015 from Dean and Debra Keating, in opposition to the application
38. Communication dated November 23, 2015 from Greg Lalier and Crystal Norman, in opposition to the application
39. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Clive Russell, in opposition to the application
40. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Gail Hibbert, in opposition to the application
41. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Colin Nichols and Candace Ellis, in opposition to the application

42. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Jessie Thiessen, in opposition to the application
43. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Jennifer Stebner, in opposition to the application
44. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Beverly Ross and Gary Ross, in opposition to the application
45. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Joan Hibbert, in opposition to the application
46. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Dean Law and Kelley Law, in opposition to the application
47. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Tom Evans, in opposition to the application
48. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Bill and Gloria Rehaluk, in opposition to the application
49. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Cheryl Antonick, in opposition to the application
50. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Janet Bodner, in opposition to the application
51. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Jennifer Petrie, in opposition to the application
52. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Stella Hyska, in opposition to the application
53. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Lisa Bednar, in opposition to the application
54. Communication received November 25, 2015 from Cindy Sperber, in opposition to the application
55. Communication dated November 25, 2015 from Lee Davis, in opposition to the application
56. Communication dated November 25, 2015 from Ariel Brillon and Maria Brillon, in opposition to the application
57. Communication dated November 25, 2015 from Darlene and Terry Boettcher, in opposition to the application
58. Report from the Urban Planning Division dated November 24, 2015
59. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Rodney Coutu, in opposition to the application
60. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Helena Walczak, in opposition to the application
61. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Cathryn Zambrzycka, in opposition to the application
62. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Marianna Zambrzycka, in opposition to the application
63. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Kamil Zambrzycki, in opposition to the application
64. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Kevin Nichols, in opposition to the application

65. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Rebecca L. Scott, in opposition to the application
66. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Cheryl Erickson, in opposition to the application
67. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Kim Hewlett, in opposition to the application
68. Communication received November 26, 2015 from J. Bruce Hembroff, in opposition to the application
69. Communication received November 26, 2015 from F. Clearwater, in opposition to the application
70. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Gary Carson, in opposition to the application
71. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Jacki Leafloor, in opposition to the application
72. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Mabel Huynh, in opposition to the application
73. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Beverly Ross and Gary Ross, in opposition to the application
74. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Andrzej Walczak
75. Petition in opposition to the application purporting to contain the signatures of 145 area residents, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
76. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Helen Whitney, in opposition to the application
77. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Joan Cormie, in opposition to the application
78. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Don Trueman, in opposition to the application
79. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Elaine Reid and Gavin Reid, in opposition to the application
80. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Mary L. Tomlinson, in opposition to the application

81. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Henry and Mary Sawatzky, in opposition to the application
82. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Jeff Smithson, in opposition to the application
83. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Patti Campbell, in opposition to the application
84. Communication received November 26, 2015 from Elizabeth Dow, in opposition to the application
85. Communication dated November 26, 2015 from David Nichols, in opposition to the application
86. Communication dated November 26, 2015 from Gavin and Elaine Reid, in opposition to the application
87. Communication dated November 26, 2015 from Penny Masniuk, in opposition to the application
88. Communication dated November 26, 2015 from Rob Everitt, in opposition to the application
89. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from B. Nowicki in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
90. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from Dorothy A. Tjaden in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
91. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from Eric Sperry in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
92. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from Danny and Karen Mowat in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
93. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from Kayla Mowat in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
94. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from Linda Kozak in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
95. Communication dated November 26, 2015, from Patricia Shaw in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
96. Communication dated November 26, 2015, from Philip Shaw in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
97. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from Dave Morris in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer

98. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from L. Sorenson in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
99. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from Shauna Sperry in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
100. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from Carleigh Lavallee in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
101. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from Janet and James Finlayson in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
102. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from John Callum in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
103. Communication dated November 20, 2015, from Margaret Gibson in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
104. Communication dated November 20, 2015, from Gordon Gibson in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
105. Communication dated November 23, 2015, from Janet Belluk in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
106. Communication dated November 23, 2015, from Linda Moffat in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
107. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from Nancy Morris in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
108. Communication dated November 20, 2015, from David Barton in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
109. Communication dated November 23, 2015, from Kendra Belluk in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
110. Communication dated November 23, 2015, from T. J. Belluk in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
111. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from Adam Sperry in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer

112. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from Rosaline Kozak in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
113. Communication dated November 25, 2015, from Eleanor Trimble in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
114. Communication dated November 25, 2015, from Bill Trimble in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
115. Communication dated November 23, 2015, from Jim and Irene Haddow in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
116. Communication dated November 23, 2015, from Neil McMillan in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
117. Communication dated November 23, 2015, from Clifford C. P. Hardy in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
118. Communication dated November 25, 2015, from Carol Leroux in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
119. Communication dated November 16, 2015, from Thelma McEvoy in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
120. Communication dated November 15, 2015, from Eddy Wazney in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
121. Communication dated November 15, 2015, from Diane Webb in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
122. Communication dated November 16, 2015, from Geoffrey Pregnall in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
123. Communication dated November 16, 2015, from Janis Pregnall in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
124. Communication dated November 13, 2015, from Ron Kaletzke in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
125. Communication dated November 13, 2015, from Elaine Kaletzke in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer

126. Communication dated November 13, 2015, from Jim Sanders in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
127. Communication dated November 13, 2015, from Lee-Anna Sanders in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
128. Communication dated November 13, 2015, from Maxine Beatty in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
129. Communication dated November 13, 2015, from Mary Buchanan in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
130. Communication dated November 13, 2015, from Grant Buchanan in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
131. Communication dated November 15, 2015, from Philip Gies in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
132. Communication dated November 15, 2015, from Heather Gies in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
133. Communication dated November 13, 2015, from Shirley Waterman in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
134. Communication dated November 13, 2015, from Harvey Waterman in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
135. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from Tom Nowicki in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
136. Communication dated November 16, 2015, from Craig G. McLean in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
137. Communication dated November 16, 2015, from Sheila McLean in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
138. Communication dated November 12, 2015, from Sharon Zarychanski in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
139. Communication dated November 12, 2015, from Lawrence Zarychanski in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer

140. Communication dated November 16, 2015, from Robert Godkin in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
141. Communication dated November 16, 2015, from Shirley Godkin in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
142. Communication dated November 16, 2015, from Janice Dillabough in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
143. Communication dated November 16, 2015, from Sid Dillaboughin in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
144. Communication dated November 18, 2015, from Tony van Rosmalen in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
145. Communication dated November 18, 2015, from Rosemary van Rosmalen in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
146. Communication dated November 20, 2015, from Bill Palmer in support of the application
147. Communication dated November 20, 2015, from Judy Palmer in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
148. Communication dated November 19, 2015, from R. O. Young in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
149. Communication dated November 19, 2015, from Mary Ellen Young in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
150. Communication dated November 18, 2015, from Marlene Tjaden in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
151. Communication dated November 15, 2015, from Diane Rankin in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
152. Communication dated November 15, 2015, from Les Rankin in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
153. Communication dated November 18, 2015, from D. Gail Reid in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer

154. Communication received November 27, 2015, from Andrew Angus in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
155. Communication received November 27, 2015, from Caroline Angus in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
156. Communication dated November 12, 2015, from Grace Gillespie in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
157. Communication dated November 22, 2015, from William J. Gillespie in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
158. Communication dated November 20, 2015, from Jacqueline Bannatyne in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
159. Communication dated November 33, 2015, from Allan and Lily Richardson in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
160. Communication dated November 21, 2015, from Harold Dodds in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
161. Communication dated November 23, 2015, from Doug Moffat in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
162. Communication dated November 22, 2015, from Ricardo Burbano in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
163. Communication dated November 17, 2015, from Jennifer Burbano McFee in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
164. Communication dated November 17, 2015, from Darlene McFee in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
165. Communication dated November 17, 2015, from Harry McFee in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
166. Communication dated November 20, 2015, from Doreen Barton in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
167. Communication dated November 25, 2015, from Mark Soltys in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer

168. Communication dated November 21, 2015, from Duncan and Jean Marrese in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
169. Communication dated November 23, 2015, from Jeffrey McLennan in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
170. Communication dated November 19, 2015, from Louise Fedorchuk in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
171. Communication dated November 20, 2015, from Stan Fedorchuk in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
172. Communication dated November 25, 2015, from Patricia S. Glen in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
173. Communication dated November 25, 2015, from David Glen in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
174. Communication dated November 25, 2015, from Rev. Dr. Michael I. Wilson, Charleswood United Church, in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
175. Communication dated November 18, 2015, from Marnie Manerch in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
176. Communication dated November 26, 2015, from Russell Jeffrey in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
177. Communication dated November 24, 2015, from Nancy Jeffrey in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
178. Communication dated November 24, 2015, from Nikki Palmer Jones in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
179. Communication dated November 23, 2015, from Herb and Shirley Schellenberg in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
180. Communication dated November 23, 2015, from Estelle Rivard in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
181. Communication dated November 23, 2015, from Grace Chudyk in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer

182. Communication dated November 23, 2015, from Lou Girard in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
183. Communication dated November 24, 2015, from Joanne Brennan in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
184. Communication dated November 23, 2015, from Bill and Diane Loxton in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
185. Communication dated November 25, 2015, from Tim McIsaac in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
186. Communication dated November 24, 2015, from Heather McIsaac in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
187. Communication dated November 11, 2015, from Maralice Blagden in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
188. Communication dated November 25, 2015, from Betty McMillan in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
189. Communication dated November 26, 2015, from Claude Lemay in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
190. Communication dated November 26, 2015, from Marilyn Lemay in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
191. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from Jack and Heather Carmichael in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
192. Communication dated November 17, 2015, from Marjorie Wright in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
193. Communication dated November 2, 2015, from Liela Goods in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
194. Petition in support of the application purporting to contain the signatures of 177 area residents, submitted by Bill Palmer
195. Communication dated November 27, 2015 from Greg, Eunice and Stuart Samuels, in opposition to the application

196. Communication dated November 27, 2015 from Ian and Jennifer Lucas, in opposition to the application
197. Petition in support of the application, originally submitted in January 2014, purporting to contain the signatures of 1,485 area residents, submitted by Bill Palmer
198. Inspection Report
199. Communication received November 30, 2015, from Shelley Bates, in opposition to the application
200. Communication dated November 30, 2015, from Marcelo Speranza, in opposition to the application
201. Communication dated November 30, 2015, from Christine Mikolajek, in opposition to the application
202. Audio Recording of public hearing held on December 1, 2015
203. Notice of Adjournment dated December 3, 2015
204. Communication received December 2, 2015, from Alexa Richardson, in opposition to the application
205. Communication dated November 30, 2015, from I. Mikawoz, in opposition to the application
206. Communication dated January 17, 2016 from Deanne Coombs in opposition to the application
207. Communication dated January 20, 2016 from Barb Cannons in opposition to the application
208. Communication dated January 24, 2016 from Barbara Fee in opposition to the application
209. Communication dated January 16, 2016 from Ethel Ann Page in opposition to the application
210. Communication dated January 16, 2016 from Emile & Freda Psooy in opposition to the application
211. Communication dated January 16, 2016 from Gordon Cherepak in opposition to the application
212. Communication dated January 17, 2016 from Jeff Lammi in opposition to the application
213. Communication dated January 24, 2016 from Jim and Barb Cannons in opposition to the application
214. Communication dated January 30, 2016 from Kevin Saranchuk in opposition to the application
215. Communication dated January 23, 2016 from Marcelo Speranza in opposition to the application

216. Communication dated January 2, 2016 from Fran Taylor, in opposition to the application
217. Communication dated January 17, 2016 from Robyn Bonnell and Andrew Musgrove, in opposition to the application
218. Communication dated January 16, 2016 from Wendy Josephson, in opposition to the application
219. Communication dated January 16, 2016 from William and Marie-Alice Grassick in opposition to the application
220. Communication dated February 1, 2016 from Lynn Otter, in opposition to the application
221. Communication dated February 2, 2016 from Tyler and Jessie Thiessen, in opposition to the application
222. Communication dated February 3, 2016 from Joan and Ken Jarvie, in opposition to the application
223. Communication undated from Jason Su, in opposition to the application, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
224. Communication undated from Anh Phan, in opposition to the application, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
225. Communication undated from Alison Sommerfield, in opposition to the application, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
226. Communication undated from Geoff Menec, in opposition to the application, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
227. Communication undated from Deanne Coombs, in opposition to the application, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
228. Communication undated from Steven Noton, in opposition to the application, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
229. Petition in opposition to the application, submitted on February 4, 2016, purporting to contain the signatures of 34 area residents, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
230. Petition in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, purporting to contain the signatures of 640 area residents, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
231. Communication undated from Don Trueman in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
232. Communication from Sharon Starr in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons

233. Communication from Grant and Deb Haysman in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
234. Communication from Don Erickson in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
235. Communication from Teri Neault in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
236. Communication from Susie Erickson in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
237. Communication from Carl Erickson in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
238. Communication from Dan Erickson in opposition to the application originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
239. Communication from L. Erickson in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
240. Communication from Heather Proveda in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
241. Communication from Tim Proveda in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
242. Communication from Karina Noonan in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
243. Communication from Chris Noonan in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
244. Communication from Derek Dupley in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
245. Communication from Kirsten Dupley in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
246. Communication from Scott Carley in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
247. Communication from Ian Lucas in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons

248. Communication undated from Janet Ali in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
249. Communication undated from Abe Friesen in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
250. Communication undated from Jeff Lammi in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
251. Communication undated from Wally Sliboda in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
252. Communication undated from Javier and Cindy Castillo in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
253. Communication from Walter Maksymowycz in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
254. Communication undated from Geraldine Haufschild in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
255. Communication undated from Ilona Oelkers in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
256. Communication undated from Rebecca Scott in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
257. Communication undated from Cheryl Erickson in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
258. Communication undated from Jan Murowski in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
259. Communication undated from Milton Graham in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
260. Communication undated from Lawrence Murowski in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
261. Communication undated from Michelle Miller in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
262. Communication undated from Grant Shiel in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons

263. Communication undated from Bill Sutton in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
264. Communication undated from William Sutton in opposition to the application, originally submitted in January 2014, submitted by Jim and Barbara Cannons
265. Revised Report from the Planning and Land Use Division dated February 2, 2016
266. Communication dated February 4, 2016 from Karen Brett in opposition to the application
267. Communication dated February 4, 2016 from Chris Stranc in opposition to the application
268. Petition in support of the application, submitted on February 4, 2016, purporting to contain the signatures of 146 area residents, submitted by Bill Palmer
269. Communication dated February 2, 2016 from Bruce Macdonald in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
270. Communication dated January 18, 2016 from Henry Dyck in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
271. Communication dated February 2, 2016 from Patricia E. Macdonald in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
272. Communication dated February 3, 2016 from Karen Hayden in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
273. Communication dated November 25, 2015 from Mark Soltys in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
274. Communication dated November 23, 2015 from Herb and Shirley Schellenberg in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
275. Communication dated November 23, 2015 from Jim and Irene Haddow in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
276. Communication undated from Dennis Funk in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
277. Communication undated Marilyn J. Funk in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
278. Communication dated November 26, 2015 from Patricia Shaw in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
279. Communication dated November 26, 2015 from Philip Shaw in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer

280. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from Ivan J. Speidel in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
281. Communication dated November 24, 2015 from C. Joan Speidel in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
282. Communication dated November 25, 2015 from Marj Crawford in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
283. Communication dated November 25, 2015 from Lisa Senebald in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
284. Communication dated November 25, 2015 from Jeff Senebald in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
285. Communication dated November 25, 2015 from Nicholas Yacheson in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
286. Communication dated November 25, 2015 from Nadine Yacheson in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
287. Communication dated November 2, 2015 from Roy Lawson Allen and Melba Marion Allen in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
288. Communication dated November 2, 2015 from Ron Johnson in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
289. Communication dated December 5, 2015 from Claude and Elaine Lambkin in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
290. Communication dated November 2, 2015 from Brian and Judy Senebald in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
291. Communication dated January 4, 2016 from Les Johnson in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
292. Communication dated January 5, 2016 from Tracy Johnson in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
293. Communication dated November 2, 2015 from Geri Shippam in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
294. Communication dated January 20, 2016 from Donna Davis in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
295. Communication dated January 20, 2016 from George Davis in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
296. Communication dated November 2, 2015 from Peter Ecker in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer

297. Communication dated November 18, 2015 from Peg White in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
298. Communication dated November 2, 2015 from Brian Langtry in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
299. Communication dated November 2, 2015 from Stan and Kathy Rybuck in support of the application, submitted by Bill Palmer
300. Petition in opposition to the application purporting to contain the signatures of 27 area residents, submitted by Jim Cannons
301. Communication dated February 6, 2016 from Jim Antonick in opposition to the application
302. Communication dated February 6, 2016 from Pat Antonick in opposition to the application
303. Power Point Presentation titled "DASZ 33/15 Commentary" dated February 9, 2015, submitted by Eric Jensen on behalf of Fred Douglas Society, in opposition to the application
304. Communication dated January 12, 2016 from Grand Lodge of Manitoba with respect to the application, submitted by Wayne Lucas at the public hearing
305. Petition in opposition to the application purporting to contain the signatures of 435 area residents, submitted by Norma Lucas at the public hearing
306. Presentation undated in opposition to the application submitted by Colin Nichols at the public hearing
307. Presentation dated February 9, 2016 titled "Community Committee Presentation" submitted by Barb Cannons at the public hearing
308. Presentation dated February 9, 2016 titled "Community Committee Presentation" submitted by Jim Cannons at the public hearing
309. Presentation undated from Joel Masniuk in opposition to the application, submitted by Candace Ellis at the public hearing
310. Presentation undated from Gail Hibbert in opposition to the application, submitted at the public hearing
311. Presentation undated from Steini Hibbert in opposition to the application, submitted at the public hearing

REPRESENTATIONS:

In Support:

Roy Lawson Allen
Melba Marion Allen
Andrew Angus
Caroline Angus
Geoff Archambault
Regan Archambault
Jacqueline Bannatyne
David Barton
DoreenBarton
Maxine Beatty
Janet Belluk
Kendra Belluk
T.J. Belluk
Maralice Blagden
Joanne Brennan
Grant Buchanan
Mary Buchanan
Ricardo Burbano
John E. Callum
Sheenagh Campbell
Heather Carmichael
Jack Carmichael
Grace Chudyk
Joshua Cummings
Marj Crawford
Donna Davis
George Davis
Janice Dillabough
Sid Dillabough
Harold Dodds
Henry Dyck
Peter Ecker
Louise Fedorchuk
Stan Fedorchuk
James Finlayson
Janet Finlayson
Marilyn J. Funk
Dennis Funk
Giovanni Geremia
Gordon Gibson
Margaret Gibson
Heather Gies

Philip Gies
Grace Gillespie
William J. Gillespie
Louis Girard
David Glen
Patricia S. Glen
Robert Godkin
Shirley Godkin
Jack Goods
Leila Goods
Sharon Gordon
Irene Haddow
Jim Haddow
George Hagyard
Gwen Hagyard
Janice Hamilton
Larry Hamilton
Bill W. Hanysh
Linda Hanysh
Clifford C.Hartmier
James Houston
Karen Hayden
Clifford C.P. Hardy
Nancy Jeffrey
Russell Jeffrey
Ron Johnson
Tracy Johnson
Les Johnson
Nikki Palmer Jones
Elaine Kaletzke
Ron Kaletzke
Linda Kozak
Rosaline Kozak
Claude Lambkin
Elaine Lambkin
Brian Langtry
Carleigh Lavallee
Claude Lemay
Marilyn Lemay
Carol Leroux
Bill Loxton
Diane Loxton
Bruce Macdonald
Patricia E. Macdonald
Marnie Manerch
Duncan Marrese

Jean Marrese
Thelma McEvoy
Darlene McFee
Harry McFee
Jennifer Burbano McFee
Heather McIsaac
Tim McIsaac
Craig G. McLean
Sheila McLean
Andy McLennan
Jeffrey McLennan
Betty McMillan
Neil McMillan
James Melvin
Doug Moffat
Linda Moffat
Dave Morris
Nancy Morris
Danny Mowat
Karen Mowat
Kayla Mowat
Shane Neufeld
B. Nowicki
Tom Nowicki
Bill Palmer
Judy Palmer
Bajnath Permanand
Marlene Pemanand
Geoffrey Pregnall
Janis Pregnall
Robert S. reston
Diane Rankin
Les Rankin
D. Gail Reid
Blaine Repko
Allan Richardson
Lily Richardson
Estelle Rivard
Susan Rogers
Kathy Rybuck
Stan Rybuck
Jim Sanders
Lee-Anna Sanders
Gordon D. Saunders
Herb Schellenberg
Shirley Schellenberg

Brian Senebald
Judy Senebald
Jeff Senebald
Lisa Senebald
Patricia Shaw
Philip Shaw
Stephen Shaw
Geri Shippam
Mark Soltys
L. Sorenson
C. Joan Speidel
Ivan J. Speidel
Adam Sperry
Eric Sperry
Shauna Sperry
Dorothy A. Tjaden
Marlene Tjaden
Bill Trimble
Eleanor Trimble
John Trimble
William Trimble
Len van Roon
Rosemary van Rosmalen
Tony van Rosmalen
Bailey Wall, on behalf of GW Architecture Inc.
Harvey Waterman
Shirley Waterman
Eddy Wazney
Diane Webb
Peg White
Rev. Michael I. Wilson
Burghard Wohlers
Gloria Wohlers
Marjorie Wright
Meaghan Wylie
Nadine Yacheson
Nicholas Yacheson
Mary Ellen Young
R.O. Young
Lawrence Zarychanski
Sharon Zarychanski

In Opposition:

Mario Ali
Janet Ali
Cheryl Antonick
Jim Antonick
Pat Antonick
Shelley Bates
Lisa Bednar
Janet Bodner
Darlene Boettcher
Terry Boettcher
Robyn Bonnell
Craig Brett
Karen Brett
Ariel Brillon
Maria Brillon
Doreen Brown
Rod Brown
Patti Campbell
Barbara Cannons
Jim Cannons
Scott Carley
Gary Carson
Cindy Castillo
Francisco Javier Castillo
F. Roman Castillo
Gordon Cherepak
F. Clearwater
Deanne Coombs
Joan Cormie
Carol A. Coulson
Dale L. Coulson
Rodney Coutu
Lee Davis
Derek Dupley
Kirsten Dupley
Elizabeth Dow
Candace Ellis
L. Erickson
Carl Erickson
Cheryl Erickson
Don Erickson
Dan Erickson
Susie Erickson
Tom Evans
Rob Everitt
Barbara Fee

Gary Fee
Natalie Fee
Carol Force
Betty-Anne Fred
Thomas Fred
Abe Friesen
Milton Graham
Marie-Alice Grassick
William Grassick
Geraldine Haufschild
Grant Haysman
Deb Haysman
Bruce Hembroff
J. Bruce Hembroff
Kim Hewlett
Gail Hibbert
Joan Hibbert
Steini Hibbert
Mabel Huynh
Stella Hyska
Joan Jarvie
Ken Jarvie
Eric Jensen
Janet E. Johnson
William Johnson
Wendy Josephson
Dean Keating
Debra Keating
Jenepher Kell
Carina Kirk
Dale Kirk
Greg Lalier
Jeff Lammi
Dean Law
Kelley Law
Jacki Leafloor
Ian Lucas
Jennifer Lucas
Norma Lucas
Wayne Lucas
Laurie L. Lywak
Heather MacKenzie
Walter Maksymowycz
Adrienne Marion
Richard Marion
Joel Masniuk

Nick Masniuk
Penny Masniuk
David D. McComber
Geoff Menec
I. Mikawoz
Christine Mikolajek
Dave Mikolajek
Jennifer B. Mikolajek
Maureen Miller
Michelle Miller
Allison Mullins
David Mullins
Jan Murowski
Lawrence Murowski
Andrew Musgrove
Teri Neault
Colin Nichols
David Nichols
Kevin Nichols
Chris Noonan
Karina Noonan
Crystal Norman
Steven Noton
Ilona Oelkers
Lynn Otter
Ethel Ann Page
Brian R. Parker
Jennifer Petrie
Anh Phan
Tim Proveda
Heather Proveda
Emile Psooy
Freda Psooy
Bill Rehaluk
Gloria Rehaluk
Elaine Reid
Gavin Reid
Alexa Richardson
Allan Robbins
Dorothy Robbins
Beverly Ross
Gary Ross
Clive Russell
Eunice Samuels
Greg Samuels
Scott Samuels

Stuart Samuels
Kevin Saranchuk
Henry Sawatzky
Mary Sawatzky
Rebecca L. Scott
Grant Shiel
Wally Sliboda
Jeff Smithson
Alison Sommerfield
Marcelo Speranza
Cindy Sperber
Sharon Starr
Jennifer Stebner
Chris Stranc
Jason Su
Bill Sutton
William Sutton
Fran Taylor
Ross Taylor
Jessie Thiessen
Tyler Thiessen
Mary L. Tomlinson
Deanna Trueman
Don Trueman
Andrzej Walczak
Helena Walczak
Bill Wallace
Deborah Wallace
Helen Whitney
Diego Zabalegui
Cathryn Zambrzycka
Marianna Zambrzycka
Kamil Zambrzycki

For Information:

Lynn Greaves

For the City:

Mr. D. Clark, Planner, Urban Planning Division, Planning, Property and Development Department
Mr. L. Escobar, Manager of Transportation, Public Works Department

Exhibit “265” referred to in File DASZ 33/2015

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Title: DASZ 33/2015 – 4820 Roblin Boulevard - REVISED

Issue: An application for consideration at the Assiniboia Community Committee public hearing to subdivide 3.75 acres of land into two lots and rezone one of the lots to the Residential Multi-Family – Small zoning district to allow for the construction of a 65 unit multiple family residential dwelling.

Critical Path: Assiniboia Community Committee – Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development – Executive Policy Committee – Council as per the *Development Procedures By-law* and *The City of Winnipeg Charter*.

AUTHORIZATION

Author	Department Head	CFO	CAO
B. Smith	N/A	N/A	

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the subdivision and rezoning under File DASZ 33/2015 be rejected.

REASON FOR THE REPORT

- The applicant is proposing to subdivide an existing 3.75 acre parcel of land into two lots (Lot 1 proposed to be 1.27 acres and Lot 2 proposed to be 2.48 acres), and rezone Lot 2 from the “R1-L” Residential Single-Family – Large district to “RMF-S” Residential Multi-Family Small district.
- The applicant is proposing to develop a 65 unit life lease multi-family residential structure on the site.
- The Urban Planning Division recommended an adjournment from the December 1st Assiniboia Community Committee hearing to the February 9th hearing in order to allow the applicants some time to address recommended design changes. While efforts have been made to address the recommended design changes, the Urban Planning Division is of the opinion that the proposal as designed is not supportable.

- Subdivisions and rezonings require a Public Hearing as per the *Development Procedures By-law* and *The City of Winnipeg Charter.*
- The Report is being submitted for the Committee's consideration of the development application at the Public Hearing.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

- If the recommendations of the Urban Planning Division are concurred in, the application to subdivide and rezone the land will be rejected.

HISTORY

1998 DASZ 14/1998

- In 1998, the City of Winnipeg received a subdivision and rezoning application to develop a three-storey, 82 unit multi-family development on the subject property. The application required a rezoning from "R1-6" Residential Single Family district to a "RM-2" Multi-Family district.
- This application was withdrawn before proceeding to a public hearing. The applicant, in a letter to the City of Winnipeg Land Development Branch, wrote that the costs of providing land drainage services to the site made the development economically unviable.
- This application was to be heard in concurrence with a Conditional Use (DCU 141/98D) to permit the maintenance of a church use with a reduced lot area.

September 2003 - DASZ 18/2003

- On September 4, 2003, Council approved a subdivision and rezoning south of the subject property to create four additional building lots along Polaris Av.

October 2006 – DASSF 542/2007

- This Short Form Subdivision was approved allowing the creation of a single-family lot fronting onto Dieppe Road. The Public Service recommended that the applicant amend its plan to delineate the easterly 40 feet of proposed Lot 1 for future street purposes,
- In light of that recommendation a key condition was added to the approvals in acknowledgement of the conceptual Dieppe / Polaris 'shadow plan' for the area.
    - *3. The Developer shall, upon demand by the City, transfer to the City for $1.00 the most easterly 40 feet in width of proposed Lot 1 if and when required for street purposes.*

May 2008 – DCU 110366/2008C

- This Conditional Use application allowed the expansion of the existing Charleswood United Church by the construction of the parish hall addition.

February 2012 – Pre-application 11-166783

- A Pre-application for a 4 storey, 65 unit multi-family development including 205 total parking stalls with access from Polaris Street.
- Key comments received and forwarded to the applicant were;
    - Public Works – '…allow for the future extension of Polaris…'
    - Wpg. Fire Department – '…require fire lanes and fire hydrants to the satisfaction of the Fire Chief.'
    - Parks – 'cash in lieu of land dedication.'
    - City Naturalist – '…relatively good quality oak forest…Salvage of some existing plant material prior to construction should be considered.'
    - Water & Waste – 'developer responsible for system upgrading and costs.'
    - Land Development – 'The costs of servicing this development will have to be borne entirely by the developer.'

January 7, 2014 – DASZ 43/2013

- An application to subdivide the land into two lots and rezone Lot 2 to the "RMF-S" Residential Multi-Family – Small zoning district.
- The Assiniboia Community Committee did not concur in the recommendation of the Winnipeg Public Service and recommended to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development that the application for subdivision and rezoning under File DASZ 43/2013, be rejected.

- Reasons for recommendation:

    1. The drainage, as well as water and waste issues, is not adequately addressed.
    2. The height of the building is not within character of the neighbourhood.
    3. Traffic issues have not been clearly reviewed or identified.
    4. The notion of a lodge as part of this project is out of character of the neighbourhood.
    5. Many questions and concerns have not been addressed.

January 22, 2014 – DASZ 43/2013

- DASZ 43/2013 was formally withdrawn by applicant at EPC.

December 1, 2015 – DASZ 33/2015

- The subject application (DASZ 33/2015) is adjourned by the Assiniboia Community Committee to the February 9th, 2016 Assiniboia Community Committee hearing.

CONSULTATION

In preparing this report there was consultation with:

- Water & Waste
- Winnipeg Emergency Services
- Public Works

SUBMITTED BY

Department	Planning, Property and Development
Division	Urban Planning
Prepared by:	Devin Clark
Date:	February 2, 2016
File No.	DASZ 33/2015

List of Schedules and Attachments

1. Appendix A — Planning Discussion
2. Schedule “A” — File No. DASZ 33/2015 Assiniboia Community Committee, dated February 2, 2016
3. Schedule “B” — Report of the Administrative Coordinating Group, dated November 20, 2015

APPENDIX 'A'

DATE: February 2, 2016

FILE: **DASZ 33/2015**
RELATED FILES: DAV 15-154696\D

COMMUNITY: Assiniboia
NEIGHBOURHOOD #: 2.614 (Eric Coy)

SUBJECT: To subdivide an existing 3.75 acre parcel of land into two lots (Lot 1 proposed to be 1.27 acres and Lot 2 proposed to be 2.48 acres), and rezone Lot 2 from the "R1-L" Residential Single-Family – Large district to "RMF-S" Residential Multi-Family Small district.

LOCATION: 4820 Roblin Blvd and 521 Dieppe Road.



APPLICANT: Bailey Wall GW Architecture
44, Princess St Unit 602
Winnipeg MB, R3B 1K2

OWNER(S): Rosaline Marie Kozak and Trustees of the Charleswood Congregation of the United Church of Canada

RECOMMENDATION: Rejection

SITE DESCRIPTION

- The subject property is located on the south side of Roblin Blvd., east of Dieppe Road. The property falls within the Eric Coy Neighbourhood of the Charleswood-Tuxedo-Whyte Ridge ward.
- Currently, the Charleswood United Church and an associated gravel surface parking lot are established on site.
- The subject property is approximately 3.75 acres in size and zoned as “R1-L” Residential Single Family – Large.
- Under the *Complete Communities Direction Strategy*, the subject site is located within the Areas of Stability – Recent Community Policy Area.



Figure 1: Aerial photograph showing approximate area of the Subject Lands (flown 2014)

SURROUNDING LAND USES AND ZONING (See Figure 2)

North: Roblin Blvd, then "R1-L" Residential Single-Family – Large.

South: Single Family Residential Dwellings zoned "R1-E" Residential Single-Family Estate.

East: Single Family Residential Dwellings zoned "R1-L" Residential Single-Family – Large then Buckingham Road

West: Single Family Residential Dwellings zoned "R1-L" Residential Single-Family – Large then Dieppe Road.



Figure 2: Zoning of the Subject Lands and surrounding area

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- The applicant is proposing to subdivide the existing 3.75 acres of land into two lots (Lot 1 proposed to be 1.27 acres and Lot 2 proposed to be 2.48 acres), and rezone Lot 2 from the "R1-L" Residential Single-Family – Large district to the "RMF-S" Residential Multi-Family Small district.
- The applicant is proposing to develop a multi-family residential building consisting of 65 units on Lot 2.

- The proposed building was initially planned to be 44 feet in height, measured to the midline of the gabled roof, consisting of three floors of residential units. Revisions to the plan now show that the building is to be 36 feet 9 inches in height, measured to the midline of the gabled roof, still with three floors of residential units.
- The length of the building running north-south is calculated at approximately 358 feet.
- The main floor is designed in two separate footprints; the 5,400 sq. ft. space, identified on submitted plans as multi-purpose and amenity area and the 25,500 sq. ft. area housing the main floor 18 units. The second and third floors each have a floor area of 33,900 sq. ft. Level 2 is proposed to have 23 units and level 3 is proposed to have 24 units.
- The submitted plans indicate that a total of 200 parking stalls will be provided on site (including 16 accessible stalls) for the church and multi-family residential building. The initial proposal was for 17 stalls located on the church lot and 183 stalls on the multifamily site. Revised plans now show that 28 stalls are to be located on the church lot and 172 stalls on the multifamily site.
- Access to the subject site is proposed via Dieppe Road.
- An associated Variance application (DAV 15-154696/D) has been applied for in concurrence with the subject subdivision and rezoning application.

ANALYSIS AND ISSUES

COMPLETE COMMUNITIES DIRECTION STRATEGY:

- Under the *Complete Communities Direction Strategy* the proposed development is within the Areas of Stability – Recent Communities policy area. With regard to this proposal, the key policies guiding the development of Areas of Stability include:
    - Support low to moderate change in low-density neighbourhoods through development and redevelopment that is complementary to the existing scale, character and built form.
    - Provide clarity and promote compatibility between existing developments and new developments through design and development standards, such as the creation of Infill Development Guidelines for Multiple-Family Developments in Low Density Neighbourhoods.
    - Promote the form of buildings and spaces that are sensitive to the community context and address the transition between new and existing developments.
    - Promote a quality public realm with a high level of accessibility to community services and amenities and opportunities for gathering and social interaction.
    - Encourage intensification to occur at centres and along corridors.
    - Focus housing growth to areas that have municipal service capacity to support intensification, in addition to commercial and recreational amenities.
    - Support Complete Communities by ensuring diverse and high quality housing stock.
    - In order to meet the full life-cycle of housing needs within the community, promote a mix of housing type and tenure, such as duplexes, low rise apartments, secondary suites, semi-detached homes, townhouses.

- Provide opportunities to increase multi-modal connectivity when redevelopment occurs.

- Infill development is discussed within the Recent Communities introduction under the *Complete Communities Direction Strategy,* that states*:*
    - Recent Communities can also accommodate some infill development to increase housing choice, increase options for 'aging in place', and to maximize the use of existing infrastructure.
    - In many cases, public transit service can be enhanced to better connect adjacent neighbourhoods. Additionally, there is an opportunity to create better pedestrian connections across arterial roads between neighbourhoods. Creating better connection through and between these neighbourhoods will help to make these neighbourhoods more complete over time.

SUBDIVISION

- The intent is to subdivide the land into two lots. Lot 1 would be established as the northernmost lot and Lot 2 would be established as the southernmost lot. Lot 1 is proposed to be established as a 1.27 acre lot where the existing church would be maintained. The property at 521 Dieppe Road is to be consolidated into proposed Lot 2, which would have a total lot area of 2.48 acres and is where the 65 unit multi-family dwelling is proposed.

REZONING

- The subject land is currently zoned "R1-L" Residential Single-Family Large.
- The applicant is proposing to rezone Lot 2 of the subject lands from "R1-L" Residential Single-Family Large to "RMF-S" Residential Multi-Family – Small.
- "RMF-S" Residential Multi-Family – Small dimensional standards are as follows:
    - a minimum front yard of 20 feet;
    - a minimum rear yard of 25 feet;
    - a minimum side yard of 4 feet and,
    - a maximum building height of 35 feet.
    - The minimum lot area is 9,000 square feet and the minimum lot area per dwelling unit is 1,250 square feet.
- Parking Requirements
    - Multi-family residential dwellings require 1.5 stalls per dwelling unit. Ten percent of the required parking spaces must be unassigned guest parking, designated as such, to the satisfaction of Director, and readily available to the entrance of the building served.

VARIANCES

- The project proponents have applied for five (5) variances to allow the project to be built as designed, (DAV 15-154696/D):

- 1) for the maintenance of a place of worship on Proposed Lot 1 to permit 17 parking stalls instead of 106 stalls. Since the initial application this has been revised to provide 28 stalls instead of the required 106 stalls.
- 2) on Proposed Lot 2:
  - a) for the construction of a multi-family dwelling to permit a height of 44 feet (13.41 metres) instead of 35 feet (10.67 metres). Since the initial application this has been revised to a 36 foot 9 inch tall building.
  - b) for the construction of a fence to permit a height in the front yard of 6 feet (1.83 m) instead of 4 feet (1.22 m);
  - c) for the establishment of an accessory parking area to permit as follows:
    - i) a front yard of 12.5 feet (3.81 metres) instead of 26 feet (7.92 metres). This has been revised to a 28 foot front yard setback
    - ii) no north side yard instead of 4 feet (1.22 metres)
    - iii) a fence buffering an abutting residential district having a continuous horizontal length of greater than 48 feet (14.63 metres) instead of 48 feet (14.63 metres) followed by a landscaped strip of 16 feet (4.88 metres).

- The variances listed above have been reviewed and discussed in detail within the Urban Planning Division report for the variance application under file DAV 15-154696/D.

COMPATIBILITY WITH THE SURROUNDING AREA

- When this proposed project was originally brought forward to the January 7, 2014 Assiniboia Community Committee Public Hearing, under file DASZ 43/2013, the Urban Planning Division assessed the merits of the project in terms of how it related to the policies within The *Complete Communities Direction Strategy*. Discussion points brought up in the public hearing by area residents provided additional information with regard to their perceptions of how the proposed project "fit" within the existing community context. Issues that were raised at that public hearing included:
  - Compatibility of the proposed multi-family use within the existing low density neighbourhood;
  - The effect of the proposed architectural massing of the building adjacent to single-family residential dwellings;
  - The impacts of the new traffic generated by the proposed 65 multi-family units and access from Dieppe Road to the site;
  - The effect on land drainage; and,
  - Operation and size of the proposed multi-purpose amenity space.
  - The loss of natural features and buffering
- Within *Areas of Stability*, *Complete Communities* tries to ensure that new development, within an infill setting, is sensitive to the local community context and addresses the transition between new and existing developments. As such, the Urban Planning Division has made efforts to help resolve or mitigate the issues that were addressed at the previous hearing and bring the needs and wants of both the area residents and the proponents closer into alignment. The following sections provide further discussion on

these issues and aims to clarify how the proposed development aligns within the community context.

Multi-family Dwellings in a Primarily Single Family Neighbourhood

The subject property falls within the Areas of Stability policy area of the '*Complete Communities Direction Strategy.'* Areas of Stability will accommodate low to moderate density infill development to support more efficient use of land, infrastructure and services as well as enhance housing choice and affordability.

- Policies in *Complete Communities* that broadly apply to site selection and encouraging a variety of housing types include:
    - Encourage intensification to occur at centres and along corridors.
    - Focus housing growth to areas that have municipal service capacity to support intensification, in addition to commercial and recreational amenities.
    - Support Complete Communities by ensuring diverse and high quality housing stock.
    - In order to meet the full life-cycle of housing needs within the community, promote a mix of housing type and tenure, such as duplexes, low rise apartments, secondary suites, semi-detached homes, townhouses.
    - Provide opportunities to increase multi-modal connectivity when redevelopment occurs.

- The Charleswood community is predominantly characterized as a low density, single-family residential neighbourhood. While this is the most typical form of housing in the area, there are examples of multi-family residential uses as well. Some of these examples that are in close proximity to the subject site include:
    - 5445 Roblin Blvd. – has 65 units on a lot that is 4.5 acres. The lot area per dwelling unit calculation is 3,015.7 square feet of lot per unit.
    - 10 Shelmerdine Drive – has 188 units on a property that is 13.4 acres. The lot area per dwelling unit calculation is 3,104.8 square feet of lot per unit.
    - 100-120 Scotswood Drive – Fronting directly onto Roblin Blvd. this development has 74 units on a lot that is approximately 2.87 acres in size. The lot area per dwelling unit calculation is 1,688 square feet of lot per unit.
    - 4314 Grant Avenue – Fronting directly onto Grant Ave., this development has 50 units on 3.405 acres (148,335 square feet). The lot area per dwelling unit is 2,966.7 square feet of lot per unit.
- By comparison, the proposed development at 4820 Roblin Blvd. would be 65 units on a lot that is 2.48 acres. The lot area per dwelling unit is calculated at 1,641 square feet. The proposed development would be the densest development in the neighbourhood if established; however, it would be relatively comparable to the development at 100-120 Scotswood Drive.

- What differentiates the existing developments from the proposed development is context and location. The existing developments are either established on lots that front directly onto the arterial corridor of Grant Avenue or Roblin Blvd., or they are established within an area that consists of primarily multi-family residential sites. Additionally, where these multi-family sites are adjacent to single family residential properties, there appear to be substantial setbacks, natural features used as buffers, and roadways or lanes separating the uses. For example, the development at 4314 Grant Avenue is established as a two storey building with a substantial amount of trees established around the property in areas adjacent to single family residential dwellings. An approximate 30-35 foot buffer is in place along the south property line where a number of mature trees visually separate the multi-family and single-family uses from one another.
- The current configuration of the proposed development on the subject property is at a disadvantage over these previously mentioned sites as it is bound on all four sides by single-family residential dwellings. This presents challenges in establishing a multi-family building that is compatible with single-family properties. The Urban Planning Division believes that in order to maintain the integrity of the area character, the preservation of and establishment of new trees and natural features is an essential minimum criterion that would help make a multi-family proposal more compatible with the surrounding single-family residential context. Thus, the recommendation was made in the previous report for the December 1st hearing to establish a 25 foot wide buffer around the perimeter of the subject property.
- Broadly speaking, multi-family residential development is encouraged in communities such as Charleswood, in accordance with policies outlined in *Complete Communities* as it can provide diverse and high quality housing stock; it helps meet the full life cycle of housing needs and provides opportunity to increase multi-modal connectivity when redevelopment occurs. Intensification along corridors is encouraged because, among other benefits, it promotes a form of development that improves walkability to amenities; improves access to transit as a means of transport; and, typically minimizes impacts on adjacent, lower density uses. That being said, the subject site is situated in a manner that presents design constraints and challenges when contemplating a multi-family residential dwelling.

Architectural Massing and Building Setbacks

- Policies in *Complete Communities* that are more site and building design related include:
    - Support low to moderate change in low-density neighbourhoods through development and redevelopment that is complementary to the existing scale, character and built form.
    - Provide clarity and promote compatibility between existing developments and new developments through design and development standards, such as the creation of Infill Development Guidelines for Multiple-Family Developments in Low Density Neighbourhoods.
    - Promote the form of buildings and spaces that are sensitive to the community context and address the transition between new and existing developments.
    - Promote a quality public realm with a high level of accessibility to community services and amenities and opportunities for gathering and social interaction.

- Design considerations were recommended in the previous report for the December 1st Community Committee hearing in order guide the form and scale of the development toward a more compatible design within the adjacent single-family context.
- One of the changes recommended to the applicant was reducing the building height. The proposed multi-family building height was originally proposed at 44 feet (measured to the midline of the slope on a pitched roof). Since the recommendation for adjournment, the 44 foot height has been brought down to 36 feet 9 inches. Without a pitched roof the building height would be established at 32 feet. According to the applicant the height reduction was accommodated by reducing the grade of slope on the roof and lowering the below surface parking area, which subsequently brought the building mass down.
- The reduced height is an improvement over the previous design and brings the proposal closer in line with the adjacent surrounding context in terms of height; however, concerns still remain with regard to the height of the west portion of the building adjacent to single family properties on Dieppe Road and the overall bulk massing of the structure.
- As mentioned in the previous planning report, the proposed multi-family building shows the primary massing of the building to be approximately 358 feet in length, running north-south on the site. The Urban Planning Division is of the opinion that a building of this length should either be physically broken up to establish smaller buildings, or that the design and façade should incorporate various articulations and setbacks, changes in colour and materials and include variations in height and roof pitches to create the sense that the massing is broken up into different buildings. Further, the Urban Planning Division had encouraged the designers to look at lower building heights in areas within the site that may have greater impacts on the adjacent single-family residential lots. Primarily this would include the portion of the building that is adjacent to the rear yards of the single-family dwellings on Dieppe Road.
- The architects have made efforts to incorporate design changes into the façade of the building, but have indicated that breaking up the massing physically into smaller buildings is not possible. Ultimately, the same building footprint is being proposed as the previous design that was considered in the December report.

Yard Setbacks

- Yard setbacks were recommended in the previous report as follows:
    - The Urban Planning Division recommends that a 25-foot setback be established along the perimeter of the property for all lot lines abutting single family residential properties on Dieppe Road and Roblin Blvd. This 25 foot setback is meant to ensure that adequate landscaping can be established around the property in a manner that will limit sight lines and noise as well as the potential for vehicle parking immediately adjacent to the single family dwellings on Dieppe Road and Roblin Blvd.
    - Along the west property line abutting the single-family residential dwellings on Dieppe Road, the Urban Planning Division recommends that a minimum 35-foot setback be established to any building. This setback could be reconsidered to a greater or lesser distance based on the height and scale of any portion of the building within close proximity to the adjacent single-family residential lots. The

Urban Planning Division encourages lower building heights if established in close proximity to the adjacent residential properties.

- A 40-foot yard setback is caveated along east property line, which is reserved for the potential future road construction through these lots. If a road were ever established through these lands then the 40-foot setback with landscaping buffer would be removed. Until then, this 40-foot setback would accommodate substantial landscaping to provide a visual buffer to the adjacent residences on Buckingham Road.

Implications of Recommended Yard Setback on Parking

- For multiple family dwellings the Zoning By-law requires 1.5 stalls per unit. Based on the proposed development for 65 units, 98 parking stalls are required.
- In the Zoning By-law a place of worship requires 1 stall for every 5 seats in the principal assembly area, but not less than 10 spaces. Based on this calculation the existing church requires 106 stalls. A total of 204 parking stalls are required between both uses.
- The revised site plans since the December 1st report shows the intent is to provide 28 stalls on the church site and 172 stalls on the multi-family site, for a total of 200 parking stalls. The previous plans showed that there would be 17 stalls on the church site and 187 stalls on the multi-family site. With either configuration the proposal is deficient by 4 parking stalls.
- Changes to the parking layout include:
    - Removal of 4 stalls near the approach at Dieppe Road. This sets the front yard setback to 28 feet and eliminates the variance that was applied for to allow a 12.5-foot front yard setback. The Urban Planning Division believes that it is important for the setbacks to be maintained in accordance with the Zoning By-law as it maintains front yard setbacks that are also consistent with adjacent single family residential properties.
    - Along the west property line that is adjacent to the rear yards of properties on Dieppe Road the applicants have removed 8 stalls and modified the length and width of the stalls to accommodate small car parking. In place of some of the stalls, bump-outs have been incorporated to accommodate more space for landscaping.
- The Urban Planning Division believes that the space along the west property line should be able to accommodate a more substantial landscaping buffer and as indicated in the previous report, a minimum 25-foot wide landscape buffer should be established along the entire west yard (inclusive of the north property line of 525 Dieppe Road). The Urban Planning Division maintains that in order to establish adequate buffering to the site from existing residential uses, a 25-foot wide landscape buffer should be established along the entire length of the west property line.
- The implication of this recommended buffer means that the proposed site layout would lose 20 parking stalls. The Urban Planning Division has not seen how site changes can be made to accommodate this landscape buffer as well as the necessary number of parking stalls and without having this information the Urban Planning Division is not in a position to recommend support for the associated variance to allow 28 stalls on the church property.

- The Urban Planning Division cannot support the proposal knowing the constraints of the development concept. This means that a variance for the church to provide 28 stalls instead of the required 106 stalls cannot be supported at this time. If a variance is not approved on the land with an associated subdivision, then the subdivision cannot proceed for approval as it would be establishing a non-conformity without variance approval of the Zoning By-law requirements.

Transportation

Vehicle Traffic Counts

- The City of Winnipeg Public Works Transportation Division Engineers have reviewed the proposed development of the 65 unit, 55 plus life lease multiple family project and have determined;
    - The proposal will generate approximately 224 new vehicle trips per day,
    - Of those trips there will be approximately 13 vehicle trips generated at the peak morning period and 16 trips generated at the peak evening period,
    - Dieppe Road functions as a Collector street due to the land use and because of the traffic signal at Roblin Blvd. Dieppe Road is expected to carry more traffic than typical residential streets.
    - Public Works does not expect traffic operating or safety concerns to result from the proposed development.
- The Public Works Department typically requests a transportation impact study whenever a proposed development will generate 100 or more new peak direction auto trips to or from the site during the adjacent roadway's peak hour or the development's peak hour (i.e. 100 new trips inbound/outbound) or due to localized safety or roadway/intersection capacity deficiencies. The proposed development is generating approximately 16 vehicle trips during the PM peak hour.

Transit

- Transit stops are located in close proximity to the subject site with regular servicing from four routes, including routes 65, 66, 67 and 79.
- Routes 65, 66 and 67 provide service to/from Downtown. Route 79 provides service to/from Polo Park mall.
- A new sidewalk along the east side of Dieppe leading from the subject site to Roblin Blvd. is a requirement in the Administrative Coordinating Group (ACG) report, which would be the developers obligation to pay for if the proposal was approved (see Schedule B). This sidewalk would improve pedestrian connectivity from the subject site to the nearby transit stops as well as existing commercial amenities and Charleswood Senior Centre located on Roblin Blvd.
- Generally, higher intensity land uses adjacent to arterial and collector streets with regular transit service may be supported as it encourages the opportunity to utilize various modes of transport, such as public transit.



Figure 3: Transit stops in relation to subject site.

Water, Land Drainage and Sewer Servicing

- Comments from the Water and Waste Department state that at this stage of the proposal, a detailed engineering analysis to assess servicing capacity for the development is not complete. A condition of the ACG report is the required submission of a comprehensive servicing report to be completed to Water and Waste's satisfaction, which will identify servicing upgrades that would be required for supporting the proposal. Water and Waste will not allow the development to proceed without water, wastewater and land drainage system upgrades that are necessary to adequately service the development and ensure the existing level of service in those system is maintained. The development agreement will then include the obligation to construct any necessary servicing upgrades for these purposes.

- The Urban Planning Division understands that land drainage sewer must be brought in from existing services at Harstone Road. As a result, significant costs are assumed to be associated with developing this land.

Multi-Purpose/Indoor Amenity Space

- The proposed development includes a 5,400 square foot multi-purpose room/indoor amenity space. Details on how this space is to be used were not clarified in advance of the December 1st Assiniboia Community Committee hearing and as such, the Urban Planning Division requested more details.
- Detailed plans of the Multi-purpose space have since been submitted and are shown below.



Figure 4: Detailed plans of multi-purpose space (January 2016)

- The Urban Planning Division recognizes that this space would serve as an amenity area for tenants of the building and that it could be rented out by tenants or by the property owners to host events that include people who do not live in the building. The amenity space cannot be rented to outside organizations such as the nearby church or school, for example, as this would classify the space as a 'hall rental'. 'Hall rental' is only allowed as an accessory use with conditional use approval in the "RMF-S" zoning district. A conditional use approval for a hall rental is not proposed as part of this application.
- The previous plan submission did not include details about how the space would be laid out and used on a regular basis. Based on a 5,400 square foot area the general occupancy loads were calculated at 270 and 527 people. With these numbers the Urban Planning Division suggested that the space should be limited in size to a maximum of 1,000 square feet. In response, the applicant has submitted updated plans which show an "Anti-room" that would be 480 square feet and a "meeting/all purpose room" that would be 888 square feet. Combined, these spaces would total 1,368 square feet and would allow between approximately 70-133 people in this space. In addition to the anti-room and meeting room, a kitchenette, storage room, offices, building maintenance, crafts/hobby room, washrooms, a fitness and games room, coat closet and lobby would make up the total floor area of the multi-purpose amenity space.
- The applicants have indicated that the intended use of the space will be for the use of residents in the building. Additionally, the Charleswood Masonic Lodge members intend to conduct meetings in this location. The proponents have submitted general user information based on records of 2015 meetings. This information shows that there were 22 meetings throughout 2015 with between 2-3 meetings per month, excluding June, July and August. Attendance ranged between 6 and 22 people including members and guests. The proponents have indicated that no other events are to be held at this location beyond these meetings.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- A report was submitted with the original application (DASZ 43/13) outlining the public consultation process for the project, highlighting the public responses to the project surveys in percentage pie charts.
- The report indicated that 4 (four) public consultation meetings were held beginning in October 2011:
    1. October 2011
    2. April 4, 2012
    3. May 31, 2012
    4. September 19, 2012
- 189 surveys were collected, 150 of which were from Charleswood residents,
- 45 comments were in favour of the project, 36 had no response and 68 raised concerns about the project, such as;
    - Building height
    - Relevance / professionalism of survey
    - Keeping greenspace
    - Traffic
    - Safety of school children and property
    - Increase in taxes
    - Decrease in property value
    - Privacy
    - Parking
    - Infrastructure
    - City policies ignored
    - Noise
    - Light pollution
- It is the Urban Planning Divisions understanding that since the original consultation process, no new consultation has taken place with regard to the proposed project.

RECOMMENDATION

The Urban Planning Division recommends **rejection** for the following reasons:

- The Urban Planning Division understands that there are development limitations for this property that include the surrounding context and the extension of land drainage sewer to the subject site. The configuration of the subject property is bound on all four sides by single-family residential dwellings and this presents challenges in establishing a multi-family building that is compatible with the surrounding single-family properties. The Urban Planning Division has determined that a more substantial landscape buffer should be established around the perimeter of the property and recommends that a 25 foot wide setback be established along the west, south and north property lines. Ultimately, this recommendation would result in the removal of at least 20 parking stalls. The applicants

have made efforts to address this design recommendation and reconfigure the parking on site; however, there does not appear to be much room to deviate from the proposed concept and the 25 foot wide landscape buffer could not be accommodated along the entire length of the west property line. As such, the parking variance on proposed Lot 1 (the church) cannot be supported at this time without knowing how a 20 stall deficiency might be addressed. Subdivision approval of the church lands depends on the parking variance and if the variance is not approved, the subdivision also cannot be approved as this would create a non-conformity for parking that does not have by-law approval.

- The building height changes are an improvement over the previous design; however, there are still some concerns with regard to proximity of the west portion of the proposed building that is adjacent to single family residential lots on Dieppe Road. Substantial landscaping is not able to be accommodated along the west yard and the reduction in height by one storey appears to not be possible as it would result in the loss of 6 units. According to the applicants, the loss of any units would result in a development pro-forma that is not feasible. In addition to the height concerns, the overall bulk massing of the structure was encouraged to be modified to break up the appearance of the massing. The applicants have indicated that it is not possible to physically break up the massing of the structure in a way that is economically feasible.
- In order to develop anything on this site, significant costs would be incurred as a result of having to extend sewer pipes from the existing infrastructure at Harstone Road. The applicants have indicated that the cost of bringing in necessary piped infrastructure means that there is little to no room to deviate from the proposed development concept in an economically feasible manner.
- The Urban Planning Division generally encourages multi-family residential development in Areas of Stability based on policies of the *Complete Communities Direction Strategy*. However, the Urban Planning Division believes that the site context and constraints have not been adequately addressed in the design proposal to a level that would establish compatible multi-family residential development on this site.

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

Report Prepared By: Devin Clark
PPD File # DASZ 33/2015

Schedule "A" for File No. DASZ 33/2015, Assiniboia Community Committee, dated February 2, 2016

By-Law No. _____

File No. **DASZ 33/15**

Atlas Sheet No.

N

AD14 ASSINIBOIA 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. 200/2006 by rezoning the land located at 4820 Roblin Boulevard & 521 Dieppe Road from an "R1-L" RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY (LARGE) DISTRICT to an "RMF-S" RESIDENTIAL MULTI-FAMILY (SMALL) DISTRICT to allow for the construction of a multi-family dwelling as shown outlined below.



THIRD READING : _____ EFFECTIVE DATE : _____

ZONING AGREEMENT : YES ☐ NO ☐ CAVEAT No. _____

SCHEDULE B

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE CO-ORDINATING GROUP – November 20, 2015

RE: PROPOSED SUBDIVISION AND REZONING OF LAND AT 4820 ROBLIN BOULEVARD AND 521 DIEPPE ROAD - DASZ 33/2015

It is recommended that the approval of DASZ 33/2015, if granted, be subject to the applicant entering into a Servicing Agreement addressing the following items:

A. Plan Considerations

1) The Developer shall, upon demand by the City, transfer to the City for $1.00 the most easterly 12.192m in width of proposed Lot 2 if and when required for street purposes.

2) No buildings or other permanent structures are to be permitted within the east 12.192m of proposed Lot 2, this area is being reserved for possible future street right-of-way to accommodate development of the rear of existing lots fronting onto Buckingham Road. This condition is to be registered as a caveat on proposed Lot 2.

B. Engineering Reports and Servicing Criteria

The Developer shall provide a comprehensive servicing report prepared by a qualified municipal engineer, which shall outline the provision of water, wastewater and land drainage services for this property.

C. Agreement Conditions

1. Wastewater Sewers

   The Developer shall at no expense to the City install wastewater sewers required to serve the proposed development as indicated by the servicing report prepared by the municipal engineer to the satisfaction of the Director of Water and Waste.

2. Watermains

   The Developer shall at no expense to the City install all watermains required to serve the proposed development as indicated by the servicing report prepared by the municipal engineer to the satisfaction of the Director of Water and Waste.

3. Land Drainage Sewers

   The Developer shall at no expense to the City install land drainage sewers required to serve the proposed development and adjacent lands as indicated by the servicing report prepared by the municipal engineer to the satisfaction of the Director of Water

and Waste.

4. Land Drainage Truck Charges

   The Developer shall pay for their share of the Regional Land Drainage System (2015 Rate = $19,819.00/acre). Any regional land drainage facilities constructed by the Developer shall be credited against this charge.

5. Share of Future Services

   The Developer shall pay to the City, on demand, at the local improvement rates prevailing at the time of collection, its share of the cost of the following works within the proposed right-of-way along the east side of the Planned Area:

   a) Watermain, Wastewater Sewer and all related works as determined by and to the satisfaction of the Director of Water and Waste; and

   b) 7.5m by 150mm Portland cement concrete pavement and all related works including, but not necessarily limited to street lighting, boulevard landscaping and land drainage sewer, all as determined by and to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.

6. Charleswood Transportation Levy

   The Developer shall, pay to the City, in cash, their share of The Charleswood Transportation Levy on proposed Lot 2, as determined by the Director of Public Works.

7. Sidewalks

   The Developer shall, at no expense to the City, construct a 1.5m. in width by 100mm in thickness Portland cement concrete sidewalk along the east side of Dieppe Road from the proposed private approach servicing proposed Lot 2 to Roblin Boulevard as determined by and to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.

8. Utilities

   a) The Developer shall 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.

   b) The Developer shall, at no expense to the City, cause underground electrical and telephone services to be installed to serve the planned area, to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.

9. Litter and Refuse Control and Cleanup

   a) The Developer shall, at no expense to the City, and of its own volition, initiate and control the regular cleanup 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, as determined by and to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works.

b) The cleanup 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.

10. Construction Traffic

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.

11. Survey Monuments

Following completion of all major construction works, the Developer shall at its cost have the locations of the survey monuments within the Planned Area verified and, where the survey monuments have been disturbed, moved, covered, mutilated or destroyed, shall have them replaced by a Manitoba Land Surveyor. The Developer shall ensure that the Manitoba Land Surveyor provides the Director of Planning, Property and Development with a certificate stating that all survey monuments within the Planned Area have been verified and/or replaced, as the case may be.

12. By-laws and Approvals

The Developer shall pay all of its and the City's costs, fees, and expenses associated with the preparation and attainment of approval for registration of the Zoning By-law(s) and plan(s) of subdivision, including all Municipal Board, Land Titles Office and other fees and expenses, all survey, engineering and advertising fees and costs, and all expenses incidental to the preparation of the Agreement and the physical development of the Planned Area.

13. Professional Fees

a) The Developer shall pay the full cost of all design services, including preliminary engineering studies, servicing reports, servicing criteria, construction drawings and specifications, and grading and landscaping plans and specifications, to be provided by Consulting Engineer(s) approved by the City, for the design of the municipal services, and associated works required to serve the Planned Area;

b) The Developer shall pay the full cost of construction and landscaping supervision services provided by or on behalf of the City for field inspection, preparation of progress estimates, provision of as-built drawings by March 31 of the year following substantial performance of the work, and all other engineering consulting services related to the installation and acceptance of municipal services, and all associated works to serve the Planned Area.

14. Administration Fees

The Developer shall pay to the City, prior to the release of the subdivision mylars for registration in the Land Titles Office, $1,200.00 plus GST per acre of the Planned Area to defray the City's administration and related costs associated with the preparation and implementation of the Servicing Agreement.

THIS REPORT SUBMITTED BY:

Administrative Co-ordinating Group
File No. DASZ 33/2015
November 20,2015

"Original Signed by G. Jasper"

G.V. Jasper, P. Eng.,
Land Development Branch

"Original Signed by C. Desjardine"

C. Desjardine P. Eng.
Public Works Department, Transportation Division

"Original Signed by M. Gajda"

M. Gajda, P. Eng.
Water & Waste Department