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] . . .' 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' 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'. Precinct Q, Precinct I calls this 'Interpretations > General Definitions'. Transcona Yards, Osborne call this 'Glossary'. 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, 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, 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.