October 27, 2020

James D Platt, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner
City of Winnipeg

PLANNING, PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
URBAN PLANNING DIVISION

TELEPHONE: 204-986-6918
EMAIL: jplatt@winnipeg.ca

Mr. Platt,

The team working on this application has reviewed the Public Service's feedback on SP 1/2018. We are encouraged that after nearly two years a "way forward" can be discussed and hopefully a mutually agreeable outcome can be achieved.

As we review the October 16, 2020 email, we are asking for clarification on the Public Service's comments.

The content in your October 16, 2020 email is basically the same as the Sarah Rentz email of December 12, 2019 with the notable exception of the omission of Ms. Rentz stating:

"*I have now had a chance to review with my client department. While I am advised that there are some 200+ modifications/corrections/amendments to be made, the majority of these are relatively minor in nature (typos, organization, layout, etc.) and can be done at our end quite easily*".

Ms. Rentz characterization of *the 200+ modifications/corrections/amendments* is much different than the characterization of this issue within the Secondary Plan administrative reports that was sent to the various committees of Council (CCCC, SPC, EPC).

I will also refer you to the statement within the Secondary Plan administrative report of May 2020 that states:

"*The Public Service is not prepared to undertake the large amount of work required to develop the content and policies missing form the plan at this stage of the process. And it would be impractical for the Public Service to recommend that Council consider the amount of new content culminating from such work."*

Are we understanding your October 16, 2020 email correctly in that the Public Service is revising the Secondary Plan administrative report to reflect a different position than stated in the administrative report of May 2020 and are now incorporating Ms. Rentz's position on *the 200+ modifications/corrections/amendments?*

It is the opinion of the team that the Public Service is not taking into account all the information detailed in paragraph 71 of Justice Grammond's October 5, 2020 decision. We do not see any mention of the Public Service taking into account the document outlined in paragraph 71 (a). The document referred to in 71(a) focuses on Public Services' Secondary Plan administrative report dated July 31, 2018 and the inaccuracies of this report as identified by the Applicant in September 2018.

The Public Service should refer to their internal documents concerning their handling of the Secondary Plan application to ensure that the administrative report does not present a misleading picture of the Public Service's conduct and handling of this application.

An overview of the Public Service comments and the Applicant's responses are attached as Schedule A.

Thank you for giving our team the chance to respond to these initial comments.

Sincerely,

**John Scott Wintrup, B.A. (Hons), M.Sc.Pl., MCIP, RPP, CNU-A**

Encl.

# Detailed Review of Planning Discussion

## *Parker Lands Secondary Plan (SP 1/2018)*

| | City Alleges | APPLICANT COMMENTS |
|---|---|---|
| **1** | **Density** | |
| **1** | a. Proponent has asked for *Urban Neighbourhood TOD* type (maximum density of 100 units per acre, or 6,970 total units for the subject site) | **I. APPLICANT COMMENTS**<br><br>Point 1.a. being raised here regarding the "6,970 dwelling units" indicates that the Public Service should take into account the documents listed in paragraph 71 of the October 5, 2020 decision as instructed by Justice Grammond. This paragraph states that the Public Service will revise the administrative reports to take into account the information described in paragraph 71.<br><br>The new information SUBMITTED 29 OCTOBER 2018 includes a clarification to the Parker Lands PDO that states:<br><br>*8. The maximum residential density for the entire Planned Area of PDO-2 PARKER LANDS shall be 1920 dwelling units.*<br><br>This replaces the previous restrictions on dwelling units of "density to 100 dwelling units per acre" in the Parker Lands PDO. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | The new information SUBMITTED 29 OCTOBER 2018 includes a revision to the Parker Lands Concept Plan for Fulton Grove showing 1918 units.<br><br>The Proposed Concept Plan SUBMITTED 29 OCTOBER 2018 for DASZ 12/2018 has less than the maximum dwelling units of 1920 expressed in the Parker Lands PDO.<br><br>The new information SUBMITTED 29 OCTOBER 2018 includes a Plan of Subdivision – Lot Plan sized appropriately to create lots for single and two-family dwellings.<br><br>The Proposed Plan of Subdivision – Lot Plan as SUBMITTED 29 OCTOBER 2018 for DASZ 12/2018 outlines the lot sizes and the dimensional standards in Lots 1 – 187. These lot sizes physically restrict density occurring on these locations, and not able to support 6970 units.<br><br>The Public Service should refer to their internal documents concerning their handling of the DASZ and SP applications to ensure that the administrative report does not present a misleading picture of the Public Service's conduct and handling of these applications.<br><br>Administration Report dated October 26, 2016 for File DAZ 214/2016 - *Text Amendment – Winnipeg Zoning By-law 200/2006* to incorporate a new "TOD" Transit- |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Oriented Development zoning district in *Winnipeg Zoning By-law 200/2006* states on page 10:<br><br>*The Public Service acknowledges that this scale of development* [allowed under the TOD Zone] *may not be appropriate for all transit station areas. However,* ***it is possible to use secondary plans, planned development overlays or zoning agreements to tailor the density down*** *to fit the individual context through the development application process [emphasis mine]*<br><br>It is entirely normal for a Developer to seek and be approved for a zoning district that has inherently no restrictions on density. Also, it is common practice for the City of Winnipeg to apply regulatory tools at the time of a rezoning to ensure capacity restrictions on density are legally enforceable as suggested by the Administration Report for incorporating the new "TOD" Transit-Oriented Development zoning district into *Winnipeg Zoning By-law 200/2006*.<br><br>Examples of subdivision and rezoning with restrictions on the zoning applied for;<br><br>• Tuxedo Yards / Seasons of Tuxedo rezoning to C4 Commercial Regional District Zone: a zoning district with no restrictions on floor area sizes for retail. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | ○ Council at the time of the subdivision and rezoning application, restricted through enforceable agreements the total of all retail land-uses to 1.5 million square feet.<br>• A more recent example is **PDO-2 INKSBROOK EMPLOYMENT LANDS** where the City Planners insisted on a cap on total gross floor area of retail not exceeding 15 percent of the total gross floor area of all principal uses.<br><br>We are proposing the same mechanism in the Parker Lands PDO to place restrictions on the number of dwellings units.<br><br>The City routinely applies legally enforceable restrictions to cap the density on the development associated with the requested zoning district. This is such a common occurrence at the City of Winnipeg that the continued suggestion by the City Planners that the Applicant here is applying for 6,970 dwelling units without any restrictions is ***factually incorrect***. |
| **1** | ***Density*** | |
| **1** | b. Public Service proposes that *Neighbourhood Medium Density TOD* type is more appropriate (maximum density of 50 units per acre, or 1,600 total units for the subject site) | **II. APPLICANT COMMENTS**<br><br>Point 1. b. regarding "Neighbourhood Medium Density" indicates that the Public Service should take into account the documents listed in paragraph 71 of the October 5, 2020 decision as instructed by Justice Grammond. This paragraph states that the Public Service will revise the |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | administrative reports to take into account the information described in paragraph 71.<br><br>The Applicants September 19, 2018 report of the July 31, 2018 City Administrative Report under ***Issue #1*** points out the erroneous use of "Neighbourhood Medium Density".<br><br>Further to this report, the Applicant points the Public Service to the TOD Handbook. In the TOD Handbook the following definitions are found for "Neighbourhood Medium Density" TOD and for "Urban Neighbourhood" TOD.<br><br>• "Neighbourhood Medium Density" has a Transit Frequency of **15-30 minutes** and a Land-Use Mix of "**Limited multi-family, with the majority of residential being single family, duplexes, accessory dwelling units, and ground-related units."** [emphasis mine] (see page 45 *Transit-Oriented Development Handbook*).<br>• "Urban Neighbourhood" has a Transit Frequency of **5-15 minutes** and a Land-Use Mix of "Mid-rise residential, condos, ground-related units, and mixed-use structures, with ground floor retail or office use required." (see page 41 *Transit-Oriented Development Handbook*).<br><br>The Beaumont BRT Station has a Transit Frequency of **5-15 minutes** as per Winnipeg Transit. This station is on the |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Blue Line. Winnipeg Transit reorganized the bus routes in November 2019 to incorporate the rapid transit corridor as its hub and spoke configuration. Additional details can be found on the Transit departments webpage.<br><br>**The Fulton Grove concept plan clearly indicates the Land-Use Mix is aligned with "Urban Neighbourhood".**<br><br>The Public Service should refer to their internal documents concerning their handling of the DASZ and SP applications to ensure that the administrative report does not present a misleading picture of the Public Service's conduct and handling of these applications. |
| **1** | c. We are willing to consider density greater than the 'Neighbourhood Medium Density TOD' contingent on access to the amenities north of the railway tracks being established as per the 'Potential Connection to Grant Park Festival Retail' included in the Graphic attached to the DASZ proposal. We are open to suggestions on how to accommodate this in the Plan. | **III. APPLICANT COMMENTS**<br><br>The Public Service should refer to their internal documents concerning their handling of the DASZ and SP applications to ensure that the administrative report does not present a misleading picture of the Public Service's conduct and handling of these applications.<br><br>On November 13, 2018 during the Public Hearing for File DASZ 12/2018 the Public Service confirmed that the railways will not deal with Private Developers regarding rail crossings. Thus, the obligation is on the Public Service to contact CN to make such a crossing happen. (see pages 98 and 99, *Public Hearing Transcript DASZ Application*). |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | City of Winnipeg Planner Michael Robinson confirmed at the Public Hearing on November 13, 2018 that he had no communication with CN on this matter; had made no attempts to communicate with CN on this matter; and made no commitment to any future attempts at communicating with CN on this matter. (see pages 98 and 99, *Public Hearing Transcript DASZ Application*).<br><br>**Since November 2018, has the Public Service held any communication with CN regarding a pedestrian/cycling connection from the site across the railroad tracks to Grant Park?** |
| **1** | ***Density*** | |
| **1c** | **c. Way Forward:**<br><br>i. The materials presented on the Proponent's website included a graphic suggesting a pedestrian crossing over the tracks to the regional amenities north of the CNR Main Line. This rail crossing is not currently mentioned or otherwise reflected in the Plan in any way. The inclusion of a pedestrian crossing in the Plan could be explored, and potentially included in the Plan.<br>ii. Inclusion of pedestrian connection to Grant Park Pavillions would improve connectivity (access) to other sub-regional centres. This could allow for the commercial mix across the CNR Mainline to be accessible from the subject area. Improved access to the amenities at the Grant Park Pavillions could justify increased residential densities of the subject land. | **IV. APPLICANT COMMENTS**<br><br>Points 1.c.i & ii. being raised here regarding density dependent on the pedestrian connection across the rail tracks >>> See comments for Point 1.c. above which are applicable for '1.Density, c. Way Forward' [sic]. |

| 2 | Detail | |
|---|---|---|
| **2** | a. The Plan does not contain sufficient detail which would permit the City to properly evaluate future proposals, with the following specific examples: | **V. APPLICANT COMMENTS**<br><br>Point 2.a. being raised here regarding "does not contain sufficient detail which would permit the City to properly evaluate future proposals" indicates that the Public Service should take into account the documents listed in paragraph 71 of the October 5, 2020 decision as instructed by Justice Grammond. This paragraph states that the Public Service will revise the administrative reports to take into account the information described in paragraph 71.<br><br>The September 19, 2018 review of the July 31, 2018 Messrs. James Platt and Braden Smith Administrative Report under ***Issue #2*** points out this erroneous claim.<br><br>The Applicant also has communications from Mr. Platt advising the Applicant to take out details from the Plan, including the same detail he later advised is 'missing' and therefore the rationale to not approve the Plan (see *May 24, 2017 Markup Draft plan*).<br><br>Additionally, the Applicant points out that File DASZ 12/2018 has been with the City of Winnipeg since early 2018, thus is not a future proposal.<br><br>File DASZ 12/2018 has been assessed by the City of Winnipeg as per the Michael Robinson/Braden Smith Administrative Report for DASZ 12/2018. And File DASZ |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 12/2018 has been assessed again, as per Mr. Andrew Ross' email of October, 2020.<br><br>We have a comprehensive analysis of the *Appendix/Attachment 5 Errors and Omissions document* provided in the Michael Robinson/Braden Smith Administrative Report for DASZ 12/2018 that details their ***faulty assessment*** of the PDO and the associated DASZ: Robinson/Smith made no claims the Secondary Plan did not allow them to evaluate the proposal, and the Applicant makes no claims the City Planners' faulty assessment is linked to 'content' of the Secondary Plan. |
| **2** | | ***Detail*** | |
| **2a** | i. | Policy 3.5.2.2 permits all residential building types to be established anywhere within the 'Urban Neighbourhood Policy Area'. This policy does not provide sufficient clarity that would prohibit single family dwellings from being considered in the first 180 metres of the Rapid Transit Station or high rise multi-family apartments being considered 800 metres from the Rapid Transit Station. | **VI. APPLICANT COMMENTS**<br><br>Point 2.a. i. being raised here regarding "Policy 3.5.2.2." indicates that the Public Service should take into account the documents listed in paragraph 71 of the October 5, 2020 decision as instructed by Justice Grammond. This paragraph states that the Public Service will revise the administrative reports to take into account the information described in paragraph 71.<br><br>The September 19, 2018 review of Messrs. James Platt and Braden Smith July 31, 2018 City Administrative Report under ***Issue #2*** points out this erroneous claim.<br><br>Mr. Platt contradicts Point 2.a. with the Platt/Smith Administration Report of July 31, 2018 with the following statement: |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | "It could also be argued that policy 3.3.2.6 (residential density shall radiate out from the Transit Station) would only allow for low density [sic] residential uses to be developed farther away from the station, and high density [sic] residential uses to be development [sic] closer to the station" (see page 25).<br><br>Mr. Platt did not advise the City Centre Community Committee that specific land-use and development details are enshrined in the DASZ subdivision and rezoning development application (14:41 of *video transcript of Nov. 13 City Centre Community Committee*).<br><br>The two applications, the Secondary Plan and the DASZ, are to inform each other. (See *Transcript of James Platt presentation to City Centre Community Committee November 13, 2018).* The Secondary Plan Application being addressed first, followed immediately by the zoning application.<br><br>Mr. Platt does not take into account the Plan of Subdivision in DASZ 12/2018 that creates blocks in the high-density areas and smaller, individual lots for the low-density areas to the west, which will act to designate where density is to occur on the site. The individual lots are designed in size specifically to accommodate only low-density residential development (see the Fulton Grove Proposed Plan of Subdivision – Lot Plan and Block Plan). |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | The Planned Development Overlay (PDO) and Subdivision Plan submitted for the DASZ 12/2018 application ensures that the density radiates out from the transit station with the lowest residential density being the farthest from the transit station.<br><br>The Parker Lands Planned Development Overlay (PDO) and Subdivision Plan submitted for File DASZ 12/2018 ensures that the residential density radiates out from the transit station with the lowest residential density being the farthest from the transit station as per policy 3.3.2.6. of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan. |
| **2a** | ii. | Policy 3.5.2.1 specifically allows for commercial, institutional and educational uses within the first 400 metres of the Rapid Transit Station. However, it does not restrict these uses from being considered outside of the first 400 metres. | **VII. APPLICANT COMMENTS**<br><br>As pointed out by Mr. Platt, there is **no policy** in the Secondary Plan **enabling** commercial, institutional and educational uses outside the first 400 metres of the Rapid Transit Station.<br><br>As such, there is no ability to have commercial, institutional and educational uses outside the first 400 metres of a Rapid Transit Station.<br><br>Mr. Platt is confusing secondary plans with zoning by-laws: one is a policy document regardless of status as 'statutory' or 'non-statutory', and the latter is a regulatory tool. |


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Secondary plans [also called area plans, specific area plans, local area plans] statutory or non-statutory, provide policy statements guiding land-use and development in a limited area; and are the long-range blueprints directing the municipalities' decision making towards an expressed future idealistic vision or goal for a neighbourhood or a specific region within the municipality.<br><br>Secondary plans are by their nature, visionary documents conveying visions and goals in policies and objectives, but sometimes only illustrating a future vision in maps and figures, that **enable an outcome**.<br><br>Whereas, zoning by-laws [also called ordinances or codes or land-use by-laws] are specific, measurable regulations for the use and development of land that **prevent an outcome**.<br><br>Secondary plans [and general plans or community wide plans or topical plans] are statements of a municipalities' vision and intent respecting an ideal future, and provide a framework towards that outcome. Their relationship with zoning is that zoning by-laws provide the essential mechanisms for implementing the visionary policies set out in the secondary plans and strive to prevent certain outcomes from occurring.<br><br>Zoning is the process of dividing all land within a municipality into 'zones' such as: agriculture, parks, commercial, residential, and industrial; and each having |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | numerously delineated sub-categories such as 'light industrial' and 'heavy industrial'.<br><br>Zoning by-laws provide an exhaustive list of defined land-uses that are categorized in a land-use table in a binary choice, either allowed or prohibited in each zone.<br><br>Zoning by-laws have a series of regulations that: may specify a variety of outright and conditional uses of land; provide the rules for the size of land; bulk dimensions and placement of buildings on land; and the form and scale of buildings all asserted in imperial or metric measurements.<br><br>The type of zone covering a piece of land usually determines all the regulations being applied to that piece of land including all the allowed or prohibited land-uses as outlined in the land-use table.<br><br>Secondary plans do not have exhaustive lists of land-uses. Secondary plans do not have land-use tables indicating what land-uses are allowed and what land-uses are prohibited in each land-use zone. What Mr. Platt is suggesting here is to convert the Parker Lands Secondary Plan into a zoning by-law. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **2** | ***Detail*** | |
| **2** | b. Residential net density of between 40 to 100 units/acre applies throughout the Urban Neighbourhood Policy Area of the Plan. | **VIII. APPLICANT COMMENTS**<br><br>This is addressed under Point 2.a.i. ***VI APPLICANT COMMENTS.***<br><br>Mr. Platt contradicts Point 2.b. with the Platt/Smith Administration Report of July 31, 2018 that contains the following statement:<br><br>"It could also be argued that policy 3.3.2.6 (residential density shall radiate out from the Transit Station) would only allow for low density [sic] residential uses to be developed farther away from the station, and high density [sic] residential uses to be development [sic] closer to the station" (see page 25). |
| **2** | c. The subdivision / rezoning proposal (DASZ 12/2018) includes a graphic which places highest density residential development (11 to 13 storey buildings) along the railway tracks to the north and away from the SWBRT station . The buildings closest to the SWBRT station are identified as only 6 storeys. The proposed density arrangement does not conform with the TOD Handbook or the Plan which require that the highest densities be nearest the SWBRT Station. | **IX. APPLICANT COMMENTS**<br><br>In engagement with the Ward Councillor, the Applicant was discouraged from placing tall buildings at the front of the lands: this was perceived at creating a 'wall effect' along Hurst Way.<br><br>Secondly, the locations being referred to in Point 2.c are all within the 400-metre radius of the Beaumont Transit Station. In fact, the taller buildings along the railway tracks are approximately 114 metres from the 6 storey |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | structures, which is not a substantial distance. And, the Applicant points the Public Service to the *Transit-Oriented Development Handbook* that indicates TOD is not measured block by block, or individual buildings:<br><br>"TOD is more than an individual parcel or development project. **TOD includes the entire area surrounding transit**, between 400 to 800 metres (1/4 -1/2 mile) from the transit stop". [emphasis mine]. (see page 16, *Transit-Oriented Development Handbook).*<br><br>Third, Parker Lands Secondary Plan indicates the highest densities, **not the tallest buildings**, are to be nearest the Rapid Transit Station.<br><br>The Parker Lands Secondary Plan reflects the *Transit-Oriented Development Handbook* that guides the placement of density in proximity to transit stations, not the placement of buildings by height:<br><br>"TOD can be defined as: **Moderate to higher density** compact mixed-use development, located within an easy five to ten minute (approximately 400m to 800m) walk of a major transit stop". (emphasis mine) (see page 6, *Transit-Oriented Development Handbook).*<br><br>**"Highest Density at the Station**: The immediate area around the station (core area) should generally contain the greatest intensity |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | and mix of uses". (emphasis mine) *(*see page 10, *Transit-Oriented Development Handbook).*<br><br>The *Transit-Oriented Development Handbook* placement of density instead of height recognizes that 'height' and 'tall buildings' are not mutually exclusive indicators of density. Mr. Platt is mixing up the assignment of density with a specific built form.<br><br>"Too many people today conflate density with height." – *Richard Florida, The Limits of Density, CityLab, May 16, 2012.*<br><br>Great Britain's ***Towards an Urban Renaissance by The Urban Task Force (1999-09-16)*** finds that the same level of density of a high-rise building can also be accommodated in different building typologies including low-rise and medium-rise buildings. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | <br>As such, the placement of taller building near the rail tracks does not necessary mean that density is not in close proximity to the transit station. |
| **2** | ***Detail*** | |
| **2** | d. **Way Forward** | |
| **2d** | i. Divide the proposed 'Urban Neighbourhood Policy Area' into at least three (3) policy areas: One each for high, medium and low density neighbourhood development. Unique policies would be included each of the three (3) policy areas to better articulate and define the types and intensities of development what would be permitted and not permitted for each. | **X.** **APPLICANT COMMENTS**<br><br>Point 2. d. i. regarding "Divide the 'Urban Neighbourhood Policy Area' into three sub-areas (or new policy areas altogether)" indicates that the Public Service should take into account the documents listed in paragraph 71 of the October 5, 2020 decision as instructed by Justice Grammond. This paragraph states that the Public Service will revise the administrative |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | reports to take into account the information described in paragraph 71.<br><br>Mr. Platt filed an affidavit in a court action in 2018 that says the Parker Lands is a good candidate site for "Transit-Oriented Development" (page 4, para 11, *Affidavit of James Platt (Mandamus)*).<br><br>Mr. Platt's own position in May 2017 during his review of the draft secondary plan content referred to a possibly of using the 'Urban Neighborhood' TOD type (see page 9 of *May 24, 2017 Markup of Draft Plan*).<br><br>This May 2017 recommendation from Mr. Platt followed years of discussions with City planners about using the 'Urban Neighborhood' TOD type as part of the policy for the site (pages 28 and 29 of *markup of 11th Draft version of Secondary Plan report, Mar. 29, 2016*).<br><br>The Applicant and their professional consulting team engaged internationally renowned experts in TOD including the planner who invented 'TOD', and the planner who advised the City on the TOD Handbook. The Applicant has confirmation that the proper application of TOD is to use **one typology, not multiple typologies** as being suggested here.<br><br>The Applicant points the Public Service to the TOD Handbook. In the TOD Handbook the following definitions are found for "Neighbourhood Medium Density" TOD and for "Urban Neighbourhood" TOD. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | • "Neighbourhood Medium Density" has a Transit Frequency of **15-30 minutes** and a Land-Use Mix of "**Limited multi-family, with the majority of residential being single family, duplexes, accessory dwelling units, and ground-related units."** [emphasis mine] (see page 45 *Transit-Oriented Development Handbook*).<br>• "Urban Neighbourhood" has a Transit Frequency of **5-15 minutes** and a Land-Use Mix of "**Mid-rise residential**, condos, ground-related units, and mixed-use structures, with ground floor retail or office use required." [emphasis mine] (see page 41 *Transit-Oriented Development Handbook*).<br><br>The Beaumont BRT Station has a Transit Frequency of **5-15 minutes** as per Winnipeg Transit. This station is on the Blue Line. Winnipeg Transit reorganized the bus routes in November 2019 to incorporate the rapid transit corridor as its hub and spoke configuration. Further details can be found on the Transit departments webpage.<br><br>**The Fulton Grove concept plan clearly indicates the Land-Use Mix is aligned with "Urban Neighbourhood".** The majority of the dwelling units (1,610 out of 1,918) or 84% are multi-family.<br><br>Whereas, the "Neighbourhood Medium Density" has a Transit Frequency of **15-30 minutes** and a Land-Use Mix |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | with a majority of the residential being single family, duplexes, and accessory dwelling units.<br><br>Point 2.d.i regarding the " . . . three (3) policy areas to better articulate and define the types and intensities of development what would be permitted and not permitted for each." Is addressed under Point 2.a.ii. **VII APPLICANT COMMENTS** that outlines Mr. Platt confusing secondary plans with zoning by-laws, and his suggestion here is also to convert the Parker Lands Secondary Plan into a zoning by-law.<br><br>The Public Service should refer to their internal documents concerning their handling of the DASZ and SP applications to ensure that the administrative report does not present a misleading picture of the Public Service's conduct and handling of these applications. |
| **2d** | ii. This approach was considered in previous draft versions of the Plan submitted by the proponent for review and comment, as well as was presented at the two (2) Open House events, but was abandoned by the proponent in the most recent version of the Plan. | **XI. APPLICANT COMMENTS**<br><br>Point 2. d.ii. regarding the multiple designation approach being 'abandoned' by the Applicant is a misleading statement.<br><br>In April 2018, after the Public Service refused the DASZ 12/2018 application for subdivision and rezoning, legal counsel for the Applicants sent a letter to the Public Service stating that although it disagreed with this approach to zoning classifications that the Applicant would use conventional zoning districts of RMU, RMF, |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | etc. in order to advance File DASZ 12/2018 to a public hearing.<br><br>This offer was an attempt to get resolution to an interminable planning process to advance File DASZ 12/2018 towards a public hearing.<br><br>**This offer was *not* accepted by the Public Service in May 2018.**<br><br>Public Engagement continued well after the August 22, 2016 Open House with the most recent plans, as per the *Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site – Public Engagement* filed with the City in 2018.<br><br>This ongoing public engagement post-August 22, 2016 allowed the public opportunities to view and comment on the most recent version of the plan proposing the single TOD typology:<br><br>▪ Information was mailed out to 1100 homes in the Beaumont Neighbourhood.<br>▪ Advertisement for the project website was placed several times in the Winnipeg Free Press and the Sou'wester, the Lance and the Metro throughout 2018.<br>▪ Between Jan. 19 and Sept. 8, 2018 (approximately eight months) the total number of independent visits to the project web site was 2534. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | ▪ Of the 2534 visitors, 1302 people viewed the Public Update information (i.e. they did not immediately close the window to exit out). |
| **3** | **Format/Organization** | |
| **3** | a. A large portion of the issues with the Plan identified by the Public Service relate to the manner in which the information is presented.<br><br>b. As per the e-mail provided December 12, 2019, we are prepared to undertake revising the Plan to address format/organization issues, without altering the intent of the Plan as provided | **XII. APPLICANT COMMENTS**<br><br>Point 3.a.& b. regarding 'information presentation' and 'format/organization issues' indicates that the Public Service should take into account the documents listed in paragraph 71 of the October 5, 2020 decision as instructed by Justice Grammond. This paragraph states that the Public Service will revise the administrative reports to take into account the information described in paragraph 71.<br><br>The September 19, 2018 review of the July 31, 2018 City Administrative Report points out this is an unjustified statement creating a false narrative to mislead council and the public that the Applicant's Secondary Plan was uncharacteristic of such plans, out of the scope of normal plans, and flawed to the extent to deny proper and due process to the Applicant.<br><br>78 % of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan reflects the direction and language of the Public Service.<br><br>Attached is a colour-coded Secondary Plan that indicates areas of input, review, comments and changes by the Public Service over the years on the final Plan. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | First, there is no industry standard or guide book similar to the "The Canadian Press Stylebook, Caps and Spelling" that is mandated in the planning profession for spelling, grammar, style, etc.<br><br>Second, the American Planning Association *Plan Making: A Primer. American Planning Association PAS QuickNotes No. 17. 2018* acknowledges ***there is no industry standard for planning documents for their format or organization***.<br><br>The Planning profession does not mandate the content, format, organization or structure of general plans, topical plans, secondary plans, or zoning codes. And, the Planning Profession does not have a standard template or structure for the organization or format of development plans, topical plans, secondary plans, or zoning codes. At best, there are guidelines available by the American Planning Association, but no universal standard for defining what is considered a 'proper' format/organization.<br><br>Some municipalities such as the Cities of Victoria and Regina will indicate in their comprehensive general plans (Official Plans, Development Plans, etc.) what the content or matters to be addressed in the secondary plans, but not the organization, format or structure. No such guideline for format/organization is in Winnipeg's Development Plan or the *City of Winnipeg Charter Act*. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Third, the Parker Lands Secondary Plan format and organization was baselined against existing City of Winnipeg secondary plans, as well as a cross jurisdictional analysis of secondary plans from Manitoba, Canada, and the United States of America (see *Attachment*):<br><br>➢ + 25 non-statutory and statutory plans in Winnipeg.<br>➢ + 25 non-statutory and statutory plans in Manitoba.<br>➢ + 65 non-statutory and statutory plans from Canada.<br>➢ + 20 non-statutory and statutory plans from the United States of America.<br><br>The organization and format of secondary plans (also called specific plans, area specific plans, area structure plans, local area plans, etc.) differ between and within jurisdictions including the City of Winnipeg.<br><br>However, there are many common features found in secondary plans including but not limited to:<br><br>• Introduction - statement regarding the purpose of the plan.<br>• Planning Area - description of the sub-area(s) effected by the plan.<br>• Vision/Goal - outline of the vision or goal of the plan.<br>• Policies - policy statements.<br>• Maps - maps illustrating the subject planning area and the policy areas. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | • Administration – an administration component for the planning document.<br><br>The organization and format of the Parker Area Plans was purposefully aligned with the following City of Winnipeg secondary plans:<br><br>▪ Precinct Q Ridgewood South.<br>▪ Precinct J Dawson Trail.<br>▪ Precinct K South Royalwoods.<br>▪ Waverley West West Neighbourhood.<br>▪ Precinct I Transcona North.<br><br>Attached is an analysis that compares and contrasts the organization and format of the Parker Lands Secondary Plans to Winnipeg's thirty (32) other Secondary Plans approved in the 21st Century was initially done in 2016 and recently expanded and updated to include the secondary plans approved by Council between 2018 and 2020.<br><br>The Parker Lands Secondary Plan, when compared and contrasted with the organization and format of Winnipeg's other thirty-two (32) secondary plans, appears to be the same or near similar, placing amongst the majority of secondary plans.<br><br>Strikingly, the Parker Lands Secondary Plan matches strongly to the secondary plans adopted in 2019 and 2020, with relatively minor differences in such items as: |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | • Font colour;<br>• having sections entitled 'definition' and 'maps';<br>• combining all infrastructure under one section instead of splitting into two; and<br>• separating sub-sections ''Implementation' and 'Time Frame' into two(2) instead of one sub-section.<br><br>In short, there is nothing remarkable, unique, or different about the format / organization of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan when matched to the other thirty-two (32) secondary plans in Winnipeg.<br><br>Mr. Platt nor did Ms. Rentz provide a complete list of missing content or identify specific issues with the organization or format. However, Mr. Platt has made several public comments on this topic during appearances at public meetings of Council committees and highlighted as the 'significant issues':<br><br>Mr. Platt appeared before the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage, and Downtown Development Regular Meeting on May 21, 2020 and stated:<br><br>"Some of the issues relate to the way the document is organized. For instance, **objectives are scattered throughout**". [emphasis mine] (7:52:41 of *video transcript of May 21, 2020 Standing Policy Committee on* |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | *Property and Development, Heritage, and Downtown Development*).<br><br>The *North St. Boniface Secondary Plan By-law 30/2017* prepared by the City of Winnipeg Planning Department, and adopted by Council on July 19, 2018, has a similar organization and format as the Parker Lands Secondary Plan.<br><br>This is a misleading statement.<br><br>The *North St. Boniface Secondary Plan* has a section entitled 'Land-Use Policies', whereas the Parker Lands Secondary Plan entitles the same section 'Land-Use Concept', a term found in many other of Winnipeg's secondary plans for the same type of section.<br><br>The Parker Lands Secondary Plan organization of 'Land-Use Concept' exactly mirrors the organization and format of the *North St. Boniface Secondary Plan* 'Land-Use Polices': **both are organized and formatted with objectives 'scattered throughout'** (see 'Table of Contents', *North St. Boniface Secondary Plan* and Parker Lands Secondary Plan). |

**2 PLANNING VISION & OBJECTIVES .....**

2.1 VISION .....
2.2 OBJECTIVES.....

**3 LAND USE POLICIES .....**

3.1 LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL POLICY AREA.....
*3.1.1 Objectives*.....
*3.1.2 Policies* .....
3.2 MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL POLICY AREA.....
*3.2.1 Objective* .....
*3.2.2 Policies* .....
3.3 HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL POLICY AREA .....
*3.3.1 Objective* .....
*3.3.2 Policies* .....
3.4 MIXED USE COMMERCIAL POLICY AREA .....
*3.4.1 Objectives*.....
*3.4.2 Policies* .....
3.5 INDUSTRIAL POLICY AREA .....
*3.5.1 Objectives*.....
*3.5.2 Policies* .....
3.6 PARKS AND OPEN SPACE POLICY AREA .....
*3.6.1 Objectives*.....
*3.6.2 Policies* .....
3.7 DESIGN REVIEW.....

2 PLANNING VISION AND OBJECTIVES .....

2.1 VISION .....

2.2 OBJECTIVES.....

*2.2.1 Placemaking: Foster Quality Place*

*2.2.2 Connected .....*

*2.2.3 Sustainability: Environmental, So*

3 LAND-USE CONCEPT.....

3.1 GENERAL.....

*3.1.1 General Policies.....*

3.2 URBAN DESIGN POLICIES.....

*3.2.1 Objectives.....*

*3.2.2 Policies .....*

3.3 DENSITY.....

*3.3.1 Objectives.....*

*3.3.2 Policies .....*

3.4 PARKING POLICIES.....

*3.4.1 Objective .....*

*3.4.2 Policies .....*

3.5 URBAN NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICY AREA .....

*3.5.1 Objective .....*

*3.5.2 Policies .....*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Mr. Platt appeared before the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage, and Downtown Development Regular Meeting on May 21, 2020 and stated:<br><br>"Some of the issues relate to the way the document is organized. . . . . the constraints section **does not really list any constraints even though it's right next to a rail line**". [emphasis mine]. (7:52:44 of *video transcript of May 21, 2020 Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage, and Downtown Development*).<br><br>This is a misleading statement.<br><br>The *North St. Boniface Secondary Plan By-law 30/2017* prepared by the City of Winnipeg Planning Department and, adopted by Council on July 19, 2018, has the CN Main Line [CN Redditt] and the CN Sprague transecting the Planning Area, with the CP Rail Line on the north boundary.<br><br>The *North St. Boniface Secondary Plan* makes **no mention** of these three (3) rail lines as a constraint, makes **no mention** of these three (3) rail lines as a feature within this planning area; furthermore, this Secondary Plan has **little-to-no policies** related to development near rail lines. Yet, the *North St. Boniface* |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | *Secondary Plan* was given a positive recommendation from the Public Service and adopted by Council.<br><br>Whereas, the Parker Lands Secondary Plan acknowledges the existence of the rail lines under Section 1.2.7 *Existing Features,* AND has dedicated an entire subsection of policies related to lands near rail lines under Section 3.10 *Railway Corridor Policies*.<br><br>It should be noted the 'Opportunities and Constraints' is a sub, sub-section that many secondary plans do not even include within their documents. This sub, sub-section is not used in the administration of a plan or forms any of the guiding policy statements of a plan, thus is not considered a 'critical' or core element of a secondary plan document.<br><br>Mr. Platt appeared before the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage, and Downtown Development Regular Meeting on May 21, 2020 and stated:<br><br>"Apart from editing and re-arranging, the plan is missing some important context. Some minor, some major, some needs to be created. For instance, the discussion in the plan right now assumes there is a sizable forest, which there is not. **The polices in the plan have not been adapted in lieu of the forest not being there**." [emphasis mine]. (7:53:00 of *video transcript of May 21, 2020 Standing Policy* |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | *Committee on Property and Development, Heritage, and Downtown Development*).<br><br>This is a false and misleading statement.<br><br>First, none of the land-use maps in the Secondary Plan identify a specific location or indicate any woodlots being retained on the lands associated with Fulton Grove: a symbol is used to indicate 'Green and Open Space' on the Fulton Grove lands (see *Figure 18: Land Policy Map*).<br><br>Under subsection 3.8.2 *Green and Opens Spaces*, the Parker Lands Secondary Plan provides 22 policies with Policy 2) indicating that a centrally located *Green and Open Space* will be located within Fulton Grove. The breadth of *Green and Open Space* includes vegetation, meaning such land-uses as tree stands are enabled to occur within Fulton Grove.<br><br>Second, under subsection 1.2.7, the Parker Lands Secondary Plan acknowledges the Fulton Grove land owners removing existing trees from their lands; and the City of Winnipeg also removing an oak forest from their lands within the Parker Lands Planning Area.<br><br>And, Mr. Platt seems to be confused between the boundaries of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan File SP 1/2018 and the Fulton Grove File DASZ 12/2018, they are not the same. As such, he would understand that a significant forest of trees remains within the Parker |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Lands Planning Area, outside of Fulton Grove, as accounted for in the Secondary Plan.<br><br>Mr. Platt appeared before the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage, and Downtown Development Regular Meeting on May 21, 2020 and stated:<br><br>"Apart from editing and re-arranging, the plan is **missing some important context**. Some minor, some major, some needs to be created. (7:53:00 of *video transcript of May 21, 2020 Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage, and Downtown Development*).<br><br>Messrs. James Platt and Braden Smith July 31, 2018 Administrative Report indicates the '**missing content'** is related to **industrial land-uses**.<br><br>"The Plan facilitates the potential for future land use conflict by permitting both industrial and high density [sic] residential uses to be established in the Neighborhood Policy Area." (See page 28)<br><br>This statement from Messrs. James Platt and Braden Smith is false.<br><br>The Public Service should refer to their internal documents concerning their handling of the DASZ and SP |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | applications to ensure that the administrative report does not present a misleading picture of the Public Service's conduct and handling of these applications.<br><br>The 'Urban Neighborhood Policy Area' outlined in the proposed Secondary Plan for the area coinciding with the Fulton Grove development ***does not*** allow for industrial land-uses.<br><br>The Applicant has made every effort to ensure the existing land-use rights of their holdings, and all other land owners in the area, are acknowledged and identified in the Parker Lands Secondary Plan as per section 5.4.<br><br>Secondary plans policies do not extinguish existing land-use rights provided under a Zoning By-law; do not terminate land-use entitlements; nor change the existing land-use zoning by-laws.<br><br>All zoning by-laws remain unchanged when a new general development or secondary plan is adopted until a process is undertaken to specifically change the land-use zoning in a manner prescribed in the *Charter.*<br><br>General development plans and secondary plans are implemented in the land-use planning hierarchy of documents through zoning regulations. Zoning can be changed by the municipality to align the land-use regulations with the vision outlined in the land-use policies; or changed by a landowner seeking to expand |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | their land-use rights via a discretionary approval that is aligned with the vision outlined in the land-use policies.<br><br>The existing land-use rights provided by a zoning by-law are not extinguished under the adoption of a secondary plan (statutory or non-statutory) including the *Complete Communities By-law* or the *OurWinnipeg* Development Plan.<br><br>The process to change the zoning of land is prescribed in the *City of Winnipeg Charter,* which also provides under *§241* for the protection of developments existing before the adoption of the zoning by-law through 'non-conforming rights', meaning only future land-use intensifications are affected with the new zoning regulations and not existing land-uses.<br><br>The existing industrial land-use rights for the Parker Lands were confirmed by the Manitoba Court of Appeal (See paragraph 2 of Page 2 of the August 30, 2017 Court of Appeal decision).<br><br>The existing land-use rights of the Parker Lands are intact until the Zoning By-law changes the allowable land-use rights on a piece of land.<br><br>The Applicant has made every effort to change the existing industrial land-use zoning with File DASZ 12/2018 to align with the vision outline in the Parker Lands Secondary Plan, while the City of Winnipeg has made no such efforts to change the existing industrial |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | zoning for their Parker Stormwater Retention Basin lands that abuts the east side of the Applicant's lands identified for the Fulton Grove residential development.<br><br>Until the Zoning By-law changes the land-use rights, the existing land-use rights are intact for all land owners [including lands not owned by the Applicant such as the City of Winnipeg owned lands] within the area covered by the Parker Lands Secondary Plan. This fact is acknowledged in the Parker Lands Secondary Plan.<br><br>Mr. Platt falsely advises the City Centre Community Committee that the Applicant purposely created a 'loophole' to enable both industrial and mixed-use development by the wording in the policies. (See *Transcript of Platt presentation to City Centre Community Committee, November 13, 2018* and *James Platt oral presentation to City Centre Community Committee, November 13, 2018*).<br><br>Mr. Platt's use of the term 'loophole' is inflammatory and is meant to discredit the Applicant.<br><br>Mr. Platt failed to notify any Committees of Council that the City owns the lands zoned 'industrial' abutting Fulton Grove that are not subject to any rezonings.<br><br>Messrs. Platt and Smith's statements seek to effectively take away existing land-use rights though the Parker Lands Secondary Plan, whereas changes in land-use |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | rights are only affected through changes to the Zoning By-law.<br><br>Mr. Platt is confusing secondary plans with zoning by-laws, and mistakenly trying to convert the Parker Lands Secondary Plan into a zoning by-law.<br><br>Mr. Platt appeared before the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage, and Downtown Development Regular on May 21, 2020 and stated:<br><br>"Updates to figures that need to reflect the engineering studies." (7:52:52 of *video transcript of May 21, 2020 Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development, Heritage, and Downtown Development*).<br><br>Mr. Platt previously stated at the November 13, 2018 City Centre Community Committee that the new information submitted October, 2018 on dry ponds would need to be 'somehow covered in the Secondary Plan'. (*Transcript of James Platt presentation to City Centre Community Committee, November 13, 2018*).<br><br>Mr. Platt is previously on record advising the Applicant that detailed engineering does not belong in a secondary plan. (Email dated November 2, 2016 from Mr. Platt relaying to the Applicant that the initial engineering report by its consultant contained 'much greater detail |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | than what would normally be required for a Secondary Plan.')<br><br>Mr. Platt's comments on updating the figures to reflect engineering studies [dry ponds] indicates that the Public Service should take into account the documents listed in paragraph 71 of the October 5, 2020 decision as instructed by Justice Grammond. This paragraph states that the Public Service will revise the administrative reports to take into account the information described in paragraph 71. |
| **3** | ***Format/Organization*** | |
| **3** | b. **Way Forward**: | |
| **3b** | i. Public Service could 'clean up' the Plan accordingly and provide proponent with revised draft version of the Plan for comment/discussion. | **XIII. APPLICANT COMMENTS**<br><br>Point 3. b.i. regarding "Public Service clean up" indicates that the Public Service should take into account the documents listed in paragraph 71 of the October 5, 2020 decision as instructed by Justice Grammond. This paragraph states that the Public Service will revise the administrative reports to take into account the information described in paragraph 71.<br><br>78 % of the plan reflects the direction and language of the Public Service. Attached is a colour-coded Secondary Plan that indicates areas of input, review, comments and changes by the Public Service over the years on the final Plan. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Mr. Platt has repeatedly withheld from Committees of Council the fact that he informed the Applicant that the Public Service would resolve as many issues as possible in advance of preparing the Administrative report. The Public Service **did not attempt** to resolve any issues. (See *email dated March 16, 2018 between Gem Equities and James Platt*). |
| **3** | | ***Format/Organization*** | |
| **3b** | ii. | Discussions could then focus on the larger and more important issues (ie Density, uses, park space, etc). | **XIV. APPLICANT COMMENTS**<br><br>Messrs. James Platt and Braden Smith state in the July 31, 2018 Administration Report:<br><br>"The Public Service's review of the Plan identified over **200 issues** (not including issues raised with the background and engineering studies)" [emphasis mine] (page 14)<br><br>Messrs. James Platt and Braden Smith state in the July 31, 2018 Administration Report:<br><br>"The Public Service review of the Plan identified **approx. 250 separate issues** that require some form of alteration or addition to be made to the Plan. Some are minor text wordings, while others are more substantial and will require significant effort to resolve. It is unfeasible for this report to specifically |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | mention all approx. 250 issues identified by the Public Service."[emphasis mine] (page 30)<br><br>Ms. Sara Rentz, Legal Services, City of Winnipeg December 12, 2019 indicated:<br><br>"While I am advised that there are some **200+ modifications/corrections/amendments** to be made, the **majority** of these are relatively **minor in nature** (typos, organization, layout, etc.) and **can be done at our end quite easily**." [emphasis mine].<br><br>Point 3.b.ii indicates that 'more important issues' are being held up for discussion for 'minor in nature' changes that can be made 'quite easily'.<br><br>The Public Service should refer to their internal documents concerning their handling of the DASZ and SP application to ensure that the administrative report does not present a misleading picture of the Public Service's conduct and handling of these applications. |

*A Cross Jurisdictional Analysis & Review of Secondary Plans [Start Date June 1999].*

*Local Area Planning, Library*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | | *Winnipeg, Manitoba* |
| a | | Palliser Major Redevelopment Site Area Master Plan NON-STAT |
| b | | Corydon-Osborne Area Plan By-law |
| c | | Waterford Green Precinct Plan NON-STAT |
| d | | Precinct 'E' – The Court Avenue Precinct By-law |
| e | | Yards at Fort Rouge Area Master Plan NON-STAT |
| f | | North Point Village Precinct Plan NON-STAT |
| g | | Taylor Redevelopment Master Plan NON-STAT |
| h | | Railside at the Forks Concept Plan NON-STAT |
| i | | BISHOP GRANDIN CROSSING AREA MASTER PLAN: Sugar Beet Lands NON-STAT |
| j | | Transcona North Precinct Plan – Precinct I of Complete Communities |
| k | | PRECINCT J – DAWSON TRAIL PRECINCT PLAN NON-STAT |
| l | | Transcona West Area Structure Plan |
| m | | Transcona Yards Industrial Neighbourhood Area Redevelopment Plan |
| n | | PRECINCT K – PRECINCT PLAN |
| o | | North St. Boniface Secondary Plan |
| p | | Ridgewood South Precinct Plan: Precinct Q of Complete Communities |
| q | | Assiniboia Downs Area Master Plan NON-STAT |
| r | | Plan for Red River Exhibition Lands (A Portion of Precinct R of Complete Communities) NON-STAT |
| s | | Precinct Plan "T": Precinct T of Complete Communities NON-STAT |
| t | | South St. Boniface Area Structure Plan |
| u | | Osborne Village Neighbourhood Plan |
| v | | West Alexander & Centennial Neighbourhood Plan |
| w | | Waverley West Area Structure Plan |
| x | | Waverley West Northeast Neighbourhood Area Structure Plan |
| y | | Waverley West Northwest Neighbourhood Area Structure Plan |
| z | | Waverley West Southeast Neighbourhood Area Structure Plan |
| za | | Waverley West Southwest Neighbourhood Area Structure Plan |
| zb | | Waverley West Town Centre Neighbourhood Area Structure Plan |
| zc | | Waverley West West Neighbourhood Area Structure Plan |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **2** | | *Manitoba, Canada* |
| **a** | | Inland Port Special Planning Area Regulation, Regulation 48/2016 |
| **b** | | A SECONDARY PLAN FOR THE RURAL SETTLEMENT CENTRE OF ROSSER |
| **c** | | RM of Rosser CentrePort Secondary Plan [2014] |
| **d** | | NORTH BRANDON GATEWAY Secondary Plan |
| **e** | | The HUB Secondary Plan [Brandon] |
| **f** | | East Brandon Industrial Area Secondary Plan |
| **g** | | Brookwood South Neighbourhood Plan [Brandon] NON-STAT |
| **h** | | BRENTWOOD VILLAGE EXPANSION NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN [Brandon] NON-STAT |
| **i** | | BELLAFIELD - DOWNEY LANDS NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN [Brandon] NON-STAT |
| **j** | | Morrison Subdivision Neighborhood Plan [Brandon] NON-STAT |
| **k** | | The Downtown Brandon Secondary Plan |
| **l** | | SOUTHWEST BRANDON SECONDARY PLAN |
| **m** | | GRAND VALLEY RM OF CORNWALLIS SECONDARY PLAN |
| **n** | | Grand Marais Secondary Plan. [RM of St. Clements] |
| **o** | | Lockport Secondary Plan St. Clements |
| **p** | | SOUTH ST. ANDREWS AREA SECONDARY PLAN |
| **q** | | ST. ANDREWS AIRPORT AREA SECONDARY PLAN |
| **r** | | Middlechurch Secondary Plan: Sustainable Community Plan [West St. Paul] |
| **s** | | WEST ST. PAUL NORTH SECONDARY PLAN [West St. Paul] |
| **t** | | West St. Paul Employment Lands Secondary Plan |
| **u** | | Altona Fringe Area Secondary Plan |
| **v** | | Plum Coulee Fringe Area Secondary Plan |
| **w** | | South Basin Lake Manitoba Planning Area Secondary Plan 2008 [Portage La Prairie Planning District] |
| **x** | | Grande Pointe Secondary Plan RM of Ritchot |
| **y** | | ST. ADOLPHE EAST DIKE SECONDARY PLAN RM of Ritchot |
| | | |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **3** | | *Saskatoon, Saskatchewan* |
| **a** | | Blairmore Sector Plan |
| **b** | | Kensington Neighbourhood Concept Plan non-stat |
| **c** | | ASPEN RIDGE NEIGHBOURHOOD CONCEPT PLAN non-stat |
| **d** | | Mayfair & Kelsey-Woodlawn Local Area Plan non-stat |
| **e** | | Meadowgreen Local Area Plan non-stat |
| **f** | | WESTMOUNT Local Area Plan non-stat |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | | *Regina, Saskatchewan* |
| a | | Core Area Neighbourhood Plan |
| b | | Coopertown Neighbourhood Plan |
| c | | Warehouse District Neighbourhood Plan |
| d | | Former Diocese of Qu'Appelle Neighbourhood Plan |
| e | | East Victoria Concept Plan – Land-Use NON-STAT |
| f | | Rosewood Park Concept Plan – Land-Use Plan NON-STAT |
| g | | Towns Concept Plan - Land-Use Plan NON-STAT |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5 | | *Calgary, Alberta* |
| a | | Transit Oriented Development NON-STAT |
| b | | WINDSOR PARK TRANSITION AREA NON-STAT |
| c | | WEST LRT LAND USE STUDY SUMMARY REPORT NON-STAT |
| d | | Transit Oriented Development Best Practices Handbook NON-STAT |
| e | | L.R.T. South Corridor Land use Study NON-STAT |
| f | | Chinook Station Area Plan NON-STAT |
| g | | CURRIE BARRACKS CFB West Master Plan NON-STAT |
| h | | CRANSTON COMMUNITY PLAN NON-STAT |
| i | | Rundle Area Master Plan LRT Station NON-STAT |
| j | | Anderson Station Area Redevelopment Plan |
| k | | Banff Trail Station Area Redevelopment Plan |
| l | | Beltline Area Redevelopment Plan: Part 1 [west portion of the Beltline] |
| m | | Beltline Area Redevelopment Plan Part 2 [East Beltline] |
| n | | Brentwood Station Area Redevelopment Plan |
| o | | Glacier Ridge Area Structure Plan |
| p | | INGLEWOOD AREA REDEVELOPMENT PLAN |
| q | | SUNALTA AREA REDEVELOPMENT PLAN |
| r | | RICHMOND AREA REDEVELOPMENT PLAN |
| s | | UPPER MOUNT ROYAL AREA REDEVELOPMENT PLAN |
| t | | WEST VILLAGE AREA REDEVELOPMENT PLAN |
| u | | International Avenue Area Redevelopment Plan [CIP Award] |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | | *Edmonton, Alberta* |
| a | | Belvedere Station Area Redevelopment Plan |
| b | | Coliseum Station Area Redevelopment Plan |
| c | | Riverview Neighbourhood Structure Plan [The Uplands Neighbourhood Structure Plan] |
| d | | McLeod (West) Neighbourhood Area Structure Plan |
| e | | Ogilvie Ridge Neighbourhood Structure Plan |
| f | | The Hamptons Neighbourhood Structure Plan |
| g | | CLAREVIEW TOWN CENTRE NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA STRUCTURE PLAN [ED NOTE; TOD policies] |
| h | | Oxford Neighbourhood Structure Plan |
| i | | Riverview Neighbourhood #3 Neighbourhood Structure Plan |
| j | | HORSE HILL AREA STRUCTURE PLAN |
| k | | Webber Greens Neighbourhood Structure Plan |
| l | | The Grange Area Structure Plan |
| m | | The Meadows Area Structure Plan |
| n | | Hawks Ridge Neighbourhood Structure Plan |
| o | | Trumpeter Neighbourhood Structure Plan |
| | | |
| 7 | | *Vancouver, BC* |
| a | | EAST FRASER LANDS OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN [cip award] |
| b | | Grandview-Woodland Community Plan |
| c | | Norquay Village Neighbourhood Centre Plan |
| d | | Joyce-Collingwood Station Precinct Plan |
| | | |
| 8 | | *Victoria, BC* |
| a | | Victoria West Neighbourhood Plan NON-STAT |
| b | | GONZALES NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMUNITY PLAN NON-STAT |
| | | |
| 9 | | *CIP Award Winning Plans* |
| a | | Ottawa-River-South-Shore-Riverfront-Park-Plan [National Capital Commission]NON-STAT |
| b | | Transit-Oriented Communities Design Guidelines Metro Vancouver [Trans Links] ]NON-STAT |
| | | |
| 10 | | *Hamilton, ON* |
| a | | Davis Creek Neighbourhood Action Plan NON-STAT |
| b | | Ancaster Secondary Plans |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **11** | | ***Ottawa, ON*** |
| **a** | | Hurdman Secondary Plan |
| **b** | | Bayview Station District Secondary Plans |
| **c** | | Transit-Oriented Development Guidelines NON-STAT |
| | | |
| **12** | | ***Toronto, ON*** |
| **a** | | RAILWAY LANDS CENTRAL SECONDARY PLAN |
| **b** | | DOWNSVIEW AREA SECONDARY PLAN |
| **c** | | QUEEN-RIVER SECONDARY PLAN |
| | | |
| **13** | | ***Halifax, NS*** |
| **a** | | MUNICIPAL PLANNING STRATEGY HALIFAX |
| | | |
| **14** | | ***Minneapolis, USA*** |
| **a** | | Van White Memorial Boulevard Station Area Plan METRO Blue Line Extension Minneapolis, MN, USA |
| **b** | | Stadium Village University Avenue Station Area Plan Minneapolis, MN, USA |
| **c** | | Loring Park NHood Master Plan |
| | | |
| **15** | | ***St. Paul, USA*** |
| **a** | | Hamline Midway Community Plan (District 11) |
| **b** | | HAMLINE STATION AREA PLAN |
| **c** | | VICTORIA STATION AREA PLAN |
| **d** | | LOWER AFTON: RED ROCK COMMUTER RAIL |
| | | |
| **16** | | ***City of Los Angeles USA*** |
| **a** | | PALMS-MAR VISTA-DEL REY Community Plan |
| **b** | | Southeast Community Plan |
| **c** | | Exposition Corridor Transit Neighborhood Plan |
| **d** | | Adelante Eastside Redevelopment Plan |
| **e** | | HOLLYWOOD REDEVELOPMENT PLAN |
| | | |
| **17** | | ***Nashville, USA*** |
| **a** | | Volume III:Community Plans. Southeast |
| **b** | | Volume III:Community Plans. Green Hills – Midtown |
| | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **18** | ***Denver, USA*** | |
| **a** | | Multi-Station Plan & Mobility Study University and Colorado Stations |
| | | |
| | | |
| **19** | ***Chicago, USA*** | |
| **a** | | Halsted Triangle Plan |
| **b** | | Fulton Market Innovation District Plan |
| **c** | | Metra Milwaukee District West Line Transit-Friendly Development Plan |
| | | |
| **20** | ***St. Louis, USA*** | |
| **a** | | McRee Town - South Neighborhood Plan |
| **b** | | North Riverfromt Commerce Corridor Land Use Plan |
| **20** | ***Porland, USA*** | |
| **a** | | Portsmouth Neighborhood Plan |
| | | |
| **21** | ***Madison, WI, USA*** | |
| **a** | | Emerson East–Eken Park–Yahara Neighborhood Plan |
| **b** | | Yahara Hills Neighborhood Development Plan |
| | | |

**Compare and Contrast the Organization and Format**
**Parker Lands Secondary Plans to Winnipeg's Secondary Plans, 2000 - 2020.**

**John S. Wintrup**

## 1. Purpose

The purpose of this study is to compare and contrast the organization and format of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan for the Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site with the other thirty-two (32) secondary plans adopted in Winnipeg since the year 2000. This study will quantify the level of correlation between the Parker Lands Secondary Plan and the (32) secondary plans in Winnipeg, and rank this level of correlation from strongest to weakest.

## 2. Background

The City of Winnipeg between 2000 and 2020 approved thirty-two (32) secondary plans for specific areas or neighbourhoods within Winnipeg.

- Twenty-two (22) are statutory, secondary plans adopted by by-law at Winnipeg Council.
- Ten (10) are non-statutory, secondary plans endorsed by policy at Winnipeg Council.

The first secondary plan was adopted in November, 2005 and the most recent was adopted in July, 2020.

A diversity of authors composed these secondary plans including private sector consultants from multinational firms, boutique firms from the United States, boutique firms from Winnipeg, and the City of Winnipeg employees. And, a diversity of civic employees reviewed and managed the secondary plans through the approval process over the last two (2) decades.

In ***Ladco v. City of Winnipeg 2020 MBQB 101***, para. 164, Justice Edmonds accepted the City of Winnipeg's affirmation that, including but not limited, seven (7) of the statutory and five (5) of the non-statutory secondary plans are part of the ***City's Regulatory Scheme***, thus meeting a legal test for the City of Winnipeg to apply regulatory charges in these sub-areas.

Notably, a clear majority (23) of the secondary plans were completed in the last 12 years under the ***Our Winnipeg / Complete Communities*** policy framework. These secondary plans mainly cover the sub-areas of Winnipeg identified as: new communities [greenfield (precincts)], and major redevelopment sites (MRS) with only two (2) secondary plans in the last 12 years covering a 'Mature Community' (Corydon and North St. Boniface).

All of these secondary planning documents were prepared under the same provincial legislative framework, ***The City of Winnipeg Charter Act S.M. 2002.***

## 3. Method

The methodology employed to analyze the organization and format of all thirty-two (32) secondary plans was a review of each secondary plans 'table of contents' and the layout of the documents: the table of contents with headings and sub-headings reflect the manner in which a document is organized and formatted.

This study did not specifically examine format in-terms of font [size, colour]; paragraph and line spacing; bullet / numbering scheme; page layout [landscape vs portrait], page size [letter vs. tabloid]; grammar, spelling, or colour scheme of the document.

This study did not get into the details of the sub, sub-section level, unless necessary.

The planning content of the secondary plans was not quantified or evaluated.

Secondary plans do not have a standard lexicon, thus there are different words being used for the same heading. The content was then reviewed to determine if the headings or sub-heading have the same meaning (i.e. one secondary plan uses the term 'Objectives' has the same type of content as a different secondary plan using the term 'Intent').

- A single point of one (1) is credited to each heading that ***matches*** to the Parker Lands Secondary Plan.

- A point of one (1) is credited to each sub-heading that ***matches*** a sub-heading under the same heading as the Parker Lands Secondary Plan Table of Contents.

- A '**match**' will include the heading or sub-heading using the exact same word; a derivative form of the word (i.e. interpret, interpreting; plan, planning); or a synonym (i.e. goal, objective, intent).

- A half-point is credited if the heading appears as a sub-heading, or if the sub-heading appears as a heading.

- No points are credited if there is no similarities [but marked as a zero] meaning the heading or sub-heading appears in an entirely different section of the document.

- No points are credited if the heading or sub-heading is absent. For example, a secondary plan for green fields may have a heading addressing underground services, whereas a secondary plan for a mature community likely will not.

The points are then totalled and scored out of 10. A score of 10 equals a perfect correlation, and zero equals no correlation in the organization and format. The secondary plans are then ranked from highest to lowest score, with the highest ranked scoring being the strongest ***match***

and the lowest being the weakest ***match***. A score above eight (8) is an indicator of a ***strong match***; and a score below eight (8) is considered a ***weak match***.

## 4. Observations

Winnipeg's secondary plans generally have similar organizations / formats with the following common features [not necessary headings], including but not limited to:

- Introduction - statement regarding the purpose of the plan.
- Planning Area - a description of the sub-area(s) effected by the plan.
- Vision / Goal - an outline of the vision or goal of the plan.
- Policies - policy statements.
- Maps - maps illustrating the subject planning area and the policy areas.
- Administration – an administration component for the planning document.

There are four (4) major differences of organization and format for secondary plans:

1) Plan Area / Planning Area – a description of the planning area effected by the plan is located in a sub-heading under the 'Introduction'; OR located as its own section.

2) Infrastructure – some secondary plans have one heading with separate sub-headings each for 'Transportation' and for 'Underground Services'; OR have these two(2) as separate headings.

3) Figures / Maps – some secondary plans place all the maps / figures at the back of the document, whereas some have the figures / maps imbedded within the document under the different sections (i.e. a map of the planning area is located under the 'Plan Area' with the text instead of at the back of the document).

4) Unique – secondary planning documents that have no similar format or organization to the orthodox format described above.

Winnipeg's 'unique' plans are: West Alexander, Taylor, Corydon-Osborne, Yards at Fort Rouge, Bishop Grandin, Osborne Village, and the Forks with formats / organizations not similar to other plans or each other. Such format / organization extends beyond the headings and sub-headings [or lack thereof] as the unique aspect of these planning documents can also be viewed in the page layouts, the illustrations, etc.

Several plans have distinct aspects within the document to address a specific issue or characteristic inherent to that particular planning area; or the author(s) preferred to do something different. For example, Precinct K – Royalwoods Secondary Plan places the 'Plan Context' in an appendix at the back of the document, instead of as a section or sub-section in the document. This is rare, but not necessarily different enough to classify as 'unique'. Several

plans call the 'Table of Contents' simply 'Content', this is a wordsmithing difference that does not warrant a plan to be classified as 'unique'.

And, there is no alarm with being 'unique': the American Planning Association *Plan Making: A Primer. American Planning Association PAS QuickNotes No. 17. 2018* acknowledges ***there is no industry standard for planning documents for their format or organization***.

The following general observation were made during this study:

- The exact same type of numbering scheme [Section 1.0; Sub-sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.4; Sub, sub-sections 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3, etc.] of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan is observed on thirty (30) other secondary plan documents.
- Five (5) other secondary plans use 'red coloured text' for the headings in the table of contents like Parker Lands Secondary Plan, whereas the majority simply use black and white text, with the most recent secondary plans using blue text for the headings.
- Letter size of the page and the portrait page orientation of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan is nearly universal, with limited exceptions.
- There was no noticeable organization / format differences between secondary plans that were statutory or non-statutory.
- There was no noticeable organization / format differences between secondary plans completed under ***Plan Winnipeg*** vs. ***OurWinnipeg***.
- There was no noticeable organization / format differences between secondary plans approved 15 years apart.

## 5. Results

The Parker Lands Secondary Plan locates the 'Plan Area' description under the 'Introduction'. Seven (7) other secondary plans share this type of format / organization, notably, the last seven (7) secondary plans approved between February 2016 and July 2020.

The Parker Secondary Plan has one heading for the infrastructure entitled 'Transportation and Servicing Policies' instead of splitting this into two (2) sub-headings: nine (9) other secondary plans including three (3) of the most recent seven(7) secondary plans [approved between 2016 and 2020] also have the same approach.

Seven (7) of the approved secondary plans including three (3) of the most recent plans approved in 2019 and 2020 score +9.0 on alignment with the Parker Lands Secondary Plan, thus rank as the strongest ***matches***.

Nineteen (19) score +8.0 on alignment with the Parker Lands Secondary Plan, thus rank as strong **matches**. Winnipeg's 'unique' secondary plans rank near the bottom with the weakest ***matches.***

***Secondary Plans, Rank and Score Against Parker Lands Secondary Plans.***

| Rank | Score | Secondary Plan |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 9.21875 | Precinct F North Point Village POLICY March 2014 |
| 2 | 9.0625 | Precinct Q Ridgewood South BYLAW May 2013 |
| 2 | 9.0625 | Precinct J Dawson Trail POLICY May 2014 |
| 2 | 9.0625 | Precinct K South Royalwoods BYLAW July 2014 |
| 2 | 9.0625 | Precinct G North McPhillips BYLAW January 2019 |
| 2 | 9.0625 | Waverley West B NHood BYLAW June 2019 |
| 2 | 9.0625 | Public Markets MRS D BYLAW July 2020 |
| 3 | 8.75 | Waverley West SE BYLAW November 2007 |
| 3 | 8.75 | Transcona West BYLAW July 2008 |
| 3 | 8.75 | Waverley West NW BYLAW July 2010 |
| 3 | 8.75 | Waverley West Town Centre BYLAW July 2010 |
| 3 | 8.75 | Waverley West W Nhood BYLAW November 2012 |
| 4 | 8.59375 | Railside Forks MRS POLICY December 2017 |
| 5 | 8.44 | Waverley West NE BYLAW November 2006 |
| 6 | 8.4375 | Waverley West SW BYLAW June 2013 |
| 6 | 8.4375 | Precinct I Transcona North BYLAW July 2014 |
| 7 | 8.28125 | Bishop Grandin Sugar Beets MRS H POLICY May 2014 |
| 7 | 8.28 | South St Boniface BYLAW November 2005 |
| 8 | 8.125 | Precinct R Red River Ex POLICY November 2016 |
| 9 | 7.8125 | North St Boniface BYLAW July 2017 |
| 10 | 6.88 | Waverley West ASP BYLAW July 2006 |
| 10 | 6.875 | Palliser MRS A POLICY September 2013 |
| 10 | 6.875 | Precinct T Castlebury Meadows POLICY November 2013 |
| 11 | 6.40625 | Precinct C Waterford Green POLICY December 2012 |
| 12 | 5.94 | Osborne Village BYLAW January 2007 |
| 13 | 5.9375 | Precinct E Court Ave BYLAW December 2014 |
| 13 | 5.9375 | Precinct R Assiniboia Downs POLICY February 2016 |
| 14 | 4.22 | Transcona Yards BYLAW February 2006 |
| 14 | 4.21875 | Yards at Fort Rouge MRS E POLICY December 2010 |
| 14 | 4.21875 | Corydon Osborne BYLAW December 2014 |
| 15 | 3.4375 | Taylor MRS F POLICY May 2013 |
| 16 | 0.625 | West Alexander BYLAW July 2008 |

***Compare and Contrast Recent Secondary Plans***

Parker Lands Secondary Plan is not 'unique' and is in fact quite typical in terms of format and organization.

The marked differences in format and organization between the Parker Lands Secondary Plans and the last three (3) secondary plans [Precinct G 2019, Waverley West Neighbourhood B 2019, and Public Markets 2020] approved are as follow:

1) Parker Lands Secondary Plans uses 'red text' for the headings in the Table of Contents:
    a. Public Markets and Waverley West Neighbourhood B use 'blue text' for the headings.
    b. Precinct G uses black and white.

2) Parker Lands has 'List of Figures' in the Table of Contents and provides the names of the figures at the back of the document on a page just before the Figures:
    a. Precinct G, Public Markets, and Waverley West Neighbourhood B has the 'List of Figures' and actually provides the list of figures with the names of the figures.

3) Parker Lands has a section entitled 'Maps' in the Table of Contents to indicate the maps are at the back of the document, but also has the maps embedded within the sections in the document:
    a. Precinct G, Public Markets, and Waverley West Neighbourhood B do not have the word 'map' in the table of contents, using 'figures'.
    b. Precinct G has the maps at the back of the document similar to Parker Lands but lists them only as figures and not under a section called 'maps'.
    c. Public Markets, and Waverley West Neighbourhood B have the maps embedded within the sections in the document; and as the maps at the back of the document same as Parker Lands, but in a section entitled 'Appendices'.

4) Parker Lands has a section entitled 'Definitions':
    a. Precinct G defines words within the section where being used.
    b. Public Markets and Waverley West Neighbourhood B have no such section.

5) Parker Lands and Precinct G have separate sections for 'Implementation' and 'Time Frame':
    a. Public Markets, and Waverley West Neighbourhood B secondary plans combines 'Implementation' with 'Timeframe' to create a new section entitled 'Implementation and Timeframe'.

6) Parker Lands has one section called 'Transportation and Servicing Policies':
    a. Precinct G has 'Transportation' and has a separate Section entitled 'Servicing'.
    b. Waverley West Neighbourhood B, and Public Markets calls this 'Transportation' and has a separate section entitled 'Municipal Services and Utilities'.

Precinct G, Public Markets, and Waverley West Neighbourhood B secondary plans each score 9.1 out of 10 compared to Parker Lands due to the differences described above. These few differences can easily be classified as 'minor', there is no significant or uniqueness amongst these four (4) secondary plans to make any of them stand apart from the others.

## 6. Conclusion

The Parker Lands Secondary Plan, when comparing and contrasting with the organization and format of the other thirty-two (32) secondary plans in Winnipeg, appears to be the same or near similar, placing amongst the majority of secondary plans.

The major headings and sub-headings, and the organization of such items in the Parker Lands Secondary Plan is found in several other secondary plans that have been approved in the last 20 years in Winnipeg. This means the Parker Lands Secondary Plan headings and sub-headings are all accounted for, no missing headings or sub-headings.

There is no perfect match between Parker Lands Secondary Plan, and any other secondary plan, as there are differences between and amongst all the secondary plans.

- The differences with the majority of the secondary plans are minor, such as a section split into two (2) sub-sections; and/or a minor sub-section is elevated to be a section.

- The differences with a select few plans, the so called 'unique' plans in-terms of format and organizations, are the same differences the majority of secondary plans have with this select minority of secondary plans.

Strikingly, the Parker Lands Secondary Plan matches strongly to the secondary plans adopted in 2019 and 2020, with relatively minor differences in such items as: font colour; having sections entitled 'definition' and 'maps'; combining all infrastructure under one section instead of splitting into two; and separating sub-sections ''Implementation' and 'Time Frame' into two(2) instead of consolidated under one sub-section.

Parker Lands Secondary Plan when compared and contrasted to the other thirty-two (32) secondary plans in Winnipeg follows the common format and organization.

In short, there is nothing remarkable, exceptional, or different about the format / organization of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan when matched to the other thirty-two (32) secondary plans in Winnipeg.

TABLE 1: Compare and Contrast the Organization and Format of Parker Lands Secondary Plans to Winnipeg's Secondary Plans, 2000 - 2020.

*2000 >>>>>>> 2010 >>>>> >>>>> >>> 2014 >>>>>>> 2016 >>> 2020*

| Parker Lands Secondary Plan | | South St Boniface BYLAW November 2005 | Transcona Yards BYLAW February 2006 | Waverley West ASP BYLAW July 2006 | Waverley West NE BYLAW November 2006 | Osborne Village BYLAW January 2007 | Waverley West SE BYLAW November 2007 | Transcona West BYLAW July 2008 | West Alexander BYLAW July 2008 | Waverley West NW BYLAW July 2010 | Waverley West Town Centre BYLAW July 2010 | Yards at Fort Rouge MRS E POLICY December 2010 | Waverley West W Nhood BYLAW November 2012 | Precinct C Waterford Green POLICY December 2012 | Taylor MRS F POLICY May 2013 | Precinct Q Ridgewood South BYLAW May 2013 | Waverley West SW BYLAW June 2013 | Palliser MRS A POLICY September 2013 | Precinct T Castlebury Meadows POLICY November 2013 | Precinct F North Point Village POLICY March 2014 | Bishop Grandin Sugar Beets MRS H POLICY May 2014 | Precinct J Dawson Trail POLICY May 2014 | Precinct I Transcona North BYLAW July 2014 | Precinct K South Royalwoods BYLAW July 2014 | Corydon Osborne BYLAW December 2014 | Precinct E Court Ave BYLAW December 2014 | Precinct R Assiniboia Downs POLICY February 2016 | Precinct R Red River Ex POLICY November 2016 | North St Boniface BYLAW July 2017 | Railside Forks MRS POLICY December 2017 | Precinct G North McPhillips BYLAW January 2019 | Waverley West B NHood BYLAW June 2019 | Public Markets MRS D BYLAW July 2020 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **TABLE OF CONTENTS** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| **1. Introduction** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| 1.1 Purpose of the Plan | 1 | **1** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| 1.2 Planning Area And Context | 1 | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| 1.3 Interpreting the Plan | 1 | **1** | **0** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | | | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| 1.31 Authority of the Plan | 1 | **1** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **0.5** | **1** | **1** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| 1.3.2 Time Frame of the Plan | 1 | **1** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | | | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| 1.3.3 Policies Applications and Interpretations | 1 | **1** | **0** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| 1.3.4 Maps | 1 | **1** | **0** | **0** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| 1.4 Monitoring, Review and Evaluation | 1 | **1** | **0** | **0** | **1** | **0** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **0** | **0** | **1** | **1** | | | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| 1.5 Amendments to the Plan | 1 | **1** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **0** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **0** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| 1.6 Supporting Studies | 1 | | | | | **1** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **1** | | | | **0** | | | **1** | **1** | **1** | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2. Planning Vision and Objectives** | **1** | **1** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **0.5** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | | | **1** | **1** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| 2.1 Vision | 1 | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **0.5** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| 2.2 Objectives | 1 | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **0.5** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **3. Land-Use Concept** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **0.5** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **0.5** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objectives | 1 | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| Policies | 1 | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objectives | 1 | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| Policies | 1 | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objectives | 1 | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| Policies | 1 | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4. Transportation and Servicing Policies** | **1** | **1** | | **0.5** | **0.5** | | **0.5** | **0.5** | | **0.5** | **0.5** | **1** | **0.5** | **1** | | **0.5** | **0.5** | **1** | **0.5** | **1** | **1** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** | **0.5** |
| 4.3 Transportation Infrastructure | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objectives | 1 | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | | | **1** | **1** | | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| Policies | 1 | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| 4.4 Water, Waste Water and Land Drainage. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objectives | 1 | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| Policies | 1 | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **5. Implementation** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | | **1** | **1** | **0.5** | **0.5** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **6. Definition** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | | | | **1** | | **1** | **0.5** | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **7. List of Figures** | **1** | | **1** | | | | | | | | | **1** | | **1** | | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | | **1** | | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **8. Maps** | **1** | | **1** | | | | | | | | | | | **1** | | **1** | | | | | **1** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **9. Appendices** | **1** | | **1** | | | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | | | **1** | | **1** | | **1** | **1** | **1** | | **1** | | | | **1** | **1** | | | **1** | **1** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **TOTAL** | **32** | **26.5** | **13.5** | **22** | **27** | **19** | **28** | **28** | **2** | **28** | **28** | **13.5** | **28** | **20.5** | **11** | **29** | **27** | **22** | **22** | **29.5** | **26.5** | **29** | **27** | **29** | **13.5** | **19** | **19** | **26** | **25** | **27.5** | **29** | **29** | **29** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **[out of 10] SCORE** | **10** | **8.28** | **4.22** | **6.88** | **8.44** | **5.94** | **8.75** | **8.75** | **0.63** | **8.75** | **8.75** | **4.22** | **8.75** | **6.41** | **3.44** | **9.06** | **8.44** | **6.88** | **6.88** | **9.22** | **8.28** | **9.06** | **8.44** | **9.06** | **4.22** | **5.94** | **5.94** | **8.13** | **7.81** | **8.59** | **9.06** | **9.06** | **9.06** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Top TEN RANK** | | **7** | | **10** | **5** | | **3** | **3** | | **3** | **3** | | **3** | | | **2** | **6** | **10** | **10** | **1** | **7** | **2** | **6** | **2** | | | | **8** | **9** | **4** | **2** | **2** | **2** |

| | |
|---|---|
| **1** | Same Format |
| **0.5** | 1) Transportation and Servicing split into two (2) separate sections. 2) Planning Area is hived off into separate section. 3) Marked to indicate this section is a sub-section. |
| **0** | Different Format. No similarity, the sub or sub-section is located in a entirely different location. |
| | |
| | Blank means section or sub-section heading not shared with Parker Lands Plans. |

TABLE 2: NOTES to TABLE 1

| Parker Lands Secondary Plan | NOTES |
|---|---|
| **TABLE OF CONTENTS** | Corydon, Railside, WW B N'Hood and Public Markets calls this 'Contents'. |
| **1. Introduction** | |
| 1.1 Purpose of the Plan | Transcona Yards has this located in the Appendix. |
| | WW ASP calls this 'General Intent'. |
| | Osborne Village calls this 'Plan Need'. |
| | WW SE, WW SW, Assiniboia Downs use 'Purpose'. |
| | Precinct C has a statement on the purpose of the plan but no sub-heading indicating 'Purpose'. |
| | Taylor calls this 'What is the Purpose of the Area Master Plan'. |
| | Palliser calls this 'MRS Sites and the Palliser MRS Area Master Plan'. |
| | Bishop Grandin calls this 'Purpose of the Area Master Plan'. |
| | Corydon calls this 'About the Corydon-Osborne Area Plan'. |
| | Railside calls this 'Purpose and Interpretation' |
| | |
| 1.2 Planning Area And Context | Osborne Village calls this as a separate section called 'Existing Situation'. |
| | Assiniboia Downs, Red River Ex, Precinct G, North St. Boniface, WW B N'Hood, Public Markets calls this 'Planning Area'. |
| | South St. Boniface, Transcona Yards, WW ASP, WW NE, Transcona West, Precinct Plan Q, Precinct Plan J, Precinct Plan I, WW NW, WW TC, WW W, WW SE and WW SW call this under its own section 'Plan/Planning Area'. |
| | Precinct C calls this under its under its own section 'Precinct C Characteristics and Context'. |
| | Yards at Fort Rouge, Taylor calls this under its own section 'Site Information'. |
| | Palliser calls this under its own section 'Palliser MRS Characteristics and Context'. |
| | Precinct T calls this under its own section 'Part B: Site Characteristics and Context' |
| | Precinct F calls this Section 2.0 'Precinct F Characteristics and Context'. |
| | Bishop Grandin has this in a separate section called 'Part B: Site Information'. |
| | Corydon places this subsection as Section 2.0 called 'About the Study Area'. |
| | Transcona Yards has this as Section 1.0. |
| | Precinct K has this in an Appendix at the back of the document. |
| | Precinct E places this subsection as Section 2.0 and calls this 'Site Information' |
| | Railside calls this 'Context'. |
| | Precinct G, North St. Boniface, WW N'Hood B call this sub-section 'Plan / Planning Area'. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.3 Interpreting the Plan | Transcona Yards, WW ASP has this on page 2 before the Table of Contents. |
| | Precinct T call this 'Plan Interpretation'. |
| | Precinct I, Red River Ex call this 'Interpretation of the Plan'. |
| | WW W, WW SE, WW SW, Precinct F, Precinct J, Precinct K, and Public Markets call this 'Interpretation'. |
| | |
| 1.3.1 Authority of the Plan | Transcona Yard has this in the Appendix. |
| | WW ASP, WW W calls this 'Plan Winnipeg 2020'. |
| | WW SE and WW SW call this 'Authority'. |
| | Yards at Fort Rouge, Precinct C, Bishop Grandin and Assiniboia Downs calls this 'Policy Framework'. |
| | Precinct T, Precinct K, North St. Boniface combines this with typical statement about the purpose of the plan under the 'Introduction' heading inside of a separate sub-section. |
| | Precinct C, and Red River Ex calls this 'Complete Communities Direction Strategy'. |
| | Taylor and Palliser calls this 'Policy Framework' and has it as a separate section. |
| | Railside calls this 'OurWinnipeg & Complete Communities Direction Strategy'. |
| | |
| 1.3.2 Time Frame of the Plan | WW SE and WW SW call this 'Timeframe'. |
| | Railside has this is in the Policy Coversheet. |
| | Precinct G, WW B N'Hood and Public Markets calls this 'Implementation and Timeframe' |
| | |
| 1.3.3 Policies Applications and Interpretations | Transcona Yards, WW ASP, WW W has this on page 2 before the Table of Contents. |
| | Transcona West, WW SE and WW SW shortens this to 'Policy'. |
| | Precinct C has statements regarding policy and map interpretations but no sub-headings for these. |
| | Osborne, Precinct Q, Precinct T, Precinct I, and Red River EX calls this 'Policy Interpretation'. |
| | Palliser calls this 'Interpreting Policy Statements" |
| | Bishop Grandin calls this 'Interpreting Policy Statements'. |
| | Assiniboia Downs calls this 'How to Interpret the Plan'. |
| | Railside calls this 'Policy Interpretation' in the policy coversheet. |
| | WW B Hood and Public Markets calls this 'Policies'. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1.3.4 Maps | Transcona Yards, WW ASP, WW W has this on page 2 before the Table of Contents. |
| | Precinct F calls this 'Figures'. |
| | Palliser calls this 'Interpreting the Land Use and Transportation Policy Map'. |
| | Bishop Grandin calls this 'Interpretation the Concept Maps'. |
| | Precinct I, Red River Ex calls this 'Map Interpretations'. |
| | Railside calls this 'Illustrations'. |
| | WW B N'Hood and Public Markets calls this 'Mapping'. |
| | |
| 1.4 Monitoring, Review and Evaluation | Transcona Yards has this subsection under the 'Implementation Section' and in the Appendix. |
| | WW ASP combines this with amendments for 'Plan Review and Amendments' |
| | Osborne locates this at the end of the document. |
| | WW W calls this 'Plan Review and Amendment'. |
| | Corydon has this under Section 'Implementation'. |
| | Precinct E has this under a separate Section entitled 'Implementation and Monitoring'. |
| | Precinct Q, Precinct T, Precinct J, Precinct I, and Red River Ex call this 'Monitoring of the Plan'. |
| | Railside calls this 'Monitoring the Plan' in the policy coversheet. |
| | |
| 1.5 Amendments to the Plan | Transcona Yards has this subsection in the Appendix. |
| | Osborne locates this at the end of the document. |
| | WW W calls this 'Plan Review and Amendment'. |
| | Bishop Grandin has this in an Appendix under 'Operationalizing the Bishop Grandin Crossing Area Master Plan'. |
| | Corydon has this under the Section 'Implementation'. |
| | Precinct E has this under a separate Section entitled 'Implementation and Monitoring'. |
| | Railside has this in the policy coversheet. |
| | |
| 1.6 Supporting Studies | Osborne calls this 'Background Studies'. |
| | Red River Ex calls this 'Supporting Background Reports'. |
| | Precinct G, WW B N'Hood, PUBLIC MARKETS calls this 'Background and Supporting Studies'. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **2. Planning Vision and Objectives** | Transcona Yard calls this 'Planning Goals' and locates it in Appendix at the back. |
| | WW ASP calls this 'Vision and Planning Principles'. |
| | Transcona West, Precinct F call this 'Vision and Goals'. |
| | WW NE, WW TC calls this 'Planning Vision and Planning Goals'. |
| | Osborne Village calls this 'Goals & Objectives' and locates it as a subsection under Section 1 'Plan Definition'. |
| | WW W calls this 'Planning Vision, Principles and Goals'. |
| | Precinct C locates this as a sub-section under 'Waterford Green Land-Use and Development Policies'. |
| | Precinct Q, and Precinct F call this 'Vision and Goals'. |
| | WW NW calls this 'Vision' and 'Goals'. |
| | Palliser combines this with the 'Land-Use Concept' and calls this entire section 'Palliser MRS Land Use and Development Policies'. |
| | Precinct T makes this a sub-section and calls this 'Goals for the Neighbourhood' under the 'Land-use and Development Policies'. |
| | Precinct F calls this 'Goals for the Neighbourhood'. |
| | Bishop Grandin combines this section with 'Land-Use Concept' for a section called 'Part C; Development Concept'. |
| | Precinct J, Red River Ex calls this 'Planning Vision and Goals'. |
| | Precinct I calls this 'Planning Vision, Context, and Goals'. |
| | Corydon calls this section 'Vision' and the sub-section 'Vision & Goals' |
| | Precinct E calls this 'Precinct Plan Vision and Goals'. |
| | Assiniboia Downs calls this 'Planning Objectives'. |
| | Red River Ex calls this 'Planning Vision and Goals'. |
| | Railside calls this 'Vision and Objectives' and the Railside policy coversheet calls it 'Planning Vision and Goals'. |
| | Precinct K, WW B N'Hood, Public Markets calls this 'Planning Vision and Guiding Principles'. |
| | |
| 2.1 Vision | Precinct Q calls this 'Goals for Ridgewood South Precinct Q'. |
| | Corydon calls this sub-section 'Vision & Goals' under the Section 'Vision'. |
| | Precinct E calls this 'Overall Vision'. |
| | Precinct I, and Red River Ex call this 'Planning Vision'. |
| | |
| 2.2 Objectives | WW ASP calls this 'Planning Principles'. |
| | WW SW, WW SE, and Precinct F call this 'Goals'. |
| | Taylor calls this 'Principles & Guidelines'. |
| | Transcona West, South St. Boniface calls this section 'Goals for the Community'. |
| | WW TC, WW W, Precinct I, Precinct J, Precinct E and Red River Ex calls this 'Planning Goals'. |
| | Precinct K, WW B N'Hood, Public Markets calls this 'Guiding Principles'. |
| | Corydon has a list that appears as goals without the sub-heading 'goals'. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **3. Land-Use Concept** | WW ASP calls this 'Plan Context and Structure'. |
| | WW SW, WW NE, Precinct J, Precinct I, Precinct K, Precinct E, North St. Boniface and Precinct G call this section 'Land Use Policies'. |
| | Osborne Village calls this 'Neighbourhood Plan'. |
| | Yards at Fort Rouge calls this 'Development Concept'. |
| | Precinct C calls this 'Waterford Green Development Concept'. |
| | Taylor calls this 'Development Framework'. |
| | Palliser combines this with the 'Vision and Objectives' and calls this entire section 'Palliser MRS Land Use and Development Policies'. |
| | Precinct T calls this 'Land-Use and Development Policies'. |
| | Precinct F calls this 'Precinct Wide Policies' with sub-sections of 'Land Use and Development' and 'Municipal Infrastructure'. |
| | Bishop Grandin calls this 'Land Use Strategy'. |
| | Corydon calls this 'Vision Development' and a sub-section of 'Vision'. |
| | Assiniboia Downs calls this 'Land Use Policy Areas'. |
| | Railside calls this 'Concept Plan' and the coversheet calls it 'Land Use Concept'. |
| | WW B N'Hood and Public Markets calls this 'Land Use'. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Objectives | WW ASP, WW NE, Osborne Village, WW W, WW SE, WW SW, Corydon, and Precinct Plan G use 'Intent'. |
| | WW NE has a statement that usually begins with 'The purpose [insert name of sub-section] . . .'<br>the actual heading of 'objective' or 'purpose' is not included. |
| | Transcona West, Precinct Q, Precinct I, South St. Boniface and Red River Ex use 'Purposes'. |
| | WW TC, and WW W has a statement that usually begins with 'The [insert name of sub-section] will . . .. ' the actual heading of 'objective' or 'purpose' is not included. |
| | Taylor calls this 'goals' |
| | Precinct F, Bishop Grandin, Precinct E, Railside have statements worded like 'objectives'<br>but without the actual heading of 'purpose' or 'objective'. |
| | Precinct J uses 'Land-use' and has statements worded as 'purposes' without this sub-heading. |
| | Assiniboia Downs uses 'Vision & Objectives'. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Policies | WW ASP, Yards at Fort Rouge, Osborne Village, WW NW, WW TC, WW SW, Precinct C, Palliser, Precinct F, and Corydon have policy statements for each sub-section but no such labelling of 'Policies'. |
| | Taylor calls this 'principles'. |
| | Precinct T uses some labelling with the sub-section name in front of the word 'policy'. |
| | Precinct Q and Bishop Grandin call these 'Policies' but with the sub-section name in front such as: 'Plaza Policies', and 'Parks Policies'. |
| | Precinct F has statements worded like 'policies' but without the actual heading of 'policies'. |
| | Precinct J uses 'Design'. |
| | WW B N'Hood and Public Markets use the term 'General Policies'. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **4. Transportation and Servicing Policies** | WW ASP has 'Regional Transportation' and several transportation type related sections, and a separate section called 'Servicing Policies'. |
| | WW NW, WW TC, WW NE has a section called 'Transportation Policies' and a separate section called 'Utilities and Servicing Policies'. |
| | Yards at Fort Rouge calls this 'Transportation Strategy'. |
| | Osborne Village calls this 'Transportation Element'. |
| | WW W Nhood calls this 'Servicing Policies'. |
| | Precinct Q has 'Transportation' and a separate section called 'Land Drainage, Wastewater and Water Servicing'. |
| | Bishop Grandin calls this 'Infrastructure and Servicing Strategy'. |
| | Transcona West, Precinct I has 'Transportation Policies' and a section entitled 'Servicing Policies'. |
| | WW SE, South St. Boniface, Precinct J, and Precinct G have Separate Sections for 'Transportation' and 'Servicing'. |
| | Precinct E calls this 'Transportation' and a separate section entitled 'Municipal Services and Utilities'. |
| | Precinct T has two(2) sub-sections under 'Land Use and Development Policies' called 'Transportation' and a separate section called 'Infrastructure'. |
| | Precinct K has a section called 'Transportation' and a separate section called 'Municipal Services and Utilities'. |
| | Precinct E call this 'Transportation' and a separate section called 'Infrastructure'. |
| | Precinct C, Palliser, Assiniboia Downs, Red River Ex and North St. Boniface calls this section 'Infrastructure'. |
| | Railside has only 'Transportation'. |
| | Precinct G has 'Transportation' and has a separate Section entitled 'Servicing'. |
| | WW B N'Hood and Public Markets calls this 'Transportation' and has a separate Section entitled 'Municipal Services and Utilities'. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **5. Implementation** | WW ASP, WW W calls this 'Plan Implementation and Growth Management'. |
| | Transcona West calls this 'Phasing'. |
| | Fort Rouge Yards, Palliser call this 'Phasing'. |
| | Precinct Q breaks this out into three(3) Section (Phasing, Cost Sharing, Development Applications). |
| | Precinct F calls this 'Staging and Phasing Policy'. |
| | Bishop Grandin calls this 'Phasing & Implementation'. |
| | Precinct E has this entitled 'Implementation and Monitoring'. |
| | Assiniboia Downs has 'Operationalizing the Assiniboia Downs Area Master Plan'. |
| | Railside has an entire Section in the Concept Plan. |
| | WW B Hood, Public Markets has this as a sub-section under 'Timeframe & Implementation'. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **6. Definition** | Transcona West calls this 'Interpretations > Glossary'.<br>Precinct Q, Precinct I calls this 'Interpretations > General Definitions'.<br>Transcona Yards, Osborne call this 'Glossary'.<br>Precinct G provides the definitions in the planning document, not separate at the end. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **7. List of Figures** | Yards at Fort Rouge, Precinct C, Precinct Q, Palliser, Precinct T, Precinct F, Bishop Grandin, Precinct J, Precinct I, Precinct G,<br>Transcona Yards, Precinct G, WW B N'Hood AND Public Markets have the actual list of all the Figures after the Table of Contents. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **8. Maps** | WW ASP, WW NE, Yards at Fort Rouge, Transcona West, Osborne Village, Taylor, WW SE, WW SW, Precinct F, Bishop Grandin, Precinct J,<br>Precinct I, Precinct K, Corydon, South St. Boniface and Assiniboia Downs locate the Map(s) within the Sections, and not at the back. |
| | Precinct Q, Precinct E, Precinct G have the maps listed in the Table of Contents as 'list of figures' with the figures at the back of the document. |
| | Precinct T has maps within the Sections and located at the back. |
| | Precinct C, Palliser, Red River Ex has the map at the back but not listed in the TOC. |
| | Bishop Grandin has the maps listed under an appendix, and has the maps in the sections and at the back of document. |
| | WW B Hood and Public Markets has the some maps listed as Figures and has some of them under an Appendix. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **9. Appendices** | WW NW, WW TC, North St. Boniface maps are called Appendix at the back of the document. |

**Compare, Contrast and Quantify the City Planners' Contributions to the Content of the Parker Lands Secondary Plans.**

## 1. Purpose

The purpose of this study is to compare and contrast the content of the final version of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan submitted in 2018 to the City of Winnipeg, with all previous versions of this secondary planning document that was reviewed, commented upon, and approved by the City of Winnipeg Planners assigned to this matter.

This analysis will allow for two (2) determinations to made:

A. What did the City of Winnipeg Planners assess, revise, modify, compose and accept in the final version of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan document?

B. How much of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan was assessed, revised, modified, composed, and accepted by the City of Winnipeg Planners?

## 2. Method

There are a number of drafts of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan: for this study the documents reviewed by the three (3) different city planners assigned to this planning project are from August 5, 2015, December 15, 2016 and May 24, 2017. Each city planner provided feedback during their involvement in composing the document before being re-assigned and replaced by a new planner. The City of Winnipeg Planners' contributions are coloured coded within the final version of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan.

As indicated on the first page after the title page of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan, the Applicant has included a Legend to explain the use of the various colour coding of the body of text throughout the Parker Lands Secondary Plan document:

- Three various shades of purple [purple] indicate information written by, or reviewed and accepted by the Public Service during previous drafts of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan. The darkest colour of purple specifically indicates the review and changes recorded by City Planner James Platt (from his May 27/17 review) that have been included in the final version of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan document.

- The yellow highlighted colour areas indicate information that the City Planner James Platt told the Applicant to remove from the document. The Applicant felt this information was too important to remove from the Parker Lands Secondary Plan as it has a direct tie to the policy section of the document. And, the removal was atypical to the orthodox established in Winnipeg's secondary plans in terms of format and organization.

- The blue highlighted colour areas represents new information added since the last reviewed draft plan by the public service (March 23, 2017 submitted draft with City comments provided on May 24/17). The Applicant notes some of this information was added in response to the

feedback comments provided by the Public Service (additional diagrams, maps, etc.) for the advised completion of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan.

The Applicant quantified the amount of input the City of Winnipeg Planners have in the final version of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan document by counting the words and text.

## 3. Results

**What did the City of Winnipeg Planners assess, revise, modify, compose and accept in the final version of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan document?**

Attached is the final version of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan that has been coloured coded to contrast the text of this document that was assessed, revised, modified, composed and accepted during the multi-year preliminary review done by the City of Winnipeg Planners.

This attachment has the breakdown of the colour coded text illustrating the City of Winnipeg's contributions on a page-by-page, word-by-word, tracking. The attachment illustrates exactly what the City of Winnipeg Planners assessed, revised, modified, composed and accepted in the final version of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan document.

**How much of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan was assessed, revised, modified, composed, and accepted by the City of Winnipeg Planners?**


Attached is the Parker Lands Secondary Plan Word Count per colour indicating the precise amount, on a page-by-page, word-by-word, of the colour coded text in the marked-up Parker Lands Secondary Plan document that is assigned to the City of Winnipeg Planners. This is used to quantify the City of Winnipeg Planner's involvement, word-by-word.

This information yielded two(2) pie charts indicating the amount of the colour coded text representing the quantity of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan document that was assessed, revised, modified, composed and accepted by the City of Winnipeg Planners.


The pie charts show the combined contributions of all three(3) City of Winnipeg Planners including Mr. Platt, indicates that:

- ⇒ **78% of the final document has been reviewed, commented, modified, revised and approved by the City of Winnipeg's Planners**.

## City vs Gem - Input into Secondary Plan




## City vs Gem - Input into Secondary Plan



City Review - Mar 29/16

City Review - Dec 15/16

City Review - May 24/17

Info James Platt wanted removed - May 24/17

New Info added since May 24/17 Review

| | 2% | 7% | 68% | 11% | 12% | 16530 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Page** | | | | | | **Word Count** |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 280 | 0 | 0 | 280 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 377 | 16 | 395 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 69 | 358 | 28 | 455 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 156 | 123 | 47 | 326 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 272 | 22 | 294 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 128 | 6 | 0 | 134 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 292 | 0 | 378 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 199 | 123 | 24 | 346 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 189 | 0 | 0 | 189 |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 171 | 0 | 15 | 186 |
| 11 | 0 | 50 | 121 | 0 | 5 | 176 |
| 12 | 0 | 0 | 383 | 0 | 13 | 396 |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 14 | 0 | 0 | 110 | 0 | 0 | 110 |
| 15 | 98 | 0 | 266 | 79 | 0 | 443 |
| 16 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 52 |
| 17 | 0 | 0 | 315 | 0 | 79 | 394 |
| 18 | 0 | 0 | 304 | 0 | 276 | 580 |
| 19 | 0 | 0 | 396 | 0 | 11 | 407 |
| 20 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 0 | 29 | 108 |
| 21 | 15 | 0 | 260 | 0 | 73 | 348 |
| 22 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 0 | 0 | 179 |
| 23 | 0 | 0 | 304 | 0 | 16 | 320 |
| 24 | 28 | 0 | 174 | 67 | 22 | 291 |
| 25 | 0 | 0 | 254 | 0 | 48 | 302 |
| 26 | 0 | 0 | 409 | 0 | 35 | 444 |
| 27 | 0 | 0 | 327 | 77 | 91 | 495 |
| 28 | 0 | 0 | 333 | 0 | 163 | 496 |
| 29 | 0 | 0 | 465 | 0 | 0 | 465 |
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 217 | 0 | 142 | 359 |
| 31 | 0 | 0 | 216 | 0 | 7 | 223 |
| 32 | 0 | 0 | 350 | 0 | 0 | 350 |
| 33 | 4 | 60 | 53 | 0 | 16 | 133 |
| 34 | 0 | 30 | 158 | 0 | 190 | 378 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 35 | 0 | 0 | 214 | 0 | 68 | 282 |
| 36 | 0 | 0 | 438 | 0 | 0 | 438 |
| 37 | 0 | 0 | 312 | 0 | 41 | 353 |
| 38 | 0 | 245 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 440 |
| 39 | 0 | 279 | 273 | 0 | 0 | 552 |
| 40 | 0 | 0 | 234 | 0 | 246 | 480 |
| 41 | 15 | 139 | 224 | 0 | 85 | 463 |
| 42 | 0 | 154 | 238 | 0 | 7 | 399 |
| 43 | 0 | 44 | 62 | 0 | 4 | 110 |
| 44 | 0 | 234 | 219 | 0 | 22 | 475 |
| 45 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 0 | 5 | 200 |
| 46 | 0 | 0 | 467 | 0 | 0 | 467 |
| 47 | 0 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 0 | 120 |
| 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 49 | 82 | 0 | 377 | 0 | 0 | 459 |
| 50 | 53 | 0 | 364 | 0 | 0 | 417 |
| 51 | 0 | 0 | 301 | 0 | 31 | 332 |
| 52 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 0 | 47 | 109 |

# PARKER LANDS

## Major Redevelopment Site
## (Site 'G')




# MASTER PLAN

December 2017

RICHARD WINTRUP

MORRISON HERSHFIELD

EcoLogic Environmental Inc.
Wildlife, Aquatics & Geomatics Consulting

InfraCor

GEM EQUITIES INC.

## LEGEND for COLOUR CODING of final MASTER PLAN

| | |
|---|---|
| | Information held over from Glen D & Brett S Aug 5, 2015 draft (Mar 29/16 Review) |
| | Information held over from Glen D & James Platt Dec 2016 draft (Dec 15/16 Review) |
| | Review and Changes by James Platt from Mar 23/17 draft (May 24/17 Review) |
| | Information James Platt wanted removed from Mar 23/17 draft (May 24/17 Review) |
| | Information added by Gem since Mar 23/17 draft |

# **PARKER LANDS** Major Redevelopment Site (Site 'G') MASTER PLAN

**John S. Wintrup**, B.A. (Hons), M.Sc. Planning, MCIP, RPP
J. Wintrup Consulting Ltd.

**Michelle E Richard**, MCP, MCIP, RPP
M. Richard & Associates Ltd.

December 2017

## Table of Contents


**1 INTRODUCTION ..... 1**

**1.1 PURPOSE OF THE PLAN ..... 1**

*1.1.1 Policy Framework ..... 2*

**1.2 PLANNING AREA AND CONTEXT ..... 8**

*1.2.1 Planning Process ..... 8*
*1.2.2 Plan Area ..... 9*
*1.2.3 Boundaries of the Plan Area ..... 11*
*1.2.4 Surrounding the Plan Area ..... 12*
*1.2.5 Existing Land-Use in and Around Plan Area ..... 14*
*1.2.6 Existing Zoning in and Around Plan Area ..... 15*
*1.2.7 Existing Features ..... 17*
*1.2.8 Environmental Assessment / Contaminated & Impacted Sites ..... 19*
*1.2.9 Existing and Planned Infrastructure & Services ..... 20*
*1.2.10 Opportunities and Constraints ..... 27*

**1.3 INTERPRETING THE PLAN ..... 28**

*1.3.1 Authority of the Plan ..... 28*
*1.3.2 Time Frame of the Plan ..... 28*
*1.3.3 Policies, Applications and Interpretations ..... 29*
*1.3.4 Maps ..... 29*

**1.4 MONITORING, REVIEW AND EVALUATION ..... 30**

**1.5 AMENDMENTS TO THE PLAN ..... 30**

**1.6 SUPPORTING STUDIES ..... 30**

**2 PLANNING VISION AND OBJECTIVES ..... 31**

**2.1 VISION ..... 31**

**2.2 OBJECTIVES ..... 32**

*2.2.1 Placemaking: Foster Quality Places and Identity ..... 32*
*2.2.2 Connected ..... 32*
*2.2.3 Sustainability: Environmental, Social and Economic ..... 32*

**3 LAND-USE CONCEPT ..... 33**

**3.1 GENERAL ..... 33**

*3.1.1 General Policies ..... 33*

**3.2 URBAN DESIGN POLICIES ..... 34**

*3.2.1 Objectives ..... 34*
*3.2.2 Policies ..... 34*

**3.3 DENSITY ..... 35**

*3.3.1 Objectives ..... 35*
*3.3.2 Policies ..... 35*

**3.4 PARKING POLICIES ..... 36**

*3.4.1 Objective ..... 36*
*3.4.2 Policies ..... 36*

**3.5 URBAN NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICY AREA ..... 37**

*3.5.1 Objective ..... 37*
*3.5.2 Policies ..... 37*

**3.6 LIMITED USES POLICY AREA ..... 38**
*3.6.1 Objectives ..... 38*
*3.6.2 Policies ..... 38*
**3.7 RAPID TRANSIT STATION NODE POLICY AREA ..... 39**
*3.7.1 Objectives ..... 39*
*3.7.2 Policies ..... 39*
**3.8 GREEN AND OPEN SPACES POLICIES ..... 40**
*3.8.1 Objective ..... 40*
*3.8.2 Policies ..... 40*
**3.9 NATURAL LANDS POLICY AREA ..... 41**
*3.9.1 Objectives ..... 41*
*3.9.2 Policies ..... 41*
**3.10 RAILWAY CORRIDOR POLICIES ..... 42**
*3.10.1 Objectives ..... 42*
*3.10.2 Policies ..... 42*

**4 TRANSPORTATION AND SERVICING POLICIES ..... 43**

**4.1 TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE ..... 43**
*4.1.1 Objectives ..... 43*
*4.1.2 Policies ..... 44*
**4.2 WATER, WASTE WATER AND LAND DRAINAGE ..... 45**
*4.2.1 Objective ..... 45*
*4.2.2 Policies ..... 45*

**5 IMPLEMENTATION ..... 49**

**5.1 ACTIONS ..... 49**
*5.1.1 Enactment ..... 49*
*5.1.2 Land Development Regulations ..... 49*
**5.2 STAGING AND PHASING ..... 50**
**5.3 COST SHARING ..... 50**
**5.4 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS ..... 50**
**5.5 URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES: SITE PLAN APPROVAL ..... 51**
*5.5.1 Purpose ..... 51*
*5.5.2 Policies ..... 51*
*5.5.3 Approval and Amendment Procedures ..... 51*

**6 DEFINITIONS ..... 53**

**7 LIST OF FIGURES ..... 55**

**8 MAPS ..... 57**

**9 APPENDICES ..... 62**

**APPENDIX A: ENGAGEMENT REPORT ..... 62**
**APPENDIX B: ENVIRONMENTAL OVERVIEW ..... 64**
**APPENDIX C: WATER, WASTEWATER AND STORMWATER SERVICING REPORT ..... 66**
**APPENDIX D: TRAFFIC ANALYSIS AND OPPORTUNITY MEMO ..... 68**
**APPENDIX E: URBAN DESIGN GUIDELINES: URBAN NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICY AREA ..... 70**
**APPENDIX F: PARKER LANDS: ENSURING SUCCESSFUL PRAIRIE TOD MEMO ..... 72**

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Purpose of the Plan

The purpose of the Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site Master Plan ("the Plan") is to provide direction on the planned and orderly development of land in a major redevelopment site as identified by *Complete Communities*. The Plan is a guide for community development with the understanding that specific applications will evolve as circumstances and influences change over time. In accordance with the *City of Winnipeg Charter*, all future development within the planning area must be consistent with the policies of the Plan.

The Plan ensures that the coordination of proposed local infrastructure serving the new land-uses in the neighbourhood fits within the planned regional infrastructure. In addition it provides details which outline actions and strategies that may inform users about the constraints, coordinate the new infrastructure, fulfill the vision for the development lands under *OurWinnipeg*, and increase certainty for all parties regarding the future of the lands.

The Vision, Principles and Policies of the Plan are consistent with *OurWinnipeg Plan By-law No. 67/2010* the City's Development Plan; *Complete Communities*, and the City's *Transit-Oriented Development Handbook.*

The work on the Plan began in early 2014 in consultation and collaboration with a number of stakeholders including various City of Winnipeg departments, the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres, Manitoba Hydro, CNR Rail, the Division Scolaire Franco-Manitobaine, and the Winnipeg School Division. Input was also received from representatives of the Winnipeg Humane Society, the Brenda Leipsic Off-Leash Dog Park users, and the local City Councilor. Development of the Plan was informed and is supported by a number of background reports, including engineering and environmental studies, which were all reviewed by the City of Winnipeg and shared with stakeholders.

### 1.1.1 Policy Framework

The following sections set out the series of City of Winnipeg policy decisions that inform development expectations for the Parker Lands upon which this Plan is built upon. Since 2007, a progression of policy decisions has occurred:

- Removal from the Industrial Lands Inventory – Employment Lands Strategy, 2008
- Winnipeg Residential Land & Infill Strategy, 2009
- City Council approves the sale of a portion of the Parker Lands to a private developer – City condition of sale is that a developer led secondary plan be undertaken, 2009
- Designation as high density mixed use site – OurWinnipeg, 2011
- Transportation Master Plan, 2011
- Winnipeg Transit-Oriented Development Handbook, 2012
- Council commissioned a study for realignment of the transit corridor for Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor Stage 2: Alignment Study Final Report, 2013
- Council approves the realignment of the Transit Corridor – Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor Alignment Stage 2, 2014
- City of Winnipeg – Stage 2 – Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor Project P3 Business Case Summary, April 2014

With each policy decision, the City of Winnipeg reinforced its expectation that the Parker Lands, Major Redevelopment Site 'G' will be developed as high density mixed use.

#### *1.1.1.1 Pre-OurWinnipeg*

***Conference Board of Canada - Population Forecast (2007)***

The Conference Board of Canada was commissioned to forecast growth for the City of Winnipeg from 2007 to 2031. It predicted that Winnipeg would grow by 188,000 people and 87,000 housing units between 2008 to 2031 or 3800 units per year. It predicted an annual growth rate between 1.5% and 1.9% or approximately 7520 people per year.

In the lead-up to the *OurWinnipeg* plan, the City commissioned two critical studies including the *Winnipeg Employment Lands Strategy* and the *Residential Land and Infill Strategy*.

***Winnipeg Employment Lands Strategy (2008)***

The City's *Employment Lands Strategy* (2008) provided the foundation for the *OurWinnipeg* plan. It set out a robust vision to accommodate Winnipeg's changing economy. It looked at the City's growing sectors and identified land that best aligned with those sectors. It also looked at areas within the City's industrial land supply that weren't functioning or were considered obsolete and recommended that they be removed and repurposed for a higher and better use.

The strategy looked at all industrial lands against a set of criteria including: access, utilities, regulation, adjacent uses, amenities, links to industry, site configuration and size. It identified the Parker Lands as unsuitable for industrial development for the following reasons:

- Transected by major utility corridor makes it difficult to develop for industrial purposes;
- Major transportation access issues;
- Requires major infrastructure improvements including sewer separation that could best be accommodated through redevelopment to another use; and
- Adjacency to existing neighbourhoods.

The strategy recommended that the Parker Lands be removed from the industrial inventory and be designated for 'neighbourhood development'.

***Winnipeg Residential Land and Infill Strategy (2009)***
This report looked at overall anticipated housing starts to 2031 based on projected growth and demographic change, using the Conference Board of Canada 2007 population forecast. It assessed the current development patterns of the city and the overall implications of these development patterns. It looked at the development capacity for a range of land categories including greenfield, infill, redevelopment land and rural lands. It also reviewed and assessed industrial lands identified for removal in Employment Lands Strategy, including the Parker Lands.

The Strategy identified the Parker Lands as critical supply of land if the City is to accommodate residential/mixed use growth within its' urban boundary. It states that without considering other forms of development such as redevelopment sites and only relying on greenfield expansion (suburban areas), the City of Winnipeg will have insufficient land capacity (15 years supply) to accommodate the anticipated housing starts required by 2031 (Winnipeg Residential Land and Infill Strategy, pg. 89; Winnipeg Complete Communities Direction Strategy, pg. 2).

The Strategy further states that even with a build out of existing suburban areas, redevelopment sites such as Parker Lands at 25 du/acre (net), identified infill (only using vacant land) and assuming development of downtown surface parking lots (3,954 units), the City of Winnipeg would still only have 18.6 years of land supply (Winnipeg Residential Land and Infill Strategy, pg. 95).

It further suggested that the Parker Lands site would be most efficiently developed to a mid/high net density scenario to justify infrastructure and transportation interventions (Winnipeg Residential Land and Infill Strategy, pg. 100).

The strategy concluded that the Parker Lands site along with other identified redevelopment sites were critical inputs into the land supply needed to meet the City of Winnipeg's growth forecast to 2031.

#### *1.1.1.2 OurWinnipeg and Complete Communities*

In 2011, *Our Winnipeg*, the City's Development Plan, was approved by the Province of Manitoba and adopted by City Council in accordance *with The City of Winnipeg Charter*. It was based on the Conference Board of Canada 2009 population forecast, the *Employment Lands Strategy* and the *Residential Land and Infill Strategy*. It directs the City to support redevelopment and densification in underutilized lands. *Complete Communities*, the City's land use and development guide, was also adopted that year by City Council as a Secondary Plan applying to the entire city, in accordance with *The City of Winnipeg Charter.*




**Figure 1:** *OurWinnipeg: City of Winnipeg Development Plan.*




**Figure 2:** *Complete Communities: a City of Winnipeg Direction Strategy.*

*Our Winnipeg* and *Complete Communities* identify the Parker Lands as a "Major Redevelopment Site" (noted as Site 'G'). *Complete Communities* states that "Major Redevelopment Sites present large-scale opportunities to enhance Winnipeg's urban fabric by repurposing obsolete land uses as new developments." It identifies each of the Major Redevelopment Sites as necessary 'supply' required to meet growth demand. Major Redevelopment Site policy areas are vacant or underutilized land that, when redeveloped, "will promote complete communities with significant residential densities in a walkable, well-designed environment, embodying the principals of sustainability and, when adjacent to high frequency transit, Transit Oriented Development."

*Complete Communities* indicates that the Parker Lands are adjacent to the second leg of the Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit (SWBRT) Corridor, and as such, "should be developed in accordance with the principles of Transit-Oriented Development." It suggests that the City and Developer will work together to remove infrastructure barriers that may be in the way of realizing density expectations. The City of Winnipeg, through the plan, acknowledges that these sites will not be developed to their full potential without the City removing barriers related to infrastructure improvements. Principles and guidelines for the development of TOD sites are provided in the City of Winnipeg's *Transit-Oriented Development Handbook*.

*Sustainable Winnipeg*

Sustainability is an overarching aspiration of the *OurWinnipeg* plan. The *Sustainable Winnipeg Direction Strategy* encourages responsible growth, environmental stewardship to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

*Winnipeg Water and Waste Direction Strategy*

The *Sustainable Water and Waste Direction Strategy* provides important policy and tools that could enable, under the right circumstances, the application of innovative practices that move away from traditional servicing requirements.

*Winnipeg Sustainable Transportation Direction Strategy*

This report is the precursor to the City of Winnipeg *Transportation Master Plan.* It sets out that a transportation system must be dynamically integrated with land use and should be developed to minimize resource consumption by transportation.

### *1.1.1.3 Post- OurWinnipeg*

A series of policy decisions were approved by Council subsequent to the adoption of *OurWinnipeg* that further reinforce the City's expectation that the Parker Lands, along with the other ten Major Redevelopment Sites, should be redeveloped to support significant levels of mixed use, high density development. Perhaps the most significant decision was the realignment of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor, Stage 2 through the Parker Lands.

***Conference Board of Canada 2012 Population Forecast Revision***

Since *OurWinnipeg – Complete Communities* was adopted in 2011, the City of Winnipeg revised its 2009 growth forecast, predicting more growth. In fact, the *OurWinnipeg* population forecast, conducted by the Conference Board of Canada, projected that annual population growth over the period of 2007 to 2031 will average 7,525 persons per year. In 2012, this forecast was adjusted to 9,000 persons per year.

This unexpected growth was reconfirmed through the 2016 Census. The population percentage change between 2011 and 2016 for Winnipeg's growth rate was 6.3%. *The City of Winnipeg 2018 Community Trends and Performance* Report further stated that it expects annual growth to be even higher at 12,500 persons per year to 2021.

Winnipeg is poised well to accommodate this unexpected growth because of the *OurWinnipeg* plan and its identification of redevelopment sites such as the Parker Lands. Without the plan, the City would be left with few options to accommodate its growth. It would be likely that this growth would be accommodated elsewhere in surrounding municipalities, missing an opportunity for Winnipeg to benefit from this growth. In fact, the City would be harmed without sites such as the Parker Lands through loss of municipal revenue, less resources to direct to infrastructure improvements and more 'wear and tear' of Winnipeg infrastructure from people commuting into the city.

***Transportation Master Plan (Adopted by Winnipeg City Council – November 16th, 2011)***

The *Winnipeg Transportation Master Plan* (TMP) was adopted after *OurWinnipeg.* It strongly reinforced the need for a greater proportion of the City's future growth to be allocated within the existing built boundary to reduce impact on existing roadway infrastructure and encourage other less harmful transportation choices to the automobile including active transportation and transit. The Plan provided a framework that guides how the Major Redevelopment Site will be developed to efficiently and effectively accommodate all transportation modes to improve access, movement and mobility.

The TMP states, "A key goal in *OurWinnipeg* is to accommodate a greater proportion of the City's future growth within the existing built boundary. This would be accomplished through redevelopment and intensification in the City's transit-supportive land use areas: the downtown, mixed-use centres, mixed-use corridors, and major redevelopment sites" (Section 4 Integrating Transportation and Land Use; *Winnipeg Transportation Master Plan*, page 30).

The *Transportation Master Plan* further clarified the specific importance of the Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site by introducing a possible Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor alignment concept that runs through the site.

***Winnipeg Transit-Oriented Development Handbook (Adopted by Wpg. City Council – Feb 22nd, 2012)***
The *Winnipeg Transit-Oriented Development Handbook* (TOD Handbook) was endorsed as policy (TR-006) by Winnipeg Council on February 22, 2012. It established the following definition of TOD:

> *"Moderate to higher density compact mixed-use development, located within an easy five to ten minute (approximately 400m to 800m) walk of a major transit stop. TOD involves high quality urban development with a mix of residential, employment and shopping opportunities, designed in a pedestrian oriented manner without excluding the automobile. TOD can be new construction or redevelopment of one or more buildings whose design and orientation facilitate the use of convenient and sustainable modes of transportation, including public transit and Active Transportation."*
>
> *(Section 2A – TOD Defined; TOD Handbook, page 6).*





**Figure 3:** *Winnipeg Transit-Oriented Development Handbook*

***Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor Stage 2 – Alignment Study – January 2013***
The City of Winnipeg commissioned an alignment study to review the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor Alignment as described in *OurWinnipeg - Complete Communities.* It looked at a series of alignment options and concluded that the *OurWinnipeg* alignment be rerouted through the Parker Lands to maximize growth and densification opportunity.

The study focused largely on *OurWinnipeg – Complete Communities* directive and the *Transit-Oriented Development Handbook* to use rapid transit to maximize development potential of Major Redevelopment Sites:

> *"In order to maximize the development potential of both the Major Redevelopment Sites and the viability of the transit system, these lands should be developed in accordance with the principles of Transit-Oriented Development."*
>
> *(Complete Communities, page 66).*
>
> *"Redevelopment Sites feature Neighbourhood Centres, including Parks, Places, and Open Spaces, that are the nodes with which to integrate public transit stations. The City's policy is to help reduce Major Redevelopment Site barriers related to the complexity of location, infrastructure, land assembly, and potential contamination."*
>
> *(Complete Communities, page 67).*

***City of Winnipeg Housing Policy – Endorsed by Winnipeg City Council – September 25th, 2013***
*City of Winnipeg's Housing Policy* (ED-006) was endorsed by Winnipeg Council on September 25, 2013. The purpose of the *Winnipeg Housing Policy* is to support the implementation of *OurWinnipeg* and *Complete Communities* to achieve a sustainable and healthy housing environment that meets the needs of the Winnipeg population.

The *City of Winnipeg Housing Policy* is focused on key areas within the jurisdiction of the City of Winnipeg, and provides a leadership role to help strengthen policies and programs of other levels of government to ensure they support needs of the Winnipeg population. The City of Winnipeg Housing Policy forms an integral part of the overall policy framework and by-laws relevant to housing in Winnipeg. Some of the priorities are:

- Targeted Housing Development – The objective is to encourage new housing development that promotes and supports City of Winnipeg policy goals. Including affordable housing, diverse housing options, universal design, and appropriate density to support infrastructure and creates complete communities;
- Neighbourhood Revitalization - Support for revitalization and maintenance of existing housing that promotes adequate, safe living conditions for homeowners and tenants, and supports safe, orderly, viable and sustainable communities which brings new life back to Mature Communities.

**HOW DO THESE LANDS FIT WITH COUNCIL'S HOUSING POLICY?**

**POLICY B.2.** The City will encourage and support housing development that:

(a) Supports thriving, Complete Communities in the Downtown, Major Redevelopment Sites, Centres and Corridors to increase residential variety and densification where appropriate; or

(b) Increases the supply of rental units to more effectively address demand.

***Re-alignment of SWRTC Phase 2 through the Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site – Stage 2 – Approved by Winnipeg City Council – June 25th, 2014***

Winnipeg City Council approved the realignment of SWRTC Stage 2 through the Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site on June 25th, 2014. Council, in their decision, cited the imperative to align rapid transit to Major Redevelopment Sites, including Parker Lands, to maximize opportunity afforded through Transit-Oriented Development.

## 1.2 Planning Area and Context

### 1.2.1 Planning Process

#### *1.2.1.1 Planning as a Collaboration*

The Plan encourages community and stakeholders involvement, and is the product of a collaborative and iterative process that solicited feedback from land owners, the Winnipeg Public Service, elected officials, key stakeholders, special interest groups, community organizations, neighbourhood groups and adjacent community residents to shape the public interest on this planning matter.

One-on-one meetings, public open houses, and a series of meetings with the City's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) with representatives from Public Works, Winnipeg Transit, Water and Waste, Community Services, City Naturalist, Parks, Emergency Services, and Planning and Property Development departments were held to share the Plan's vision with stakeholders; assess infrastructure and community services capacities; and determine future requirements to implement the new land-uses and transportation connections in the Planned Area. This active consultation of sharing information and gathering feedback resulted in several modifications to the project to reflect and address the opinions being expressed.

The solicitation of input is an important component of the planning process as a means of generating planning policies that reflect the feedback, and providing a basis of support for the general planning directions of the Secondary Plan. A complete engagement report documenting the stakeholder feedback received through the active consultation with the public and stakeholders is included as an Appendix in this Plan.

### *1.2.1.2 Public Engagement*

A series of public open houses to promote discussion were held at well-advertised venues, of varying times and dates in conjunction with numerous one-on-one interviews, meetings and communication exchanges with individuals and key stakeholders. This active consultation, in an inclusive, transparent and fair process allowed interested parties an opportunity to articulate their positions on this planning matter. Relevant project information was provided to all those engaged. The opinions and information gathered were shared back with all other stakeholders as their input and the implications of their comments were included in the next iteration of the planning process demonstrated in this Plan.

## 1.2.2 Plan Area

The Parker Lands represent a prominent brownfield, infill site in south central Winnipeg with redevelopment potential as identified in *OurWinnipeg* where it is cited as one the Major Redevelopments Sites (MRS) and labelled in *Complete Communities* as Site 'G' from Transformative Areas (see figure 4 below). It is one of eleven sites identified and included in the City's supply/demand analysis to meet current growth projections to 2031.

**MAJOR REDEVELOPMENT SITES**





**Figure 4:** *Major Redevelopment Sites in Winnipeg (from Complete Communities, pg. 65)*

Administratively, the Parker Lands are within the River Heights-Fort Garry Ward and almost entirely in the larger Parker Neighbourhood 1.654). A small portion is in the Beaumont Neighbourhood. It is centrally located in Winnipeg close to Downtown (approximately 10 minutes by car or bus), and approximately the same distance to the University of Manitoba, St. Vital and Polo Park shopping areas.

**NEIGHBOURHOODS**





**Figure 5:** *Winnipeg Neighbourhood Areas*

The Parker Lands are a large contiguous area with multiple lots and parcels, and will be one of a select few Transit-Oriented Developments (TODs) along the Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit Corridor (Stage 2). The Parker Lands represent an historic opportunity to create diverse infill housing with multi-modal connections in close proximity to the Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit Corridor and within 2.5 km of the City Centre.

The whole of the Parker Lands (the 'Plan Area') is approximately 54 hectares (133 acres), with an average length and width of approximately one mile (east to west) and one-quarter mile (north to south), respectively. Lands within the Plan Area are owned by the City of Winnipeg, Manitoba Hydro as well as some private entities.

The subject lands are entirely within the Winnipeg School Division and immediately north of the Pembina Trails School Division.

The area is intersected by a Rapid Transit Corridor policy area and is adjacent to a Mature Communities policy area and a Recent Communities policy area (of *OurWinnipeg* and *Complete Communities*).

### 1.2.3 Boundaries of the Plan Area

The Plan Area is triangular (right angled) shaped with the hypotenuse located immediately south of CNR Rivers Main Line tracks (see Figure 6 – Location Map). The western leg of the triangle is the eastern boundary of Hurst Way, and east side of the eastern property line of 45 Hurst Way/860 Waverley Street. The southern boundary is the adjacent leg of the triangle, which is the north sides of Parker Ave. west of Daniel St. and the north side of Heatherdale Ave. east of Daniel St. The eastern boundary is where the hypotenuse and adjacent legs form a point at the most eastern track of the CNR Letellier Principle Branch Line.





**Figure 6:** *Location Map illustrating Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site Boundaries*

### 1.2.4 Surrounding the Plan Area

The Plan Area is within a 1 to 5 km proximity of other nodes and corridors identified in *OurWinnipeg* as important to meeting Winnipeg's growth projections to 2031:

- Major Redevelopment Site 'E', Fort Rouge Yards at 18 acres with the *Yards at Fort Rouge Master Plan* endorsed by Council on December 15, 2010. It is being redeveloped as high density residential with a mixture of housing types. It is to the immediate north east of the Parker Lands on the north east corner of the Pembina Highway / Jubilee Avenue overpass on the Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit Corridor, Stage 1.

- Major Redevelopment Site 'F', the Taylor Lands at 48 acres with the *Taylor Redevelopment Master Plan* endorsed by Council May 29, 2013. It is being developed as Grant Park Pavilions with commercial retail and services, employment, and residential land-uses on the south side of Taylor and to the immediate north of the CNR Rivers Main Line which bisects the Taylor Lands from the Parker Lands. Manitoba Hydro's former head office at 820 Taylor Avenue with Hydro Sub-Station is also located to the immediate north of CNR Rivers Main Line as well as the Grant Park Festival with a current multi-tenant commercial land-use.

- The existing Beaumont Neighbourhood (1.602), directly south of Parker/Heatherdale Avenues, and the east-west MB Hydro Corridor, is identified as a 'Mature Community' in *Complete Communities* with a full range of municipal services. Beaumont is predominantly single-family dwellings with 91.9 percent of the dwellings constructed prior to 1980; 91.5 percent (865) of the dwellings (945 total) being single-family; and 90.4 percent are 'owner occupied' (2011 Census). Beaumont's eastern boundary is Pembina Hwy, which is identified as a Regional Mixed Use Corridor 'F', a 'Transformative Area' with commercial land-uses such as gas bar, restaurants, personal services and some medium to high density housing.

- To the southwest of the Parker Lands across the MB Hydro Corridor is the Buffalo Industrial Neighbourhood (1.652) 'Employment Lands' with land-uses such as warehouses, distribution centres, head offices; and the City of Winnipeg's waterworks *W.D. Hurst Station* and Ralph Cantafio Soccer complex.

- Further south from the Plan Area along the Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit Corridor, Stage 2 is Major Redevelopment Site 'H' Sugar Beets Lands at 131 acres with the *Bishop Grandin Crossing* endorsed by Council on May 13, 2014 for a mixture of employment, commercial and residential land-uses.





**Figure 7:** *Context Map*

### 1.2.5 Existing Land-Use in and Around Plan Area

More than half of the Parker Lands is currently underutilized, not-in-use, open spaces covered by vegetation. The privately owned and developable land within the Parker Lands is bounded to the south by a wide field occupied by Manitoba Hydro infrastructure and power lines. A portion of this field had been used as the site of the Brenda Leipsic Park (on approximately 18 acres), which included an off-leash dog area. This property is owned by Manitoba Hydro and the City of Winnipeg, and will also be the site of the future Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit Corridor, Stage 2.




**Figure 8:** *Existing Land Use Map*

Outside of the Parker Lands, to the south of the Hydro Corridor, is a large area of single-family dwellings in the Beaumont Neighbourhood. This area includes amenities such as General Byng School, Fort Garry Community Centre Victoria site, several parks and play areas, a large industrial facility (CG Powers Systems Canada) and a funeral home with accessory cemetery.
To the north of the Plan Area, directly across the CNR Rivers main line, there are substantial commercial, office, recreation & leisure facilities and schools in proximity to the site. This includes land recently rezoned for commercial and residential uses (Grant Park Pavilions)which has a Walmart, as well as the Taylor Festival with a Sobeys grocery store. Further beyond this to the north is the Grant Park Neighbourhood (1.604) with the Pan Am Pool, Grant Park High School, Grant Park Shopping Centre, Charles A. Barbour (Grant Park) Arena, Harrow School, as well as many single-family and multi-family residential dwellings.

North-East of the Plan Area, across Pembina Hwy/Jubilee Avenue is Berwick Athletic Fields and the 'Yards at Fort Rouge' Transit-Oriented Development adjacent to McKittrick Park in the Lord Roberts Neighbourhood (1.665).

Immediately to the west adjacent to the Plan Area are the remaining land-uses in the Parker Neighbourhood, which include the Winnipeg Humane Society, a storage locker facility, and a multi-tenant strip mall. Further west and southwest is the residential neighbourhood of Linden Woods (1.634) and the Kenaston/McGillivray Power Centre, and due west is the Seasons of Tuxedo/IKEA redevelopment of the former CNR Intermodal Yard into a mixed-use, commercial and residential hub abutting the same CNR Rivers main line.

### 1.2.6 Existing Zoning in and Around Plan Area

W*innipeg's Zoning By-law 200/2006* divides areas into zoning districts in order to separate residential, commercial and industrial land-uses; and to regulate specific land-uses and built forms.

Zoning regulations do not apply to either unimproved or improved Public Street Right-of-Ways (ROWs) or Public Lane ROWs. An unimproved ROW means no concrete, asphalt or gravel has been laid down and the road bed remains in a natural state though legally open as a right-of-way.

The Parker Lands are currently zoned as the following:

- "A" Agricultural Districts;
- "R1" Residential Single-Family Districts;
- "M1" Manufacturing Light Districts; and
- "M2" Manufacturing General Districts.

M1 and M2 districts are intended to provide for light manufacturing, processing, service, storage, wholesale, and distribution operations, with some limited outside operations and storage.

The Parker Lands are also abutting or near the aforementioned zoning districts and:

- "C2" Commercial Community Districts;
- "C3" Commercial Corridor Districts;
- "PR1" Parks and Recreation 1 (Neighbourhood) Districts;
- "PR2" Parks and Recreation 2 (Community) Districts;
- "PR3" Parks and Recreation 3 (Regional) Districts;
- "M1" Manufacturing Light Districts; and

"M2" Manufacturing General Districts.

The Taylor Lands MRS are zoned "C3" with a Planned Development Overlay 2 ("PDO-2") that is unique to the Taylor Lands MRS. The "PDO-2" allows multiple-family dwellings, wholesaling and warehousing as permitted uses, not-with-standing that they are not allowed in the "C3" District.





**Figure 9:** *Existing Zoning Map*

### 1.2.7 Existing Features

Starting from the northwest corner of the site, the CNR Rivers main line rail tracks run west to east through Portage Junction towards the CNR Fort Rouge Rail Yards approximately 1km northeast of the site. The tracks are at-grade with a slightly higher profile than the surrounding terrain. Immediately adjacent to the CNR main line to the south is a service road in use by CNR. There appears to be a slight high point in the tracks approximately mid-point of the site.

Major overhead electrical infrastructure crosses the middle of the site on towers and poles on a north/south tangent (See Figure 8 - Existing Land Use map). A line of poles at the centre and south of the site can be observed running in a westward direction turning south before reaching Hurst Way down a hydro corridor. It is generally understood that the tower infrastructure is transmission, while lines on poles are local distribution. Within the hydro corridor the entire parcel appears to be maintained such that grasses are allowed to grow to a height of approximately six inches during the summer months.

The centre and east side of the Parker Lands is currently under construction with the excavation of a storm retention basin and roads for the second leg of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor. An off-site communication tower can be seen further to the east and is a dominant feature. The Pembina Highway/Jubilee Avenue underpass, which is also under construction, is due east of the site. Parker Avenue is the northernmost roadway of the Beaumont Neighbourhood to the south which contains mostly single family dwellings. Just north of that is Heatherdale Avenue which is a gravel back lane.

#### *1.2.7.1 Existing Forest*

The trees within the planning area are mainly deciduous, of an estimated average age of approximately twenty to thirty years on the western half; fifteen years towards the centre of the planning area; and several small groupings of older deciduous trees along the northern and southeastern edges of the planning area. Surveys conducted within the Parker Lands have revealed no provincially or federally listed species at risk. Taking into account the size of the area and the high level of anthropogenic disturbance, there is limited functional habitat for the majority of wildlife species.



**Figure 10:** *Examples of debris dumped in the Project Study Area., June 15, 2016.*

In March, 2017 the City of Winnipeg began removing a small oak forest within the planning area to clear a path for the second leg of the transit way corridor and active transportation pathway.

There are several foot trails on the private landowner's site that have evolved from recreational uses. As part of the intensive environmental survey work conducted by biologists who studied the Plan Area (an Environmental Overview report by EcoLogic Environmental Inc. can be found in **Appendix B**), it was noted that the site had been heavily used with a matrix of human and dog walking trails throughout the footprint of the site creating an extensive pathway system. An additional report was conducted by biologists to determine the effect of past and future person-use on vegetation which could be utilized as green space areas. This report can be found in **1.6 Supporting Studies**.

In late summer and early fall of 2017, the private land owners removed some trees from the west and central part of the planned area to prepare for geotechnical drilling and surveying as part of the planning work for the privately-owned lands. Prior to any tree removal, the site was investigated by biologists for bird species at risk and breeding bird activity nesting sites. This Pre-Clearing Breeding Bird Survey Report was completed in June, 2017 and outlined the methods used for the Pre-Clearing Breeding Bird Survey work as well as the results of the survey (for full report see **1.6 Supporting Studies**). There were eight nests identified within the specified area of the Parker Lands during the Pre-Clearing Breeding Bird Survey, of which only three were determined to be active nests. A 50 metre clearing restriction buffer was recommended for an active Coopers Hawk nest until such time as the chick within the nest had successfully fledged. No migratory birds or bird species at risk nests were identified in the Parker Lands, therefore no tree clearing activity restriction buffers were required.

### *1.2.7.2 Topography*

The site is of relatively flat topography and had been vegetated with a combination of grasslands and trees. As of summer 2017, the grasslands and some of the trees were removed to reshape the site. Most of the remaining trees on site are deciduous with several small groupings of older deciduous trees along the northern and southeast edges of the site.

There were some low-lying areas on the northern part of the Plan Area. Through the spring and summer months, there were tall grasses and cattails evident in the low-lying areas, consistently immersed in several inches of standing water from poor drainage conditions. A low ridge sets apart the eastern low area from the rail lines to the north. The CNR Rivers main line is approximately 1.5 metres above the lowlands and grassed area between the Hydro towers.

A naturalized Stormwater Retention Basin (SRB) is being constructed on the eastern half of the Plan Area. The edge of the SRB will be planted with native plantings, which provide similar functions to natural wetlands. With large expanse of water and naturalized edge, the SRB will potentially be similar to a Class V Wetland.

### *1.2.7.3 Soil Profile*

Soil composition is Glacial Lake Agassiz clay of the Pleistocene era. Bedrock is Palaeozoic carbonate: limestone and dolomitic limestone, inferred at 15.5 to 21.3 m below ground surface. The nearest open body of water is the Red River, approximately 650 m to the east of the property. Groundwater is inferred to follow this direction to the river.

### 1.2.8 Environmental Assessment / Contaminated & Impacted Sites

As a portion of the site was a former rail yard, there is a possibility that environmental contamination may be present. The portion of the site which was used as a rail yard is the northern boundary on the northeast quadrant of the site (part of where the future storm retention pond will be). This would fall under the jurisdiction of the Province of Manitoba's *Contaminated Sites Remediation Act* (CSRA). Manitoba Conservation is the responsible agency for 'contaminated' and 'impacted' sites under the act and is the agency which provides oversight on remediation if required.

Pinchin Environmental Ltd. (Pinchin) carried out a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the site in October, 2010 and for additional land in January, 2015 (see **1.6 Supporting Studies**).

In their reports, Pinchin noted that based on review of documentation in the Manitoba Archives and previous environmental reports nothing was identified that is likely to give rise to potential subsurface impacts in connection with the Site.

However, with regards to the north eastern portion of the site, Pinchin noted that a rail yard operation with several spur lines could be observed on that portion of the site in the 1948 and 1959 aerial photographs. Due to this, it could give rise to potential subsurface impacts in connection with the site.

Based on the findings noted above, Pinchin recommended completing a Phase II ESA of the site for the northeast portion of the Plan Area.

Dillon Consulting provided recommendations for a Phase II ESA (see **1.6 Supporting Studies**). Dillon concluded that a Phase II ESA was not necessary, for the following reasons:

- The exposure pathway for the types of impacts associated with former rail operations is incidental soil ingestion or dust inhalation;
- An effective way to manage this risk is through a ground surface cover, or cap, that acts as a separation barrier keeping any material below the surface;
- Incorporating a cap has been demonstrated as a cost-effective approach and has been tested in numerous industrial properties, including former rail operations;
- This approach has been adopted on a similar redevelopment that creates the Yards at Fort Rouge;
- This approach is acceptable to Manitoba Conservation as an effective means of managing exposure risk associated with surgical soil impacts.
- Accordingly, the assessment studies for this site do not call for environmental remediation beyond the provision of a ground surface cover if necessary, as recommended by Dillon.

## 1.2.9 Existing and Planned Infrastructure & Services

Figure 11 below shows the existing Water, Waste Water and Land Drainage infrastructure services in and around the Plan Area.





**Figure 11:** *Existing Infrastructure and Site Services Map*

### *1.2.9.1 Existing and Planned Water Infrastructure*

As indicated by site records, a 250 mm water main crosses the west side of the site on a north/south alignment with the unimproved Cooney Street Right-of-Way (see Figure 11 – Existing Infrastructure and Site Services Map). A Feeder main crosses through the southwest corner of the site, perpendicular to Parker Avenue and then turn 90 degrees west directly down the Hurst Way Right of Way towards Waverley.

### *1.2.9.2 Existing and Planned Land Drainage Infrastructure*

**1) Land Drainage**

Natural drainage on the site generally runs in an eastward direction towards the Red River. The CN rail tracks on the north boundary limit the migration of water to the north. The area of the developable land on site is currently undergoing a significant increased elevation change with the final grading holding drainage on site but generally draining in an easterly direction. Recent infrastructure upgrades on city and hydro lands have directed drainage in an easterly direction and contained drainage within those lands. A naturalized Storm Retention Basin (SRB) is currently being constructed on the eastern area of the site to accommodate drainage from the Parker Lands and other neighbouring communities.

**2) Combined Sewers**

The area surrounding the Parker Lands site falls within the Cockburn & Calrossi combined sewer districts (Cockburn West). Work to the north and east began in 2011 to relieve the combined sewers and improve existing services. This work is scheduled to take around 5 to 7 years to complete. An outfall to the Red River was constructed in 2014 and pipes from the future retention pond to the outfall on the Red River started to be installed in the summer of 2017.

The intersection at Parker Avenue and Wynne Street will be the location of the Waste Water connection point for future development in the Parker Lands as provided by the City Public Works department. This is the nearest location that has pipe capacity for residential development to tie in to for Waste Water services. All the pipes serving the redevelopment of the lands in the Planned Area have yet to be installed.

### *1.2.9.3 Existing and Planned Waste Water Infrastructure*

There are no existing Waste Water pipes within the Planned Area. The nearest Waste Water pipe is in Parker Avenue, south of Heatherdale Avenue, terminating at the west side of Daniel Street, and is between 375mm to 600mm in diameter. The nearest Waste Water tie-in point is at Parker Avenue and Wynne Street (see Figure 12).





**Figure 12:** *Parker Lands Waste Water tie-in location*

### *1.2.9.4 Existing and Planned Transportation Infrastructure*

**1) Local Road Network**

Part of the Hurst Way ROW forms a portion of the western limit of the Parker Lands and part of the Parker Avenue ROW forms a portion of its southern limit. These portions of ROWs have only been improved into P2 collector, non-regional snow route roads with a rural cross-section and asphalt. Hurst Way extends west of the Parker Lands to Waverley Street and Sterling Lyon Parkway as a four lane, divided concrete roadway. Parker Avenue extends easterly to connect several of the north-south streets that extend from the Beaumont Neighbourhood as improved ROWs. A number of unimproved ROWs existing from the Plan of Subdivisions registered in the early 20th Century still criss-cross portions of the Plan Area.





**Figure 13:** *Existing and Planned Transportation Infrastructure Map*

Part of the Heatherdale Avenue ROW forms a portion of the southern limit of the Parker Lands. It has only been improved into a gravel back lane with a concrete flare where it ties into Parker Avenue and does not have piped drainage.

The improved portions of the Planet Street ROW and Beaumont Street ROW extend south from Parker Avenue with the full range of municipal services, however, at their connections with Parker Avenue:

- Planet Street has only been improved into a local road with a rural cross-section; and
- Beaumont Street has only been improved into a collector road with a rural cross-section.

The improved portions of the Daniel Street ROW and the Derek Street ROW extend south from Heatherdale Avenue but have only been improved into local roads with rural cross-sections. The Rockman Street ROW and the Wynne Street ROW only extend as far north as Heatherdale Avenue. They too have only been improved into local roads with rural cross-sections at and just south of Heatherdale Avenue. This is the only municipal transportation infrastructure near the Parker Lands and there is no other existing City transportation infrastructure in the Parker Lands.

**2) Regional Road Network**

Regional Networks in the periphery of the study area and all Boundary intersections including Waverley Street and Taylor Avenue, Waverley Street and Wilkes Avenue/Hurst Way, McGillivray Boulevard and Pembina Highway are largely operating at overcapacity conditions during morning and afternoon rush hours, and at near-capacity conditions during off-peak hours (see Preliminary Traffic Analysis memo by Morrison Hershfield in **Appendix D**).





**Figure 14:** *Existing Transportation Network*

Existing traffic shortcutting along neighborhood roads is significant, ranging from about 30 percent to 50 percent of current AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes on roads such as Windermere Avenue, Beaumont Street, Parker Avenue, and Hurst Way. Existing traffic shortcutting through the neighborhood is mainly attributed to overcapacity conditions at the intersection of Waverley Street and Taylor Avenue as well as traffic disruptions and long queues at the existing at-grade CNR Rivers rail crossing at Waverley Street caused by frequent train operations. With approximately 30,000 vehicles and between 35 and 40 train movements passing through the intersection daily, the Waverley Street

rail crossing has become a major vehicle traffic bottleneck in the area (see Figure 14 – Existing Transportation Network).

To alleviate most of the Waverley Street traffic delays, construction of a grade separated crossing of Waverley Street at the CNR Rivers Main Line was approved by Winnipeg City Council and began construction in 2017. The "Waverley Underpass Project" (beneath the train tracks just south of Taylor) along with capacity improvements of both Waverley Street and Taylor Avenue, and Waverley Street and Hurst Way intersections are all anticipated to be completed by Spring 2020. Significant improvements in regional traffic flows in the southwest quadrant of Winnipeg are expected as a result of all these infrastructure improvements.

The Traffic Analysis suggests that the Pembina Highway Underpass upgrades as part of the Southwest Transitway Project are to improve traffic flows between Point Road and Stafford Avenue with the provision of a third north bound lane. In addition, this work will also improve pedestrian and cyclist facilities on Pembina Highway between Jubilee Avenue and Stafford Street by providing dedicated pedestrian/cycle corridors on both sides the underpass (see Figure 15 – Southwest Transitway below).





**Figure 15:** *Southwest Transitway – Underpass Upgrades to Pembina Hwy*

**3) Active Transportation**

The *City of Winnipeg Pedestrian and Cycling Strategy* adopted by Winnipeg Council July 2015 identifies a citywide network concept, which seeks to connect cyclists to a variety of downtown and regional centres. The City of Winnipeg *Transportation Master Plan* Map for Active Transportation was also amended and includes 'Proposed Additions to AT Network' being identified through the Parker Lands and Beaumont Neighbourhood to connect Pembina Highway with AT facilities alongside Waverley Street. The *Pedestrian and Cycling Strategy* associate map for the SW Quadrant indicates a proposed *Off-Street Pathway* aligned with Parker Avenue.

In addition, a future regional AT path that would extend east-west through the Parker Lands (north of Hurst Way) and pass under two rail lines and over Pembina Highway is also being proposed as part of the SWRTC project. This will include future sidewalks and paths that would connect existing sidewalks in the Beaumont Neighbourhood to the regional path (see figure 15).

The adjacent Southwest Bus Rapid Transit Corridor, Stage 2 will be integrated into the Plan Area as part of the design strategy to allow an additional transportation access, and reduce reliance on vehicles.

**4) Public Transit Services**

There is currently no transit service in the Planned Area and little in the Beaumont Neighbourhood – only along Windermere, south on Beaumont and out to McGillivray Boulevard. Public transit is available near the Parker Lands within a short walking distance from the neighbourhood on Waverley Street and on Pembina Highway. Access to each of these will be improved with the introduction of the AT paths described above.





**Figure 16:** *City of Winnipeg Transit Route Access Map*

Once the new Parker Transit Station is completed just north west of Beaumont Street terminus at Parker Avenue, it is anticipated that connector buses will also travel through from Waverley Street and the Beaumont Neighbourhood, connecting up to the Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit Corridor (Stage 2) to provide direct access to other routes across Winnipeg.

**5) Railway**

Rail lines extend through the eastern portion of the Parker Lands. The rail corridor of another rail line forms the eastern limit of the Parker Lands. These lines are principle branch lines. They connect to the CNR Letellier Principle Branch Line and the CNR Rivers Main Line. The rail corridor of the Rivers Main Line is partly in the Parker Lands (see Figure 13 - Existing and Planned Transportation Infrastructure Map).

### *1.2.9.5 Existing Utilities*

Parker Avenue is indicative of a typical street in a mature neighborhood with overhead power lines and telephone services.

Heatherdale Avenue will be the most likely route for future off-site utility connections from the proposed residential development to the north based on the Site Servicing study by InfraCor (see **Appendix C**) with pipes connecting at the intersection of Parker Avenue and Wynne Street to existing waste water sewer infrastructure.

The existing Hydro Power Lines and Towers prominently seen in the area will be a major consideration during the design and construction of the deep utilities (see Figure 8 – Existing Land Use Map for distribution and transmission line locations). The existing Parker Tot Lot to the west of Daniel St. and the private property to the east will also be a consideration during construction.

### *1.2.9.6 Existing Libraries*

Through consultation with City of Winnipeg departments and the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres it has been determined that, in the Parker Land, there is no need for a new library. The nearest existing library location as displayed on the Context Map in Figure 7 is Fort Garry Library at 1360 Pembina Highway.

### *1.2.9.7 Existing Protective and Emergency Services*

As identified on the Context Map in Figure 7, the nearest existing fire paramedic location is Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service Station #13 on Beresford Avenue and Lilac Street (in Lord Roberts).

In addition, other locations of fire paramedic stations nearby are:

- Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service Station #12 on 1780 Taylor Ave. (Mathers Neighbourhood).
- Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service Station #22 at 1567 Waverley St. (Chevrier Neighbourhood).

It has been determined that there is no need for a new fire-paramedic station in the Planning Area.

### *1.2.9.8 Existing Parks and Recreation Facilities*

The nearest Community Centre is Fort Garry Community Centre (Victoria Site) located at 80 Derek Street in the Beaumont Neighbourhood which is about 1.7 km south of the Humane Society at 45 Hurst Way (see Figure 7 – Context Map).

Other existing community centres within close proximity include:

- Linden Woods Community Centre located at 414 Lindenwood Drive West which is about 2.5 km from the Humane Society;
- Crescentwood Community Centre at 1170 Corydon Avenue is about 2.8 km from the Humane Society;
- Fort Garry Community Centre (Hobsen Site) is located at 880 Oakenwald Avenue which is about 2.9 km from the Humane Society;
- River Heights Site of Corydon Community Centre at 1370 Grosvenor Avenue which is about 2.9 km from the Humane Society;
- Westridge Community Centre at 3 Marshall Crescent which is approx. 3.1 km south of the Humane Society; and
- Lord Roberts Community Centre at 725 Kylemore Avenue which is about 4.0 km from the Humane Society.

Through consultation with the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres it has been determined that, in the Parker Lands, there is no need for a new community centre in the Planning Area.

#### *1.2.9.9 Existing Schools*

The Parker Lands fall within the Winnipeg School Division, Ward 1 (see Primary and Secondary Schools Analysis in the **Supporting Studies** for map and review of the area schools). Schools located within this district are Brock Corydon (N-6), Grant Park High School (7-12), Harrow (N-6), J.B. Mitchell (N-6), Montrose (N-6) and Rockwood School (N-6).

All of these schools, however, are to the north of the CNR Rivers mainline, which could prove difficult and dangerous for young children to walk to school due to the frequency of trains crossing. With the infrastructure improvements of the Waverley and Pembina underpass projects underway, access to these schools will be much improved with their new dedicated AT pathways under the active rail lines.

Alternately, the closest public school to the Parker Lands would actually be in the Beaumont Neighbourhood (General Byng School for K-9). However, this is within the Pembina Trails School Division where the associated High School is Vincent Massey at 975 Dowker Avenue (grades 9-12 for immersion and 10-12 for English).

Future discussions with these two neighbouring school districts will have to take place to determine final placement for the future students. At the time of writing, through consultation with the School Divisions it has been determined that, in the Parker Lands, there is no need for a new school.

### 1.2.10 Opportunities and Constraints

#### *1.2.10.1 Opportunities*

The Parker Lands can be an opportunity to support a thriving and complete community to increase residential variety and densification. The Parker Lands can promote and support the City of Winnipeg's Housing Policy goals for including diverse housing options, universal design, and appropriate density to support infrastructure and create complete communities. Opportunities exist for:

- Location - To take advantage of a site located midway between downtown and the University of Manitoba on the new Southwest Bus Rapid Transit Corridor with improved travel of buses every 3 to 5 minutes; also a proximity to existing amenities located in neighbouring mature communities (see Figure 7 – Site Influences map);
- Connectivity - has been improved due to new City infrastructure projects like the Southwest Bus Rapid Transit project and associated AT pathways, the new Waverley Underpass project as well as the Pembina Underpass project;
- Increased Density – provides an opportunity for a Transit Oriented Development with infill housing in a non-suburban location, leading to a decrease in Green House Gas emissions;
- Improved City Infrastructure – in addition to initiatives mentioned above (SWRTC, Waverley and Pembina Underpasses, new AT pathways) the creation of a Storm Retention Basin will enhance servicing over a wider area into other neighbourhoods (not just the Planning Area).
- Fulfilling Council's policies and past decisions to repurpose the land (refer to Section 1.1.1 Policy Framework).

See **Appendix F** for memo from Planning Consultant on Parker Lands: Opportunities for Prairie TOD.

#### *1.2.10.2 Constraints*

At one time, the constraints for the Plan Area were the shortage of transportation connections to and within the Parker Lands resulting in a scarcity of choices. This was primarily due to a deficiency of transportation infrastructure for pedestrians, cyclists, transit and cars in and around the Planning Area.

Winnipeg Council's decision to approve +$630 million on capital projects in and around the Plan Area have greatly enhanced the connectivity of the Parker Lands with new infrastructure for pedestrians, cyclists, transit users and automobiles.

Some of these projects include:

- Winnipeg Transit extending the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor Stage 2 westward from Jubilee Avenue through the Parker Lands and southward along a hydro corridor, which will increase the permeability of the Planning Area for transit users, pedestrians and cyclists.
- The new east/west alignment for Hurst Way from Waverley Street will serve the Parker Station and enhance the connections directly into the Plan Area for multiple modes of transportation.
- The Waverley Underpass Project will provide a divided four-lane roadway with pedestrian/cycling facilities under the CN Main line to increase connectivity and reduce wait times and traffic congestion due to delays from passing trains.
- The Pembina Highway Underpass to widen the roadway and add pedestrian/cycling infrastructure with buffered bike and pedestrian lanes. This will help to provide better links for multiple modes of transportation past the MB Hydro Corridor and the CN Main line.

## 1.3 Interpreting the Plan

### 1.3.1 Authority of the Plan

*Complete Communities* indicates there are a number of tools for implementing the vision and goals for *OurWinnipeg* including *Planning*. A Major Redevelopment Site Master Plan is one such proactive *planning tool* that establishes a broad framework for the future redevelopment of a planned area. This framework is based on a community vision and includes land-use and transportation concepts with a series of policy statements that work together as a guide to implementing the vision. The framework should not be overly prescriptive, but should provide clarity and direction on a variety of land-use planning and development issues, such as servicing, to both the public and private sectors.

The formulation of a Master Plan under *Complete Communities* is a proactive and collaborative effort between the municipality, land owners and the general public. It provides a high-level community vision with the understanding that the vision, along with the plan itself, will evolve as circumstances change over time. Accordingly, a Master Plan is both a starting point that establishes local goals and objectives; and a guide for future community development.

### 1.3.2 Time Frame of the Plan

This plan is future oriented and guides how the Planned Area will change over an extended period of time, through a coordinated series of purposeful public and private investment actions, building towards a common vision. The timing of these actions will be dependent on the economic conditions within Winnipeg. No specific timeframe is applied to the Plan although most of the proposed redevelopment is to occur within a 15-20 year time frame.

### 1.3.3 Policies, Applications and Interpretations

The Plan should be read as a whole and understood as a comprehensive vision of, and guide for the redevelopment of the Planned Area.

Objectives and goals are statements provided to enhance the understanding of the associated policies. Should an inconsistency arise between an objective or goal and an associated policy, the policy shall take precedence.

Where "may" is used in a policy, it is provided as a guideline or suggestion toward implementing the policy in a manner that is consistent with its purpose.

In cases where the word "should" is used in a policy, the policy is intended to apply to a majority of situations. The policy may be deviated from in a specific situation where the deviation is necessary to address unique circumstances that will otherwise render compliance impractical or impossible, or to allow an acceptable alternate means to implement the policy in a manner that is consistent with its purpose.

In cases where the word "shall" is included in a policy, the policy is considered mandatory. However, where actual quantities or numerical standards are contained within a mandatory policy, the quantities or standards may be deviated from provided that:

- The deviation is necessary to address unique circumstances that will otherwise render compliance impractical or impossible; and
- The policy is implemented in a manner that is consistent with its purpose.

The policies, land-use and transportation concepts contained within the Plan recognize and maintain the existing use of land or buildings as they are currently zoned and developed in accordance with the Zoning Bylaw prior to the adoption of this Plan.

Nothing in this Plan precludes current uses in the Planned Area from continuing as they may exist today, and for as long as the land owner wishes, until such time as the Zoning By-law is amended to affect the land-use rights. The intentions of the Plan polices are when a land owner wishes to change (i.e. intensify) their lands, via a rezoning, a subdivision, or a conditional use, then this intensification shall be consistent with the policies which serve to direct the changes towards the vision outlined for the Planned Area.

### 1.3.4 Maps

The boundaries, transportation networks and land-use policy areas shown on the maps & figures contained herein are intended to be approximate only and should be considered as such. They are not intended to identify specific locations, except where a boundary is located on an easily identifiable natural or man-made landmark such as a river, railway corridor, Hydro corridor or public right-of-way. The figures are conceptual and shall be considered flexible with respect to the precise location of land-use areas and features, however, the spatial relationship among the various land-use policy areas and transportation networks is intentional.

The indication of any proposed roads, green spaces, open spaces, services or infrastructure in policy text or on the policy maps & figures will not be interpreted as necessarily being specifically, or solely, the responsibility of the City to provide, finance or otherwise implement.

The purpose of providing figures with illustrations, photographs, drawings, and non-policy maps is to provide clarification regarding the characteristics, context, history, natural features, existing land uses and current development policies/regulations of the planned area and the surrounding areas. Should an inconsistency arise between a figure, etc. and a policy statement or policy map, the policy statement or policy map shall take precedence when and where appropriate.

## 1.4 Monitoring, Review and Evaluation

The Plan is intended to be a flexible document that will adjust as circumstances change within and adjacent to the planning area. Periodic review and amendment of the Plan will occur as changing market and engineering conditions affect the adjacent community and the planning area.

## 1.5 Amendments to the Plan

The Plan may require amendments as circumstances within or adjacent to a policy area warrant. As a (secondary plan) by-law, application to amend the Plan must be submitted to the Planning, Property and Development for review and approval by Council or it's designate. Where appropriate, the amendment process should include public consultation.

## 1.6 Supporting Studies

The following studies were prepared in support of and to inform this Plan. They have contributed to the conceptual land use plan and policies of the Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site. The supporting studies have been completed at a high level and may not be sufficiently detailed to form the basis for individual subdivision or rezoning applications. More detailed studies and/or analysis may be required at time of subsequent rezoning and subdivision. The completed supporting studies include:

- History of the Site
- Policy Framework Review by Richard Wintrup
- Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (Parcel B) by Pinchin
- Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (Vacant Land Northeast of Hurst Way) by Pinchin
- Environmental Risk Management Strategy by Dillon
- Pre-Clearing Breeding Bird Survey by EcoLogic
- Community Park Retention Area Overview by EcoLogic
- An Economic Benefits Analysis by Altus
- Primary and Secondary Schools Analysis

# 2 PLANNING VISION AND OBJECTIVES

## 2.1 Vision

The Parker Lands will become an area of Winnipeg that is largely transit-oriented by transforming and repurposing an underutilized vacant brownfield site adjacent to an existing community. Through private investment it will become a vibrant, environmentally, socially and economically sustainable neighbourhood. It will offer a variety of housing choices with significant densities planned out in a well-designed urban form to encourage placemaking. Multi-modal transportation connections will capitalize on existing and new major regional infrastructure public investments. A diversity of green and open spaces should provide natural and planned recreational areas.

The Parker Lands will become one of the first Transit-Oriented Developments (TODs) within Winnipeg in keeping with the guidelines and vision consistent with the TOD Handbook. The proposed Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit Corridor (Stage 2) will be connected into the urban design of the planned neighbourhood allowing for easy transportation access, reduced reliance on vehicles and better management of transportation demand and parking requirements.



**Figure 17:** *Parker Station Plaza Concept Image*

A clear vision for the *Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site* needs a series of principles that will be the collective goals to informing planning objectives and guide actions to make that vision a reality. The vision, principles and goals reflect the main themes that emerged from the consultation process of discussions with stakeholders and the community at-large.

## 2.2 Objectives

### 2.2.1 Placemaking: Foster Quality Places and Identity

Creating a sense of place through urban design is important to establish a strong identity for the area for the new residents and existing visitors. Effective site designs of the Plan Area will demonstrate how the pieces fit together with appropriate land-use locations, building types, massing and orientation while establishing green spaces and open spaces distinct to the area, and provide a resilient visual identity for the new neighbourhood.

### 2.2.2 Connected

People will be considered in the transportation systems and their connections as will all other public open spaces in an urban design strategy to improve safety and accessibility for current visitors while balancing movements with creating a sense of place for local residents. It will mitigate and make porous at safe locations the solid physical barriers that separate the Plan Area from the surrounding community; and robustly connect green spaces/recreational areas with new and existing residential living areas.

### 2.2.3 Sustainability: Environmental, Social and Economic

This site will become a model for the three (3) pillars of sustainability: environmental, social and economic. The overall carbon footprint will be significantly reduced through a dense compact urban form, and by way of reduced vehicle miles travelled to nearby work, recreation, goods and services destinations especially with alternative modes of transportation. Efficient energy uses for homes and buildings will be considered in using green technology.

Retaining existing wooded areas and adding new green spaces will provide habitats for animals, insects and vegetation while providing open spaces for people to connect with nature. Social networks will be strengthened through careful planning of the public realm rights-of-ways and open spaces, and providing accessibility to diverse housing choices.


A dense urban environment will grow in the Parker Lands that will financially support nearby employment and commercial centres with employees and customers; and maximize public investment in regional transportation infrastructure. It is important to understand the marketplace to meet the needs of the community by taking in the consideration of growing and evolving populations; evolving consumer preferences for housing and community amenities; and overall demand for housing stocks.

# 3 LAND-USE CONCEPT

## 3.1 General

The policy Map of the Parker Lands applies to all of the Parker Lands (see Figure 18 - Land-Use Policy Map). Land in the Parker Lands is designated as any one of the following policy areas:

- Urban Neighbourhood Policy Area
- Limited Use Policy Area
- Rapid Transit Station Node Policy Areas
- Green and Open Spaces Policy Area
- Natural Lands Policy Area
- Railway Corridor Policy Area








**Figure 18:** *Land-Use Policy Map*

### 3.1.1 General Policies

1) Development should be consistent with Crime Prevention through Environmental Design Principles and Sustainable Design Principles.
2) All advertising signs must pertain to a use, location, building or development in the Parker Lands, notwithstanding signs pertaining to public transportation infrastructure or public transit service.
3) All non-residential publically accessible developments shall be consistent with Universal Design Principles.

## 3.2 Urban Design Policies



### 3.2.1 Objectives

The intention of the Urban Design Policies are to realize the vision for the Parker Lands as a dense, infill complete community connected with a choice of multi modal transportation. Part of creating a walkable community is linking streets and building designs that encourage pedestrian activities, ensures multi modal transportation choices, and integrates the Planning Area with the neighbourhoods surrounding the site by following the planning principles of sustainability, placemaking and connectivity. Also part of creating a walkable community is achieving a critical mass of people and uses in a dense urban form.

### 3.2.2 Policies

The specific detailed designs of site and buildings shall be determined through the Development Application process and should be implemented through the use of a variety of methods including design standards, plan approval, plans of subdivisions, development agreement, zoning agreement, or a planned development overlay. The specific detailed designs of the site and building plans may be guided by Urban Design Guidelines (see **Appendix E**) which shall consider the following:

1) The Urban Design Guidelines should ensure that development in the Parker Lands area is consistent with the vision and policies of the Master Plan.
2) Urban Design Guidelines should include the principles of CPTED and Universal Design.
3) Urban Design Guidelines should be 'general' that avoid detailed design specifics to ensure building professionals have flexibility in designing each building and site, and avoid repetitious building designs.
4) Urban Design Guidelines may address the Urban Neighbourhood Policy Area.
5) Urban Design Guidelines for the Urban Neighbourhood Policy Area shall encourage the residential densities required to deliver a walkable community, and the mixed-use amenities that create a sense of community.
6) The Urban Design Guidelines for the Urban Neighbourhood Policy Area should be unifying the public realm and the street network to create one overall community for the residential area.
7) Urban Design Guidelines for the Urban Neighbourhood should encourage building exteriors and site designs that facilitate pedestrian movements, and sustain multi modal transportation choices.
8) Urban Design Guidelines for the Urban Neighbourhood should allow and encourage a diversity of building typologies.
9) The Urban Design Guidelines for the Urban Neighbourhood shall only address the exterior of buildings and above grade site plans, and the public realm areas of right-of-ways and public spaces.

## 3.3 Density

### 3.3.1 Objectives

The intention of the Density Policies is to implement the TOD Handbook's "Scale of TOD" that classifies the TOD Zone for the SWBRT Parker Station as 'Urban Neighbourhood' TOD Type based on the regional connectivity as 'Medium, access to Downtown' and the frequency of the buses being every 5-15 mins.





**Figure 19:** *Urban Neighbourhood Density Policy Map*

### 3.3.2 Policies

1) Urban Neighbourhood Area shall be the TOD Zone, which is within the first 800 metres (1/2 mile) of the SWBRT Parker Station.
2) Net housing densities for the Urban Neighbourhood Area TOD Zone shall be 99-247 units per net hectare (40-100 units per net acre) as per the TOD Handbook.
3) Net densities shall mean the buildable area of the entire Plan Area after street right-of-ways, and the public reserves of green and open spaces have been subtracted.
4) Net housing density shall be calculated across the entire Plan Area. Net housing density shall not be calculated building by building, lot by lot, or sub-sector by sub-sector. Rather Net housing density shall be calculated as the mean average density for the entire Plan Area.
5) Net housing densities in the Urban Neighbourhood Area shall be greater than the Net housing densities of the adjacent Beaumont Neighbourhood.
6) Residential densities shall radiate out from the Rapid Transit Station with 'density' being in an inverse relationship to 'distance'; as the distance from the Rapid Transit Station increases, the density shall decrease.
7) A concentration of residential densities should be within 400 metres (a 5-minute walk) of the Rapid Transit Station.
8) Residential densities shall not exceed the capacity of the required infrastructure services of waste water sewer, land drainage, and water.

## 3.4 Parking Policies




### 3.4.1 Objective

The intention of the Parking Policies are to minimize vehicle miles travelled, decreasing Green House Gases; reduce commuting times and stress on the environment; and lower energy requirements for transportation due to reduced automobile usage. The policies will also encourage more usage of public transport, walking & cycling which meets the principles of sustainability, placemaking and connections.

### 3.4.2 Policies

**Parking Requirements**

The detailed design, location and number of automobile parking and bicycle stalls that will be associated with the Residential Areas shall be determined through the Development Application process and should be implemented through the use of a variety of methods including design standards, plan approval, development agreement, zoning agreement, Zoning By-law, and/or a planned development overlay. The Parking Policies considerations are the following:

1) Parking should be consistent with the core principles of the City of Winnipeg TOD Handbook for Innovative Parking Strategies:
    (a) Parking provided on an area basis (i.e., shared uses) rather than building by building.
    (b) Reduced parking requirements through zoning by-laws such as parking maximums.
    (c) Parking facilities located behind buildings, in parking structures with ground floor retail, and screened from adjacent land uses.
    (d) On-street parking on all streets except limited access arterials.
    (e) Parking design integrated with the development to relate to the streetscape and circulation routes.
    (f) Paid parking or time-limited free parking.
2) Preferential parking nearest front entrances of buildings should be given for bikes, hybrids/electric vehicles and car shares.
3) One parking space per unit for residential uses, or such other parking ratio as may be determined under the development application to reduce the size of on-site surface parking areas shall be encouraged.
4) High-quality landscaping in surface parking areas should be provided.
5) Cycling infrastructure in multi-family residential buildings may include a washing station, repair station, and indoor bike parking.
6) Bike parking may include space for trailers and cargo bikes, which are bigger than the standard bikes.
7) A mixture of outdoor, short-term bicycle parking; and indoor, long-term bicycle parking shall be provided in Urban Neighbourhood Policy Areas and near the Parker Station BRT.
8) Outdoor, short-term bicycle parking lock-ups in all Policy Areas, where possible, should be encouraged to enable cycling to and within the Planned Area.
9) Motor vehicle parking shall be considered on an area-wide basis instead of building-by-building to allow consolidation of motor vehicle parking in fewer lots and shared parking by different users at different times of the day.
10) If the redevelopment is phased, a phasing plan may be produced that identifies all current and future parking requirements; encourages parking areas to be constructed incrementally

to match land-use build-out schedules; and supports temporary sub-standard parking ratios when the timing of land-use build-out exceeds the timing of parking area build out.

11) Bicycle parking shall be considered on an area-wide basis instead of building-by-building to allow consolidation of bicycle parking in central locations with shared amenities.
12) Secured bicycle parking associated with residential uses shall be centrally located in close proximity to the residential uses.
13) Outdoor, ground level, open-air motor vehicle parking lots should be discouraged from being located along public pedestrian/cycling routes in Residential Areas.
14) Parking facilities located underground or above ground in structures with the facilities designed to avoid blank walls along pedestrian/cycling routes, and with direct pedestrian connections to higher density uses shall be encouraged.
15) Demand for motor vehicle parking should be monitored as the Plan Area redevelops the lands, and revise motor vehicle parking requirements to align with observations so as to size the parking requirements realistically to match the automobile usage rates.
16) Guidelines as a companion for the master plan for the cycling parking program detailing specific materials, location, directional signage, and type of cycling lock-up infrastructure for both short-term and long-term bicycle parking may be generated to provide more detail direction.

## 3.5 Urban Neighbourhood Policy Area



### 3.5.1 Objective

The intention of the Urban Neighbourhood Area policies is to transform and repurpose the Parker Lands into a TOD neighbourhood with medium access to downtown, a diversity of housing choices and significant densities to support a commercial zone which meet the principles of sustainability, placemaking and connectivity.

### 3.5.2 Policies

1) Community and neighbourhood-scale commercial, institutional and educational uses; and residential dwellings shall be allowed within the first 400 metres (1/4 mile) of the Rapid Transit Station.
2) All types of residential dwellings and public open spaces shall be allowed within the first 800 metres (1/2 mile) of the Rapid Transit Station.
3) Nothing in the policies of this plan shall preclude 'home occupations'; secondary suites or live-work land-uses from being allowed in single-family or multiple family type dwellings.
4) Urban Neighbourhood Area shall provide pedestrian and cycling linkages to the Rapid Transit Station.

## 3.6 Limited Uses Policy Area



### 3.6.1 Objectives

The purpose of the Limited Use Policy Area is to designate lands to be retained for existing and future major infrastructure and restrict new residential structures from being erected. These areas can meet the principles of sustainability, placemaking and connectivity by becoming opportunities for recreational and leisure uses that are compatible with major infrastructure while providing a natural buffer between the Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit Corridor, and existing and future residential areas.

### 3.6.2 Policies

The detailed design and locations of the Limited Use Policy Area shall be determined through the Development Application process and may be implemented through the use of a variety of methods including design standards, plans of subdivision, plan approval, development agreement, zoning agreement, Zoning By-law, and/or panned development overlay. The Limited Policy Areas considerations are the following:

1) Residential land-uses are not permitted within the Limited Uses Policy Area.
2) Passive recreational uses that serve the needs of surrounding neighborhoods shall be encouraged.
3) Existing and intensified Hydro infrastructure may accommodate outdoor public recreational and leisure activities by judicious layout of public spaces, programming of uses, and landscape design [with permission from Manitoba Hydro as appropriate].
4) Group activities and other recreational activities not feasible or desirable in other neighbourhood park facilities, including a designated off-leash dog park and farmers markets shall be encouraged, provided they are compatible with existing and future infrastructure.
5) Non-accessory motor vehicle parking associated with the Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit Corridor may be enabled as an acceptable land-use within Limited Uses Policy Areas.
6) Non-accessory motor vehicle parking may be encouraged to develop with gravel surfacing when and where warranted.
7) A mixture of outdoor, short-term bicycle parking; and indoor, long-term bicycle parking may be provided within Limited Uses Policy Areas near the Parker Station BRT.
8) Linkages through the area that are compatible with infrastructure (i.e. Hydro Power Lines, Stormwater Retention Basin, and Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit Corridor) shall be encouraged.
9) Electricity distribution and transmission, communications, water, wastewater, land drainage and transportation infrastructure shall be allowable.
10) Other uses that shall be encouraged include passive park space, such as recreational paths, and playgrounds provided they are compatible with existing and future infrastructure.
11) Manitoba Hydro's Land and Property Secondary Use Application process should be undertaken in the future to determine the potential treatment of the Hydro Corridor lands.
12) Native or ornamental planting should buffer incompatible uses or softens hard edges along railways, highways, parking, etc.
13) Public use facilities (including off-leash dog parks, transit station, and recreational active transportation paths) are to be buffered from infrastructure facilities in a manner consistent with current practice.

## 3.7 Rapid Transit Station Node Policy Area



### 3.7.1 Objectives

The purpose of this policy area is to designate nodes within the Limited Uses policy area for the creation of neighbourhood focal points that will act as viable, people friendly, urban spaces such as plazas and squares. These nodes will create an enduring sense of place and connect the future SWRTC station to areas designated residential and mixed-use. In addition to being an important component of the non-motorized pathway network, this node could be a focal point for the community, with a variety of uses throughout the year that is safe and accessible public space that can be used day or night. This meets the principles of sustainability, placemaking and connections.

### 3.7.2 Policies

The detailed design and locations of the Rapid Transit Station Node Policy Area shall be determined through the Development Application process, and should be implemented through the use of a variety of methods including design standards, plan approval, development agreement, zoning agreement, Zoning By-law, and/or a planned development overlay. The Rapid Transit Station Node Policy Areas considerations are as follows:

1) A portion of the Limited Use Policy Area may be designated as a 'Rapid Transit Station Node' in accordance to the development of the BRT Station, and in location(s) with a high degree of visibility and public access, such as adjacent to one or more pathways or sidewalks that is a route to-and-from Urban Neighbourhood Areas.
2) Flexible Public Space designed for a diversity of temporary/seasonal uses and events shall be encouraged.
3) The highest quality public space within the TOD area, with special attention to pedestrian amenities, accessibility, and adjacency to private and civic uses shall be encouraged.
4) Transportation links between the residential areas and the BRT station shall be provided.
5) Public spaces of appropriate size and design may be created to accommodate seasonal uses and special events.
6) Paved pathways shall link the BRT station and Urban Neighbourhood policy areas.
7) Sufficient nighttime lighting that is oriented to pedestrians should be provided.
8) Development of this policy area shall be compatible with existing and future electricity, communications and transportation infrastructure.
9) Design should allow for temporary uses such as a farmers' market, fundraising/special event and seasonal sales should also be allowed in this policy area.
10) Pathways should connect to the regional Active Transportation network, existing and future residential land-uses in the Parker Lands and in the Beaumont Neighbourhood.
11) The City should use this Policy Area to consider the incorporation of art into the public spaces by committing to the incorporation of public art in major public work initiatives such as the Parker BRT Station; and by developing programs to exhibit temporary art in existing public spaces near the Parker BRT Station.
12) This Plan shall not be interpreted so as to direct, or in any way limit, transit operations occurring on the Southwest Bus Rapid Transit Corridor (Stage 2). Rather, it is intended to ensure residential land-uses shall be appropriately buffered from transit operations.
13) Non-accessory and accessory motor vehicle parking shall be discouraged within the 'Rapid Transit Station Node' of the Limited Uses Policy Areas.
14) A mixture of outdoor, short-term bicycle parking; and indoor, long-term bicycle parking may be provided within the 'Rapid Transit Station Node' near the Parker Station BRT.

## 3.8 Green and Open Spaces Policies



### 3.8.1 Objective

The intention of the Green and Open Spaces policies below is to realize the vision for Parker Lands as a vibrant neighbourhood with a diversity of well-connected publicly owned active open spaces, following the planning principles of sustainability, placemaking and connectivity. The Green and Open Spaces provide lively public areas in a safe context that complement urban living: play areas for children, off-leash dog runs for pet owners, sitting areas for seniors, walking networks for neighbourhood connectivity, and temporary events to celebrate the seasons. Vibrant Green and Open Spaces are places where people want to be, be seen, and/or meet others.

They can include well landscaped parks, playing fields, urban plazas, public squares, or similar built up areas that are gathering places for people, which can become the centre of community life. Green and Opens Spaces can also have pop up events and temporary infrastructure, food kiosks, cafés and restaurant land-uses, including outdoor dining areas, to animate public spaces with transportation connections that strongly integrate these 'outdoor rooms' into the surrounding community.

### 3.8.2 Policies

The detailed design and location of Green and Open Spaces shall be determined through the Development Application process and should be implemented through the use of a variety of methods including design standards, plan approval, plans of subdivision, development agreement, zoning agreement, Zoning By-law and/or a planned development overlay. The Green and Open Spaces design and location considerations are the following:

1) Green and Open spaces shall only be established within the Urban Neighbourhood Policy Area, Rapid Transit Station Node Policy Area, Limited Use Policy Areas, and the Railway Corridor Policy Areas.
2) The Urban Neighbourhood Policy Area shall have at least one Green and Open Space that shall be centrally located to ensure inclusivity and optimize use for local residents.
3) Green and Open spaces should be located within, adjacent or abutting residential land-uses to enable residents a comfortable walk to and through their community.
4) Green and Open spaces in Urban Neighbourhood Policy Area should be a unifying public realm, part of the open space, and street network that creates one overall community for the residential area.
5) Green and Open spaces shall have strong sight lines to encourage 'eyes on the street' critical to community safety.
6) Green and Open spaces should be constructed in accordance with CPTED and Universal Design principles.
7) There should be a diversity of Green and Open spaces in the Planning Area with different functions and facilities to accommodate an assortment of activities.
8) Each Green and Open space should have a clear function, character and shape with well-defined boundaries through the positioning of adjacent buildings, walls, fences, trees and plantings.
9) Green and Open spaces should have lighting, directional signage, focal points and connect to the cycling and pedestrian networks of the Planning Area.

10) Green and Open spaces may have a variety of vegetation plantings such as flowers, trees and/or shrubs along with boxes and plots for community gardening.
11) Green and Open spaces should provide seating areas that allow people to rest and observe surrounding activities.
12) Amenities such as water features, clock towers, public art and/or architectural features may be considered as landmarks in Green and Open spaces that provide identity to the neighbourhood.
13) Café, restaurants, food trucks, food kiosks, eating and drinking land-uses and outdoor dining and drinking areas should be encouraged.
14) Children play areas, playgrounds, community gardening, pop up activities, off-leash dog runs, organized recreational games, leisure events, outdoor art and music events, seasonal and temporary events should be land-uses that are encouraged.
15) Accessory motor vehicle surface parking and bicycle parking (short and long term) may be enabled as an acceptable land-use within Green and Open Spaces Policy Areas.
16) Collaboration with Manitoba Hydro to identify opportunities to accommodate passive leisure and recreational uses in the Hydro Corridors of the Limited Use Policy Areas as appropriate should be encouraged.
17) Collaboration with the private sector to identify opportunities to accommodate in Green and Open Spaces, cafés, restaurants, food trucks, food kiosks, eating and drinking land-uses and outdoor dining and drinking areas should be encouraged.
18) Green and Open spaces shall be connected to existing pathways or sidewalks to facilitate easy pedestrian and cycling movements
19) Regional pathways may connect to and through Green and Open Spaces.
20) Green and Open spaces should provide at least one universally accessible path that connects to one or more existing adjacent path or sidewalks.

## 3.9 Natural Lands Policy Area



### 3.9.1 Objectives

The intention of the Natural Lands is for designating some areas within the Planning Area for retention as passive publicly owned public spaces that reflect their existing features such as grassy areas, woodlots and/or natural topography, which meets the principles of sustainability, placemaking and connections. Natural Lands should remain relatively 'as is' since Green and Opens Spaces will provide the active spaces for the public.

### 3.9.2 Policies

The location of Natural Lands shall be determined through the Development Application process and may be implemented through the use of a variety of methods including land dedication, plans of subdivision, development and zoning agreements, Zoning By-law and/or a Planned Development Overlay (PDO). The Natural Lands design and location considerations are as follows:

1) Natural Lands Areas may be within the Limited Use Policy Areas, Green and Open Space Areas and the Railway Corridor Policy Areas.
2) There shall be minimal modifications to Natural Lands Area in order to maintain the passive character of these lands.
3) Natural Lands Areas may not necessarily be publicly accessible by streets, sidewalks or pathways

/

4) Motor vehicle and bicycle parking may be enabled as an acceptable land-use that serves a Natural Lands Area.
5) Passive, low-impact public facilities for seating, cycling and walking may be facilitated; and when occurring should be constructed in accordance with CPTED and Universal Design Principles.
6) The exact boundaries and location of any Natural Lands Area shall be established through a Development Application planning process and until such time, all existing land-use tenure and rights remain in place.

## 3.10 Railway Corridor Policies



/

### 3.10.1 Objectives

The intention of the Railway Corridor policies is ensure the continued operations of the existing railways without impediments while providing adequate safety measures for the new residents. The policies achieve this by providing a clear outline on the method and process for determining what is considered as the appropriate edge treatment for the new habitable dwellings being located in close proximity to the rail lines at this specific area.

### 3.10.2 Policies

The detailed design of the edge treatment including the setback between the rail corridors and Urban Neighbourhood Areas shall be determined through the Development Application process, and should be implemented through the use of a variety of methods including design standards, plan approval, development agreement, zoning agreement, Zoning By-law, and/or a planned development overlay.

The *Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations, 2013* (NDPRO) by the Federation of Canadian Municipalities is a reference document to be used. In meeting the principle of inclusion, the Railway Corridor Policies considerations are as follows:

1) New residential dwellings adjacent to existing rail corridors shall be carried out consistently with the recommendations of a qualified engineer following 'best practices' as provided in the NDPRO; and in consultation with CNR for their Main and Principle Branch Lines.
2) This Plan shall not be interpreted so as to direct, or in any way limit, railway operations occurring on railway lands. Rather, it is intended to ensure residential land-uses shall be appropriately buffered from railway operations.
3) 'Residential' land-uses in the context of the Railway Corridor Setback should not preclude allowing motor vehicle parking, bicycle parking, landscaping, accessory structures (except those with a secondary suite), porches, carports, aviaries, swimming pools, hot tubs, open decks, landings, staircases, gazebos, seating areas, canopies, balconies, porticos, sunrooms, Green and Open Spaces, garbage enclosures, and temporary construction trailers or buildings from being established within the established Urban Neighbourhood Area setback for a rail corridor.

# 4 TRANSPORTATION AND SERVICING POLICIES

The following section will present more specified objectives and policies that will guide the changes for the Parker Lands in a manner consistent with the planning principles, and designed to achieve the vision for the Parker Lands as a dense, vibrant and viable neighbourhood adjacent to a mature community as illustrated in the transportation and servicing concepts.

## 4.1 Transportation Infrastructure

### 4.1.1 Objectives

Ensure publicly accessible, safe, functional, efficient and convenient transportation networks are provided to pedestrians, cyclists, public transit users and motorists, which are consistent with principles of TOD and meet the principles of this plan of sustainability, placemaking and connections.




**Figure 20:** *Transportation Network*

### 4.1.2 Policies

The detailed design & location of transportation routes & networks including public ROWS shall be further refined and determined through the Development Application process and should be implemented through the use of a variety of methods including plans of subdivision, design standards, plan approval, development agreement, zoning agreement, or a planned development overlay. The transportation infrastructure designs and locations considerations are as follows:

1) Transportation networks that connect a variety of travel modes to destinations in the Parker Lands, shall be provided and shall connect to the adjacent regional transportation infrastructure to allow movements to external destinations.
2) Efficiently and effectively the Planned Areas' transportation network shall connect pedestrian, cycling, public transit and vehicular modes of travel by:
    (a) Creating coherent pedestrian networks encouraging access from new residential areas to the Rapid-Transit Station, the regional path, destinations in the Parker Lands and adjacent pedestrian infrastructure;
    (b) Accommodating a regional path for Active Transportation adjacent to the Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit Corridor;
    (c) Connecting cyclist routes to one another and to the regional path;
    (d) Providing roadways necessary;
    (e) Accommodating opportunities for a variety of convenient commuting options from and through the Planned Area;
    (f) Orientating vehicular access and egress towards collector and arterial streets, where possible, to prevent traffic infiltration on adjacent residential local streets.
3) A pedestrian and cycling network on private lands should be designed that complements and connects to the public transportation network of the surrounding community.
4) Cycling as a mode of transportation shall be encouraged through the provision of cycling infrastructure; including paths, roads, and traffic control devices and secure bicycle parking facilities especially in close proximity to the Rapid-Transit Station.
5) The alignment of a transportation routes shall avoid fragmenting land into areas that are not suitable for their intended uses.
6) Vehicular transportation networks shall accommodate on-street motor-vehicle parking on most roads (which does not include driveways or back lanes) unless safety concerns or loading needs suggest otherwise.
7) Vehicular transportation networks shall include roads, back lanes, driveways and parking and loading/unloading facilities.
8) At-grade direct private motor vehicle access to the Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit Corridor (Stage 2) shall not be permitted except at controlled crossings.
9) At-grade direct pedestrian or cycling access to the Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit Corridor (Stage 2) shall not be permitted except at controlled crossings.
10) As required, emergency or temporary access to the developing portion of the Planned Area shall be identified at the Development Application stage, and maintained in a satisfactory manner until such time as the permanent road network is developed.
11) Wherever possible, pedestrian and cycling should be located within or integrated with a park or natural feature (including the linear parkway and storm water management areas).
12) The Transportation Network for the planning area shall be designed to adequately and efficiently serve the ultimate buildout of the development.

## 4.2 Water, Waste Water and Land Drainage

### 4.2.1 Objective

To ensure new land-uses within the Planning Area are serviced with the full range of municipal services, meaning with paved streets with curbs, piped municipal water, piped waste water and piped land drainage facilities with sufficient capacities that are provided in an environmentally sound and economically fashioned manner, meeting the sustainability principles of this plan.

For the purposes of determining the impact of the redevelopment on the existing neighbourhood infrastructure, a servicing engineering study was conducted in terms of land drainage, water and waste water generation, and potential off-site improvements.

The infrastructure required for City and Manitoba Hydro planned improvements in the Limited Uses area will be the responsibility of the City and Hydro to implement.





**Figure 21:** *Servicing Policy Map*

### 4.2.2 Policies

The detailed design & location of water, waste water and land drainage facilities shall be further refined and determined through the Development Application process and should be implemented through the use of a variety of methods including plans of subdivision, design standards, plan approval, development agreement, zoning agreement, or a planned development overlay. The water, waste water and land drainage infrastructure designs and locations considerations are as follows:

**(1) All Underground Services**

(a) The alignment and capacity of streets, water distribution mains, waste water sewers and land drainage sewers shall be to the satisfaction of The City of Winnipeg, based upon utility servicing studies and analysis.

(b) Rights-of-way and easements shall be provided to accommodate municipal services as determined necessary.

(c) Rights-of-way and easements, public utility lots and road rights-of-way may be required to be pre-dedicated or registered across undeveloped land as determined necessary to facilitate orderly and sequential urban development.

(d) Should the required regional land drainage facilities to adequately service the Planned Area is not yet get constructed, interim, land drainage flows from the site shall be accommodated through on-site storage based upon utility servicing studies and analysis, all to the satisfaction of The City of Winnipeg.

(e) As part of the initial Development Application, the Developer shall submit:

I. Land drainage servicing criteria including a storm water management plan consistent with the Regional Land Drainage Plan to demonstrate that the site can be serviced in accordance with the overall design of the land drainage system for the area.

II. Waste water servicing criteria to demonstrate that the subject site can be serviced in accordance with the overall design of the wastewater collection system for the area.

III. Water servicing criteria including a water distribution analysis along with current development phasing plans to demonstrate that any future development sites can be serviced in accordance with the overall design of the water distribution system for the area.

(f) The water distribution system, waste water collection system, and the land drainage system for the planning area shall be designed to adequately and efficiently serve the ultimate development of the area.

(g) Staging and phasing of development will be largely driven by market conditions and by the extension of municipal services. Phasing shall occur in a logical and contiguous fashion as determined through the development application process.

**(2) Water**

(a) The water distribution system shall be designed to adequately and efficiently serve the potable water and fire suppression needs of all development within the Planned Area.

(b) As part of the initial development application, a developer(s) may be required to submit a site- or development-specific water distribution analysis along with development phasing plans in order to demonstrate that any future development can be serviced in accordance with the overall design of the water distribution system for the area.

(c) The water distribution system for the proposed development will be designed to adequately and efficiently serve the ultimate development of the area.

**(3) Waste Water**

(a) The sanitary sewage system shall be designed to adequately and efficiently serve all development within the Planned Area.

(b) The waste water management system shall be designed to operate using a gravity system unless otherwise determined by the City of Winnipeg.

(c) As part of the Development Application, the developer(s) shall be required to submit a waste water sewer servicing analysis to demonstrate that the subject sites and developments can be serviced in accordance with the overall design of the waste water sewer system for the area.

**(4) Land Drainage**

(a) The stormwater management system shall be designed to operate using a gravity system unless otherwise determined by the City of Winnipeg.

(b) As part of the development approval process, the developer(s) shall submit a Stormwater Management Plan consistent with the Master Drainage Plan as approved by the City to demonstrate that the site(s) can be serviced in accordance with the overall design of the stormwater management system for the area.

# 5 IMPLEMENTATION

The Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site Master Plan ("the Plan") provides direction on the redevelopment of the Plan Area. The Plan does this by outlining a clear vision with planning principles & goals that can realize the inherent opportunities presented in the Plan Area as well as mitigate the constraints by following a series of objectives & policies. This will lead to the creation of dense residential land uses with strong transportation connectivity in a major redevelopment site being integrated in an existing community as identified by Complete Communities Direction Strategy By-law No. 68/2010.

The Plan is a guide for Council, the community and land-owners to provide certainty amongst the stakeholders and the public at-large who have been engaged in the planning process, that the over-arching future direction of the Planned Area has been articulated in a clear vision. In accordance with the City of Winnipeg Charter, all future intensifications of lands with new developments applications, and Council actions within the planning area, must be consistent with the policies of the Plan.

## 5.1 Actions

### 5.1.1 Enactment

1) The Plan's policies shall be used to guide changes to land-use regulations housed in Zoning By-law and/or Zoning Agreements to implement the vision for the Planned Area.
2) The City shall support the rezoning of some, or all of, the Parker Lands by the creation of a Planned Development Overlay (PDO) District should a proponent put forward and application for such a zoning tool.
3) The purpose of a PDO zoning tool shall be to provide a means to alter or specify allowed uses and/or order to achieve local planning objectives in specially designated areas [that may consist of the policy area of a master plan]" (Zoning By-law 200/2006).
4) The PDO should provide the quantities or numerical dimensions and standards as regulations for lots, land-uses, buildings, yards, parking, densities, railway setbacks, etc. as guided by the policies of the Plan.
5) Municipal by-laws and works shall be guided by this Plan.
6) Decisions and actions of the City, including public investment in services and infrastructure, shall be guided by this Plan.
7) Municipal resources, especially infrastructure, lands and buildings, shall be guided by the Plan for their best strategic advantage in advancing the strategies of this Plan and leveraging other public and private investment to implement the vision for the Planned Area.

### 5.1.2 Land Development Regulations

1) The detailed design & location of land-uses, buildings, parking, densities, railway setbacks, transportation routes & networks including public ROWs, and underground services shall be further refined and determined through the Development Application process and should be implemented through the use of a variety of methods including plans of subdivision, design standards, plan approval, development agreement, zoning agreement, or a planned development overlay.

2) Quantities or numerical dimensions and standards that are to be established as regulations for lots, land-uses, buildings, yards, parking, densities, railway setbacks, transportation routes & networks including public ROWs, and underground services shall be further refined and determined through the Development Application process and should be implemented through the use of a variety of methods including plans of subdivision, design standards, plan approval, development agreement, zoning agreement, Zoning By-law regulations including a planned development overlay, and/or Subdivision Regulations.

## 5.2 Staging and Phasing

Staging and phasing of the redevelopment in the Planned Area will be largely driven by market conditions and the construction of municipal services. Phasing shall occur in a logical and contiguous fashion with a full range of municipal services as determined through development applications. It is possible that once the designs of development, transportation, and services is undertaken, the phases may be adjusted to reflect the engineering and market realities.

## 5.3 Cost Sharing

The City of Winnipeg's *Development Agreement Parameters (PD-006)* shall be applicable as guidelines for Winnipeg Public Service and Developers in formulating development conditions for consideration by Winnipeg Council and its relevant Committees including cost sharing of servicing and improvements installed by the Developer and benefitting other property owners.

## 5.4 Development Applications

Until such time as the Zoning By-law regulations are changed in a Development Application, nothing in this Plan shall preclude current uses in the Planned Area from continuing as they existed prior to the Plan, with all the zoning land-use rights inherent in the lands, and for as long as the land owner wishes.

- Should a land owner wish to change (i.e. intensify) their land-use rights via a rezoning, a subdivision, or a conditional use development application, the intensification shall require the appropriate Development Application, and shall follow the Plan policies to direct the changes towards the vision outlined for the Planned Area.
- Site Plans and/or Plans of Subdivision that refine and determine exact detailed designs & locations of land-uses, building lots, buildings, parking, densities, railway setbacks, transportation routes & networks including public ROWs, and underground services shall be submitted as part of Development Application processes when and where appropriate as determined by the City of Winnipeg.
- Developers of land shall enter into agreements with the City as conditions of development applications, when and where appropriate as determined by the City of Winnipeg, which shall direct the Developer to intensify uses on the land in the Planned Area in a manner that is consistent with the policies of the Plan.

## 5.5 Urban Design Guidelines: Site Plan Approval

### 5.5.1 Purpose

The purpose of Urban Design Guidelines site plan approval is to ensure the development is of a high quality and conforms with the associated design guidelines. Urban Design Guidelines have been developed for the Urban Neighbourhood Policy Area (see **Appendix E**).

### 5.5.2 Policies

1) The City of Winnipeg may endorse, maintain and make available to the public written Design Guidelines, entitled "Parker Lands Urban Design Guidelines: Urban Policy Area".
2) The Parker Lands Urban Design Guidelines should serve to guide the design of new and/or expanding developments within the Planning Area with respect to:
    (a) Building Design,
    (b) Site Design,
    (c) Landscape Design,
    (d) Pedestrian and Active Transportation Design,
    (e) Sign Design; and
    (f) Off-Street Parking Design.
3) All applications for new and/or expanding developments within the Planning Area will require plan approval, which will be evaluated and assessed against the Parker Lands Urban Design Guidelines, in addition to review for conformity with any applicable design standards as required by the Winnipeg Zoning By-law.
4) The Parker Lands Urban Design Guidelines shall not apply or affect the ability of land owners exercising their existing land-use rights for developing lands currently zoned for Industrial land-uses.

### 5.5.3 Approval and Amendment Procedures

Design Guidelines Adoption:

1) The Design Guidelines should be endorsed in principle by Council.
2) The critical path for endorsement is:
    (a) City Centre Community Committee - Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development - Executive Policy Committee - Council.

Design Guidelines Amendment:

3) An application to amend the design guidelines can be made by:
    (a) The owner of a property within the plan area
    (b) An agent of the owner authorized in writing by the owner
    (c) The City of Winnipeg

4) Process:
    (a) Application for the amendment is made to the Director of Planning Property and Development
    (b) The critical path for an amendment is:

        - City Centre Community Committee - Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development - Executive Policy Committee - Council.

Notification:

5) Should an owner, or an agent of the owner authorized in writing by the owner, make an application to amend the Design Guidelines, the City of Winnipeg may require the applicant to notify affected property owners within the plan area of the proposed amendment by mail. The requirement for notification will be dependent upon the nature of the proposed amendment and whether it is deemed to have any potential impact on surrounding properties.
6) Should the City of Winnipeg make an application to amend the design guidelines, the City of Winnipeg shall notify all affected property owners within the plan area of the proposed amendment by mail.