Q1 How well do you think the site and building design guidelines for single family detached and up/down duplex will help new infill integrate into existing neighbourhoods?

Answered: 768 Skipped: 6



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Not well at all	31.25%	240
Somewhat	38.54%	296
Very well	26.56%	204
Neutral/No opinion	3.65%	28
TOTAL		768

Q2 How do you think the site and building design guidelines for single family detached and up/down duplex could be improved to help new infill integrate into existing neighbourhoods?

Answered: 575 Skipped: 199

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Make the homes fit the neighborhood they are being built in. If the homes are bungalows then build bungalows. Stop putting 2 narrow homes on one lot!	10/23/2020 8:18 AM
2	New infill to not add to retention of surface water on adjacent properties and not to block or reduce drainage of meltwater on neighbors property	10/23/2020 7:10 AM
3	Reduce them to the same height, not the extra 5 feet. Depending on the roof line, 5 feet more can be overpowering. Also you need to keep 4 feet on each side, anything less and the building becomes to close.	10/22/2020 11:27 PM
4	New, infill development should conform to surrounding properties in terms of style, size, lot coverage, height, roof type/style, architectural details, landscaping/grading, etc.	10/22/2020 11:22 PM
5	Lot coverage of 30% plus an additional 12% for the garage is still twice as much coverage as many existing homes (which are closer to 16%-20% for home, plus single garages. Lot coverage is still too big -- and this means blocked sidelines, loss of mature trees. It would be better to take an average of the lot coverage on a block - then the houses would integrate much more. Your diagrams are very misleading as they show abutting homes that also have 30% coverage - so of course these proposed homes look like they integrate. But as mentioned, homes in most mature communities have lot coverage much lower than 30%. If you use visuals to ask peoples's opinions, it would be more honest to use accurate, real-life examples. Regarding landscaping credits - it's preposterous that a developer could cut down dozens mature trees, but save one or two, and that absolves them from having to satisfy the landscaping requirements. This is insane. And, developers will undoubtedly choose to remove existing mature trees and build a larger home and make a bigger profit, because all they have to do is supply 1 or two trees and a couple of shrubs to get credits? Good lord, that's less than $100. What do you think they are going to do? Seriously, these landscaping requirements are not even close to adequate. These guidelines are boasting how they are prioritizing trees, which ALL citizens benefit from. These proposed landscaping requirements REALLY need to be much more strict. Elsewhere in the city's regulations for removing trees for commercial reasons (films etc), trees are ranked and valued, and much much larger penalties levied (in the thousands of dollars). M. Barwinsky has been quoted as saying a large mature tree can be valued at $40,000. If you are serious about saving our canopy, start charging developers the REAL value of what they are destroying. Maybe then they will begin to choose their lots carefully, and plan houses that allow for mature trees to remain on the property.	10/22/2020 11:06 PM
6	Stricter where possible, especially with regards to retaining mature trees. Mature trees should be protected. Less variation from the average for setbacks.	10/22/2020 10:24 PM
7	Actually put some regulations in place though I’m sure developers will find ways to get around them like apply for variances.	10/22/2020 10:22 PM
8	1. There needs to be clear definition of terms contained used in every document so that planners and the community have a better understanding of the documents - There should be no projections allowed without going to the community for review. - balconies need to considered as part of the footprint and in the setbacks.	10/22/2020 9:54 PM
9	If a lot already has an existing two-family dwelling then a new two-family dwelling should be allowed to be built there to replace it. Existing infrastructure such as roads and sewers would have to be upgraded to handle the extra volume.	10/22/2020 9:11 PM
10	Shouldn’t be allowed to build two homes on one site	10/22/2020 9:05 PM
11	There should be financial penalties to the developer if he/ she do not submit detailed house plans and landscaping plans along with their application to divide a lot or a zone variance. There should be a hefty fine for any tree removal due to the house plan. Will the infill committee treat with respect the people who appear before them, asking for an appeal to the variance? The developer must also consult with the surrounding community. The City NEEDS to hire more arbourists, who would be able to ascertain what trees should be planted to prevent Ash borer, etc.	10/22/2020 5:12 PM
12	It seems like people will have the option of not planting sod. Instead they can use pavers or stone with some perennials/trees. I have seen yards in Winnipeg with this landscaping choice. They are UGLY and OUT OF PLACE. The houses are most often owned by people of certain ethnic backgrounds who have absolutely no interest in taking care of a yard. So fine. Then live in an apartment or condo where you don’t have to take care of grass. Everyone has a few	10/22/2020 5:07 PM

	weeds in their grass. They blend in. But yards that are completely concrete and stone only look good for the first few months after the landscaping is done. Then they become weed magnets and look terrible! So all the other neighbors with grass have to look at these weed filled ugly yards all the time? I think it's still illegal to use effective weed killer in the city, right? MAKE THEM PLANT GRASS!!	
13	Maintain well designed city by-laws and with continual detailed communication with existing neighbourhood residents ... at high standards , so that we don't have a hodgepodge of poorly supervised ugly buildings thrown into historically desired settings. Consulation with experts in Environmental Design, and architectural design impacts on people's psychological health and well being in building a cohesive neighbourhood.	10/22/2020 3:41 PM
14	There appears to be very little "bite" in the new regulations to ensuring new housing built in the A1R1 districts appropriately reflects the character of the neighbourhoods. The word "should" means that there is no need for enforcement. The word "should" or "consider" must be replaced with "shall" or "will" throughout this document in order to ensure the integrity of these guidelines. Eg. 6.6 Landscaping. "Boulevard trees should not be removed ... ". This is meaningless to a contractor, and difficult to enforce with current wording. Every "should" or "consider" in the landscaping section must be replaced with "shall or will" or it will not be done or even considered by contractors. New neighbourhoods enforce high standards re building heights, materials, setbacks and even colours of the stonework and stucco. Established neighbourhoods should be granted these same rights! Maximum building height must not be allowed to exceed the average height of a 2 story home on the block ... forget the 35 ft. Rule. Lot splitting should be held to a minimum in established neighbourhoods. It can destroy the integrity of a neighbourhood, changing the character of existing neighbourhoods, while removing trees and green spaces. Increasing neighbourhood density must be done with a high degree of sensitivity. These guidelines do NOT offer this sensitivity. The introduction of landscaping requirements are written as considerations rather than requirements.	10/22/2020 3:38 PM
15	reduce building heights to match existing houses. Stop allowing existing single lots to be divided into two narrow lots. Also stop allowing tall multi story houses that tower above the single story bungalows in the rest of the neighbourhood	10/22/2020 3:36 PM
16	Building two single family detached on a 40 foot lot will mean a very high build height, which is not desired by existing neighbours. It ordinarily means removal of mature trees, loss of sun, loss of privacy. Lots splits should not occur on site widths of less than 50 feet or wider. These new builds don't usually provide green space for children to play and families to rest, celebrate and garden.	10/22/2020 3:21 PM
17	There is no identification of how much increased population density and infill housing is recommended or proposed for each area. This all should be part of a local area plan so cumulative effects of development on infrastructure such as schools, parks, transportation, libraries, roads sewer and water systems can be considered.	10/22/2020 2:32 PM
18	Do not allow lot splitting.	10/22/2020 2:31 PM
19	The size of infill houses must be fitting to those in the area. They should not be over sized for the older houses.	10/22/2020 2:19 PM
20	The reference to context is encouraging. Assuming my interpretation of this term is similar to the wording.	10/22/2020 1:23 PM
21	Infill single family dwellings absolutely must be restricted for height, width and depth of the building, and occupation of the lot space, to be matching the dwellings adjacent to them, or to other single family dwellings on the same street block if the lot is a corner lot or is next to a business or apartment building.	10/22/2020 12:06 PM
22	Design styles evolve over time and design guidelines that are overly prescriptive may end up resulting in mature neighbourhoods looking overly homogeneous. Lot coverage and prioritized infill locations greatly limit the ability from mature neighbourhoods to move away from predominantly single-family zoning and single-family residences.	10/22/2020 11:42 AM
23	Higher priority should be given to ensuring lot coverage requirements, building height requirements, and rear yard setbacks. I think these are central criteria that determine the "size" of infill houses. The "size" of infill housing should closely follow was already exists in the neighborhood. I think the criteria should be the same for corner lots and non-corner lots.	10/22/2020 11:17 AM
24	The design guidelins are flawed, fix infrastructure such as sewers before even considering it.	10/22/2020 11:15 AM

25	Side yard setbacks should be further considered, perhaps on a neighbourhood by neighbourhood basis, possibly based on original neighbourhood averages. As infills are already generally very imposing, the towering effect they have would be likely be reduced if they weren't so closely planted to neighbouring homes. If lot splitting makes larger side setbacks infeasible, greater height restrictions might need to be introduced. Also, as past infills will greatly skew any "averages" for height, lot coverage, etc., they should not be included when new infills are calculating height allowances. More needs to be done to address site and building guidelines for on site during the actual building process. More needs to be done to address environmental impacts such as lead released during demolition, and to encourage removal, reuse, recycling of usable materials from the home before demolition.	10/22/2020 11:08 AM
26	Make lots minimum 25 feet wide when no access to back lane.	10/22/2020 11:02 AM
27	The rear yard setback is unrealistic in a huge variety of neighborhoods in the city outlined by the map, particularly st james and st boniface. The statement implies context is taken from abutting properties but that's not evident in this section at all. Why should infill developments have any more stringent requirements for locating their garage than existing homes adding a detached garage? I am very supportive of protecting mature trees and their root systems. Most of the other dictates of the section are sensible aside from what I've outlined above.	10/22/2020 10:06 AM
28	By not aggressively targeting specific neighbourhoods in selected parts of the city and by refusing to endorse double standards	10/22/2020 9:55 AM
29	have a mechanism to actually PLAN the rate at which a given street gets infill. Instead of letting market decide. Look at some streets in St Vital's Glenwood which have had multiple infills while others have none. Slow down the pace and there will be less opposition.	10/22/2020 9:51 AM
30	I believe that the side yard setback should be a minimum of 4 feet on both sides, no matter the size of the lot.	10/21/2020 11:55 PM
31	The guidelines should also include the exterior guidelines of the homes and require the new exterior to be similar to the existing homes or the character is lost.	10/21/2020 10:26 PM
32	Cal the number of lot divisions permitted per block or only allow multi until dwellings on corner lots	10/21/2020 10:08 PM
33	Do not allow lot splitting as this completely destroys the integrity and character of these established and desirable neighbourhoods.	10/21/2020 10:00 PM
34	-Include accessibility/barrier-free considerations -Specify sustainability in the landscaping, lawn alternatives, composting, and consider gardening facilities onsite, which are all very appealing to people for livability	10/21/2020 8:24 PM
35	It would be best if lots are not split, as this does reduce the size of the outdoor space that a house has to use. Also to place multiplexes on a street with single houses or duplexes even at a corner takes away privacy from the nearby houses. The balconies often overlook neighbouring yards and make it very unpleasant to use a yard. No one likes to be stared at when in their own yard. Especially from a balcony . When a person buys a house on a street they expect that the vibe of the street will remain the same and not become crowded and invasive.	10/21/2020 7:06 PM
36	Too much 'should' and not enough 'shall' or 'must' in policy criteria. From my experience at appeals, this just means developers will do what they want and the appeals committee will cave to their wishes.	10/21/2020 6:55 PM
37	My concern with the infills being developed relate to the quality of materials used. I am concerned about the longevity of the homes. Design guidelines are a good start but we see a lot of homes built with poor workmanship, poor design and poor quality of materials.	10/21/2020 3:54 PM
38	the two story houses are huge and out of scale. It is frustrating to have two side by side like this.	10/21/2020 3:54 PM
39	The site and building guidelines need to more accurately reflect the style, size and character of current homes.	10/21/2020 3:49 PM
40	The required external design should look similar to the neighbourhood and garage	10/21/2020 3:18 PM
41	Inclusion for disabilities. Steep staircase = skinny lot, high entrance = no ramp, not accessible. Grandparents can't visit, families with children in wheelchairs stuck with no	10/21/2020 12:52 PM

	housing but apartments. Replace 3 storey walkups with high rises, versus adding them to the area. Advise adjacent property owners of infill and give opportunity to appeal.	
42	Make them look like the other houses on the street, NOT stick out, tower over neighbours, look giant, threatening and ugly, especially not black.	10/21/2020 12:11 PM
43	Not building two houses in one lot that severely affect neighbours. The house that's built next to our house is essentially right next to the fence now with multiple windows/doors overlooking our yard and property. Or building smaller homes.	10/21/2020 11:51 AM
44	new infill should continue the single family neighbourhood concept & be consistent in design with existing dwellings	10/21/2020 10:59 AM
45	Have the design of new houses try to fit in with the existing neighborhood rather than outrageously huge buildings that tower over everything	10/21/2020 10:48 AM
46	Do not allow lot splits.Minimum lot area of 2500 sq ft. (as allowed for R1-small zoning) should not be allowed as it is too small. Instead of allowing 30% lot coverage, coverage should be an average of the 2 adjacent properties. Do not allow attached garages except for corner lots. The guidelines state on p.6 that they "will revitalize aging housing stock and expand the housing options available to groups of people including first-time homebuyers, young families and seniors looking to downsize while staying in the neighborhoods they love ". In reality, the new builds allowed by these guidelines are large and expensive and exclude every category mentioned in the above quote. Plus developers first outbid young families and first-time homebuyers for affordable housing, and then destroy them and replace them with expensive houses that are out of the reach of the buyers that the guidelines are supposedly trying to help.	10/21/2020 10:34 AM
47	No "twin tower" builds and don't cut down 90 year old trees	10/21/2020 10:15 AM
48	No narrow lot development.	10/21/2020 7:39 AM
49	- eliminate lot splitting - reduce lot coverage percentage to match pre-2000 percentage of the larger of two immediate neighbouring homes - eliminate attached garages with possible exception of corner lots	10/21/2020 7:23 AM
50	front and back of the house have to line up with the neighbouring houses. Height should be able to be 2 stories but not more. Ideally single story with side by side duplex would be better than up/down ones though.	10/20/2020 11:24 PM
51	I think matching the roof pitch/patterns of the adjacent lots will help a lot. Keeping the main floor 1.22m or lower will also help in older areas. I liked the idea of cantilevers not being able to take up the entire side yard.	10/20/2020 9:47 PM
52	Only the immediate 2 to 4 adjacent properties should be considered in determining the front or rear setback of a new build. Consider when there are 4 existing homes in a row with a 25ft front setback; but then across the street, or farther down the block, there are 4 other houses with only a 15ft front setback. The average of 20ft minus the allowed 5ft, allows the new house to be built with a15ft set back, protruding a full 10ft ahead of the 4 adjacent homes. Yet the same math would keep the same new house in a straight line with other houses mentioned if it were built across the street. By only considering the 4 adjacent homes; 2 on either side, the new house would integrate well on either side of street, and not just the one. No one loses. Allowing the 5ft plus or minus of only the 4 adjacent properties should be generous enough for the developers. The developers will gets more building square footage as they push the limits which each new build that goes up. This would also protect the existing home values a little bit longer.	10/20/2020 8:56 PM
53	Leave the building guidelines as they are because the changes will accommodate the builders who want to build homes with granny-suites, and want to max-out the building size on tiny lots for a profit, jeopardizing our unique character-home/large lot/mature treed community...all for their gain and our loss.	10/20/2020 7:29 PM
54	Same 1 level homes should be built to keep the same look	10/20/2020 6:01 PM
55	Dumb	10/20/2020 5:14 PM
56	I think if they where lower not so high they would fit better into the neighbour hoods.	10/20/2020 3:34 PM
57	No opinion	10/20/2020 3:05 PM
58	Remove landscaping requirements... nothing preventing removal after permit closure, therefore	10/20/2020 2:50 PM

	useless. Also, makes building on small lots more difficult. Remove lot coverage, height and setback requirements. Remove lot width requirements for duplexes... walkability requires density on small lots. Limiting density to larger lots doesn't help for walkability, it actually hinders walkability, which is a prerequisite for livable density.	
59	They should be in tune with the existing architecture of the area, as all neighbourhoods in Winnipeg are unique. It's part of what makes our City great.	10/20/2020 2:19 PM
60	Eliminate the ability for lot splitting on streets with unpaved (gravel, mud) back lanes. I have no ideological problem with infill, but my backlane is an unpaved mess at the best of times. I spent 15k on a new garage last year, and it was nearly unusable over the winter due to ruts and deep ditches in the middle of the lane. In the spring, we end up with a literal pond, nearly a foot deep, that we refer to with disdain as Lake Fernwood. Adding further desity to streets with unpaved back lanes will cause undue damage to an already nearly unusable lane from the construction needs, and will reduce the amount of time it remains usable after grading due to the increase in residential traffic. I also worry about the impact on infrastructure like water and sewage. We are responsible, we compost, we have a bidet and use toilet paper sparingly, use screens on our drains to prevent food waste from ending up in the sewer system, and still we've had to call roto rooter twice to clean out our main line to the city all the way to or past our property line due to backup. adding density to the neighbourhood concerns me for those reasons.	10/20/2020 2:07 PM
61	The building heights do not conform to abutting properties. Also only certain areas should be set aside for infill properties.	10/20/2020 2:01 PM
62	limiting the main floor heights and overall building heights would integrate homes into neighbourhoods better.	10/20/2020 11:12 AM
63	Let the professional planners employed by the city do their jobs and keep politics and special interest groups out of it.	10/20/2020 10:30 AM
64	Make it mandatory for them to not be higher than the houses on either side!!!!	10/20/2020 9:35 AM
65	The proposal is completely inappropriate for areas like Kingston Crescent & ST George & Elm Patk in St Vital . No need to say these houses are no longer viable. Kingston Crescent needs to be revitalized? Have you ever been to BDI?	10/19/2020 9:51 PM
66	by not squeezing two houses on one lot	10/19/2020 7:38 PM
67	Include more affordably priced homes for low income, involve 3rd sector like Habitat Homes, etc	10/19/2020 3:26 PM
68	make is fair through all neighborhoods. set rules and have developers follow them.	10/19/2020 2:06 PM
69	More space required between houses to prevent cramp conditions.	10/19/2020 1:52 PM
70	Don't do it. Not democratic.	10/19/2020 11:56 AM
71	Respect the neighborhoods, densification is not improvement, respect character and people, one home on one lot should be replaced by one home on one lot. Street parking, lanes are already poorly maintained and full slamming in more residents and paving over yards to park cars does nothing for future.	10/19/2020 9:37 AM
72	Ensure subdivisions will not disrupt existing households, especially in areas where houses are located closely together. Introduce restrictions for hired contractors that limit location they can park (ie not in back lanes blocking other resident's access)	10/19/2020 9:26 AM
73	Stop building them	10/19/2020 8:48 AM
74	A greater percentage of land left with open permeable ground. Greater setbacks from property line	10/18/2020 10:09 PM
75	This is a corrupt and dishonest thing to do to neighbourhoods.	10/18/2020 9:05 PM
76	No lot splitting on streets with gravel lanes. Lanes are already in terrible condition, insane to permit two new homes each with secondary suites and then require back lane access only. Also need some ability to limit number of builds on one block in any two year period	10/18/2020 8:31 PM
77	Better design needed to go along with existing homes in the neighborhood. Too many of the same infill house in every area of the city. Need more different plans.	10/18/2020 8:09 PM

78	Don't allow lot splitting on lots that are average size for the neighbourhood. Splitting a 50ft lot into 2 x 25ft lots is unacceptable regardless of back lane access. 50ft should be the minimum width of a up/down duplex lot and match predominant setbacks and coverage for the street.	10/18/2020 8:02 PM
79	The above are improvements but conern remains regarding the lack of distance between homes and property lines. The current infill homes do not fit the architecture of the existing homes and look cheap.	10/18/2020 6:57 PM
80	People are not comfortable in the duplex at all. The quality of air is horrible. Most of the houses in most of the old areas in Winnipeg are already too small they do not have enough space to move around and yard for kids to play. The distance between houses In some neighbourhoods isn't spacious enough. Winnipeg has a lot of vacant land to build New developments with affordable and decent houses for single families. I think that Our elected Officials that are making decisions should have a better and greater picture and plan of the urbanization of the city. Otherwise, the infrastructure of Winnipeg will be identical with some cities of the third world countries I have been. No to infill integrate!	10/18/2020 6:26 PM
81	It should be mandatory for there to be a paved parking lot or garage with enough parking for every unit. Also if there are trees on the lot, the design should have to work around them instead of cutting them down. We are in a climate crisis, we need all the trees we have. Three-feet from the property line is way too close.	10/18/2020 5:01 PM
82	no comment/don't know	10/18/2020 3:40 PM
83	I don't like the idea of infill	10/18/2020 12:41 PM
84	Larger footage lots required	10/18/2020 12:26 PM
85	Maximize existing lot to include granny suites in R1 area. DO NOT SPLIT lots	10/18/2020 11:03 AM
86	More attention needs to be paid to providing and/or maintaining options for a range of income levels. Some of these neighbourhoods have been places where young people can afford their first homes as well as places with larger more expensive housing. Also, there is insufficient attention to trees, whether existing or new plantings. Many usual measures to protect existing trees are insufficient, and the trees end up dying within a few years of the construction. The construction of new foundations for example will likely to significant damage to any large mature trees on the property. Winnipeg's tree canopy has in the past been a matter of great pride and also has ecological value. Someone needs to be responsible for monitoring the health of both existing and newly planted trees for these sites. Perhaps builders might put down a guarantee deposit to be refunded after 5 years if the trees survive. Planting two trees for killing one large mature one is insufficient. Tree list might be expanded. The setback specification "or portion of block" allows for too much wiggle room. What does that really mean? The entire block should be considered in that average.	10/18/2020 11:02 AM
87	New guidelines are an improvement, but still a compromise to existing neighbors who did not have a building wall 3-4' from their property line when they bought their house in a mature, affordable neighborhood.	10/18/2020 10:37 AM
88	Well not with in the scope of this project there needs to be a set of rules that protects the structural integrity of neighboring structures.	10/18/2020 10:27 AM
89	Minimum lot widths are too narrow. A lot more concrete detail needed regarding what's required to ensure infill blends well into existing communities. Nothing here but "considerations", no rules.	10/18/2020 10:15 AM
90	i dont like the idea of infill anywhere in my neighborhood	10/17/2020 11:41 AM
91	Take into account mature trees to leave them in place	10/17/2020 8:25 AM
92	Blend the looks of new infill with what is there presently. Try not to have them be drastically different in height or ridiculously close to the present homes.	10/16/2020 11:51 PM
93	Our neighbourhood has a lot of new infill. They have taken out all of the mature trees, and the back yards are only gravel. With this new guideline, the houses could get higher and higher, as developers could now build 5 ft higher than the already high infills. Our property values have gone DOWN because of infill, not up.	10/16/2020 11:24 PM
94	Need requirements for larger set back from houses on either site and from front and back street. Developers (either homeowners or commercial developers) need to be liable for any	10/16/2020 11:14 PM

	damages incurred by neighbours due to construction of infill houses. The proof of claim for neighbours should not be an undue hardship. There should be a minimum size for yard (front and back) that needs to be kept for infill to match the character of the neigbourhood. Infill should not be more than 2 stories tall in residential neighbourhoods.	
95	I don't know. I'm not an expert. You're supposed to do this.	10/16/2020 8:53 PM
96	More limitation on overall size differentials. Less of an issue when the infil is of this scale.	10/16/2020 8:01 PM
97	"responding to the context" is pretty meaningless. Look at me, responding to the context in this survey. See? Useful and prescriptive, no?	10/16/2020 7:20 PM
98	Tax incentive to existing surrounding homes where infill is occurring. Additional space for parking on the property should be required to infill the property. Streets are overflowing with parked cars.	10/16/2020 7:00 PM
99	Stricter regulations from an official regulating office, to ensure strict compliance with essential guidelines. Caps on amount of infill creating in mature neighbourhoods so overreaction from greedy developers doesn't see too sharp a rise in population density contribute to overburdening community services, amenities, and infrastructure.	10/16/2020 6:10 PM
100	An infill committee should have final say as to whether the proposed infill home will conform with surrounding homes.	10/16/2020 4:20 PM
101	In my opinion, these guidelines will somewhat make a "better" infill solution. To most people I met from the past engagement, "infill" became synonymous as "lot splitting" and their reasons opposing this differs from one person to another.	10/16/2020 2:39 PM
102	I lot I single family dwelling. No lot splitting.	10/16/2020 2:17 PM
103	Keep single family homes in the area	10/16/2020 2:17 PM
104	No changes needed.	10/16/2020 1:10 PM
105	Tear down all old neighborhoods surrounding downtown.	10/16/2020 9:05 AM
106	Do not agree that infill integration should be allowed at all in neighbourhoods.	10/16/2020 9:00 AM
107	up/down duplexes are not R1. If a developer wants to build a duplex on a 50ft lot (not 25ft), then they can get that site rezoned and build a 1 1/2 story duplex (MAX)	10/15/2020 10:13 PM
108	Have them fit in with the character and size of surrounding homes and quit the lot splitting!!!!!!	10/15/2020 9:51 PM
109	Draft guidelines say that setbacks will be based on the average setback of the street. We have a couple of "monster houses" that go right to the edges . Taking them into account will dramatically reduce the average setback. Further, variances always seem to be granted by developers, and then the guidelines aren't gfollowed anyway. this must not be done.	10/15/2020 9:46 PM
110	contractors should follow the guidelines more closely.	10/15/2020 9:45 PM
111	I'm not sure	10/15/2020 9:01 PM
112	Possibly allow for more flexibility in terms of setbacks and lot coverage at the rear of the lot especially in neighbourhoods where small/short lots are the norm.	10/15/2020 8:57 PM
113	They don't belong in old neighborhoods..suggest to have their own areas	10/15/2020 8:42 PM
114	Don't split lots. Have single family homes with a yard for kids to play in. Curb sprawl by providing homes in mature areas the compete with the homes in new developments.	10/15/2020 6:41 PM
115	only allow single family homes to be build on lots presently with single dwelling homes. This would be consistent with the existing neighbour hood.	10/15/2020 5:26 PM
116	Loss of greenspace on properties with new guidelines. Lawns and trees will clearly be reduced. Current duplex infills, close to these guidelines, within our block have no grass in front (only stones), minimum setbacks and not appreciable back yard (bare minimum to the lane). Other older infills with single family dwellings have retained or improved the neighborhood- but these new guidelines will not.	10/15/2020 5:10 PM
117	The lots are 25 feet wide in some cases. How will height restrictions be.imposed effectively? Nothing mentioned about clear cutting the trees.	10/15/2020 4:34 PM

118	Lots should not be able to be divided if they are less then 50ft frontage.	10/15/2020 3:13 PM
119	I do not have any suggestions on improvements. I have positive commentary in that I approve of the landscaping requirements for trees / shrubbery.	10/15/2020 2:56 PM
120	Land coverage should be increased, side yards reduced, height of the building should go up to 35 feet as it always been.To many landscaping requirements that make the project less cost effective and it will reduce the affordability.	10/15/2020 2:34 PM
121	Prioritizing and denial are two different things. If the city has infill guidelines, this should apply to all neighbourhoods so that residents can be treated fairly.	10/15/2020 2:31 PM
122	n/a	10/15/2020 12:40 PM
123	Homes need to have larger yards for children to play and adults to sit out and enjoy. It is more important now than ever with social restrictions!	10/15/2020 12:23 PM
124	Guidelines need to be more realistic and way less demanding. Some of the points doesn't make sense and cost of production of the house will sky rocket making it not financially feasible. Infill houses are first of all affordable houses not luxury mansions. Overkilling it with demands for design, landscaping and restricting in size to match 100 years old houses will just stop the hole infill in the city.	10/15/2020 10:19 AM
125	The section on building height requirements could be a bit more assertive in the allowance of more height. One floor more than average surrounding seems appropriate.	10/15/2020 10:11 AM
126	Taking into consideration the windows and light of the neighbours. All infill looks the same in Winnipeg, why? Make it more like the original buildings and/or use complimentary designs. "Significant architectural features" sounds absurd. If you mean something more like blending into the existing infrastructure or creating facades, that makes more sense. Realistically I want infill to fit in but to also be AFFORDABLE. we have a poverty and homelessness crisis in our city. If we build infill and new devleopments they should REQUIRE (and not find loops holes like True North Square did) to provide a certain percentage of affordable/rent geared to income suites/residences. We should also be incentivizing the creation of affordable, sustainable housing. We need better building codes regarding heat and energy consumption. We also need better rights for tenants who rent and more consequences for property owners if they don't comply.	10/15/2020 8:48 AM
127	First of all there are no guidelines, it is decided by some pocket filling city councillors who frankly do not give a shit about the established homeowners in this city!	10/15/2020 8:34 AM
128	I didn't notice any height maximum for garages or other structures behind the house. My single- and two-family neighborhood has a number of monsterous two-story garages that completely shade the adjacent back yards. This should be considered.	10/15/2020 6:44 AM
129	One house - one lot. Bungalow for bungalow. Single family detached for single family detached. Extra units lead to extra traffic and destroy the character of the neighbourhood.	10/14/2020 10:41 PM
130	Restrict the number of infills being build on the same block and the same street in the same year. The disruption that exists with the building should not go on continuosly.	10/14/2020 10:11 PM
131	They do not. Lot splitting on one lot can create a safety Hazzard. The houses are to close to each other & pose a fire hazzard.	10/14/2020 9:28 PM
132	Stop allowing lot split of 50 ft lots into two 25 ft lots. The Glenwood area was not designed to squeeze duplexes and large tall and narrow almost to the property line builds, to try to maximize two large square foot homes All to maximize developers profit on 25 ft lots. This is destroying trees, encroaching too close to existing homes existing tax payers like myself for over 15 years, who bought in the area for its free space, small quaint homes, single family environment large backyards lots of light and outdoor space, with a sense of privacy. These new duplexe builds on split lots destroy everything attractive about the Glenwood neighbourhoor: blocking existing homes' sunlight. My house is a 1 1/2 storey as is typical in the area and. The only windows on the top floor are on the sides facing neighbouring lots. If tall narrows homes duplexes are built right tip the th eproperty line there will be no natural light on the top floor sand no privacy inthe backyard with o l'y concrete walls to stare and, no natural light for backyard and garden either. The new infills in split lots block sunlight into Neighboruing backyards. The area is being converted into a crowded osbourne or downtown concrete stucco environment which is the opposite of beauty and agreeablenes of the area. The area is too small for more people, and was meant for single family detached homes not duplexes, there is	10/14/2020 6:15 PM

	not enough parking and the bus service is overwhelmed in Glenwood with already overflowing buses by the time they get to Glenwood at rush hour. I have been turned away in the dead off winter because buses were too full. Furthermore, by tearing down existing single homes on 50 ft lots to build two homes with duplexes removes any opportunity for single families to buy an affordable starter home with backyard for kids. One home should be replaced by only one home. Why is there no incentive to owners to improve their existing properties, perhaps make one small home slightly bigger? The area should remain owner- lived in (single family homes), not owned by landlords who have no consideration for neighbours, and property care and maintenance.	
133	Houses should be replaced in kind with fewer lot splits allowed. The neighborhood's character should be fostered/preserved and part of that character is the state of the ratio of house size to lot size, as well as the mature trees. Taking out large trees to put in new houses affects the neighborhood as a whole!	10/14/2020 5:49 PM
134	As someone that lives in an infill house that is wildly different than neighbouring housing I really think that this policy is too limiting. Winnipeggers are generally adverse to change, this strategy will not help houses look the same as surrounding in the way that folks are mad about. I think this strategy is good in some ways, landscaping, setbacks, etc, but doesn't allow for creativity in architecture and design.	10/14/2020 5:49 PM
135	The height of buildings is not clear in the guidelines based on the diagram. Are you using half of the height of the roof - the line runs about half way through. The picture looks like the infill is way beyond the 5 ft maximum. That is a current problem where many of these infill monsters dwarf charming homes that are now constantly caste in shadow. I am also concerned about the lack of green space that comes with higher density. With small homes replaced with divided lots and up/down duplexes, we are doubling the people without ensuring adequate yards or small parks to support that need. Kids now play on busy streets. Parking needs also increase and they need to be incorporated realistically.	10/14/2020 5:39 PM
136	Have all residents living in the area take part in the design and infill of their neighbourhood.	10/14/2020 3:21 PM
137	Pay more attention to the adjoining property heights. In some cases the 28 feet is still too high. Have city inspectors follow-up to ensure guidelines are followed and enforced. Issue substantial fines if not followed. The lot sizes realistically don't allow for the tree requirements that should be met.	10/14/2020 3:13 PM
138	Remove encroachment provision. Require infill housing design to match area housing design and size.	10/14/2020 2:44 PM
139	in many cases the guidelines are not followed anyway, it's obvious that four families living in a space where one family lived will cause problems. it seems there must be some kind of kickbacks. when a home can be built with no inspections which has happened and it's supposed to be torn down but that that didn't happen, what good are guidelines when they are not enforced. four families living in a space where one lived will cause infastructure problems which the rest of us will end up paying for	10/14/2020 12:45 PM
140	Build homes that look like the neighborhood; not these skyscrapers.	10/14/2020 12:36 PM
141	have a single story (main floor/basement) duplex. The height of infill housing with a 2nd story subtracts from the character and green space within neighborhoods.	10/14/2020 10:48 AM
142	Introduce building distance requirements between new constructions and abutting properties that reflect the established pattern and character of the neighbourhood. Have off-street parking requirements that also leave enough space for a back yard that reflects the pattern and character of the neighbourhood.	10/14/2020 10:31 AM
143	New infills should "fit in" architecturally in the neighbourhood.	10/14/2020 10:18 AM
144	The only way they can help is not to build them at all.	10/14/2020 10:03 AM
145	up/down duplex options should not be permitted to replace a single family detached home. This results in increased traffic, increased transiency (renters) and generally splitting a single family home into 4 households.	10/14/2020 9:00 AM
146	Some of this guidance still seems a bit vague. As a homeowner, I worry that someone could build an infill house that quite severely impacted my backyard, particularly by shading my garden. The guidance seems a bit unclear still to me on how far back into the backyard the infill can be. The previous survey options were much more clear (e.g. the option that it had to	10/14/2020 8:52 AM

	be the average of the two houses on either side. I think this would reduce impact on neighbours. In some scenarios, I think the current guidelines could still lead to severe impacts).	
147	The specific distancing and setback recommendations will not work in mature, older neighbourhoods with narrower lots. They may work in newer suburbs. Two different sets of infill rules would make more sense, one for suburbia, and one for older, mature neighbourhoods. The setbacks, clearances etc HAVE to be smaller in the mature neighbourhoods, or every single development will need variances. Plenty of lots are 25 feet wide - and that just doesn't fit with the new infill proposals.	10/14/2020 7:51 AM
148	Allowing for space and landscaping consistent with the existing neighborhoods	10/14/2020 5:43 AM
149	not as tall,4ft. lot line setbacks,better landscaping	10/13/2020 10:20 PM
150	If infill was permitted only in cases where the new construction matched nearby existing homes in size, style, exterior materials, and lot footprint, there would be much less resistance to new infill in existing neighbourhoods.	10/13/2020 10:19 PM
151	Ensure it is transformative enough that infill happens in a meaningful way such that adjacent and nearby home owners end up able to sell their homes for more money and by way of that have a financial vested interest in the success of infill development and roll out.	10/13/2020 8:42 PM
152	Requirements for minimal parking needed for all sizes of new infill, including single family detached and up/down duplex. Concrete guidelines as to what would qualify as 'sufficient', since this term is greatly open to interpretation. Also should set limitations on the percentage of properties in a given area/street that can be split for any property development to minimize the impact to existing properties and residents. More evenly distributing the influx of new residents/builds around the areas in question so as not to have certain streets in a constant state of disrepair due to continuous new construction. Residential taxes on existing properties where infill has been completed or is planned in the near future should be re-assessed more regularly and vigorously, as this sort of infill can decrease the resale value of existing properties, as also can cause great inconveniences to property owners during and after construction.	10/13/2020 8:26 PM
153	As I read the document, I saw no mention of parking. That is definitely a concern when there are multiple family units on a re designed 50 foot lot. There can be as many as 4 family units and therefore 8 vehicles.It does talk about the possibility of using transit, which would be great, but not necessarily happening. Parking becomes an issue because it is street parking and traffic moving through becomes congestion. There is not enough parking on the 25 foot lot for that many vehicles.	10/13/2020 8:17 PM
154	It could be improved by preserving character of neighbourhood and residential streets, duplex homes should be build on busier streets i.e at Mary’s or St. Anne’s... if a single family detached home is being build then make the make of the home blend in for example not a home that was constructed in 1955 being a bungalow right beside a modern house built it 2020 it hurts the eyes. I just bought a home in st.Vital and the houses down the street on Havelock Ave look very ugly if i had the power I would demolish those homes and rebuilt ones that fit into the culture and mosaic of the 50’s homes. One other thing I would like to add is that the homes in River Heights are well over age and no investor or homebuyer would ever kill the character or personality of those homes instead they would draw and construct a genuine infill that blends well into that neighbourhood.	10/13/2020 7:31 PM
155	They have not built one of these near my house in almost 3 years. They should at least have this option...	10/13/2020 7:17 PM
156	I believe that current new infill is already doing an excellent job of integrating into existing neighbourhoods. There are a few exceptions, but the vast majority I see around the city look terrific and are a vast improvement on the rundown, undersized houses built decades ago. We shouldn't be replicating tiny bungalows on 50-foot lots.	10/13/2020 5:34 PM
157	They have to fit into the existing neighborhood. Roof Height should not be higher than the houses beside the infill.	10/13/2020 4:49 PM
158	It is important that the dwelling does not change from a single family to a duplex	10/13/2020 4:25 PM
159	by maintaining the character of the existing neighbourhood and stringently enforcing guidelines for developers.	10/13/2020 4:20 PM

160	Build a side by side if you're so concerned with adding housing	10/13/2020 3:53 PM
161	One of the biggest conflicts outside of lot coverage, which I think is *much* better addressed by the new draft guidelines centers around building height, in particular where the built environment is primarily bungalow-style house construction. For example, in mature areas in St. Boniface, St. Vital and Fort Rouge, many streets have nearly complete blocks of small bungalow-type dwellings that would be dwarfed by a 28-35 ft. structure, as the roofline might only extend to 14 ft. In such instances, it would seem that a storey-and-a-half design would be more in keeping with the neighbourhood, whereas a 28 ft structure would effectively stick out like a sore thumb until adjacent lots were re-developed. In such instances, a lower roofline of a front/rear duplex (where the lot abuts a lane) would seem preferable, or a secondary suite opening to the lane. I do not see provisions for these types of duplexes (where one dwelling essentially faces the rear lane, the other the front lane being contemplated in this plan.	10/13/2020 3:06 PM
162	Make them so that they blend in with the established housing. So if there is stucco, siding or brick, make the house's exterior match. Also if you have all the houses are with different designs don't infill with all the same bi-level type homes. and make the roof lines similar.	10/13/2020 2:40 PM
163	The city, especially paid personnel, needs to stop being fanboys for ugly infill buildings.	10/13/2020 2:30 PM
164	What are the design guidelines? How is this survey not beginning with them? The number one concern in my opinion should be speed of construction. New homes in established residential neighbourhoods should be allowed no more that 30 days of construction. Let the industry decide if this is best accomplished by prefab means, but stop allowing contractors to build in drips and starts over months and months.	10/13/2020 12:15 PM
165	problem is Committees regularity allow variances = not following the rules and making the exception the rule. This strategy is useless as history of council members is not to follow rules despite area residents requests for the rules to be applied as passed in bylaws	10/13/2020 12:11 PM
166	I think Winnipeg should look into following Minneapolis and Edmonton's decisions to eliminate single family zoning to encourage density and infill developments. Then, all new developments could adhere to one set of rules. It would be simpler and enforce stricter standards while still encouraging infill development.	10/13/2020 12:06 PM
167	I don't see why "integration" should be given this much priority. It doesn't matter to me at all if the houses on a street all look the same or different	10/13/2020 11:51 AM
168	Needs a big change.We have two duplexes on small lots We have half of a house on a very small lot and one that looks like a full house.	10/13/2020 11:29 AM
169	I think the guidelines should be less constraining in terms of what they allow. We should be making it easier for developers to add density to our neighborhoods. I also wish the guidelines included provisions for detached suite construction. I wish they didn't continue to mandate on site parking. Some of us want homes without driveways, and if the market supports it developers should be able to build it.	10/13/2020 10:45 AM
170	Inform the neighbourhood. The residents who have lived there their whole lives	10/13/2020 8:41 AM
171	Take into consideration what the height of these new houses does to the neighbors on either side with regards to their backyards. Sunlight is blocked, the second level of the houses have windows that look right into neighbors back yards which means privacy is gone and they don't match the neighborhood designs. Older neighborhoods have consistency in heights. New developments have consistency in design so why is it OK for these tall homes to change the look in older neighborhoods.	10/13/2020 8:35 AM
172	Mandates to ensure developers are following guidelines. Back entrances offset from existing properties or lower than fence line.	10/13/2020 6:52 AM
173	do not even entertain exspections	10/12/2020 9:47 PM
174	I would love to see homes with more natural light including the sides. Allow for proper duplexes as opposed to secondary suites to replace dilapidated old homes.	10/12/2020 9:38 PM
175	I think the city should treat all lots the same. The river lots should also be able to be subdivide to similar sizes if they are zoned the same and have lots equal or smaller than the proposed lot split.	10/12/2020 9:17 PM
176	Take into account the character of the neighbourhood to a greater extent	10/12/2020 9:04 PM

177	Don't build such big houses in an area where small houses are the majority. No one wants to live next to these huge 3 level houses that tower over every other house on the street.	10/12/2020 8:09 PM
178	The guidelines DO NOT provide a framework that supports infill, rather, the guidelines appear to discourage infill development.	10/12/2020 6:57 PM
179	Limit length of infill to be in line with surrounding homes.Limit height to be in line with surrounding homes.4 feet minimum from property line.NO TOP DECKS!	10/12/2020 6:38 PM
180	They are so complicated -- and specific -- it's prohibitive for individuals to build infill. Yet individual families who want to live in the neighbourhood are the MOST likely to build a house that will fit in well because they actually want to live there and get along with their neighbours. Guidelines are good prevent anarchy and stupid decisions but shouldn't be so rigid that real people can't make exceptions based on real circumstances that don't quite match the rules.	10/12/2020 3:47 PM
181	Don't let big ugly box type houses be built to stand out in a neighborhood. They should blend in and not make the street look it is out of place rather than have it enhanced!	10/12/2020 9:13 AM
182	It will bring people from all around the city into the st.boniface neighborhood and more people will be buying duplexs and renting them out.	10/12/2020 5:05 AM
183	These take up full yard - we need yards for gardens to play in, to attract young families. These are also very expensive homes. We need proper consultation, one neighbourhood at a time. Urban Ridge came door to door, but what they built in St B is out of context, not to mention that shoddy building and safety practices have made it a nightmare for neighbours while building, and now it's blocking out the view and light. We do not need updown duplexes!	10/11/2020 8:53 PM
184	Building design guidelines wording should be changed from "encourage" to incorporate architectural elements from the neighbourhood; to the the wording that is used for town homes guidelines - "MUST" include at least 2 architectural elements from the neighbourhood. Using the word "encourage" without any incentives makes this guideline unenforceable. If townhomes need to reflect architectural elements from a neighbourhood, up-down duplexes should also. Up-down duplexes should not be allowed in R1 neighbourhoods (which are in Area 1), and it needs to be clearer what the difference is between a up-down duplex and single family home with a secondary suite. Calling it a secondary suite to avoid up-down duplex guidelines should not be allowed, especially if the City continues with allowing them to be called secondary suites via the Board of Adjustment rulings. There need to be clearer guidelines on AirBNBs in the City. A R1 neighbouhood should not have to deal with up down duplexes being used only as AirBNBs and never having had families living in them. Without City guidelines, the ones in my neighbourhood get very noisy when rented out as party houses; especially on holidays and weekends. That is one less house with a neighbour(s) that contributes to the neighbourhood and community. Guidelines need to further consider the impact higher density will have on the amount of traffic and reduced parking in a neighbourhood. Higher density in areas not located near reliable Winnipeg transit will be adversely affected by this.	10/11/2020 8:26 PM
185	The City must be responsible for ensuring the contractors are following the guidelines and halt construction if guidelines are not followed.	10/11/2020 3:24 PM
186	By not building them. WE DON'T WANT THEM	10/11/2020 3:23 PM
187	Restrict subdivision of existing lots-- residential lots should not be narrower than 40 feet. Restrict height of infill housing-- infill should not tower over neighbouring homes, Infill housing should not be permitted to project into required setbacks. Developers should not be permitted to destroy mature trees and/or required to plant new trees 1-for-1 to replace mature trees. This obligation should continue for 10 years post-construction. Developers should be required to post bonds before beginning construction to cover any damage to neighbouring properties caused by excavation equipment or any other part of the construction process.	10/11/2020 12:01 PM
188	Think of accessibility for disabled homeowners, or family and friends of homeowners. The main floor entrance at minimum should be level with the ground.	10/11/2020 11:55 AM
189	Duplexes or multi-family units should never be allowed on a lot that once held a single family dwelling. Front and back yard size should mirror the neighbourhood. We need more green space not less. And rocks or rock fill is NOT green space. It just promotes weed growth.	10/11/2020 10:58 AM
190	Parking is an issue and also space between buildings	10/11/2020 8:32 AM
191	I believe if there is an existing driveway, the option to retain it should remain even if there is lane access. A front drive is often helpful for the for wheelchair users or people with mobility	10/10/2020 10:44 PM

	challenges.	
192	Prioritize sidle-family homes over duplexes. My observations show that the vast majority of infills are duplexes. Traffic in St. Vital cannot cope with the large increase in density.	10/10/2020 9:41 PM
193	They should have to at least match what is currently in the neighborhood. People who are established in the neighbourhood have bought for privacy and having second floor decks doesn't allow for that	10/10/2020 9:15 PM
194	If the houses beside them are from the early 1900's most being single level houses makes their houses seem out of place. If they design the homes more like the neighborhood it will be more suitable	10/10/2020 9:14 PM
195	The infill houses need to be smaller in height as well as farther away from property lines. They need to fit into mature neighbourhoods rather than looming over existing houses. As they are now, they look out of place and have completely deteriorated the community.	10/10/2020 3:45 PM
196	We have an over abundance in our area already.	10/10/2020 10:58 AM
197	I am not in favour of lot splitting at all for lots that are 60 feet and narrower. I am in favour of replacing old and worn out houses on 60 ft lots and smaller with an equivalent new build house that respects the percentage of lots covered by house and garage and distances between house and garage, side yard allowances, window placements as in the proposed guidelines.	10/10/2020 10:35 AM
198	More emphasis on single family dwellings as opposed to secondary suite concepts.	10/10/2020 9:23 AM
199	Please set guidelines to keep in check with the neighborhood’s character!	10/10/2020 9:04 AM
200	enough with with updown duplex	10/10/2020 8:49 AM
201	make them all single dewelling	10/10/2020 8:30 AM
202	I don't see why it has to integrate. There are houses with shopping carts in the yard and boarded up windows that stick out more.	10/10/2020 8:26 AM
203	Not to be built at all	10/10/2020 7:48 AM
204	This is a loaded question in that it pre-supposes that I think this "infill development" idea is a good one. I do not. It is very misguided. It will greatly increase the range of house prices and quality in an area and this will lead to social problems and introduce disharmony into these neighbourhoods. This is not the way to increase available housing in Winnipeg.	10/9/2020 11:03 PM
205	I don’t think that the guidelines allow for proper space per family. I think the number of family per lot and the size of the lots should be reconsidered. These guidelines are slowly making us go towards a society like in Dubai or Japan.	10/9/2020 10:41 PM
206	No lot splitting single family houses only	10/9/2020 6:45 PM
207	I think that a guideline to match the existing architectural style of the neighbouring houses in a mature neighbourhood would be nice.	10/9/2020 4:26 PM
208	These houses should only be one story as anything taller blocks the sun and invades the neighbours privacy	10/9/2020 4:03 PM
209	the need to fit the character of the neigbourhood. Multi-family housing should be limited to corner lots.	10/9/2020 1:15 PM
210	its all rental and all kinds of noise	10/9/2020 1:03 PM
211	Stricter rules for contractors/developers for the following: Only one house ever On a lot, not two. Total cash grab for the city having two homeson a single home lot. Houses should have larger front and backyards not a house built the entire length of the lot, no consideration whatsoever given to the homeowners views beside the infill housing being built, there should be height and distance rules in place. Better rules to protect the home owners beside, across the street from and behind the developing infill homes being built to protect their homes and structures such as tress, water & sewer, fences and clean up of debris. Fines for contractors not adhering the infill guidelines.	10/9/2020 11:44 AM
212	incentives for infill development. remove parking requirements. remove prescriptive architectural design requirements leaving for flexibility for interpretation.	10/9/2020 10:06 AM

213	The requirements should be adhered to and no change should be allowed	10/9/2020 8:51 AM
214	The architecture needs to be in line with the neighbourhood. I don't mind the sizes, but no yard shoved in, modern design with harsh lines at odds with the old styles look terrible together. So many cities have infill and townhouses on old streets. That blend in and look that old style as well. Toronto and Montreal have these multi unit buildings next to single family houses, but they keep the same style of the neighbourhood and add to its charm.	10/8/2020 10:34 PM
215	It’s not fair that certain neighborhoods are exempt from infills and others aren’t. Stop lot splitting. Expand roads so more people can travel instead of continuing to create a bottle neck in the south.	10/8/2020 9:09 PM
216	The new houses should have height restrictions. Builders should not be allowed to cut mature trees down unless they absolutely have to. There should only be 2 houses per lot (not duplexes).	10/8/2020 7:58 PM
217	More consideration needs to be given to parking. The reality is that most 2 person homes have 2 cars, not 1.2 cars the guidelines call for. Street parking for visitors to my home is almost non existent, and navigating the back lanes is hazardous as people are parking halfway into the lane because there is no room on their lots. Traffic has become dangerous. Parking needs to be banned on Vivian, which has the only traffic light to enter or exit the Glenwood neighborhood. Building heights based on neighborhood averages is meaningless now, as we've had over 20 years of infill housing built in this neighborhood that did not come close to matching the character of the neighborhood.	10/8/2020 5:47 PM
218	The problem is that these are just guidelines but as we know, none of them are followed. There needs to be enforcement and fines. Not just variances that always get approved no matter what in the end.	10/8/2020 4:54 PM
219	no infill to be allowed to destroy neighborhoods!	10/8/2020 3:38 PM
220	It won't! It detracts from the core look and feel of existing neighbourhoods by putting up cookie cutter houses which lack style and symmetry while taking away the look and feel provided by mature trees and natural green space.	10/8/2020 2:46 PM
221	I feel that all homes/houses should have a nice sized yard....for children , for sitting out side , for a garden, a barbecue..etc..I have seen buildings going up between two other properties that have 4 or 5 feet between them?? Is that the cities idea of making the residential home better? Not only is it stuffing to live in, but stuffing to look at. Many of our Senior apartments are built the same way.. a few feet between buildings.. going outside is not an option... the big concern is the buck, not the people that have to live in them.,,, I would be ashamed of the people that would vote for this.. just curious , how many that would vote for this, would move to a place that is only a few feet apart.? Sincerely Jean Delorme	10/8/2020 2:07 PM
222	Just want to ay, I have no problem with infills! Keep them coming!!	10/8/2020 2:00 PM
223	Don't build them on existing lots, stop split lots, stop ruining our neighbourhoods.	10/8/2020 1:57 PM
224	Neighborhood input should be required. Building a duplex for fast turnover rentals in a residential area surrounded by single family homes Is not cohesive and is frustrating to neighbors	10/8/2020 1:28 PM
225	Ensure sightlines at four-way corners are not imepeded by infill.	10/8/2020 1:27 PM
226	ensure that the infill has a garage or parking for 2 vehicles on the lot. There is not enough street parking as it is, and doubling the occupancy is creating traffic issues. the infrastructure was not designed for that amount of occupancy.	10/8/2020 11:04 AM
227	Lower the height	10/8/2020 10:56 AM
228	I firmly disagree with infill proposals in existing mature neighborhoods. This will destroy the character of the areas currently occupied by owners who have seeked out larger lots and mature areas. I also firmly disagree with proposals that would allow mature trees to be removed to increase available space for infill structures.	10/8/2020 9:58 AM
229	Don't alow these stupid looking, not to mention ugly, skinny houses, particularly on skinny lots. They stick out like a sore thumb.	10/8/2020 8:33 AM
230	By forcing a side yard limiting distance that is average to adjacent buildings.	10/8/2020 6:25 AM

231	Ensure the neighborhood can support it. Kingston crescent doesn't.	10/8/2020 5:39 AM
232	The lot width should be at least 50'	10/7/2020 8:48 PM
233	There are too many homes being built with secondary suites in the basement and I think it would be beneficial to limit these per block and have a maximum amount.	10/7/2020 7:50 PM
234	Generate a provision that ensures setback does not creep forward as the average changes with each new build.	10/7/2020 7:48 PM
235	Reduce the number of requirements for the infill housing	10/7/2020 3:27 PM
236	The only way to achieve this is to keep the historical size of the lot the same. Do not spilt any lots. Keep the lot size the same, and the square footage of the new homes needs to be consistent with the size of the homes on that street. Preserve the green space on the property and spacing between neighbouring lots.	10/7/2020 2:21 PM
237	Front building face should not be allowed to project beyond adjacent properties or allow average calculations. Height restrictions are based on averages and allowed to be higher than adjacent properties. Allowing this type of calculation to continue severely impacts adjacent property access to sun light. Shading of the sun on adjacent properties due to development height limits potential of community greening. Current guidelines do not favour responsible design, but are still geared to developers bottom line by allowing more square footage vertically. Allows for loop holes.	10/7/2020 2:04 PM
238	Lots should not split more than to produce a two unit side by side. 40 feet should be the minimum width for all split sites, including up-down duplex.	10/7/2020 12:06 PM
239	Construction methods need to be reviewed in order that any new homes will survive for a reasonable period of time. No shortcuts!	10/7/2020 10:29 AM
240	City planners need to follow guide lines . They don't.	10/7/2020 10:14 AM
241	The requirements for laneway access will prevent these guideline being able to be implemented for large sections of the citys mature neighbourhoods	10/7/2020 9:53 AM
242	be sure neighboring properties are not compromised by contractors doing damage & height causing loss of privacy	10/7/2020 7:15 AM
243	Do all of the above as well as ask the public about what they like about their neighbourhood, ie: a certain architectural design, the size of the yard. Replicating something that exists within all the houses in that specific neighbourhood.	10/6/2020 10:19 PM
244	Ban lot splitting. There is no mention of lot splitting in the infill guidelines. The allowable building area on a lot should be a certain percentage (say 110%) of the average of the existing houses in the same area. The new guidelines will still result in infill houses that are much larger than the existing houses in an area.	10/6/2020 9:35 PM
245	Eliminate up/down duplex	10/6/2020 8:37 PM
246	Divide the areas more. Have housing that is 75 to 100+ years old and housing that is less than 75 years old.	10/6/2020 7:52 PM
247	They should not be in integrated into our neighbourhoods. They are to big and damage near by propertys and landscape.	10/6/2020 5:55 PM
248	make sure you have enough parking	10/6/2020 4:09 PM
249	If single family homes in neighbourhood should stay single family on 50 foot lots no lot splitting Parking is HUGE problem	10/6/2020 3:23 PM
250	Recognize the average sized lot in the neighbourhood in question, and retain that average lot size -- rather than arbitrary sizes designed for different neighbourhoods. in other words, have FLEXIBLE guidelines that recognize and take into account the neighbourhood in question.	10/6/2020 3:04 PM
251	Leave as existing single lots, DO NOT SPLIT into 2 lots	10/6/2020 2:53 PM
252	use of plain language so the average person can understand the developer jargon referenced.	10/6/2020 2:32 PM
253	Not build them at all	10/6/2020 11:14 AM
254	Need to looker longer teem and be more visionary than reinforce the status quo of smaller and	10/6/2020 7:38 AM

	older inefficient homes needing to be replicated when new home buyers are looking for more space that will serve their present needs much better.	
255	- Provide regulations to builders protecting neighbouring homes. - Reduce projection allowances (especially on the recommended second floor projections) - Not allowing increased development on unfinished lanes. - Clear guidelines for maintaining the tree canopy and significant fines for those who destroy old growth.	10/5/2020 9:04 PM
256	The problem is making 25' lots at all. There were NO 25' lots on our street until lot-splitting for infills began. There are now eight 25' lots within 2 blocks. They don't fit in...they are crammed together with no side yards.	10/5/2020 5:24 PM
257	Disagree with dividing an existing lot into 2 properties. If the community is made of 40 ft lots, a 40 ft lot infill should be allowed but not 2 x 20' lots. Side guidelines of 4 ft also not sufficient--should match existing housing.	10/5/2020 1:39 PM
258	There should be criteria for a bi-level and different criteria for a 2 storey.	10/5/2020 12:26 PM
259	It will spoil everything that has been right. *No social distancing in a small area - too close and all it takes is one incident to ruin it all. *No parking room for guests or tenants *No back lanes - garage is better in the front. *No to any thought of redesigning that way - who is the moron who brought this one up...would he live in one - I didn`t think so. *How many would be in a unit at the same time - don`t plan it if you don`t know the answer.	10/5/2020 12:11 PM
260	The site and building design guidelines does not, and needs to include regulations and protection to the adjacent existing structures (such as foundations, fences, garages, unpaved back lanes, sidewalks, etc.) Current bylaws allow excavation to the property line - causing damage to existing structures. This is negligent of the city to know of these issues and approve infill developments, at the cost of and without protecting existing properties. The city could also be opening itself to financial liability. Homeowners who have their houses seriously damaged by construction on a neighbouring property, could sue the city for failing to protect them. In other Canadian jurisdictions, temporary retaining walls and additional supports are required in mature neighbourhoods. It is also included in their guidelines to developers that any damage incurred as a result of the construction of the property will be the responsibility of the land owner to repair. It is essential that these guidelines also include: Safety as a priority. Ex. The construction site must be kept safe for both neighbours and workers, and must be properly fenced. Noise in the Neighbourhood. Include specifics on the bylaw permits of operation of construction equipment. Respect for Neighbours. Include guidelines on portable toilets, maintenance of weeds and unkept grass, site litter and debris, and parking permits for construction vehicles to ensure lanes, streets and sidewalks are not blocked. Communication with Neighbours. Including building plans, estimated time of construction, contact information if they have concerns about the project, and scheduled access to their properties if required during construction. Other jurisdictions have created a Infill Conversation Toolkit as a resource. Addition of a Contact and Enquiries section. Including the Residential Infill Department, Community Standards Bylaw, and 311 for issues and complaints relating to infractions of the City Bylaws. In addition, it is essential that a process is outlined in the development guidelines specific to the accountability of developers to follow these guidelines. If required, new bylaws need to be enacted to ensure the city has jurisdiction to enforce the requirements of this strategy. Currently, without such a process, commitments are made by developers at the initial stages of application to the City and then not completed on site. This includes such commitments as landscaping, parking structures, saving existing trees, and building fences. It also includes infractions to site safety, cleanliness, noise, traffic and neighbourhood liveability bylaws. The enforcement of development permits needs to become the responsibility fo the city and not an adjacent property owners responsibility. In addition, new guidelines should include that final inspection by the City is required before occupancy and/or use.	10/5/2020 12:04 PM
261	Limit side yards to a minimum of 5'. End the practice of subdividing property into 25' lots in established neighborhoods where larger lots are the norm. Permit multifamily dwellings only on 50' lots and provide strict design guidelines. Make community approval mandatory, particularly adjacent property owners.	10/5/2020 10:46 AM
262	A focus needs to be put on builders keeping their sites safe and clean, many do not keep projects clean enough during construction in existing neighbourhoods.	10/5/2020 8:11 AM
263	Protect the existing properties that are being damaged by the vibrations of the heavy machinery. Set aside a fund from the increased revenue received from property taxes to property repair the roads that are being dug up to do utility connections. Eliminate the "income	10/4/2020 10:43 PM

	suites" in lots that were originally built as single family dwellings, or ensure that they provide parking on the property for at least 3 vehicles.	
264	If you look at Glenwood almost every variance has been approved. Houses much higher than the surrounding buildings built that do not fit the neighborhood at all. Healthy trees that took decades to grow cut down. There's no green space left really. Demolishing old houses and driving all old materials to the dump is environmentally a disaster. What is the point of bylaws if they are not enforced?	10/4/2020 9:39 PM
265	Water runoff, green space and serious by-law enforcement all need to be taken into consideration as well.	10/4/2020 5:11 PM
266	My major concern is the preservation of mature neighborhoods. By keeping the houses similar to those in the area as well as mandatory landscaping on all infill.	10/4/2020 4:07 PM
267	Removing old housing stock in Winnipeg is important, but there are neighbour hoods that are more desirable because of the trees, lot size and proximity to river, parks and downtown that should be kept intact. A new home, but not a four plex, continue to have an outdoor space and room for more trees not less.	10/4/2020 1:51 PM
268	Could strengthen "encouragement" to reflect existing styles to "require".	10/4/2020 1:12 PM
269	no mention of snow clearance - I live in area 1 . A number of lots have been subdivided somewhat successfully so far. Parking has always been an issue; but there is more. Cars towed from St-Anne's Rd to our street remained there for weeks (except for the one towed because it had no plates - we had phoned about the cars parked there and it was the only one towed). Back lanes snow clearance from the garage aprons can be a problem. I personally set back my fence to have extra space to dump the snow - some years that wasn't enough. A house is soon going on sale in my backyard; we welcome the potential new neighbours but have concerns about our unimproved back lane. Having an extra garage and vehicles will further destroy the back lane not to mention to snow dumping problem.	10/4/2020 1:12 PM
270	The aesthetic integration of infill development into existing neighbourhoods should not be prioritized above the goals of increased density and walkability. Stricter controls regarding front driveways would improve safety and mobility for active transportation users.	10/4/2020 9:55 AM
271	With respect to our Kingston Crescent community, lot splitting in inappropriate. Single family detached on existing lots should be maintained.	10/4/2020 9:34 AM
272	Allow single family homes only!!! Duplexes invite renters. Single family homes invite buyers.	10/3/2020 10:57 PM
273	will the neighbors have a say in any development	10/3/2020 9:57 PM
274	No multi family homes in predominantly single family home neighborhoods.	10/3/2020 7:55 PM
275	The size, height and style of new buildings should fit in with existing buildings to maintain privacy, drainage, and views/sunshine in neighbouring yards as well as the value of the existing homes. There should also be adequate off-street parking.	10/3/2020 7:44 PM
276	They cannot be higher than existing home or encroach on the neighboring homes	10/3/2020 7:25 PM
277	It can’t be improved. It’s just awful.	10/3/2020 7:20 PM
278	Making sure that the destruction of trees is minimal.....	10/3/2020 3:54 PM
279	Depends massively in the neighbourhood. It is not good enough to create a single plan to apply to all neighbourhoods or residential zones. I have yet to see an infill house/duplex that respects and incorporates the “style” of the existing neighbourhood. They are all modern looking structures that do not blend with the older homes that make up the majority of the houses in the neighbourhood targeted in this plan. Not enough profit for developers to take the time/expense to build infill housing that would meet modern standards while keeping an older-style appearance.	10/3/2020 2:01 PM
280	The lot coverage and height requirements should not be hard and fast. The coverages allowed need to be higher for 25 foot lots to provide the amenites people want if you want people to invest in homes on these lots - and you should because the housing stock is failing. With respect to height requirements, the state of adjoining buildings (IE remaining life) as well as the prevalent structures on the street should be considered. Height restrictions should note be required if the house next door is falling down. I would observe that there are homes on Morely and Rosedale that could not be built under the proposed guidelines regarding lot coverage.	10/3/2020 12:49 PM

281	Guidelines for digging up roads, crushing pipes	10/3/2020 11:32 AM
282	Don’t know	10/3/2020 10:59 AM
283	There needs to be specific restriction on infill structures blocking sunlight to adjacent properties	10/3/2020 10:45 AM
284	Clear clear communication And good guideline enforcement which there is no faith in because developers will somehow get around things...	10/3/2020 10:37 AM
285	The building height for a single family dwelling should reflect the surrounding homes. For instance, in a neighborhood with predominantly bungalows, the building height should not be allowed to be 28 feet max. It should be the average height of neighboring homes plus 5 feet to account for raised main floors (higher ceiling basements).	10/3/2020 10:31 AM
286	People don't want to do much in the way of yard work. Include parking for 2 vehicles per unit along with enough personal outdoor space to accommodate a BBQ, patio table for 6 people and a little space for pets such as a dog.	10/3/2020 10:11 AM
287	New buildings should not be allowed to exceed the mass and height of existing buildings immediately adjacent.	10/3/2020 10:09 AM
288	Not to integrate into older communities. Modern housing is meant for new areas. For those people fostering the look of their 'older style' property, this does not work.	10/3/2020 9:10 AM
289	The guidelines for height and lot coverage need to be stricter. Homes should also fit into the character of the neighbourhood.	10/3/2020 8:59 AM
290	Not sure	10/3/2020 8:20 AM
291	Strict guidelines to protect neighbouring properties/landscaping from damage, during tear down and rebuild. Contractors to pay for any damages caused.	10/3/2020 7:50 AM
292	Ensuring the new guidelines are followed will help. Also ensuring the park-like feel (in neighborhoods) small to mid sized houses have with big yards, by not using all of them as an infill.	10/2/2020 11:34 PM
293	An up down duplex should be permitted on a lot with a width of 25'.. there are perfectly good duplex designs possible on a 25' x 100' lot and you able to provide 1 stall per unit. Lot coverage of 30% for a principal dwelling is too low... that only allows for a 750 sq ft floor plate on a standard 25' x 100' lot which limits opportunities significantly. Perhaps there could be an exception to allow for a higher lot coverage ratio if the owner agrees to not build a garage in the future? Some of the tree protection measures requested are onerous and add significant cost... I think these costs need to be examined more carefully. There should also be more freedom of design for infill homes, trying to have every house look the same makes for a boring, homogenous neighbourhood. Architectural features and material selections are highly subjective, why should it be planners that decide on what looks good or not? The requirement for at least 2 different prominent facade materials doesn't make sense.. for example, with a traditional style house it would be quite acceptable to have a lap siding as the only facade material and have it look quite nice. Trying to add a different material to that facade would make it look bizarre. I do not agree with setting minimums on coverage areas for windows on front elevations... again with certain styles of home there are less windows and that looks perfectly fine. The main floor height requirement is not written in clear language; is it 4' maximum to the front entrance, but less than that if the rest of the street is lower, or just 4' maximum??	10/2/2020 9:24 PM
294	Disallow lot splitting. Build one dwelling (with or without rental suite) on existing lots.	10/2/2020 7:36 PM
295	Don't set rules as this will stifle infill. These rules might help current infill to "integrate" into the neighbourhood but will not increase density.	10/2/2020 3:25 PM
296	rear year setbacks - a must... but they need to be very generous in a neighbourhood with mature trees and established homes with gardens.	10/2/2020 2:58 PM
297	Not well. At least not in my part of St.Vital on Havelock Avenue. You might try it on Park Blvd. or some of those streets in Tuxedo.	10/2/2020 2:14 PM
298	Further reducing the height which is allowed and reducing the allowed square footage of infill home allowed on lots. 1023 Lorette Ave is a perfect example of what should NOT BE	10/2/2020 2:05 PM

	ALLOWED to be constructed. Making corrugated metal siding a maximum of 10% of building exteriors.	
299	only allowed to build if it is designed to “fit in” with existing houses on the street	10/2/2020 1:25 PM
300	Stay with Either single family OR up/down duplex - depends on surrounding properties	10/2/2020 12:35 PM
301	The guidelines are exceedingly complex. How are community members supposed to assess them?	10/2/2020 10:09 AM
302	establish minimum green space parameters ie don't overcrowd neighbourhood stop splitting 50 ft lots	10/2/2020 9:58 AM
303	Don’t make them so big. Looks so stupid with these giant 2 storey houses in these old beautiful neighbourhoods. You can make the house look as fancy as you want from the outside but they stand out and are eyesores for the street. I don’t even recognize the old neighborhood I grew up in anymore in old St Vital with all these giant monstrosities that are being built. These builders build as big as they possibly can not giving a crap what they are doing to theses neighborhoods. Just so they can make more money. Why not just build a nice bungalow that will fit on the lot. Remember back in the day when you had a front and a back yard to play in. Those days are long gone with infill housing.	10/1/2020 10:16 PM
304	Better design guidelines for corner lots. Those on purely residential streets should complement existing neighbour hood. Particularly as they present 2 street views as well as a lane view.	10/1/2020 8:22 PM
305	Restricting height size and orientation as well as how close to adjacent properties, they are built!	10/1/2020 8:07 PM
306	Survey neighbourhood residents.	10/1/2020 5:11 PM
307	eliminate parking ratios, reduce set back and side yard requirements	10/1/2020 4:37 PM
308	clarification better	10/1/2020 4:08 PM
309	A few pictured homes were overshadowed by the taller, newer homes. Not fair to the existing owner of the single level home. Their property would be cast in darkness, overshadowed by the lumps of houses on either side. Additional homes should not be considered next to single level homes. Tax paying Residents have the right to enjoy sunlight, brightness without being blocked by new monstosities.	10/1/2020 3:15 PM
310	DO NOT ALLOW 50 ft. lots to be subdivided into 2-25 ft. lots. There is not adequate yard space to make the property USEFUL. No room for a garden or garage, or for even a dog to run around in a backyard that does not exist. and most times only ONE door ***UNSAFE**	10/1/2020 3:13 PM
311	Parking, set backs, building size, and lot coverage limits are essential. However the landscaping and architectural requirements are very subjective, arbitrary, and, in some cases, impractical. I can plant whatever I want on my existing property. Why should new builds be subject to a higher standard? Furthermore, mandating a tree AND shrubs on a tiny lot is ridiculous. There are 25x100' lots in this city. If I had to do that I would have no yard to speak of and wouldn't be able to see out my front windows. As for arch elements, whose taste decides? For example, many think wartime era housing is ugly. Would you require an ugly build to match an ugly area? Also, they are arbitrary given that existing properties are not subject to those requirements. Requiring fancy design elements (e.g., 4.4 and 4.5) also increases costs. We are talking about infill here and that means many of these builds need to be affordable housing. That doesn't happen when these eye candy details are added. There's also contradiction in the section about roofs - point 1 says use the same roof lines. Point 3 says use a variety.	10/1/2020 2:40 PM
312	DO SOMETHING.They don't fit in with the area.Too close to each other.	10/1/2020 2:26 PM
313	Trying to create a very prescriptive approach swings the pendulum too far, does not allow for reasonable personalization or use of their property.	10/1/2020 1:50 PM
314	Save trees or protect trees while during construction	10/1/2020 1:35 PM
315	The affect that it will have on pre existing water and sewer lines. And parking still does not seem to be a issue.	10/1/2020 1:25 PM
316	No improvements needed.	10/1/2020 11:46 AM

317	I feel currently the allowed height of the infill housing is not appropriate for all adjacent properties. This will provide maximum height difference	10/1/2020 11:45 AM
318	Include cleanup and safety requirements. Too much construction garbage left sitting for weeks. Enforce safety barriers more diligently. Lots of open sites with just a flimsy fence used to keep people out.	10/1/2020 11:25 AM
319	I don't think these limitations are necessary. Multi-family dwellings are more environmentally friendly so I support allowing larger structure beyond what is typical in the existing neighbourhood.	10/1/2020 11:07 AM
320	Landscaping should be drought resistant. Distance between houses should be considered	10/1/2020 11:04 AM
321	Stop allowing these massive two story houses to be build in areas where there are none or hardly any. And stop allowing lot splitting.	10/1/2020 6:26 AM
322	Loosing a lot of mature trees. Stronger wording than "landscaping requirements"	9/30/2020 10:58 PM
323	Firstly, up and down huge duplexes are not to be built mid block. These belong on regional or main corridors.	9/30/2020 10:25 PM
324	Expand the areas for infill houses	9/30/2020 9:32 PM
325	Though the proposed guidelines are better than what is currently in place, infill developments are likely to still stand out from the neighbourhoods they are in. Allowing infill to five feet above abutting buildings means that they will build to the maximum allowed. I believe the surrounding houses on the block should be calculated when deciding maximum heights allowed. There needs to be more direct guidance on roof pitch as well. Current guidelines seem to leave room for big block-style building that look out of place in neighbourhoods. People, such as myself, have chosen these neighbourhoods because of the sparse population. Many people who come to my house say how great the neighbourhood is because its calmer and more relaxed. Some neighbourhoods seem to have been chosen to face infill development while more wealthy neighbourhoods do not seem to have infill development. Some blocks have already been made ugly and even unpleasant to walk by with completed infill development. Wealthier areas do not seem to take their share of infill development. Will developers benefit from infill that has already been completed? Are developers able to use recently completed buildings when calculating allowable heights or when making comparisons by nearby roof pitches? Will this harm communities that have already had to face the brunt of negative infill projects? Developers will benefit developing next to infill they have already developed as proposed developments will be allowed a further five feet if they are next to a infill that has already been completed. Having tall houses has reduced the view of others as well as caused issues with light being blocked out. This has eliminated the possibility of gardens for those affected. How will community spaces like parks be affected by increased population density? These spaces have been designed with the current population in mind. I have appreciated attempts to have developments look more in touch with the surrounding community. Completed developments seem to look very similar regardless of the neighbourhood they are in and vary little from one another. More varied designs that actually fit in the neighbourhood would be appreciated. I was not able to see any regulations related to increased demand for parking being addressed.	9/30/2020 8:48 PM
326	Make the design work so you don't encroach forward on the lot and disrupt your neighbours view out their front window	9/30/2020 7:10 PM
327	Very well	9/30/2020 6:45 PM
328	Applying them consistently throughout the city, not a the whim of a particular city employee nor on the affluence of the applicant nor on the affluence of the appellant	9/30/2020 3:24 PM
329	No townhouse	9/30/2020 2:53 PM
330	I have a problem with lot splitting. Lot sizes are small as is and having a neighbours lot split into two or more units should not be done. When one buys a house in a residential area single family they expect that area to remain single family. That is why they chose that house in the first place	9/30/2020 2:00 PM
331	What does the existing neighbourhood plan already say? In my area I think the concept of making the infill housing match the area has been tossed out the window,	9/30/2020 12:52 PM
332	Too restricted for architectural features and building design (for example, requiring two different materials and a main entrance to be on the front face of the building should NOT be up to	9/30/2020 11:50 AM

	planners, but rather architects / builders).	
333	I do agree there should be some guidelines to ensure the neighbourhood maintains a similar feel but I also think that people who are building new homes using the infill method should be allowed to create a home that might not exactly match existing homes in the neighborhood. I am not advocating for developers coming in and creating multiple duplexes on a lot that was a single home dwelling.	9/30/2020 11:40 AM
334	conform with existing buildings	9/30/2020 8:29 AM
335	Need to be cognizant of cost of lot, including demolition and asbestos abatement and the ability of a builder to put a new home on that lot that allows for a profitable build, that still fits the neighborhood.	9/29/2020 11:35 PM
336	Too boxy of a design.	9/29/2020 11:03 PM
337	The guidelines render entire existing neighbourhoods illegal to rebuild, even SFH and duplexes. Much too restrictive for a city-wide policy. Remove restrictions on minimum lot widths, side yards, main floor height, building height, parking minimums.	9/29/2020 7:41 PM
338	Not very well.	9/29/2020 4:40 PM
339	Allow infill, but no lot splits. Large lots and space between neighbours is what brought many to the neighbourhood. To make mature areas more dense with people isn't fair to the people who currently live in these areas. I believe it decreases the value of homes in the area when double the amount of homes become available and they are too close together.	9/29/2020 3:58 PM
340	I think that the 45min fire resistive burn time could be made stronger on the empty lot being developed and thus not needing to close the windows in the nearby existing proerty.	9/29/2020 3:13 PM
341	Make the design criteria more specific to require buildings to fit in the context; "significant architectural features" that are out of context are just as bad as a bland building that is out of context. Standards should apply to colour as well; the current fad to make buildings, structures and fences black ruins the look and feel of many a street. likewise, landscaping should meet the standard of the neighbours; if the neighbours don't have stone and gravel ground cover, it should be introduced; if the neighbours have more than a tree or two, that should be reflected in the minimum.	9/29/2020 1:24 PM
342	By actually referring to the "Neighborhood Plan" and adhereing to it. Not only that, but continuing with the established existence of current homes in the area, to continue the serenity of the community. If you want to get rid of private dwellings, and turn everything into 'tax generators' like all of the 'Projects' in New York, then buy everyone out at honest value, then bulldoze everything, and build your feed-lot of a 'happy concept' income farm.	9/29/2020 1:22 PM
343	The proof will be in how the guidelines are applied; and that will affect how this is received for both residents and developrs.	9/29/2020 11:56 AM
344	-Not allowing tall building designs that change neighboring properties significantly. For example, properties with significant summer sun coverage are sometime drastically changed when an infill property is built and creates a shadow over said properties. This drastically changes an owner's value of land and ability to enjoy their property for activities such as gardening. -Adding landscaping regulations that disallow builders from cutting down significant trees. I have seen century old trees that stood at the edge pf properties out of the way where a building would stand cut down without consideration. If we are trying to regain the tree cover in Winnipeg, why are we allowing builders to cut down any tree they want? A young tree newly planted is hardly a replacement for a 100 + year old tree.	9/29/2020 10:34 AM
345	I think they could micro-manage the aesthetics less. Few neighbourhoods are entirely homogeneous, and apart from mandating the max. percentage of the lot to be covered and the distance from other properties, the city should stay out of things like landscaping requirements and requiring significant architectural features.	9/29/2020 10:00 AM
346	I don't think it matters. If someone takes out a mortgage, buys a lot, demolishes a house and build a new one to code and bylaws, it's literally nobody else's business. Duplex construction should be taken into account for traffic in a neighbourhood, but single-family infill homes' opinions should only be recognized by those who put their money up--not a bunch of whiny neighbours.	9/29/2020 9:40 AM
347	Don't allow them	9/29/2020 9:38 AM

348	Site and design guidelines should be secondary to energy performance requirements for infill development	9/29/2020 8:21 AM
349	Up and down duplexes do not fit in neighbourhoods filled with older bungalows, like Old St. Vital. Build in the character of the existing neighbourhood! Leave some green space. The present influx of infill designs are horrible.	9/28/2020 9:39 PM
350	They are not suited for this neighbourhood	9/28/2020 9:22 PM
351	Building designs that fit into the older neighborhood, not modern mixed in	9/28/2020 7:40 PM
352	There could be guidelines established that must be adhered too. Minimum lot size should be a minimum of 40 feet. So more 20 to 25 foot lots. Must have backyards and green space. Too many have a long narrow house then a gravel parking pad with no back yard or green space	9/28/2020 6:39 PM
353	Single family detached where the design fits into the heritage of our neighbourhood.	9/28/2020 12:34 PM
354	Buildings should integrate better with the neighborhood feel. Tall narrow grey boxes I'm seeing in my Glenwood neighborhood are ugly, with no yard and no trees. Shameful.	9/28/2020 11:26 AM
355	Take into consideration the general design and look of the surrounding community, for the infill to blend in with the community.	9/28/2020 9:40 AM
356	These are vague outlines that developers will abuse to their advantage.	9/28/2020 8:12 AM
357	Houses should be comparable in size, design and overall yard size as neighbouring homes.	9/28/2020 7:59 AM
358	Make sure it conforms to standard of the area. Don’t subdivide too small where lots are large and make two house.	9/28/2020 12:27 AM
359	I think we worry far too much about how infill "integrates" and the more effort we spend governing and regulating it, the easier it looks by comparison to just build on an empty lot at the edge of the suburbs.	9/28/2020 12:07 AM
360	Aside from the landscaping and perhaps reasonable height limits, I feel the site criteria fixation on "integrating" homes into the neighourhood is deeply misguided. The City shouldn't be prescribing the construction of homes that resemble homes built many decades ago under different building codes. It should be allowing the construction of homes that increase density, meet today's building codes, and are desirable to contemporary homebuyers. Trying to prescribe something, through exacting technical regulations, as subjective as aesthetics (via architectural features) is an absolute fool's errand.	9/27/2020 11:40 PM
361	The coverage limits are far too low. A property owner should be able to build on most of their property, save the setbacks. Coverage limit should be over 70%.	9/27/2020 10:54 PM
362	Restrict the size and number fo trees a developer can cut per lot. Enforce guidelines on protecting trees on infill lots during construction. The city is focusing on mature neighbourhoods for its infill strategy which could result in a significant loss to Winnipeg's canopy. Please consider this inevitable loss as diminishing to the character of these mature neighbourhoods.	9/27/2020 8:02 PM
363	The coverage guidelines for home and garage are useful, but do not appear to include solid-paved driveways, which have a large impact on storm water drainage. Maintaining a good percentage of PERMEABLE surface should be considered.	9/27/2020 5:00 PM
364	all lots should match existing ones. no 5o ft or less lots	9/27/2020 2:32 PM
365	Allow only single family homes and the lots cannot be divided to 25 foot lots.	9/27/2020 2:10 PM
366	footprint requirements correspond to those of neighbouring homes (and why does your spellcheck flag "neighbouring"?)	9/27/2020 9:49 AM
367	Please respect and restore the beauty of traditional symmetrical designed homes with unique curbside appeal that integrate within a neighborhood using modern updated environment friendly and efficient constructions and solidly placed foundations. Winnipeg currently has a number of eye-sore placed modern homes. I am so tired of the half angled roof-style - can always spot a cookie cutter house. Since arriving from Ontario to Winnipeg have been so disappointed in the available housing either over-priced or depleted quality. Almost every house I have visited no matter how beautiful have sinking foundations. And please consider building smart affordable housing under 1000 square feet to assist with energy efficiency and costs.	9/26/2020 7:20 PM

368	No duplexes on a 25 foot lot! They need to stay SINGLE FAMILY HOMES. There is no room for vehicles or even anything resembling a yard. Where would children play? In gravel??	9/26/2020 4:19 PM
369	When it comes to in-fills it should be mandatory that an arborist report is required before a permit is issued. Landscaping belonging to existing homes nearby needs to be taken into consideration and protected from damage, and if damaged there should be easier means to received compensation for damage done. Work on in-fills should only be done during the work week and not on the weekend. Large equipment is used and outdoor generators are employed that are extremely noisy. Residents near in-fills should not have to deal with this level of noise on weekends and holidays. Also construction crew should be adhering to the city b-laws regarding work start and stop times. Also city needs to do much, much more to ensure in-fill homes retain the integrity of the neighbourhood with their design and size. There are far too many in-fills going up that are too large for the lot or their design does not fit in with the other homes on the street.	9/26/2020 3:56 PM
370	Requiring buildings to include significant architectural features does not guarantee good design, and often hinders it.	9/26/2020 2:55 PM
371	If there is a single family BUNGALOW home is on the property, then a single family home should be built. This will help keep the current infrastructure in the area at status quo. EXISTING homeowners on either side of the infill will therefore not have privacy issues. Current residents in the area have worked hard to maintain their yards; larger structures could prove to block sunlight which current homeowners had not counted on when designing their yards. Also, in building a larger structure, current landscaping (mature, healthy, trees) are being cut down to accomodate a larger structure's needs (such as parking).	9/26/2020 12:06 PM
372	We shouldn't be allowing infill housing, but if we do keep them very small and no taller than the adjacent buildings.	9/26/2020 11:06 AM
373	I don't understand the second criteria, but I think it is important that infill houses' size ane style be in harmony with sourrounding houses.	9/25/2020 11:32 PM
374	There needs to be limits on height of buildings, width and space between that property and the next. And the guidelines need to be enforced. In my neighbourhood Glenwood there has been no limits, and no enforcement of codes. The developers are free to do whatever they want and the city does not appear to care at all.	9/25/2020 6:10 PM
375	Multi unit dwellings would allow more residents in a building on a normal size lot to allow adequate space between buildings.	9/25/2020 4:55 PM
376	If infill means to fill in the empty lots, then why are lots with perfectly good houses being subdivided, the houses torn down, and new buildings put up?	9/25/2020 2:37 PM
377	The buildings need to be a similiar size and scale in relation to nearby and or adjacent buildings. Building codes must be changed to demand that all mature trees within 4' of buidling must be preserved and building practices must be adopted to preserve the trees.	9/25/2020 1:21 PM
378	Do not permit single lots to be split into to lots - particularly if the proposed houses will be two stories. This leads to bungalows and yards being ridiculously dwarfed and shadowed by four houses. I note the "guidelines" actually set criteria (not guidelines) for location - but other factors are simply "secondary considerations". Setting "criteria" in guidelines is sneaky and underhanded. This sets up a huge hole through which developers will drive giant houses and your staff will be limited only to consider many factors which reflect and respect established community standards. What's to stop location criteria from being the only factor? The secondary considerations should also be established as criteria. Did you consider establishing minimum size lots - i.e., how much smaller is the proposed lot than the other lots on the street? There should be clarity on how far the front and back of the houses can differ from the other houses on the street. Instead of setting the starting point at the public street or sidewalk, the starting point should be based on the average front and back for all the houses on the street. The map is terrible - I can't tell which zone I live in since there are no helpful identifiers.	9/25/2020 12:37 PM
379	Scrap: landscaping requirements, requirements for architectural features. lot coverage requirements and and building height requirements should include minimums that contemplate maximizing the space, and no maximums. Infill should be prioritized overall. Get rid of parking minimums.	9/25/2020 9:32 AM
380	Two Issues: (i) these guildeines were written under the direction of developers (as implied by Ventura Homes in the CBC news on Sept 24) (ii) It is to easy for developers/builders to apply	9/25/2020 8:26 AM

	for (and receive) variances that allow them to avoid any rules the interfere with their plans.	
381	Have a limit to the amount of lots on each city block , so population density increases are controlled	9/25/2020 8:20 AM
382	No	9/25/2020 6:51 AM
383	Stop overegulating. Some regulations make sense, such as side setback,but others like landscaping, size of garages and design features shall be left to the owner. We don't want cookie cutter houses, in fact, some new neighbourhoods should build various designs and sizes and put some character back into the neighbourhoods.	9/25/2020 1:09 AM
384	Privacy is important. Making sure the infill house is not looking down into a bedroom	9/24/2020 8:00 PM
385	Stop ripping down current homes that are affordable and replacing them with poor quality cookie-cutter expensive houses.	9/24/2020 7:35 PM
386	I think many neighbourhoods are racist and elitist. I bought an affordable infill house, but was difficult, took a year. What I found in house search was these run down, old dilapidated, mouldy, nob and tube wiring extremely overpriced houses that look identical to others on the street. I am in favour of infills that are safe, new, efficient, and affordable. Not everyone has the money to buy a house in sage creek, or taylor farms or other exclusive neighbourhoods.	9/24/2020 7:07 PM
387	-Require developers who spilt lots to retain the intrinsic natural features of each building site -Require developer and home builders to consult with an architect to ensure homes being built work within the context of each site and neighbourhood instead of "clear cutting" and "plopping" off the shelf plans on to the sites -Require developers and home builders to consider the light requirements of existing neighbours	9/24/2020 4:10 PM
388	Front yard setback guidelines should also be added.	9/24/2020 3:48 PM
389	The problem with some of the infills is that they are rental units, parking is now an issue on the street and will only get worse. They should only be single family units.	9/24/2020 12:28 PM
390	Guidelines will allow for a fair, consistent, and easy to understand rules for developers and residents. apply the same rules across the city, as opposed to wealthy neighborhoods like Tuxedo getting their own exceptions to the rules.	9/24/2020 11:22 AM
391	Reduce height, decrease lot coverage	9/24/2020 11:03 AM
392	For up/down and even side-by-side duplexes, the rear yard should not look like a parking lot. It should be landscaped so that neighbours do not have to look at a concrete pad.	9/24/2020 9:56 AM
393	The guidelines address all of the areas which have been of concern to me.	9/24/2020 9:44 AM
394	We need fewer restrictions on a larger swath of the city. Just two examples - There should be no 'single family' zones. Look to other cities that have removed them. Eliminate the parking requirement for residential infill. We can do better. Much better	9/24/2020 9:34 AM
395	Guidelines must be laws that are upheld rigidly with prompt repercussions to developers if there are violations.	9/24/2020 9:21 AM
396	Make sure the new building fits in with the existing homes	9/24/2020 9:17 AM
397	need to keep the character of the neighbourhood. the issue is that the new housing defies all variances and encroaches on the adjacent neighbour to be able to enjoy their property. the infill strategy to date actually goes against the City's own livability guidelines and bylaw	9/24/2020 9:08 AM
398	more focus on community life improvement, less on filling lots for maximum profit and building coverage.	9/24/2020 8:43 AM
399	Go and look at the area and the existing structures, needs to be more of an individual decision. Be more upfront with the designs of the newer structure when posting signs in neighbourhoods	9/24/2020 8:43 AM
400	Stop any split lots 50' or smaller. They need to be at least 60' or wider for that	9/24/2020 7:54 AM
401	The new house should reflect the other houses on the street. Not these eyesore two storey houses that tower above the rest of the bungalows in the neighborhood.	9/24/2020 7:50 AM
402	It's simple: developers can follow the existing zoning guidelines, or get 100 per cent agreement from the other owner-owned properties on the same block when planning a new structure	9/24/2020 7:12 AM

	outside of those guidelines. In my neighborhood (Stafford/McMillan), developers have been getting away with disrespectful buildings - and behavior in order to get them built. I've recently spoken with Dwell Design, to name one, which intends to build one structure across three properties on McMIllan Avenue, and its "community consultation" consists of yelling at people who disagree with its plans. Enough's enough - give the power to the property owners who've invested their families' future in their communities.	
403	Developers should have to respect the existing zoning parameters OR get the approval of 90 per cent of the owner-homed households on the block in which they plan to build, including the properties immediately adjacent. Let's be honest: no one likes these structures except developers, because they don't live in the neighborhoods where they're building them.	9/24/2020 7:01 AM
404	The proposed guidelines leave too much grey area in terms of maintaining the character of the existing neighbourhood. For example, there’s a suggestion that there is an incentive to preserve mature trees. In my neighbourhood last week a newly purchased empty lot full of mature trees and shrubbery had every bit of it removed pending new “infill” construction. What specific and binding measures will be taken in the future to prevent this?	9/24/2020 12:12 AM
405	Consider the number of properties on a street already approved for infills where the lot is divided into two or more residences. A significant number of all-but identical houses on a street in a neighbourhood of bungalows look out of place. As density increases, increased vehicle traffic is an issue and affects children's activities and safety.	9/23/2020 10:40 PM
406	It would be nice if proposed new infrastructure comes within a certain threshold of requirements (for instance the high requirements or proximity to edge of lot) there is consultation with relevant stakeholders (for instance neighboring property owners). Guidelines as stated above don't guarantee the imposed requirements will be sufficient to not have infill structures be imposing on existing residences	9/23/2020 10:24 PM
407	Many infill projects appear to tear down mature trees that were in the front yard, and not replacing them. The addition of larger, taller buildings make them stick out and reduce our canopy	9/23/2020 10:23 PM
408	Should be done only upon approval of existing home owners. If there is majority of neighbors that are opposed variance should not be approved	9/23/2020 10:04 PM
409	Consult the neighbours and blend with the type of neighbourhood look. Should enhance the other homes and neighboring area, not conflict with it and block views and violate privacy in other's yards/homes.	9/23/2020 9:34 PM
410	Make them somewhat resemble the surrounding homes. The infills tower over the homes in the area. They stick out, like a sore thumb and they are an eyesore.	9/23/2020 9:00 PM
411	I think guidelines that reduce the size of infills and density of infills (number on a block), number of residences within a unit would help maintain mature community character and function. Demand on utilities could increase if density of infills increase on block especially if allowed to split small lots or able to build multi family dwellings. Massive houses put mature house in a shadow in some situations.	9/23/2020 8:52 PM
412	Clear guidelines that developers have to follow that take into account the surrounding neighbourhood. Requires opportunity for input from the community before development.	9/23/2020 8:51 PM
413	Do not allow exceptions for variance in height & size. People need green space.	9/23/2020 8:27 PM
414	This proposal is too restrictive. City should not be policing aesthetics.	9/23/2020 8:22 PM
415	If population density is increased there should be safe green space (parks) built accordingly.	9/23/2020 8:07 PM
416	The infill housing needs to better match the surrounding architecture.. Often they are build to look like an eyesoar. They take up to much of the lot compared to the surrounding houses. It blocks light for the surrounding houses and does not allow for any plants.	9/23/2020 7:59 PM
417	Can not have same policy in all areas. Should depend on dimensions of existing structures in the street/area.	9/23/2020 7:23 PM
418	Infill for increased residential density should only be permitted in large scale and corner lots. They should not be squeezed into existing lots or split lots. Infill needs to consider gravel lanes, garbage and recycling requirements and snow clearing. Design standards should also consider neighbourhood context.	9/23/2020 6:47 PM

419	factor in purchase prices. Many houses go up and are unaffordable to folks who live in the area and may want to own over rent.	9/23/2020 6:37 PM
420	Buildings need to fit the property size in relation to the surrounding buildings. A 4 foot is likely not enough when it is being used as a footpath	9/23/2020 6:34 PM
421	limit building heights to fit with neighbourhood - infill is desigrating neighbourhood community with four plexes amongst single family housing - it changes the character	9/23/2020 6:33 PM
422	The rules you make MUST be followed - There are 3 infill houses in my block in River Heights. 2/3 violate the neighborhood feel, are too close to the edge of the properties, shade the neighbors back yard in a huge way, run from the front directly to the back of the yard with very littleneck yard remaining, and are enormous in size, including exceptionally high. This is not fair to existing neighbors. It destroys the feel of the neighborhood, pushes the limits beyond what is tolerable from a neighborly point of view (these are extremely self serving), violates the front setback further shading the neighbor homes - there is so much wrong with what has been built here - very unfair to the rest of us	9/23/2020 6:28 PM
423	reduce the height of up/down duplex to the height of a single family detached buillding.	9/23/2020 6:13 PM
424	I think in some areas, the minimum lot size for new builds should be 30 feet so the new houses and yards have a bit of continuity with the existing houses in the neighbourhood which may be on 40 or 50 foot lots.	9/23/2020 6:00 PM
425	Enhance zoning application process Instead of using automatic lot splitting so each case can be evaluated based on the character of the neighborhood	9/23/2020 5:47 PM
426	They should be held to variance agreements. We had a infill on the lot next to us.. they never did watershed agreement, my bacement floods now because they built the land on the yards up take than my basement window and they removed all earth so there is nothing but stone and the water has no where to go. The owner of the old home and bew infill that share a lot and path now are always fighting . The new home and garage cover over 85% of the land possibly 90% and the snow and water has nowhere to go. I hate winnipeg and hate my home now because the city allowed my home and neighborhood to be ruined. I'm going to sell the only home my kids have known for 20 years and move out of the city. Winnipeg is plagued by piss poor decisions by politicians, bad enough they allowed the mushroom plant to exceed its original maximum size and our area smells like diarrhea because of it. Winnipeg is no longer the place I want to call home and the corrupt city with their ever greedy tentacles is constantly destroying our city with everything from closing our youth centers and selling the land to doubling our property taxes and water Bill's under the lie of upgrading our water system but instead build a rapid transit with the money so we can look like a big boy to other cities. Winnipeg is a dump. Tore up roads and crooks everywhere. I fill houses are trash and tall long ugly homes that cast shadows over other yards and all the snow blows iff the super tall roofs into other yards. Glen murry was the best this city ever had, he made a difference and created value where there was none prior to his term as mayor . Ever since he left the greedy destructive city has destroyed all the good he did. For christ sakes we cant even pay our police their overtime but hey we need rapid transit to screw all the traffic lights up so buses can save 5 minutes on rush hour, who is the mad scientist running this dump.	9/23/2020 5:25 PM
427	-existing lots should not be split -infills should not be higher than the existing houses in the neighbourhood and should fit with the current aesthetic of the neighbourhood -developers should have to build off-street parking (it's a lie to say that people who move in won't own cars; it's Winnipeg) -trees and other landscaping should be preserved and there should be severe penalties for developers who violate this policy	9/23/2020 5:23 PM
428	Limit height to maintain privacy and avoid multifamily housing rentals.	9/23/2020 5:13 PM
429	Similar exterior architectural features	9/23/2020 4:46 PM
430	The new infill housing should not be allowed to look completely different than the surrounding homes. Each neighbourhood has stylistic differences that set it apart from other neighbourhoods. Lots of infill housing in mature neighbourhoods looks like it belongs In a new development beyond the perimeter highway.	9/23/2020 4:43 PM
431	If trees are being cut down particularly mature trees in mature neighborhoods it should be mandatory to replace them and plant additional trees to offset the carbon footprint associated with the new build.	9/23/2020 4:40 PM

432	Guidelines are essential, and I'm glad to see that some are being drafted (and shocked that there aren't any already). These major decisions that impact current residents and neighbourhoods should not be left to a small group of planners who may or may not be heavily influenced by developers. As far as single family detached goes, I'm not convinced a developer should be able to put two houses on one lot. If it is allowed, I don't believe that 4 feet between houses is enough.	9/23/2020 4:39 PM
433	Height restrictions to not allow infills to exceed a single story.	9/23/2020 4:31 PM
434	Single family dwelling only. No more up/down as this double the number per house. City was never developed on this like sewer lines, water, roads, etc.. Already front road looks like parkade, and sewers cannot handle additional housing projects, especially in the future.	9/23/2020 4:31 PM
435	2 homes on a 50 foot lot was except able...but now they have 2 homes with 2 apartments per home. That is too much stress on are system and to many cars per 50 foot lot.	9/23/2020 4:30 PM
436	I think building new duplexes improves the neighborhood but I don’t like the stucco boxes. I like was is located at 111 & 113 Haig	9/23/2020 4:22 PM
437	Do not squeeze 2 buildings into a lot. Force new buildings to blend into surrounding existing houses.	9/23/2020 4:19 PM
438	more consideration of the impact on neighbouring homes in terms of height (privacy, sun light etc), maintaining trees, etc. Neighbourhood liveability	9/23/2020 4:14 PM
439	Has to fit in with existing homes.	9/23/2020 3:58 PM
440	Add: Introduce FRONT yard setbacks that respond to the context of abutting properties.	9/23/2020 3:58 PM
441	Prevent identical house plans - especially for lot splits; (have tighter controls over duplication/mirroring of house plans); prepare neighbourhood-specific design guidelines; require a significant deposit that will be released only if all requirements are satisfied (landscaping, for example)	9/23/2020 3:55 PM
442	Limit the size of new houses and duplexes to no more than the largest in the neighborhood on similar lots. Ensure the character of new buildings matches that of existing ones.	9/23/2020 3:38 PM
443	Who checks to make sure the developer abides by guidelines?	9/23/2020 3:36 PM
444	Keep infill out, the infrastructure wasn’t built to handle the density infill brings.	9/23/2020 3:33 PM
445	There should be size and build restrictions to the nearest existing structures to avoid houses from going up too close or out of character to the neighbourhood	9/23/2020 3:28 PM
446	Don't do it. Adding more housing on a regular single lot will add residential parking strain and affect green space. the streets and surrounding parking was not made to accommodate changes	9/23/2020 2:12 PM
447	Houses should be able to take up more than 30% of the lot, so long as setbacks on street are consistent. I have no issue with houses extending deeper into lots. Also not sure why floor height needs to be regimented.	9/23/2020 11:33 AM
448	No raised basement	9/23/2020 11:21 AM
449	Garages on smaller split lots need more of a set back from backlanes to allow for snow removal/storage...its it 2 feet from backlane nowhere for all garages built here? There is no where for these lots to put their snow with garages going right across the small lots...they pile it on the lanes or on other properties. It would be better if garages are kept at a min size based on the property width ie single car or are set back more 4 ft or are allowed to be attached to back of house. This should be the requirement for all garages off of backlanes.	9/23/2020 10:54 AM
450	Tree protection is very important! These mature neighborhoods often have mature trees that are removed to build housing. No one currently is managing developers in these neighborhoods ensuring there is proper tree protection. The trees are either just clear cut, or totally mutilated and die in the next year or so. Landscape requirements sound good too, but who would manage this? It is easy to write down a guideline but developer's don't often follow them.	9/23/2020 10:37 AM
451	Yes	9/23/2020 10:05 AM
452	Good as is.	9/23/2020 9:33 AM

453	This guideline will just create more confusion and grey areas for developers, designers and residents alike.	9/23/2020 9:29 AM
454	There should be some guidelines about protecting trees, and there needs to be better enforcement of existing guidelines.	9/23/2020 9:14 AM
455	not exceeding sq ft of neighboring properties	9/23/2020 9:06 AM
456	I don't believe that a 25' rear set back for single family homes is enough. In areas with an alley, this leaves just enough space for parking with no yard. The guidelines also mean a very large house can still be built that is not consistent with many neighborhoods. I live in Lord Robert and several homes have been built this way. I live in an infill house which has a much larger rear set back (approximately 40' on a 25'x100' lot) and it is much more suitable for the area.	9/23/2020 9:03 AM
457	needs same total height of adjacent building	9/23/2020 8:59 AM
458	It would be nice if these new homes would also be more energy efficient	9/23/2020 8:59 AM
459	houses should match the neighborhood	9/23/2020 6:45 AM
460	Don't allow at all	9/23/2020 4:48 AM
461	Provide a consistent approach to this where at least 33% of the total square footage of a lot is allocated to the single family dwelling. Anything smaller than this will limit the construction of a bi level home.	9/22/2020 11:35 PM
462	I'd encourage the city to follow the design guideline research of Jan Gehl. Another great book is Happy City by Charles Montgomery. The current guidelines are a good first step, but we can be more rigorous. The current focus is not to totally upsetting the NIMBYs. The next step is to totally follow what needs to be done to ensure Winnipeg has the built environment to become a Happy City!	9/22/2020 10:07 PM
463	Should include parking space suitable to occupant expectations and not rely on street spaces	9/22/2020 7:50 PM
464	Building materials and finishings match the neighbourhood aesthetic	9/22/2020 4:25 PM
465	Make it easier for subdivisions.	9/22/2020 4:04 PM
466	More permissive	9/22/2020 3:58 PM
467	The style needs to fit into existing home styles and not exceed existing heights of homes.	9/22/2020 3:15 PM
468	-Consult neighbours prior to infill -Give neighbours a say -Increase setback on either side of infill so as to avoid damaging existing homes' foundations and walls. -Prioritize the renovation of older (historic) structures rather than simply rubberstamp demolition -Prioritize sustainability: reuse of old building materials and old growth wood rather than stick them into the dump	9/22/2020 1:54 PM
469	The assumption here is that the City's justification for its infill policy is good and acceptable. Since the justification is not established, the answer to this question is pointless.	9/22/2020 1:32 PM
470	It can't help. This is a horrible idea, badly thought out and one of the worst ideas I have ever heard the City make.	9/22/2020 1:27 PM
471	Firstly, neighborhoods that have 50 foot lots must remain 50 foot lots. Secondly, in-fill does not mean a developer coming in, buying a perfectly good house, tearing it down, and building 2 - 2 to 3 storey houses with no regard for trees, neighbourhood sunlight, and has 2 ugly structures built. 3. This is about equity. If a 150 foot lot comes up for sale in Tuxedo- Wellington Crescent, Yale, Kingsway, then in- fill with 25 foot lots should apply. If you are doing this in Old Kildonan, old St.Vital, old St. James, River Heights, old West End, then you, as city planners and councillors must do the same in the wealthiest neighbourhoods. The inequity is so blatant! 4. Those homes that are boarded up and are in need of demolition should be in-fill. In the inner city, there are any number of dilapidated structures that are fire traps. Start improving in- fill in the inner city, like Alfred, Burrows, anywhere around Dufferin School.	9/22/2020 1:17 PM
472	architecture appropriate to the neighborhood should be a requirement ie no more big black boxes in older neighborhoods	9/22/2020 11:38 AM
473	As a relatively new resident, I am not overly familiar with the design development procedure but some of the infill housing seems a bit visually unfortunate. The developer/architect wants to attract attention for a quick sale, but seemingly at the expense of the neighbourhood context. The Wpg Site and Building Design Guidelines could be stronger, more of a 'design	9/22/2020 9:39 AM

	standards document' than just guidelines. A number of the listings/criteria for new residential design uses flexible words such as 'should' as opposed to 'must'. The word 'consider' is used throughout, eg. "Consider using similar rooflines to surrounding properties to complement the architectural character of the street and neighbourhood."	
474	No duplexes at all!!	9/22/2020 8:00 AM
475	Allow infill only on existing lots not lot splitting creating lost that are half the size of existing homes.	9/22/2020 12:46 AM
476	To prevent the design of houses that don't wit with the atmosphere of the neighborhood	9/21/2020 10:08 PM
477	I am very concerned about what the city has already allowed in that huge buildings side by side on small lots and we have lost all of our backyard privacy as the houses are built so high.	9/21/2020 6:39 PM
478	Allow the lot sizes to stay the same for a single dwelling, and keep them single dwelling. In my neighborhood, that would be 1 house on a 50 x100 ft lot.	9/21/2020 6:04 PM
479	It will be important to hold true to rear yard setback rules and not allow new builds to overly extend past existing homes.	9/21/2020 5:01 PM
480	They should NOT be allowed to change the size and style of the existing neighbourhoods. My neighbourhood has seen this happen and it is NOT good. Bungalows and 1 1/2 story homes were previously the norm ... now all the infills are coming in as 2 stories. They tower over the rest of the homes and all privacy is lost.	9/21/2020 4:44 PM
481	Design needs to blend with existing homes better. Infill homes springing up in our beautiful, mature neighborhoods are eye cheap-looking eye sores that are ruining the architectural and historic integrity of existing surroundings.	9/21/2020 4:41 PM
482	I think that they meet most requirements . People are opposed to change but new design and code makes it a better asset on the property	9/21/2020 4:38 PM
483	In neighbourhoods with larger lots, for example Old Tuxedo with 75 and 100 feet lots, larger side lot setbacks would help keep new builds in line with traditional building practices and better preserve the character of the neighbourhood.	9/21/2020 4:34 PM
484	Don't make them all into duplexes make some single.	9/21/2020 2:55 PM
485	Do NOT allow 50 ft lots to be split.	9/21/2020 2:47 PM
486	Consider the other houses on the immediate sides and across from infill site. If no other two stories exist, they should not be added.	9/21/2020 2:23 PM
487	not be allowed to be taller than neighbouring structures	9/21/2020 2:03 PM
488	Would like to see additional requirements for all mutli-units, townhouses, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, apartments, and townhomes to have space available for the residents to use as onsite composting of organics and for gardening and growing of food. This should help divert waste from city landfills and allow for those in such facilities to have the option to contribute to green composting, as people living in a single family home can do. Currently composting isn't available for most multi-unit residences. Having access to garden space would also improve quaility of life and neighborhood community as many multi-unit residences don't have access to gardens. Also would help improve food security.	9/21/2020 2:02 PM
489	The size and shape of the infill houses need to be in line with the existing neighborhood and area residents should have a voice in the approval process. They are the ones who have lived in the area for years and have built the neighborhood reputation to where infills are wanting to be built there.	9/21/2020 12:35 PM
490	The content and direction of the guidelines are well-intentioned, and seem to reflect a response to community concerns. I see challenges in implementation - what are the incentives for builders to actually follow the guidelines? Many of the infill projects that have been implemented in existing neighborhoods seem to have lack of respect for the neighbors and neighborhood as a common complaint. Perhaps having builders work more with community would be a solution	9/21/2020 11:38 AM
491	I think it is important to have stronger requirements around tree protection, many of these infill lots remove beautiful old trees and are not required to plant more. I think it is also important to keep an eye on how many people you are adding to an existing place. If they are turning a	9/21/2020 11:03 AM

	single lot now into a double lot that will now have two families, it seems like common sense that the developer must work with the city to increase resource (buses, sewage etc).	
492	Modern designs with roofs in harsh angles do not look good in older neighborhoods. If the lot is less that 50 feet wide the housing should be single family detached. If the houses on either side of the lot are bungalows than nothing higher should be allowed to be built. The roofs of the house should be at least 2 feet apart from the closest houses on either side to prevent fire spread from roofs and also space for fences, trees, and current sheds or garages.	9/21/2020 10:39 AM
493	It should help ensure potential concerns of new development is in line with existing mature communities.	9/21/2020 9:58 AM
494	The current approved lot sizes are small, too small to honestly allow for trees of any real size to be there for any prolonged period of times as their roots will eventually be a problem for pipes, etc. They eliminate any real green space, which is fine if you're a single couple without kids or pets, or plan on gardening. Again, it depends on whom one is trying to sell this idea to, to a family with more than one child who plan on spending any time in their yard these sizes are far too small for them. For a couple or single person or renter without kids, then I suppose these work.	9/21/2020 9:12 AM
495	somewhat	9/21/2020 8:38 AM
496	maintaining the character, architecture and landscape of the area.	9/21/2020 8:31 AM
497	There is still no effort to have the infill fit the existing character with the context of the established block & neighbourhood. Furthermore, more effort is needed to maintain more mature trees and less "boxy" look in mature historic neigbourhoods.	9/21/2020 8:21 AM
498	the infills should not be allowed to be so huge that they tower over next door properties that are well minted and will be around for a long long time...it is a respect	9/21/2020 7:23 AM
499	Period designs and character architecture are key for homeowners whose homes, even while well maintained, are turned into an 'out of date' appearance when the guidelines are not specific enough for a street where all the single family detached homes are mid century modern bungalows, and two homes are redesigned from mid century modern appearances, into modernist homes, using new exterior materials for the structures.	9/20/2020 11:16 PM
500	I am particularly concerned about ruining historic neighbourhoods. There aren’t a lot of quality stock older homes In Winnipeg, and tearing them down to infill multiple family dwellings on the larger lot may result in more taxes for the city, but it permanently changes the history and appeal of the area. Winnipeg needs to have some historical areas. What a designer considers attractive now will be out of date 15 years from now and (!) the affected neighbourhood starts to lose its character, in cascading effect. In a city that doesn’t have the best reputation for beauty (and I’m a dyed in the wool pegger) why reduce the limited stock there is?	9/20/2020 10:47 PM
501	We must preserve our existing tree canopy. Old growth trees should not be removed for infill housing.	9/20/2020 9:48 PM
502	The maximum lot coverage for accessory structures of 12% is far too small. For an older standard 33 x 100 lot, this means that the ADU can only be 20x20 - or if the laneway house is lot width less 4ft each side, 25ftx16ft. Perhaps 15 or 18% should be allowed for small lots? In order to get a Vancouver-style laneway house on there.	9/20/2020 9:04 PM
503	Give neighbourhoods a say in whether they want infill housing	9/20/2020 6:29 PM
504	If followed *properly*, it could work for my neighbourhood.	9/20/2020 5:13 PM
505	if a lot is split in 2 allow only 2 single family dwellings to be built not 2 duplexes with no yard area, not enough parking, no room for garbage/recycling bins to be kept on the property rather than the back lane	9/20/2020 4:19 PM
506	Add requirements for infill designs to fit the existing character of the neighbourhood.	9/20/2020 3:43 PM
507	Allow 3 story structures with smaller building foot prints.	9/20/2020 3:20 PM
508	The building design guidelines still allow both buildings and main floors to be considerably taller than existing homes. As it stands right now, the use of varied roof lines and contemporary building materials do not blend with older construction, and it doesn't seem like the guidelines will actually change that. The site guidelines seem more specific and helpful.	9/20/2020 2:45 PM

509	It is fascinating how many of these new infill housing do not match the neighborhoods that they are in. I understand homebuilders want to maximize profits but the houses look odd and out of place.	9/20/2020 1:56 PM
510	Love it! I do think that neighborhoods should look diverse. Tall houses, small houses, etc.	9/20/2020 1:33 PM
511	provide for a neighborhood review of each application	9/20/2020 1:28 PM
512	Ensure the design looks at the very specific site being proposed (existing buildings and street presence), not just a generic plan by a builder.	9/20/2020 12:18 PM
513	By incorporating similar design elements into the design. To give the infill a cohesive appearance with the neighbourhood	9/20/2020 11:21 AM
514	Include minimum back yard sizes, and match the design to the neighbourhood	9/20/2020 10:22 AM
515	Maintaining lot size proportional to adjacent properties.	9/20/2020 9:14 AM
516	By not existing, why must we fill every inch of land with construction? Why must we pack people in like sardines?	9/20/2020 8:37 AM
517	The outside design should better fit with the surrounding houses. All the new builds in mature neighborhoods are super obvious, they stand out and are too tall for the surrounding area, with no yard	9/20/2020 4:21 AM
518	Do not add more than six up/down duplexes to any street. Do not include too many significant architectural features as it looks like "a dog's breakfast" with so many different styles and is almost worse than row housing where there are no different architectural features at all. Let the trees, gardens, parks, and greenspace add variety instead.	9/20/2020 1:05 AM
519	Don't build square blocks into old neighbourhood that are 1 1/2 floors homes built for the returning WWII veterans. They are 1 1/2 floors with the upstairs with the "A" frame	9/20/2020 12:36 AM
520	Universal home entrances are imperative.	9/19/2020 10:16 PM
521	Protect the existing side yard setbacks on properties less than 30’ wide and/or increase to 4’ minimum.	9/19/2020 9:42 PM
522	Honestly we need to setup a dense neighbourhood system. Build houses more brooklyn style. Close to the road, with no gaps between the neighbours and give the people bigger back yards, with parking under the main floor. You get significantly more people together, in better quality homes (they would for fire purposes need to be brick/concrete on the outside walls). Meaning the sewer and waste system upgrades that need to be done can be spread over more users. But for this to work we would need to tear down entire neighbourhoods which I worry that Winnipeg/MB would not be ready to do.	9/19/2020 7:50 PM
523	Follow up with builder to ensure they built what they said they were. Make them accountable.	9/19/2020 7:21 PM
524	The major issue is the height guidelines. There are pictures in your examples of good infill which illustrates two storey homes beside bungalows. Which as per your guidelines would not be able to be achieved. The market will drive the housing needs. At one point infill was almost exclusively bungalows. Now you see many two stories as families are looking for something different. What if a bungalow owner wants to add to there home would they be allowed? If so it's discrimination to someone who wants to build new over renovate.	9/19/2020 6:49 PM
525	Just fine	9/19/2020 5:59 PM
526	Ensure developers actually follow guidelines	9/19/2020 5:28 PM
527	Allow unrestricted lot size anywhere in the city. Also unrestricted multiple residence zoning.	9/19/2020 5:25 PM
528	Ensure the guidelines are followed	9/19/2020 5:22 PM
529	Consider maximum height of dwellings to be limited to average of abuting dwellings +/- 5 feet, and not automatically 28ft. In areas where most dwellings are single storey or 1.5 storey homes, even 28 feet towers above neighbouring buildings.	9/19/2020 5:22 PM
530	I worry about side entrance doors to the second unit as these often run right beside the neighbour's household. Better to only have front and rear access with how close the homes are in my area (area 2)	9/19/2020 4:53 PM

531	Ensure there is balance between the required architectural complexity, exterior finishes and landscaping in the draft and the affordability of these requirements.	9/19/2020 3:39 PM
532	Why should anyone care about how buildings blend into the houses beside them?	9/19/2020 2:38 PM
533	The most important factor will be to have new structures be restricted in size and footprint to be compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood. No more monstrosities plunked down in the middle of a neighbourhood with houses half the size.	9/19/2020 2:33 PM
534	Require Inspection of Plan Design Accuracy and mandate certain neighbour hood design requirements. Also mandate fences and require builders to put fences if to close to property lines to eliminate disputes. Do a By law inspection to ensure items such as Retaining walls are built.	9/19/2020 1:58 PM
535	New buildings have to be the same as existing ones, no bigger, no more dense. All this is meaningless until Planning requires its Planners to comply. For years, Planning has not complied with the 2008 Infill Guidelines or any bylaws. Planners make excuses for non-compliance and there has been no meaningful supervision. Sloppy scholarship, lazy rigour, and outright cheating and fabrication of the truth has been commonplace. Result: no faith these guidelines have any meaning at all.	9/19/2020 1:48 PM
536	The minimum site with of 12 metres for single family detached houses could easily be reduced to 10 metres or less. By allowing a smaller site size, more existing lots will be eligible, and this will help align the incentives of existing homeowners who may want to divide their lot. If people want to live on a smaller lot and developers want to build it, then they should be permitted to do so.	9/19/2020 1:44 PM
537	Adequate parking and room to place snow in winter so it is not shoveled into the back lane thus becoming hazardous for neighbours Destruction of tree canopy and green space extremely important. Many infills do not have room to build a garage. I feel the lot size should be adequately accommodate a garage or it is too small	9/19/2020 1:39 PM
538	Building units more similars to exisitng housing	9/19/2020 1:27 PM
539	I believe it is important to promote quality infill. The process is extremely difficult for families and small businesses. This draw back causes big builders that are money hungry to step in and take over. If the process was made easier we may see families develop houses for themselves to live in for years to come. The focus seems to be how to stop the big builders when it should be how to promote infill for family's and small businesses.	9/19/2020 1:20 PM
540	No subdivisions!	9/19/2020 12:55 PM
541	Architectural features	9/19/2020 11:21 AM
542	There's not enough information/detail here to be able to evaluate.	9/19/2020 10:45 AM
543	Should be less restrictive. This sounds too bureaucratic. Front yards do not matter any more and are a waste of space. We should encourage building up two and three stories. There are too many bungalows that waste space and many should be torn down and replaced.	9/19/2020 10:39 AM
544	More restrictions need to be in place	9/19/2020 10:19 AM
545	Love the idea of rules being specific to the look of the neighbourhood.	9/19/2020 10:15 AM
546	Design of new buildings must blend into the neighbourhood	9/19/2020 10:13 AM
547	Very well	9/19/2020 10:09 AM
548	I don't want infill in my neighbourhood. The houses are ugly, poorly made, and out of character with the neighbourhood. .	9/19/2020 9:52 AM
549	Equally applied to all potential infill developments	9/19/2020 9:33 AM
550	Property has to be in keeping. Setback could be decreased to allow more density.	9/19/2020 9:30 AM
551	New builds should be the same height and width as neighbouring properties. When you build a 2 or 3 story building next to a bungalow it spoils the look of the neighborhood	9/19/2020 9:12 AM
552	The guidelines need more “teeth”. In its current form, the draft document is simply a list of suggestions that an infill developer may choose to follow; it will change nothing, good infill developers are already following these guidelines. The point of this document was meant to	9/19/2020 8:48 AM

	prevent bad infill development... I also believe that the max height/set-back, etc should be limited to the max of the mature homes on the block, or average + 5feet, whichever is smaller. The point is to minimize the impact on existing homes.	
553	New houses should match existing houses in the neighborhood. Allowing new dwellings to be built taller and bigger allow for more people to live in the community adding to the traffic, noises levels and parking issues.	9/19/2020 8:22 AM
554	Ensure they are constructed in the same architectural style as the existing a homes. A neighbourhood with 90% large wide bungalows should not be an area for tall two storey infills.	9/19/2020 8:18 AM
555	Infill homes built on split lots gives a poor aesthetic and leaves the house with a small lot usually with no yard of garage. There should be rules against lot splitting.	9/19/2020 8:07 AM
556	Architectural style matters. Infill in mature neighbourhood needs to be complimentary to the era of the neighbourhood. The house on the front of the document is terrible. I'd like to see more examples of existing houses beside infill houses throughout the document. Images showing how infill fits into mature neighbourhoods, vs Developer attempts to be designers/architects, would be appreciated. Most Developers will take the document literally. Imagery matters. Also, inter generational housing is super important. Plus, is it possible to tie in garden suits into these design guidelines, if there aren't already?	9/19/2020 7:50 AM
557	All infill developments must match adjacent properties....no exceptions unless all adjacent neighbours agree in writing!	9/19/2020 6:16 AM
558	More consideration is needed regarding the type of mature neighbourhood for these projects — some mature neighbourhoods consist of old beauties in good shape, and shouldn't have these taken down, ruining the neighbourhoods character, just for the purpose of densification.	9/19/2020 5:27 AM
559	Infills should only be allowed, if there is enough clearance to neighbouring houses and they should be of about the same height and form. Developers should not be allowed to squeeze in as many houses as possible on a small lot. Houses should have a garage and a fence.	9/19/2020 12:12 AM
560	restrict height	9/18/2020 10:48 PM
561	Stop making giant infill houses which can overpower other homes in the area	9/18/2020 8:54 PM
562	You are going to have taller houses which will block out the sun for the house*s* next to it. The houses need to be similar in size	9/18/2020 8:45 PM
563	Stop splitting lots. 25 feet wide is not a property to be building multi family homes. 4-5 mature healthy trees will need to be taken down in the tiny lot behind my house to build a 15ft wide house	9/18/2020 8:23 PM
564	The role of infill development should be to increase the overall population density. Our existing neighbourhoods do not promote population density so infill has to result in a change in our existing neighbourhoods. If we want to preserve a specific feel for a neighbourhood this would be best achieved by requiring specific architectural styles be used and let developers use those styles while maximizing the potential population density	9/18/2020 8:01 PM
565	Make them only two levels	9/18/2020 7:59 PM
566	Too many of the recommendations regarding rooflines, setbacks garage placement etc are recommendations. They suggest developers "consider" matching rooflines and quality materials and planting viable trees so there is no guarantee that these concerns will actually guide development or be enforced in any way.	9/18/2020 7:22 PM
567	many infill buildings I see are much taller than the adjacent properties. Many are larger lots split into 2, then tall narrow houses built. Overshadowing the neighborhood. They don't fit in and are unsightly, having the guidelines should help the buildings fit into the atmosphere of the neighborhood rather than look out of place	9/18/2020 7:08 PM
568	All infill designs stand out as ugly sore thumbs	9/18/2020 7:04 PM
569	Consideration should be given to the front yard setback as well. I'd rather a house be a bit bigger in the front and a bit bigger in the back, than all jutted one direction. You say height requirements for abutting properties. But if they go the MAX height and can spread fully in a particular direction....all of a sudden the view/sun for the abutting properties can be severely compromised. I ALSO think you MUST keep the side yard distances. You cannot allow smaller side yards. Current residents bought their homes for reasons that go far beyond interior design.	9/18/2020 5:23 PM

	We like the space between our homes. I've seen infill in the neighbourhood and would be extremely angry and fight any move to shorten side yards.	
570	Spread it fairly among all Neighbourhoods	9/18/2020 5:14 PM
571	personally my concern is not to assist new infill but to limit the amount of infill that is already occurring rapidly	9/18/2020 5:00 PM
572	Height and distance from lot lines is important. Guidelines for keeping the home in the character of the neighbourhood is important. For example, no 2 stories on a street that is majority bungalows. No extremely narrow houses on streets with wide houses. Extremely modern designs should not be implemented in older neighbourhoods. There should be some attempt to mimic the overall character of the homes in the same period that the existing homes were built	9/18/2020 4:54 PM
573	I think a lot of new infill housing looks jarringly different from what currently exists in hundred year old neighborhoods.	9/18/2020 4:50 PM
574	Guidelines need to better consider the reality of increased density within affected neighbourhoods.	9/18/2020 4:44 PM
575	Mostly it's pretty good, but I do think guidelines should allow for flexibility - especially as it may pertain to a bilevel or raised basement with higher ceilings. These may give more livable/comfortable space inside so the 4' recommendation I think might be questionable.	9/18/2020 3:04 PM

Q3 How well do you think the site and building design guidelines for two-unit side-by-side housing will help new infill integrate into existing neighbourhoods?

Answered: 696 Skipped: 78



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Not well at all	33.05%	230
Somewhat	38.07%	265
Very well	23.42%	163
Neutral/No opinion	5.46%	38
TOTAL		696

Q4 How do you think the site and building design guidelines for two-unit side-by-side housing could be improved to help new infill integrate into existing neighbourhoods?

Answered: 439 Skipped: 335

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Same thing. All new homes built should match the neighborhoods they are being put into. If there are no side by sides in that neighbourhood they should not be added now!	10/23/2020 8:19 AM
2	New infill to not add to retention of surface water on adjacent properties and not to block or reduce drainage of meltwater on neighbors property	10/23/2020 7:10 AM
3	The same can be said for two-Unit side-by-side housing. No matter the type of infill housing being constructed, the new building should conform to those properties that surround it.	10/22/2020 11:23 PM
4	see previous note regarding coverage and trees.	10/22/2020 11:07 PM
5	I don't like when they are super tall and skinny and identical and close together. The guidelines will help with that, but the worst infill is the double skinny house; it never fits in anywhere. Maybe this type should have stricter guidelines with regards to setback and height.	10/22/2020 10:26 PM
6	More tree protection.	10/22/2020 10:24 PM
7	- There should be no projections allowed without going to the community for review. - balconies need to considered as part of the footprint and in the setbacks. - variances should be allowed and incorporated into the builders plan. - All buildings require green space and landscaping and landscaping requirements should not be removed through a committee.	10/22/2020 9:59 PM
8	If a site already has an existing two-family dwelling on it than a replacement two-family dwelling should be allowed. Existing infrastructure such as roads and sewers would have to be upgraded to handle the extra volume.	10/22/2020 9:11 PM
9	.	10/22/2020 9:05 PM
10	Have the guidelines backed up with hefty fines if the developer does not adhere to the community approved housing recommendations. I do not recall the issue of building in a sustainable manner either as part of the guidelines.	10/22/2020 5:15 PM
11	My experience with this type of housing is that it attracts trashy trouble causing renters. Make them all single family units and don't allow people to rent out their homes.	10/22/2020 5:09 PM
12	How can one possibly give a definite answer to #3 , if how specific details and visual plannings are left open ended? That would need absolute trust in the system that has created the mess I see in the neighbourhoods that I live in and visit .	10/22/2020 3:45 PM
13	If there are no side by sides in the neighbourhood, they should not be allowed. Once again the requirements are written more as suggestions rather than requirements. Be brave! Use the word should or must once in awhile.	10/22/2020 3:40 PM
14	two unit side by side housing should not be allowed in neighborhoods that presently are for single bungalows	10/22/2020 3:38 PM
15	Increase lot width. Restrict to larger corner lots.	10/22/2020 3:21 PM
16	There is no mention of of ongoing building supervision or guideline enforcement.	10/22/2020 2:32 PM
17	Do not allow lot splitting.	10/22/2020 2:31 PM
18	319 Chalmers Ave in Winnipeg would be a good example of a good design for the lot. It leaves a certain amount of green space and room for detached structure and parking as many households have 2 and 3 cars.	10/22/2020 1:31 PM
19	Don't build them at all on streets that do not have similar dwellings.	10/22/2020 12:07 PM
20	Design styles evolve over time and design guidelines that are overly prescriptive may end up resulting in mature neighbourhoods looking overly homogeneous. Lot coverage and prioritized infill locations greatly limit the ability from mature neighbourhoods to move away from predominantly single-family zoning and single-family residences.	10/22/2020 11:42 AM
21	Make them bungalows so only a small family can dwell there , have consideration for the damage to neighbour's property and infrastructure ,such as sewer, water lines and foundation. Upgrade the sewers before adding more volume of sewage that they can't handle.	10/22/2020 11:27 AM
22	This style of infill development should be minimized because it is often at odds with the neighborhood style. This sort of development should be restricted to lots on arterial streets	10/22/2020 11:20 AM

23	I think that besides height restrictions, many of these recommended changes don't address the concerns of our existing communities. I'm not concerned about the architectural features of my neighbourhoods homes or the landscaping that is done after the construction is finished. The concern is that during construction there is attention paid to landscape maintenance. This leads to an abundance of weeds spreading around the neighbourhood, unsafe public sidewalks, and general unacceptable and unprofessional levels of messiness which is forced upon everyone in the neighbourhood. This includes construction garbage flying into everybody's yard every day, impassable or nearly impassable sidewalks due to mud, nails, damaged concrete, etc. More needs to be done to address site and building guidelines for on site during the actual building process. More needs to be done to address environmental impacts such as lead released during demolition, and to encourage removal, reuse, recycling of usable materials from the home before demolition.	10/22/2020 11:08 AM
24	My previous gripes with back yard exclusions and garage placements still apply, otherwise I have no criticisms here. The rest of the guidelines look sensible to me	10/22/2020 10:09 AM
25	Force developers to pay higher taxes on the properties they have built if their value exceeds that of the previous property on the land developed.	10/22/2020 9:58 AM
26	The idea of "preferred" locations including gravel alleys is completely wrong. This is absolutely insane when the city refuses to even add gravel to lanes - I live on a gravel lane and adding infill housing shows a complete lack of planning , not an attempt to "integrate" into existing neighborhoods	10/22/2020 9:54 AM
27	Over concentration of building which contributes to parking issues and loss of existing character within these established neighbourhoods.	10/21/2020 10:05 PM
28	Same as the previous question	10/21/2020 8:24 PM
29	It is always better to have single detached houses. If one side of the duplex is not kept up and allowed to deteriorate, it can affect the other side and cause problems for the innocent person maintaining their side. Also if a two unit is approved please make sure there is enough land to give some amount of yard and not be so close to the neighbour. I have seen houses where the eaves are over the neighbouring house.	10/21/2020 7:10 PM
30	Don't allow in single family residential zone.	10/21/2020 6:55 PM
31	In general I would like to see architects and designers be part of teams who develop or approve plans, not only planners and developers, whose primary goal is to turn a profit and not create a community.	10/21/2020 3:56 PM
32	The site and building guidelines need to more accurately reflect the style, size and character of current homes.	10/21/2020 3:49 PM
33	The required external design should look similar to the neighbourhood and garage	10/21/2020 3:19 PM
34	Bigger area needed to provide yard big enough for recreation, children playing, relaxation, gardening, privacy, noise and 'vaping' free zones, etc.	10/21/2020 12:53 PM
35	Don’t let them tower over neighbours. They should be compatible with other architecture on the street and not look out of place or hulking.	10/21/2020 12:19 PM
36	Smaller homes.	10/21/2020 11:52 AM
37	increase side lot size. Height should be consistent with street	10/21/2020 11:04 AM
38	Improve building designs to fit in with the neighborhood, not stick out like a sore thumb	10/21/2020 10:50 AM
39	They can be improved by not being Built at all. What in the heck are you doing to our area????	10/21/2020 8:39 AM
40	No two-unit side-by-side housing in areas that don't historically have that type of housing.	10/21/2020 7:40 AM
41	-see previous comments	10/21/2020 7:24 AM
42	They look like regular houses with a split. So they’ll be great. They should have parking though as replacing single family homes with multiple units eats up street parking.	10/20/2020 11:25 PM
43	Only the immediate 2 to 4 adjacent properties should be considered in determining the front or rear setback of a new build. Consider when there are 4 existing homes in a row with a 25ft front setback; but then across the street, or farther down the block, there are 4 other houses with	10/20/2020 8:57 PM

	only a 15ft front setback. The average of 20ft minus the allowed 5ft, allows the new house to be built with a15ft set back, protruding a full 10ft ahead of the 4 adjacent homes. Yet the same math would keep the same new house in a straight line with other houses mentioned if it were built across the street. By only considering the 4 adjacent homes; 2 on either side, the new house would integrate well on either side of street, and not just the one. No one loses. Allowing the 5ft plus or minus of only the 4 adjacent properties should be generous enough for the developers. The developers will gets more building square footage as they push the limits which each new build that goes up. This would also protect the existing home values a little bit longer.	
44	Limit the number of them on a full street (including all blocks of the street) and the number of builds in a particular neighborhood. The Glenwood neighborhood is a target zone for rental-property builds right now!	10/20/2020 7:33 PM
45	Should not be built	10/20/2020 6:01 PM
46	Scrap this infill	10/20/2020 5:14 PM
47	I think the sites should have lawns or some kind of greenery.	10/20/2020 3:36 PM
48	Not at all, Making it too crowded, blocking the sun, and much more difficult for social distancing. So I say a definite NO!	10/20/2020 3:05 PM
49	Remove landscaping requirements... nothing preventing removal after permit closure, therefore useless. Also, makes building on small lots more difficult. Remove lot coverage, height and setback requirements. Remove lot width requirements... walkability requires density on small lots. Limiting density to larger lots doesn't help for walkability, it actually hinders walkability, which is a prerequisite for livable density.	10/20/2020 2:50 PM
50	They should reflect existing architecture of area to keep with the look of the neighbourhood.	10/20/2020 2:20 PM
51	My answer remains the same here. I have no ideological problem with infill, but my backlane is an unpaved mess at the best of times. I spent 15k on a new garage last year, and it was nearly unusable over the winter due to ruts and deep ditches in the middle of the lane. In the spring, we end up with a literal pond, nearly a foot deep, that we refer to with disdain as Lake Fernwood. Increasing housing density will cause undue damage to an already nearly unusable lane from the construction needs, and will reduce the amount of time it remains usable after grading due to the increase in residential traffic. I also worry about the impact on infrastructure like water and sewage. We are responsible, we compost, we have a bidet and use toilet paper sparingly, use screens on our drains to prevent food waste from ending up in the sewer system, and still we've had to call roto rooter twice to clean out our main line to the city all the way to or past our property line due to backup. adding density to the neighbourhood concerns me for those reasons.	10/20/2020 2:07 PM
52	Should all be built in one specified area, not scattered throughout neighbourhoods.	10/20/2020 2:03 PM
53	make some provisions to protect tree cover, preferably to save some of the big trees being taken down. At worst, if you take a big tree down, must replace with a mature (not sapling/seedling) tree.	10/20/2020 11:15 AM
54	Communicate to neighbours that new side-by-sides improve their property values and the neighbourhood...opposed to doing nothing with existing derelict houses and abandoned lots.	10/20/2020 10:33 AM
55	They should be banned. They’re ugly and they ruin the look of neighbourhoods.	10/20/2020 9:36 AM
56	Again the proposals are not needed throughout Sg Vital. This can stay in Glenwood and Varennes - serious insult to other areas to suggest they are declining. People fix up their homes - and many of these are NOT pre 1950’s as you claim - and pay their taxes to be told by city planners their houses need to go. Unbelievable arrogance.	10/19/2020 9:54 PM
57	hopefully make homes affordable for 1st time buyers, retirees	10/19/2020 3:27 PM
58	make it fair though all neighborhoods, have developers follow guidlines	10/19/2020 2:08 PM
59	Don't ruin my neighbourhood.	10/19/2020 11:56 AM
60	Do not agree with adding side by sides into predominantly single family neighborhoods.	10/19/2020 9:38 AM
61	Stop building them	10/19/2020 8:48 AM

62	This is about the city helping a few developers make money. You are pushing this through. I feel very upset.	10/18/2020 9:06 PM
63	Makes some sense to allow duplexes on gravel lanes, if these are limited to only two units, only two!	10/18/2020 8:32 PM
64	The area is too limited as to where this type of constructed homes can go. Why do they need to be close to industrial areas and on bus routes. If the design is right I think they can be incorporated into any area. Again more variety in design.	10/18/2020 8:12 PM
65	I do not feel that side-by-sides fit into established communities with mature homes.	10/18/2020 6:59 PM
66	It won't help. Expand the city by building new development with new single and very affordable houses for low income families to buy. That'll be Very good and impactful on the lives of thousands of Winnipegers.	10/18/2020 6:32 PM
67	I think that side-by-side duplexes are a better solution that splitting the lots. It would allow for more space between neighbouring houses.	10/18/2020 5:03 PM
68	no	10/18/2020 3:41 PM
69	Takes away from the single family home	10/18/2020 12:42 PM
70	There is insufficient attention to implications for parking in the neighbourhood, including providing access to plugging in block heaters in the winter. More attention needs to be paid to providing and/or maintaining options for a range of income levels. Some of these neighbourhoods have been places where young people can afford their first homes as well as places with larger more expensive housing. Also, there is insufficient attention to trees, whether existing or new plantings. Many usual measures to protect existing trees are insufficient, and the trees end up dying within a few years of the construction. The construction of new foundations for example will likely to significant damage to any large mature trees on the property. Winnipeg's tree canopy has in the past been a matter of great pride and also has ecological value. Someone needs to be responsible for monitoring the health of both existing and newly planted trees for these sites. Perhaps builders might put down a guarantee deposit to be refunded after 5 years if the trees survive. Planting two trees for killing one large mature one is insufficient. Tree list might be expanded. The setback specification "or portion of block" allows for too much wiggle room. What does that really mean? The entire block should be considered in that average.	10/18/2020 11:05 AM
71	Eliminate it, stay with one unit	10/18/2020 11:04 AM
72	Well not t in the scope of this project there needs to be an additional set of rules that protects the structural integrity of adjacent properties and buildings	10/18/2020 10:30 AM
73	i am for no new housing at any part of my established neighborhood	10/17/2020 11:42 AM
74	Enforceable Good neighbor contracts	10/17/2020 8:26 AM
75	Winnipeg would need to add a ton of infrastructure to support the traffic which is already 20 years behind. Winnipeg keeps adding residential areas but doesn't have any freeways going through to help people navigate to their jobs and on top you want to add more folks in already condensed neighborhoods. Kingston crescent where I reside doesn't have the hydro or infrastructure to support this type of development and this should be obvious to any engineer that would do a proper evaluation of this. Developers would need strict guidelines regarding not chopping down trees that are old and coveted... why does the city of Winnipeg forestry spend so much of its budget planting trees if Developers will come in and tear down so that these buildings can go up... I bought my house at a high price to live in this type of neighborhood where character homes are cherished and appropriated daily on our walks. Perhaps a survey could be sent to residents and if 70% objects the project doesn't move forward?	10/17/2020 6:26 AM
76	Blend looks, not too different in height, not too close to property line.	10/16/2020 11:51 PM
77	Good landscaping requirements.	10/16/2020 11:25 PM
78	You're the experts, not me. If you're not, hire some.	10/16/2020 8:53 PM
79	"significant architectural features" means…. windows? Do we get windows?	10/16/2020 7:21 PM
80	Stricter regulations from an official regulating office, to ensure strict compliance with essential guidelines. Caps on amount of infill creating in mature neighbourhoods so overreaction from	10/16/2020 6:11 PM

	greedy developers doesn't see too sharp a rise in population density contribute to overburdening community services, amenities, and infrastructure.	
81	Let us have an emphasis on curb appeal and how well these homes will fit into the neighbourhood.	10/16/2020 4:20 PM
82	same	10/16/2020 2:40 PM
83	Single family dwellings only.	10/16/2020 2:18 PM
84	Keep single family dwellings in the area	10/16/2020 2:18 PM
85	No changes needed.	10/16/2020 1:11 PM
86	Tear down all neighborhoods surrounding downtown.	10/16/2020 9:06 AM
87	any duplex should done via zoning change and also build on a minimum 50ft wide lot.	10/15/2020 10:15 PM
88	We have a situation on the next block where three houses were shoehorned into two lots. They are not duplexes, but even if they were, I would not like to see the same situation for them.	10/15/2020 9:49 PM
89	I'm not sure	10/15/2020 9:02 PM
90	For building height, maintain the current guideline at the sides of the duplex but allow for the possibility of a transition to a somewhat higher height at the centre portion of the duplex. Would probably only be feasible on a wider lot. Allow for duplexes that aren't necessarily symmetrical from side to side.	10/15/2020 9:00 PM
91	no way to improve	10/15/2020 8:43 PM
92	When you double (or quadruple) the occupancy of an existing property, you double (or quadruple) the number of vehicles associated with that 'one' property. Winnipeg has winter. Winnipeg has SNOW STORMS. Where will the cars go when the clearing machinery needs to perform?	10/15/2020 6:52 PM
93	restrict the limit on height of new two unit side by side housing.	10/15/2020 5:27 PM
94	Do not split lots that are already small and typical for the current neighborhood (50' wide or less) for single family dwellings.	10/15/2020 5:12 PM
95	Side by sides are often rentals. Alot of renters do not take care of the appearance of property ie long grass, weeds, garbage outside. Let's be honest.	10/15/2020 4:37 PM
96	No lots should be divided if less then 50 ft frontage	10/15/2020 3:13 PM
97	Lot-splitting is a controversial subject and I believe it can be mitigated by encouraging the construction of side-by-side duplexes. The city's policies should encourage building these over lot-splitting, though I am not opposed to lot splitting.	10/15/2020 2:56 PM
98	Land coverage should be increased, side yards reduced, height of the building should go up to 35 feet as it always been. It should be allowed to build it on 40 feet wide lots and more !To many landscaping requirements that make the project less cost effective and it will reduce the affordability.	10/15/2020 2:36 PM
99	It should apply to all neighbourhoods and not just those that are prioritized. Rules should be applied throughout the city.	10/15/2020 2:32 PM
100	n/a	10/15/2020 12:41 PM
101	See previous	10/15/2020 12:24 PM
102	rear setbacks should be kept at 25' nothing to do with neighbors' yards	10/15/2020 10:21 AM
103	While the mass is appropriate in itself, Landscaping and architectural detail are extremely important in this instance to accommodate the bulk of the mass.	10/15/2020 10:14 AM
104	Okay so everything I said on the last question AND... when you build infill or a certain style of residence (single-family, duplex, side-by-side, row housing, etc.) too many are made. we need MIXED-USE development. We need developments that have a range of income levels so nothing gets derelict, forgotten and run down. We build too many row houses or areas like the Manitoba Housing complex on Dufferin that turns into ghettos. Infill should be a "one-off" lot and not a whole area of the same kind of housing.	10/15/2020 8:53 AM

105	Two unit! I have a 5 plex being built on the lot beside me with doors and winndows looking directly into my yard. Couldn't fight it, I didn't have enough money!	10/15/2020 8:35 AM
106	I didn't notice any height maximum for garages or other structures behind the house. My single- and two-family neighborhood has a number of monsterous two-story garages that completely shade the adjacent back yards. This should be considered.	10/15/2020 6:44 AM
107	If the original house on the lot is single family detached, build a like dwelling. Don't change the housing just because you can. Extra units lead to extra traffic.	10/14/2020 10:41 PM
108	Restrict the height, no two stories.	10/14/2020 10:15 PM
109	These side by side housing belong together in a designated area & not in single nabourhoods	10/14/2020 9:32 PM
110	The guidelines are too permissive to crowding and encroaching on neighbouring properties and do nothing concrete to protect the interests of existing Neighbourhood residents	10/14/2020 6:17 PM
111	The requirement for two "architectural features" is crazy. I appreciate requirements for sustainable facade materials, but you're essentially forcing architects/designers/builders to build using the same materials. Not allowing concrete on a main front face is wild.	10/14/2020 5:54 PM
112	Better but the landscaping seems like a wish list not a requirement. We need teeth or it will get ignored. Same for the single and duplexes.	10/14/2020 5:40 PM
113	too often a variance is given for properties, the builders do what they want, apply for a new variance if there are complaints and receive the new variance which they know will happen right from the get-go. This should not be allowed just for the tax dollars it generates. I don't think the city employees who allow this to happen want the same thing to happen in their neighbourhoods.	10/14/2020 4:06 PM
114	Size and height are always a concern.	10/14/2020 3:13 PM
115	Remove encroachment provision entirely. Encourage mix of facade materials and "no blank walls" idea. Encourage mix of facade designs.	10/14/2020 2:50 PM
116	the problem is those guidelines won't be followed, overcrowding areas with with small lots is just plain stupid and it does lower our property values. one two story on these lots is fine	10/14/2020 12:56 PM
117	Build one normal bungalow on each lot.	10/14/2020 12:36 PM
118	I feel the lots in older neighborhoods to be too small for two unit side by side housing.	10/14/2020 10:49 AM
119	Require that they reflect the pattern and character already established in that area. So, if if it is the pattern in that established area to have 6foot or less distances between the building and abutting buildings on EITHER or BOTH side. In other words, no crowding. I cannot remember seeing crowding between buildings on my walks in my neighbourhood near Windsor Park golf course except with new fill-in builds. There are new builds that are exemplary, that on Imperial Avenue on the North side between Des Meurons and Egerton being one.	10/14/2020 10:31 AM
120	Roof height of infill house should not exceed the existing property on either side.	10/14/2020 9:00 AM
121	The specific distancing and setback recommendations will not work in mature, older neighbourhoods with narrower lots. They may work in newer suburbs. Two different sets of infill rules would make more sense, one for suburbia, and one for older, mature neighbourhoods. The setbacks, clearances etc HAVE to be smaller in the mature neighbourhoods, or every single development will need variances. Plenty of lots are 25 feet wide - and that just doesn't fit with the new infill proposals.	10/14/2020 7:51 AM
122	Properly integrate the houses into the neighborhood	10/14/2020 5:43 AM
123	In all cases, strong preference should be given to rehabilitation and renovation of existing structures rather than tear-downs and replacement with new construction. Any new construction that take places should match existing nearby structures in size, footprint, architectural style and exterior building materials. I object to including corner lots as preferred locations for infill. Corner lots are often slightly larger than mid-block lots and for some families who spend lots of time outdoors, they are very attractive. By prioritizing infill on these lots, the city is removing corner lots as locations where families who want single family homes can reside.	10/13/2020 10:20 PM
124	You should continue to allow more and more site coverage and ensure the City’s tax base	10/13/2020 8:46 PM

	increases in such a worthwhile manner that infill becomes a universally accepted approach to growing the Urban fabric of the city. Further, the more people that live within a short distance of their work the more that will utilize transit and alternative transportation options - cycling, car share, etc. We need to replenish both the aging housing and aging population in mature communities to bring back vibrancy that used to make it attractive. We need to retain and create more housing diversity in mature communities to combat age old discrimination by zoning to allow a wider variety of lifestyles and age demographics to be accommodated.	
125	Requirements for minimal parking needed for all sizes of new infill, including single family detached and up/down duplex. Concrete guidelines as to what would qualify as 'sufficient', since this term is greatly open to interpretation. Also should set limitations on the percentage of properties in a given area/street that can be split for any property development to minimize the impact to existing properties and residents. More evenly distributing the influx of new residents/builds around the areas in question so as not to have certain streets in a constant state of disrepair due to continuous new construction. Residential taxes on existing properties where infill has been completed or is planned in the near future should be re-assessed more regularly and vigorously, as this sort of infill can decrease the resale value of existing properties, as also can cause great inconveniences to property owners during and after construction.	10/13/2020 8:26 PM
126	The contractors need to make sure that they comply with the guidelines set up so that their builds fit into the community and STOP challenging the guidelines every step of the way. The 35 foot height seems high when the surrounding homes are not very tall. These builds should/could be bi levels but not with a bi level type basement and then a main and a second floor.	10/13/2020 8:18 PM
127	Side by side units should have their own place and time, they don’t belong into established neighbourhood	10/13/2020 7:32 PM
128	Having limits on what can be done. I have rented my house for three years. On my side of the street alone we have had 3 lots change. That is 6 new mansions that have been built on a street that takes less than 5 minutes to walk up. Some of the mansions that are side by sides also have two units in them. So upwards of four families could be in the side by sides. Also this is only the left side. When counting across the street there have been 2 lots sold. Additionally, the backlane has had 4 lots sold this year alone, so 8 new homes have gone up or are upcoming. We have also had apartment buildings added on to st. Annes.	10/13/2020 7:18 PM
129	The neighbours should have the right to be consulted before hand.	10/13/2020 4:26 PM
130	by maintaining the character of the existing neighbourhood and stringently enforcing guidelines for developers.	10/13/2020 4:20 PM
131	As long as they also add adequate parking for multiple family homes, there shouldn't be an issue	10/13/2020 3:53 PM
132	Again make them blend into the establish area	10/13/2020 2:41 PM
133	Two unit side by sides are preferable to large multiplex buildings in many neighbourhoods.	10/13/2020 2:30 PM
134	What are the requirements? How are they changing? Is this survey for real?	10/13/2020 12:17 PM
135	same as previous comment - council does not follow its own rules	10/13/2020 12:12 PM
136	I don't see why "integration" should be given this much priority. It doesn't matter to me at all if the houses on a street all look the same or different	10/13/2020 11:51 AM
137	You are cramming two houses on to small lots.To close to the road.Not enough parking.	10/13/2020 11:30 AM
138	Two unit side by sides should not tower over the existing height of the other houses on the same street. The view becomes an eyesore the the neighborhood	10/13/2020 8:38 AM
139	Twenty five foot lots for up/down duplexes should not be allowed and single family dwellings for twenty five foot lot sizes should only take up 60% or less of lot and building height to be enforced.	10/13/2020 6:56 AM
140	Prioritize infill in preferred locations is subjective	10/12/2020 9:48 PM
141	I haven’t seen any information about this concept?	10/12/2020 9:39 PM
142	if there is room to do so there should be no problems. The city is always saying they are short	10/12/2020 9:21 PM

	of money. They can get taxes for 1 lot or they can double there money and get taxes on both houses. The services are already set up so minimals cost to the city with big gains.	
143	Don't build houses higher then the average height of the existing homes on either side of the proposed building lot.	10/12/2020 8:13 PM
144	The "guidelines" make it hard for homeowners to renovate their properties & add suites, e.g. Granny Suites at a time when aging in place will become more and more important.	10/12/2020 7:00 PM
145	Ensure adequate parking.These homes especially never have enough.At least 2 spaces per unit.I know your studies have shown that the average household only has 1.2 vehicles and this very well be true but if you take an average of the "suburbs" of Winnipeg(where most of these infills are being built) I feel you will find the number to be more than that.Inner city and north end will have lower numbers.	10/12/2020 6:43 PM
146	Density is a good thing. Multi-family units are a good thing. Make this easier not harder to build.	10/12/2020 3:50 PM
147	it wouldn't work in our neighborhood due to no front streets and even with single family homes here there are too many vehicles parked in the lane.	10/12/2020 9:15 AM
148	I feel like side by sides should be build away from current housing as it disrupts neighbours	10/12/2020 5:06 AM
149	Again, we need yards. And breathing room. Not these monstrosities. Also, sharing a wall is hell - when Matt Allard and Brian Hayes live in condos or duplexes, I'll believe they really believe in this and that it isn't just a hope to raise taxes	10/11/2020 8:54 PM
150	Guidelines need to further consider the impact higher density will have on the amount of traffic and reduced parking in a neighbourhood. Higher density in areas not located near reliable Winnipeg transit will be adversely affected by this.	10/11/2020 8:26 PM
151	The suites should not be used for rental properties. Homeowners should live in both suites, perhaps two homeowners as in a condo/shared building.	10/11/2020 3:26 PM
152	WE DO NOT WANT THEM	10/11/2020 3:23 PM
153	Think of accessibility for disabled homeowners, or family and friends of homeowners. The main floor entrance at minimum should be level with the ground. Also accessibility at sides, rear and front of building.	10/11/2020 11:56 AM
154	Far too often I have seen multi-family units squeezed into the space of a single family dwelling with no allowance for parking or green space. Case in point are the corner of Brazier and Kimberly and the Corner of Brazier and Oakview. In each case, 3 condos were put into the space of a single family dwelling with almost no green space because the landlord doesn't want to be bothered with grass, trees or a garden. Concrete doesn't promote good mental health.	10/11/2020 11:01 AM
155	keep two-unit side-by-side housing to a minimum.	10/10/2020 9:42 PM
156	It depends on the neighborhood some areas suit that others are more suited single family homes	10/10/2020 9:15 PM
157	They should not be allowed in many areas of old st vital. They do not fit into the environment. They create problems with parking and traffic.	10/10/2020 3:47 PM
158	I do not agree with the plan of replacing single family residences in existing mature neighborhoods with multifamily dwellings like two unit side by side buildings. I lived for many years in a 25 foot lot neighborhood and moved away to my current neighborhood so I could enjoy more yard space and a bigger home. I do not agree with targeting mature neighborhoods and splitting lots and making these areas more dense. If people want dense living, there are lots of older mature neighborhoods where dense living is available.	10/10/2020 10:42 AM
159	By keeping a neighbourhood character in check	10/10/2020 9:06 AM
160	build in new areas	10/10/2020 8:49 AM
161	smaller houses	10/10/2020 8:31 AM
162	Not to be built at all	10/10/2020 7:48 AM
163	See previous comment.	10/9/2020 11:03 PM

164	No lot splitting	10/9/2020 6:46 PM
165	By making sure the houses look like they belong in the area	10/9/2020 4:06 PM
166	resrict new buildings to just one family occupancy	10/9/2020 2:37 PM
167	Secondary suites should not be allowed in two by two housing because it goes from being a duplex to a fourplex.	10/9/2020 1:22 PM
168	all rental units not good	10/9/2020 1:04 PM
169	Same as question 2 would be my answer. The home has Fit the neighbourhood as well as not be an inconvenience to the neighbouring residences	10/9/2020 11:46 AM
170	Should be built to be in line with housing in the area, not grain elevators next to a smaller house	10/9/2020 10:46 AM
171	remove prescriptive guidelines for main entrances and architectural features, not required, focus on scale, height, positioning, site features.	10/9/2020 10:07 AM
172	It should not be allowed. When people buy homes in a single family area, it should remain as such.	10/9/2020 8:53 AM
173	Places to park needs to be addressed. The back of these I fills are either awful gravel dirt piles with no structure or have no parking at all. Residential streets have snow routes and such. Where are they to go then?	10/8/2020 10:38 PM
174	It is not clear how strong the requirements will be. We need clarification	10/8/2020 9:10 PM
175	There has to be height restrictions. Respect the mature trees in our neighbourhood. Allow only 2 houses per lot (not duplexes)	10/8/2020 8:00 PM
176	While I appreciate the attempt to create guidelines for lot coverage, but one size does not fit all. Consideration must be given to existing homes, and PLEASE ban rock as ground cover. New homes must have enough room in their own yards to pile snow in the winter, and absorb the melting snow in the spring. Because of the infill housing next to us, we now have problems with drainage into our yard, and have had to deal with overland flooding. Two years ago I slipped and fell on ice caused by an infill house running their sump pump hose onto the public sidewalk.	10/8/2020 5:53 PM
177	Hard to comment when it's not stated what the heights are or what the guidelines recommend.	10/8/2020 4:54 PM
178	It won't! It detracts from the core look and feel of existing neighbourhoods by putting up cookie cutter houses which lack style and symmetry while taking away the look and feel provided by mature trees and natural green space. Plus be an eyesore as it doesn't fit into the aesthetics of the neighbourhood.	10/8/2020 2:47 PM
179	Choose areas that are big enough, to accommodate the building.... make sure there is enough room for the residents to be able to sit outside with family or friends, BBQ, .,etc Room for flower gardens, room for garage, parking in the back.. that would be much better. JEAN	10/8/2020 2:13 PM
180	STOP lot splitting and putting 2 boxes. this means tearing down trees, safety issues, fires, traffic and parking issues. Using more sewer and water on existing pipes that are old as it is.	10/8/2020 2:00 PM
181	duplex and rentals in rental communities... single family homes in single family communities. A renter will not care and landscape for their yard like a homeowner will. It depreciates the value of the neighborhood	10/8/2020 1:44 PM
182	Less height	10/8/2020 10:57 AM
183	Subdividing lots is undesirable in many mature neighborhoods. Other options for infill and increasing density are more desirable. Lots less than 40ft wide should not be allowed in some neighborhoods (East Fort Garry is one place this should not be allowed).	10/8/2020 10:25 AM
184	I firmly disagree with side-by-side infills in existing neighborhoods.	10/8/2020 9:59 AM
185	Ditto	10/8/2020 8:34 AM
186	Side yard average of adjacent buildings.	10/8/2020 6:26 AM
187	Lot width should be at least 30' each.	10/7/2020 8:49 PM

188	Reduce the requirements & restrictions for infill housing	10/7/2020 3:28 PM
189	Do not introduce two unit or side by side housing in single family (R1)residential neighbourhoods. Do not split any lots in older neighbourhoods.	10/7/2020 2:25 PM
190	Still allowing significant height increases to adjacent properties The picture shows another massive development affecting adjoining properties availability to sunlight. Guidelines need to reduce the height of these developments, not promote a way forward for developers to continue to impact neighbourhoods negatively.	10/7/2020 2:05 PM
191	Parking must be only lane access. Lanes must be improved upon to accommodate the greater traffic flow. Lanes must be upgraded from gravel. Splits should only be allowed on oversized lots and/ or corner lots.	10/7/2020 12:11 PM
192	Two homes on a site which had previously had a single home can't be improved	10/7/2020 10:30 AM
193	Only if Guide lines are followed.	10/7/2020 10:16 AM
194	Same laneway comment as previous, this will not be workable in many mature areas owing to no back lanes. This will be an opportunity lost.	10/7/2020 9:54 AM
195	two-unit side-by-side housing should not be allowed in existing areas that don't already have this type of housing. If an area is single family it should stay single family.	10/6/2020 9:37 PM
196	Divide the areas more. Have housing that is 75 to 100+ years old and housing that is less than 75 years old.	10/6/2020 7:52 PM
197	They should not be built in our neighbourhoods	10/6/2020 5:55 PM
198	no opinion	10/6/2020 4:10 PM
199	Don’t put these in neighbourhood with single family property’s keep streets with single homes Separate. Balance things this forcing new into old is just not working and it looks ridiculous	10/6/2020 3:29 PM
200	the landscape requirements are not nearly stringent enough in our neighbourhood -- which is well-visited as an urban park. If we followed the side yard rules the neighbourhood would lose a great deal of green space and tree canopy. **Please complete the tree-protection bi-law or policy planned for year 2 BEFORE you complete the infill guidelines, so residents and developers know what is expected.	10/6/2020 3:06 PM
201	2 Unit housing creates little to no back yards, extra traffic on back-lanes (if available). Concern for fires of one unit setting the other unit on fire. Do a survey of small lots in areas like old Fort Rouge and the North End where homeowners will express their existing problems with parking, traffic, etc.	10/6/2020 2:57 PM
202	Not build at all	10/6/2020 11:14 AM
203	This will likely be more helpful than for single family as two unit side by side has been more intrusive and possibly destabilizing to existing character of street	10/6/2020 7:40 AM
204	- Guidelines to protecting neighbouring houses - - Provide regulations to builders protecting neighbouring homes. - Clear guidelines for maintaining the tree canopy and significant fines for those who destroy old growth.	10/5/2020 9:04 PM
205	Rather than 2 side-by-side duplexes each crammed onto their own 25' lot, consider 4-plex of come kind centred within the 50' lot. It seems that most of these infills have become rental properties in which case a 4-plex makes more sense and would be cheaper to build, leave better side yards, leave green space around the building to allow drainage from the roof to be absorbed and not flood out all over the place.	10/5/2020 5:30 PM
206	Should only be built where there is existing 2-unit homes. I don't want multifamily units next door when I bought here for the single family nature of the community.	10/5/2020 1:40 PM
207	Bleah!! Leave the existing neighborhoods alone.	10/5/2020 12:13 PM
208	The site and building design guidelines does not, and needs to include regulations and protection to the adjacent existing structures (such as foundations, fences, garages, unpaved back lanes, sidewalks, etc.) Current bylaws allow excavation to the property line - causing damage to existing structures. This is negligent of the city to know of these issues and approve infill developments, at the cost of and without protecting existing properties. The city could also be opening itself to financial liability. Homeowners who have their houses seriously	10/5/2020 12:06 PM

	damaged by construction on a neighbouring property, could sue the city for failing to protect them. In other Canadian jurisdictions, temporary retaining walls and additional supports are required. It is also included in their guidelines to developers that any damage incurred as a result of the construction of the property will be the responsibility of the land owner to repair. It is essential that these guidelines also include: Safety as a priority. Ex. The construction site must be kept safe for both neighbours and workers, and must be properly fenced. Noise in the Neighbourhood. Include specifics on the bylaw permits of operation of construction equipment. Respect for Neighbours. Include guidelines on portable toilets, maintenance of weeds and unkept grass, site litter and debris, and parking permits for construction vehicles to ensure lanes, streets and sidewalks are not blocked. Communication with Neighbours. Including building plans, estimated time of construction, contact information if they have concerns about the project, and scheduled access to their properties if required during construction. Other jurisdictions have created a Infill Conversation Toolkit as a resource. Addition of a Contact and Enquiries section. Including the Residential Infill Department, Community Standards Bylaw, and 311 for issues and complaints relating to infractions of the City Bylaws. In addition, it is essential that a process is outlined in the development guidelines specific to the accountability of developers to follow these guidelines. If required, new bylaws need to be enacted to ensure the city has jurisdiction to enforce the requirements of this strategy. Currently, without such a process, commitments are made by developers at the initial stages of application to the City and then not completed on site. This includes such commitments as landscaping, parking structures, saving existing trees, and building fences. It also includes infractions to site safety, cleanliness, noise, traffic and neighbourhood liveability bylaws. The enforcement of development permits needs to become the responsibility fo the city and not an adjacent property owners responsibility. In addition, new guidelines should include that final inspection by the City is required before occupancy and/or use.	
209	Do not allow two-unit housing on 25' lots. Insure that infill is actual side-by-side construction on 50' lots.	10/5/2020 10:51 AM
210	Same as before	10/5/2020 8:11 AM
211	The buildings should not be allowed to be higher than surrounding buildings. There should be a requirement to keep old healthy trees. Also should there be a requirement to recycle recyclable materials from demolitions.	10/4/2020 9:41 PM
212	The major issue is a lack of an overall plan, including investments in green space, services, or paying for transportation, water and waste infrastructure that is impacted by infill development but sees no changes.	10/4/2020 5:12 PM
213	I believe the same applies from the previous sectio	10/4/2020 4:07 PM
214	The lot should be larger than 25 feet	10/4/2020 1:52 PM
215	there will be construction trash in the neighbourhood, contractors should see that this does not become the neighbours problems. The neighbours and I have done renovations and ensured that this did not impact the neighbours.	10/4/2020 1:14 PM
216	Stronger landscaping requirements would improve these guidelines, especially in regards to rainwater retention/absorption. The city should encourage this type of gentle density wherever possible.	10/4/2020 10:05 AM
217	Kingston Crescent is not a SxS area. It is asingle family community.	10/4/2020 9:36 AM
218	I do not approve of multi unit houses in single family neighbourhoods.	10/3/2020 10:59 PM
219	I think it is important to maintain single family homes in neighborhoods where the existing buildings are single family homes.	10/3/2020 7:46 PM
220	They cannot be taller than existing homes and building footprint cannot take up the whole lot	10/3/2020 7:26 PM
221	Forget about the 2 unit side by side... making it possible for ONE unit ONLY.....	10/3/2020 3:58 PM
222	See answer to previous question.	10/3/2020 2:01 PM
223	"Significant architectural features" is very subjective. My home was designed by a well respected architect but wasn't to the planner's taste. It got built anyway and gets a lot of "drive-by" admiration and offers to buy. My neighbours love it.	10/3/2020 12:54 PM
224	The same. When they are opening the street, it needs to be inspected before it is filled again.	10/3/2020 11:34 AM

	Sound barriers between duplex. Hours they are allowed to work.	
225	Again, infill needs to be sensitive to existing structures so perhaps a review by third party design professionals trained in context sensitivity (ie: architects) should be required. This cannot be hired by the developer, it must be a true third party review.	10/3/2020 10:48 AM
226	Make sure historic housing stock is not firstly torn down but that firstly potential for re design is sought... and protection of neighbours foundations etc	10/3/2020 10:39 AM
227	Include provisions to have parking in the front with fencing in the back to section off personal spaces. This will open up more options in areas without a back lane. The less non native grasses we use the better. Trees make more sense.	10/3/2020 10:14 AM
228	New buildings should not be allowed to exceed the mass and height of existing buildings immediately adjacent.	10/3/2020 10:11 AM
229	Not to integrate at all. These properties were designed with families in mind by having backyards etc. These side by sides, fill a property with as much as they can for the sake of revenue.	10/3/2020 9:14 AM
230	There should be no two-unit side-by-side housing where it currently doesn't exist where the homes in the area are well maintained.	10/3/2020 9:02 AM
231	variety	10/3/2020 8:20 AM
232	height requirements and rear yard setbacks are really important in integrating infill houses. Two many side-by-sides in a block my cause parking problems.	10/2/2020 11:45 PM
233	Side by siding houses should be permitted on smaller lots; because of the two side yard setbacks that are no longer needed (let's say an extra 6' total) they should be viable on a 44' lot quite easily. Maximum coverage should be higher than 30% (maybe 35%), as you don't have any interior side yard setbacks. I think even higher than 35% could be permitted if owners agree not to build garages. Many of my earlier comments about single family or up-down duplex dwellings apply to this as well - not as many restrictions on facade materials to encourage good design (maybe make exceptions based on the style of the home when appropriate)	10/2/2020 9:42 PM
234	Remove applications (non-refundable $5000-$6000) that are not guaranteed to be approved. Let people decide what they want to build but with the proper permits. If I want to have a duplex instead of a single family home, it should be permitted as long as the upgrade is one step up (no going from R1 to a 20 unit buliding). So single family to duplex is fine, duplex to 3 or 4-plex is fine.	10/2/2020 3:28 PM
235	not at all.... the houses get squeezed. The yards get pinched. And the open sense of community gets "pinched too" Don't do this!	10/2/2020 2:59 PM
236	Do not split 50 foot lots in my neighborhood (Havelock Ave. St. Vital. Try downtown.	10/2/2020 2:16 PM
237	shouldn’t be allowed...period	10/2/2020 1:26 PM
238	The guidelines are exceedingly complex. How are community members supposed to assess them?	10/2/2020 10:09 AM
239	minimum green space requirements need to be addressed	10/2/2020 10:01 AM
240	By not building them. They end up being rental properties and are trashed within a couple of years	10/1/2020 10:18 PM
241	Same concern re corner lots and design guidelines. They are more visible so guidelines should take that into account.	10/1/2020 8:24 PM
242	Size will be the issue.	10/1/2020 8:08 PM
243	Survey neighbourhood residents.	10/1/2020 5:12 PM
244	same as #2	10/1/2020 4:38 PM
245	requirements to be specific	10/1/2020 4:09 PM
246	Maximize the number of these two unit side-by-sides per block. Added restraint on street parking and traffic for smaller neighbourhoods could be a problem.	10/1/2020 3:17 PM

247	DO NOT ALLOW 50 ft. lots to be subdivided into 2-25 ft. lots. There is not adequate yard space to make the property USEFUL. No room for a garden or garage, or for even a dog to run around in a backyard that does not exist. and most times only ONE door ***UNSAFE	10/1/2020 3:13 PM
248	Same comments as in single	10/1/2020 2:40 PM
249	They don't fit in with the area,,too close to the sidewalk.	10/1/2020 2:28 PM
250	no opinion	10/1/2020 1:36 PM
251	nothing to add	10/1/2020 1:13 PM
252	Introduce rear yard setbacks that respond to the context of abutting properties. This is concerning	10/1/2020 11:46 AM
253	I don’t think these requirements are necessary and support the building of larger multi-family dwellings.	10/1/2020 11:08 AM
254	Distance between homes	10/1/2020 11:04 AM
255	The prices are far higher than a smaller single detached house in the area and these sit on the market for a much longer period of time.	10/1/2020 6:27 AM
256	It creates a lot of density in the neighborhood which takes away from green space.	9/30/2020 10:59 PM
257	Again, this type of infill needs to be built on regional streets.	9/30/2020 10:32 PM
258	Does not allow for increased space for yards for increased amounts of people. This reduces the possibility of children in the neighbourhood having a place to play outside at their home. This will either increase demand for public spaces or decrease the amount of people with families moving into neighbourhoods. The regulations allow for too much lot coverage, this will continue to allow infill development to be excessively large and not fit into the community aesthetic.	9/30/2020 8:48 PM
259	the problem I've seen so far is neighbours are obliged to submit part of their yard to allow machinery to work so close to their property line, and trees roots are damaged. Don't allow a front encroachment, make a 5 or 6 foot buffer on the sids but build further back. But also build smaller homes. get used to living small.	9/30/2020 7:16 PM
260	If there’s 38% lot area covered. That should be enough	9/30/2020 6:47 PM
261	Long delays	9/30/2020 2:54 PM
262	If the lot has always been a two unit side by side then the above guidelines sound fair. However splitting a single family into a two unit side by side should not be allowed.	9/30/2020 2:02 PM
263	What does the existing neighbourhood guideline state?	9/30/2020 12:53 PM
264	Too restricted for architectural features and building design (for example, requiring two different materials and a main entrance to be on the front face of the building should NOT be up to planners, but rather architects / builders).	9/30/2020 11:51 AM
265	Unless there are clear examples of these types of dwellings on the street in question already I think these types of infills should be allowed.	9/30/2020 11:42 AM
266	do not destroy existing character	9/30/2020 8:30 AM
267	Need to be cognizant of cost of lot, including demolition and asbestos abatement and the ability of a builder to put a new duplex home on that lot that allows for a profitable build, that still fits the neighborhood.	9/29/2020 11:35 PM
268	They are not that nice looking. They need to be more sleek and take up less of a footprint while still offering enough sq ft.	9/29/2020 11:06 PM
269	The guidelines render entire existing neighbourhoods illegal to rebuild. Much too restrictive for a city-wide policy. Remove restrictions on minimum lot widths, side yards, main floor height, building height, parking minimums.	9/29/2020 7:41 PM
270	These should not be allowed to replace single family homes in mature areas.	9/29/2020 3:59 PM
271	I think there should be a "no rental" rule applied for the first 8 to 10 years a Side-by-side two unit development is built.	9/29/2020 3:15 PM

272	Same design / landscape issues as in previous question. Managing yard setbacks does not ensure that the actual back yards match in the neighbourhood; some of the diagrams in the accompanying documents indicate a lack of useable back yards for the residents of the new homes.	9/29/2020 1:27 PM
273	By simply continuing with the "single Family dwelling" not unlike what is stated in the Neighbourhood Plan	9/29/2020 1:23 PM
274	In older neighbourhoods, ensure they're built townhouse-style and not a big square block.	9/29/2020 9:41 AM
275	Don’t allow them to replace single family homes	9/29/2020 9:39 AM
276	Site and design guidelines should be secondary to energy performance targets for two unit housing.	9/29/2020 8:22 AM
277	Build with neighbourhood character in mind. Bungalows where bungalows exist. Stop filling up entire lots with buildings.	9/28/2020 9:41 PM
278	Again, this is not the neighbourhood for in full housing	9/28/2020 9:22 PM
279	Single family detached where the design fits into the heritage of the neighbourhood so the developers should not be able to apply for any variances such as rear, frontage and elevation ie. distance from street or back lane.	9/28/2020 12:40 PM
280	Since these buildings are designed to fill practically the entire lot there is no room for parking in the back so on street parking really becomes a problem.	9/28/2020 11:27 AM
281	Again, take into consideration the general design and look of the surrounding community, for the infill to blend in with the community.	9/28/2020 9:40 AM
282	These are vague outlines that developers will abuse to their advantage.	9/28/2020 8:13 AM
283	House should not exceed size or height of neighbouring homes. Yards should be kept comparable to existing yards as to allow for green spaces, trees and still grace our environment.	9/28/2020 8:02 AM
284	Do not put side by side two units in areas not suited	9/28/2020 12:29 AM
285	Again, aside from perhaps landscaping and maybe height, I believe prescribing various site location features to be foolhardy. Neighbourhoods zoned in an exclusionary, single-family-only way are going to have to change if our City and planet has any hope of sustainability. The lot coverage requirements at 30 per cent, in particular, are much too onerous.	9/27/2020 11:43 PM
286	Why limit building height when we need to allow more density in our neighbourhoods. We can’t freeze neighbourhoods, but instead should be enabling the market to drive their intensification.	9/27/2020 10:56 PM
287	Restrict the size and number fo trees a developer can cut per lot. Enforce guidelines on protecting trees on infill lots during construction. The city is focusing on mature neighbourhoods for its infill strategy which could result in a significant loss to Winnipeg's canopy. Please consider this inevitable loss as diminishing to the character of these mature neighbourhoods.	9/27/2020 8:02 PM
288	no way	9/27/2020 2:33 PM
289	The lots are too small to support the size of the house. There is no yard, Just a house.	9/27/2020 2:11 PM
290	nil	9/27/2020 9:50 AM
291	No side by side, no duplexes. Single family homes only!	9/26/2020 4:19 PM
292	Two-unit side by side housing should not be permitted in older existing neighbourhoods where the majority of homes are single family dwellings.	9/26/2020 3:59 PM
293	Requiring buildings to include significant architectural features does not guarantee good design, and often hinders it.	9/26/2020 2:55 PM
294	Why does it have always have to be two-unit? Is it to draw more taxes from these properties? Seems like a tax grab to me. Many of the infill homes currently are way overpriced which causes them to sit empty for long periods of time.	9/26/2020 12:11 PM
295	Do not allow infill housing, but if you do keep them small and no taller than the adjacent	9/26/2020 11:07 AM

	properties	
296	The duplexes in the neighbourhood usually seem like the shabbiest on the block. I don't know how to get around the problem of renters not being commited to their home and yard. Doing a better job of making sure someone mows would be a start.	9/25/2020 11:35 PM
297	If guidelines are consistent and enforced this would be a good thing. I have little faith they will be. In my area Glenwood residents concerns are being ignored. Developers can do whatever they want and City Council rubber stamps it. I attended an appeal and the board was rude and condescending to residents. There needs to be height, lot coverage rules and landscaping rules. We have lost acres of nature trees. I have little faith the city will enforce guidelines. The process is designed to make it look like the City is listening, but after attending the appeals meeting it is clear the City is more interested in developers interests then those of its citizenry.	9/25/2020 6:15 PM
298	By requiring height & yard details that match abutting properties.	9/25/2020 4:57 PM
299	If infill means to fill in the empty lots, then why are lots with perfectly good houses being subdivided, the houses torn down, and new buildings put up?	9/25/2020 2:37 PM
300	Need to be same size and scale as nearby properties.	9/25/2020 1:22 PM
301	please see my comments per single family	9/25/2020 12:39 PM
302	don't squeeze them into one narrow lot	9/25/2020 11:33 AM
303	Scrap: landscaping requirements, requirements for architectural features. lot coverage requirements and and building height requirements should include minimums that contemplate maximizing the space, and no maximums. Infill should be prioritized overall. Get rid of parking minimums.	9/25/2020 9:32 AM
304	The percentage of house vs. land ratio creates the appearance of 18th century row housing. Side yards should be larger to allow more distance between buildings to 'breakup' the row-housing image.	9/25/2020 8:28 AM
305	A limited number per block	9/25/2020 8:21 AM
306	No	9/25/2020 6:51 AM
307	Stop ripping down current homes that are affordable and replacing them with poor quality cookie-cutter expensive houses.	9/24/2020 7:35 PM
308	-Require developers who spilt lots to retain the intrinsic natural features of each building site -Require developer and home builders to consult with an architect to ensure homes being built work within the context of each site and neighbourhood instead of "clear cutting" and "plopping" off the shelf plans on to the sites -Require developers and home builders to consider the light requirements of existing neighbours	9/24/2020 4:10 PM
309	proportions of the structures should be considered. lots should not be sub-divided creating tall, narrow, ugly homes.	9/24/2020 3:50 PM
310	Add more character. Some are done very well. With porches. Landscaping is a must. Some yards are never finished and are an eye sore even with a new property.	9/24/2020 12:32 PM
311	same comment as single family homes	9/24/2020 11:22 AM
312	Reduce height and coverage	9/24/2020 11:04 AM
313	Traditionally, there are few side-by-side duplexes in mature neighbourhoods. Up-and-down duplexes might fit better with the existing older homes.	9/24/2020 9:57 AM
314	The guidelines cover my concerns.	9/24/2020 9:45 AM
315	Guidelines must be laws that are upheld rigidly with prompt repercussions to developers if there are violations.	9/24/2020 9:21 AM
316	Side by sides should not be allowed where existing homes do not including side by sides	9/24/2020 9:19 AM
317	do not allow variances to the requirements	9/24/2020 9:08 AM
318	Sadly guidelines are so rarely used, its mostly profit driven.	9/24/2020 8:46 AM
319	Go and look at the area and the existing structures, needs to be more of an individual decision.	9/24/2020 8:43 AM

	Be more upfront with the designs of the newer structure when posting signs in neighbourhoods	
320	We need specific guidelines on splitting and combining properties.	9/24/2020 7:13 AM
321	Please define "preferred locations."	9/24/2020 7:02 AM
322	In many of the areas covered by the draft there is absolutely no mention of the development maintaining the integrity of the neighbourhood by incorporating elements of design similar to what exists.	9/24/2020 12:15 AM
323	Within 400 m of major routes or transit is ok, but increased density becomes an issue for parking, safe pedestrian transportation, children's activities. Off-set entrances improve visual appeal and reduce massing impact.	9/23/2020 10:43 PM
324	I like the idea of prioritizing infill locations, more information needs to be provided on how those prioritized locations will be determined. Also more detail on requirements for other proposed guidelines would be necessary to determine the adequacy.	9/23/2020 10:29 PM
325	Depends on neighborhood.	9/23/2020 10:05 PM
326	I don't like duplex units or multi-family units that overpower an existing single familyresidential area. What about green space? Play areas for families and children?	9/23/2020 9:37 PM
327	I think parking needs to be addressed as an increase in residents will increase street parking. This will disrupt traffic flow on some streets and make it difficult for residents to park. The increased usage on the existing infrastructure such as sewage, power needs to be addressed as introducing two homes where there was once one will increase the amount of usage on this infrastructure.	9/23/2020 8:55 PM
328	Attempt to maintain trees on lots to preserve the character of the mature neighbourhood. I really think more community engagement before they start building would be nice. Easy to passively put up a sign and then expect people to understand what that means. Grandparents and other baby boomers barely know how to email. It seems sneaky.	9/23/2020 8:55 PM
329	Allow more density everywhere. Side by side shouldn't need to exist; townhouses should be more common instead. But allow it all and let the market decide.	9/23/2020 8:23 PM
330	Infill for increased residential density should only be permitted in large scale and corner lots. They should not be squeezed into existing lots or split lots. Infill needs to consider gravel lanes, garbage and recycling requirements and snow clearing. Design standards should also consider neighbourhood context.	9/23/2020 6:47 PM
331	limit number per neighbourhood	9/23/2020 6:34 PM
332	These builders/contractors are interested in profit, not preserving the neighborhood, they are squeezing every ounce of building onto lots that should be 60ft wide not 50ft. It is as if they build, break the rules, then ask for forgiveness. They do not ask for permission then follow the rules, they do what they want, whatever brings in the greatest profit, then move on and do it again someplace else.	9/23/2020 6:31 PM
333	Good	9/23/2020 6:23 PM
334	make each unit of a two unit side-by-side housing the same size as an existing single bungalow housing unit.	9/23/2020 6:15 PM
335	Behave zoning variance guidelines instead of automatic lot splitting so character of neighborhoods can be taken into consideration	9/23/2020 5:48 PM
336	Dont build them they are trashy and will be future ghetto homes	9/23/2020 5:25 PM
337	This type of housing should not exist. It is ugly and only benefits developers who charge double the price for half the space. No one wants to share a wall with their neighbours. The city should stop allowing this type of development.	9/23/2020 5:24 PM
338	Depends on how bullet 3 is interpreted	9/23/2020 5:14 PM
339	No windows on the sides of the houses, more space between the adjacent properties, developer to pay for landscaping for adjacent properties as well to assist with privacy. For example, in addition to the landscaping on the property being built, should the adjacent property owners feel as though their privacy has been impacted, the developer should have to pay up to $X (set by the city based on the size and impact of the property being developed).	9/23/2020 4:44 PM

	Infill can help revitalize neighbourhoods, but at the end of the day, it is about the property developer making money, and they should have to contribute to the community and existing residents...this is not happening at all, they are just going in, doing what they want, making money and leaving the residents to deal with it.	
340	Again tree replacements should be mandatory.	9/23/2020 4:40 PM
341	Restrict infills to one build per lot.	9/23/2020 4:33 PM
342	Affects the overall theme/culture of the neighbourhood.	9/23/2020 4:32 PM
343	New construction could be allowed to move closer to the front street to make more room in the back	9/23/2020 4:23 PM
344	By ensuring that the housing does not tower over neighbouring pre-existing homes.	9/23/2020 4:19 PM
345	same as previous concerns	9/23/2020 4:15 PM
346	It could be improved by adding: "Introduce FRONT yard setbacks that respond to the context of abutting properties"	9/23/2020 4:00 PM
347	Same as my answer for #2	9/23/2020 3:55 PM
348	Side-by-sides should only be allowed in neighborhood areas that already have them. If most or all of the houses on a street are single family then two-unit housing should be disallowed	9/23/2020 3:39 PM
349	These need to be regulated to make sure they are not being built on lots that cannot support two additional dwellings. I understand the draw to the city to create additional tax revenues but this often creates further issues within the neighbourhoods	9/23/2020 3:31 PM
350	same as previous	9/23/2020 2:12 PM
351	Again, rear yard regulations should be greatly relaxed. What does it matter if these buildings extend further towards the back lane? LET'S BUILD DENSELY!	9/23/2020 11:38 AM
352	Restrict doors coming off of the side of the properties	9/23/2020 10:56 AM
353	Good as is.	9/23/2020 9:34 AM
354	Landscaping takes years to develop properly. This guideline is a token measure and does not understand this.	9/23/2020 9:30 AM
355	do not exceed neighboring sq ft	9/23/2020 9:07 AM
356	need to minimize number of vehicles now parked in the area. a single family home changing to a duplex now doubles the cars driving and parking in the same area	9/23/2020 9:00 AM
357	No	9/23/2020 4:49 AM
358	Again, ensure parking to match occupancy not relying on on street spots. Also ensure utilities are not a resource drain or issue	9/22/2020 7:52 PM
359	Allow more of them	9/22/2020 3:58 PM
360	Keep them cohesive with existing homes and structures	9/22/2020 3:19 PM
361	-Consult neighbours prior to infill -Give neighbours a say -Increase setback on either side of infill so as to avoid damaging existing homes' foundations and walls. -Prioritize the renovation of older (historic) structures rather than simply rubberstamp demolition -Prioritize sustainability: reuse of old building materials and old growth wood rather than stick them into the dump	9/22/2020 1:55 PM
362	The question is similar to that in #2 above, and my response here is essentially the same as I gave there.	9/22/2020 1:35 PM
363	same answer as previous screen. Abandon this ludicrous idea also.	9/22/2020 1:28 PM
364	Don't do it. We need to keep all the green space, all of the mature trees. If you have restoration of older homes as a priority, in partnership with Red River College, with trades in restoration, what beautification could happen. The old oak floors, the window panes redone- there is so much potential, but NO leadership.	9/22/2020 1:20 PM
365	"preferred Locations" are implied to be outside of old River Heights; side-by-side should be	9/22/2020 11:39 AM

	integrated into all of River Heights. Also no more Big Black Box buildings	
366	Please avoid the encouragement of crazy roof pitches. The words '...use high-quality materials' - is rather unambiguous. Does that include the use of plastic siding (seeing a lot of that lately).	9/22/2020 9:42 AM
367	No side by side. Single family homes only.	9/22/2020 8:01 AM
368	Set clear guidelines in where such development will not be considered so it is clear for developers and residents seeking to purchase homes in single family areas that homes in those areas will remain the same.	9/22/2020 12:48 AM
369	Ensure that they are bungalows and not high boxes.	9/21/2020 6:41 PM
370	Put them in their own neighborhood, or yours? We are single family dwellings on mostly 50 foot lots, a few have snuck in?	9/21/2020 6:09 PM
371	HOW do you think allowing 2 unit side by sides in will possibly integrate ??? They don't. Want to tear down an old house that is beyond reno's ? Great. Now build one nice home to replace it. Is that so hard ??? Cramming two homes into that lot OR a side by side is NOT integrating. It is forever changing the neighbourhood and NOT for the better !!!!	9/21/2020 4:46 PM
372	New builds should be designed with the style of neighbouring homes in mind.	9/21/2020 4:42 PM
373	Goes very well	9/21/2020 4:39 PM
374	Splitting a 40-45 lot in to two is incongruous with the neighborhood.	9/21/2020 3:25 PM
375	Build one building with two suites saving trees and lot coverage.	9/21/2020 2:56 PM
376	Do NOT allow 50 ft lots to be split. Nothing less than 35 ft lots...or existing.	9/21/2020 2:48 PM
377	Keep them on like streets, also, make sure they don't exit directly onto city sidewalks	9/21/2020 2:24 PM
378	scale back the height allowed	9/21/2020 2:05 PM
379	Really like idea of relocating air conditioning units and other noise makers, as well as exhaust from heating units. Would also encourage availability of composting space and gardening space for residents.	9/21/2020 2:03 PM
380	Ensure that the infrastructure can support the additional population - from parking to water and electricity.	9/21/2020 11:38 AM
381	Make sure there are requirements to replant any trees that have been removed and to complete landscaping.	9/21/2020 11:05 AM
382	Many homeowners do not look after landscaping on boulevards or their own lawns even if it done for them. In areas where sodding is done when sidewalks ends up in tall weeds.	9/21/2020 10:47 AM
383	I think what has been put in place is fine.	9/21/2020 9:59 AM
384	There should be sound dampening requirements as well, side by sides historically have had issues after being built with sound pollution, smells, smoke from attached units. This typically has come from a variety of reasons, all which stem from the initial construction or design. As for requiring existing architectural features, that leaves it open to interpretation, if there are two or three existing in fill units there-they could just say they're copying those. This needs to be better written/laid out. As for prioritizing, no, places like Tuxedo or Charleswood should also be included if this is going to happen as the lots are much larger and more room to expand.	9/21/2020 9:22 AM
385	maintaining the character, architecture and landscape of the area.	9/21/2020 8:31 AM
386	There is still no effort to have the infill fit the existing character with the context of the established block & neighbourhood. Furthermore, more effort is needed to maintain more mature trees and less "boxy" look in mature historic neigbourhoods. The privacy guidelines do not go far enough for a residental neighbourhood.	9/21/2020 8:23 AM
387	two unit side by side housing should not be allowed where the neighbourhood is all single family units	9/21/2020 7:28 AM
388	With attention to the larger area home in terms of general character, in the selection of exterior structure materials.	9/20/2020 11:18 PM
389	See previous narrative answer	9/20/2020 10:48 PM

390	Greenspace is being lost to infill housing. The housing that is being built misses the mark of sustainability, because it does not include a vision for conserving what treasured greenspace we have. This pushes people to want to move outward and creates further urban sprawl.	9/20/2020 9:51 PM
391	Same as previous	9/20/2020 6:29 PM
392	There are no duplexes, nor room for duplexes, *if the guidelines are applied fairly*. So, they wouldn't work at all.	9/20/2020 5:14 PM
393	Introduce must have a walkout basement. Or a separate stairs to the ground level from the basement. Allow secondary Suite in 2 unit Sxs. Almost like a 4 plex.	9/20/2020 3:24 PM
394	Again, the regulations around height, rooflines, and facade materials do not actually integrate well into existing neighbourhoods.	9/20/2020 2:46 PM
395	Some units match the areas they are in. Some are too high for the area. They look like shoe boxes	9/20/2020 1:58 PM
396	provide for a neighborhood review of the application	9/20/2020 1:29 PM
397	Ensure the design looks at the very specific site being proposed (existing buildings and street presence), not just a generic plan by a builder.	9/20/2020 12:19 PM
398	They should have a cohesive appearance with the rest of the neighbourhood in terms of design, Height, siting, etc.	9/20/2020 11:23 AM
399	match the design to the neighbourhood	9/20/2020 10:22 AM
400	Not really possible because multi-family dwellings of any kind increase the population way too much and destroy the trees and healthy ambience of the neighbouthood which will be impossible to replace. But that being said two unit side by side housing takes up to much greenspace. Up/down duplexes when used with restraint are much more acceptable.	9/20/2020 1:05 AM
401	don't build any side by sides in older areas	9/20/2020 12:37 AM
402	Universal home entrance ways are imperative.	9/19/2020 10:17 PM
403	Same as previous.	9/19/2020 7:51 PM
404	Again the higher issue is the problem. Infill has do have an element of change as needs of families change. If we had restrictive guidelines like this some of our best neighbourhoods would not be built	9/19/2020 6:50 PM
405	Ensure developers follow guidelines	9/19/2020 5:29 PM
406	Remove any requirements as listed	9/19/2020 5:26 PM
407	See my previous comment	9/19/2020 3:40 PM
408	Do not allow exceptions. If there are guidelines for some, there must be guidelines for all, strictly enforced. Oversight will be needed and enforced.	9/19/2020 2:35 PM
409	Require Parking and occupancy limits. Some side by sides have to many vehicles on the front street restricting individual parking.	9/19/2020 2:00 PM
410	New buildings have to be the same as existing ones, no bigger, no more dense. All this is meaningless until Planning requires its Planners to comply. For years, Planning has not complied with the 2008 Infill Guidelines or any bylaws. Planners make excuses for non-compliance and there has been no meaningful supervision. Sloppy scholarship, lazy rigour, and outright cheating and fabrication of the truth has been commonplace. Result: no faith these guidelines have any meaning at all.	9/19/2020 1:49 PM
411	Both new construction of two-unit side-by-sides, and modification of existing houses of into two units should be permitted.	9/19/2020 1:49 PM
412	No side by sides	9/19/2020 1:27 PM
413	Subdivisions ruin neighbourhood and should not be permitted	9/19/2020 12:55 PM
414	There's not enough information/detail here to be able to evaluate.	9/19/2020 10:45 AM
415	Not sure we need landscaping requirements	9/19/2020 10:40 AM

416	I do not think it is appropriate to turn one lot into two. Something else needs to change instead of clogging established neighborhoods up with dime a dozen poorly constructed for profit homes	9/19/2020 10:21 AM
417	Use sparingly	9/19/2020 10:14 AM
418	For the duplexes not to stand out in the neighborhood, don't allow duplexes to be built in streets that don't have duplexes	9/19/2020 9:34 AM
419	Should maintain the look of the neighborhood	9/19/2020 9:13 AM
420	See my answer to the previous question.	9/19/2020 8:48 AM
421	Side by sides are fine as long as they match the current ones like I have on my street. Keeping construction workers and equipment off the street and use of the back lane should be used as it disrupts traffic and makes a mess of the street.	9/19/2020 8:25 AM
422	Side by sides should not be added to existing neighbourhoods unless the property already was zoned for a side by side.	9/19/2020 8:18 AM
423	This is fantastic! It’s not always possible to save every mature tree, but street facing trees are super important to older neighbourhoods. There needs to be accountability. Too many Developers get away with stripping the site of mature trees without consequence.	9/19/2020 7:53 AM
424	Developer must compensate adjacent neighbours for any future loss of property value. Essentially do not allow unless the infill property matches all neighbouring properties.	9/19/2020 6:18 AM
425	More consideration is needed regarding the type of mature neighbourhood for these projects — some mature neighbourhoods consist of old beauties in good shape, and shouldn’t have these taken down, ruining the neighbourhoods character, just for the purpose of densification.	9/19/2020 5:27 AM
426	If there are currently no side by side housing in the neighbourhood it should not be allowed.	9/19/2020 12:32 AM
427	Two units shouldn’t be used as infills.	9/19/2020 12:14 AM
428	crowding on small lots creates parking issues,no green space	9/18/2020 10:49 PM
429	Because new homes won't over shadow existing homes	9/18/2020 8:46 PM
430	Infill should be on lots larger than 33 feet wide. Tiny tall duplexs replacing nature's healthy trees is wrong	9/18/2020 8:25 PM
431	See my comments regarding single family homes. The focus should be on promoting increased population density, not trying to match an arbitrary neighbourhood style	9/18/2020 8:02 PM
432	There needs to be a city-wide list of urban trees and homeowners and developers should be prevented from cutting down existing trees on their lot as well as on the city boulevard and if they must they should be required to pay for doing so. A hundred year old elm and a five year old hackberry are not equal in their contribution to the community tree canopy.	9/18/2020 7:25 PM
433	buildings should look like they fit into the neighborhood. they are narrow and tall. making the neighborhood look cut up rather than flow. The guidelines should help this.	9/18/2020 7:10 PM
434	Don't build them in existing single family neighborhoods	9/18/2020 7:05 PM
435	Same as previous answer. There are loopholes here. Side yards must remain. Parking in THE BACK must be provided. Also no removal of trees with ten years of life left. Old growth is part of our neighbourhood. Don’t forget to pull answer from before up here. Also no more than two bedroom dwellings as we also bought here for the quiet nature of the neighbourhood. We don’t need ten people moving in next door. Has the overall “feel” of the neighbourhood been considered?? The SOFT concerns as opposed to strictly measurement and height concerns?	9/18/2020 5:27 PM
436	Don't make them all with suites.	9/18/2020 5:17 PM
437	Limitations of how a lot is to be developed need to be further considered due to already existing infill creating a "low income" housing look and interference with exsiting homes	9/18/2020 5:02 PM
438	Do not allow side by sides as infill lots on streets that are primarily single family. It is completely out of character	9/18/2020 4:55 PM
439	The infill requirements are too restrictive, they should be simple - landscaping requirements	9/18/2020 4:38 PM

	and setback rules for front and rear of the property - that’s it. There’s absolutely no pointing in restricting builder to replace old homes with more modern ones.	

Q5 How well do you think the site and building design guidelines for three-unit housing will help new infill integrate into existing neighbourhoods?

Answered: 669 Skipped: 105



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Not well at all	43.50%	291
Somewhat	29.30%	196
Very well	18.39%	123
Neutral/No opinion	8.82%	59
TOTAL		669

Q6 How do you think the site and building design guidelines for three unit housing could be improved to help new infill integrate into existing neighbourhoods?

Answered: 390 Skipped: 384

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Same thing. Cohesion needs to be created. I shouldn't be able to tell which homes are infill homes but I can. That's a problem.	10/23/2020 8:20 AM
2	As before, surface water drainage must be a consideration	10/23/2020 7:12 AM
3	Similar to the other two housing types, three unit housing should conform well with those properties that surround it. There should be adequate privacy between the building and those neighbouring it and measured should be in place to limit the number of occupants in low-density neighbourboods.	10/22/2020 11:25 PM
4	It is not possible to answer because projections and balconies nullify the effect of setbacks and add to the size of the building. Moreover, there is a need for visitable housing and buildings that add to the variety of housing types in a community. Focusing on one building at a time with no community matrix for what is needed in any community will not result in a complete community.	10/22/2020 10:28 PM
5	More needs to be done to protect mature trees	10/22/2020 10:26 PM
6	Protect the mature trees.	10/22/2020 10:24 PM
7	If a lot already has a three-unit structure than a replacement three-unit structure should be allowed to replace it. Existing infrastructure such as roads and sewers would have to be upgraded to handle the extra volume.	10/22/2020 9:11 PM
8	3! Should only be one	10/22/2020 9:06 PM
9	What about increasing the amount of green space according to the 3 house unit? Children and adults need green space.	10/22/2020 5:16 PM
10	Same answer. This attracts trashy trouble causing renters. Make them single family units and don’t rent them out.	10/22/2020 5:11 PM
11	Again , asking me to vote before I see a successful model presented to the public at large.	10/22/2020 3:46 PM
12	See previous statements on single family, and 2 unit side by sides.	10/22/2020 3:41 PM
13	infill housing should match existing. three unit housing should only be built in neighborhoods that already have existing three unit housing.	10/22/2020 3:40 PM
14	Increase lot width.	10/22/2020 3:25 PM
15	There should be height restrictions for 3 and 4 unit buildings.	10/22/2020 2:33 PM
16	Do not allow lot splitting.	10/22/2020 2:32 PM
17	Do not build them at all on street blocks that do not have similar structures.	10/22/2020 12:07 PM
18	Design styles evolve over time and design guidelines that are overly prescriptive may end up resulting in mature neighbourhoods looking overly homogeneous. Lot coverage and prioritized infill locations greatly limit the ability from mature neighbourhoods to move away from predominantly single-family zoning and single-family residences.	10/22/2020 11:42 AM
19	Make them one unit bungalows.	10/22/2020 11:27 AM
20	Side yard setbacks should be considered further. More needs to be done to address site and building guidelines for on site during the actual building. More needs to be done to address environmental impacts such as lead released during demolition, and to encourage removal, reuse, recycling of usable materials from the home before demolition.	10/22/2020 11:08 AM
21	Triplex on a 35 wide space means you can only go up. This means stairs. And that eliminates people with disabilities and people with mobility issues from being able to reside there.	10/22/2020 11:04 AM
22	I would highly recommend banning 3+ unit dwellings from back lanes, having lived on a 0.7km long back lane in St James with many duplexes - it was complete chaos. There was nowhere to put snow, which needs to be considered unless the city intends to start actually removing snow from back lanes.	10/22/2020 10:12 AM
23	Restrict building height allowances as they have a detrimental effect on neighbouring properties.	10/21/2020 10:07 PM

24	Same as the first question. Check out the housing designs knows as the "triple decker" in the northeast United States, which were created as an alternative to row housing and designed for maximum natural light into the units.	10/21/2020 8:26 PM
25	It is best to allow three or more unit housing only on main routes. Unless there is enough land, they are just crowding the neighbourhood. With not enough land, they tend to build up blocking the sun and taking away privacy of the neighbours. Also has anyone considered that the sewers were not planned for multiple units. This also causes sewer back ups .	10/21/2020 7:13 PM
26	Don't allow in single family residential zoned areas.	10/21/2020 6:57 PM
27	The site and building guidelines need to more accurately reflect the style, size and character of current homes.	10/21/2020 3:49 PM
28	The required external design should look similar to the neighbourhood and/or parking	10/21/2020 3:20 PM
29	Bigger are for recreation, children, pets, gardens; more space between buildings (side and front and back set-backs).	10/21/2020 12:54 PM
30	Blend in with the street scape, with similar architectural details including no hulking big black monstrosities. They should in like they’re part of the landscape, with big trees etc.	10/21/2020 12:22 PM
31	Three unit housing should not be in single family neighborhoods. Duplexes okay, but not three!	10/21/2020 10:51 AM
32	I don’t support three unit housing builds within existing mature neighbourhoods	10/21/2020 10:16 AM
33	We are loosing our trees as it is, Stop building and removing our trees	10/21/2020 8:40 AM
34	No three unit housing in neighbourhoods that don't already have that type of housing.	10/21/2020 7:40 AM
35	That’s bad. That’s an apartment. Too many people occupying a space originally designated for a single family. This will have a negative impact on the neighbourhood. (More cars. More noise. Less yard space. Bigger buildings. Less uniform to the neighbourhood.)	10/20/2020 11:27 PM
36	Section on municipal servicing was lacking any details. How would they know who to contact?	10/20/2020 9:49 PM
37	Limit the number of 'rental builds" of all sizes, allowed in one neighborhood.	10/20/2020 7:34 PM
38	Do not allow	10/20/2020 6:02 PM
39	Hate this	10/20/2020 5:14 PM
40	Not in favour of this type	10/20/2020 3:37 PM
41	No opinion.	10/20/2020 3:06 PM
42	Remove landscaping requirements... nothing preventing removal after permit closure, therefore useless. Also, makes building on small lots more difficult. Remove lot coverage, height and setback requirements. Remove lot width requirements for duplexes... walkability requires density on small lots. Limiting density to larger lots doesn't help for walkability, it actually hinders walkability, which is a prerequisite for livable density.	10/20/2020 2:50 PM
43	All new homes built in mature areas should reflect the architecture of the area.	10/20/2020 2:20 PM
44	In general I have no issue with three unit housing as long as it is restricted to corner lots and to streets with paved backlanes. I do worry about the impact on our sewer system by increasing density though, having had two incidents requiring the services of roto rooter due to sewer backups.	10/20/2020 2:07 PM
45	Should not be allowed at all	10/20/2020 2:03 PM
46	duplex infills are increasing parking and traffic needs, three unit housing is just that much worse. 3 unit infills are most likely to be all rental units, in which case, yards are not looked after as well as owner occupied units.	10/20/2020 11:17 AM
47	Reduce the red-tape and regulations.	10/20/2020 10:34 AM
48	Should be illegal.	10/20/2020 9:36 AM
49	This does not seem to be the big in St. Vital - the Problem is the city planners claiming houses are not worth keeping. No desire for this in area. “Seniors can move into new much more vertical housing “ do you know ANY senior who says this??	10/19/2020 9:57 PM

50	same answer as before	10/19/2020 2:08 PM
51	Don't ruin my neighbourhood.	10/19/2020 11:56 AM
52	This should not be allowed, this type of unit destroys communities and is disrespectful of all neighbors.	10/19/2020 9:39 AM
53	It will not improve the neighbourhood	10/19/2020 8:49 AM
54	These are terrible ideas. What are you doing?	10/18/2020 9:07 PM
55	very poor plan to allow three unit builds on streets with gravel back lanes - more traffic on already badly rutted lanes	10/18/2020 8:33 PM
56	Areas of development are again very limiting.	10/18/2020 8:14 PM
57	Three unit housing plans in the middle of established areas are no appropriate and should be avoided. There are newer areas withing the city that can address this need in a better manner.	10/18/2020 7:01 PM
58	It won’t help. Extending the city boundaries of the city by building affordable single houses for average and low income families is a better idea.	10/18/2020 6:36 PM
59	no	10/18/2020 3:41 PM
60	lot specific to areas that do not overshadow neighboring property	10/18/2020 11:05 AM
61	There is insufficient attention to implications for parking in the neighbourhood, including providing access to plugging in block heaters in the winter. More attention needs to be paid to providing and/or maintaining options for a range of income levels. Some of these neighbourhoods have been places where young people can afford their first homes as well as places with larger more expensive housing. Also, there is insufficient attention to trees, whether existing or new plantings. Many usual measures to protect existing trees are insufficient, and the trees end up dying within a few years of the construction. The construction of new foundations for example will likely to significant damage to any large mature trees on the property. Winnipeg's tree canopy has in the past been a matter of great pride and also has ecological value. Someone needs to be responsible for monitoring the health of both existing and newly planted trees for these sites. Perhaps builders might put down a guarantee deposit to be refunded after 5 years if the trees survive. Planting two trees for killing one large mature one is insufficient. Tree list might be expanded. The setback specification "or portion of block" allows for too much wiggle room. What does that really mean? The entire block should be considered in that average.	10/18/2020 11:05 AM
62	Well not within the scope of this project there needs tp be an addition for a set of rules regarding the protection of the structural integrity of adjacent properties and buildings	10/18/2020 10:32 AM
63	no	10/17/2020 11:42 AM
64	Just not allow	10/17/2020 8:26 AM
65	Even worst than my previous response	10/17/2020 6:26 AM
66	Maintain the character of the neighbourhood. 3 units should be strategically place so as not to depress the value of present homes.	10/16/2020 11:53 PM
67	Well, these guidelines don't say much do they? And maybe existing neighbourhoods just need to accept the fact that they're unsustainable and change happens	10/16/2020 7:22 PM
68	Stricter regulations from an official regulating office, to ensure strict compliance with essential guidelines. Caps on amount of infill creating in mature neighbourhoods so overreaction from greedy developers doesn't see too sharp a rise in population density contribute to overburdening community services, amenities, and infrastructure.	10/16/2020 6:11 PM
69	While urban density is an end goal, again, curb appeal and how well the structure conforms with surrounding homes.	10/16/2020 4:21 PM
70	same	10/16/2020 2:40 PM
71	Keep our neighborhood the way it is no multifamily dwellings on a standard 50 x 100 foot lot.	10/16/2020 2:20 PM
72	Again, keep single family homes in the area	10/16/2020 2:18 PM

73	There needs to be adequate parking.	10/16/2020 1:59 PM
74	No changes needed.	10/16/2020 1:11 PM
75	Tear down all neighborhoods surrounding downtown.	10/16/2020 9:06 AM
76	Do not agree with this concept at all.	10/16/2020 9:01 AM
77	The lack of planning from the planning department in Glenwood has desecrated the character of the neighbourhood, going to 3 unit housing will further deteriorate the area. Areas are over-densified, why continue the massacre by introducing 3 unit buildings?	10/15/2020 10:19 PM
78	Same comment as per two-unit.	10/15/2020 9:50 PM
79	I'm not sure	10/15/2020 9:03 PM
80	Preferred locations are a good idea. As housing goes beyond the scale of a duplex, mid block becomes more difficult to achieve satisfactorily.	10/15/2020 9:03 PM
81	no allowed	10/15/2020 8:43 PM
82	Design guidelines can't make a bad idea better. It seems YOU are trying to move the 'less desirable' inner city a little farther out. Instead of "infilling", and making better, the inner city. Are you not capable?	10/15/2020 7:17 PM
83	we are changing the neighbour hood by allowing three unit housing in areas where there are none presently.	10/15/2020 5:29 PM
84	Once again, splitting lots and increasing coverage with multi-unit dwellings will detract from a neighborhood that already has small lots. Revitalization does not mean higher densities and increased traffic. The is also the issue of allowing these to develop in advance of utility upgrades (water, sewer, etc.) - a backwards plan that will cost homeowners and taxpayers more in the not-so-long run.	10/15/2020 5:16 PM
85	2 units not acceptable. 3 units forget it.	10/15/2020 4:38 PM
86	As long as your neighbours yard is at 5 ft apart or more	10/15/2020 3:14 PM
87	Triplexes should be encouraged on corner lots as it provides good visibility of the front door and easy access to each suite.	10/15/2020 2:56 PM
88	Land coverage should be increased, side yards reduced, To many landscaping requirements that make the project less cost effective and it will reduce the affordability.	10/15/2020 2:36 PM
89	n/a	10/15/2020 12:41 PM
90	See previous!	10/15/2020 12:24 PM
91	What I said in the previous questions. We need mixed-use, different sizes of units. We also need to have different income levels. maybe 10% of all units have to have an affordable suite (that is the same design-wise) as the market priced suites). We need to give people decent, respectable, affordable homes.	10/15/2020 8:55 AM
92	It's a fricking joke!	10/15/2020 8:36 AM
93	As stated before, build like dwellings on lots. Don't change the housing just because you can. Extra units also lead to extra traffic.	10/14/2020 10:41 PM
94	Three unit housing should not exist. that is like putting a mini apartment in a residential area. can the existing sewer system handle such a increased load.	10/14/2020 10:21 PM
95	In designated areas only	10/14/2020 9:33 PM
96	I don't think that the question should be whether or not infill housing will "integrate within existing neighbourhoods," your very design guidelines are essentially mandating that it will not. We desperately need infill housing, that is durable, energy efficient, and built to last, which are things that wartime row housing are inherently not. Developers need to be held to high standards of building, but architects and designers also need the flexibility to be creative!	10/14/2020 7:04 PM
97	Again, the requirements are too permissive and the lot sizes requirements are too small.	10/14/2020 6:18 PM
98	I guess I am not confident that builders don't bully the guidelines as they have in the past. The	10/14/2020 5:42 PM

	proposals seem to help but only if enforced.	
99	My home was bought as a single family residence in a neighbourhood that was zoned for single family dwellings and only multiple family/rentals were allowed in specified areas. Now it is happening on any property that is bought by developers.	10/14/2020 4:07 PM
100	Remove encroachment provision entirely. Encourage a mix of facade designs and materials, ensure height matches neighbourhood. No blanks walls.	10/14/2020 2:50 PM
101	The lots are too small to accommodate these houses; they dwarf the entire street.	10/14/2020 12:37 PM
102	one 3 unit complex rather than two two unit. leave more green space.	10/14/2020 10:50 AM
103	Roof height should not exceed existing properties.	10/14/2020 9:01 AM
104	I like the addition of multi family in every neighbourhood. The rules that make this possible in suburbs - like Charleswood - have to be different from the rules that will allo wthis to happen in West Broadway, or Dufferein. Different neighbourhoods need different rules.	10/14/2020 7:53 AM
105	In all cases, strong preference should be given to rehabilitation and renovation of existing structures rather than tear-downs and replacement with new construction. Any new construction that take places should match existing nearby structures in size, footprint, architectural style and exterior building materials. I object to including corner lots as preferred locations for infill. Corner lots are often slightly larger than mid-block lots and for some families who spend lots of time outdoors, they are very attractive. By prioritizing infill on these lots, the city is removing corner lots as locations where families who want single family homes can reside.	10/13/2020 10:20 PM
106	Encourage the Province to remove any restrictions on infill development as it pertains to its environmental licence and encourage as many units as possible to be built within our aging mature communities.	10/13/2020 8:47 PM
107	Requirements for minimal parking needed for all sizes of new infill, including single family detached and up/down duplex. Concrete guidelines as to what would qualify as 'sufficient', since this term is greatly open to interpretation. Also should set limitations on the percentage of properties in a given area/street that can be split for any property development to minimize the impact to existing properties and residents. More evenly distributing the influx of new residents/builds around the areas in question so as not to have certain streets in a constant state of disrepair due to continuous new construction. Residential taxes on existing properties where infill has been completed or is planned in the near future should be re-assessed more regularly and vigorously, as this sort of infill can decrease the resale value of existing properties, as also can cause great inconveniences to property owners during and after construction.	10/13/2020 8:26 PM
108	I have not seen these and would not like to in my area because of how poorly constructed the two unit housing is.	10/13/2020 7:19 PM
109	It should not be accepted on residential streets where there are no existing 3-unit housing already.	10/13/2020 4:27 PM
110	by maintaining the character of the existing neighbourhood and stringently enforcing guidelines for developers.	10/13/2020 4:20 PM
111	Perhaps pick a new development area for homes like this as they do not suit the look of the older neighborhoods	10/13/2020 3:54 PM
112	I think greater clarity on how parking would be handled (or required) would be preferable - three and four unit properties potentially add significant demand for on-street parking if parking at the rear lane area only allows for a small amount of parking.	10/13/2020 3:16 PM
113	you would need larger lots and have to develop them to fit into the established surroundings	10/13/2020 2:42 PM
114	You’ve got to be kidding me...	10/13/2020 12:17 PM
115	same as previous comment - council does not follow its own rules	10/13/2020 12:12 PM
116	I don't see why "integration" should be given this much priority. It doesn't matter to me at all if the houses on a street all look the same or different	10/13/2020 11:51 AM
117	Must look and fit into the units are the same as the houses around them.	10/13/2020 11:31 AM

118	Three unit housing should only be allowed where the streets already have two & three unit housing. Not in developed residential single family dwelling homes.	10/13/2020 8:40 AM
119	I think that new housing should be in line with the other properties. If it's mostly single family, the two family should be the most, not triplex	10/13/2020 6:54 AM
120	Prioritize infill in preferred locations is subjective	10/12/2020 9:49 PM
121	This will change the entire feel of the neighbourhoods. There are places to build such large units but existing area neighbourhoods are not one of them.	10/12/2020 8:16 PM
122	Height requirements may be too rigorously applied; there's nothing intrinsically virtuous in a single story structure, or negative in a 2 or 3 story build.... Do agree that quality of the architecture coul use a boost....	10/12/2020 7:03 PM
123	More parking for residents..and definitely have adequate greenspace to absorb its own runoff.	10/12/2020 6:44 PM
124	again there is no where to park a vehicle in our unique sty[e neighborhood. Bus service is very limited as well	10/12/2020 9:16 AM
125	We don't necessarily have the room for more density in some of these residential neighbourhoods where parking is already tough. We need to make sure there's plenty of land for gardens, for play areas for children. And at least two parking spots per unit within their property so that it doesn't become congested for all.	10/11/2020 8:55 PM
126	Guidelines need to further consider the impact higher density will have on the amount of traffic and reduced parking in a neighbourhood. Higher density in areas not located near reliable Winnipeg transit will be adversely affected by this.	10/11/2020 8:26 PM
127	The suites should not be rental properties. The building should be a shared homeowner as in a condo living arrangement.	10/11/2020 3:27 PM
128	WE DO NOT WANT THEM	10/11/2020 3:24 PM
129	Main floor unit be accessibility for disabled homeowners, or family and friends of homeowners. The main floor entrance at minimum should be level with the ground. Also accessibility at sides, rear and front of building.	10/11/2020 11:57 AM
130	Please see comment under #4	10/11/2020 11:02 AM
131	Parking will be an issue	10/11/2020 8:34 AM
132	Keep three-unit housing to a minimum, since the traffic in St. Vital cannot cope even with the current population density - never mind increased densiity.	10/10/2020 9:43 PM
133	there is often not enough parking and then they park on the street and the streets do not get cleaned in the winter	10/10/2020 9:16 PM
134	If this happens it should be corner lots as they seem to suit that area most	10/10/2020 9:15 PM
135	Should not be allowed on streets where there are smaller (single story) single detached homes.	10/10/2020 7:44 PM
136	They are terrible for most residential streets. They create too much traffic. They look out of place. They do not fit old st vital.	10/10/2020 3:48 PM
137	This level of compact living is just nasty to think about in our area. We have so many trees and beautiful homes in our neighborhood that to density it to three or four unit housing would really impact the charm and character of our community.	10/10/2020 10:46 AM
138	Please keep the neighborhood’s character incheck	10/10/2020 9:09 AM
139	no needed or wanted	10/10/2020 8:49 AM
140	single dewellings	10/10/2020 8:32 AM
141	Not to be built at all	10/10/2020 7:48 AM
142	See previous comment.	10/9/2020 11:03 PM
143	require approval from exsisting neighborhood	10/9/2020 2:42 PM
144	There is no need for three unit housing in area 2 neigbourhoods.	10/9/2020 1:23 PM

145	Same answer to question 2	10/9/2020 11:46 AM
146	3 unit housing should not be allowed, sewer and water lines are all old in area and this just puts a strain on them. Street parking is already at a premium on streets don't need more cars on them.	10/9/2020 10:49 AM
147	They should not be allowed in single family housing	10/9/2020 8:54 AM
148	Need more details	10/8/2020 9:10 PM
149	Height restrictions are a must. Respect our mature trees and only 2 houses per lot not 4 living spaces.	10/8/2020 8:01 PM
150	I'm sorry, but three unit housing on a 50 foot frontage (which is pretty much the largest lot size you'll find in Glenwood) is too small an area for the size of structure that would be built.	10/8/2020 5:55 PM
151	Again, what are these guidelines?	10/8/2020 4:55 PM
152	no infills!	10/8/2020 3:39 PM
153	It is a ridiculous idea which ruins the look and feel of the neighbourhood and devalues existing property values.	10/8/2020 2:48 PM
154	My answer is the same as previous.. don't squeeze the new building between two others.	10/8/2020 2:15 PM
155	ugly!!!!!!!!!! too invasive to the neighbourhood	10/8/2020 2:01 PM
156	mature neighbourhoods don't need the density increase 3 unit housing will bring.	10/8/2020 1:28 PM
157	These unit house too families resulting in parking problems as they don’t allow for on site parking for these many cars	10/8/2020 10:59 AM
158	I firmly disagree with the concept of splitting existing lots to allow for larger multi-family dwellings to exist in mature neighborhoods.	10/8/2020 10:00 AM
159	ditto	10/8/2020 8:34 AM
160	Should only be permitted on corner lots. No exceptions.	10/7/2020 8:50 PM
161	Have three units on corner lots.	10/7/2020 7:51 PM
162	Reduce the requirements & restrictions for infill housing	10/7/2020 3:28 PM
163	Three unit housing should only be introduced in neighbourhoods that already have Three unit housing. Do not split any lots, keep the green space. Ensure sufficient parking is available on the lot. If parking and green space is not available then the lot is too small to accommodate for a three housing unit.	10/7/2020 2:29 PM
164	Average frontage calculations should be allowed on corner lots only, all other developments should align with existing building faces without exception. It is great to promote planting of trees and shrubs, however with not much land left, it becomes nice when they are planted, fast forward 10 years and a disaster is present. No forward thinking in this plan regarding green growth. Height seems a recurring issue in this document, catering to developer bottom line and allowing square footage profit to affect adjacent properties ability to access sun light. Where is "the right to light" in this province so people can grow things in their gardens????	10/7/2020 2:10 PM
165	I do not think they should be allowed in mature neighbourhoods.	10/7/2020 12:11 PM
166	These will become fire and safety hazards and can't be improved.	10/7/2020 10:31 AM
167	Issues remain re design,height,set back,parking,trees ,etc.	10/7/2020 10:18 AM
168	three-unit housing should not be allowed in existing areas that do not have this type of housing. Single family areas should remain single family.	10/6/2020 9:38 PM
169	Divide the areas more. Have housing that is 75 to 100+ years old and housing that is less than 75 years old.	10/6/2020 7:52 PM
170	They should not be built in our neighbourhoods	10/6/2020 5:56 PM
171	no opinion	10/6/2020 4:10 PM
172	Don’t integrate into residential area unless close to bus route and major road. Again no parking	10/6/2020 3:31 PM

173	Every house with a backlane in our neighbourhood is further than 800 meters from a primary transit stop. Only duplexes or semi-detached homes. All other homes are on the river and exempt. So possibly the answer if 'Does not apply?'. We have NO low-density infill here, so I think people would be pretty shocked to see middle density housing come in before other types of lower density in-fill.	10/6/2020 3:11 PM
174	You are having complaints and problems with 2-unit housing and now you're looking at 3-units. Ha, ha. Give your head a shake.	10/6/2020 2:59 PM
175	Not build at all	10/6/2020 11:15 AM
176	Helpful	10/6/2020 7:40 AM
177	- Provide regulations to builders protecting neighbouring homes. - Clear guidelines for maintaining the tree canopy and significant fines for those who destroy old growth.	10/5/2020 9:05 PM
178	What kind of residential neighbourhood currently has 3-plexes? May be OK on a 50' lot depending on the design. No lot size seems to be stipulated here.	10/5/2020 5:35 PM
179	Sewer and parking was only built for current dwelling sizes. No space for multiple vehicles replacing one former vehicle. Sewer is already problematic so adding households will exacerbate the situation.	10/5/2020 1:42 PM
180	The city needs density, there should not be strict criteria for triplexes as long as there is 1:1 parking.	10/5/2020 12:27 PM
181	None of the suggested would improve and if the city figures it would, they`re dreaming. Just drop it, and do more research on what is legal and what is dangerous before you do any more damage.	10/5/2020 12:16 PM
182	The site and building design guidelines does not, and needs to include regulations and protection to the adjacent existing structures (such as foundations, fences, garages, unpaved back lanes, sidewalks, etc.) Current bylaws allow excavation to the property line - causing damage to existing structures. This is negligent of the city to know of these issues and approve infill developments, at the cost of and without protecting existing properties. The city could also be opening itself to financial liability. Homeowners who have their houses seriously damaged by construction on a neighbouring property, could sue the city for failing to protect them. In other Canadian jurisdictions, temporary retaining walls and additional supports are required. It is also included in their guidelines to developers that any damage incurred as a result of the construction of the property will be the responsibility of the land owner to repair. It is essential that these guidelines also include: Safety as a priority. Ex. The construction site must be kept safe for both neighbours and workers, and must be properly fenced. Noise in the Neighbourhood. Include specifics on the bylaw permits of operation of construction equipment. Respect for Neighbours. Include guidelines on portable toilets, maintenance of weeds and unkept grass, site litter and debris, and parking permits for construction vehicles to ensure lanes, streets and sidewalks are not blocked. Communication with Neighbours. Including building plans, estimated time of construction, contact information if they have concerns about the project, and scheduled access to their properties if required during construction. Other jurisdictions have created a Infill Conversation Toolkit as a resource. Addition of a Contact and Enquiries section. Including the Residential Infill Department, Community Standards Bylaw, and 311 for issues and complaints relating to infractions of the City Bylaws. In addition, it is essential that a process is outlined in the development guidelines specific to the accountability of developers to follow these guidelines. If required, new bylaws need to be enacted to ensure the city has jurisdiction to enforce the requirements of this strategy. Currently, without such a process, commitments are made by developers at the initial stages of application to the City and then not completed on site. This includes such commitments as landscaping, parking structures, saving existing trees, and building fences. It also includes infractions to site safety, cleanliness, noise, traffic and neighbourhood liveability bylaws. The enforcement of development permits needs to become the responsibility fo the city and not an adjacent property owners responsibility. In addition, new guidelines should include that final inspection by the City is required before occupancy and/or use.	10/5/2020 12:07 PM
183	Fire safety was once a priority for side yard requirements. This aspect has been completely ignored with the current infill strategy. The guidelines should revert to the 5' minimum side yards. Revert back to lot coverage requirements that conform to original standards.	10/5/2020 10:57 AM
184	Same as first option	10/5/2020 8:12 AM

185	See my previous comments	10/4/2020 9:41 PM
186	The greater the change from existing housing, the greater the need for an overall plan.	10/4/2020 5:16 PM
187	see single and double answers	10/4/2020 4:08 PM
188	There needs to be outdoor space and more trees.	10/4/2020 1:52 PM
189	not sure - as we haven't had any nearby	10/4/2020 1:15 PM
190	The city should encourage this type of gentle density wherever possible.	10/4/2020 10:05 AM
191	Three unit housing would be horrible.	10/4/2020 9:36 AM
192	Again I think single family homes only as infill in single family neighbourhoods.	10/3/2020 11:00 PM
193	No multi family units in single family home neighbourhoods	10/3/2020 7:56 PM
194	I think it is important to maintain neighborhoods with single family homes.	10/3/2020 7:48 PM
195	Cannot be taller than existing homes or be built right up against the property line	10/3/2020 7:27 PM
196	Making sure that the height requirements not only « respond ....,BUT are IN LINE with the adjacent housing....	10/3/2020 4:04 PM
197	Hello? Same thing. Also address issues of old/inadequate existing infrastructure. What about various traffic issues this infill would create? What about the fragility of some of the older homes that are beside this new construction? Who pays for the damage to neighbours foundations, interior plaster walls, etc.	10/3/2020 2:04 PM
198	See #4	10/3/2020 12:54 PM
199	More inspections!	10/3/2020 11:35 AM
200	Again, sensitivity to context, especially access to sunlight and third party design review needed.	10/3/2020 10:49 AM
201	Communication clear communication to even get it accepted in neighbourhood!	10/3/2020 10:40 AM
202	Make sure each unit is self-contained. For example do not allow for sharing facilities such as washrooms.	10/3/2020 10:15 AM
203	Should not be allowed unless replacing a similar building.	10/3/2020 10:11 AM
204	Not to integrate at all. I stand by what I have mentioned previously, The goal of having as many places on one property is for the sake of revenue.	10/3/2020 9:16 AM
205	They should be cosidered if the property is beside an apartment block or comerical building. They should never appear in the middle of an street with detached single family homes.	10/3/2020 9:12 AM
206	variety	10/3/2020 8:21 AM
207	Only allowing three unit dwellings in neighborhoods where larger or taller homes are already common place. These dwelling on a street with single storey homes are out of place and cannot be designed to fit it in to the neighborhood, just based on the sheer size required for a 3 unit dwelling	10/3/2020 6:46 AM
208	That "overcrowded" feeling will most likely occur when noticing the dwellings from street view, even though the guidelines seem good. The height is still a concern.	10/3/2020 12:28 AM
209	Minimum lot width should only be 30' as three parking stalls can be easily accommodated and that also provides lots of space for a building footprint. Maximum coverage should be higher than 30% (maybe 35%), as you don't have any interior side yard setbacks. I think even higher than 35% could be permitted if owners agree not to build garages. The photo used in the draft document with the caption of "an example of a triplex with unique and innovative design..." shows a very modern looking building which I'm using is in an older more established area. I am definitely for modern designs like this, but based on other wording in this draft document this design would not be permitted as it doesn't fit into the context. This needs to be clarified by saying exceptions can be made as long as high quality facade materials are used, etc etc.	10/2/2020 9:45 PM
210	No no no All here are single family dwellings - here for a long time. 3 unit housing would destroy it all.	10/2/2020 3:00 PM

211	Do not build them in my neighborhood (St.Vital Havelock Avenue). However such an idea might work well in Tuxedo.	10/2/2020 2:18 PM
212	These builders should purchase land for example east of the Mint to start their own “streets”	10/2/2020 1:28 PM
213	The guidelines are exceedingly complex. How are community members supposed to assess them?	10/2/2020 10:09 AM
214	Survey neighbourhood residents.	10/1/2020 5:12 PM
215	same as #2	10/1/2020 4:38 PM
216	rear yard setbacks	10/1/2020 4:09 PM
217	These do not belong in older neighbourhoods. Take away the value of quiet areas. Should only be introduced to new and upcoming neighbourhoods, where buyers are fully aware of their being part of the development of the area.	10/1/2020 3:19 PM
218	DO NOT ALLOW lots to be subdivided into 25 ft. lots. There is not adequate yard space to make the property USEFUL. No room for a garden or garage, or for even a dog to run around in a backyard that does not exist. and most times only ONE door ***UNSAFE	10/1/2020 3:13 PM
219	Same comments as in single	10/1/2020 2:40 PM
220	Building must be exterior "no maintenance " All yards fenced with Chain link, no unsightly wood fences- re: upkeep. Not on corner lots re: grass cutting maintenance will be ignored .	10/1/2020 1:40 PM
221	nothing to add	10/1/2020 1:14 PM
222	the guideline should contain info on importance of the overall character of the street frontage and identification of a street character defining elements that must be protected	10/1/2020 11:49 AM
223	Fine as is	10/1/2020 11:47 AM
224	I don’t think these guidelines are necessary.	10/1/2020 11:09 AM
225	Distance between houses should be considered	10/1/2020 11:04 AM
226	What purpose does three unit housing serve? Many that I see are poorly looked after (yes new builds) and the residents are short term so not committed to the neighborhood.	10/1/2020 6:28 AM
227	They don't belong anywhere mid block. They are suitable for streets such as River, Grovenor, Wellington Cres, Nairn	9/30/2020 10:35 PM
228	Because they follow the single family regulations, they still will be an eyesore in communities.	9/30/2020 8:48 PM
229	All these considerations are reasonable, but don't allow a triplex to be built in between single homes. the traffic of people and cars coming and going would be very disruptive to the homes already there. build them on the corners of a block. BUT, most homes will want to have two cars. so if you think 6 cars parked in an area designed for 1, the traffic on the road is going to be a problem in the neighbourhood, not to mention when snow removal happens on the streets. Quality of life is not improved when you have to live stressed about the city towing your car away.	9/30/2020 7:24 PM
230	Yes	9/30/2020 6:47 PM
231	None at all .. to big for the area	9/30/2020 2:55 PM
232	This survey is not making it clear if these lots are existing two unit housing or three unit housing. If not then letting a developer come in and build units in order to maximize profit should not be allowed.	9/30/2020 2:05 PM
233	What does the existing neighbourhood guideline state?	9/30/2020 12:53 PM
234	Too restricted for architectural features and building design (for example, requiring two different materials and a main entrance to be on the front face of the building should NOT be up to planners, but rather architects / builders).	9/30/2020 11:51 AM
235	This would be tough and for me not serving the neighbourhood.	9/30/2020 11:43 AM
236	build them on park boulevard . see what happens then.	9/30/2020 8:31 AM

237	Need to be cognizant of cost of lot, including demolition and asbestos abatement and the ability of a builder to put a new multi-unit home on that lot that allows for a profitable build, that still fits the neighborhood.	9/29/2020 11:35 PM
238	The guidelines render entire existing neighbourhoods illegal to rebuild, even SFH and duplexes. Much too restrictive for a city-wide policy. Remove restrictions on minimum lot widths, side yards, main floor height, building height, parking minimums.	9/29/2020 7:44 PM
239	Only single family homes should be allowed.	9/29/2020 4:05 PM
240	we should stay away from 3 unit houses unless a moratorium is presented on the units becoming rentals within the first 8 to 10 years	9/29/2020 3:26 PM
241	Same.	9/29/2020 1:27 PM
242	Simply by scrapping the garbage idea, and not trying to re-write the future of history, and keeping things as they are already established in the neighbourhood.	9/29/2020 1:24 PM
243	Only allow them to replace existing three unit housing	9/29/2020 9:40 AM
244	Site and design guidelines should be secondary or tertiary in priority. Energy performance/carbon emissions should be prioritized for infill development.	9/29/2020 8:24 AM
245	3-unit housing doesn't fit in to some existing neighbourhoods. Period.	9/28/2020 9:42 PM
246	I cannot even imagine what one way traffic in and out street would look like with three unit housing. This is not the appropriate area for this strategy.	9/28/2020 9:23 PM
247	Building heights shouldn't tower over neighbouring houses esp if single family housing is neighbouring	9/28/2020 6:40 PM
248	This is such a broad statement! It depends on the neighbourhood, street and community. It would definitely not be suitable for my heritage neighbourhood.	9/28/2020 12:43 PM
249	Older neighborhoods such as mine (Glenwood) are not equipped to squeeze 9-12 (2 bedroom x 3 units) people into one lot.	9/28/2020 11:29 AM
250	I don't think that 3 units would blend in well in communities where these types of building generally don't exist.	9/28/2020 9:41 AM
251	These are vague outlines that developers will abuse to their advantage.	9/28/2020 8:13 AM
252	Not be situated where increase of population will cause problems and encroach on and crowd out already existing residents. Garbage, parking etc all increase and population increases and as does the other negative impacts put on residents. Tree loss etc.	9/28/2020 8:08 AM
253	Not suited for suburb. Needs to conform to area standards.	9/28/2020 12:30 AM
254	The lot coverage requirements are much too restrictive and requiring someone choose from a laundry list of "significant architectural features" is the death of creativity and neighbourhood evolution. Scrap these requirements.	9/27/2020 11:45 PM
255	Rear yard setbacks should only be for second storey and higher. The first floor should not have a rear yard setback (or side yard setback) requirement because it won’t cause privacy concerns like taller building elements might.	9/27/2020 10:57 PM
256	Restrict the size and number fo trees a developer can cut per lot. Enforce guidelines on protecting trees on infill lots during construction. The city is focusing on mature neighbourhoods for its infill strategy which could result in a significant loss to Winnipeg's canopy. Please consider this inevitable loss as diminishing to the character of these mature neighbourhoods.	9/27/2020 8:02 PM
257	get serious!	9/27/2020 2:33 PM
258	Build nothing beyond 2 units	9/27/2020 2:21 PM
259	We want single family homes to be replaced by single family homes on a 50 foot lot.	9/27/2020 2:12 PM
260	What the what???!! 3 units on a 25 foot (sometimes 23 foot) lot? Are you insane? If the new owner wants and apartment block then they need to buy property somewhere else.	9/26/2020 4:21 PM
261	Like two unit housing they should not be permitted in order, established neighbourhoods.	9/26/2020 4:00 PM

262	Requiring buildings to include significant architectural features does not guarantee good design, and often hinders it.	9/26/2020 2:55 PM
263	SEE my answers for multi-family dwellings.	9/26/2020 12:12 PM
264	Do not allow	9/26/2020 11:07 AM
265	No to three units! It’s bad enough the lot splitting. I had one house behind me and now I have two duplexes. I can no longer sit in my backyard as I’ve lost all privacy.	9/25/2020 6:16 PM
266	If infill means to fill in the empty lots, then why are lots with perfectly good houses being subdivided, the houses torn down, and new buildings put up?	9/25/2020 2:37 PM
267	Shouldn't allow them in single family neighbourhoods.	9/25/2020 1:23 PM
268	please see my comments per single family	9/25/2020 12:39 PM
269	Scrap: landscaping requirements, requirements for architectural features. lot coverage requirements and and building height requirements should include minimums that contemplate maximizing the space, and no maximums. Infill should be prioritized overall. Get rid of parking minimums.	9/25/2020 9:32 AM
270	The units that were built in imy neighbourhood in the past three years did not meet any of your above-stated requriements. Your rules mean nothing if you don't enforce them.	9/25/2020 8:31 AM
271	Limit total units per block, so popution density is not greatly increased	9/25/2020 8:24 AM
272	No	9/25/2020 6:51 AM
273	Three unit housing would not fit into many established neighborhoods	9/24/2020 8:01 PM
274	we do not want dense rental housing in our neighbourhoods.	9/24/2020 7:35 PM
275	-Require developers who spilt lots to retain the intrinsic natural features of each building site -Require developer and home builders to consult with an architect to ensure homes being built work within the context of each site and neighbourhood instead of "clear cutting" and "plopping" off the shelf plans on to the sites -Require developers and home builders to consider the light requirements of existing neighbours	9/24/2020 4:10 PM
276	front yard set back guidelines.	9/24/2020 3:50 PM
277	Not at all. Not zoned. In our neighborhood parking is an issue. When winter comes and the 2nd infill beside us complete I will end up having to park so far down our street it is ridiculous that I cannot even park in front of my own house which I have for years. I guess city hall doesn't take any of that into consideration.	9/24/2020 12:34 PM
278	It depends on the rules, main drags make sense, but changing the character of a neighbourhood with lot splitting for single family homes in in favor of due to the cost of doing infill. However ending up with an apartment living beside your single family home of 30 years should not be allowed in residential areas not on main roads ways. I highly enjoy infill on the main drags being more dense. St.Mary's Road south of Fermor has been receiving some great multi-family Infill.	9/24/2020 11:24 AM
279	There are no three-unit homes in mature neighbourhoods. If they are built, they should be constructed away from the mature homes, on vacant land.	9/24/2020 9:59 AM
280	3 unit housing should not be allowed on residential streets	9/24/2020 9:20 AM
281	do not allow variances to the guidelines. that is the problem now. developers have the ability to get a variance.	9/24/2020 9:09 AM
282	very strict guide to were these are located, instead of lot size or limited neighbourhood informal signed petitions.	9/24/2020 8:55 AM
283	Go and look at the area and the existing structures, needs to be more of an individual decision. Be more upfront with the designs of the newer structure when posting signs in neighbourhoods	9/24/2020 8:43 AM
284	Again, let's have some guidelines outlining what's OK and not OK in terms of splitting and combining properties. As well, let's have some guidelines banning things that developers are wont to do in order to get their projects approved - like tearing down all the trees before even	9/24/2020 7:16 AM

	submitting an application, letting properties fall into disrepair, and renting them to unruly tenants to "punish" the neighbors for being against the new development.	
285	Three unit housing does not belong in a residential area where the housing stock consists of primarily single detached houses. Period.	9/24/2020 12:17 AM
286	only near major routes or on corners, nowhere else	9/23/2020 10:43 PM
287	See response to previous section.	9/23/2020 10:30 PM
288	Unless the unit is on a very large property, this seems to be too big for the infrastructure that already exists	9/23/2020 10:24 PM
289	Again depends on existing neighborhood	9/23/2020 10:05 PM
290	I think three houses on a lot that had one makes no sense. I think parking needs to be addressed as an increase in residents will increase street parking. This will disrupt traffic flow on some streets and make it difficult for residents to park. The increased usage on the existing infrastructure such as sewage, power needs to be addressed as introducing three homes where there was once one will increase the amount of usage on this infrastructure. Further, larger structures need to take into account the height of the structure so that it doesn't affect the neighbours.	9/23/2020 8:57 PM
291	I think that three unit housing makes no sense on a property that used to have one house. The infrastructure is not designed for this.	9/23/2020 8:57 PM
292	Too much detail here. Allow townhouses everywhere. No need for specific two, three-unit policies.	9/23/2020 8:24 PM
293	Where will the kids play? In the back lane with all the needles?	9/23/2020 8:12 PM
294	Infill for increased residential density should only be permitted in large scale and corner lots. They should not be squeezed into existing lots or split lots. Infill needs to consider gravel lanes, garbage and recycling requirements and snow clearing. Design standards should also consider neighbourhood context.	9/23/2020 6:47 PM
295	limit number to 1 per neighbourhood	9/23/2020 6:34 PM
296	These builders/contractors are interested in profit, not preserving the neighborhood, they are squeezing every ounce of building onto lots that should be 60ft wide not 50ft. It is as if they build, break the rules, then ask for forgiveness. They do not ask for permission then follow the rules, they do what they want, whatever brings in the greatest profit, then move on and do it again someplace else.	9/23/2020 6:31 PM
297	Good	9/23/2020 6:24 PM
298	reduce the number of tree unit housing to zero.	9/23/2020 6:15 PM
299	There should be guidelines protecting mature trees	9/23/2020 5:48 PM
300	Dont build them expand the cities barriers instead of building on top. London bridge fell and winnipeg the dump that it is has a massive surge of aggressive drivers because some t built rapid transit screwing up every other tax payers use if the roads, who was the guy who decided to use tax dollars paid by car owners and home owners would instead of repairing our tore up roads and pipes they thought get let's tip up roads to put curbs in them for bikes, bikes that pay zero into infrastructure, thought hey let's build rapid transit, transit has never earned a dollar for the city since it was built infact taxpayers contribute 50% subsidy to transit because they operate at a massive loss every year. Who was the smart guy that saud let's dump tens of millions into the failed business that has never made a dollar of profit so that business can save 5 minutes each trip. The bus us subsidized and cheap because it takes longer. Why should we pay massive costs for gas, car repairs, insurance , property tax just so bikes can have nice paths , so buses can save 5 minutes , so they can build roundabouts on roads that gave no traffic, what a fool whoever's put those in. I bet kickbacks happened with that construction	9/23/2020 5:33 PM
301	See my previous comments. This type of development only benefits developers who can outbid first-time buyers for a piece of property, tear down an old house, and put in a multi-unit structure and charge people three times the price. This type of development should not be allowed.	9/23/2020 5:25 PM

302	Need to keep the height of these buildings in check. General concern about how well these guidelines will be followed by planning department when reviewing projects.	9/23/2020 4:45 PM
303	Again, allow only a single dwelling to built on a single city lot.	9/23/2020 4:34 PM
304	The guidelines sound good	9/23/2020 4:25 PM
305	same as previous concerns	9/23/2020 4:15 PM
306	Guidelines could be improved by adding: "Introduce FRONT yard setbacks that respond to the context of abutting properties.	9/23/2020 4:02 PM
307	Same as my answer for #4	9/23/2020 3:55 PM
308	Triplex, Fourplex and Townhouses should be limited to areas that are being substantially redeveloped, or new developments. Multi-family housing does not integrate well into a neighborhood of single family structures.	9/23/2020 3:41 PM
309	Slippery slope argument... if there was a single home, would a triplex be approved in its lot. That is a concern.	9/23/2020 3:39 PM
310	same as previous	9/23/2020 2:12 PM
311	Ensure there are quality parks nearby and the lack of backyards won't matter. Let these buildings extend farther back towards the back lane. Remove parking requirements. (See Minneapolis, Edmonton, Europe)	9/23/2020 11:41 AM
312	Restrict doorways coming off of side properties facing existing properties; garages need to be limited in size/scope or attached to the building if there is a backlane	9/23/2020 10:59 AM
313	Three unit housing need to have appropriate parking available for tenants, including some parking on private property	9/23/2020 10:41 AM
314	Good as is.	9/23/2020 9:34 AM
315	Less design guidelines about what materials a planner thinks looks good.	9/23/2020 9:31 AM
316	only if street already has multiple occupancy	9/23/2020 9:07 AM
317	3 units are too many next to many single family homes	9/23/2020 9:01 AM
318	Should be prohibited	9/23/2020 4:49 AM
319	Triplex should have a minimum of 33’ wide lots	9/22/2020 11:36 PM
320	Lot size? Green space? Parking? Traffic circulation	9/22/2020 7:53 PM
321	Permit more of them	9/22/2020 3:59 PM
322	I think as long as they fit in with the existing neighborhood not making differences between new builds and mature homes so that neighborhoods retain a neighborhood feeling more people will accept them	9/22/2020 3:22 PM
323	The increased emphasis on multi-family units puts a lot of pressure on existing infrastructure and fails to address the needs of the neighbourhood for affordable/ family housing. Our neighbourhood (previously single family homes, some with apartments, and 100 year old apartment buildings) has been flooded with upscale condo and apartment buildings. These knock down 100 year old homes rather than renovate them, look all the same (like cubes of one kind or another) and simply just boost the cost of living here for everyone by raising more income for developers and in taxes. It does not make a more liveable neighbourhood for the neighbours who chose a mature neighbourhood. I have had to deal with multiple construction projects within a block of my home (Dorchester Ave/Stafford) and see no end in site. It's not increasing desireability, it makes our most expensive asset (our home) LESS valuable because developers pay less money for what they consider to be a tear down. It's important to preserve historic neighbourhoods, but right now, I see historic districts only equate to honouring the lives of the white male robber barons around Wellington Crescent. Not the rest of the old, more modest homes in the area.	9/22/2020 2:00 PM
324	The question is similar to that in #2 and #4 above, and my response here is essentially the same as I gave there.	9/22/2020 1:35 PM
325	Abandon this ludicrous idea NOW!	9/22/2020 1:29 PM

326	Build your 3 unit in-fill in River Park South, or Sage Creek.	9/22/2020 1:22 PM
327	Again "preferred Locations" is pretty discriminatory in favor of affluent property owners; housing should be intergrated. And No More Big Black Boxes	9/22/2020 11:41 AM
328	Unfortunately the UK/European idea of 'flats' has a bad Winnipeg interpretation - townhouses. It would be great if a visionary developer attempted a more sophisticated urban design plan.	9/22/2020 9:45 AM
329	This would be even worse than duplexes! What are u even thinking! Split the lot and put two single family homes with a height restriction. Simple. The city gets their density and extra $$$ and we get to keep our neighbourhood.	9/22/2020 8:04 AM
330	Three unit development should not be allowed on split lots. The fact that such development would be allowed in lost at are 35 wide seems way too small frontage for a triplex.	9/22/2020 12:49 AM
331	Again, keeping them at bungalow height.	9/21/2020 6:42 PM
332	Put them somewhere else. We are not zoned for this! Nor do we want them.	9/21/2020 6:11 PM
333	STOP allowing our mature neighbourhoods to be destroyed. My neighbourhood has been ruined and none of the original homeowners on my block are happy with the infill housing !!!	9/21/2020 4:47 PM
334	See previous answers.	9/21/2020 4:43 PM
335	That is too many.	9/21/2020 2:57 PM
336	Do NOT allow lots to split (sub-divide). NOthing less than 35 ft lots frontage.	9/21/2020 2:49 PM
337	ensuring privacy and sunlight for neighbouring properties is not unreasonably compromised - requirement rather than a recommendation	9/21/2020 2:07 PM
338	Would like to see additional requirements for all mutli-units, townhouses, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, apartments, and townhomes to have space available for the residents to use as onsite composting of organics and for gardening and growing of food. This should help divert waste from city landfills and allow for those in such facilities to have the option to contribute to green composting, as people living in a single family home can do. Currently composting isn't available for most multi-unit residences. Having access to garden space would also improve quaility of life and neighborhood community as many multi-unit residences don't have access to gardens. Also would help improve food security.	9/21/2020 2:04 PM
339	Must replant any removed trees!!	9/21/2020 11:05 AM
340	There is a shortage of parking in most older neighborhoods as most homeowners have more than 2 cars. Whenever there is any local street or lane improvements happen in older neighborhoods there is no place to park the cars and traffic is looking to find parking is difficult especially for anyone with limited mobility.	9/21/2020 10:54 AM
341	It is fine and should help.	9/21/2020 10:00 AM
342	Again, these units should be optioned to be built throughout high income areas, not just the lower income/tax brackets. Charleswood/Tuxedo should have always been some of the first areas to be targeted as their lot sizes allow for more growth/more units to be put in. As well as rental buildings and renters to move into the area.	9/21/2020 9:26 AM
343	somewhat	9/21/2020 8:38 AM
344	making sure the units are suitable for the area in question such as big house/building, small plot of land.	9/21/2020 8:33 AM
345	if neighbourhood is single family housing it should remain as such	9/21/2020 7:29 AM
346	With attention to the back lane egress and entry to garage, parking and visitor and services for each unit, opportunity to park, without inflicting a downside for the older homes on that street and vicinity. Each unit also brings a density of come and go traffic, creating parking issues,	9/20/2020 11:22 PM
347	same as previous	9/20/2020 6:31 PM
348	Multi-family dwellings are not part of the neighbourhoods character.	9/20/2020 5:16 PM
349	Make smaller building foot print but allow 3 story building plus basement.	9/20/2020 3:25 PM

350	most of these units are rentals, they make the area look cheaper	9/20/2020 1:59 PM
351	provide for a neighborhood review of the application	9/20/2020 1:29 PM
352	Ensure the design looks at the very specific site being proposed (existing buildings and street presence), not just a generic plan by a builder.	9/20/2020 12:19 PM
353	It is ridiculous to even consider integrating three unit housing in these mature neighborhoods. The infrastructure wont take the increase in population and it will totally destroy the character of the neighbourhood	9/20/2020 1:05 AM
354	don't just don't as all the other properties will be appealing the property assessments due to a complete loss of privacy in what little back yards we have	9/20/2020 12:39 AM
355	Universal home entrance ways are imperative.	9/19/2020 10:18 PM
356	Same as first.	9/19/2020 7:51 PM
357	Three unit housing does not integrate into established / older neighourhoods	9/19/2020 7:23 PM
358	Ensure developers actually follow guidelines	9/19/2020 5:29 PM
359	remove all requirements	9/19/2020 5:27 PM
360	This goes beyond the existing housing in the area. It's a jump to more people and vehicles in a typical single home area	9/19/2020 5:26 PM
361	I don't think triplexes are as good a fit in the area unless the lot is bigger.	9/19/2020 4:53 PM
362	See my previous comment	9/19/2020 3:40 PM
363	Do not allow 3-unit housing if they don't fit the nature of the existing neighbourhood.	9/19/2020 2:36 PM
364	These seem like very reasonable requirements and I cannot think of changes.	9/19/2020 2:25 PM
365	Parking Requirements	9/19/2020 2:02 PM
366	New buildings have to be the same as existing ones, no bigger, no more dense. What kind of flummery is "respond to the context"? Respond seems to mean now: ignore. All this is meaningless until Planning requires its Planners to comply. For years, Planning has not complied with the 2008 Infill Guidelines or any bylaws. Planners make excuses for non-compliance and there has been no meaningful supervision. Sloppy scholarship, lazy rigour, and outright cheating and fabrication of the truth has been commonplace. Result: no faith these guidelines have any meaning at all.	9/19/2020 1:50 PM
367	No way to improve	9/19/2020 1:28 PM
368	Subdivisions should not be allowed	9/19/2020 12:56 PM
369	There's not enough information/detail here to be able to evaluate.	9/19/2020 10:45 AM
370	Not sure we need rear yard setbacks. Depends what it is set at. Responding to the context of abutting properties makes sense. But most of these descriptions depends on what it is set at and how the city applies it. It should not be too prescriptive.	9/19/2020 10:44 AM
371	Don’t build them	9/19/2020 10:35 AM
372	I do not think it is appropriate to squeeze more than a single dwelling into a preexisting lot. Something else needs to change instead of clogging established neighborhoods up with dime a dozen poorly constructed for profit homes	9/19/2020 10:24 AM
373	Not in standard single residence neighbourhood	9/19/2020 10:15 AM
374	Do not allow these in residential street sections. What about parking requirements?	9/19/2020 9:35 AM
375	See first.	9/19/2020 8:48 AM
376	We do not need three unit housing in established neighbourhoods in Winnipeg.	9/19/2020 8:19 AM
377	Super important. Very happy with this.	9/19/2020 7:53 AM
378	See earlier comments.	9/19/2020 6:18 AM

379	Three units shouldn't be used at all as infills.	9/19/2020 12:14 AM
380	Improve building form and design by requiring buildings to include significant architectural features- I need more info on what this would include	9/18/2020 8:47 PM
381	No infill on lots 33 feet and under	9/18/2020 8:26 PM
382	The city should simply decide what the largest allowed development is for a given square footage/lot size. As a result the larger the lot size the larger the potential infill development regardless of the name or style of a given neighbourhood	9/18/2020 8:03 PM
383	Too tall with no elevator	9/18/2020 8:00 PM
384	I would like to see a requirement for multiple housing units that they maintain the facade of the house they are replacing, or create the same street feel, even if they have denser housing behind them.	9/18/2020 7:26 PM
385	It appears to help it fit into the neighborhood	9/18/2020 7:14 PM
386	There are no ways to improve it	9/18/2020 7:06 PM
387	See my previous answer. And multiply by two. I am in a single family home area with SPACE. Bought here to NOT be in a brand new squishy area overrun with people cars and no yards. How about buying lots from Qualico and squishing infill in their neighborhoods? They already have close together teeny tiny lots. Here. Lots of people (not infill) are buying. Tearing down. Building huge. FOR THE SPACE.	9/18/2020 5:30 PM
388	Make one building with 3 suites instead of 3 separate buildings.	9/18/2020 5:18 PM
389	again limitations on height and appearance are essential to maintain the look of a community and the affect the infill has on surrounding home owner. Renting the new infill homes MUST be limited	9/18/2020 5:03 PM
390	Same reason as stated previously. We should be allowing builders to put in townhomes that are higher than nearby building - why limit it? 2-3 floors would be perfect to increase density.	9/18/2020 4:40 PM

Q7 How well do you think the site and building design guidelines for four-unit housing will help new infill integrate into existing neighbourhoods?

Answered: 648 Skipped: 126



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Not well at all	45.68%	296
Somewhat	27.31%	177
Very well	17.28%	112
Neutral/No opinion	9.72%	63
TOTAL		648

Q8 How do you think the site and building design guidelines for four-unit housing could be improved to help new infill integrate into existing neighbourhoods?

Answered: 373 Skipped: 401

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Same comments as before.	10/23/2020 8:20 AM
2	Four-unit housing should conform reasonably well with surrounding properties. Well it is rare that this infill will be completely surrounded by similar, four-unit buildings, the new building should be scaled to those that surround it, not being overly large or extravagant, when compared to neighbouring properties. Adequate privacy should be implemented and, like three unit buildings, the number of occupants should be limited.	10/22/2020 11:27 PM
3	If the 4-unit dwelling can go up to 42% (taking the additional 12% from the garage) -- will cars from the building still need parking on the lot, and won't that take up more space on the lot? Seems like the building is going to be very large, with a parking lot behind it.	10/22/2020 11:10 PM
4	• Improve landscaping requirements – there is need for landscape requirements that cannot be waived in any City committee • Introduce lot coverage requirements – projections, including balconies need to be included in the lot coverage • Building height requirements that respond to the context of abutting properties – New building should not tower over the abutting properties and building should need to have similar roof lines as a slanted roof can appear on a block of homes with a peaked roof is out of place. • Introduce rear yard setbacks that respond to the context of abutting properties but a setback should include more than a parking area • Improve building form and design by requiring buildings to include significant architectural features - Often new homes look like a bad crazy quilt and do not fit into the street or community. My street has primarily the same type of homes with peaked roofs and they are lovely and a new homes with 'significant architectural features' could be out of place.	10/22/2020 10:45 PM
5	More needs to be done to protect mature trees	10/22/2020 10:26 PM
6	Protect the mature trees.	10/22/2020 10:25 PM
7	Existing infrastructure such as roads and sewers would have to be upgraded to handle the extra volume.	10/22/2020 9:11 PM
8	Again, is this just a social adventure to appease neighbourhoods but once the housing is sold, who is going to make the developer do these new guidelines. An infill house, which was just complete at 667 Kildonan Drive was supposed to have a tree landed, which has never been done. The house is priced at 399,000 and there is virtually no green space. The buyer will have to have a Volkswagen or Smart Car to park in the back. We need "Teeth" for these guidelines!	10/22/2020 5:21 PM
9	If a single family home is torn down then it should be law that a single family home is put back there. If it was already a multi-unit building, then fine replace it with that.	10/22/2020 5:13 PM
10	All dependent Architectural design and complementing of existing neighbourhood aesthetics and form .	10/22/2020 3:48 PM
11	Four unit housing does not belong in infill housing in R1A1 If there are no 4 unit housing units, they should not be allowed. If there are existing 4 unit housing units then the use of the words shall and will should be used and not only on a case by case basis.	10/22/2020 3:45 PM
12	stop allowing multi-units in single family bungalow neighborhoods.	10/22/2020 3:40 PM
13	Older neighbourhoods often don't have the space, and/or infrastructure to support larger builds such a four unit housing.	10/22/2020 3:23 PM
14	There should be height restrictions on four unit housing. Three and four unit housing should be restricted to corners except on main arteries.	10/22/2020 2:33 PM
15	Do not allow lot splitting.	10/22/2020 2:32 PM
16	The insistence on landscaping and green space as density increases is more and more compelling.	10/22/2020 1:33 PM
17	Don't build them on street blocks that do not have similar structures in place.	10/22/2020 12:08 PM
18	Design styles evolve over time and design guidelines that are overly prescriptive may end up resulting in mature neighbourhoods looking overly homogeneous. Lot coverage and prioritized infill locations greatly limit the ability from mature neighbourhoods to move away from predominantly single-family zoning and single-family residences.	10/22/2020 11:42 AM
19	Make them one unit bungalows .	10/22/2020 11:28 AM

20	Side yard setbacks should be further considered - including appropriate yard space for residents. More needs to be done to address site and building guidelines for on site during the actual building. More needs to be done to address environmental impacts such as lead released during demolition, and to encourage removal, reuse, recycling of usable materials from the home before demolition.	10/22/2020 11:08 AM
21	I don't know.	10/22/2020 11:06 AM
22	See previous comment on back lanes. Balconies should be limited to front and rear of the building.	10/22/2020 10:16 AM
23	Eliminating four-unit housing as it is a cash cow for developers	10/22/2020 9:58 AM
24	Is this going to be on gravel alleys? if so this is not planning but rather desperation ignoring actual neighborhood conditions	10/22/2020 9:54 AM
25	Four units should not be allowed except on corner lots	10/21/2020 10:10 PM
26	Prioritizing infill in "preferred locations" will have a negative impact and make a once desirable location, less desirable because of loss of neighbourhood characteristics.	10/21/2020 10:10 PM
27	Again with the barrier-free considerations and the landscaping sustainability.	10/21/2020 8:26 PM
28	Put these on main routes only. They do not add to a community.	10/21/2020 7:14 PM
29	Don't allow in single family residential zoned areas.	10/21/2020 6:57 PM
30	The site and building guidelines need to more accurately reflect the style, size and character of current homes.	10/21/2020 3:49 PM
31	The required external design should look similar to the neighbourhood and/or parking	10/21/2020 3:20 PM
32	Bigger yard, underground parking to address street congestion issues, bigger set-backs on all sides. Only on block corners and only if backlane paved.	10/21/2020 12:56 PM
33	Never higher than two stories. Nothing that looks trendy or “on trend” in cladding or colours that will look outdated in a few years. Should be classic in design, to look great for many years.	10/21/2020 12:24 PM
34	Should not be allowed	10/21/2020 10:52 AM
35	Don’t support four unit housing builds in mature neighbourhoods	10/21/2020 10:17 AM
36	Just regular homes should be built on the lot that people purchase. Go to another area if you want more housing being built	10/21/2020 8:42 AM
37	No four-unit housing in neighbourhoods that don't already have that type of housing.	10/21/2020 7:41 AM
38	Don’t make them. Those are small apartments at this point.	10/20/2020 11:27 PM
39	Section on municipal servicing was lacking any details. How would they know who to contact?	10/20/2020 9:49 PM
40	Limit the number of 4-unit builds allowed on any one street and in any one neighborhood. Our sewer system, run-off sewers, are often backed up and overflowing the streets after heavey rains this year already. What will happen once all these additional new builds over the 178 we already have, add to our present sewer/run-off system. And what happens to the removed greenspaces/treed lots...our mature-treed community is being deforested.	10/20/2020 7:39 PM
41	Neighborhood value comes down	10/20/2020 6:02 PM
42	Enough. Stop infill	10/20/2020 5:14 PM
43	not in favour at all for 4 unit in residential areas	10/20/2020 3:37 PM
44	Up to 4-plexes should be allowed as of right, with very (and I mean VERY) minimal site requirements. As such, remove landscaping requirements... nothing preventing removal after permit closure, therefore useless. Also, makes building on small lots more difficult. Remove lot coverage, height and setback requirements. Remove lot width requirements for duplexes... walkability requires density on small lots. Limiting density to larger lots doesn't help for walkability, it actually hinders walkability, which is a prerequisite for livable density.	10/20/2020 2:52 PM
45	They should blend into the existing look of the area.	10/20/2020 2:21 PM

46	In general I have no issue with four unit housing as long as it is restricted to corner lots and to streets with paved backlanes. I do worry about the impact on our sewer system by increasing density though, having had two incidents requiring the services of roto rooter due to sewer backups.	10/20/2020 2:07 PM
47	Should not be allowed to build in mature, existing neighbourhoods.	10/20/2020 2:04 PM
48	same issues as 3 unit housing	10/20/2020 11:18 AM
49	Design guidelines should be from professional planners and not neighbourhood groups.	10/20/2020 10:36 AM
50	Illegal.	10/20/2020 9:36 AM
51	in some locations, eg near services like schools, health care	10/19/2020 3:28 PM
52	Don't ruin my neighbourhood.	10/19/2020 11:57 AM
53	This should not be allowed in single family neighborhoods. Permit only in areas of city to replace existing rooming houses or existing large split level dwellings.	10/19/2020 9:41 AM
54	No	10/19/2020 8:50 AM
55	I didn’t drink the cool aid. Who came up with these childish rushed ideas? I don’t want infill. In Covid people don’t want dense neighborhoods. Find another project.	10/18/2020 9:08 PM
56	this should not be permitted where there are gravel lanes.	10/18/2020 8:33 PM
57	Same.	10/18/2020 8:14 PM
58	This is not an approprite option for the city's beautiful mature areas with their landscaped yards.	10/18/2020 7:02 PM
59	Not a good idea.	10/18/2020 6:38 PM
60	no	10/18/2020 3:42 PM
61	Significant landscaping and only allow in areas with sufficient parking or very easy access to transit. Along main corridors and only in zones already allowing this type of housing	10/18/2020 11:08 AM
62	There is insufficient attention to implications for parking in the neighbourhood, including providing access to plugging in block heaters in the winter. More attention needs to be paid to providing and/or maintaining options for a range of income levels. Some of these neighbourhoods have been places where young people can afford their first homes as well as places with larger more expensive housing. Also, there is insufficient attention to trees, whether existing or new plantings. Many usual measures to protect existing trees are insufficient, and the trees end up dying within a few years of the construction. The construction of new foundations for example will likely to significant damage to any large mature trees on the property. Winnipeg's tree canopy has in the past been a matter of great pride and also has ecological value. Someone needs to be responsible for monitoring the health of both existing and newly planted trees for these sites. Perhaps builders might put down a guarantee deposit to be refunded after 5 years if the trees survive. Planting two trees for killing one large mature one is insufficient. Tree list might be expanded. The setback specification "or portion of block" allows for too much wiggle room. What does that really mean? The entire block should be considered in that average.	10/18/2020 11:05 AM
63	Well not within the scope of this project there needs tp be an addition for a set of rules regarding the protection of the structural integrity of adjacent properties and buildings	10/18/2020 10:32 AM
64	no	10/17/2020 11:42 AM
65	Not allow	10/17/2020 8:26 AM
66	This wouldn't even be a feasible option if anyone would assess the area properly	10/17/2020 6:27 AM
67	Ensure they are strategically placed so as not to depress present home values.	10/16/2020 11:54 PM
68	I think no more of this than anything I've read so far.	10/16/2020 7:22 PM
69	This is getting ridiculous	10/16/2020 7:02 PM
70	Stricter regulations from an official regulating office, to ensure strict compliance with essential guidelines. Caps on amount of infill creating in mature neighbourhoods so overreaction from	10/16/2020 6:11 PM

	greedy developers doesn't see too sharp a rise in population density contribute to overburdening community services, amenities, and infrastructure.	
71	same	10/16/2020 2:40 PM
72	single family homes only	10/16/2020 2:20 PM
73	Keep single family homes in the area	10/16/2020 2:18 PM
74	There has to be adequate parking.	10/16/2020 1:59 PM
75	No changes needed.	10/16/2020 1:11 PM
76	As other Canadian cities have demonstrated the entire street should be torn down where the larger infill is going.	10/16/2020 9:08 AM
77	Do not agree with this concept at all.	10/16/2020 9:02 AM
78	The lack of planning from the planning department in Glenwood has desecrated the character of the neighbourhood, going to 3 unit housing will further deteriorate the area. Areas are over-densified, why continue the massacre by introducing 3 unit buildings?	10/15/2020 10:19 PM
79	Same comment as per two-unit.	10/15/2020 9:51 PM
80	I'm not sure	10/15/2020 9:03 PM
81	Same as for triplex	10/15/2020 9:03 PM
82	not allowed	10/15/2020 8:44 PM
83	All of the infill buildings that I have seen do not meet existing new build landscape elevation requirements. The City of Winnipeg is in breach of it's own requirements. Who shall be liable?	10/15/2020 7:24 PM
84	restrict height limits on new housing. New housing should fit in not stand out in existing areas	10/15/2020 5:30 PM
85	Once again, increasing occupant density before utility upgrades is backwards. Furthermore, additional traffic and greatly reduced greenspace on these properties will significantly detract from the appearance and function of the neighborhoods.	10/15/2020 5:18 PM
86	They look ridiculous and no matter what is "proposed" they will not fit in to mature neighbourhoods ie st. Vital.	10/15/2020 4:41 PM
87	Where 4-plexes require a rear parking pad, there should be a requirement for wiring at least one 240 volt, 50 amp circuit near the parking area. This would encourage adoption of electric vehicles by providing an easy way for the homeowner to install an electric car charger in the future.	10/15/2020 2:56 PM
88	Land coverage should be increased, side yards reduced, To many landscaping requirements that make the project less cost effective and it will reduce the affordability.	10/15/2020 2:37 PM
89	n/a	10/15/2020 12:41 PM
90	Homes need more green space!	10/15/2020 12:25 PM
91	If landscaping is of such great importance for these developments, 4 shrubs and a single tree is a paltry requirement to achieve a well considered and integrated landscape.	10/15/2020 10:16 AM
92	Same as in last questions. We also need to be aware of neighbouring views/ windows and what size of complex you build in the area. We do not want infill to be a burden. We want it to be exciting and fresh.	10/15/2020 8:56 AM
93	Sure keep sticking a knife into the neighbours backs.	10/15/2020 8:37 AM
94	If the area is zoned for single family detached, leave it that way. Extra traffic. Destroys the character of the neighbourhood. Build like for like.	10/14/2020 10:43 PM
95	I didn't know such a thing existed, and if it does, it is totally out of line.	10/14/2020 10:25 PM
96	Same as last question	10/14/2020 9:34 PM
97	Comments are same as last three categories	10/14/2020 7:46 PM
98	These requirements do nothing concrete to protect the interests of existing neighbourhood	10/14/2020 6:19 PM

	residents and property owners.	
99	Same concerns as the triplexes. Better if they actually get applied.	10/14/2020 5:42 PM
100	Not allow it at all in single family zoned areas.	10/14/2020 4:08 PM
101	Remove encroachment provision entirely. Encourage a mix of front facade materials and designs, keep height to match neighbourhood. Remove tandem parking provision - single space parking only. No blank walls.	10/14/2020 2:50 PM
102	if these are built a limit on how many can be built in any area should be implemented	10/14/2020 1:03 PM
103	Build on commercial lots somewhere; not in residential areas.	10/14/2020 12:38 PM
104	In this area, there are maybe two lots that can I can think of that could accomodate four-unit housing and introducing any is out of pattern and character for this area	10/14/2020 10:33 AM
105	Does not fit into an existing neighborhood. Roof too high and building too large.	10/14/2020 9:04 AM
106	vehemently opposed to the notion of four-unit housing. Would a single family home on Wellington take kindly to a multi-unit being built beside it??	10/14/2020 9:02 AM
107	I like the addition of multi family in every neighbourhood. The rules that make this possible in suburbs - like Charleswood - have to be different from the rules that will allo wthis to happen in West Broadway, or Dufferein. Different neighbourhoods need different rules.	10/14/2020 7:53 AM
108	In all cases, strong preference should be given to rehabilitation and renovation of existing structures rather than tear-downs and replacement with new construction. Any new construction that take places should match existing nearby structures in size, footprint, architectural style and exterior building materials. I object to including corner lots as preferred locations for infill. Corner lots are often slightly larger than mid-block lots and for some families who spend lots of time outdoors, they are very attractive. By prioritizing infill on these lots, the city is removing corner lots as locations where families who want single family homes can reside.	10/13/2020 10:20 PM
109	Be more imaginative and transformative - encourage a young, age friendly approach to urban renewal. Stop allowing financial discrimination by way of zoning and development restrictions and create housing for everyone.	10/13/2020 8:48 PM
110	Requirements for minimal parking needed for all sizes of new infill, including single family detached and up/down duplex. Concrete guidelines as to what would qualify as 'sufficient', since this term is greatly open to interpretation. Also should set limitations on the percentage of properties in a given area/street that can be split for any property development to minimize the impact to existing properties and residents. More evenly distributing the influx of new residents/builds around the areas in question so as not to have certain streets in a constant state of disrepair due to continuous new construction. Residential taxes on existing properties where infill has been completed or is planned in the near future should be re-assessed more regularly and vigorously, as this sort of infill can decrease the resale value of existing properties, as also can cause great inconveniences to property owners during and after construction.	10/13/2020 8:27 PM
111	Limitations should be made. Additionally parking should be ensured. Almost all of the old homes in my area do not have front or back parking. These new homes have the potential to and they arent being built	10/13/2020 7:20 PM
112	not well at all. This type of unit should not be accepted as an infill.	10/13/2020 4:27 PM
113	by maintaining the character of the existing neighbourhood and stringently enforcing guidelines for developers.	10/13/2020 4:21 PM
114	I think greater clarity on how parking would be handled (or required) would be preferable - three and four unit properties potentially add significant demand for on-street parking if parking at the rear lane area only allows for a small amount of parking. I also thing that careful consideration of how parking would be handled for properties abutting an arterial street would be important - some have rush hour parking restrictions or snow route parking rules that may limit the real availability of on-street parking to support this type of infill development.	10/13/2020 4:07 PM
115	These would also have to be on larger lots. To have a single lot turned into a 4-plex without considering the parking and adjacent homes would not help in established neighbourhoods	10/13/2020 2:43 PM

116	a. joke.	10/13/2020 12:17 PM
117	same as previous comment - council does not follow its own rules	10/13/2020 12:12 PM
118	I don't see why "integration" should be given this much priority. It doesn't matter to me at all if the houses on a street all look the same or different	10/13/2020 11:51 AM
119	They won't fit into older areas.	10/13/2020 11:32 AM
120	Only allow in areas where these already exist & is consistent with the neighborhood	10/13/2020 8:42 AM
121	Four unit housing should only be located on cornerlots on main thorough fairs, not in residential areas	10/13/2020 6:59 AM
122	Feeds into prejudice against renters vs ownership....	10/12/2020 7:04 PM
123	More parking and greenspace.	10/12/2020 6:44 PM
124	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	10/12/2020 9:17 AM
125	From the example I have here in St B by Urban Ridge, the four unit housing looks big enough to be an 8 unit. It is high, blocks out the sun and view. And the whole building experience was a nightmare. It doesn't fit in with the neighbourhood. This is a mid-class residential place, not a luxury neighbourhood. There's no yard left on that property so where will the children play? Where will the flowers and trees grow? It's awful to see. So no, the only improvement would be to make sure the lots are huge and can accommodate gardens and play areas, plus again, their own parking spaces (2 per unit) so that the roads aren't congested.	10/11/2020 8:58 PM
126	Guidelines need to further consider the impact higher density will have on the amount of traffic and reduced parking in a neighbourhood. Higher density in areas not located near reliable Winnipeg transit will be adversely affected by this.	10/11/2020 8:26 PM
127	Three and four unit housing should be on bus line routes e.g. St Marys, Goulet, Marion.	10/11/2020 3:28 PM
128	WE DO NOT WANT THEM	10/11/2020 3:24 PM
129	Main floor unit be fully accessible for disabled homeowners, or family and friends of homeowners. The main floor entrance at minimum should be level with the ground. Also accessibility at sides, rear and front of building.	10/11/2020 11:58 AM
130	Too often more units are "crammed" into the space that was once a single family dwelling. Greater density is great but not if it compromises green space.	10/11/2020 11:03 AM
131	Traffic is insane already without adding more to the roads on residential streets. Not to mention parking for four units	10/11/2020 8:36 AM
132	Keep four-unit housing to a minimum. Traffic in St. Vital cannot cope with an increase in population density.	10/10/2020 9:44 PM
133	Should be by other places like it or apartments	10/10/2020 9:16 PM
134	Should not be allowed on streets where there are smaller, single story single detached homes.	10/10/2020 7:45 PM
135	They need to be much much smaller.	10/10/2020 3:49 PM
136	No parking for anyone.	10/10/2020 10:59 AM
137	No 4 plexus on any side streets	10/10/2020 9:11 AM
138	not needed or wanted	10/10/2020 8:49 AM
139	single dewellings	10/10/2020 8:32 AM
140	Not to be built at all	10/10/2020 7:48 AM
141	See previous comment.	10/9/2020 11:04 PM
142	restricted to a one house family	10/9/2020 2:44 PM
143	There isn't. minimum lot size needs to be greater than 50 ft. There is more flexibly for this type of housing in area 1 because there are already many empty lots.	10/9/2020 1:27 PM
144	Same answer to question 2	10/9/2020 11:47 AM

145	same as 3 unit housing	10/9/2020 10:49 AM
146	Four unit housing shoould not be allowed in single family neighborhod	10/9/2020 8:56 AM
147	I don't know. I feel like a four unit house is an apartment. Put them on corners only towards major streets.	10/8/2020 10:40 PM
148	More information	10/8/2020 9:10 PM
149	same as previous	10/8/2020 8:01 PM
150	Four unit housing on a 50 foot frontage is far too small an area for the size of structure that would be built. This should only be allowed on much larger lots (at least 60 foot frontage)	10/8/2020 5:56 PM
151	no infills!	10/8/2020 3:39 PM
152	A COMPLETE WASTE! There is no reason or value to this at all. It diminishes and devalues existing land and homes.	10/8/2020 2:50 PM
153	Do not put large complexes/ buildings in an area of single family homes.. that would cause a war... you all know this.. you would not allow this to happen on you street.	10/8/2020 2:19 PM
154	We have a street with all single family bungalows and we want to keep it that way !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	10/8/2020 2:02 PM
155	Dont mix rentals into quiet, single family home neighborhoods	10/8/2020 1:45 PM
156	Too dense.	10/8/2020 1:28 PM
157	We don’t think the sewer, water infrastructure Can accommodate as these neighborhoods have older systems	10/8/2020 11:02 AM
158	I firmly disagree with the concept of splitting existing lots to allow for multi-family dwellings within mature areas. This is not what current homeowners want in their neighborhoods. Listen to the existing home owners!!	10/8/2020 10:02 AM
159	ditto previously said.	10/8/2020 8:35 AM
160	Corner lots only. No exceptions.	10/7/2020 8:51 PM
161	Have 4 units on corner lots.	10/7/2020 7:51 PM
162	Reduce the requirements & restrictions for infill housing	10/7/2020 3:28 PM
163	These never integrate well into existing mature neighbourhoods. These should only apply to major routes/thoroughfares and not side streets and all existing city infrastructure should be examined and upgraded before this type of density is allowed, mature neighbourhoods are built for the houses they have, not for densification!	10/7/2020 2:13 PM
164	I do not think they should be allowed in mature neighbourhoods at all.	10/7/2020 12:12 PM
165	Impossible	10/7/2020 10:31 AM
166	History shows that planners ignore guide lines	10/7/2020 10:20 AM
167	Divide the areas more. Have housing that is 75 to 100+ years old and housing that is less than 75 years old.	10/6/2020 7:53 PM
168	They should not be built in our neighbourhoods	10/6/2020 5:56 PM
169	Too many empty apartments in this city why are we ruining residential property by squeezing these in	10/6/2020 3:33 PM
170	See prior comment. I don't think it applies. (Note: In our neighbourhood, only 1 side of the street is available for infill, as all other houses are on the river. It would be a truly odd neighbourhood if one side of the dead end street had triplexes and fourplexes, and other side had multi-million dollar single family detached homes on the river.	10/6/2020 3:12 PM
171	See previous comment on 3-units.	10/6/2020 2:59 PM
172	Not build at all	10/6/2020 11:15 AM
173	Helpful	10/6/2020 7:41 AM

174	- Provide regulations to builders protecting neighbouring homes. - Clear guidelines for maintaining the tree canopy and significant fines for those who destroy old growth.	10/5/2020 9:07 PM
175	OK on a 50' lot.	10/5/2020 5:36 PM
176	Do not want multiple family dwellings built on property that formerly was a single family dwelling: parking issues, sewer issues, traffic and noise issues.	10/5/2020 1:43 PM
177	With 1:1 parking ratio, this should be allowed on 40-50' lots.	10/5/2020 12:28 PM
178	It won`t. I don`t agree with it, and never will. That is not the way to go, and you better get over it. I won`t vote for the mayor again, if he wants to push crap like this through.	10/5/2020 12:17 PM
179	The site and building design guidelines does not, and needs to include regulations and protection to the adjacent existing structures (such as foundations, fences, garages, unpaved back lanes, sidewalks, etc.) Current bylaws allow excavation to the property line - causing damage to existing structures. This is negligent of the city to know of these issues and approve infill developments, at the cost of and without protecting existing properties. The city could also be opening itself to financial liability. Homeowners who have their houses seriously damaged by construction on a neighbouring property, could sue the city for failing to protect them. In other Canadian jurisdictions, temporary retaining walls and additional supports are required. It is also included in their guidelines to developers that any damage incurred as a result of the construction of the property will be the responsibility of the land owner to repair. It is essential that these guidelines also include: Safety as a priority. Ex. The construction site must be kept safe for both neighbours and workers, and must be properly fenced. Noise in the Neighbourhood. Include specifics on the bylaw permits of operation of construction equipment. Respect for Neighbours. Include guidelines on portable toilets, maintenance of weeds and unkept grass, site litter and debris, and parking permits for construction vehicles to ensure lanes, streets and sidewalks are not blocked. Communication with Neighbours. Including building plans, estimated time of construction, contact information if they have concerns about the project, and scheduled access to their properties if required during construction. Other jurisdictions have created a Infill Conversation Toolkit as a resource. Addition of a Contact and Enquiries section. Including the Residential Infill Department, Community Standards Bylaw, and 311 for issues and complaints relating to infractions of the City Bylaws. In addition, it is essential that a process is outlined in the development guidelines specific to the accountability of developers to follow these guidelines. If required, new bylaws need to be enacted to ensure the city has jurisdiction to enforce the requirements of this strategy. Currently, without such a process, commitments are made by developers at the initial stages of application to the City and then not completed on site. This includes such commitments as landscaping, parking structures, saving existing trees, and building fences. It also includes infractions to site safety, cleanliness, noise, traffic and neighbourhood liveability bylaws. The enforcement of development permits needs to become the responsibility fo the city and not an adjacent property owners responsibility. In addition, new guidelines should include that final inspection by the City is required before occupancy and/or use.	10/5/2020 12:07 PM
180	Do not allow four-unit infill into primarily single family neighborhoods.	10/5/2020 10:59 AM
181	Keep sites clean.	10/5/2020 8:12 AM
182	Same as for all previous questions	10/4/2020 9:42 PM
183	What is required is buy-in from communities. In many cases the damage has already been done. This plan appears to be focused on not seeing the forest for the trees. The design and function and physical character of a neighbourhood is not just a question of having a series of houses that meet conditions, but whether they all work together.	10/4/2020 5:18 PM
184	I am not in favour or this at all	10/4/2020 1:53 PM
185	not sure as we haven't had any nearby	10/4/2020 1:15 PM
186	The city should encourage this type of gentle density wherever possible.	10/4/2020 10:05 AM
187	4 unit housing would be even worse.	10/4/2020 9:37 AM
188	Single family homes only in single family neighbourhoods	10/3/2020 11:00 PM
189	There should be no four unit buildings in a neighborhood of single family homes.	10/3/2020 7:49 PM
190	Cannot be taller than existing homes	10/3/2020 7:27 PM

191	Disallow	10/3/2020 4:04 PM
192	See previous answers.	10/3/2020 2:05 PM
193	See #4	10/3/2020 12:54 PM
194	Again, sensitivity to context, especially access to sunlight and third party design review needed.	10/3/2020 10:49 AM
195	This will be harder to pass in established neighbourhood due to lack of faith.	10/3/2020 10:41 AM
196	Be very clear on 4 unit designs. 2 story, 2 main floor and 2 second floor. Include access to basement for each unit. Divide basement into 4 self-contained areas with private access for each unit. Example one common door into basement, centre hallway with 2 doors on each side for each unit's private space.	10/3/2020 10:17 AM
197	Should not be allowed unless replacing a similar building.	10/3/2020 10:11 AM
198	Not to integrate at all. I stand by what I have mentioned previously, The goal of having as many places on one property is for the sake of revenue.	10/3/2020 9:16 AM
199	variety	10/3/2020 8:21 AM
200	See comment section from 3 unit dwelling, as this would apply to 4 unit dwellings as well.	10/3/2020 6:47 AM
201	I like the wording about additional lot coverage up to 42% being allowed if no garages are built... this should be applies to all single family, duplexes and triplexes as well. In many cases it doesn't make sense to build a garage on those properties. Apart from that, no new comments that haven't been mentioned previously by me.	10/2/2020 9:50 PM
202	As it stands, there are some 4-unit houses in my neighbourhod that, according to the new rules, are illegal. This means that if this house were to burn or have to be destroyed due to neglect, only a single family home could be rebuilt, thus reducing density. The opposite of what is needed for this city to thrive.	10/2/2020 3:30 PM
203	same as for 3 unit - does not fit!!!!	10/2/2020 3:01 PM
204	Do not build them anywhere that resembles a nice quiet neighborhood like mine. Try downtown.	10/2/2020 2:19 PM
205	Same as previous answer	10/2/2020 1:28 PM
206	The guidelines are exceedingly complex. How are community members supposed to assess them?	10/2/2020 10:09 AM
207	It cant	10/1/2020 10:18 PM
208	Parking should be addressed	10/1/2020 8:25 PM
209	Survey neighbourhood residents.	10/1/2020 5:12 PM
210	same as #2	10/1/2020 4:38 PM
211	building forms	10/1/2020 4:10 PM
212	These have no place in quiet, developed older areas. An eyesore and too much added traffic for quieter streets.	10/1/2020 3:20 PM
213	DO NOT ALLOW lots to be subdivided into 25 ft. lots. There is not adequate yard space to make the property USEFUL. No room for a garden or garage, or for even a dog to run around in a backyard that does not exist. and most times only ONE door ***UNSAFE	10/1/2020 3:14 PM
214	Same comments as in single.	10/1/2020 2:40 PM
215	no opinion	10/1/2020 1:41 PM
216	WTF is a significant architectural feature anyway? That sounds like its open to interpretation.	10/1/2020 1:28 PM
217	nothing to add	10/1/2020 1:14 PM
218	fine as is	10/1/2020 11:47 AM
219	I don’t think these guidelines are necessary. I support infill building in any format.	10/1/2020 11:09 AM

220	Distance between houses should be considered	10/1/2020 11:06 AM
221	See all of my previous statements.	10/1/2020 6:28 AM
222	Same deal	9/30/2020 8:48 PM
223	As with 3 Plexiglas housing, enough room for cars is important, and allowing each place a green space, like what's was done on the corner of Novavista and Dakota. And again, that much traffic coming and going it needs to be at the end of a block, not in the middle, next to single homes.	9/30/2020 7:28 PM
224	45 to 50 feet lot frontage should be allowed for a four Plex	9/30/2020 6:48 PM
225	Not good at all	9/30/2020 2:55 PM
226	I am having difficulty with this survey. It is not clear the actual intent and feel that it is transparent. Is the planning committee talking about rezoning single family lots?	9/30/2020 2:08 PM
227	What does the existing neighbourhood guideline state?	9/30/2020 12:54 PM
228	Too restricted for architectural features and building design (for example, requiring two different materials and a main entrance to be on the front face of the building should NOT be up to planners, but rather architects / builders).	9/30/2020 11:51 AM
229	same answer as I have stated already.	9/30/2020 11:43 AM
230	dont build them	9/30/2020 8:31 AM
231	Need to be cognizant of cost of lot, including demolition and asbestos abatement and the ability of a builder to put a new fourplex home on that lot that allows for a profitable build, that still fits the neighborhood.	9/29/2020 11:36 PM
232	The guidelines render entire existing neighbourhoods illegal to rebuild, even SFH and duplexes. Much too restrictive for a city-wide policy. Remove restrictions on minimum lot widths, side yards, main floor height, building height, parking minimums.	9/29/2020 7:44 PM
233	Only single family homes should be permitted.	9/29/2020 4:05 PM
234	a moratorium on the development becoming a rental for the first 8 to 10 years should be in place.	9/29/2020 3:26 PM
235	Same	9/29/2020 1:27 PM
236	They cannot be 'improved' nor accepted, and anyone who thinks otherwise is a communist simply by their stance of "this is what we're doing, and we'll ram it down your throats, so 'Like It'."	9/29/2020 1:25 PM
237	This is a really poorly designed survey. Just stop letting giant monstrosities come up where a single family house used to be.	9/29/2020 9:44 AM
238	It comes down to space. If there's space for traffic flow and added residents on a street, it should be fine. People should be able to do what they want with their property.	9/29/2020 9:42 AM
239	Make energy and carbon performance the priority for all infill development. Neighbourhoods have to change if Winnipeg is to meet any climate action goal.	9/29/2020 8:25 AM
240	Come in these multi-unit housing complexes in 100 year old neighbourhoods look like monstrosities! Tear one house down, build one house!	9/28/2020 9:43 PM
241	Height guidelines should be established and not tower over neighbours	9/28/2020 6:41 PM
242	Again, definitely depends on neighbourhood, street and community. Definitely not a heritage street.	9/28/2020 12:44 PM
243	Yikes! Don't even want to think about that in my neighborhood.	9/28/2020 11:30 AM
244	Same as 3 units, to big for most communities.	9/28/2020 9:42 AM
245	These are vague outlines that developers will abuse to their advantage.	9/28/2020 8:14 AM
246	Not be developed where current residents have not bought into densely populated areas. Not what they signed up for.	9/28/2020 8:10 AM

247	Not for old established neighborhoods. If lots accommodate one house should stay that way.	9/28/2020 12:32 AM
248	These guidelines, again, are much too restrictive. We need more multi-family homes across Winnipeg and previously exclusionary, single-family-only neighbourhoods must change. Scrap the lot coverage requirement and stop trying to prescribe subjective aesthetics.	9/27/2020 11:46 PM
249	It’s going to be hard to get four units with coverage maximums like that. These are far too restrictive.	9/27/2020 10:58 PM
250	Four-unit housing where there was previously a single family home will create overly densely populated areas. This will drive current citizens to look for areas outside the city where they can regain this lost space resulting in a decrease in tax base. Restrict the size and number fo trees a developer can cut per lot. Enforce guidelines on protecting trees on infill lots during construction. The city is focusing on mature neighbourhoods for its infill strategy which could result in a significant loss to Winnipeg's canopy. Please consider this inevitable loss as diminishing to the character of these mature neighbourhoods.	9/27/2020 8:10 PM
251	not compatable at all	9/27/2020 2:34 PM
252	build nothing beyond 2 units	9/27/2020 2:21 PM
253	I want my neighbourhood to have homeowners. not renters	9/27/2020 2:12 PM
254	See previous answer about 3 unit dwellings. Four is an even larger insult to this community.	9/26/2020 4:21 PM
255	See comments for two and three until housing for older neighbourhoods.	9/26/2020 4:00 PM
256	Requiring buildings to include significant architectural features does not guarantee good design, and often hinders it.	9/26/2020 2:56 PM
257	WHAT?!! 4-unit housing on a previous single family dwelling??!! That IS ridiculous and would change the whole esthetics of the current neighborhood.	9/26/2020 12:14 PM
258	Fo not allow	9/26/2020 11:08 AM
259	No four unit housing! I have two duplexes behind my property where there was one single detached house. All the trees were cut down - there were 4 mature trees in the yard and now there are none. I no longer have privacy in my backyard. I’ve also noticed this is occurring in working class neighbourhoods but not wealthy ones.	9/25/2020 6:18 PM
260	If infill means to fill in the empty lots, then why are lots with perfectly good houses being subdivided, the houses torn down, and new buildings put up?	9/25/2020 2:37 PM
261	Please see my comments per single family	9/25/2020 12:40 PM
262	Scrap: landscaping requirements, requirements for architectural features. lot coverage requirements and and building height requirements should include minimums that contemplate maximizing the space, and no maximums. Infill should be prioritized overall. Get rid of parking minimums.	9/25/2020 9:32 AM
263	Same as I noted earlier; you rules means nothing if a developer can simply apply for a vaiaiance to avoid them.	9/25/2020 8:34 AM
264	This is too large a dwelling for a site that previously had a single unit on it	9/25/2020 8:25 AM
265	No	9/25/2020 6:51 AM
266	Same comment as in previous question	9/24/2020 8:02 PM
267	we do not want dense rental apartments in our neighbourhood.	9/24/2020 7:36 PM
268	-Require developers who spilt lots to retain the intrinsic natural features of each building site -Require developer and home builders to consult with an architect to ensure homes being built work within the context of each site and neighbourhood instead of "clear cutting" and "plopping" off the shelf plans on to the sites -Require developers and home builders to consider the light requirements of existing neighbours	9/24/2020 4:10 PM
269	front yard setback guidelines	9/24/2020 3:50 PM
270	I live beside a new four unit housing rental units and parking is the issue. Plus landscaping is horrible does not go with the neighborhood at all.	9/24/2020 12:37 PM

271	same comments apply as 3 unit.	9/24/2020 11:25 AM
272	Four-unit homes are not typical in mature neighbourhoods and should be built on vacant land and not beside mature homes. There is a four-unit housing on Jubilee Avenue with a paved parking lot in the backyard and this is an eyesore.	9/24/2020 10:01 AM
273	I am happy to have this type of improved design in my mature neighbourhood to increase vitality.	9/24/2020 9:46 AM
274	Do not allow 4 unit housing on existing residential streets	9/24/2020 9:21 AM
275	need to look at the neighbourhood's current character. fourplexes may work in some areas but not in all. and allowing developers to get variances means its a free for all	9/24/2020 9:10 AM
276	Go and look at the area and the existing structures, needs to be more of an individual decision. Be more upfront with the designs of the newer structure when posting signs in neighbourhoods	9/24/2020 8:44 AM
277	You keep asking basically the same question here. Build homes that are similar to the other houses in the neighborhood.	9/24/2020 7:51 AM
278	For all of the previous reasons. Specifics will be very important across these guidelines.	9/24/2020 7:17 AM
279	See previous comment.	9/24/2020 12:17 AM
280	See response to previous	9/23/2020 10:30 PM
281	To big for the Infrastructure that exists	9/23/2020 10:25 PM
282	Don't use older existing single family residential areas for multiple units.	9/23/2020 9:38 PM
283	I think a four unit housing on one lot is for one, too large for the area. Parking would be difficult. Run off issues, infrastructure can't handle load. There would have to be some major guideline restructictions to make this remotely make sense. Sorry I have no real suggestions but in essence size limitations (height, depth, width) and lot splitting would need to be considered. Having four family's on on lot is just not what some neighbourhood are made for. Also again the trees are part of the maturity and give the neighborhood value.	9/23/2020 9:02 PM
284	I think four houses on a lot that had one makes no sense. I think parking needs to be addressed as an increase in residents will increase street parking. This will disrupt traffic flow on some streets and make it difficult for residents to park. The increased usage on the existing infrastructure such as sewage, power needs to be addressed as introducing four homes where there was once one will increase the amount of usage on this infrastructure. Further, larger structures need to take into account the height of the structure so that it doesn't affect the neighbours. Also this amount of development would take away the natural beauty of the area by removing mature trees that makes the neighbourhood what it is.	9/23/2020 9:00 PM
285	Same as before. More renters, more needles, more theft, more muggings.	9/23/2020 8:13 PM
286	Infill for increased residential density should only be permitted in large scale and corner lots. They should not be squeezed into existing lots or split lots. Infill needs to consider gravel lanes, garbage and recycling requirements and snow clearing. Design standards should also consider neighbourhood context.	9/23/2020 6:47 PM
287	some neighbourhoods are over represented - such as Osborne Village - limit it to zero	9/23/2020 6:36 PM
288	Only if it currently exists nearby in the neighbourhood. This creates a big parking problem on the street	9/23/2020 6:35 PM
289	These builders/contractors are interested in profit, not preserving the neighborhood, they are squeezing every ounce of building onto lots that should be 60ft wide not 50ft. It is as if they build, break the rules, then ask for forgiveness. They do not ask for permission then follow the rules, they do what they want, whatever brings in the greatest profit, then move on and do it again someplace else.	9/23/2020 6:31 PM
290	Good	9/23/2020 6:24 PM
291	no four unit housing to be allowed.	9/23/2020 6:16 PM
292	Protect trees and individual neighbour hood character	9/23/2020 5:49 PM
293	Plenty of land outside the city to build on. How about expanding the city limits instead of	9/23/2020 5:35 PM

	making the city a smelly sardine can	
294	See my previous comments. This type of development only benefits developers who can outbid first-time buyers for a piece of property, tear down an old house, and put in a multi-unit structure and charge people three times the price. This type of development should not be allowed.	9/23/2020 5:25 PM
295	Should be corner only.	9/23/2020 4:45 PM
296	Sounds good	9/23/2020 4:25 PM
297	when population density is projected because of increased number of family units (which I support overall) the city and developer need to ensure there is additional green space/ recreation / playground space within walkable distance.	9/23/2020 4:17 PM
298	Guidelines could be improved by adding: "Introduce FRONT yard setbacks that respond to the context of abutting properties.	9/23/2020 4:02 PM
299	Same as my answer for #6	9/23/2020 3:56 PM
300	Triplex, Fourplex and Townhouses should be limited to areas that are being substantially redeveloped, or new developments. Multi-family housing does not integrate well into a neighborhood of single family structures.	9/23/2020 3:41 PM
301	I question that it could be improved. But would likely be approved anyhow.	9/23/2020 3:40 PM
302	same as previous	9/23/2020 2:12 PM
303	Remove parking requirements. (We want people to walk, bike + take transit more, right?) Allow in ALL neighbourhoods. (Density = yes please) Let these buildings extend further towards back lane. I totally understand lining up fronts of homes. But lining up the backs is silly, unnecessarily restrictive and not worth the effort.	9/23/2020 11:43 AM
304	Garages need to be limited or attached to building when there is a backlane	9/23/2020 10:59 AM
305	Private property parking should be available	9/23/2020 10:42 AM
306	Good as is.	9/23/2020 9:34 AM
307	street must already have multiple occupancy	9/23/2020 9:08 AM
308	need to limit 4 unit housing. too many units next to existing single family homes	9/23/2020 9:01 AM
309	Madness and stupidity	9/23/2020 4:50 AM
310	Remove parking minimums if developers offer incentives (Peg City Car Co-op memberships & cars), transit passes and bike storage to tenants.	9/22/2020 10:10 PM
311	Green space, noise buffer, parking, not street parking. Traffic impact,	9/22/2020 7:54 PM
312	I think the important part of new housing in established neighborhoods is to ensure that the new homes blend in with the mature neighborhood	9/22/2020 3:26 PM
313	The plan to target corners of streets means that once a corner has been redeveloped in a desireable area, the whole block must expect to be targeted at every corner. Simply look at what has happened on the block of McMillan Avenue between Stafford and Harrow. First, two bungalows were torn down to make a gigantic condo building which was justified because of a modest apartment across the street and an office building on Corydon. Then, the McMillan/Stafford side of that block was targeted and is now going to be a multi-use structure with loads of parking. Now, the other side of McMillan and Stafford is being targeted by another developer. This is happening many corners along Stafford and Harrow...as well as along Grosvenor. The condos and apartments are all overpriced and some take years to sell. This is not an improvement to the neighbourhood, it puts stress on the infrastructure and decreases the value of other properties on corners, as they are immediately targeted by developers. It's not fair to existing neighbours and it doesn't improve the community/neighbourhood, it just boosts the tax base for the city.	9/22/2020 2:03 PM
314	The question is similar to that in #2, #4 and #6 above, and my response here is essentially the same as I gave there.	9/22/2020 1:36 PM
315	Abandon this ludicrous idea NOW!	9/22/2020 1:29 PM

316	If you are talking coop housing now, like the Old Grace location, that completely beautified and enhanced Arlington Avenue. That has potential, if the city would work with the existing community and actually work with beautiful trees and green space development	9/22/2020 1:24 PM
317	Really don't like the "preferred Locations" which will produce too much density in some areas and segregation from affluent areas; all home owners should have the privilege of hosting a 4 plex on their street	9/22/2020 11:42 AM
318	Ok, see my previous comment regarding 3-unit.	9/22/2020 9:45 AM
319	Seriously.....4 unit housing on a lot that used to have 1 home.....this is a bad idea altogether. There will be absolutely no more green space, no where to shovel snow, all the trees will be cut down, all the city services will be strained. I live on Pilgrim ave, where we have seen the most lots splits, across the street from me where there used to stand five single family homes and five families there is now 10 duplexes and 20 families....can't tell me that is not gonna strain the amenities!!	9/22/2020 8:08 AM
320	Again, it should be clear where these types of development will be considered. There aren't enough restrictions on these larger unit developments.	9/22/2020 12:51 AM
321	Don't build them at all.	9/21/2020 6:42 PM
322	Put them somewhere else. We are not zoned for this! Nor do we want them!	9/21/2020 6:13 PM
323	There was two 4 plexes allowed to be built at the end of my street. The site went from TWO single family homes to EIGHT new households. Increasing the population density is NOT GOOD for our neighbourhoods. Parking is a nightmare and these new homes have no room for play structures , patios or SPACE BETWEEN NEIGHBOURS. No more privacy around these infills.	9/21/2020 4:49 PM
324	See previous answers.	9/21/2020 4:43 PM
325	That is way too many.	9/21/2020 2:58 PM
326	Do NOT allow lots to be subdivided. Nothing less that 35 ft lots.	9/21/2020 2:49 PM
327	Allow only on like streets	9/21/2020 2:25 PM
328	same comment as for three-unit, plus scale back the height allowed	9/21/2020 2:08 PM
329	Would like to see additional requirements for all mutli-units, townhouses, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, apartments, and townhomes to have space available for the residents to use as onsite composting of organics and for gardening and growing of food. This should help divert waste from city landfills and allow for those in such facilities to have the option to contribute to green composting, as people living in a single family home can do. Currently composting isn't available for most multi-unit residences. Having access to garden space would also improve quaility of life and neighborhood community as many multi-unit residences don't have access to gardens. Also would help improve food security.	9/21/2020 2:04 PM
330	To many cars and not enough parking. Three and four unit housing does not belong on streets where all the houses are single family units on small lots. High density creates too many cars and more noise overall. Unless there is a park or school near by there is almost no place for children to play.	9/21/2020 10:58 AM
331	It should work well.	9/21/2020 10:00 AM
332	Again, Charleswood/Tuxedo should have been prioritized to be included as they have larger lots to allow for more rental units/housing units to be moved in allowing for larger growth and more people to move into the area.	9/21/2020 9:26 AM
333	somewhat	9/21/2020 8:38 AM
334	if the neighbourhood is single family housing it should remain as such	9/21/2020 7:30 AM
335	If density building for infill housing is not considered from the outset, in areas where street parking is an issue for the exisiting neighbourhood, increasing the nunber of units must come with requiring parking, within that building design.	9/20/2020 11:27 PM
336	Same as previous	9/20/2020 6:31 PM
337	Multi-family dwellings are not part of the neighbourhoods character.	9/20/2020 5:16 PM

338	usually do not have enough parking available so most homes have one vehicle parked on the street at all times, therefore no room for other residents to have visitors able to park nearby	9/20/2020 4:21 PM
339	Allow basement to be used as parking. Allow building to be 3 story high as long as total building height stays under 34 feet.	9/20/2020 3:27 PM
340	provide for a neighborhood review of the developers application	9/20/2020 1:32 PM
341	Ensure the design looks at the very specific site being proposed (existing buildings and street presence), not just a generic plan by a builder.	9/20/2020 12:19 PM
342	Don't even consider it. No guidelines could make it acceptable as four unit housing would destroy the character of the neighbourhood completely.	9/20/2020 1:05 AM
343	Are we going to ask for 5 unit or 6 unit or 7 next?	9/20/2020 12:40 AM
344	Universal home entrance ways are imperative.	9/19/2020 10:19 PM
345	Ensure developers actually follow guidelines	9/19/2020 5:29 PM
346	remove all requirements except add housed must be platinum standard green buildings	9/19/2020 5:28 PM
347	Too many units. See previous EMT.	9/19/2020 5:27 PM
348	See my previous comment	9/19/2020 3:40 PM
349	These large multi-unit structures are causing the issues and must be kept out of single house neighbourhoods.	9/19/2020 2:36 PM
350	These will fit with existing neighbourhoods well.	9/19/2020 2:27 PM
351	Parking Requirements and should be apply for variance to alert neighbours for concerns	9/19/2020 2:02 PM
352	Absolutely terrible! New buildings have to be the same as existing ones, no bigger, no more dense. All this is meaningless until Planning requires its Planners to comply. For years, Planning has not complied with the 2008 Infill Guidelines or any bylaws. Planners make excuses for non-compliance and there has been no meaningful supervision. Sloppy scholarship, lazy rigour, and outright cheating and fabrication of the truth has been commonplace. Result: no faith these guidelines have any meaning at all.	9/19/2020 1:50 PM
353	Subdivisions should not be allowed	9/19/2020 12:56 PM
354	There's not enough information/detail here to be able to evaluate.	9/19/2020 10:45 AM
355	Again, depends on how these are applied	9/19/2020 10:45 AM
356	Don’t build them	9/19/2020 10:35 AM
357	Not in single residence neighbourhood	9/19/2020 10:16 AM
358	Do not allow these to be built in area that do not currently have multiplex built	9/19/2020 9:36 AM
359	I do t think multi unit structures should be build in single family neighbourhoods	9/19/2020 9:14 AM
360	Limit the number of new units in each block. We already have 4 such units on our block and the increased traffic in the lane by renters who don't seem to care about the community: speeding, shovelling snow onto the lane instead of keeping it on their property, not cleaning up after their animals, garbage thrown from cars has increased since the building have gone up, parking cars on the lane so other traffic can't get by, etc. Renters have no stake in the neighbourhood and are already approaching the population of the rest of the block.	9/19/2020 8:44 AM
361	This is a mini apartment block. There is no way a four unit house should be allowed within a single family residential area.	9/19/2020 8:19 AM
362	Super important. Very happy with this.	9/19/2020 7:54 AM
363	See earlier comments.	9/19/2020 6:18 AM
364	Four units shouldn’t be used at all as infills.	9/19/2020 12:15 AM
365	Improve building form and design by requiring buildings to include significant architectural features-Need more info	9/18/2020 8:47 PM

366	No large infill	9/18/2020 8:26 PM
367	As I have indicate in this same survey multiple times, the purpose of infill development should be to increase population density, not match an arbitrary neighbourhood style. If this means building more housing units in an area that previously held single family homes then so be it	9/18/2020 8:05 PM
368	Too big to fit in.	9/18/2020 7:27 PM
369	Who ever suggested this has a real problem of their own	9/18/2020 7:07 PM
370	Can’t. Just no. Not here. NIMBY.	9/18/2020 5:31 PM
371	Not have them at all.	9/18/2020 5:19 PM
372	no opinion	9/18/2020 5:03 PM
373	Again too restrictive, we should allow neighbourhoods to modernize themselves as demand requires.	9/18/2020 4:41 PM

Q9 How well do you think the site and building design guidelines for multi-unit/apartment/townhouse will help new infill integrate into existing neighbourhoods?

Answered: 635 Skipped: 139



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Not well at all	43.15%	274
Somewhat	26.93%	171
Very well	19.06%	121
Neutral/No opinion	10.87%	69
TOTAL		635

Q10 How do you think the site and building design guidelines for multi-unit/apartment/townhouse could be improved to help new infill integrate into existing neighbourhoods?

Answered: 342 Skipped: 432

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Same comments as the others.	10/23/2020 8:21 AM
2	The guidelines could again be improved when dealing with multi-unit buildings. All new infill should conform reasonably well to surrounding properties. The building should not be overly large in comparison to neighbouring buildings. It's landscaping should be similar, as should it's style and features.	10/22/2020 11:29 PM
3	I would like to make the same points as made previously in this survey. The City appears to be pushing builders to build multi unit /apt. / townhouses without considering the need for these developments or the need for housing that will meet the needs of families (3 bedrooms) or low income people. There needs to be a needs assessment for every community that is updated every five years that includes green space.	10/22/2020 10:51 PM
4	Protect the mature trees.	10/22/2020 10:25 PM
5	Existing infrastructure such as roads and sewers would have to be upgraded to handle the extra volume.	10/22/2020 9:11 PM
6	I attended the online public engagement event and I learned by attending that multi-unit buildings will be encouraged to locate on corner streets. Busy corner streets are not enjoyable areas to live by. This does not encourage people to live in apartments/multi-units buildings. We need incentives that will get people to live in higher density buildings to improve our city footprint. And this aspect does not help with that. For sure, your guidelines should encourage townhouses along streets, not just on corner streets.	10/22/2020 7:04 PM
7	The city infill committee was very transparent at the appeals season I attended in January 2019. More taxes are required and it was not important to listen to seniors, even those hard of hearing, as well as professional people, including a shopping mall developer, who joined our appeal. Cell phones usage should be banned! Ms Santos , in spite of hearing the similar appeals from 13 different areas, was the only councillor who did not use a cellphone during the marathon from 9 am to 1 am the next day. People appealing the variance need to be treated with respect! Also the more units or housing on site, the greater the need for more green space.	10/22/2020 5:27 PM
8	Where are the new parks for all these new residents? If you guys drag your feet on setting aside land with mature trees for new parks then all the land will be bought up by developers and no one will have a place to go for a picnic and walk their dog off leash. Ever tried going to Kildonan Park in the summer?? Fat chance finding a nice quiet picnic table. All the Filipinos have them taken up and you have to drive around the park 3 times just to find a parking spot. WE NEED MORE BIG PARKS!!	10/22/2020 5:17 PM
9	This screams of existing neighbourhood homes, and the existing homeowners being forced into lifestyles that they did not buy into. We are talking about setting existing homeowners at odds with new owners , creating tensions and possible hostilities. A no win situation. And loss of the value , both aesthetical and financial , of the side lots of families homes !!	10/22/2020 3:54 PM
10	See previous notes on 4 unit housing.	10/22/2020 3:47 PM
11	multi-units should be grouped together and not built next to single level bungalows.	10/22/2020 3:42 PM
12	These types of build should not be on quiet residential streets.	10/22/2020 3:24 PM
13	Do not allow lot splitting.	10/22/2020 2:33 PM
14	The insistence on landscaping and green space as density increases is more and more compelling.	10/22/2020 1:33 PM
15	Don't build them as infill, period.	10/22/2020 12:08 PM
16	Design styles evolve over time and design guidelines that are overly prescriptive may end up resulting in mature neighbourhoods looking overly homogeneous. Lot coverage and prioritized infill locations greatly limit the ability from mature neighbourhoods to move away from predominantly single-family zoning and single-family residences.	10/22/2020 11:42 AM
17	Make them one unit bungalows .	10/22/2020 11:28 AM
18	I don't know.	10/22/2020 11:07 AM

19	Parking access should only be from a lane if the dwelling is within 100m of the end of the block, having a 10 plex in the middle of a long block with only rear access from a back lane would ruin the lane for everyone. A complex this large must be required to remove snow from the lane on to the property at a designated location or remove the snow from the parking area/back lane entirely.	10/22/2020 10:19 AM
20	is this planned for gravel alleys, if so it's ridiculous	10/22/2020 9:55 AM
21	Definitely still holds with the accessibility and the sustainable landscaping. Any thought about enabling green roofs? Lots of benefits for temperature control of the building and surrounding area with more green infrastructure.	10/21/2020 8:27 PM
22	Once again do not put these on residential single or duplex housing streets.	10/21/2020 7:15 PM
23	Don't allow in single family residential zoned areas.	10/21/2020 6:57 PM
24	The site and building guidelines need to more accurately reflect the style, size and character of current multi-unit homes.	10/21/2020 3:49 PM
25	The required external design should look similar to the neighbourhood and/or parking	10/21/2020 3:20 PM
26	Winnipeg needs fewer 3 storey walk-ups and more high rises, the latter of which are accessible. Current streets cannot handle this density without underground parking and more traffic lights. will the developer pay for those aspects, including improving sewage system, etc.????	10/21/2020 12:57 PM
27	Should be classic and stately - not “ on trend” in colour and material so the don’t look outdated in a few years. Should blend into landscape with a low profile and not be tall and overpowering.	10/21/2020 12:26 PM
28	Not in favour in the middle of a residential street	10/21/2020 10:53 AM
29	Not in favour of multi unit complexes being built in mature neighbourhoods	10/21/2020 10:17 AM
30	Not interested in any of these ideas	10/21/2020 8:43 AM
31	No multi-unit housing EXCEPT at the intersection with major thoroughfares.	10/21/2020 7:42 AM
32	No. Bad. These should not exist. This will only negatively impact the neighbourhood. It will decrease my property value as no one wants to live next to an apartment.	10/20/2020 11:28 PM
33	Section on municipal servicing was lacking any details. How would they know who to contact?	10/20/2020 9:49 PM
34	Keep single family homes in an area	10/20/2020 6:03 PM
35	Delete the proposal. Infill is stupid	10/20/2020 5:15 PM
36	spoil the look of the neighbour hood.	10/20/2020 3:38 PM
37	No opinion.	10/20/2020 3:07 PM
38	The guidelines seem to be much more about appeasing a small group of vocal opponents, rather than developing sound policy that will lead land use to a more fiscally sustainable, environmentally sustainable, equitable form (you know, actually meeting the goals of OurWinnipeg). That means making a transition to more compact, walkable neighbourhoods requiring a built form where buildings are taller (up to 3 or 4 storeys), closer together (or touching), mixing uses (horizontally and vertically), where everyone can participate on the small scale of 4-5 units or less (not just professional developers) and green space is shared/public rather than everyone having their own private slice. These guidelines move us towards the exact opposite of that.	10/20/2020 2:58 PM
39	Apartment units should be built with character similar to the area's existing homes.	10/20/2020 2:21 PM
40	I don't think this is a good thing for suburban neighbourhoods. Should be built on regional streets, or in more urban areas.	10/20/2020 2:06 PM
41	as mentioned, if they were on the busier arteries, not in the middle of neighbourhoods, the definition of arteries is not defined from what I can see.	10/20/2020 11:21 AM
42	Communicate that we live in an urban environment and that if people want 50' wide lots they should move to Anola.	10/20/2020 10:37 AM
43	for those getting out of parents home, new arrivals in City,	10/19/2020 3:28 PM

44	Don't ruin my neighbourhood.	10/19/2020 11:57 AM
45	Replace housing or buildings in kind, this should not be permitted in single family neighbor hoods.	10/19/2020 9:42 AM
46	No	10/19/2020 8:50 AM
47	You obviously spent a lot of time working on this. We are not New York. Don’t ruin any more neighbourhoods. Glenwood lot splits are embarrassing.	10/18/2020 9:09 PM
48	I still don’t agree that they always need to be on busier streets.	10/18/2020 8:15 PM
49	This type of option is still not appropriate for existing communities and is better suited in newly developing areas. The parking would always be an issue.	10/18/2020 7:04 PM
50	Not a good idea! Winnipeg should be a bigger/ larger city. Building new development with cheap and decent single houses for low and average Income family is a better idea.	10/18/2020 6:42 PM
51	If it is multi-unit, I have concerns as to how vehicle parking would impact the site and affect traffic activity around the dwelling.	10/18/2020 3:43 PM
52	main corridors only	10/18/2020 11:08 AM
53	There is insufficient attention to implications for parking in the neighbourhood, including providing access to plugging in block heaters in the winter. More attention needs to be paid to providing and/or maintaining options for a range of income levels. Some of these neighbourhoods have been places where young people can afford their first homes as well as places with larger more expensive housing. Also, there is insufficient attention to trees, whether existing or new plantings. Many usual measures to protect existing trees are insufficient, and the trees end up dying within a few years of the construction. The construction of new foundations for example will likely to significant damage to any large mature trees on the property. Winnipeg's tree canopy has in the past been a matter of great pride and also has ecological value. Someone needs to be responsible for monitoring the health of both existing and newly planted trees for these sites. Perhaps builders might put down a guarantee deposit to be refunded after 5 years if the trees survive. Planting two trees for killing one large mature one is insufficient. Tree list might be expanded. The setback specification "or portion of block" allows for too much wiggle room. What does that really mean? The entire block should be considered in that average.	10/18/2020 11:05 AM
54	Well not within the scope of this project there needs tp be an addition for a set of rules regarding the protection of the structural integrity of adjacent properties and buildings	10/18/2020 10:32 AM
55	improve the already existing apartments	10/17/2020 11:43 AM
56	Maybe in poor neighborhoods where single bedroom houses are located like the north end	10/17/2020 6:28 AM
57	Needs to be more rules on how to integrate these structures with present homes. I wouldn't want to live beside one and having one put up beside a single detached home will decrease the value of the home significantly.	10/16/2020 11:55 PM
58	It seems these won't apply to areas with secondary plans so pointless for those of us who live in those areas.	10/16/2020 8:02 PM
59	Well, I guess treating them the same as a single family home is perfect.	10/16/2020 7:23 PM
60	I wouldn't be happy if one of these showed up near my place. And I would be less happy with what I'd be able to sell my house for when I try and get away from it.	10/16/2020 7:03 PM
61	Stricter regulations from an official regulating office, to ensure strict compliance with essential guidelines. Caps on amount of infill creating in mature neighbourhoods so overreaction from greedy developers doesn't see too sharp a rise in population density contribute to overburdening community services, amenities, and infrastructure.	10/16/2020 6:11 PM
62	same	10/16/2020 2:40 PM
63	Keep single family homes in the area	10/16/2020 2:19 PM
64	Further relax parking requirements as not everyone has or wants to drive a vehicle. By maintaining artificially high parking requirements, those who don't need parking facilities are essentially subsidizing the costs of those who need/want it. Let the market decide how much	10/16/2020 1:15 PM

	is needed, including offering none at all, rather than imposing a vehicle-centric framework on everyone.	
65	Do not put larger infill buildings unless tearing down the small old houses.	10/16/2020 9:09 AM
66	Do not agree with this concept at all.	10/16/2020 9:02 AM
67	The lack of planning from the planning department in Glenwood has desecrated the character of the neighbourhood, going to 3 unit housing will further deteriorate the area. Areas are over-densified, why continue the massacre by introducing 3 unit buildings?	10/15/2020 10:35 PM
68	We already have a problem with parking in our neighbourhood, because of houses being turned into student rentals. This would exacerbate our situation.	10/15/2020 9:52 PM
69	I wonder if townhouses should be treated separately. If well done they could be appropriate mid block. The requirement that townhouse be located at a corner or abutting a multi-unit residential or commercial property seems overkill. Multi-unit apartment implies a blockier form which is probably most suitable at corners so the greater restrictions are appropriate.	10/15/2020 9:13 PM
70	I'm not sure	10/15/2020 9:03 PM
71	not allowed in old neighbourhoods	10/15/2020 8:45 PM
72	If our goal is to drive existing residence, to homes outside the city tax zone, then I suggest we follow this type of plan	10/15/2020 5:31 PM
73	These guideline are simplying putting lipstick on the pig that has been discussed in the earlier responses.	10/15/2020 5:20 PM
74	See previous answer.	10/15/2020 4:41 PM
75	There should fewer exemptions for parking space requirements. In addition, there should be a requirement for wiring at least one 240 volt, 50 amp circuit near the parking area. This would encourage adoption of electric vehicles by providing an easy way for the homeowner to install an electric car charger in the future.	10/15/2020 2:56 PM
76	Land coverage should be increased, side yards reduced, To many landscaping requirements that make the project less cost effective and it will reduce the affordability.	10/15/2020 2:37 PM
77	n/a	10/15/2020 12:41 PM
78	As I stated in the previous questions. Be SUPER aware of home owners and renters in the area. If you depreciate their home value or ruin their views, you will not have a good relationship and partnership with them. We need infill tenants to be safe, have good heat and energy, good windows, and a respectable home. Make multi-unit/apartment/townhouses have different sized suites and maybe make it a fun but effective shape? nice colours.	10/15/2020 8:59 AM
79	In fact it has damaged my home, my yard fell into the hole they dug because it wasn't shored up, I have had abuse from the builder, the city of Winnipeg is useless in helping, they allowed a 5 plex onto a zone 2 lot, couldn't afford to fight it and could not deal with the intimidation, threats and abuse from the owners company. The City allowed him to pack the appeals room with his own personal thugs and one of the city councillors made a mockery of the people trying to fight for their rights.	10/15/2020 8:41 AM
80	They won't integrate well. They block the sunlight, there will be extra traffic, the character of the neighbourhood will be destroyed. Build like for like.	10/14/2020 10:44 PM
81	No comment, I am not a engineer, architect or city planner.	10/14/2020 10:31 PM
82	Same as previous 4 categories	10/14/2020 7:46 PM
83	same issues as before.	10/14/2020 5:43 PM
84	My neighbourhood has existing houses that are close together and contain rental housing already. Adding more to this will only add more stress to our services such as water and sewer, deteriorating streets and back lanes, sidewalks, schooling and the list goes on. We live in MB where there is still a lot of land that could be developed without putting existing neighbourhoods into worse conditions than they already face. This is all about money, not making things better.	10/14/2020 4:14 PM
85	Remove encroachment provision entirely. Encourage a mix of facade materials and designs.	10/14/2020 2:51 PM

	Keep height to match neighbourhood. No tandem parking - single space parking only. No blank walls.	
86	same as three and four	10/14/2020 1:04 PM
87	Need to keep these huge units on the outskirts of town where there is lots of room, not on residential streets.	10/14/2020 12:39 PM
88	See my previous answer...they would be out of character	10/14/2020 10:33 AM
89	Seems too large for an existing neighborhood.	10/14/2020 9:05 AM
90	I like the addition of multi family in every neighbourhood. The rules that make this possible in suburbs - like Charleswood - have to be different from the rules that will allo wthis to happen in West Broadway, or Dufferein. Different neighbourhoods need different rules.	10/14/2020 7:53 AM
91	In all cases, strong preference should be given to rehabilitation and renovation of existing structures rather than tear-downs and replacement with new construction. Any new construction that take places should match existing nearby structures in size, footprint, architectural style and exterior building materials. I object to including corner lots as preferred locations for infill. Corner lots are often slightly larger than mid-block lots and for some families who spend lots of time outdoors, they are very attractive. By prioritizing infill on these lots, the city is removing corner lots as locations where families who want single family homes can reside.	10/13/2020 10:20 PM
92	We need a more aggressive approach to the development of these types of infill. This is where the real transformation of the mature communities can happen by enabling them to build up above existing allowable heights and maximize site density.	10/13/2020 8:49 PM
93	Requirements for minimal parking needed for all sizes of new infill, including single family detached and up/down duplex. Concrete guidelines as to what would qualify as 'sufficient', since this term is greatly open to interpretation. Also should set limitations on the percentage of properties in a given area/street that can be split for any property development to minimize the impact to existing properties and residents. More evenly distributing the influx of new residents/builds around the areas in question so as not to have certain streets in a constant state of disrepair due to continuous new construction. Residential taxes on existing properties where infill has been completed or is planned in the near future should be re-assessed more regularly and vigorously, as this sort of infill can decrease the resale value of existing properties, as also can cause great inconveniences to property owners during and after construction.	10/13/2020 8:27 PM
94	Have to put "Neutral/No opinion" on these questions because I lack the planning expertise to have an opinion. From what I've seen, most infill developers are building very attractive buildings that fit in well.	10/13/2020 5:37 PM
95	It changes the dynamic of the area by adding renters to a single dwelling family housing.	10/13/2020 4:28 PM
96	by maintaining the character of the existing neighbourhood and stringently enforcing guidelines for developers.	10/13/2020 4:21 PM
97	unless it is a corner lot and there is already walkup apartments in the area it would not fit in with the established neighbourhood	10/13/2020 2:45 PM
98	w.t.f.	10/13/2020 12:18 PM
99	same as previous comment - council does not follow its own rules	10/13/2020 12:13 PM
100	I don't see why "integration" should be given this much priority. It doesn't matter to me at all if the houses on a street all look the same or different	10/13/2020 11:51 AM
101	fit in with the neighbours hoods	10/13/2020 11:34 AM
102	Stay consistent with the dwellings on the same street and not allow them to build in areas that have single family dwellings	10/13/2020 8:44 AM
103	Public notices of plans, drawings to me made available with feedback seriously considered prior to breaking ground.	10/13/2020 7:01 AM
104	My overall sense of the draft guidelines is that the pander excessively to a "Little Englander" type of attitude to infill.... which at its worst it has a distinct tinge of racism	10/12/2020 7:06 PM

105	Same as last 2 answers.	10/12/2020 6:45 PM
106	Parking minimums stifle density and are completely unnecessary.	10/12/2020 3:52 PM
107	just creating low rental then slums!	10/12/2020 9:17 AM
108	Where will the children play? Where will people park? How will we deal with more traffic? These should not be built in neighbourhoods like St B or downtown. We need green areas and parks. Turn infill areas into small parks, as they have in Europe, where people can sit down, read a book, meet neighbours.	10/11/2020 8:59 PM
109	Change the wording for energy performance from "consider building design.....that improves energy performance" to mandating these buildings meet a energy performance guideline such as ones found in 3 Green Globes, LEED or other guidelines from the Canada Green Building Council. "Consider" is not enforceable or measurable. More energy efficient buildings will have less demand on resources and utilities and contribute towards a better functioning and designed city environment	10/11/2020 8:26 PM
110	should be restricted to bus routes e.g. St Marys, Goulet, Marion.	10/11/2020 3:29 PM
111	WE DO NOT WANT THEM	10/11/2020 3:24 PM
112	Main floor unit be fully accessible for disabled homeowners, or family and friends of homeowners. The main floor entrance at minimum should be level with the ground. Also accessibility at sides, rear and front of building.	10/11/2020 11:58 AM
113	Please listen to the community. Too often I have seen community meeting held where the community is opposed to the development and the development goes ahead ignoring community concerns. City planners have sided with developers or builders rather than tax paying citizens who live in the neighbourhood.	10/11/2020 11:06 AM
114	No privacy for neighbors	10/11/2020 8:38 AM
115	Increasing population density in St. Vital will make bad traffic even worse. Focus on widening St. Annes and St. Mary's before thinking of increasing density I'm St. Vital.	10/10/2020 9:45 PM
116	they do not have enough parking. They park on the streets and the streets do not get cleaned properly in the winter	10/10/2020 9:17 PM
117	The thing with these is they over price the ren	10/10/2020 9:17 PM
118	Should not be allowed on streets that do not have a public bus route.	10/10/2020 7:45 PM
119	this is an awful idea. They create too much traffic, do not fit with the look of the area. All the trees get removed and replaced with a tree that is much smaller and not comparable. They make old st vital look like absolute shit.	10/10/2020 3:51 PM
120	Only on main streets not residential streets	10/10/2020 9:11 AM
121	not needed or wanted	10/10/2020 8:49 AM
122	single dewellings	10/10/2020 8:33 AM
123	Not to be built at all	10/10/2020 7:49 AM
124	See previous comment.	10/9/2020 11:04 PM
125	same answer as question 8	10/9/2020 2:45 PM
126	There is no need for this type of development in area 2. Real estate speculators are buying homes and letting them fall into such disrepair that they need to be taken down because costs to fix them back up is cost prohibitive.	10/9/2020 1:30 PM
127	Same answer as question 2	10/9/2020 11:47 AM
128	I don't think multi units should replace a lot where there once was a single house	10/9/2020 11:04 AM
129	It should only be allowed if at all along major streets	10/9/2020 8:57 AM
130	There are many examples of beautiful rows of townhouses in Montreal and Toronto that blend in with the neighborhood. Again, in my opinion the harsh contrast of competing designs is the problem.	10/8/2020 10:42 PM

131	same as previous	10/8/2020 8:02 PM
132	An apartment in this neighborhood (Glenwood) would be totally out of character, and cause a nightmare with traffic and parking issues.	10/8/2020 5:58 PM
133	no infills!	10/8/2020 3:40 PM
134	This a joke if this is to be taken seriously. It serves no practical purpose other that a make money program for the developer and a Tax grab for the City.	10/8/2020 2:52 PM
135	Same comment as before.. Jean	10/8/2020 2:20 PM
136	Stay out of our neighbourhood!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	10/8/2020 2:02 PM
137	Far too dense in areas that are currently single or duplex areas.	10/8/2020 1:28 PM
138	Puts pressure on infrastructure and parking	10/8/2020 11:02 AM
139	I firmly disagree with this concept. Build new homes in new areas. Do not destroy existing mature neighborhoods.	10/8/2020 10:03 AM
140	too many people.	10/8/2020 8:36 AM
141	Without proper adjustments to traffic corridors prior to development, driving to and from the neighbourhood becomes unmanageable with cars idling in long lines out front of residences.	10/7/2020 8:53 PM
142	Reduce the requirements & restrictions for infill housing	10/7/2020 3:29 PM
143	Need to keep green space or create green space for adequate trees on the property. The property needs to be able to have enough space for parking lot to prevent tenants from parking on the street. Do not split any lots, if anything amalgamate lots.	10/7/2020 2:35 PM
144	This type of development would be a travesty in mature neighbourhoods, the fact the City even has this as an option is mind boggling. These would need to be strictly limited to main thoroughfares or main arterial routes into communities and never on side streets.	10/7/2020 2:17 PM
145	I do not think they should be allowed in mature neighbourhoods at all.	10/7/2020 12:12 PM
146	Impossible	10/7/2020 10:32 AM
147	So far blending into the neighbourhood has been ignored	10/7/2020 10:23 AM
148	Keep multi-unit/apartment/townhouse out of existing single family areas.	10/6/2020 9:38 PM
149	They should only be on Arterial streets or Bus transitways.	10/6/2020 7:54 PM
150	They should not be built in our neighbourhoods	10/6/2020 5:57 PM
151	It should be placed on mainy arteries and not forced into older residential streets.	10/6/2020 3:36 PM
152	See previous comments. (I am only responding to my own neighbourhood.)	10/6/2020 3:13 PM
153	Parking, traffic, lack of open space for children, safety concerns.	10/6/2020 3:00 PM
154	Not build at all	10/6/2020 11:16 AM
155	Should be positive in allowing more intensification in mature communities but under design guideline control	10/6/2020 7:42 AM
156	These would fit very well on major streets where there is good access to public transit. Having parking available in a residential neighbourhood doesn't bear thinking about with the potential of there being more than one vehicle per unit.	10/5/2020 5:39 PM
157	Again, do not want multi-unit dwellings built on property formerly occupied by single family unit.	10/5/2020 1:44 PM
158	If the zoning is there, there should be no problem integrating more units into older neighborhoods.	10/5/2020 12:29 PM
159	Not good for residential neighborhoods. The streets and water and sewers have been updated, and the lots were not updated to provide for rezoned spaces. Don`t tear the housing down that is working. See what happened to rapid transit - places are gone, and the City loses - no one expected it to work, and no one wants it anymore. Another dumb decision by City Hall who thought they knew better.	10/5/2020 12:22 PM

160	The site and building design guidelines does not, and needs to include regulations and protection to the adjacent existing structures (such as foundations, fences, garages, unpaved back lanes, sidewalks, etc.) Current bylaws allow excavation to the property line - causing damage to existing structures. This is negligent of the city to know of these issues and approve infill developments, at the cost of and without protecting existing properties. The city could also be opening itself to financial liability. Homeowners who have their houses seriously damaged by construction on a neighbouring property, could sue the city for failing to protect them. In other Canadian jurisdictions, temporary retaining walls and additional supports are required. It is also included in their guidelines to developers that any damage incurred as a result of the construction of the property will be the responsibility of the land owner to repair. It is essential that these guidelines also include: Safety as a priority. Ex. The construction site must be kept safe for both neighbours and workers, and must be properly fenced. Noise in the Neighbourhood. Include specifics on the bylaw permits of operation of construction equipment. Respect for Neighbours. Include guidelines on portable toilets, maintenance of weeds and unkept grass, site litter and debris, and parking permits for construction vehicles to ensure lanes, streets and sidewalks are not blocked. Communication with Neighbours. Including building plans, estimated time of construction, contact information if they have concerns about the project, and scheduled access to their properties if required during construction. Other jurisdictions have created a Infill Conversation Toolkit as a resource. Addition of a Contact and Enquiries section. Including the Residential Infill Department, Community Standards Bylaw, and 311 for issues and complaints relating to infractions of the City Bylaws. In addition, it is essential that a process is outlined in the development guidelines specific to the accountability of developers to follow these guidelines. If required, new bylaws need to be enacted to ensure the city has jurisdiction to enforce the requirements of this strategy. Currently, without such a process, commitments are made by developers at the initial stages of application to the City and then not completed on site. This includes such commitments as landscaping, parking structures, saving existing trees, and building fences. It also includes infractions to site safety, cleanliness, noise, traffic and neighbourhood liveability bylaws. The enforcement of development permits needs to become the responsibility fo the city and not an adjacent property owners responsibility. In addition, new guidelines should include that final inspection by the City is required before occupancy and/or use.	10/5/2020 12:08 PM
161	Limit multi-unit development to main feeder routes. Include front yard setbacks which allow for and include landscape considerations.	10/5/2020 11:03 AM
162	See comments on first question	10/4/2020 10:44 PM
163	There should be underground parking mandatory within the multi-unit building	10/4/2020 9:43 PM
164	I will keep saying this - the issue is one of an overall plan, and enforcement of existing regulations. In some neighbourhoods, significant and still-functional historic buildings have been stripped of status, in others dozens of one-off lot splits mean a piecemeal patchwork which is a benefit to developers but not to development.	10/4/2020 5:21 PM
165	a few have gone up in the neighbourhood on corner lots and it seems to be working well	10/4/2020 1:16 PM
166	The city should encourage this type of gentle density wherever possible.	10/4/2020 10:07 AM
167	Kingston Crescent is NOT a MULI FAMILY community.	10/4/2020 9:38 AM
168	Only allow these buildings in areas that already have them	10/3/2020 7:56 PM
169	They should not be built.	10/3/2020 7:49 PM
170	cannot be taller than existing homes	10/3/2020 7:28 PM
171	Disallow	10/3/2020 4:05 PM
172	Who designed this survey? Are there nit any other questions that could be asked? See answers to previous questions.	10/3/2020 2:06 PM
173	NA	10/3/2020 12:55 PM
174	Ensure developers can’t bypass guidelines!!! What is the consequences when they... what if inspectors turn a blind eye... It happens in single family residence building like how did the massive house ever get allowed on Kildonan Drive where it turns into Helmsdale on a lot where a previous house slipped into River!!! That house casts a massive shadow, presence that should never have happened... that house is a good teaching example of what not to allow as infill... it is as big as any multi complex and an example of unforeseen impact.	10/3/2020 10:52 AM

175	Again, sensitivity to context, especially access to sunlight and third party design review needed.	10/3/2020 10:49 AM
176	Take grass out of the landscaping requirements. focus on trees. Again, parking in front is OK and each unit needs its own personal space.	10/3/2020 10:19 AM
177	Should not be allowed unless replacing a similar building.	10/3/2020 10:11 AM
178	Not to integrate at all. I stand by what I have mentioned previously, The goal of having as many places on one property is for the sake of revenue.	10/3/2020 9:16 AM
179	variety	10/3/2020 8:21 AM
180	Multi unit dwellings should only be allowed in neighborhoods where a number of existing multi unit dwellings are located	10/3/2020 6:48 AM
181	I think more explanation is needed about the building location being measured from a 45 degree angular plane etc etc. No other comments that haven't been covered previously by me.	10/2/2020 9:57 PM
182	The question should not be "how well do the buildings integrate into the neighbourhood?" but "are we adding the right density to the neighbourhood?". If we allow small incremental steps in infill housing, the character of the neighbourhood will change slowly. However, as it stands, there is no development then the neighbourhood has no infill and does not renew resulting in "undesirable" neighbourhoods. We need constant incremental renewal. If we don't then we have rundown neighbourhoods or we need to tear down a whole block for renewal.	10/2/2020 3:35 PM
183	DO not do this. PLEASE	10/2/2020 3:01 PM
184	Do not build in single family 50 foot lot neighborhoods. Build them down town or maybe Tuxedo.	10/2/2020 2:21 PM
185	Same as previous answers	10/2/2020 1:28 PM
186	The guidelines are exceedingly complex. How are community members supposed to assess them?	10/2/2020 10:09 AM
187	Depends where they put them	10/1/2020 10:19 PM
188	Parking should be addressed	10/1/2020 8:25 PM
189	Survey neighbourhood residents.	10/1/2020 5:12 PM
190	same as #2.	10/1/2020 4:38 PM
191	Might need to allow higher buildings than the abutting properties and street types, depending on special needs of that area. E.g. if it's right on major bus lane and close to larger green spaces, it seems higher multi-unit buildings should be allowed.	10/1/2020 4:25 PM
192	landscaping	10/1/2020 4:10 PM
193	Unless entire blocks are being bought out, these create too much traffic in older developed areas. Not to mention devaluing an older neighbourhood.	10/1/2020 3:22 PM
194	There's no such thing as a 10+ mutli-unit site that has adequate snow storage on site if there's on-site above ground parking. Everyone hauls it away. Please don't put unobtainable requirements in these guidelines. Look at the old Grace hospital site. Same contradiction in roofing.	10/1/2020 2:48 PM
195	Not to be placed among an established neighborhood . Apartments / Town houses need to be more on their own .	10/1/2020 1:43 PM
196	fine as is	10/1/2020 11:47 AM
197	talk about parking issues that arise from these units. Introduce parking space requirements	10/1/2020 11:27 AM
198	I think fewer restrictions would be better and I support infill building.	10/1/2020 11:10 AM
199	Distance between houses should be considered	10/1/2020 11:07 AM
200	Same as previous.	10/1/2020 6:29 AM
201	These don’t belong in established neighborhoods.	9/30/2020 11:00 PM

202	Main Corridors	9/30/2020 10:36 PM
203	Same	9/30/2020 8:48 PM
204	My concern is people being able to look back into my yard. But what was done and Novavista and Dakota, is an example of good placement in a neighbourhood. Id be more interested in the new occupants and house they feel about living next to a busy road. But this example is not a mature neighbourhood. Don't encroach on their front yard view.	9/30/2020 7:32 PM
205	Smaller	9/30/2020 2:55 PM
206	We had a developer that wanted to rezone a church parking lot in Charleswood in order to put in a 65 unit condo. Surrounding homes were all single family units. With a couple of houses 2 storeys. Total disregard to the neighbourhood. This survey is not transparent	9/30/2020 2:11 PM
207	What does the existing neighbourhood guideline state?	9/30/2020 12:54 PM
208	Too restricted for architectural features and building design (for example, requiring two different materials and a main entrance to be on the front face of the building should NOT be up to planners, but rather architects / builders).	9/30/2020 11:51 AM
209	Again, unless there are clear examples of these types of building on the street already or the street has changed so much over the years that is now a main artery and not really that residential any longer than this type of building could be considered.	9/30/2020 11:45 AM
210	crazy	9/30/2020 8:32 AM
211	The guidelines render entire existing neighbourhoods illegal to rebuild, even SFH and duplexes. Much too restrictive for a city-wide policy. Remove restrictions on minimum lot widths, side yards, main floor height, building height, parking minimums.	9/29/2020 7:44 PM
212	Only single family homes should be permitted.	9/29/2020 4:05 PM
213	The concept is so far beyond ridiculous, and tantamount to insanity, that it is hard to believe that 'elected officials' can support this. They OBVIOUSLY are not supporting their electorate now, are they? The Neighbourhood Plan clearly doesn't allow for this, nor should it. But we all know that these questions and responses are completely ignored by anyone who has the authority to do anything about it, and therefore, whatever I say here will simply be manipulated into "compete support and happiness" of whatever idea. Not unlike the Communist Chinese Party line-think.	9/29/2020 1:29 PM
214	Same	9/29/2020 1:27 PM
215	De-prioritize site and design guidelines in favour of energy and carbon emissions reduction targets.	9/29/2020 8:26 AM
216	These plans do not fit in to my neighbourhood. No more infill in Glenwood! We are losing trees every day, yet Mayor Bowman was on TV last week on National Tree Day preaching the virtue of trees? No more infills!	9/28/2020 9:46 PM
217	Same as my other comments	9/28/2020 6:41 PM
218	Never	9/28/2020 12:44 PM
219	While this could work, providing a sufficient number of properties are acquired, and leave a reasonable amount of space between the new structures and existing houses, lets say something in the order of 30 to 50 feet space, to the next property line, in order to maintain a level of privacy for existing homes.	9/28/2020 9:45 AM
220	These are vague outlines that developers will abuse to their advantage.	9/28/2020 8:14 AM
221	Should not be imposed on long term residents if they are not in favour of major developments affecting the quality and use ability of their property. Privacy, fire, parking, noise, etc all increase as does population.	9/28/2020 8:13 AM
222	We need more apartments and townhouses across the City in exclusionary, single family only neighbourhoods like River Heights. Do NOT introduce lot coverage requirements and stop trying to prescribe aesthetics.	9/27/2020 11:48 PM
223	Our best neighbourhoods have multi-unit buildings mixed with single-family homes. Why don’t	9/27/2020 10:59 PM

	we allow this anymore? Multi-unit buildings should be allowed everywhere, not just on busy roads.	
224	cant be done	9/27/2020 2:34 PM
225	keep to minimum two units	9/27/2020 2:22 PM
226	Don't allow them at all. There are plenty of these properties already on St. Anne's and St. Mary's roads	9/27/2020 2:13 PM
227	There is no room for apartments, condos or anything like that in Old St. Vital. They would need to build on St. Mary's or St. Anne's Roads.	9/26/2020 4:23 PM
228	Not well at all. Lots are usually far too small and not appropriated for residential areas, unless on a major thoroughfare.	9/26/2020 4:02 PM
229	The neighbourhood as a whole should be used as context for building height recommendations. A three or four story apartment building on the corner of a larger thoroughfare and a residential street might be entirely appropriate, even though the adjacent properties have one or two story buildings on them. Requiring buildings to include significant architectural features does not guarantee good design, and often hinders it.	9/26/2020 3:00 PM
230	NOT AT ALL. The City has enough buildings going up in new areas of the city that won't place undue stress on the current existing areas. Let people move to those areas.	9/26/2020 12:16 PM
231	DO NOT ALLOW	9/26/2020 11:08 AM
232	It is important not to concentrate low income housing, public housing, group homes and halfway houses, as it is a recipe for ghettos.	9/25/2020 11:39 PM
233	The above guidelines talk about matching property next door to it. However in my neelighbour hood Glenwood they are building apartment blocks next to bungalows. So much for that rule. I have little faith the City will enforce any of this.	9/25/2020 6:20 PM
234	See my comments per single family Consideration should be given to ensure adequate on street parking	9/25/2020 12:41 PM
235	Scrap: landscaping requirements, requirements for architectural features. lot coverage requirements and and building height requirements should include minimums that contemplate maximizing the space, and no maximums. Infill should be prioritized overall. Get rid of parking minimums.	9/25/2020 9:33 AM
236	Same commnent. In fact , in my neighbourhood, the infrrsturcture needed to be replced to support the new building. The developer refused to pay for it, so the City billed the current residents (even after they submitted a petition against it as per City rules).	9/25/2020 8:36 AM
237	It cant	9/25/2020 8:26 AM
238	No	9/25/2020 6:51 AM
239	These houses should be on corner lots and close to secondary roads not on bays or on residential streets	9/24/2020 8:03 PM
240	we do not want dense rental apartments in our neighbourhood	9/24/2020 7:36 PM
241	-Require developers who spilt lots to retain the intrinsic natural features of each building site -Require developer and home builders to consult with an architect to ensure homes being built work within the context of each site and neighbourhood instead of "clear cutting" and "plopping" off the shelf plans on to the sites -Require developers and home builders to consider the light requirements of existing neighbours	9/24/2020 4:10 PM
242	not descriptive enough to determine. what are the height and coverage requirements...?	9/24/2020 3:55 PM
243	More parking issues in residential neighborhoods. Unless there is a parking lot for these units	9/24/2020 12:38 PM
244	same comments apply for 3 and 4 story units.	9/24/2020 11:25 AM
245	Multi-unit housing should be built on vacant land and not near the mature housing since such housing is not traditional in mature neighbourhoods.	9/24/2020 10:02 AM
246	They should be at corners.	9/24/2020 9:47 AM

247	Do not allow multi units on existing residential streets	9/24/2020 9:22 AM
248	developers will not follow these types of guidelines and will look for ways to maximize the size of the builidng to get the most amount of money. guidelines are only suggestions and they have the ability to get variances so why even have guidelines if the planning department routinely allows a variance?	9/24/2020 9:12 AM
249	Go and look at the area and the existing structures, needs to be more of an individual decision. Be more upfront with the designs of the newer structure when posting signs in neighbourhoods	9/24/2020 8:44 AM
250	Again: a step in the right direction. To make sure it actually works, I suggest we have a neighborhood oversight committee for each mature community made up of residents who live there. Yes, I'd be happy to be on one...for free!	9/24/2020 7:21 AM
251	These units should only be allowed on major roadways and where there is existing public transport available.	9/24/2020 12:19 AM
252	Restrict on to closer to major routes	9/23/2020 10:44 PM
253	See response to previous. Depends on details of imposed requirements.	9/23/2020 10:32 PM
254	Extreme public consultation with an easy method of public engagement where residents don't have to go out of their way to express concerns. Big infill simply need more space and the proper infrastructure. Like should replace like. If there was already an apartment there ok replace it. If there was a 800 SQ foot house there don't split the lot and build two tall double unit houses. And also where sense if community without a yard or trees	9/23/2020 9:05 PM
255	I think multiunits on a lot that had one makes no sense. I think parking needs to be addressed as an increase in residents will increase street parking. This will disrupt traffic flow on some streets and make it difficult for residents to park. The increased usage on the existing infrastructure such as sewage, power needs to be addressed as introducing three homes where there was once one will increase the amount of usage on this infrastructure. Further, larger structures need to take into account the height of the structure so that it doesn't affect the neighbours. Also this amount of development would take away the natural beauty of the area by removing mature trees that makes the neighbourhood what it is.	9/23/2020 9:01 PM
256	Allow townhouses everywhere.	9/23/2020 8:24 PM
257	Here you really need corresponding green space, clean and safe.	9/23/2020 8:14 PM
258	Infill for increased residential density should only be permitted in large scale and corner lots. They should not be squeezed into existing lots or split lots. Infill needs to consider gravel lanes, garbage and recycling requirements and snow clearing. Design standards should also consider neighbourhood context.	9/23/2020 6:47 PM
259	with single family neighbourhoods - limit numbers so that some communities are not desicrated by infill	9/23/2020 6:37 PM
260	Must consider the parking as the streets become very full and cars are not being towed to have proper plowing creating dangerous ice ridges.	9/23/2020 6:35 PM
261	no multi-unit/apartment/townhouse in any infill situation.	9/23/2020 6:17 PM
262	Needs to preserve mature trees over more development and protect the character of neighbourhoods - why not just make the zoning variance process less cumbersome to ensure residents get a say while also streamlining the timing?	9/23/2020 5:50 PM
263	Create a new zone for the city outside of the city. Incorporate some of the small towns around the city. Make the city bigger not fatter. No room in the cities wardrobe for obesity . These infill dumps are the obesity giving our city heart damage	9/23/2020 5:36 PM
264	See my previous comments. This type of development only benefits developers who can outbid first-time buyers for a piece of property, tear down an old house, and put in a multi-unit structure and charge people three times the price. This type of development should not be allowed.	9/23/2020 5:25 PM
265	I don't believe there are many cases for these buildings to exist in already zoned single family neighbourhoods. I currently have a large apartment building (100+ units) being built almost in my backyard (no back lane) and there are dozens of units that look into my bedrooms, bathrooms, and backyard resulting in a complete loss of privacy. I restate my earlier thoughts	9/23/2020 4:52 PM

	of the developer in question proving impacted residents with a landscaping budget to help mitigate the loss of privacy caused by their structures. Again, they're getting in, making money and leaving. Meanwhile residents' quality of life and property values diminish. In addition, there will be parking for 100 cars on a surface lot which will cause light, noise (car alarms, doors slamming) no matter how far the requirements are from the adjacent property (10 feet is way too little).	
266	Limit builds to single family dwellings.	9/23/2020 4:35 PM
267	Homes and apartments are not the same. Keep areas as designated. Quit mixing different housing alternatives!	9/23/2020 4:33 PM
268	Residents of nearby homes should be consulted and should have a say in the design of these properties ie. the height, front yard setbacks, landscaping. I also don't believe that parking regulations should be able to relaxed, especially if the building is on a street with no on-street parking and there is restricted parking on nearby streets ie University Crescent condos.	9/23/2020 4:22 PM
269	Include green space/ play space to correspond to number of families/ children projected to live in the new housing.	9/23/2020 4:18 PM
270	Guidelines could be improved by adding: "Introduce FRONT yard setbacks that respond to the context of abutting properties.	9/23/2020 4:03 PM
271	Same as my answer for #8	9/23/2020 3:56 PM
272	Parking, traffic, 'city planning' to acommodate increased traffic or lack thereof, disregard of residents and businesses who already can't find street parking... noise, building on green spaces.. city does not care.	9/23/2020 3:42 PM
273	Triplex, Fourplex and Townhouses should be limited to areas that are being substantially redeveloped, or new developments. Multi-family housing does not integrate well into a neighborhood of single family structures.	9/23/2020 3:41 PM
274	Provided they are spaced accordingly for the lot these are more welcome than trying to fit in multiple infill houses in one small lot.	9/23/2020 3:33 PM
275	same as previous	9/23/2020 2:13 PM
276	These need to be built EVERYWHERE. Don't limit them by neighbourhood. No parking requirements. Let the buildings extend back further towards back lane. On commercial streets these should abut the sidewalk. On streets with limited residential or old residential that is going to require extensive turnover, these can be used to set new precedents by building to the sidewalk and deeply into yard. Re-image what certain streets/neighbourhoods could be. (ie: West Exchange / Centennial / West End / Osborne Village / South Osborne along train tracks/ Point Douglas)	9/23/2020 11:56 AM
277	Parking..parking ...parking increase parking provided on property	9/23/2020 11:05 AM
278	Some of the new infills have windows that are directly into the neighboring houses. Architectural features like this should be considered to neighboring properties.	9/23/2020 10:43 AM
279	Good as is.	9/23/2020 9:35 AM
280	45' height is too low for 4 storeys. Typical floor to floor height is 11'. That's 44' and that leaves no room for a parapet or having a building up from grade by a foot.	9/23/2020 9:33 AM
281	Adding this many units to an existing neighbourhood is too many.	9/23/2020 9:15 AM
282	very dependent on access roads into the development - using same roads as existing homes quadrupling traffic in an otherwise quiet neighborhood should be a no	9/23/2020 9:09 AM
283	Make sure they are affordable for those who rely on apartment living. We must ensure that gentrification of neighborhoods does not allow for housing to be priced too high for people who need to live in these neighborhoods but have a lower income.	9/23/2020 9:02 AM
284	Don't allow in single family areas	9/23/2020 4:50 AM
285	Same as previous on parking minimums. Dr. Donald Shoup has incredible research on this and his presentation in Winnipeg can be viewed on the Downtown Winnipeg BIZ and Green Action Centre sites.	9/22/2020 10:12 PM

286	Parking, traffic, noise, safety	9/22/2020 7:55 PM
287	I believe the important need is that it’s a seamless transition from mature neighborhoods to new buildings	9/22/2020 3:28 PM
288	The setbacks are inadequate and damage the foundations and walls of existing properties. Neighbours have little say in what will be built and this causes, in many cases, their homes/investment to lose value. The plan to target corners of streets also means that once a corner has been redeveloped in a desirable area, the whole block must expect to be targeted at every corner. Simply look at what has happened on the block of McMillan Avenue between Stafford and Harrow. First, two bungalows were torn down to make a gigantic condo building which was justified because of a modest apartment across the street and an office building on Corydon. Then, the McMillan/Stafford side of that block was targeted and is now going to be a multi-use structure with loads of parking. Now, the other side of McMillan and Stafford is being targeted by another developer. This is happening many corners along Stafford and Harrow...as well as along Grosvenor. The condos and apartments are all overpriced and some take years to sell. This is not an improvement to the neighbourhood, it puts stress on the infrastructure and decreases the value of other properties on corners, as they are immediately targeted by developers. It's not fair to existing neighbours and it doesn't improve the community/neighbourhood, it just boosts the tax base for the city and fills the pockets of the developers. It also doesn't make any effort to prioritize renovation and restoration of older housing to accommodate apartments or multi-unit settings. Our home is over a hundred years old and was used as a boarding house for a long time. It was reconverted to a single family home and could easily be converted again into three historic condos. However, the emphasis in these guidelines is on demolition and new builds, not on maintaining and appreciating what we have in terms of old, sturdy housing stock.	9/22/2020 2:07 PM
289	The question is similar to that in #2, #4, #6 and #8 above, and my response here is essentially the same as I gave there.	9/22/2020 1:36 PM
290	Abandon this ludicrous idea NOW!	9/22/2020 1:29 PM
291	You have a coop model. Use it!	9/22/2020 1:25 PM
292	again, all neighborhoods should enjoy the privilege of multi-family housing, not just busy streets and intersections; people who live in multi-family dwellings also deserve quiet sidewalks and tree canopies	9/22/2020 11:44 AM
293	This applies to all of the categories, there seems to be a conflict between: "Consider using similar rooflines to surrounding properties to complement the architectural character of the street and neighbourhood" and "Consider using a variety of roof lines (sic) to provide visual interest and enhance the residential character of the streetscape". Specific to townhouses, the item: "Exterior walls should be articulated through a combination of materials and architectural features that create three-dimensional depth and add interest to the building façade." Why? Look at some of the wonderful European neighbourhoods with their minimal pallet of materials such as stone or brick. I know you want to avoid visual monotony but will likely encourage bad design. Why does a facade have to be as festive as a Hawaiian dress shirt?	9/22/2020 10:00 AM
294	We should absolutely NOT be allowing multi family dwellings. PERIOD!	9/22/2020 8:09 AM
295	Keep these units out of small scale residential streets.	9/21/2020 6:45 PM
296	Put them somewhere else. We are not zoned for this! Nor do we want them in our neighborhood!	9/21/2020 6:15 PM
297	Including more specific rules on and guidelines on lighting. It is important to illuminate parking areas for safety however how bright is too much and the type of light as well? Should warmer lighting tones be favored over the much harsher white daylight types?	9/21/2020 5:23 PM
298	Units of this size should only be built in areas of other large complexes. DO NOT cram them into neighbourhoods of mostly single family homes. We decide to live in a neighbourhood of single family homes for a reason ... if we wanted to live like sardines we would not have bought a home where we did !!!	9/21/2020 4:50 PM
299	See previous answers. And multi-unit dwellings do not belong in the middle of a single-family neighborhood. Privacy (upper floors looking down into back yards) and parking are also concerns.	9/21/2020 4:45 PM
300	Put them on main traffic and bus routes.	9/21/2020 2:59 PM

301	We need to KEEP greenspace, and have places for kids to [lay in their **OWN** yards.	9/21/2020 2:50 PM
302	allow buildings of this size only in very special circumstances given potential for impact on neighbouring residences is quite significant	9/21/2020 2:10 PM
303	Would suggest that large multi-family building have shared gardening space, and access to local onsite composting. Suggest that garbage chutes be replaced with composting chutes to facilitate easy composting.	9/21/2020 2:08 PM
304	It depends on the the neighborhood but in older parts like the north and west end there are almost no parks or tot lots for people to get out and exercise so increasing population, cars and congestion does not enhance life for anyone.	9/21/2020 11:03 AM
305	There should be a way to apply for an exception if needed for any of these infill programs.	9/21/2020 10:01 AM
306	Again, these units should be optioned to be built throughout high income areas, not just the lower income/tax brackets. Charleswood/Tuxedo should have always been some of the first areas to be targeted as their lot sizes allow for more growth/more units to be put in. As well as rental buildings and renters to move into the area.	9/21/2020 9:27 AM
307	somewhat	9/21/2020 8:38 AM
308	have to make sure there is suitable amount of parking for the vehicles.	9/21/2020 8:34 AM
309	should not be allowed where single family housing exists	9/21/2020 7:31 AM
310	Creating building that allow for natural light options for the existing buildings and home, so that a multi unit complex does not overwhelm those residents, by closing that light down.	9/20/2020 11:29 PM
311	For townhouses, front yard setbacks are too restrictive. 'average less 5ft' could still leave unreasonably small remaining areas for building townhouses. Closer to the curb is better. Parking minimums are too high. 1.2 cars per dwelling is too high. It should be .5, at most.	9/20/2020 9:09 PM
312	Same as previous	9/20/2020 6:31 PM
313	Multi-family dwellings are not part of the neighbourhoods character.	9/20/2020 5:17 PM
314	Must have underground parking. Use the same saved surface parking space for Landscaping and snow storage.	9/20/2020 3:28 PM
315	provide for an active neighborhood review when the developer applies	9/20/2020 1:34 PM
316	Ensure the design looks at the very specific site being proposed (existing buildings and street presence), not just a generic plan by a builder.	9/20/2020 12:19 PM
317	There are no guidelines that could make more blocks or multi apartment townhouses acceptable in the Glenwood neighbourhood for instance.	9/20/2020 1:05 AM
318	Not a fan. No comment.	9/19/2020 10:19 PM
319	Ensure decks and patios do not over hang into neighbouring yards	9/19/2020 5:30 PM
320	remove all requirements. Add platinum standard for green buildings	9/19/2020 5:29 PM
321	Too many units. More people. More vehicles. More traffic. Mature area does not beckon this development.	9/19/2020 5:29 PM
322	There are already too many of these monstrosities along streets like St. Mary's Road, near Fermor, that are destroying the neighbourhood for people living around them. Keep these giant condo buildings away from single-residential housing.	9/19/2020 2:37 PM
323	Reducing or eliminating parking minimums will help convince neighbours of the merits of apartments and townhouses. The large surface lots that result from parking minimums are hideously ugly, and undermine the density the infill plan is intended to encourage.	9/19/2020 2:35 PM
324	Build on Main roads only, not residential streets. Diminishes home values and creates parking and traffic issues	9/19/2020 2:03 PM
325	These don't belong in any mature community. New buildings have to be the same as existing ones, no bigger, no more dense. All this is meaningless until Planning requires its Planners to comply. For years, Planning has not complied with the 2008 Infill Guidelines or any bylaws.	9/19/2020 1:51 PM

	Planners make excuses for non-compliance and there has been no meaningful supervision. Sloppy scholarship, lazy rigour, and outright cheating and fabrication of the truth has been commonplace. Result: no faith these guidelines have any meaning at all.	
326	It is more reasonable to place greater restrictions on large apartment buildings. Where they are located and how tall they are. They should be located in the main thouroughfairs close to transit and not block the sun for those with single family dwellings and yards. Apartment building should have to have outdoor recreational space, gardens, and roof top patios for their residents and sufficient garbage and recycling collection, elevators if they are more than 2 stories. And sufficient parking, underground parking preferably. The buildingS should be appealing to look at and include landscaping. Also apartment unit sizes should be regulated and not be allowed below a certain square footage and should have higher standards for utilities, facilities, laundrey, balconies, Only those buildings that meet a certain level of affordability or social housing should be allowed to meet a lower standard for size of unit and facilities.	9/19/2020 10:54 AM
327	There's not enough information/detail here to be able to evaluate.	9/19/2020 10:45 AM
328	Don’t build them	9/19/2020 10:35 AM
329	As long as there is proper space	9/19/2020 10:17 AM
330	Parking requirements	9/19/2020 9:36 AM
331	Make units look more like the neighborhood houses. Not big 2-3 story structures with minimal green space next to bungalows with yards	9/19/2020 9:16 AM
332	Developers MUST have to account for a place for residents to shovel their snow instead of being allowed to fill up all the parking spaces with cars and then shovel snow onto the lane where it causes everyone to get stuck. Limit the number of new units in each block. We already have 4 such units on our block and the increased traffic in the lane by renters who don't seem to care about the community is overwhelming to established residents: speeding, shovelling snow onto the lane instead of keeping it on their property, not cleaning up after their animals, garbage thrown from cars has increased since the buildings have gone up, parking cars on the lane so other traffic can't get by, etc. Renters have no stake in the neighbourhood and are already approaching the population of the rest of the block.	9/19/2020 8:48 AM
333	If these are built in neighbourhoods with existing apartment lots, then it may work and improved integration with landscaping would be good.	9/19/2020 8:20 AM
334	Excellent. In general - realistically Developers may be more on board if they feel they are “getting something” for abiding by new guidelines. Ie. what’s the incentive for them? Can you build in some incentive? Ie. if they meet all Design guidelines they get “x”? They’ve gotten away with so much for so long, this will be a shock to their process. Also, accountability is going to matter. How will the City regulate these guideline and hold developers accountable? Thanks for the hard work.	9/19/2020 7:59 AM
335	See earlier comments.	9/19/2020 6:19 AM
336	Multi units should never be used as infills!	9/19/2020 12:17 AM
337	Make building height mandatory	9/18/2020 8:48 PM
338	No more multi units in mature neighborhood	9/18/2020 8:27 PM
339	Too big. We have many new ones in our area and they completely occupy the lot, have no trees, and huge garages.	9/18/2020 7:29 PM
340	See above answer but add !!!!	9/18/2020 7:08 PM
341	Remove requirements for certain numbers of parking spaces, as we should be encouraging personal car-free lifestyles to help combat climate change and make communities more connected and vibrant	9/18/2020 6:57 PM
342	Nope.	9/18/2020 5:31 PM

Q11 How do you think the location criteria for single family detached and up/down duplex could be improved?

Answered: 407 Skipped: 367

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Make the homes match the area thru are in. Stop reducing lot sizes.	10/23/2020 8:22 AM
2	Maintain existing characteristics of neighbourhoods with larger lots by not allowing lot splitting in mature neighborhoods	10/23/2020 7:17 AM
3	See previous note: A lot coverage of 30% is still almost twice as big as the average lot coverage in most mature communities.	10/22/2020 11:12 PM
4	The city seems to be against yards and this is wrong. Right now, with Covid, families are looking for homes with a yard in which their families and pets can get outside while staying at home. The plan needs to acknowledge that yards are an important part of a home for those that want a yard that can accommodate a garden and green space.	10/22/2020 11:03 PM
5	Stronger requirements for protecting mature trees, and minimum lot sizes.	10/22/2020 10:28 PM
6	Protect mature trees. Incentives to replace trees. I am tried of developers building as large as possible for the most possible money. There needs to be balance.	10/22/2020 10:28 PM
7	Not all infill should be large houses- smaller homes should also have a place. Existing infrastructure such as roads and sewers would have to be upgraded to handle the extra volume.	10/22/2020 9:14 PM
8	The developer should approach the neighbourhood for their input before submitting his/her application.	10/22/2020 5:30 PM
9	Not sure	10/22/2020 5:19 PM
10	Stop lot splitting, and follow the new guidelines. Build these units but not on split lots. No duplexes where there currently are none.	10/22/2020 4:01 PM
11	Smaller , architecturally designs respectful to the size and style of the historical existing neighbourhood. Dwarfing the existing homes beside dose nothing but look out of place and affects the quality of life of existing owners.	10/22/2020 3:57 PM
12	There should be a limit to how many can be built in an area, and that is definitely not happening.	10/22/2020 3:25 PM
13	Do not allow lot splitting. Building tall skinny houses on split lots is ruining mature neighborhoods like River Heights.	10/22/2020 2:37 PM
14	The zone map attached to the guidelines was too small to be understood.	10/22/2020 2:33 PM
15	I support these items most. -Limiting the size of new buildings to bring them more in line with existing homes -Introducing site and building design requirements that are more in character with the neighbourhood But I would say I generally support most points on this page (single family detached and up/down duplex)	10/22/2020 1:45 PM
16	Abolish single family zoning to allow greater ease of a variety of infill developments. Allow more flexibility in lot width requirements to allow a variety of infill densities in existing mature neighbourhoods.	10/22/2020 11:45 AM
17	Additional single family detached should be discouraged. Duplexes should be encouraged everywhere in both Area 1 and 2. Location criteria for Area 1 should be as flexible as Area 2.	10/22/2020 11:32 AM
18	Make them one unit bungalows.	10/22/2020 11:29 AM
19	The focus of the location criteria should center on these three: - Limiting the size of new buildings to bring them more in line with existing homes, - Introducing site and building design requirements that are more in character with the neighbourhood, and - Introducing new minimum lot size requirements for up/down duplexes. Precise criteria, tailored to the specific neighbourhood, need to be set out clearly and enforced.	10/22/2020 11:27 AM
20	Encouraging plans that maintain character of homes in area, all these new modern massive home builders drive up prices and exclude people on lower incomes	10/22/2020 11:12 AM
21	I think back lane/back yard requirements should be relaxed for single family detached dwellings, most of these requirements don't exist for existing dwellings	10/22/2020 10:20 AM
22	the idea that seniors want to live in houses that are more vertical and with more steps than	10/22/2020 9:56 AM

	current homes shows a writer with no idea of seniors issues. This is literally the reverse of what seniors want	
23	Focus on other locations as character neighbourhoods would lose their desirability due to radical and drastic changes that interrupt the essential nature of these areas.	10/21/2020 10:18 PM
24	Multi unit dwellings should be reserved for corner lots only	10/21/2020 10:13 PM
25	Need more discussion of how many bedrooms will be built in to accommodate families. Need to specify accessibility. standards.	10/21/2020 8:30 PM
26	Do not split the lots. When the lot is kept the same size and a new house is built on it, then the neighbourhood improves without looking cold and crowded.	10/21/2020 7:17 PM
27	Adhere to the single family residential zoning and make the concept enforceable in the by-law. Currently, 50 foot lots with one family and associated cars are subdivded into 25 foot lots for at least two families and associated cars. Some of these new houses are built to allow so called 'granny suites' so we could have four families and associated cars. Lots smaller than 35' create issues for snow clearing and certainly minimize capability for mature trees.	10/21/2020 7:09 PM
28	I think it’s important to build density into our city, but to do it in a planned and measured way, taking into account walkability, the character of the existing neighbourhood, tree canopies and the quality of the surrounding homes. Infill homes offer an incredible opportunity to build quality homes that improve neighbourhoods, to date that is not what I’ve witnessed with infills. I would like to see developers have less control. I live in a home that was redone by a “contractor” who used poor materials, shoddy workmanship and didn’t effectively consider design. We’re now having to redo a lot of what he did, which is wasteful both financially and environmentally. Quality, design and community planning need to be considered at the get go.	10/21/2020 4:01 PM
29	unsure	10/21/2020 3:51 PM
30	Minimum 50% of new buildings wheelchair accessible: main floor bathroom, level entry or room for ramp AND yard green space. ONLY first block off main artery for multi-unit buildings. Replace existing 3 storey walkups with high rises (with elevators). If multi replacing single, MUST have on site parking for 2 vehicles per adult living in the unit.	10/21/2020 1:06 PM
31	Owners should prove that they cannot renovate instead of tearing down. Do not allow the footprint to be larger than what’s being replaced. Do not allow buildings as high as proposed in the guidelines. Build smaller square footage per dwelling. People do NOT need ensuites, walk-in closets, islands plus dining tables for eating. Live smaller - as in Europe.	10/21/2020 1:03 PM
32	Again, smaller homes and better plans. When the house went up next to ours they completely demolished our fence (by accident) with two large dogs a baby it was a nightmare for many months before it was rebuilt.	10/21/2020 11:53 AM
33	lot sizes cannot support multi-family housing.	10/21/2020 11:10 AM
34	see previous answer-	10/21/2020 10:37 AM
35	No "moderate density" infill in River Heights!	10/21/2020 7:43 AM
36	-see previous comments	10/21/2020 7:26 AM
37	St. Vital/st. George/Worthington/Pulberry etc. Should be included in the predominately single family homes zone. They should be required to stay as single family homes.	10/20/2020 11:31 PM
38	Seemed clear	10/20/2020 9:49 PM
39	The guideline mentions that secondary suites are permitted but does nothing to define them. It is well know that developers are exploiting the classification to create two-family homes, where the requirements of a duplex cannot be meet. But that loop hole must be eliminated to prevent duplexes from become 4-plexes.	10/20/2020 9:19 PM
40	Retain a specific percentage of 50' lots in our area (that can not, ever be split) in order to maintain the 1 truly significant characteristic of the Glenwood area. At this date in time, the lot-splitting and new builds are destroying the unique character of our original, spacious community , over-densifying it which will create a future "rentals" community with few permanent residents and eventually in 20 years will become an inner-city rental area with parking issues, no mature trees/grassed yards...a transient area, which are generally uncared-for by the non-permanent residents.	10/20/2020 7:54 PM

41	Really? That's the question. I hate infill.	10/20/2020 5:16 PM
42	Putting them in neighbour hoods that they would not look like an eye sore.	10/20/2020 3:40 PM
43	No opinion.	10/20/2020 3:25 PM
44	Remove the distinction between Areas 1 and 2... it only further serves to entrench existing socio-economic divisions. Remove lot size requirements... density needs walkability to be livable, and walkability needs narrow lots. Therefore, intensification needs to be allowed to happen on all lot sizes. On limiting the sizes of buildings to be "compatible", anything under 4 storeys should simply be allowed... anything that is scaled to a person walking is compatible. The goal isn't density, it's walkability (even though walkable places will be dense, dense places aren't always walkable).	10/20/2020 3:06 PM
45	We should strive to achieve balance in established neighbourhoods. Not overload them with overcrowding and homes that stick out.	10/20/2020 2:23 PM
46	ELIMINATE LOT SPLITTING FOR STREETS WITH UNPAVED (mud, gravel) LANES. I have no ideological problem with infill, but my backlane is an unpaved mess at the best of times. I spent 15k on a new garage last year, and it was nearly unusable over the winter due to ruts and deep ditches in the middle of the lane. In the spring, we end up with a literal pond, nearly a foot deep, that we refer to with disdain as Lake Fernwood. Adding further desity to streets with unpaved back lanes will cause undue damage to an already nearly unusable lane from the construction needs, and will reduce the amount of time it remains usable after grading due to the increase in residential traffic.	10/20/2020 2:08 PM
47	Convince people in neighborhoods such as River Heights and Glenwood that housing has to evolve or these places will continue to shrink in population.	10/20/2020 10:43 AM
48	Less design and size restrictions	10/20/2020 8:27 AM
49	By using some common sense and avoiding these incentives in areas that clearly don’t need it like Elm Park , St George. And secondly - the video bubbles that we can use existing infrastructure - have you ever ever seen the back lane behind Elm Park? It’s mud , not gravel and the idea is put more drivers on this? That’s your great existing infrastructure , but you somehow forgot to mention that.	10/19/2020 10:00 PM
50	NA	10/19/2020 3:29 PM
51	Don't ruin my neighbourhood.	10/19/2020 11:57 AM
52	How does city suggest densification in polo park area after just narrowing the streets on empress and other access into area, where do you think all the cars will go and park. AVPA secondary plan is not considered, noisy enough around airport the densification should not be permitted in this zone.	10/19/2020 9:45 AM
53	The city should proofread these documents. Many sentences don’t have a subject and verb. If there is so little attention to language how much can there be to the finer details. How much are these people paid to write this garbage? It’s embarrassing.	10/18/2020 9:11 PM
54	the line drawing that puts 1950's and 1960's areas like St George in st Vital into "mature communities" where homes are supposedly past their life span denies actually reality - these neighbourhoods are not in decline so why encourage tear downs. Very broad application of theory to reality . AND no lot splits where there are gravel lanes. City limits development on gravel roads - why try to increase density on gravel lanes.	10/18/2020 8:38 PM
55	Infill development should be included in other areas not just area 1 and 2.	10/18/2020 8:23 PM
56	The homes need to be of higher quality and similar design versus the current cheap cookie-cutter style that are not in the style of the existing area. One lot in the area went from a single home to three tall narrow homes that are spaced too closely without any landscaping and insufficient parking..	10/18/2020 7:10 PM
57	Élargir la ville de Winnipeg en construisant de nouvelles maisons détachées pour les famille à revenus moyens ou bas serait une meilleure idée	10/18/2020 6:47 PM
58	You should not be able to build two up/down duplexes. Either build two single family houses or one duplex. There should also be a limit to how many infills per street within a 5-year gap.	10/18/2020 5:08 PM
59	no	10/18/2020 3:45 PM

60	There is insufficient attention to implications for parking in the neighbourhood, including providing access to plugging in block heaters in the winter. More attention needs to be paid to providing and/or maintaining options for a range of income levels. Some of these neighbourhoods have been places where young people can afford their first homes as well as places with larger more expensive housing. Also, there is insufficient attention to trees, whether existing or new plantings. Many usual measures to protect existing trees are insufficient, and the trees end up dying within a few years of the construction. The construction of new foundations for example will likely to significant damage to any large mature trees on the property. Winnipeg's tree canopy has in the past been a matter of great pride and also has ecological value. Someone needs to be responsible for monitoring the health of both existing and newly planted trees for these sites. Perhaps builders might put down a guarantee deposit to be refunded after 5 years if the trees survive. Planting two trees for killing one large mature one is insufficient. Tree list might be expanded. The setback specification "or portion of block" allows for too much wiggle room. What does that really mean? The entire block should be considered in that average.	10/18/2020 11:07 AM
61	Too late. Rental properties with 10 bedrooms on a lot that had 2-3 in a residential block that was entirely single family has destroyed the esthetic of an entire block. The residential single family designation posted on the variance is deceitful and misleading. Duplexes should only have been allowed on blocks where duplexes and multifamily already exist.	10/18/2020 10:41 AM
62	Well not within the scope of this project there needs tp be an addition for a set of rules regarding the protection of the structural integrity of adjacent properties and buildings. with increased density in these areas the issue of street parking becomes a major issue. Perhaps introduce parking passes as a pay for service.	10/18/2020 10:37 AM
63	dont	10/17/2020 11:43 AM
64	Take into account Trees	10/17/2020 8:29 AM
65	Have people from the community be part of a community to ensure proper criteria are being met	10/17/2020 6:31 AM
66	Maintain mature trees	10/16/2020 11:57 PM
67	limit size, protect trees, create green space.	10/16/2020 11:27 PM
68	Setbacks from streets and neighbouring homes needs to be increased. Houses (detached and duplex) should be no more than 2 stories tall.	10/16/2020 11:18 PM
69	I'm a theatre artist, not a city planner. Why are you even asking us these questions?	10/16/2020 8:54 PM
70	Apply to areas with secondary plans	10/16/2020 8:03 PM
71	its fine.	10/16/2020 7:24 PM
72	Parking	10/16/2020 7:06 PM
73	Listing the specific lot size requirement for consideration instead of leaving with a generic 'new minimum lot size requirement' blurb... If there's a requirement what is it? You don't just get blanket approval with just the generic placeholder	10/16/2020 6:14 PM
74	I would rely on your "case to case" basis when allowing multiple units to be built from a single one due to its location and factors around that area.	10/16/2020 2:49 PM
75	leave our neighborhoods' alone . Time for a Change at city Hall	10/16/2020 2:22 PM
76	Keep single family homes in the neighbourhoods	10/16/2020 2:22 PM
77	You need adequate parking.	10/16/2020 2:02 PM
78	What happens when a street or area has never had infill development before, could lot splitting ever happen in that type of situation?	10/16/2020 1:21 PM
79	consistency and alignment with existing neighbourhood aesthetic and community structure.	10/16/2020 11:24 AM
80	Every home in the St. Mathews, Central St. Boniface, Dufferin and Sargent Park area should be inspected and torn down if couldn't pass today's safety/health inspections.	10/16/2020 9:12 AM
81	Minimum lot size for a single family house (not a granny suite) should be the 35'. The granny	10/15/2020 10:39 PM

	suites should not be rental units, the owners should be residing in one of the units (like Victoria, Brandon etc...). Not have up/down duplexes, only have duplexes after the lot has been rezoned (lot only not the neighbourhood) Too high, the majority of the houses are bungalows or 1 1/2 storey.	
82	limiting the height and size of new buildings	10/15/2020 9:53 PM
83	I'm not sure. I don't think it should be done at all	10/15/2020 9:04 PM
84	build neighbourhoods to accomodate these 2-storey,and multi-dwellings so that they all match each other in some harmony	10/15/2020 8:48 PM
85	I could be improved by stopping it. Why do you hate children so much that you won't give them a yard to play in. You're encouraging urban sprawl, not curtailing it.	10/15/2020 7:30 PM
86	Do not group single family and duplex criteria and areas. These are distinct dwelling types and this should be recognized in the guidelines.	10/15/2020 5:22 PM
87	Keep it at LOW density	10/15/2020 4:43 PM
88	I have no suggestions for up-down duplexes and am in support of lot subdivision as a means of increasing density where the space allows (per the guidelines).	10/15/2020 3:06 PM
89	The maximum density should be allowed in Areas 1 and 2.	10/15/2020 2:38 PM
90	Minimum lot sizes should be increased to 30 feet wide.	10/15/2020 2:34 PM
91	n/a	10/15/2020 12:42 PM
92	MINIMUM lot size of 60’ x 120’	10/15/2020 12:27 PM
93	Improving building type diversity should be the north star of this document.	10/15/2020 10:19 AM
94	It can't.	10/15/2020 8:42 AM
95	more unity/ same design in the style of housing available on each street. Similar floorplan/ layout or sq footage size to the homes offered on residential keep businesses and commercial buildings to main streets and routes. offer bike lanes on residential street rather than on main routes to avoid taking away parking for businesses, allowing tranquil bike ride and no frustration with traffic, large trucks, and parking.	10/15/2020 8:23 AM
96	Just don't do it. Build like for like. Don't destroy the character of existing neighbourhoods. Increased traffic is also a danger.	10/14/2020 10:50 PM
97	Give examples	10/14/2020 10:38 PM
98	Remove the clause that requires building design to be in character with the neightbourhood. Let design professionals do their job and don't force such prescriptive requirements.	10/14/2020 7:50 PM
99	More concrete limitations needs to me inplace instead of subjective elementS in the guidelines. lots sizes for any new build infill should be at least 30-35 ft wide Per Single lot. Distance between buildings and property lines should be at least 5 ft. Height restrictions should be implemented to be equivalent to front, back and Especially side neighbouring properties.	10/14/2020 6:27 PM
100	I think the lot sizes that can be divided or made into duplexes are too small. You change the character of the neighbourhood entirely. Infill can be good, so I am not against it outright but it would be nice to recognize your neighbourhood. Many of the changes happening now are awful. So what you propose had better look and feel different. I like the ideas of more character and charm that you propose and the set backs and window considerations, but I hope you have staff to enforce these.	10/14/2020 5:51 PM
101	Keep the zoning the way it is in those areas and not allow for variances. Development must be in tune with the existing buildings and not stick out like sore thumbs.	10/14/2020 4:16 PM
102	Zoning by-laws should be followed. Spread the densification process throughout the whole city. Do not require one or two neighborhoods to solve all the densification problems. Many areas of the city have large lots that can be divided. Why are some postal codes immune to infill location?	10/14/2020 3:23 PM
103	Allow no encroachments. Facade must be in line with neighbours. Keep height low. No lot-line-to-lot-line building. No Tandem parking.	10/14/2020 2:55 PM

104	as long as they are followed	10/14/2020 1:05 PM
105	Build on the outskirts of town where more land is available.	10/14/2020 12:40 PM
106	The owners who have made these "mature" areas over time had a dream of property ownership which included space to allow their children to play on their yards and make neighbourhood friends; be the antithesis of the crowded city. Lets not merely move the "crowded city" into the suburbs	10/14/2020 10:33 AM
107	Location Secondary Considerations These are almost totally subjective and leaves approval at the whim of a single city employee; that is too variable and unfair to the designer/owner for planning purposes and could be too or not enough permissive when compared to other city employees in the same department. Single-Family Detached and Up-Down Duplex Dwellings Excessively mandating lot coverage does not meet the needs of 21st century and aging or extended families. • Requiring a minimum 25 foot long rear yard, when rear yards are considered by a significant portion of modern homeowners as a waste of space because the space is better used as interior living space (especially in Winnipeg with our long winters), and is punitive to those who do not enjoy the outdoors or have medical conditions that do not handle outdoors. • The maximum lot coverage numbers are excessively restricted and mean that between 70% and 58% of the lot is required to be outdoor space and not usable as living space during the winter. This leads to small houses on most lots, which does not increase density or allow multi-generational families to live together. As it is visible to the public it also requires continuous upkeep (which isn't done by a lot of homeowners, creating an eyesore) and is difficult for retired people with disabilities and/or on a fixed income. As long as existing setbacks are observed owners should be able to use the property as they see fit. Landscaping • In general, houses in my mature neighbourhood do not have trees on their property (as the boulevards have trees), yet you are requiring new trees. o In our case, and many in our neighboured, trees cannot be planted on the property that meet the listed criteria as either their canopy or roots will cross property lines, encroach on the building and/or interfere with existing boulevard tree roots and/or create expensive and recurring damage to infrastructure such as sewer, gas and waterlines (which happens regularly in mature neighbourhoods) Roof Pitches o Roof pitches (and the number of them) are a design choice that should not be dictated by the city at all. There is so many varied ones in our neighbourhood already that examples of any desire could be noted, including single/simple pitches without complexity. Requiring complex roofing is dooming homeowners to expensive roof repairs in the future, both due to the generally inevitable water damage those designs cause and complexity of installation, again a burden on a future retiree. Façade Materials and Architectural Features o This section is too prescriptive and infringes on owner's design choices. Even in mature neighbourhoods there is more diversity than would be allowed under this section. o Why must a house have an area projecting or recessed, or have a porch (especially so prescriptive in dimensions)? o Why must they have two prominent façade materials? Many mature neighbourhood homes don't. o Why must there be a minimum of 20% window area facing a primary street and a minimum of 15% on the flanking street? Why can't the majority be on the flanking street if the designer/owner so choses, especially if they can access passive solar due to being south facing? o Alternate Equivalency: This is too subjective and leaves approval at the whim of a single city employee; that is too variable and unfair to the designer/owner for planning purposes and could be too or not enough permissive when compared to other city employees in the same department. Entrances o Why shall (aka must) a primary entrance be located on the front façade of the building? Our current home, and many others in our mature neighbourhood, do not (primary and secondary are actually side entrances). Projections into Setbacks Side Yard Projections o On a similar note, our "primary" entrance on the side yard includes enclosed steps to the main level that exceeds the new height maximum of 2 feet (about 4'), so we couldn't even duplicate the existing character of our home in our neighbourhood with these new build guidelines.	10/14/2020 10:33 AM
108	New builds should maintain / complement existing neighbourhood character.	10/14/2020 10:20 AM
109	Limit the size. I don't want to sit in my side deck and look at a huge wall that will block any sunlight that we get.	10/14/2020 10:06 AM
110	More input from existing neighborhood. If the street doesn't want a large house that blocks sun for existing homes then it should not go ahead.	10/14/2020 9:07 AM
111	Expanding eligible areas (i.e. Glenwood)	10/14/2020 9:03 AM
112	I'm still not keen on allowing builders to split lots in two. If that happened on my street, it would look dreadful.	10/14/2020 8:54 AM

113	Craft different guidelines for mature neighbourhoods that take into account the typically narrower lot sizes. Make is MUCH easier to add lane suites or secondary suites.	10/14/2020 7:58 AM
114	In all cases, priority should be given to the rehabilitation and renovation of existing structures. If infill was permitted only in cases where the new construction matched nearby existing homes in size, style, exterior materials, and lot footprint, there would be much less resistance to new infill in existing neighbourhoods.	10/13/2020 10:20 PM
115	Infill should be equally transformative as it should be contextually sensitive. That said, WE ARE NOT building UP instead of OUT if we simply allow existing built form and heights to be re-built on a site. We MUST encourage bold strategies that will visibly change the mature neighbourhoods in Winnipeg into an attractive place for people of all walks of life to live - young, old, disabled, families, rich, poor, middle class.	10/13/2020 8:51 PM
116	The guidelines are not specific enough for home buyers or existing residents to know what may be acceptable in their neighbourhood or on their street in terms of new-build building size. Their are broad guidelines as to what may be acceptable, but these are not nearly specific enough for those who are not experts in housing and construction development to be able to set reasonable expectations. This is especially frustrating, considering the very large sections that are considered 'Area 1' or 'Area 2'. How can anyone expect to be able to plan for what may be acceptable on their own street when the guidelines are written so generally?	10/13/2020 8:33 PM
117	Make sure there is enough parking available for the new owners without street parking.	10/13/2020 8:19 PM
118	Like mentioned before make the homes fit in the neighborhood not stick out like a sore thumb and don’t disturb another homeowners piece all because of investors and their cheap “IKEA” built homes.	10/13/2020 7:33 PM
119	I'd support allowing upzoning up to quadplexes in all current single family zones. Residents deserve more options in every neighbourhood. I don't believe we should be restricting duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes so narrowly as proposed.	10/13/2020 5:40 PM
120	by maintaining the character of the existing neighbourhood and stringently enforcing guidelines for developers.	10/13/2020 4:21 PM
121	For up/down duplexes, greater clarity on entry/exit requirements would be helpful, for example, avoiding "band-aid" style solutions where exterior stairwells are added to access upper units without being incorporated effectively into the overall design. Also, although I'm not sure of minimum site widths specified in the zoning bylaws, it would seem to be ineffective to allow lot splits of properties less than 50 ft. in width.	10/13/2020 4:14 PM
122	Rooflines should also be considered	10/13/2020 2:47 PM
123	The communities should have just as much say in poor communities as they have in rich communities.	10/13/2020 2:31 PM
124	This is a ridiculous survey that will only confirm biases.	10/13/2020 12:18 PM
125	eliminate situation where developer purchases homes at a premium to develop into multifamily units which changes dynamic of neighbourhood. Height limits should be based on neighbouring properties and not bylaw limits. Multifamily units should be encouraged on "feeder" streets with single family behind them.	10/13/2020 12:16 PM
126	line up with the houses that are there .Not closer to the street.Proper parking.	10/13/2020 11:36 AM
127	The Height of these buildings really needs to be considered in mature areas.	10/13/2020 8:48 AM
128	I think if you have a big lot a builder should be able to develop that lot to its full potential and build a house that fits in the area. This will only benefit the city when it comes to more tax revenue which is good business.	10/12/2020 9:31 PM
129	At any decision point, allow a more "liberal" interpretation of the guidelines in favour of infill; rewrite the draft in a less restrictive direction....	10/12/2020 7:12 PM
130	No variances should be allowed AT ALL ..rules are rules..stick to them no matter how deep the developers pockets are!	10/12/2020 6:47 PM
131	the criteria are too detailed and complex for individual homeowners to be able to make adjustments to their property.	10/12/2020 3:54 PM

132	not applicable to our neighborhood	10/12/2020 9:19 AM
133	It's a busy area, so I think more houses should be built.	10/12/2020 5:07 AM
134	Builders should be incentivized to build up as opposed to covering the lot with as much of a structure (house and/or garage) as possible. Landscaping features, such as trees, should be required. Car parking should be considered - new builds that are located on streets that have parking bans (e.g. snow route, times ban) should not rely on the future occupier parking on the street (especially in the case of dividing a lot to put up duplexes).	10/11/2020 11:23 PM
135	Make sure there is sufficient land for gardens, and play areas. Make sure there is sufficient area for a garage onsite and parking. Make sure the view of neighbours isn't blocked when these updown ugly duplexes are built.	10/11/2020 9:01 PM
136	Change the minimum allowable lot width that an existing lot can be split down into. Proposed guidelines for lot sizes are too narrow and do not add to privacy or enjoyment of outdoor green space. The COVID pandemic has highlighted the importance of outdoor spaces for mental and physical health. Or else the City should be contributing to more green spaces. Guidelines need to further consider the impact higher density will have on the amount of traffic and reduced parking in a neighbourhood. Higher density in areas not located near reliable Winnipeg transit will be adversely affected by this. Up down duplexes should not be allowed in R1 neighbourhoods (which are in Area 1), and it needs to be clearer what the difference is between a up-down duplex and single family home with a secondary suite. Calling it a secondary suite to avoid up-down duplex guidelines should not be allowed, especially if the City continues with allowing them to be called secondary suites via the Board of Adjustment rulings. There need to be clearer guidelines on AirBNBs in the City. A R1 neighbouhood should not have to deal with up down duplexes being used only as AirBNBs and never having had families living in them. Without City guidelines, the ones in my neighbourhood get very noisy when rented out as party houses; especially on holidays and weekends. That is one less house with a neighbour(s) that contributes to the neighbourhood and community.	10/11/2020 8:27 PM
137	no comment.	10/11/2020 3:30 PM
138	WE DO NOT WANT THEM	10/11/2020 3:24 PM
139	I'm fine with new housing wherever but as a disabled person it is nearly impossible to find housing that can accomodate a wheelchair. I can't have my friends with disabilities come over, and can't park well enough as restrictions with the street don't allow me to get in and out of my car easily. I wish more thought and possibly legal building code standards would be put in place to put accessiblity for all at the forefront for any new builds.	10/11/2020 12:01 PM
140	Pay careful attention to the infill housing mirroring the design and character of the neighbourhood it is being built in. Many "modern" designs stand out like sore thumbs and they don't need to.	10/11/2020 11:15 AM
141	If I wanted to move to the suburbs I would have bought a house there. City of winnipeg logic: create massive low density suburbs where developers have huge profits, then put pressure on mature area to increase their density. How is this ethical? Mature areas are being destroyed by these terrible infill houses. The roads are destroyed, the trees are removed, these tall houses are so close to each other with no character. This once unique area is being overrun with these shitty houses	10/10/2020 3:57 PM
142	single dewellings	10/10/2020 8:34 AM
143	There should be no up/down duplexes in established neighborhoods that don’t have any as it is	10/10/2020 7:51 AM
144	See previous comment.	10/9/2020 11:06 PM
145	No lot splitting	10/9/2020 6:49 PM
146	By only allowing a certain percentage of the properties to be split.	10/9/2020 4:10 PM
147	We need to do a better job of preserving the character of our older neighbourhoods. Knocking down 100 year old stately homes to build a brand new house that doesn't fit into the existing neigbourhood is doing more harm to our city. Some of the most beautiful cities in the world are governed by architectural controls. Even new subdivisions have caveats on building styles	10/9/2020 1:34 PM
148	one house on one lot	10/9/2020 11:05 AM
149	Provide flexibility for development in various centralized neighbourhoods in Winnipeg	10/9/2020 10:10 AM

150	They should stick to the rules, but there is always someone who decides that they do apply to them.	10/9/2020 9:00 AM
151	Height restrictions. And a major increase in the space between them and property next to them.	10/8/2020 10:48 PM
152	Why doesn't it outline requirements for old st vital or Armstrong point?	10/8/2020 9:11 PM
153	go downtown....There are older homes in older areas ....bring more people downtown.....	10/8/2020 8:04 PM
154	no infills	10/8/2020 3:40 PM
155	By putting a moratorium on this practice or eliminating it entirely. The whole idea is a step backward in the improvement of these areas and an insult to these areas Heritage.	10/8/2020 2:54 PM
156	Didn't see all the locations, As long as you all don't try getting near Transcona east .. I don't think the west would like it either.	10/8/2020 2:26 PM
157	Build them closer to outside the city , near perimeter. Stay away from Munroe !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	10/8/2020 2:04 PM
158	Respect the neighbors in the proposed area. Building a duplex or more rental next to a single family house creates noise pollution and blocks the sunlight of existing homes in the area. Renters just don't seem to have any respect once they move into these new places, travelling thru others yards and the inevitable police visits to the area that seem to follow the building of these multi family residences	10/8/2020 1:52 PM
159	look for opportunities where infrastructure will support the increase	10/8/2020 11:06 AM
160	Limit the number of infill properties on a given block.	10/8/2020 11:04 AM
161	Discard the concept of new minimum lot sizes. Homeowners do not want their neighborhoods destroyed by partitioning existing lots and packing multi-family residences within this space. Have you considered the fire risk associated with condensing home locations. What about the impact on mature trees. What about the social impact and inevitable change to the neighborhood.	10/8/2020 10:06 AM
162	don't build them next to bungalows.	10/8/2020 8:39 AM
163	Set out requirements per street (I.e. min-maximum 10 single family, min. 5 duplexes, etc.)	10/7/2020 7:53 PM
164	Do not split any lots in mature old neighbourhoods. Keep the 50 foot lots the same as they were originally created, same goes with 75 or 100 foot lots. Do not allow builders to build " shoe boxes ". Any new housing or building needs to blend in with the character or the neighbourhood. Keep the green space consistent with older lots. Do not allow any up down building on 25 foot lots, they need to be at the minimum on 50 foot lots or larger to preserve green space and accommodate parking for vehicles. If it's zoned single family, do not introduce up and down buildings in those neighbourhoods that never had them.	10/7/2020 2:50 PM
165	Single family dwellings are fine, however up/down duplex's should not be allowed adjacent single family dwellings, period.	10/7/2020 2:50 PM
166	They should only be allowed on corner lots, thoroughfares or oversized lots as judged by the typical size lot on the specific street.	10/7/2020 12:16 PM
167	The rules being proposed are cookie cutters, not reflecting the actual built environments that exist in for example Garden City. This will prevent the successful implementation of this initiative.	10/7/2020 9:56 AM
168	up/down duplex should only be allowed in areas that already have these types of houses. Single family areas should stay single family.	10/6/2020 9:40 PM
169	I think these are valuable improvements in each of the above factors.	10/6/2020 7:56 PM
170	They should not be built in our neighbourhoods	10/6/2020 5:57 PM
171	No lot splitting and more blending into older properties. We had three reasonably big houses built near me and fourth one came in exceeding Everything on street	10/6/2020 3:42 PM
172	1. The bi-law for tree protection (green space and canopy) should be developed and passed before infill for housing is considered in this neighbourhood. (It is like a park here, and that is	10/6/2020 3:21 PM

	why people moved here.) 2. Make minimum lot sizes match the context of the neighbourhood. One size does not fit all -- the guidelines as they are drawn up assumes lot sizes that are simply not representative of this neighbourhood, where lots are either 50 feet, or 75 feet on both sides of the street. I am actually in favour of infill housing - but the focus on specific lot size minimums do not fit in this neighbourhood. Also there is not a lot of info (that I saw anyway) on other forms of infill; garden suites, secondary suites, semi-detached (like Calgary or Toronto) etc. It seems like a very narrow focus, designed for a completely different neighbourhood. 3. We need FLEXIBLE infill guidelines that fit into the context of the neighbourhood in question, or I suspect infill will fail. Note; again, in our neighbourhood, more than half the houses are exempt, as they are on the river. It seems odd that the inside houses would have completely different lot sizes. There will be immense opposition to all infill if these are the guidelines for this neighbourhood. I would prefer flexible, specific guidelines for our neighbourhood. 4. We need better consultation for this neighbourhood. Most people don't even know it is going on, or the implications to the green space and future.	
173	First, do a test-run in an area like Tuxedo and see how that works out.	10/6/2020 3:03 PM
174	Guideline Quality Management should be considered as when developers get approval it seems there is no oversight by CofW Planning after that point.	10/6/2020 2:35 PM
175	Leave homes where they are and don't infill	10/6/2020 11:16 AM
176	Not entirely sure why the need to create two areas for mature communities - zoning will always be important and should be less about what neighbourhood it is. Are we going to create heritage designations for Area 1 neighbourhoods like Armstrong Point and Crescentwood?	10/6/2020 7:48 AM
177	Consider street density (parking, traffic, sewer congestion etc) when allowing lot splitting	10/5/2020 9:12 PM
178	Lot-splitting on our street has involved approval being given for splitting lots that were a couple of feet or more smaller than 50', resulting in smaller than 25' lots being built on. I guess I don't trust the guidelines.	10/5/2020 5:58 PM
179	Must be a process for surrounding neighbours to have a say in what is built that carries weight. Also want to see clear restrictions on construction processes to limit damage to yard/ building next door to construction site.	10/5/2020 1:47 PM
180	This should not be a thing, forward thinking cities have eliminated R1 zoning entirely.	10/5/2020 12:30 PM
181	I don`t agree with the up down duplex idea in the first place. I, along with many others, like a residential street to stay the size and design in which it was created. No digging it all up and putting up a few all ugly buildings, not in my back yard!!	10/5/2020 12:27 PM
182	The site and building design guidelines does not, and needs to include regulations and protection to the adjacent existing structures (such as foundations, fences, garages, unpaved back lanes, sidewalks, etc.) especially within these mature neighbourhoods. Current bylaws allow excavation to the property line - causing damage to existing structures. This is negligent of the city to know of these issues and approve infill developments, at the cost of and without protecting existing properties. The city could also be opening itself to financial liability. Homeowners who have their houses seriously damaged by construction on a neighbouring property, could sue the city for failing to protect them. In other Canadian jurisdictions, temporary retaining walls and additional supports are required in mature neighbourhoods. It is also included in their guidelines to developers that any damage incurred as a result of the construction of the property will be the responsibility of the land owner to repair. It is essential that these guidelines also include: Safety as a priority. Ex. The construction site must be kept safe for both neighbours and workers, and must be properly fenced. Noise in the Neighbourhood. Include specifics on the bylaw permits of operation of construction equipment. Respect for Neighbours. Include guidelines on portable toilets, maintenance of weeds and unkept grass, site litter and debris, and parking permits for construction vehicles to ensure lanes, streets and sidewalks are not blocked. Communication with Neighbours. Including building plans, estimated time of construction, contact information if they have concerns about the project, and scheduled access to their properties if required during construction. Other jurisdictions have created a Infill Conversation Toolkit as a resource. Addition of a Contact and Enquiries section. Including the Residential Infill Department, Community Standards Bylaw, and 311 for issues and complaints relating to infractions of the City Bylaws. In addition, it is essential that a process is outlined in the development guidelines specific to the accountability of developers to follow these guidelines. If required, new bylaws need to be enacted to ensure the city has jurisdiction to enforce the requirements of this strategy. Currently, without such a	10/5/2020 12:15 PM

	process, commitments are made by developers at the initial stages of application to the City and then not completed on site. This includes such commitments as landscaping, parking structures, saving existing trees, and building fences. It also includes infractions to site safety, cleanliness, noise, traffic and neighbourhood liveability bylaws. The enforcement of development permits needs to become the responsibility fo the city and not an adjacent property owners responsibility. In addition, new guidelines should include that final inspection by the City is required before occupancy and/or use. The current bylaw is 0.8 cars per unit in mature neighbourhoods. That figure needs to be updated based on recent research, and not outdated information. With densification, there is an increase need for parking.	
183	No comment.	10/5/2020 11:06 AM
184	Some of these areas are desirable for the lot sizes, and not having the next door houses so close. Owning a property like this, and then having an infill built much closer should be part of neighbourhood design.	10/5/2020 8:15 AM
185	See comments on first question	10/4/2020 10:44 PM
186	It needs to be mandatory to keep old mature trees. Duplexes should only be allowed if they aren't higher than surrounding houses. There should be a minimum of green space mandatory as well as enough room for snow clearing.	10/4/2020 9:53 PM
187	The problem here is "providing opportunities to increase housing supply on larger lots". There is a serious question here of access to greenspace as well as drainage options.	10/4/2020 5:28 PM
188	I believe that this looks good as is	10/4/2020 4:10 PM
189	making sure the neighbourhood can support it re-landscaping, privacy concerns, parking, etc	10/4/2020 1:17 PM
190	Require a demonstration of how proposed plan integrates into the surrounding area.	10/4/2020 1:15 PM
191	The focus on design and aesthetic requirements is unnecessary and counterproductive. Neighbourhoods change, and artificially preserving the predominant built form/aesthetic character of a neighbourhood at the expense of gentle density, increased walkability, and the efficient use of existing infrastructure is poor city planning.	10/4/2020 10:15 AM
192	I can't commnt on other neighborhoods but certainly Kingston Crescent shoul be designated as a single family only so that there is certainty when homes are sold in the fututre.	10/4/2020 9:43 AM
193	Lots should not be divided.	10/3/2020 7:50 PM
194	If the population is to become more dense the area will have to have adequate community spaces and programs	10/3/2020 7:29 PM
195	It should not be allowed in areas where the infrastructure cannot support it.	10/3/2020 7:23 PM
196	Builders should not be allowed to build higher than adjacent buildings...	10/3/2020 4:08 PM
197	Part of diversity is that our city has neighbourhoods with diversity of lot/yard sizes. Not everything that now needs to be constructed has to have very little yard/green space. Having neighbourhoods with large trees, grass, space on the street to park (that isn't someone's driveway), should also be valued - not just whether there is all ranges of economic accessibility, family sizes and ages that can live in a neighbourhood.	10/3/2020 2:12 PM
198	It appears that the Riverview area has been designated Area 1. I believe that there are parts of Riverview that should be Area 2- ie Morley, Brandon and Arnold. The same could be said for parts of Fort Rouge. I think that some more creative guidelines for development on 25 foot lots on these streets could result in the construction of more up/down duplexes and perhaps condos on select lots, to the benefit of the community, area businesses and the tax rolls.	10/3/2020 1:05 PM
199	Good idea as long as people are not forced out to build new	10/3/2020 11:36 AM
200	Developers should look at moving away from basements as the constant gotoo design. Eliminates basement flooding!	10/3/2020 10:56 AM
201	Bringing proposed new 'more in line' and 'more in character' are too subjective & weak; consider simply 'in line' and 'in character'	10/3/2020 10:54 AM
202	Criteria is fair.	10/3/2020 10:49 AM
203	Less focus on existing housing. Houses in Winnipeg have an end-of-life that doesn't span a lot	10/3/2020 10:23 AM

	of years as they do in Europe. It is important to increase density in all neighbourhoods regardless of where they are. We need to begin changing the culture where everyone wants a single unit dwelling. We don't need yards that are like mini parks. Put enough parks in the neighbourhoods and only allow for enough space to park a couple of vehicles and to have a bit of room to hang out outside.	
204	In Area 1: new buildings should not be allowed to exceed the height and mass of the buildings immediately adjacent. In Area 2: new buildings should not be allowed to exceed the height and mass of the buildings they are replacing.	10/3/2020 10:14 AM
205	Not having secondary suites for rent	10/3/2020 9:20 AM
206	I don't agree with introducing modern housing options into existing neighbourhoods. There are modern housing options throughout Winnipeg in the new areas recently developed. Anyone who wants a modern home can acquire one there.	10/3/2020 9:20 AM
207	seems fine now	10/3/2020 8:21 AM
208	I think there should be a maximum lot coverage size for these dwelling that better reflects the neighboring housing. Many times builders will build the largest house possible on a lot where the neighboring houses have larger spacing than the infill. Also, not allowing double lots to be spilt if the surrounding dwellings all sit on double lots.	10/3/2020 6:52 AM
209	First of all, I believe that the economic impact of these proposed building and design guidelines need to be given careful consideration before putting them into place. Some of the guidelines could have the inadvertent effect of slowing down or stopping infill, which should not be a desired outcome for the City and its stakeholders. Up down duplex should be permitted on a 25' lot as 2 parking stalls can be provided and there is enough land to produce a good floor plan. If we are allowing houses with secondary suites on 25' lots I don't see how duplexes are much different than that.	10/2/2020 10:03 PM
210	No size requirements for lots. Why 40 feet for a duplex, for example? It seems arbitrary as a frontage for a duplex.	10/2/2020 3:41 PM
211	Does the neighbourhood want any up/down duplex? Ask each community Diversity in a community comes from the types of people and their relationships, the length of time (short or long) that they have lived there... Think about community - not about the number of houses. That is really short sighted to add more houses to a happy and well populated neighbourhood with long roots. GO elsewhere for space to build. Manitoba is not short on space.	10/2/2020 3:05 PM
212	Leave the existing character of older neighborhoods alone. Or maybe you might want to pull this craziness off in the Wolseley area. That'll get you a reaction.	10/2/2020 2:24 PM
213	Increasing the required distance to 6' from exterior outer most wall or extension from property lines.	10/2/2020 2:12 PM
214	whatever happened to the good old days of buying a house and fixing it up to flip?? These “shady” building companies can still make money while keeping peace in the neighbourhood	10/2/2020 1:33 PM
215	Increasing residential housing density must be done in conjunction with providing adequate green space for those people. Failure to do this will result in high density slums !	10/2/2020 10:11 AM
216	Make them smaller.	10/1/2020 10:20 PM
217	river heights was not allowed to split a lot, but glenwood was, why? Money talks, not the community!	10/1/2020 8:11 PM
218	Allow for maximum greenspace. Survey neighbourhood residents. Owners/developers should live in the area in which they are building.	10/1/2020 5:15 PM
219	These Areas are exclusionary and have more to do with socio-economic class and keeping NIMBY's at the bay more than anything.	10/1/2020 4:40 PM
220	Do not allow splits of larger lots into smaller ones, in areas with just larger lots there.	10/1/2020 4:27 PM
221	inline with existing homes	10/1/2020 4:10 PM
222	Why are smaller lots allowed for duplexes? That makes no sense. More yard space needed for 2 families, more need for parking. Allow subdivision into more than 2 lots as long as the	10/1/2020 3:27 PM

	divided lots are equal in width, meet zoning minimum and will not be narrower and/or smaller than the smallest existing lot on the block	
223	Lot sizes should never be lowered. Homes are close enough as it is. Existing homes have windows at the side of their homes, and should not have them blocked by a new wall, far too close for safety and privacy.	10/1/2020 3:24 PM
224	DO NOT ALLOW lots to be subdivided into 25 ft. lots. There is not adequate yard space to make the property USEFUL. No room for a garden or garage, or for even a dog to run around in a backyard that does not exist. and most times only ONE door ***UNSAFE	10/1/2020 3:14 PM
225	Being sure there is plenty of green space available .	10/1/2020 1:46 PM
226	not allowing so much building to be on the lot, more green space, with landscaping required.	10/1/2020 1:19 PM
227	Limiting the size of new buildings to bring them more in line with existing homes.Love this idea	10/1/2020 11:48 AM
228	I don’t think these limitations are appropriate. I support larger multi-family dwellings being built even if they don’t “fit in” in the existing neighbourhood. I think this is more environmentally friendly and also prevents classism in neighbourhoods.	10/1/2020 11:14 AM
229	Same size may not always work because some lots have very small houses	10/1/2020 11:09 AM
230	Very clear wording on height with maximum of 25 feet, quality design principles and standards.	9/30/2020 10:45 PM
231	The zones are far too large. The area south of Marion and East of Traverse is very low density. I am sure other examples exist as well. This allows for considerable change for large parts of various communities as it the defined areas are too large and too varied.	9/30/2020 8:48 PM
232	by being sensitive or considerate to who and what is already in the area. When a developer applies for a permit to move the building 10 feet forward, you don't get to see what is being built. Let the neighbours know what is being built next to them. Is it going to be a 4 story mega home, or is to going to be considerate to who lives there and what's already built.	9/30/2020 7:42 PM
233	What are the guidelines for areas outside of 1and 2? Why is my 60 year old house in an established neighbourhood not considered “mature”. What were the criteria for determining the maturity of a neighbourhood?	9/30/2020 3:27 PM
234	Single family	9/30/2020 2:56 PM
235	I found that the City of Winnipeg Planning Branch's rules and regulations for what they considered high usage for vehicular traffic on side streets extremely loose. For instance Dieppe Road's was considered a major transport route even though it is gravel packed, has ditches. Only a block long and most of that block is taken up by Dieppe School. The planning department also stated that a 64 unit condominium cramed into a 2 acre lot in mature residental area fit into their low density criteria. City of Winnipeg Planning department's rules and regulations are extremely flawed and can't be relied upon	9/30/2020 2:19 PM
236	What does the existing neighbourhood guideline say? In my neighbourhood, it would seem that the developers are running city hall again.	9/30/2020 12:56 PM
237	If infill is about providing more density, then accommodating low-density infill doesn't make a lot of sense to me, but is nonetheless an improvement	9/30/2020 11:58 AM
238	I think there needs to be precedence on the street to allow this type of building on a neighbourhood street.	9/30/2020 11:48 AM
239	build them in bridgewater. focus on suburbs	9/30/2020 8:33 AM
240	Need to be cognizant of cost of lot, including demolition and asbestos abatement of existing structure, and the ability of a builder to put a new home on that lot, that allows for a profitable build, that still fits the neighborhood.	9/29/2020 11:37 PM
241	Remove lot width minimums.	9/29/2020 7:43 PM
242	I don't see opportunities for improvement - they seem very clear	9/29/2020 5:45 PM
243	it is important to allow owners of double lots to push firecodes and building codes on to the development lot (IE the development lot should go over and above current codes) and thus existing buildings do not need to be retrofit through closing windows etc...	9/29/2020 3:30 PM

244	Limiting the size of new buildings; by limiting height, builders have not been able to build 3 story homes in areas which already have 3 story homes; that requires spreading out over more of the lot to get the same interior space. Some people still want big homes, so maximum height should be managed by context, not by a city-wide standard. Diversifying housing in all neighbourhoods will work against matching context; If a project doesn't match context, then does it get approved because it satisfies the "all types" policy? The "modern housing options" policy should be dropped; there is a market for modern housing and there is a market for traditional housing; why prioritize modern housing? We had a "modern" house built next door; they knocked down a well built 100 year old house and built a modern box, using "modern" materials and "modern" methods, justifying it by arguing it met the bylaw and building requirements, creating a structure that will struggle to last beyond 40-50 years. That approach is environmentally unsustainable. It would be more productive and sustainable to introduce a policy to encourage the maintenance of quality old stock housing.	9/29/2020 1:44 PM
245	By simply sticking to the established Neighbourhood Plan. Leave things alone.	9/29/2020 1:31 PM
246	The city needs to be open to move older neighbourhoods forward.	9/29/2020 1:24 PM
247	Single family: It shouldn't matter. It's their lot and they paid for it. Let them build modern if they want to. Up/down duplex: as long as parking is ensured not to be disrupted by the added residents, it should be fine.	9/29/2020 9:44 AM
248	Remove incentive for lot splitting, increase motivation for up/down and side by side duplex and mandate energy efficiency and carbon targets. Incentivise lot joining to make larger multi-unit buildings possible. Our neighbourhoods have to become much more dense if we are to meet any climate change targets.	9/29/2020 8:30 AM
249	No more tall boxes. Houses must be in line with the existing neighborhood. When builders break the rules, make them tear it down. They just don't follow the rules. No single-family dwelling should have two Hydro meters. No more tearing down hundred year old trees.	9/28/2020 9:50 PM
250	Not well	9/28/2020 9:24 PM
251	It should be consistent throughout the city, so that more affluent areas have the same guidelines as less. The fact that a 150 foot lot couldn't be split into two 75 foot lots in a more affluent area last year, but 50 foot lots are commonly split into 25 foot lots in less affluent areas (e.g. st. Vital).. is not fair. That 150 foot lot would be okay'd to be split Into 6 lots in st. Vital so that a 75 foot lot was "too small" and "didn't fit the neighbourhood" in the affluent area is unfair to those of us in older and less affluent neighbourhoods.	9/28/2020 6:44 PM
252	Single family detached homes that fit into the character of our street. Not up/down duplex as it would not fit into the heritage area of our neighbourhood.	9/28/2020 12:49 PM
253	Limiting size of new buildings and distance between. Not removing mature trees. Above all make sure the homes blend in with the existing neighborhood!	9/28/2020 11:33 AM
254	Conduct surveys and community meetings with the affected communities, in order to lay out the proposed plan and respond to concerns that might arise from current community members.	9/28/2020 9:49 AM
255	A I said previously, these are good outlines. Size matters. When a 600sq ft home is replaced by one or two towering monsters it is obnoxious and difficult for the whole neighbourhood. But developers will always abuse the guidelines for their benefit. No matter what restrictions you apply, they will always stress the limits to the maximum. I think light blocking to neighbouring homes should be given more weight. There is one 4 plex development here on Debuc in St. B where the the neighbour's light on the entire yard is obliterated. Outrageous.	9/28/2020 8:22 AM
256	Take complaints and consider concerns put forth by neighbouring residents seriously after variances are appealed.	9/28/2020 8:18 AM
257	Definitely keep each area of the city in mind when deciding	9/28/2020 12:34 AM
258	Limiting the size and having site/building requirements to keep SFH and up/down duplexes "in character" with the neighbourhood should be less of a goal. Single-family-only zoning has excluded people from affluent inner suburbs like Central River Heights in the past. Trying to keep all homes "in character" with this only further entrenches this divide.	9/27/2020 11:55 PM
259	Restrict the size and number fo trees a developer can cut per lot. Enforce guidelines on protecting trees on infill lots during construction. The city is focusing on mature neighbourhoods for its infill strategy which could result in a significant loss to Winnipeg's	9/27/2020 8:12 PM

	canopy. Please consider this inevitable loss as diminishing to the character of these mature neighbourhoods.	
260	listen to home owners not developers	9/27/2020 2:35 PM
261	I am opposed to multi-dwelling infill in Area 1 neighbourhoods except perhaps on Metroroutes.	9/27/2020 9:53 AM
262	Intelligent energy efficient house constructions that respect design symmetry, and smart landscaping that integrate within a neighborhood near available transport and groceries. We need spaces that have benches for sitting and cycling. This city is very car centric - not for walkers or cyclists. Also we need way more speed bumps in high traffic areas.	9/26/2020 7:51 PM
263	Limit the height allowable. We have near 3 storey homes being built next to existing century old single level homes. It's perverse! Limit the footprint of the home on the lot. Make sure there is a YARD, you know those things with grass, flowers and trees?? Limit the actual lot size allowable to 30 feet frontage. Tall and skinny tower buildings are laughable in mature neighborhoods.	9/26/2020 4:27 PM
264	I listed several suggestions previously, and I am unclear as to the last suggestion here- 'providing opportunities.....larger lots'. If a lot is larger than average ones in the neighbourhood there still should be guidelines in place where there is still ample room/space between the in-fill and its neighbours. Common complaint I hear is that infills are going up that block daylight and view from their neighbours.	9/26/2020 4:06 PM
265	Limits to the size of new buildings must be reasonable. Mature neighbourhoods already contain a range of sizes, and larger buildings (like mid-rise apartment buildings) are often appropriate on corner lots and a long thoroughfares. Minimum lot sizes may not be necessary for up/down duplexes, especially if minimum parking requirements are removed. To diversify the opportunities for all housing types in all neighbourhoods, denser housing types are also necessary in low density neighbourhoods.	9/26/2020 3:06 PM
266	I guess this survey is just to try and justify why the City is intent on destroying mature neighborhoods.	9/26/2020 12:19 PM
267	These are okay but they need to strictly follow the guidelines and it needs to be enforced. I have little faith this will happen.	9/25/2020 6:22 PM
268	If infill means to fill in the empty lots, then why are lots with perfectly good houses being subdivided, the houses torn down, and new buildings put up?	9/25/2020 2:38 PM
269	Change building codes to ensure preservation of mature trees within 4' of building.	9/25/2020 1:33 PM
270	It irritates me that you have established location criteria in the "guidelines" and then lumped all the community/neighbourhood factors as only secondary considerations. I saw how the developers pushed and clawed their way to undermine the neighbourhood/street designs on Lanark and with the ridiculous development between two backlanes further west. As we saw with these developments secondary considerations become just that, secondary considerations - no teeth whatsoever. Surely you can do better to enshrine and protect community interests.	9/25/2020 12:50 PM
271	Scrap: limiting the size of buildings to bring them in line with existing buildings, site and building requirements that are more in the character with the neighborhood, introducing minimum lot size requirements. Get rid of minimum parking spaces.	9/25/2020 9:35 AM
272	Enforce you rules; don't allow developers to use variances to avoid them.	9/25/2020 8:38 AM
273	Limit the amount of lots split per block To control/ maintain population densities, it’s not just the type of new houses built but how much you increase the population on a city block if I wanted to live in an area with no available street parking and houses that fill the lot with little green space I would have chosen wosley instead of river heights	9/25/2020 8:31 AM
274	Location decision should be left to the owner.	9/25/2020 1:13 AM
275	We cannot understand the map because there is no reference points on it or names of neighbourhoods. This is a useless map.	9/24/2020 7:37 PM
276	Change the zoning rules: https://fortune.com/2020/07/21/black-housing-neighborhoods-economic-opportunity/	9/24/2020 7:11 PM
277	Consider the context of each site and neighbourhood instead of "clear cutting" and "plopping"	9/24/2020 4:11 PM

	off the shelf plans on to the sites	
278	The criteria is good hopefully it is followed especially in neighborhoods that don't have infill construction yet	9/24/2020 12:42 PM
279	There should be limits on how infill homes are built in a particular area. Too many infill houses will destroy the character of mature neighbourhoods. There should be financial incentives available to renovate older homes rather than demolish them and build infill housing.	9/24/2020 10:07 AM
280	As long as it addresses the above guidelines, it will be viable and fit in, while allowing these communities to become more vibrant.	9/24/2020 9:49 AM
281	I really consider this just silly. You cannot successfully increase density to any significant degree with this kind of pandering. Abolish Area One and apply Area 2 rules to both areas. It is still too little, but at least it would be a start.	9/24/2020 9:38 AM
282	Do not change required lot size for up/down duplex	9/24/2020 9:26 AM
283	ALL areas of the City should be included - especially Tuxedo which is a mature community as well. Why is there this push to split small 50 foot lots into 25 lots when a 150 ft lot isn't allowed to be split into a 75 ft lot? These communities and associated housing lot sizes are a good size for not encroaching on anyone's ability to enjoy their home as per the City's livability bylaw. Creating more density within an area that doesn't have a lot of wiggle room to accommodate these large scale infill homes increases traffic and road conditions worsen which will never be fixed because the City doesn't prioitize residential street renewal. many of the new infill housing do not have garages so the parking is on the street which impacts the ability for people to visit friends/relatives because there is no available on street parking. Additionally, side streets are being used by commuters to park and then catch a bus downtown.	9/24/2020 9:18 AM
284	Go and look at the area and the existing structures, needs to be more of an individual decision. Be more upfront with the designs of the newer structure when posting signs in neighbourhoods	9/24/2020 8:45 AM
285	Loaded words: "modern housing options." Seriously, we need specifics because, without them, you end up getting buildings the size of the Titanic painted black next to heritage homes (please do visit McMillan and Hugo, and ask yourself, "What happened here?" Was it "modern housing options" that did it?)	9/24/2020 7:26 AM
286	The document states that “In area 1 and 2 a lot with a rear lane may be subdivided into two (2) equal sized lots and shall refer to the minimum site width requirements of the Zoning By-law.” How convenient! Many of the lots in East Kildonan are 33 feet wide and have back lanes. Are we really proposing a lot 16 feet wide can accommodate a house, 3 feet distance on either side to adjacent structures, while “incentivizing” maintaining mature trees, and preserving the design characteristics of the existing neighbourhood? It’s ridiculous. Just how many properties would be excluded from subdivision if we accept the 32 foot guideline for division? Very few is my guess.	9/24/2020 12:44 AM
287	neighbourhoods are at risk of losing their unique characteristics. green spaces are being lost.	9/23/2020 10:45 PM
288	No option	9/23/2020 10:27 PM
289	provide space for things like a convenience store on a main floor or office space.	9/23/2020 10:10 PM
290	It looks good	9/23/2020 9:49 PM
291	Consult property owners in that area.	9/23/2020 9:39 PM
292	More public consultation and less building of massive developments on a lot with a tiny house. There shouldn't be a bunch of these on one block or same location. Reduce density of these infills to put less burden on parking, utilities and cutting down trees. Also if you replace one house a year for 20 years that's 20 years of construction... Space it out and reduce the clustering	9/23/2020 9:09 PM
293	I think parking needs to be considered when putting up new housing. Where parking needs to be included in the lot.	9/23/2020 9:03 PM
294	How will it be enforced? Who decides what is inline with that location? What happens if builder does something they aren’t supposed to do?	9/23/2020 8:32 PM
295	Do away with location criteria. Allow townhouses everywhere.	9/23/2020 8:25 PM

296	Please address safety issues also. Increasing density does not seem to increase safety unless the downtrodden are priced out, and then they just go elsewhere.	9/23/2020 8:18 PM
297	Infill for increased residential density should only be permitted in large scale and corner lots. They should not be squeezed into existing lots or split lots. Infill needs to consider gravel lanes, garbage and recycling requirements and snow clearing. Design standards should also consider neighbourhood context. There should be equal greenspace for new developments as for existing residential units - e.g. backyards and front yards	9/23/2020 6:51 PM
298	there is a saturation point that destroys neighbourhoods and a sense of community - Osborne is saturated	9/23/2020 6:38 PM
299	Must look like the houses surrounding it and not just be a 'guideline'. There should be a limited number of lots in a given area which can be divided.	9/23/2020 6:36 PM
300	Hold the builders accountable and send inspectors while the house is being built - often - stop them when they push the boundaries beyond what is reasonable for the existing neighbors AND extend the variance period to one month - people take vacations for two weeks and sneaky contractors learn this and post the variance while the neighbors are away.	9/23/2020 6:33 PM
301	stop pushing infill on tax payers	9/23/2020 6:18 PM
302	Kingston Row and Crescent cannot handle more density given the current infrastructure- we already have power outages at least twice a month, and due to the one way streets and nature of the peninsula have limited parking options and driving route alternatives- adding more density to this peninsula will be detrimental to the character and value of the neighborhood	9/23/2020 5:52 PM
303	Make a brw neighborhood maybe a seniors neighborhood with everything seniors need in their neighborhood. It will make traffic flow better when elderly are not so terrified from aggressive drivers that they drive even slower this creating more aggressive drivers. This city is full. It needs epitac syrup to toss back up a bit because it's over eaten and buldging at the seams. The city us greedy though and wants more taxes so it approves these dumb ideas	9/23/2020 5:40 PM
304	See my previous comments. I oppose duplexes as this type of development only benefits developers who can outbid first-time buyers for a piece of property, tear down an old house, and put in a multi-unit structure and charge people three times the price. This type of development should not be allowed.	9/23/2020 5:26 PM
305	Require very careful consideration to allow lot splitting in Area 1.	9/23/2020 4:56 PM
306	Restrict these buildings to areas that are already predominantly of this style.	9/23/2020 4:38 PM
307	Neighborhood structures should be consistent. Quit allowing up/down into single family areas!	9/23/2020 4:35 PM
308	I think duplexes should be allowed in all areas. I understand the tax increases from an old dilapidated house to 2 duplexes drastically increases the tax base and Winnipeg needs to embrace this.	9/23/2020 4:31 PM
309	I support diversified housing in all neighbourhoods but believe that green space/ recreation space/ play space are essential and must be created simultaneously with housing.	9/23/2020 4:20 PM
310	n/a	9/23/2020 4:16 PM
311	Add exceptions for specific neighborhoods of particularly unique and historic significance, such as Armstrong's point, and old Crescentwood.	9/23/2020 4:10 PM
312	When subdividing lots, under no circumstance should a property be allowed to subdivide if either or both (or all) resultant lots NOT be the smallest on the street or in the neighborhood	9/23/2020 3:43 PM
313	by following the guidelines	9/23/2020 3:43 PM
314	only allow on double sized lots	9/23/2020 2:13 PM
315	Each neighbourhood needs to have density targets, and they all need to be substantially higher than they are now. To combat sprawl, this is imperative. We can't look at our mature neighbourhoods in isolation from the broader city growth situation. Apartments and townhouses can happen in River Heights and Munroe type neighbourhoods. Those residents aren't going to flee because of it, so stop pandering to them. Change happens. City's grow. That said, in the West Exchange, along the rail lines, Burnell Street, along transit routes, and in parts of the west end there are countless areas ripe for high and medium density focus. There are	9/23/2020 11:56 AM

	countless parking lots and dead lots that can be renewed. Housing policy should also be looked at through racial and socio-economic lenses. How can build new housing in ways that bring people together instead of pushing them further apart? Housing can be a powerful tool for combatting Winnipeg's long history with racism, if we want it to be. Long story short, Winnipeg was built one way, a long time ago. Change is needed. We need to densify, or we're going to go broke. Density also supports small businesses, creates urban vibrancy which attracts investment and retains youth, and is more cost-effective. If we do density well, Winnipeg can become a truly engaging city and begin to counter-act the decades of clunky urban experiences that visitors have had, leading to our not-great reputation. But to really do that, we need a vision, and the willingness to challenge and educate mature communities that have been one way for a very long time. I live in one myself. But if you knocked down half my street and replaced it with townhouses and apartments, I would welcome it. (I miss the vitality of Osborne Village. We can expand that level of urbanism much wider.)	
316	Look at the parking on the lot and the effect of more people parking on the street; the size garages on smaller lots need to be reduced/restricted and set back from lane to allow for snow / garbage pick up	9/23/2020 11:13 AM
317	Adding tree protection (boulevard trees or private trees) and landscaping to the list.	9/23/2020 10:44 AM
318	Good as is.	9/23/2020 9:37 AM
319	Stop trying to define what you think makes "character". This is subjective nonsense. You can't ask for diversity and have things look the same as the neighbouring properties at the same time.	9/23/2020 9:34 AM
320	keep multiple occupancy out of single family housing areas	9/23/2020 9:11 AM
321	Keep them out.	9/23/2020 4:51 AM
322	All areas should be equal.	9/22/2020 11:37 PM
323	Looking at parking, also yards are pretty small so how do you balance green space. You need to ensure neighbourhood has parks available to give recreational space	9/22/2020 7:59 PM
324	Less regulation, allow all types of housing to be approved with less red tape	9/22/2020 4:27 PM
325	I don’t have an opinion at this time	9/22/2020 3:30 PM
326	-Emphasize and prioritize sustainability: reuse and renovation of existing housing to accommodate 21st century needs. Stop the unnecessary builds when things can be renovated and restored.. -Increase setbacks to enable existing homeowners to keep their investments safe. Current zoning and setbacks (4 ft) mean that in the current demolition/rebuild next to my home, I had a digger 18" from my dining room window while we tried to eat dinner. There is simply no way to protect existing homes with these poor zoning regs. --Increase protections for existing homeowners...: 1) Ask for their feedback when proposing infill 2) Listen to their concerns and make adjustments 3) Protect their properties so their foundations and walls aren't damaged 4) Keep them apprised of demolition and excavation dates, by law. 5) Provide pest remediation when a building will be demolished. At present, when a house is demolished, all the mice, rats, rabbits, etc. all end up in the existing neighbours' homes and properties. It's a disaster. 6) Provide environmental protections. When you knock down a 100 year old home, lead paint ends up all over the neighbours' properties, gardens and yards. This is unsafe and unnecessary.	9/22/2020 2:12 PM
327	What problem in the host neighborhoods is intended to be addressed by these location criteria? Until the City adequately explains the problem that it is trying to address through its infill policy and location criteria, it will be unable to gain widespread buy-in. Respect the age, stability, value of these neighborhoods, and above all, respect taxpayers.	9/22/2020 1:45 PM
328	It can't - abandon this useless idiotic idea NOW!	9/22/2020 1:34 PM
329	Must keep 50 foot lots. We don’t want to create the ghetto like environment of the North End, Weston and Pt.Douglas that happened for the immigrants, and “ unwashed”, while Assiniboine and around the Leg became the enclave of wealth. That inequity is not justified by you today!	9/22/2020 1:30 PM
330	All neighborhoods should provide access to people who can only afford multi-family housing.	9/22/2020 11:45 AM
331	More neighbourhoods need to be included. For example, middle Tuxedo needs protections to the niegbourhood asthetic that would be provided by these guidelines	9/22/2020 10:18 AM

332	New houses should reflect the existing architectural context. No crazy roof or plastic cladding.	9/22/2020 10:03 AM
333	No duplexes!	9/22/2020 8:11 AM
334	Lot sizes for new updown duplexes should only be allowed to be built on lots that are consistent with existing lot frontages of the community. Lot splitting should not be allowed. Frontages should remain consistent to maintain the look and feel of the community.	9/22/2020 12:54 AM
335	This is well thought out.	9/21/2020 6:46 PM
336	By maintaining the neighborhoods charm & keeping it single dwelling. If you want duplexes, triplexes etc etc, put them in your nice tidy neighborhood and see what happens!	9/21/2020 6:22 PM
337	Larger infill homes then the existing homes is fine, many older homes are almost two small for how people live and entertain today. However, on a street where the average house is 1400 sq ft perhaps there should not be a single family detached infill home approaching 3000 sq ft plus. Larger homes can update a neighborhood and make it more dynamic whereas too large of new infill homes exacerbates gentrification and prices out current and future homeowners/renters who make some of these mature neighborhoods so dynamic.	9/21/2020 5:23 PM
338	By stopping the zoning variances when the don't meet the codes for lot sizes. One infill near me allowed the new property line to be ONE FOOT from an existing house !!! STOP ALLOWING this to happen.	9/21/2020 4:52 PM
339	People who desire modern housing have other location options. Modern designs ruin character neighborhoods.	9/21/2020 4:47 PM
340	Is there room in the plan for any given neighbourhood to opt-out or modify guidelines? For example, in Old Tuxedo there are not many, if any duplexes that I am aware of. Would increasing the number of duplexes really be in keeping with the character of this unique neighbourhood?	9/21/2020 4:46 PM
341	No	9/21/2020 4:40 PM
342	Put them in the SUBURBS.	9/21/2020 3:00 PM
343	Do NOT allow 25 ft. lots. Nothing less than 35 ft. lots. Allow for plenty of GREENSPACE and for a proper garage and driveway to be built in future.	9/21/2020 2:52 PM
344	Prefer not to have subdivision of lots in Area 1, and prefer to have rebuilds to the current lot instead of cramming in multiple houses into the same space.	9/21/2020 2:29 PM
345	Keep in mind other house types ie;bungalows and very few two storey homes, and group similarily	9/21/2020 2:28 PM
346	significantly restricting height and mass of infill structures	9/21/2020 2:12 PM
347	Looks good.	9/21/2020 12:12 PM
348	I think that further dividing the areas into sub areas would be helpful. There are neighborhoods in Area 1 that are better suited to up/down duplex or lot splitting than others. Providing modern housing options that respect existing architectural aesthetics is important.	9/21/2020 11:40 AM
349	I think if residents of River Heights or other high end neighborhoods don't want on their street it should be considered that residents of the West End may not want higher density on their streets. The West End needs more parks and green space especially trees to make it livable like River Heights not more crime, congestion and cars.	9/21/2020 11:22 AM
350	I think the City of Winnipeg needs to be more flexible in their thinking and do what they can to help reduce regulation that prevents growth to the city.	9/21/2020 10:02 AM
351	Limiting isn't the issue though, most of the new infill houses thus far aren't too large. Quite the opposite, they're too narrow/small built on tiny lots allowing for little or no green space let alone trees. Pricing of said units would definitely be a concern as some of the new units, for what you pay is more than half of what the original property/house on the single lot that was then split into two. There is lots of room there for play for the prices to be brought down to lower levels, as the people who want to live in these areas are mostly working class families who don't have as much money to play with in the first place.	9/21/2020 9:33 AM
352	too many new housing developments	9/21/2020 8:40 AM

353	Introducing site and building design requirements that are more in character with the neighbourhood!!!!! Limiting the size of new buildings to bring them more in line with existing homes	9/21/2020 8:26 AM
354	Changing lot sizes in established neighbourhoods where the density is low, but the homeowners are investing in the upgrading of their home because there is a rise in the value of their own real estate, cannot be seen by anyone with that investment already into their property as positive, regardless of The above criteria. If changing the density of a neighbourhood is the entire focus, then there is no point in assessing a home for taxation. A bungalow or two story older home that has an upgraded interior and exterior, on a street with homes of the same size and period character, would lose significant value, when the street is altered by spliting lots to increase density. Where is the fair value expectation of a home owner who buys a home in such an area, spends money year over year to maintain it, upgrades over the decades, and pays taxes for that increased value, when density infill is introduced to the street? How is it fair that a developer gets to leverage off of the value built up by the home owners on a street or area filled with well maintained single detached homes? Taking advantage of the financial input of people over decades is wrong, for well established neighbourhoods where the lots are all of long accepted sizes, to introduce any kind of density for the profit of others, inside of those neighbourhood home owners. Totally wrong and unacceptable.	9/20/2020 11:51 PM
355	Anything that stops building new homes for Winnipeggers is a problem. Size limits should be less stringent, minimums should be lower for lot sizes, and the notion of 'more in character' is inherently anti-modern.	9/20/2020 9:10 PM
356	Give people a choice if this happens in their neighbourhood	9/20/2020 6:33 PM
357	I applaud rules to limit the blight of towering, narrow buildings that have sprung up in neighbourhoods, and do not belong in the neighbourhood.	9/20/2020 5:24 PM
358	need to include green landscaping requirement, not just a gravel front yard	9/20/2020 4:23 PM
359	More newer buildings increase the property values. Allow more density	9/20/2020 3:30 PM
360	provide modern housing that matches or comes close to what other housing in the area looks like. Promote the use of sustainable materials and technologies such as passive solar.	9/20/2020 2:02 PM
361	Provide an active involvement of any street/area residents when a new in fill application is made by a developer to ensure that only appropriate units are built.	9/20/2020 1:46 PM
362	Love it!	9/20/2020 1:35 PM
363	Restrict these to Area 2 and to main streets in Area 1	9/20/2020 1:32 PM
364	Determining the minimum lot width and not varying from this. A lot adjacent to my Home was subdivided to less than 25' (the standard minimum width in the neighbourhood), which I had to take personal time to object/appeal at the City. A dangerous precedent is set when the City allows lots narrower than the set minimum.	9/20/2020 12:22 PM
365	Remove modern housing options	9/20/2020 10:23 AM
366	Why must we increase housing supply in existing, established areas, I live in an established older neighbourhood BECAUSE of its character and charm and individuality, I've seen what infills do to a neighbourhood. I spent 8 years in Vancouver in the 80's when two houses were stuck on one lot. How can your plans be improved, they cannot.	9/20/2020 8:43 AM
367	Limit up/down duplexes to 6 per street in Area 1 neughbourhoods.	9/20/2020 1:05 AM
368	don't build them anywhere near the 1 1/2 story homes. If you all think its fine then build them on Wellington Cresent	9/20/2020 12:41 AM
369	Make it easier to increase density in all neighborhoods.	9/19/2020 10:55 PM
370	No improvements necessary.	9/19/2020 10:21 PM
371	The facades, materials and other elements are up to the owner. The cities place should be height, side yard, front, rear yard etc. Design and architecture controls should be left up to home owners' associations if they are able to form. Part of the appeal of infill is changed and I have looked at modern homes that fit well in mature neighbourhoods	9/19/2020 6:57 PM
372	The word "should" should be removed from the criteria. It allows a loophole. Be clear of what	9/19/2020 5:34 PM

	will happen not may happen.	
373	Zone the whole city area 2.remove all requirements. Add platinum standard for green buildings	9/19/2020 5:31 PM
374	Although I understand its political necessity, be cautious with "matching the character of he neighbourhood". There is a risk of having new homes looking dated, or the neighbourhood stagnating.	9/19/2020 4:29 PM
375	I think it is adequate as per the draft.	9/19/2020 3:42 PM
376	Enforce the guidelines. Examples abound in the city where homeowners get a permit for just a renovation of an existing structure and without the knowledge of the city, tear down and rebuild. One of these exists in my neighbourhood...at Hull and St. David.	9/19/2020 2:40 PM
377	Don’t limit new buildings. Promote new but with neighbour hood approved designs	9/19/2020 2:06 PM
378	Stop gaslighting residents' concerns. South Osborne is already dense, esp Lord Roberts. Never allow duplexes, or any other infill, to be taller than the neighbours'. Stop implying that old housing is decrepit, not modern, and needs to come down.	9/19/2020 1:56 PM
379	Not allowing subdivisions	9/19/2020 12:57 PM
380	I agree with the last four bullet points completely. And the first bullet. I think the 2nd and 3rd bullet should be very broadly interpreted and not applied strictly. Neighborhoods should be allowed to evolve and change over time to meet modern needs while retaining some of the original character. I think modern designs can better meet families needs. But we should encourage retention of backyards, porches, verandas, decks, balconies and patios or rooftop patios to create and maximize outdoor spaces on lots. We should also encourage more spacious designs and better use of garages and building up to make better use of lots. Also should allow for more rental units and grandparent suites in homes to allow for extended families.	9/19/2020 11:06 AM
381	Currently the City's zoning is meaniingless. $$$, means anything goes, absolutely anywhere.	9/19/2020 10:47 AM
382	Building size still too big, designs still too modern looking - should match character of surrounding homes	9/19/2020 10:38 AM
383	Sounds good so far	9/19/2020 10:19 AM
384	This is good!	9/19/2020 9:56 AM
385	Parking requirements	9/19/2020 9:36 AM
386	Good. River heights needs more density and infill projects. So many of the homes while ‘character’ homes look in bad shape. Continued new development will bring more energy to the area.	9/19/2020 9:32 AM
387	Make housing match the neighborhood	9/19/2020 9:18 AM
388	Acceptable.	9/19/2020 8:53 AM
389	If a house on a predominantly single family residential area is torn down, it should only be replaced by a single family home of the same size and foot print. For example, in Garden City, the mid century modern bungalows on wide lots should not be subdivided and turned into multi family or narrow single family homes. They do not suit the neighbourhood and reduce the character, liveability and value of the neighbourhood.	9/19/2020 8:24 AM
390	I think it’s super important and makes sense... but how are you going to get buy in from Developers? Monetary incentive comes to mind. Can they get back 3%(?) of City admin fees if/after build is inspected & they follow through/comply with guidelines?	9/19/2020 8:01 AM
391	Do not support.	9/19/2020 6:20 AM
392	More consideration is needed regarding the type of mature neighbourhood for these projects — some mature neighbourhoods consist of old beauties in good shape, and shouldn’t have these taken down, ruining the neighbourhoods character, just for the purpose of densification.	9/19/2020 5:30 AM
393	Stick to the character of the neighbourhood and don’t build bigger.	9/19/2020 12:21 AM
394	require adequate lot size for both parking and green space,limit height of structures,require builder to landscape	9/18/2020 10:51 PM

395	I don't think they could be.	9/18/2020 8:55 PM
396	Not building on lots smaller than 33ft wide	9/18/2020 8:28 PM
397	Ultimately the criteria for building infill projects should be based on the size of the lot. The larger the lot size the larger the allowed development. The developer can decide whether they want that square footage to be in the form of a single family home or a multi unit development. If this means	9/18/2020 8:07 PM
398	I just moved to a new neighborhood (Kingston Crescent) that's in area 1, picking my area exactly because of the maturity and low density. Now all of the sudden the city is going to force this change on us? Why did I spend literally almost $1 million on a new house specifically because of the neighborhood characteristics, to now have this change forced on me that would invalidate many of the reasons I picked this area? Completely unfair to make blanket policies that affect huge areas of the city. I like my neighborhood as it is.	9/18/2020 7:57 PM
399	The assumption that this is a good idea is based on something in the research document, the idea that mature neighbourhoods have houses which have reached "the end of their useful life." Most of those homes are so much better built than their replacements that this is a false argument. The ecological costs of a house are in its construction and knocking down homes that already exist and can be maintained is wasteful and ecologically indefensible. There is no talk here of making new homes sustainable, or of making sure that tree canopy is retained so that houses don't need air conditioning.	9/18/2020 7:36 PM
400	I think these guidelines should help	9/18/2020 7:16 PM
401	It is a good idea to increase density of existing neighbourhoods, but not at the expense of the local character. These buildings need to fit within the current context, not simply try to fit as many units as possible within a small space	9/18/2020 6:58 PM
402	How about old Fort Garry, St. Vital, Lyndale Drive, Riverview, around St. John's Park?	9/18/2020 6:00 PM
403	We have larger lots — for the space between homes. These sideyards cannot be compromised. Any duplex must be two bedroom at most. Maybe even one. I know your goal is population density. BUT in the Area one spots maybe think more CONDO. first time singles\couples. Keeps the neighbourhood as is essentially while adding housing. Win win	9/18/2020 5:50 PM
404	improvement on ensuring that guidelines are followed is required additionally that the surrounding home owners are not affected by the constant noise and mess left. This needs to be added of the responsibilty of the builders as well. Additionally i would like to see a green requirement added, such as sod being laid down. Currently the new infill homes often look terrible	9/18/2020 5:07 PM
405	I think when you're writing surveys you should consider your audience. This feels like it was written by an analyst.	9/18/2020 4:52 PM
406	The criteria is ridiculously restrictive, why would the city not allow these neighborhoods to go through the natural process of modernizing....	9/18/2020 4:43 PM
407	I don't think it's a bad idea, but sometimes globalizing areas may not allow for very specific street/micro area considerations. As long as it's remembered it's a guideline while acknowledging that areas also change and diversity may not be totally bad.	9/18/2020 3:06 PM

Q12 How do you think the location criteria for two-unit side-by-side housing could be improved?

Answered: 329 Skipped: 445

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Maintain existing density in established neighborhoods. Do not allow increase in density existing neighborhoods	10/23/2020 7:20 AM
2	See previous note: A lot coverage of 30% is still almost twice as big as the average lot coverage in most mature communities.	10/22/2020 11:20 PM
3	At least one unit needs to be visitable and there needs to be green space requirements. Projections and balconies need to be included as part of the setbacks.	10/22/2020 11:11 PM
4	This would all help as long as developers were actually held to these standards. Protect mature trees. We are predicted to lose 35% of our urban forest in the next 10 years.	10/22/2020 10:30 PM
5	These ones always stick out the most and get the most complaints. Stronger/strongest guidelines for making the development fit with the area. Ensure preservation of mature trees	10/22/2020 10:29 PM
6	Existing infrastructure such as roads and sewers would have to be upgraded to handle the extra volume. Building such housing should not only fall to developers but be allowed to be done by the current owners of the property.	10/22/2020 9:16 PM
7	Same as before - communicate with the neighbourhood. Fine the developer if details the community approved were ignored.	10/22/2020 5:31 PM
8	The location criteria isn't explained very well	10/22/2020 5:20 PM
9	Dividing lot size within existing neighbourhoods should not be part of this plan. Take down a single home and replace it with a respectfully designed single unit. Perhaps we have lots to learn from our older European communities where the facade has to be respectfully retained ... still permitting lots of design scope for a more modern interior space. Lets learn from the good and the horrible approaches of older countries successes and failures .	10/22/2020 4:03 PM
10	Do not allow these units where non currently exist.	10/22/2020 4:02 PM
11	Do not allow this type of housing in mature single housing neighborhoods.	10/22/2020 2:38 PM
12	I generally support these new points regarding (two-unit side-by-side housing)	10/22/2020 1:46 PM
13	Abolish single family zoning to allow greater ease of a variety of infill developments. Allow more flexibility in lot width requirements to allow a variety of infill densities in existing mature neighbourhoods.	10/22/2020 11:45 AM
14	Same answer as 11.	10/22/2020 11:33 AM
15	Make them one unit bungalows .	10/22/2020 11:29 AM
16	Location criteria for this type of housing should be strict in order to limit the amount of this type of infill housing.	10/22/2020 11:29 AM
17	More space between properties and fewer anomalous buildings in areas with a specific residential look	10/22/2020 10:00 AM
18	Do not allow side-by-side development in these areas if they are not already in existence as this will reduce property values for existing properties in these neighbourhoods.	10/21/2020 10:20 PM
19	Need more discussion of how many bedrooms will be built in to accommodate families. Need to specify accessibility. standards.	10/21/2020 8:30 PM
20	Side by sides always seem to become rapidly run down. If the owner of one side does not maintain their house, this adversely affects the other side. Don't have more than one or two on a street. Where the whole street is side by sides, the general feel and look becomes very slum like, very fast.	10/21/2020 7:20 PM
21	Don't want it in single family neighbourhood to keep my investment from dropping.	10/21/2020 7:10 PM
22	unsure	10/21/2020 3:51 PM
23	May NOT encroach on garden or back yard of existing bungalow. Must have onsite parking AND green space in backyard. MUST be at least 4 ft setback on both sides adjacent to other houses.	10/21/2020 1:08 PM
24	Owners should prove that they cannot renovate instead of tearing down. Do not allow the	10/21/2020 1:03 PM

	footprint to be larger than what's being replaced. Do not allow buildings as high as proposed in the guidelines. Build smaller square footage per dwelling. People do NOT need ensuites, walk-in closets, islands plus dining tables for eating. Live smaller - as in Europe.	
25	Should be limited to existing high density areas	10/21/2020 11:14 AM
26	no opinion	10/21/2020 10:37 AM
27	I don't support lot splitting for two unit side by side builds in area 1 and 2 zones	10/21/2020 10:20 AM
28	Not in River Heights!	10/21/2020 7:43 AM
29	-see previous comments	10/21/2020 7:26 AM
30	These are okay in neighbours that already have existing duplexes. Not in predominately single family home areas.	10/20/2020 11:31 PM
31	Seemed clear	10/20/2020 9:50 PM
32	The guideline mentions that secondary suites are permitted but does nothing to define them. It is well know that developers are exploiting the classification to create two-family homes, where the requirements of a duplex cannot be meet. But that loop hole must be eliminated to prevent duplexes from become 4-plexes.	10/20/2020 9:19 PM
33	Limit the amount in one neighborhood.	10/20/2020 7:55 PM
34	Not in favor	10/20/2020 6:04 PM
35	I hate infill	10/20/2020 5:16 PM
36	By keeping them smaller height	10/20/2020 3:41 PM
37	No opinion.	10/20/2020 3:26 PM
38	Remove the distinction between Areas 1 and 2... it only further serves to entrench existing socio-economic divisions. Remove lot size requirements... density needs walkability to be livable, and walkability needs narrow lots. Therefore, intensification needs to be allowed to happen on all lot sizes. On limiting the sizes of buildings to be "compatible", anything under 4 storeys should simply be allowed... anything that is scaled to a person walking is compatible. The goal isn't density, it's walkability (even though walkable places will be dense, dense places aren't always walkable).	10/20/2020 3:06 PM
39	We should strive to achieve balance in established neighbourhoods. Not overload them with overcrowding and homes that stick out.	10/20/2020 2:23 PM
40	I have no ideological problem with infill, but my backlane is an unpaved mess at the best of times. I spent 15k on a new garage last year, and it was nearly unusable over the winter due to ruts and deep ditches in the middle of the lane. In the spring, we end up with a literal pond, nearly a foot deep, that we refer to with disdain as Lake Fernwood. Adding further desity to streets with unpaved back lanes will cause undue damage to an already nearly unusable lane from the construction needs, and will reduce the amount of time it remains usable after grading due to the increase in residential traffic.	10/20/2020 2:08 PM
41	Address old-fashioned farmer mentality of people who are clinging to over-sized lots and want city planning based on 'not in my back yard'	10/20/2020 10:47 AM
42	not sure	10/19/2020 3:29 PM
43	Don't ruin my neighbourhood.	10/19/2020 11:57 AM
44	Limit this type of housing to neighborhoods with similar types, this should not be permitted to be placed in streets with single family homes.	10/19/2020 9:46 AM
45	Don't do it. It's a stupid idea. Leave these neighbourhoods alone. Maybe fix the roads, and spend time on things that matter. Are millennials running the city now?	10/18/2020 9:13 PM
46	This seems more acceptable than blind application of lot splitting in areas. However, duplex should be limit on gravel lanes, no lot splits, no triplex etc	10/18/2020 8:38 PM
47	Development should be allowed in other areas as well. Why is a SxS unit any different than an up/down duplex.	10/18/2020 8:25 PM

48	These homes should not be plunked into the middle of mature neighbourhoods where only bungalows currently exist.	10/18/2020 7:11 PM
49	La qualité d'air dans ces maisons sont souvent horribles. Il faut que les autorités politiques de la ville pensent à élargir les bornes de la ville en construisant des logements abordables pour les famille à revenus faible ou moyen.	10/18/2020 6:55 PM
50	no	10/18/2020 3:46 PM
51	There is insufficient attention to implications for parking in the neighbourhood, including providing access to plugging in block heaters in the winter. More attention needs to be paid to providing and/or maintaining options for a range of income levels. Some of these neighbourhoods have been places where young people can afford their first homes as well as places with larger more expensive housing. Also, there is insufficient attention to trees, whether existing or new plantings. Many usual measures to protect existing trees are insufficient, and the trees end up dying within a few years of the construction. The construction of new foundations for example will likely to significant damage to any large mature trees on the property. Winnipeg's tree canopy has in the past been a matter of great pride and also has ecological value. Someone needs to be responsible for monitoring the health of both existing and newly planted trees for these sites. Perhaps builders might put down a guarantee deposit to be refunded after 5 years if the trees survive. Planting two trees for killing one large mature one is insufficient. Tree list might be expanded. The setback specification "or portion of block" allows for too much wiggle room. What does that really mean? The entire block should be considered in that average.	10/18/2020 11:07 AM
52	Well not within the scope of this project there needs tp be an addition for a set of rules regarding the protection of the structural integrity of adjacent properties and buildings. with increased density in these areas the issue of street parking becomes a major issue. Perhaps introduce parking passes as a pay for service.	10/18/2020 10:37 AM
53	Trees, Traffic calming, Parking, Regulated access on to main roads.	10/17/2020 8:30 AM
54	Maintain mature trees	10/16/2020 11:57 PM
55	Setbacks from streets and neighbouring homes needs to be increased. Houses (detached and duplex) should be no more than 2 stories tall.	10/16/2020 11:18 PM
56	apply to areas with secondary plans	10/16/2020 8:03 PM
57	I don't really care about existing homes. If part of the point of infill is to increase density in our insane city, we need more people occupying the space, not the same number. Especially around transit routes.	10/16/2020 7:25 PM
58	Parking	10/16/2020 7:06 PM
59	Listing the specific lot size requirement for consideration instead of leaving with a generic 'new minimum lot size requirement' blurb... If there's a requirement what is it? You don't just get blanket approval with just the generic placeholder	10/16/2020 6:15 PM
60	same	10/16/2020 2:52 PM
61	Don't build them. Stay away they are not wanted.	10/16/2020 2:22 PM
62	Don't put them in our single family neghbourhoods	10/16/2020 2:22 PM
63	You need adequate parking.	10/16/2020 2:02 PM
64	No changes to suggest.	10/16/2020 1:21 PM
65	Why are the rents so high? You are going to have at least 4-6 renters in one unit because no one can afford a single unit.	10/16/2020 9:14 AM
66	Minimum lot size should be 50ft,	10/15/2020 10:40 PM
67	limiting the size and height	10/15/2020 9:54 PM
68	Consider a narrower acceptable lot width. Basically removing two side yards from two adjacent single family houses.	10/15/2020 9:16 PM
69	I'm not sure. I don't think it should be done at all	10/15/2020 9:05 PM

70	n/a	10/15/2020 8:49 PM
71	Improvement: Make ALL multi occupancy properties condominium. No rental properties. Provide assistance if necessary (to the buyer, not the developer). By the way, who is the developer? Are you beholden to the developer (not you the reader but, you know what I mean)?	10/15/2020 7:42 PM
72	Explicitly consider utility loads and do not split 50' wide lots.	10/15/2020 5:23 PM
73	Skip	10/15/2020 4:44 PM
74	The two-unit side-by-side location requirement should be reduced from 50 feet wide to 48 feet wide. This would allow for side-by-side duplexes to be built on streets with post-war houses on streets like Handyside in Glenwood. These new dwellings would fit well in this neighborhood which already has wide single family houses on double-lots.	10/15/2020 3:07 PM
75	The maximum density should be allowed in Areas 1 and 2.	10/15/2020 2:38 PM
76	n/a	10/15/2020 12:42 PM
77	Larger lot sizes	10/15/2020 12:28 PM
78	More should be allowed!	10/15/2020 10:21 AM
79	Pembina?	10/15/2020 9:01 AM
80	It can't.	10/15/2020 8:42 AM
81	Build like for like. Don't change the zoning. People in existing neighbourhoods are there because they didn't want to live in ugly new houses.	10/14/2020 10:55 PM
82	I do not know I am not a landscaper , engineer or architect, all I know is all this construction is just becoming too much. Since the covid we are encouraged to stay in our homes, and all this noise and traffic on our street is just too much.	10/14/2020 10:50 PM
83	They do not belong here.	10/14/2020 9:41 PM
84	Remove the clause that requires building design to be in character with the neightbourhood. Let design professionals do their job and don't force such prescriptive requirements.	10/14/2020 7:50 PM
85	Leave single home properties as single home properties, replace single homes with single homes, and build side by sides and duplexes in new development neighbourhoods in suburbs plans where appropriate property sizes can be set aside for multi housing and densification needs. None of these multi housing infills ever get approved for rich mature neighbourhoods such as tuxedo, yet Glenwood continues to be ravaged by infills, the new excuse being used in finished backlands, which my personal property taxes are paying for in the Glenwood area. So existing Low-middle income starter home single family owner residents have literally paved the way to allow for these new guidelines to bulldoze the noghbourhood into a concrete and stucco crises rental landlord owned neighbourhoods with no space privacy backyards trees or natural light. Devastating.	10/14/2020 6:35 PM
86	There must be rules and regulations to allow this type of development and they must be adhered to without allowing variances.	10/14/2020 4:21 PM
87	Spread the densification around the city	10/14/2020 3:23 PM
88	Allow no encroachments. Facade must be in line with neighbours. Keep height low. No lot-line-to-lot-line building. No Tandem parking.	10/14/2020 2:55 PM
89	stop putting 2 units on one small lot there is land all around winnipeg for more homes, greed and profit is the only reason this mess is happening	10/14/2020 1:08 PM
90	By purchasing land on outskirts of the city	10/14/2020 12:41 PM
91	The owners who have made these "mature" areas over time had a dream of property ownership which included space to allow their children to play on their yards and make neighbourhood friends; be the antithesis of the crowded city. Lets not merely move the "crowded city" into the suburbs	10/14/2020 10:33 AM
92	Similar to single-family and two-unit up-down.	10/14/2020 10:33 AM
93	Limit the size and make it look like the rest of the street	10/14/2020 10:07 AM

94	If existing neighborhood doesn't want a large house blocking sun from existing homeowners then it should not go ahead.	10/14/2020 9:08 AM
95	Craft different guidelines for mature neighbourhoods that take into account the typically narrower lot sizes. Make is MUCH easier to add lane suites or secondary suites.	10/14/2020 7:58 AM
96	In all cases, priority should be given to the rehabilitation and renovation of existing structures. If infill was permitted only in cases where the new construction matched nearby existing homes in size, style, exterior materials, and lot footprint, there would be much less resistance to new infill in existing neighbourhoods.	10/13/2020 10:21 PM
97	Should not be two areas. Let this happen everywhere and make plans to significantly increase allowable heights and density within areas with PDO’s and Secondary Plans.	10/13/2020 8:52 PM
98	The guidelines are not specific enough for home buyers or existing residents to know what may be acceptable in their neighbourhood or on their street in terms of new-build building size. Their are broad guidelines as to what may be acceptable, but these are not nearly specific enough for those who are not experts in housing and construction development to be able to set reasonable expectations. This is especially frustrating, considering the very large sections that are considered 'Area 1' or 'Area 2'. How can anyone expect to be able to plan for what may be acceptable on their own street when the guidelines are written so generally?	10/13/2020 8:33 PM
99	by maintaining the character of the existing neighbourhood and stringently enforcing guidelines for developers.	10/13/2020 4:21 PM
100	Rooflines again should be taken into consideration	10/13/2020 2:47 PM
101	Nope	10/13/2020 12:19 PM
102	eliminate situation where developer purchases homes at a premium to develop into multifamily units which changes dynamic of neighbourhood. Height limits should be based on neighbouring properties and not bylaw limits. Multifamily units should be encouraged on "feeder" streets with single family behind them.	10/13/2020 12:16 PM
103	Sounds good.	10/13/2020 11:37 AM
104	When considering size take the height into consideration so they don't tower over the next door houses	10/13/2020 8:50 AM
105	Build to the lot potential	10/12/2020 9:34 PM
106	Shy of so-called "monster homes", which do not appear to be an issue in Winnipeg, more infill should trump less infill.	10/12/2020 7:14 PM
107	Same answer!	10/12/2020 6:48 PM
108	the size limitations are too stringent.	10/12/2020 3:55 PM
109	not in this neighborhood due to no place to park as is with single family homes	10/12/2020 9:20 AM
110	Side-by-sides are often more affordable options for young buyers; if splitting a lot on a busy street ensure that there is room for cars to park and a back yard. Frontage should be less of a priority on a busy street. Proximity to a park is not the same quality of a substitute for a backyard space.	10/11/2020 11:25 PM
111	Make sure there is sufficient land for gardens, and play areas. Make sure there is sufficient area for a garage onsite and parking. Make sure the view of neighbours isn't blocked when these units are built.	10/11/2020 9:01 PM
112	If the city allows placement of 2-unit side by side in Area 1 -There need to be enforcement of current zoning guidelines and clearer guidelines on AirBNBs in the City. A neighbouhood should not have to deal with new builds being used only as AirBNBs and never having had families living in them. Without City guidelines, the ones in my neighbourhood get very noisy when rented out as party houses; especially on holidays and weekends. That is less house(s) with a neighbour(s) that contributes to the neighbourhood and community.	10/11/2020 8:38 PM
113	The two unit housing should not be taller than a two story house with attic eg Rathgar Street housing.	10/11/2020 3:31 PM
114	WE DO NOT WANT THEM	10/11/2020 3:24 PM

115	Again make it accessible	10/11/2020 12:02 PM
116	See previous comment.	10/11/2020 11:15 AM
117	Take into account parking availability and traffic. St. Vital gets gridlocked on an almost daily basis and cannot handle an increase in population density.	10/10/2020 9:48 PM
118	By not having them at all. They look like shit and are too big	10/10/2020 3:57 PM
119	Limiting the size of the structure to fit in with the neighbourhood	10/10/2020 9:16 AM
120	why not build them in new areas like bridgewater , sage creek.. and by the way make sure they build them right beside a single family home, see if the owner enjoys that	10/10/2020 8:51 AM
121	Don't built them at all	10/10/2020 7:52 AM
122	See previous comment.	10/9/2020 11:06 PM
123	Again by allowing a percentage of the properties to be sold to split	10/9/2020 4:11 PM
124	I don't think that mature neigbourhoods need side by side housing, but if it must happen, the lots must be much larger, architecturally fit into the neighbourhoods, restrict height and limit the maximum size the home can take up on the lot.	10/9/2020 1:38 PM
125	not build on a single lot	10/9/2020 11:06 AM
126	Two unit-side-by-side should not be allowed in single family area.	10/9/2020 9:02 AM
127	Clarify these broad level statements	10/8/2020 9:11 PM
128	go downtown	10/8/2020 8:04 PM
129	no infills	10/8/2020 3:40 PM
130	By putting a moratorium on this practice or eliminating it entirely. The whole idea is a step backward in the improvement of these areas and an insult to these areas Heritage.	10/8/2020 2:54 PM
131	Find a larger piece of property and near similar building with larger properties.	10/8/2020 2:28 PM
132	Build them closer to the perimeter, stay away from Munroe !!!

	typical size lot on the specific street.	
145	two-unit side-by-side housing should not be allowed in Area 1 and Area 2.	10/6/2020 9:41 PM
146	They should not be built in our neighbourhoods	10/6/2020 5:58 PM
147	Leave the lots larger and houses blending in	10/6/2020 3:44 PM
148	I am struggling with the idea that your blanket guidelines would cover "limiting the size of new buildings to bring them more in line with existing homes", when the existing home sizes and lot sizes are so different than what these guidelines seem to be designed for.	10/6/2020 3:23 PM
149	First, do a test-run in an area like Tuxedo and see how that works out.	10/6/2020 3:03 PM
150	same as previous comment	10/6/2020 2:36 PM
151	Leaving homes alone	10/6/2020 11:17 AM
152	seems reasonable	10/6/2020 7:49 AM
153	Consider street density (parking, traffic, sewer congestion etc) when changing a single family lot into multi-family units.	10/5/2020 9:13 PM
154	By not allowing them on 50' lots.	10/5/2020 6:00 PM
155	Do not agree with multi-unit buildings in Area 1 where the block is primarily single family units.	10/5/2020 1:48 PM
156	Not a fan of side by side housing.	10/5/2020 12:30 PM
157	Make sure that it is facing the street, not somewhere in the back yard. To do that is just plain stupid.	10/5/2020 12:28 PM
158	The site and building design guidelines does not, and needs to include regulations and protection to the adjacent existing structures (such as foundations, fences, garages, unpaved back lanes, sidewalks, etc.) especially within these mature neighbourhoods. Current bylaws allow excavation to the property line - causing damage to existing structures. This is negligent of the city to know of these issues and approve infill developments, at the cost of and without protecting existing properties. The city could also be opening itself to financial liability. Homeowners who have their houses seriously damaged by construction on a neighbouring property, could sue the city for failing to protect them. In other Canadian jurisdictions, temporary retaining walls and additional supports are required in mature neighbourhoods. It is also included in their guidelines to developers that any damage incurred as a result of the construction of the property will be the responsibility of the land owner to repair. It is essential that these guidelines also include: Safety as a priority. Ex. The construction site must be kept safe for both neighbours and workers, and must be properly fenced. Noise in the Neighbourhood. Include specifics on the bylaw permits of operation of construction equipment. Respect for Neighbours. Include guidelines on portable toilets, maintenance of weeds and unkept grass, site litter and debris, and parking permits for construction vehicles to ensure lanes, streets and sidewalks are not blocked. Communication with Neighbours. Including building plans, estimated time of construction, contact information if they have concerns about the project, and scheduled access to their properties if required during construction. Other jurisdictions have created a Infill Conversation Toolkit as a resource. Addition of a Contact and Enquiries section. Including the Residential Infill Department, Community Standards Bylaw, and 311 for issues and complaints relating to infractions of the City Bylaws. In addition, it is essential that a process is outlined in the development guidelines specific to the accountability of developers to follow these guidelines. If required, new bylaws need to be enacted to ensure the city has jurisdiction to enforce the requirements of this strategy. Currently, without such a process, commitments are made by developers at the initial stages of application to the City and then not completed on site. This includes such commitments as landscaping, parking structures, saving existing trees, and building fences. It also includes infractions to site safety, cleanliness, noise, traffic and neighbourhood liveability bylaws. The enforcement of development permits needs to become the responsibility fo the city and not an adjacent property owners responsibility. In addition, new guidelines should include that final inspection by the City is required before occupancy and/or use. The current bylaw is 0.8 cars per unit in mature neighbourhoods. That figure needs to be updated based on recent research, and not outdated information. With densification, there is an increase need for parking.	10/5/2020 12:15 PM
159	Limit development of side-by-side housing to 50' lots with 5' side yards in established single family neighborhoods.	10/5/2020 11:09 AM

160	See comments on first question	10/4/2020 10:44 PM
161	Just look at the Glenlawn neighborhood and you will find countless examples of what isn't working and how it shouldn't be done.	10/4/2020 9:54 PM
162	Add environmental and infrastructure (water, waste, greenspace) impacts	10/4/2020 5:48 PM
163	I believe that this looks good as is	10/4/2020 4:10 PM
164	careful consideration of the other homes adjacent to the proposed site	10/4/2020 1:18 PM
165	The focus on design and aesthetic requirements is unnecessary and counterproductive. Neighbourhoods change, and artificially preserving the predominant built form/aesthetic character of a neighbourhood at the expense of gentle density, increased walkability, and the efficient use of existing infrastructure is poor city planning.	10/4/2020 10:15 AM
166	Again lots should not be separated and single unit houses only in neighborhoods where the existing homes are single unit.	10/3/2020 7:51 PM
167	If it fits with the area is it predominantly sides by sides or single family homes. It must fit with the community	10/3/2020 7:30 PM
168	Put them in areas that are already made for side by sides.	10/3/2020 7:24 PM
169	Part of diversity is that our city has neighbourhoods with diversity of lot/yard sizes. Not everything that now needs to be constructed has to have very little yard/green space. Having neighbourhoods with large trees, grass, space on the street to park (that isn't someone's driveway), should also be valued - not just whether there is all ranges of economic accessibility, family sizes and ages that can live in a neighbourhood.	10/3/2020 2:13 PM
170	See #11	10/3/2020 1:05 PM
171	good	10/3/2020 11:36 AM
172	Bringing proposed new 'more in line' and 'more in character' are too subjective & weak; consider simply 'in line' and 'in character'	10/3/2020 10:54 AM
173	Criteria is fair.	10/3/2020 10:50 AM
174	Stop making reference to low densities. Change the language so that we all can expect higher density in residential areas. Continuing to say "low density" creates expectations. As well as thinking of up and down, also consider front and back. especially when lots are tight and there is a back lane.	10/3/2020 10:25 AM
175	Lots should not be allowed to be split into smaller lots uncharacteristic of the existing neighbourhood. For example, In a neighbourhood where the smallest existing lot size is 50', a 75' lot could NOT be split in half, but two adjacent 75' lots COULD be split into three 50' lots. New buildings could not exceed the mass and height of buildings immediately adjacent.	10/3/2020 10:23 AM
176	These should never be built in these areas. Single family detached homes continue to sell well. If there were many unsold homes, this would be reasonable. Their introduction seems like a money grab by developers.	10/3/2020 9:24 AM
177	Not having secondary suites for rent	10/3/2020 9:20 AM
178	no change	10/3/2020 8:21 AM
179	Further narrowing the area classifications, some neighborhoods have side by side units throughout while others only have them in small sections. By generalizing the whole neighborhood you could potentially allow these units where other existing units like them are not found in a significant radius.	10/3/2020 6:56 AM
180	They should be permitted on smaller lots because of the elimination of the interior side yards (extra 6' total), so I thin it's reasonable to say they should be permitted on 44' lots.	10/2/2020 10:04 PM
181	Do we actually want neighbourhoods to be uniform? Last I heard is that a variety (in types of housing and citizens) is more healthy for neighbourhoods to thrive.	10/2/2020 3:42 PM
182	DOn't put them in Area 1 at all.	10/2/2020 3:05 PM
183	Build downtown or Wolseley area.	10/2/2020 2:26 PM

184	Increasing the required distance to 6' from exterior outer most wall or extension from property lines.	10/2/2020 2:12 PM
185	The City “approved” two houses with rental suites in the basements on my street of bungalows! How is this “OK”??!!	10/2/2020 1:35 PM
186	Allow for maximum greenspace. Survey neighbourhood residents. Owners/developers should live in the area in which they are building.	10/1/2020 5:15 PM
187	These Areas are exclusionary and have more to do with socio-economic class and keeping NIMBY's at the bay more than anything.	10/1/2020 4:40 PM
188	design requirements	10/1/2020 4:11 PM
189	no comment	10/1/2020 3:27 PM
190	Keeping with the design of the neighbourhood would benefit all existing Residents on the street. Maintenance of a safe, private distance between the new buildings and the existing homes.	10/1/2020 3:26 PM
191	Make sure there is adequate room for PARKING or for a garage to be built.	10/1/2020 3:15 PM
192	no comment	10/1/2020 1:19 PM
193	nothing	10/1/2020 11:49 AM
194	I don’t think these limitations are appropriate. I support larger multi-family dwellings being built even if they don’t “fit in” in the existing neighbourhood. I think this is more environmentally friendly and also prevents classism in neighbourhoods.	10/1/2020 11:14 AM
195	Same size may not always work because some lots have very small houses	10/1/2020 11:09 AM
196	Again, Make sure the design fits with the neighbourhood. "Modern housing" in terms of look of design, often doesn't blend well. Most people who move into an established neighbourhoods did so because that's how they wanted to live; with space around them. Built new modern homes using exterior materials already used in the neighbourhood; to help blend in.	9/30/2020 7:50 PM
197	Not building	9/30/2020 2:56 PM
198	Not be allowed if the lot is zoned single family residential	9/30/2020 2:19 PM
199	What does the existing livability neighbourhood plan say?	9/30/2020 12:56 PM
200	Same answer as 11.	9/30/2020 11:49 AM
201	same answer	9/30/2020 8:33 AM
202	restriction against them becoming rentals within the first 10 years	9/29/2020 3:31 PM
203	same	9/29/2020 1:44 PM
204	They can't, and should be abolished. Anyone in support of such changes, should be removed from office.	9/29/2020 1:31 PM
205	the city needs to be open to keep old neighbourhoods as a place for people to want to live.	9/29/2020 1:25 PM
206	If there's space, build it.	9/29/2020 9:44 AM
207	Allow for thicker walls without penalty - make exterior insulation immune from tax assessment and setback limits.	9/29/2020 8:31 AM
208	Side-by-side housing would not fit into a heritage neighbourhood.	9/28/2020 12:53 PM
209	Limiting size of new buildings and distance between. Not removing mature trees. Above all make sure the homes blend in with the existing neighborhood!	9/28/2020 11:33 AM
210	Conduct surveys and community meetings with the affected communities, in order to lay out the proposed plan and respond to concerns that might arise from current community members.	9/28/2020 9:49 AM
211	see previous comments	9/28/2020 8:22 AM
212	Take complaints and consider concerns put forth by neighbouring residents seriously after variances are appealed. Consider the major impact that might be forced on neighbours.	9/28/2020 8:22 AM

	Appeals against variances are not takin into consideration and Neighbourhoods such as Glenwood are being transformed. Against to majority of long term residents. 25 foot lots don't fit everywhere, not without impacting the green spaces or life style of neighbours.	
213	Each area of the city in mind needs to be considered. Needs to fit in with current	9/28/2020 12:35 AM
214	Site & building design requirements and size rules need to be less aimed at preserving the status quo in neighbourhoods and more aimed at providing economical housing options to people in all mature communities. Less onerous requirements for Area 1.	9/27/2020 11:56 PM
215	Restrict the size and number fo trees a developer can cut per lot. Enforce guidelines on protecting trees on infill lots during construction. The city is focusing on mature neighbourhoods for its infill strategy which could result in a significant loss to Winnipeg's canopy. Please consider this inevitable loss as diminishing to the character of these mature neighbourhoods.	9/27/2020 8:12 PM
216	cant	9/27/2020 2:35 PM
217	Min lot size 30x100. Single family homes only.	9/26/2020 4:28 PM
218	Building design requirements in the character of the neighbourhood are no guarantee of good design. Hiring a professional architect is the best guarantee of good, neighbourhood-sensitive design.	9/26/2020 3:09 PM
219	If there is a single home on the property, then a single home should be built.	9/26/2020 12:20 PM
220	Again height, lot coverage, preservance of mature trees and landscaping must be enforced.	9/25/2020 6:22 PM
221	If infill means to fill in the empty lots, then why are lots with perfectly good houses being subdivided, the houses torn down, and new buildings put up?	9/25/2020 2:38 PM
222	change building codes to ensure preservation of every tree on lot from property lines to within 4' of building.	9/25/2020 1:34 PM
223	please see 11	9/25/2020 12:50 PM
224	Scrap: limiting the size of buildings to bring them in line with existing buildings, site and building requirements that are more in the character with the neighborhood, introducing minimum lot size requirements. Get rid of minimum parking spaces.	9/25/2020 9:36 AM
225	same	9/25/2020 8:38 AM
226	Limit amount / block as well as size	9/25/2020 8:32 AM
227	Location decision should be left to the owner.	9/25/2020 1:13 AM
228	Stop ripping down current homes that are affordable and replacing them with poor quality cookie-cutter expensive houses.	9/24/2020 7:38 PM
229	https://fortune.com/2020/07/21/black-housing-neighborhoods-economic-opportunity/	9/24/2020 7:11 PM
230	not build them.	9/24/2020 5:20 PM
231	Consider the context of each site and neighbourhood instead of "clear cutting" and "plopping" off the shelf plans on to the sites	9/24/2020 4:11 PM
232	As long as the new criteria is followed	9/24/2020 12:42 PM
233	Limit the number of such houses in a mature neighbourhood to preserve the character.	9/24/2020 10:08 AM
234	"Limiting the size of new buildings to bring them more in line with existing homes." This is a recipe for retaining the status quo. We want a mix of housing styles. There is no reason that a street with houses cannot include a mix of styles, including walk up apartments and four plexes. Tinkering like this is doomed to fail.	9/24/2020 9:40 AM
235	as per the response previous will also apply to this question	9/24/2020 9:19 AM
236	Go and look at the area and the existing structures, needs to be more of an individual decision. Be more upfront with the designs of the newer structure when posting signs in neighbourhoods	9/24/2020 8:46 AM
237	Again: specifics and scenarios. "Larger lots." Can a developer buy two or three houses, knock them down, and build a huge building on it?	9/24/2020 7:28 AM

238	The issue is with parking, access to the street and maintaining the existing character of the neighbourhood. In my area, a two unit side by side replaced an older house that needed to be replaced. For five years the lawn was a weed patch and the gravel driveway has largely consumed what was once a nice yard. The renters have little regard for maintaining the property and are using the “driveway” to store vehicles. Not an improvement over what was there before.	9/24/2020 12:44 AM
239	only along major routes, restrict otherwise	9/23/2020 10:46 PM
240	It looks good	9/23/2020 9:50 PM
241	Again if we are to bring things in line with what was there then location and density issues could be addressed	9/23/2020 9:10 PM
242	I think parking needs to be considered when putting up new housing. Where parking needs to be included in the lot.	9/23/2020 9:04 PM
243	I see an opportunity to expand the location criteria to improve density and land usage to less mature neighborhoods. One way is to set criteria for any new developments	9/23/2020 8:39 PM
244	Community members need to feel heard in throughout the process.	9/23/2020 8:33 PM
245	Do away with location criteria. Allow townhouses everywhere. No need for two-unit or three-unit policies.	9/23/2020 8:26 PM
246	same.	9/23/2020 8:18 PM
247	Infill for increased residential density should only be permitted in large scale and corner lots. They should not be squeezed into existing lots or split lots. Infill needs to consider gravel lanes, garbage and recycling requirements and snow clearing. Design standards should also consider neighbourhood context. There should be equal greenspace for new developments as for existing residential units - e.g. backyards and front yards	9/23/2020 6:52 PM
248	Not in Area 1	9/23/2020 6:33 PM
249	no two-unit side-by-side houseing in infill lots	9/23/2020 6:19 PM
250	We cannot take more density in the Kingston crescent neighbour hood- already too many power outages and not enough parking	9/23/2020 5:53 PM
251	Move outside city limits	9/23/2020 5:40 PM
252	See my previous comments. This type of development only benefits developers who can outbid first-time buyers for a piece of property, tear down an old house, and put in a multi-unit structure and charge people three times the price. This type of development should not be allowed.	9/23/2020 5:26 PM
253	Require very careful consideration of allowing this in Area 1.	9/23/2020 4:56 PM
254	Have seen homes blocked over by other structures. Keep communities structures the same !	9/23/2020 4:36 PM
255	2 unit side by side should be allowed anywhere	9/23/2020 4:32 PM
256	as with previous concerns	9/23/2020 4:20 PM
257	n/a	9/23/2020 4:16 PM
258	Add exceptions for specific neighborhoods of particularly unique and historic significance, such as Armstrong's point, and old Crescentwood.	9/23/2020 4:11 PM
259	The lot size for side-by-side housing should not be smaller than would result in side and rear yards to be less than those on the rest of the street. Also, parking areas must be restricted to allow at least 3 meters of width allowing for the same "side yard" as the building itself	9/23/2020 3:48 PM
260	same as previous	9/23/2020 2:14 PM
261	Build em anywhere and everywhere.	9/23/2020 11:56 AM
262	Look at the parking on the lot and the effect of more people parking on the street; the size garages on smaller lots need to be reduced/restricted and set back from lane to allow for snow / garbage pick up	9/23/2020 11:13 AM

263	Good as is.	9/23/2020 9:37 AM
264	do not allow in single family housing areas	9/23/2020 9:12 AM
265	See previous	9/22/2020 7:59 PM
266	I think at this time criteria seems reasonable	9/22/2020 3:31 PM
267	-Emphasize and prioritize sustainability: reuse and renovation of existing housing to accommodate 21st century needs. Stop the unnecessary builds when things can be renovated and restored.. -Increase setbacks to enable existing homeowners to keep their investments safe. Current zoning and setbacks (4 ft) mean that in the current demolition/rebuild next to my home, I had a digger 18" from my dining room window while we tried to eat dinner. There is simply no way to protect existing homes with these poor zoning regs. --Increase protections for existing homeowners...: 1) Ask for their feedback when proposing infill 2) Listen to their concerns and make adjustments 3) Protect their properties so their foundations and walls aren't damaged 4) Keep them apprised of demolition and excavation dates, by law. 5) Provide pest remediation when a building will be demolished. At present, when a house is demolished, all the mice, rats, rabbits, etc. all end up in the existing neighbours' homes and properties. It's a disaster. 6) Provide environmental protections. When you knock down a 100 year old home, lead paint ends up all over the neighbours' properties, gardens and yards. This is unsafe and unnecessary.	9/22/2020 2:13 PM
268	See response to #11 above.	9/22/2020 1:45 PM
269	Abandon this stupid infill housing idea NOW!	9/22/2020 1:35 PM
270	I have seen side by side housing. One side takes are of their side, the other is a total mess and then becomes an eyesore filer the whole street. Keep 50 foot lots. Interesting that you are developing into so many areas where there was farmland and now developers develop in these areas, and you can’t keep 50 foot lots in the inner city. Close to downtown, close to the Forks. You have a double standard, as usual	9/22/2020 1:35 PM
271	All neighborhoods should provide access to people who can only afford multi-family housing.	9/22/2020 11:45 AM
272	No issues as long as new building heights are consistent with existing residential development	9/22/2020 12:56 AM
273	This is well thought out.	9/21/2020 6:47 PM
274	By maintaining the neighborhoods charm & keeping it single dwelling. If you want duplexes, triplexes etc etc, put them in your nice tidy neighborhood and see what happens!	9/21/2020 6:22 PM
275	By putting them only in areas of similar construction NOT in neighbourhoods of single family homes.	9/21/2020 4:53 PM
276	Bring down property vslues	9/21/2020 4:48 PM
277	No	9/21/2020 4:40 PM
278	Make them smaller allow for trees and grass.	9/21/2020 3:01 PM
279	Allow for GREENSPACE and for PARKINGof at least two vehicles for each unit.	9/21/2020 2:52 PM
280	Locate the two-unit side-by-side closer to major highways instead of embedded far into the neighborhoods. The old neighborhoods have a lot of single storey housing, and the larger buildings, even at 28 feet don't fit well next to it. Also, the smaller streets can't accommodate constant apartment traffic and parking, so place and high density multi-family units closer to the main highways.	9/21/2020 2:40 PM
281	same as previous comment	9/21/2020 2:12 PM
282	looks great	9/21/2020 12:12 PM
283	By identifying areas that are best suited for this type of housing.	9/21/2020 11:41 AM
284	Newer developments should include affordable two unit side by side housing. Decades ago in new housing developments like the Maples, Transcona, Valley Gardens, St. Norbert and other parts of the cities included multi housing units like duplexes and townhouses. Now new developments being built consist of bays of huge houses with attached front garages. Real affordable housing like new builds of single homes about of 900 sq feet on 30 foot lots should be what is being built and what most families need and could afford and sustainable.	9/21/2020 11:34 AM

285	I think the City of Winnipeg needs to be more flexible in their thinking and do what they can to help reduce regulation that prevents growth to the city.	9/21/2020 10:02 AM
286	With side by sides, the main issue being post construction problems. Such as noise and smoke/smell pollution. Historically side by sides have had issues with this, and it almost always stems from construction. Making it mandatory to be checked/tested include sound dampening should be a priority. Side by sides though, should be a last option for housing, not a first choice. Most consumers you will find don't want to be attached to their neighbor.	9/21/2020 9:35 AM
287	Introducing site and building design requirements that are more in character with the neighbourhood Limiting the size of new buildings to bring them more in line with existing homes	9/21/2020 8:27 AM
288	Area by area with the two proposals, one could drive up and down the streets, and see where introducing a well designed two story where there are already two story homes would be in keeping with the general character of the neighbourhood, without diminishing the values of existing home owners investments. Each area must be allowed to speak for themselves, and elected councellors must be obliged to take those opinions as critical to whether or not any infil developement is allowed.	9/20/2020 11:56 PM
289	Same as previous	9/20/2020 6:33 PM
290	I am concerned there are too many loopholes to allow such development to take place against the betterment of the community.	9/20/2020 5:27 PM
291	ensure the lot is large enough to accomodate the building	9/20/2020 4:24 PM
292	Agreed with above suggestions	9/20/2020 3:31 PM
293	Provide an active involvement of any street/area residents when a new in fill application is made by a developer to ensure that only appropriate units are built.	9/20/2020 1:46 PM
294	It’s great!	9/20/2020 1:38 PM
295	Remove modern housing options	9/20/2020 10:24 AM
296	Side by side units take up too much of the lots(green space). Don't put more than 6 of them per street in Area 1 neighbourhoods. No place for children to play, or for pets or for BBQ's etc.. Parks can't accomodate all these needs.	9/20/2020 1:06 AM
297	Make it easier to increase density in all neighbourhoods.	9/19/2020 10:55 PM
298	No improvements necessary.	9/19/2020 10:21 PM
299	The second last comment of providing modern housing with these guidelines are at conflict. With too many restrictions you can not achieve this	9/19/2020 6:58 PM
300	See previous comment.	9/19/2020 5:35 PM
301	remove all requirements. Add platinum standard for green buildings	9/19/2020 5:31 PM
302	Be willing to revisit size limitations in the future once Winnipeggers become more accustomed to infill housing appearing in their neighbourhood.	9/19/2020 4:32 PM
303	See previous comment	9/19/2020 3:43 PM
304	Be explicit and specific about restrictions related to footprint, height, etc. Allow no exceptions. Hire more city inspectors to ensure what is applied for on the permit is actually what is built.	9/19/2020 2:42 PM
305	No	9/19/2020 2:06 PM
306	Stop gaslighting residents' concerns. South Osborne is already dense, esp Lord Roberts. Never allow duplexes, or any other infill, to be taller than the neighbours'. Stop implying that old housing is decrepit, not modern, and needs to come down.	9/19/2020 1:56 PM
307	Once again no subdivisions	9/19/2020 12:57 PM
308	I agree with these principles generally. I don’t think we should limit the size of houses too much. But we should place limits on apartment buildings and condo buildings when built in older neighborhoods	9/19/2020 11:09 AM
309	"character with the neighbourhood" As determined by who? This is all too vague.	9/19/2020 10:48 AM

310	Same as previous answer	9/19/2020 10:38 AM
311	Sounds okay	9/19/2020 10:20 AM
312	This is fine!	9/19/2020 9:57 AM
313	Parking requirements	9/19/2020 9:37 AM
314	Make sure there is enough green space around the buildings	9/19/2020 9:19 AM
315	Acceptanle	9/19/2020 8:53 AM
316	Two unit side by sides should not be allowed within Area 1 neighbourhoods, as they do not suit the existing housing and style of Area 1 neighbourhoods.	9/19/2020 8:25 AM
317	Again: I think it's super important and makes sense... but how are you going to get buy in from Developers? Monetary incentive comes to mind. Can they get back 3%(?) of City admin fees if/after build is inspected & they follow through/comply with guidelines?	9/19/2020 8:02 AM
318	Do not support.	9/19/2020 6:20 AM
319	More consideration is needed regarding the type of mature neighbourhood for these projects — some mature neighbourhoods consist of old beauties in good shape on large lots, and shouldn't have these taken down, ruining the neighbourhoods character, just for the purpose of densification.	9/19/2020 5:31 AM
320	Stick to the character of the neighbourhood and don't create more two units.	9/19/2020 12:23 AM
321	There needs to be some consideration for parking. These lot splits/two unit houses go from requiring parking for 1-2 vehicles to 4-8 vehicles.	9/18/2020 11:26 PM
322	Don't think they could	9/18/2020 8:55 PM
323	Not building on lots smaller than 33ft wide	9/18/2020 8:28 PM
324	You are repeating the exact same line of questioning repeatedly in this survey. Simply tell us how much housing can be built on a given size of lot and let the market determine what gets built.	9/18/2020 8:08 PM
325	I don't want this in my neighborhood (Kingston Crescent).	9/18/2020 7:58 PM
326	Same argument.	9/18/2020 7:37 PM
327	See all my previous. And make them condos. If you can get first time home buyers here then the housing market can continue to grow. Right now this is a HARD area to buy into due to reputation safety feel etc. If condo buyers are here then they will move up and buy more expensive when a family comes. Pride of ownership and upkeep. Etc	9/18/2020 5:53 PM
328	size and building design are essential and needs to have very strong guidelines to prevent the look of low income housing that already appears due to the new infill	9/18/2020 5:08 PM
329	same	9/18/2020 3:06 PM

Q13 How do you think the location criteria for three-unit housing could be improved?

Answered: 317 Skipped: 457

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Maintain existing density in established neighborhoods. Do not increase the density existing neighborhoods	10/23/2020 7:20 AM
2	See previous note: A lot coverage of 30% is still almost twice as big as the average lot coverage in most mature communities.	10/22/2020 11:20 PM
3	On sites located within 2,625 feet (800 metres) of the primary transit network or rapid transit station - It should be 400 meters and not 800. - They should not be located on corner lots of a block that is primarily single family homes as that sets the tone for the entire block. I know that when the apartment block featured in your draft guidelines was build, it was set back against a park with a baseball field in it. The land has now all been developed and there is not green space for families to enjoy - add that information to your guidelines when showing what exists.	10/22/2020 11:19 PM
4	All great ideas, keep developers accountable. I'd like them to be stricter.	10/22/2020 10:31 PM
5	Existing infrastructure such as roads and sewers would have to be upgraded to handle the extra volume. Building such housing should not only fall to developers but be allowed to be done by the current owners of the property.	10/22/2020 9:16 PM
6	These should not be just in corner lots. There are big houses in some of theses areas and there a three-unit house could be build to replace one single family home. Some people want to live is smaller spaces to reduce their carbon footprint and others want to downsize.	10/22/2020 7:13 PM
7	Consult the community and fine if conditions are not met.	10/22/2020 5:32 PM
8	I don't know	10/22/2020 5:20 PM
9	Again , this can be perceived in several ways.This also can be read as ambiguous . Again a trust level has to be proven in a control group's ethics and behaviour. I went for lots of long walks this past summer, and the level of obvious disrespect of the builders for the side existing home owners was so disappionting and deploring.	10/22/2020 4:07 PM
10	The criteria focus for "three-unit housing" appears to be an improvement.	10/22/2020 1:48 PM
11	Abolish single family zoning to allow greater ease of a variety of infill developments. Allow more flexibility in lot width requirements to allow a variety of infill densities in existing mature neighbourhoods.	10/22/2020 11:45 AM
12	Same answer as 11. Should be encouraged everywhere in both Areas.	10/22/2020 11:37 AM
13	Make them one unit bungalows.	10/22/2020 11:29 AM
14	By not targeting the suburbs	10/22/2020 10:00 AM
15	Do not introduce these types of developments in areas where they do not currently exist as they will have a detrimental effect on existing properties in these mature neighbourhoods. Don't shoehorn large scale buildings into neighbourhoods destroying existing character and conformity.	10/21/2020 10:24 PM
16	Corner lots only	10/21/2020 10:14 PM
17	Need more discussion of how many bedrooms will be built in to accommodate families. Need to specify accessibility. standards. The online engagement last week mentioned that the bigger 3 and 4 family buildings will be limited to street corners. I am concerned that this will drive up the cost through scarcity and prime real estate.	10/21/2020 8:34 PM
18	Put them on main routes only, so single detached houses don't have balconies overlooking their yards. Also has anyone realized the difficulty to have adequate guest parking on the streets where these are.	10/21/2020 7:22 PM
19	Don't want it in single family neighbourhood to keep my investment from dropping.	10/21/2020 7:11 PM
20	unsure	10/21/2020 3:51 PM
21	They cannot be. The space is better used for an apartment building, with onsite parking.	10/21/2020 1:09 PM
22	Owners should prove that they cannot renovate instead of tearing down. Do not allow the footprint to be larger than what's being replaced. Do not allow buildings as high as proposed in	10/21/2020 1:03 PM

	the guidelines. Build smaller square footage per dwelling. People do NOT need ensuites, walk-in closets, islands plus dining tables for eating. Live smaller - as in Europe.	
23	changing the character of single family neighbourhoods does not improve an area, this will only force more relocation to outer suburbs	10/21/2020 11:18 AM
24	no opinion	10/21/2020 10:37 AM
25	I don’t support lot splitting for three unit housing builds in area 1 and 2 zones	10/21/2020 10:21 AM
26	Not in River Heights!	10/21/2020 7:44 AM
27	These should not exist in established neighbourhoods unless along a main route. (Ie. frontage on st. Mary’s or ste. Annnes but not on the streets that run between them)	10/20/2020 11:33 PM
28	Limit the amount in one neighborhood.	10/20/2020 7:55 PM
29	No	10/20/2020 6:04 PM
30	Hate infill. Dumb move by city	10/20/2020 5:16 PM
31	I don't	10/20/2020 3:41 PM
32	No opinion.	10/20/2020 3:27 PM
33	Remove the distinction between Areas 1 and 2... it only further serves to entrench existing socio-economic divisions. Remove lot size requirements... density needs walkability to be livable, and walkability needs narrow lots. Therefore, intensification needs to be allowed to happen on all lot sizes. On limiting the sizes of buildings to be "compatible", anything under 4 storeys should simply be allowed... anything that is scaled to a person walking is compatible. The goal isn't density, it's walkability (even though walkable places will be dense, dense places aren't always walkable).	10/20/2020 3:06 PM
34	We should strive to achieve balance in established neighbourhoods. Not overload them with overcrowding and homes that stick out.	10/20/2020 2:23 PM
35	RESTRICT THREE UNIT HOUSING TO CORNER LOTS.	10/20/2020 2:09 PM
36	Re-zone to allow these on all corner lots in River Heights and Tuxedo.	10/20/2020 10:48 AM
37	Don't ruin my neighbourhood.	10/19/2020 11:57 AM
38	Limit this type of housing to neighborhoods with similar size split homes, this should not be permitted to be placed on streets with single family homes.	10/19/2020 9:46 AM
39	Who wrote the survey? It’s propaganda not a survey. Is there no oversight at city hall? Who is supervising the bureaucrats who write this garbage in overly long nonsense paragraphs.	10/18/2020 9:14 PM
40	none of this on gravel lanes	10/18/2020 8:38 PM
41	There would need to be accomodations for ample off street parking.	10/18/2020 7:13 PM
42	no	10/18/2020 3:46 PM
43	There is insufficient attention to implications for parking in the neighbourhood, including providing access to plugging in block heaters in the winter. More attention needs to be paid to providing and/or maintaining options for a range of income levels. Some of these neighbourhoods have been places where young people can afford their first homes as well as places with larger more expensive housing. Also, there is insufficient attention to trees, whether existing or new plantings. Many usual measures to protect existing trees are insufficient, and the trees end up dying within a few years of the construction. The construction of new foundations for example will likely to significant damage to any large mature trees on the property. Winnipeg's tree canopy has in the past been a matter of great pride and also has ecological value. Someone needs to be responsible for monitoring the health of both existing and newly planted trees for these sites. Perhaps builders might put down a guarantee deposit to be refunded after 5 years if the trees survive. Planting two trees for killing one large mature one is insufficient. Tree list might be expanded. The setback specification "or portion of block" allows for too much wiggle room. What does that really mean? The entire block should be considered in that average.	10/18/2020 11:08 AM
44	Well not within the scope of this project there needs tp be an addition for a set of rules	10/18/2020 10:37 AM

	regarding the protection of the structural integrity of adjacent properties and buildings. with increased density in these areas the issue of street parking becomes a major issue. Perhaps introduce parking passes as a pay for service.	
45	Trees, Traffic calming, Parking, Regulated access on to main roads.	10/17/2020 8:30 AM
46	Sounds good	10/16/2020 11:57 PM
47	Infills kept to neighbourhood sizes should also be kept affordable.	10/16/2020 11:19 PM
48	apply to areas with secondary plans	10/16/2020 8:03 PM
49	I think that the corner lot suggestion should be scrapped. Do it anywhere that works	10/16/2020 7:26 PM
50	Parking	10/16/2020 7:06 PM
51	Listing the specific lot size requirement for consideration instead of leaving with a generic 'new minimum lot size requirement' blurb... If there's a requirement what is it? You don't just get blanket approval with just the generic placeholder	10/16/2020 6:15 PM
52	same	10/16/2020 2:52 PM
53	Not located in single dwelling neighbourhoods	10/16/2020 2:23 PM
54	You need adequate parking.	10/16/2020 2:02 PM
55	No changes to suggest.	10/16/2020 1:21 PM
56	Rent control should be involved to actually control rent. There will be no end to cheap infill properties being developed if they are getting $1500/month for a crappy box.	10/16/2020 9:16 AM
57	Should not be located in Glenwood. City planners have already ruined the neighbourhood.	10/15/2020 10:40 PM
58	limiting size and height	10/15/2020 9:57 PM
59	I'm not sure. I don't think it should be done at all	10/15/2020 9:05 PM
60	No thoughts.	10/15/2020 7:43 PM
61	If such a structure is the largest building in a given block residence in affected areas should be clearly informed.	10/15/2020 5:40 PM
62	Explicitly consider utility loads and do not split 50' wide lots.	10/15/2020 5:23 PM
63	Skip	10/15/2020 4:45 PM
64	There should be an emphasis on having good visibility of each suite entrance. This would provide safety as neighbors can see if someone has fallen or is in trouble. Other than that, triplex housing provides reasonable increases to density.	10/15/2020 3:10 PM
65	The maximum density should be allowed in Areas 1 and 2.	10/15/2020 2:38 PM
66	n/a	10/15/2020 12:42 PM
67	Larger lot sizes	10/15/2020 12:28 PM
68	More should be allowed!	10/15/2020 10:22 AM
69	Pembina?	10/15/2020 9:01 AM
70	It will just force people to sell and take a finacial loss.	10/15/2020 8:43 AM
71	People in existing neighbourhoods obviously don't want to live in modern housing. Crowding 3 & 4 unit housing on to a lot just because they fit is wrong. Please just do this in new developments. This will just lead to more traffic and blocked sunlight. Build like for like.	10/14/2020 11:00 PM
72	They do not belong here	10/14/2020 9:42 PM
73	Remove the clause that requires building design to be in character with the neightbourhood. Let design professionals do their job and don't force such prescriptive requirements. Also, with increased density, an opportunity for smaller scale commerce exists. Has this been considered? Corner stores etc on the triplex/fourplex lot situations.	10/14/2020 7:51 PM
74	Same comment as for question 12.	10/14/2020 6:35 PM

75	Ensure that these multi-family units are not located in single family dwelling neighbourhoods except for on the more major routes.	10/14/2020 5:53 PM
76	Rules and regulations must be adhered to in developed neighbourhoods which align with the existing buildings and initial housing guidelines.	10/14/2020 4:23 PM
77	Once again spread these infill developments around the city.	10/14/2020 3:24 PM
78	Allow no encroachments. Facade must be in line with neighbours. Keep height low. No lot-line-to-lot-line building. No Tandem parking.	10/14/2020 2:55 PM
79	same as last response	10/14/2020 1:09 PM
80	The owners who have made these "mature" areas over time had a dream of property ownership which included space to allow their children to play on their yards and make neighbourhood friends; be the antithesis of the crowded city. Lets not merely move the "crowded city" into the suburbs	10/14/2020 10:33 AM
81	Similar to single-family and two-unit up-down.	10/14/2020 10:33 AM
82	Keep it on major streets not on residential streets.	10/14/2020 10:07 AM
83	Same as previous comments.	10/14/2020 9:09 AM
84	A larger minimum lot size should only be considered for three unit housing (i.e. 70')	10/14/2020 9:04 AM
85	Craft different guidelines for mature neighbourhoods that take into account the typically narrower lot sizes. Make is MUCH easier to add lane suites or secondary suites.	10/14/2020 7:58 AM
86	In all cases, priority should be given to the rehabilitation and renovation of existing structures. If infill was permitted only in cases where the new construction matched nearby existing homes in size, style, exterior materials, and lot footprint, there would be much less resistance to new infill in existing neighbourhoods.	10/13/2020 10:21 PM
87	Let it happen anywhere so long as the plans are stamped by an engineer and meet code requirements. Why do we care if triplexes are built on 30 ft or 40 ft or corner lots? Build them on any lot so long as it works for the consumer.	10/13/2020 8:53 PM
88	The guidelines are not specific enough for home buyers or existing residents to know what may be acceptable in their neighbourhood or on their street in terms of new-build building size. Their are broad guidelines as to what may be acceptable, but these are not nearly specific enough for those who are not experts in housing and construction development to be able to set reasonable expectations. This is especially frustrating, considering the very large sections that are considered 'Area 1' or 'Area 2'. How can anyone expect to be able to plan for what may be acceptable on their own street when the guidelines are written so generally?	10/13/2020 8:34 PM
89	I would like to see greater clarity for Area 2 neighbourhoods on where triplexes could be constructed - a 35 x 100 ft lot is not very large, and some consideration ought to be given to proximity to transit as parking for 3 vehicles on such a property with access from the laneway could be difficult if any obstructions existed, such as power poles limiting access to a parking space. Additionally, it could prove difficult to manage storage of waste/recycling bins along the laneway for the same reason.	10/13/2020 4:22 PM
90	by maintaining the character of the existing neighbourhood and stringently enforcing guidelines for developers.	10/13/2020 4:21 PM
91	Make sure that they have proper space for parking waste/recycling bins and some green space	10/13/2020 2:49 PM
92	Crap design	10/13/2020 12:19 PM
93	eliminate situation where developer purchases homes at a premium to develop into multifamily units which changes dynamic of neighbourhood. Height limits should be based on neighbouring properties and not bylaw limits. Multifamily units should be encouraged on "feeder" streets with single family behind them.	10/13/2020 12:16 PM
94	like i said make them look like the houses already there.	10/13/2020 11:38 AM
95	This type of housing should not be added to a mature area that has a consistency with the design. This is part of the beauty of the neighborhood and adding these 2 or 3 unit houses decreases the value & desire of resale value in the area	10/13/2020 8:52 AM

96	should be allowed only with neighbors approval. These dwelling could block out the sunlight to the houses next door.	10/13/2020 6:57 AM
97	Build to the lot potential	10/12/2020 9:35 PM
98	Short of egregious and potentially illegal situations property owners ought not to be unreasonably constrained....	10/12/2020 7:16 PM
99	Same answer!	10/12/2020 6:48 PM
100	Consider the diversity that harmoniously already exists in neighbourhoods like the West End and West Broadway. Are these stringent guidelines full of limitations really necessary to ensure a harmonious neighbourhood?	10/12/2020 3:56 PM
101	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	10/12/2020 9:20 AM
102	Make sure there is sufficient land for gardens, and play areas. Make sure there is sufficient area for a garage onsite and parking. Make sure the view of neighbours isn't blocked when these units are built. DO NOT BUILD IN ST B PLEASE. They do not fit in. Turn infill into small squares or parks where neighbours can meet, read a book, enjoy a social space.	10/11/2020 9:02 PM
103	Enforce current zoning by-laws	10/11/2020 8:38 PM
104	no comment.	10/11/2020 3:32 PM
105	WE DO NOT WANT THEM	10/11/2020 3:25 PM
106	Accessibility from main floor	10/11/2020 12:02 PM
107	More green space.	10/11/2020 11:16 AM
108	Take into account parking and traffic availability. St. Vital cannot handle more population density. St. Annes and St. Marys road get gridlocked regularly - more population will only make it worse.	10/10/2020 9:50 PM
109	by not having them. They are too big and look like shit.	10/10/2020 3:58 PM
110	Less is better	10/10/2020 11:02 AM
111	This type of housing is not wanted in residential neighbourhoods like St Vital	10/10/2020 9:17 AM
112	why not build them in new areas like bridgewater , sage creek.. and by the way make sure they build them right beside a single family home, see if the owner enjoys that	10/10/2020 8:51 AM
113	Don’t built them at all	10/10/2020 7:52 AM
114	See previous comment.	10/9/2020 11:07 PM
115	Instead of having guidelines there need to be stronger language. ie. restrictions on where these types of homes are located. along main artery roadways and on corner lots. NOT mid block	10/9/2020 1:50 PM
116	??	10/9/2020 11:06 AM
117	Three-unit housing should not be allowed in single family areas. Large ots shold not be subdivided to accommodate them.	10/9/2020 9:04 AM
118	go downtown.....we don't want these in single family housing areas....	10/8/2020 8:05 PM
119	no infills!	10/8/2020 3:41 PM
120	By putting a moratorium on this practice or eliminating it entirely. The whole idea is a step backward in the improvement of these areas and an insult to these areas Heritage.	10/8/2020 2:54 PM
121	Same as previous.	10/8/2020 2:28 PM
122	Build them closer to the perimeter, stay away from Munroe. !!!!

125	Discard the concept of increasing housing supply for larger lots. Do not split existing lots!	10/8/2020 10:08 AM
126	as long as they are single story.	10/8/2020 8:40 AM
127	Proximity to recreational activities should be a factor	10/8/2020 6:38 AM
128	looks great	10/7/2020 7:53 PM
129	Do not introduce three unit housing in Areas 1, Single family areas. Only on major roadways to accommodate for vehicles, parking and green space.	10/7/2020 2:55 PM
130	Do not allow them adjacent single family dwellings, unless on a corner lot only with increased height restrictions.	10/7/2020 2:50 PM
131	They should not be allowed other than on main thoroughfares, such as Jubilee.	10/7/2020 12:17 PM
132	three-unit housing should not be allowed in area 1. three-unit housing should only be allowed in area 2 if a street already this type of housing.	10/6/2020 9:42 PM
133	Close proximity to the primary transit network should be more limited about 200 or 250 metres.	10/6/2020 8:00 PM
134	They should not be built in our neighbourhoods	10/6/2020 5:59 PM
135	Not on residential streets houses then area set aside for muilti family dwellings	10/6/2020 3:46 PM
136	See previous comments - I think they won't apply here do to distance to primary transit. ***Also: we have very poor road infrastructure, poor electrical infrastructure, gravel back lanes, challenges with flooding...I am not sure how these things would be addressed.	10/6/2020 3:24 PM
137	First, do a test-run in an area like Tuxedo and see how that works out.	10/6/2020 3:03 PM
138	same as previous comment	10/6/2020 2:36 PM
139	Leave homes alone	10/6/2020 11:17 AM
140	reasonable	10/6/2020 7:49 AM
141	Consider street density (parking, traffic, sewer congestion etc) when changing a single family lot into multi-family units.	10/5/2020 9:13 PM
142	Sounds OK	10/5/2020 6:01 PM
143	Do not agree with multi-unit housing in blocks where it is primarily single family homes. Infrastructure is not there to handle extra demand.	10/5/2020 1:48 PM
144	As long as there are bus routes within walking distance, there shouldn't be other requirements.	10/5/2020 12:31 PM
145	Are they attached	10/5/2020 12:29 PM
146	The site and building design guidelines does not, and needs to include regulations and protection to the adjacent existing structures (such as foundations, fences, garages, unpaved back lanes, sidewalks, etc.) especially within these mature neighbourhoods. Current bylaws allow excavation to the property line - causing damage to existing structures. This is negligent of the city to know of these issues and approve infill developments, at the cost of and without protecting existing properties. The city could also be opening itself to financial liability. Homeowners who have their houses seriously damaged by construction on a neighbouring property, could sue the city for failing to protect them. In other Canadian jurisdictions, temporary retaining walls and additional supports are required in mature neighbourhoods. It is also included in their guidelines to developers that any damage incurred as a result of the construction of the property will be the responsibility of the land owner to repair. It is essential that these guidelines also include: Safety as a priority. Ex. The construction site must be kept safe for both neighbours and workers, and must be properly fenced. Noise in the Neighbourhood. Include specifics on the bylaw permits of operation of construction equipment. Respect for Neighbours. Include guidelines on portable toilets, maintenance of weeds and unkept grass, site litter and debris, and parking permits for construction vehicles to ensure lanes, streets and sidewalks are not blocked. Communication with Neighbours. Including building plans, estimated time of construction, contact information if they have concerns about the project, and scheduled access to their properties if required during construction. Other jurisdictions have created a Infill Conversation Toolkit as a resource. Addition of a Contact and Enquiries section. Including the Residential Infill Department, Community Standards Bylaw, and 311 for issues and complaints relating to infractions of the City Bylaws. In addition, it is	10/5/2020 12:15 PM

	essential that a process is outlined in the development guidelines specific to the accountability of developers to follow these guidelines. If required, new bylaws need to be enacted to ensure the city has jurisdiction to enforce the requirements of this strategy. Currently, without such a process, commitments are made by developers at the initial stages of application to the City and then not completed on site. This includes such commitments as landscaping, parking structures, saving existing trees, and building fences. It also includes infractions to site safety, cleanliness, noise, traffic and neighbourhood liveability bylaws. The enforcement of development permits needs to become the responsibility fo the city and not an adjacent property owners responsibility. In addition, new guidelines should include that final inspection by the City is required before occupancy and/or use. The current bylaw is 0.8 cars per unit in mature neighbourhoods. That figure needs to be updated based on recent research, and not outdated information. With densification, there is an increase need for parking.	
147	Make majority community approval mandatory.	10/5/2020 11:11 AM
148	See comments on first question	10/4/2020 10:45 PM
149	See comments before	10/4/2020 9:54 PM
150	A commitment to buy-in.	10/4/2020 5:54 PM
151	I believe that this looks good as is	10/4/2020 4:10 PM
152	careful consideration of the other homes adjacent to the proposed site	10/4/2020 1:18 PM
153	The focus on design and aesthetic requirements is unnecessary and counterproductive. Neighbourhoods change, and artificially preserving the predominant built form/aesthetic character of a neighbourhood at the expense of gentle density, increased walkability, and the efficient use of existing infrastructure is poor city planning.	10/4/2020 10:15 AM
154	I think 3 unit houses do not belong in single family neighbourhoods	10/3/2020 11:03 PM
155	Denying building of multiple unit housing.	10/3/2020 7:52 PM
156	They will not suit area 2	10/3/2020 7:31 PM
157	Put them in places where there are already multiple units gathered together.	10/3/2020 7:25 PM
158	Part of diversity is that our city has neighbourhoods with diversity of lot/yard sizes. Not everything that now needs to be constructed has to have very little yard/green space. Having neighbourhoods with large trees, grass, space on the street to park (that isn't someone's driveway), should also be valued - not just whether there is all ranges of economic accessibility, family sizes and ages that can live in a neighbourhood.	10/3/2020 2:13 PM
159	See #11	10/3/2020 1:05 PM
160	good	10/3/2020 11:36 AM
161	Bringing proposed new 'more in line' and 'more in character' are too subjective & weak; consider simply 'in line' and 'in character'	10/3/2020 10:54 AM
162	Because many blocks/area classified as Area 2 do not have existing mixed height/large size buildings, some criteria for triplex for Area 1 should be extended to Area 2: specifically the minimum lot area of 3500 SF and corner site requirement UNLESS the builder can show existing mixed dwelling size on that particular block.	10/3/2020 10:54 AM
163	Lots should not be allowed to be split into smaller lots uncharacteristic of the existing neighbourhood. For example, In a neighbourhood where the smallest existing lot size is 50', a 75' lot could NOT be split in half, but two adjacent 75' lots COULD be split into three 50' lots. New buildings could not exceed the mass and height of buildings immediately adjacent.	10/3/2020 10:23 AM
164	They should only be built next to existing apartments or commercial buildings. "Corner lots" need to be better defined. There is difference between a corner lot of Palmerston and Chestnut and one on Corydon and Kelvin. Although that's a poor example because shown that neighbours that have money, like Tuxedo, and influence won't have their lots subdivided.	10/3/2020 9:32 AM
165	Not having secondary suites for rent	10/3/2020 9:20 AM
166	no change	10/3/2020 8:22 AM
167	Do not in areas predominantly lived in by the home owner. Better in more rental predominant	10/3/2020 7:57 AM

	areas.	
168	They should be permitted on 30' wide lots as 3 stalls can be accommodated and there is plenty of space for a large floor plate.	10/2/2020 10:06 PM
169	Absolutely no criteria would convince me that these should go in area 1 neighbourhoods	10/2/2020 3:06 PM
170	Limit to downtown.	10/2/2020 2:27 PM
171	Increasing the required distance to 6' from exterior outer most wall or extension from property lines.	10/2/2020 2:12 PM
172	does not apply in my situation	10/2/2020 1:35 PM
173	Three-unit housing is just another cash grab by the city and developers	10/2/2020 10:14 AM
174	Allow for maximum greenspace. Survey neighbourhood residents. Owners/developers should live in the area in which they are building.	10/1/2020 5:15 PM
175	These Areas are exclusionary and have more to do with socio-economic class and keeping NIMBY's at the bay more than anything.	10/1/2020 4:40 PM
176	Do not allow too many of these in Area 1 areas.	10/1/2020 4:29 PM
177	sizing	10/1/2020 4:11 PM
178	Why are smaller lots allowed for triplexes than single family? That makes no sense. More yard space needed for 3 families, more need for parking.	10/1/2020 3:29 PM
179	Only add if there are existing 3 unit/apartment buildings in the neighbourhood,	10/1/2020 3:27 PM
180	no comment	10/1/2020 1:19 PM
181	Limiting the size of new buildings to bring them more in line with the scale of existing homes.Like this	10/1/2020 11:49 AM
182	I don’t think these limitations are appropriate. I support larger multi-family dwellings being built even if they don’t “fit in” in the existing neighbourhood. I think this is more environmentally friendly and also prevents classism in neighbourhoods.	10/1/2020 11:14 AM
183	Standardization and quality. It's time for a definitive plan that is clear, concise and carries significant financial penalties for contractors that massage the rules.	9/30/2020 10:51 PM
184	Ensure there is enough room for parking and increased traffic flow, and don't allow windows to look down on existing backyards.	9/30/2020 7:52 PM
185	Not good to big	9/30/2020 2:56 PM
186	Not be allowed if the lot is zoned single family residential	9/30/2020 2:20 PM
187	What does the existing livability neighbourhood plan say?	9/30/2020 12:56 PM
188	Same answer as 11. There needs to be some example on the street already of such a building or something close or similar before this should be allowed. And if the street is longer than a normal block in length that should be taken into consideration as well	9/30/2020 12:51 PM
189	same answer	9/30/2020 8:34 AM
190	restriction against them becoming rentals within the first 10 years	9/29/2020 3:31 PM
191	same	9/29/2020 1:44 PM
192	They can't, and should simply stick to the Neighbourhood Plan.	9/29/2020 1:32 PM
193	the city needs to be open to keep old neighbourhoods as a place for people to want to live.	9/29/2020 1:25 PM
194	If there's space, build it.	9/29/2020 9:44 AM
195	Allow for thicker walls (insulation) and better energy performance by incentives (Passive House Certification = setback relax, or zoning tolerance or tax credit), removing zoning barriers and install energy and carbon performance criteria instead of design and site limits.	9/29/2020 8:34 AM
196	Three unit housing should only be built on a triple lot, 150 feet wide.	9/28/2020 9:51 PM

197	Three unit housing would not fit into a heritage neighbourhood.	9/28/2020 12:53 PM
198	Limiting size of new buildings and distance between. Not removing mature trees. Above all make sure the homes blend in with the existing neighborhood!	9/28/2020 11:33 AM
199	Conduct surveys and community meetings with the affected communities, in order to lay out the proposed plan and respond to concerns that might arise from current community members.	9/28/2020 9:49 AM
200	Again, listen to the community and take concerns seriously.	9/28/2020 8:24 AM
201	see previous comments	9/28/2020 8:22 AM
202	Need to fit in with what’s already there	9/28/2020 12:35 AM
203	Less onerous requirements for Area 1. We need more multi-family homes in historically exclusionary, single-family-only neighbourhoods.	9/27/2020 11:57 PM
204	Don’t limit development to the same as the houses already there. We have apartment buildings in Crescentwood that add more character and vitality than a house, and are much larger than one, but who would complain about it?	9/27/2020 11:02 PM
205	Restrict the size and number fo trees a developer can cut per lot. Enforce guidelines on protecting trees on infill lots during construction. The city is focusing on mature neighbourhoods for its infill strategy which could result in a significant loss to Winnipeg's canopy. Please consider this inevitable loss as diminishing to the character of these mature neighbourhoods.	9/27/2020 8:12 PM
206	cant be done	9/27/2020 2:35 PM
207	nothing beyond two units	9/27/2020 2:24 PM
208	Allow them only on main thorough fares. Not on residential streets	9/27/2020 2:15 PM
209	The infrastructure that is 100 years old in Old St. Vital CANNOT handle 3 or 4 unit dwellings on 25 foot lots. (I feel like I'm yelling at a brick wall here.)	9/26/2020 4:30 PM
210	Limits to the size of new buildings must be reasonable. Mature neighbourhoods already contain a range of sizes, and larger buildings are often appropriate on corner lots and a long thoroughfares. Building design requirements do not guarantee good design and potentially hinder it.	9/26/2020 3:11 PM
211	Single home on current property - single home should be built.	9/26/2020 12:20 PM
212	DO NOT ALLOW	9/26/2020 11:13 AM
213	I don’t agree with this in mature neighbourhoods.	9/25/2020 6:23 PM
214	I think limiting the size of three unit housing to match the scale of housing in the neighborhood will make it too difficult to increase these kind of units.	9/25/2020 5:03 PM
215	If infill means to fill in the empty lots, then why are lots with perfectly good houses being subdivided, the houses torn down, and new buildings put up?	9/25/2020 2:38 PM
216	Change building codes to preserve every mature tree btween propert line and 4; of new building.	9/25/2020 1:34 PM
217	please see 11	9/25/2020 12:50 PM
218	Scrap: limiting the size of buildings to bring them in line with existing buildings, site and building requirements that are more in the character with the neighborhood, introducing minimum lot size requirements. Get rid of minimum parking spaces.	9/25/2020 9:36 AM
219	same	9/25/2020 8:38 AM
220	Same answer	9/25/2020 8:33 AM
221	Location decision should be left to the owner.	9/25/2020 1:13 AM
222	I don’t think these should be allowed in area 1 neighbourhoods	9/24/2020 8:46 PM
223	Stop ripping down current homes that are affordable and replacing them with poor quality cookie-cutter expensive houses.	9/24/2020 7:38 PM

224	https://fortune.com/2020/07/21/black-housing-neighborhoods-economic-opportunity/	9/24/2020 7:11 PM
225	not build them.	9/24/2020 5:20 PM
226	Consider the context of each site and neighbourhood instead of "clear cutting" and "plopping" off the shelf plans on to the sites	9/24/2020 4:11 PM
227	NO three unit building in residential neighborhoods	9/24/2020 12:43 PM
228	These types of homes are not traditional in mature neighbourhoods and there should be limits on how many are constructed in an area.	9/24/2020 10:09 AM
229	as per previous response applies to this question as well	9/24/2020 9:20 AM
230	Go and look at the area and the existing structures, needs to be more of an individual decision. Be more upfront with the designs of the newer structure when posting signs in neighbourhoods	9/24/2020 8:46 AM
231	There's a lot that's buried in the language. Ask yourself, "How would a developer define "modern housing options?" and imagine the worst thing you've ever seen. I give you: Dwell Design.	9/24/2020 7:31 AM
232	A three unit housing development can not be “more in line with the scale” of a residential neighbourhood consisting of two or three bedroom homes and do not belong.	9/24/2020 12:45 AM
233	It looks good. 'Strategic locations' should be further explained.	9/23/2020 9:51 PM
234	Put these larger developments near busy streets where front yards are not needed and focus these larger units to larger lots	9/23/2020 9:14 PM
235	I think parking needs to be considered when putting up new housing. Where parking needs to be included in the lot. Take into account the surrounding area and by cutting down old big trees your taking away from the maturity of the neighborhood.	9/23/2020 9:06 PM
236	I see an opportunity to expand the location criteria to improve density and land usage to less mature neighborhoods. One way is to set criteria for any new developments to allow for more mixed models	9/23/2020 8:39 PM
237	same	9/23/2020 8:19 PM
238	St. Boniface lots are smaller in scale and can't adequately accomodate three and four unit housing types. That is the reason there is always community opposition. Just because the are is desirable does not mean it is suited for three and four unit infills squeezed onto the lots with little green space and circulation around the building. Infill for increased residential density should only be permitted in large scale and corner lots. They should not be squeezed into existing lots or split lots. Infill needs to consider gravel lanes, garbage and recycling requirements and snow clearing. Design standards should also consider neighbourhood context. There should be equal greenspace for new developments as for existing residential units - e.g. backyards and front yards	9/23/2020 6:55 PM
239	developer requests seem to be rubber stamped - listen to the neighbourhood constituents	9/23/2020 6:40 PM
240	Not in Area 1	9/23/2020 6:34 PM
241	absolutely no three-unit housing in infill lots	9/23/2020 6:19 PM
242	We cannot handle more density in Kingston crescent given current infrastructure- one way streets limit traffic Speed which is already busy, there is no parking due to the nature of being on a peninsula and the power always goes out	9/23/2020 5:55 PM
243	Dont build where it was never legal to build. Quote taking bribes and uphold the rules . Our city is corrupt they are even considering making the airport move at a massive cost to tax payers do greedy ass shindico can make more money.	9/23/2020 5:43 PM
244	See my previous comments. This type of development only benefits developers who can outbid first-time buyers for a piece of property, tear down an old house, and put in a multi-unit structure and charge people three times the price. This type of development should not be allowed.	9/23/2020 5:26 PM
245	Corner only, not overlooking adjacent properties. Very careful consideration on whether to allow this in Area 1.	9/23/2020 4:57 PM

246	I agree with the above criteria.	9/23/2020 4:39 PM
247	Should be allowed on larger lots as per the guidelines.	9/23/2020 4:33 PM
248	as with previous concerns - also adding accessbile housing in older areas that currently lack these options would be a plus	9/23/2020 4:21 PM
249	n/a	9/23/2020 4:17 PM
250	Add exceptions for specific neighborhoods of particularly unique and historic significance, such as Armstrong's point, and old Crescentwood.	9/23/2020 4:12 PM
251	Not allowing them in neighborhoods or on streets that are primarily single family dwellings	9/23/2020 3:49 PM
252	don't do in areas that are not already accustom to this	9/23/2020 2:14 PM
253	Build em anywhere and everywhere.	9/23/2020 11:56 AM
254	Look at the parking on the lot and the effect of more people parking on the street; the size garages on smaller lots need to be reduced/restricted and set back from lane to allow for snow / garbage pick up	9/23/2020 11:14 AM
255	Good as is.	9/23/2020 9:37 AM
256	keep out of single occupancy areas	9/23/2020 9:12 AM
257	Outdoor rec space not interfering with business or safety of others using public transport, parking not taking away from business	9/22/2020 8:02 PM
258	Allow existing duplexes in mature neighbourhoods to add tertiary suites above a garage in the back lane.	9/22/2020 2:37 PM
259	Stop targeting corner lots that harm the value of the rest of the neighbourhood. If you must increase density above all else, make sure the builds are affordable housing for all and not a big dump of high end condos and apartments that no one can afford. A recent build on Grosvenor Ave. offered apartments starting at $2200 a month. My 2.5 story home, at more than double the square footage, has a mortgage that is considerably less than this. This is a cash grab for developers and city taxes and not diversifying the neighbourhood. The buildings do not fit into the neighbourhood and the more the developers target these areas, the less character exists.	9/22/2020 2:16 PM
260	See responses to #11 and #12 above.	9/22/2020 1:46 PM
261	Abandon this stupid infill housing idea NOW!	9/22/2020 1:35 PM
262	All neighborhoods should provide access to people who can only afford multi-family housing.	9/22/2020 11:45 AM
263	Three unit housing should only be allowed for on lost with frontage that are consistent with existing adjacent development. Threeplex units should not be allowed on recently split lots.	9/22/2020 12:59 AM
264	Parking issues have to be improved.	9/21/2020 6:48 PM
265	By maintaining the neighborhoods charm & keeping it single dwelling. If you want duplexes, triplexes etc etc, put them in your nice tidy neighborhood and see what happens!	9/21/2020 6:24 PM
266	Limiting the size of new buildings to bring them more in line with the scale of existing homes This is hillarious. The city has NOT followed this up till now ... why would it start now ????	9/21/2020 4:54 PM
267	Bring down propert values.	9/21/2020 4:48 PM
268	Maybe	9/21/2020 4:40 PM
269	PUT THEM IN THE SUBURBS.	9/21/2020 3:02 PM
270	Allow for GREENSPACE and for PARKING of at least two vehicles for each unit.	9/21/2020 2:52 PM
271	Let's try to keep Three-unit housing and larger out of Area 1. Most lots in Area one aren't big enough for large mutli-family units to fit in with the property sizes, consider focusing the larger units into the Secondary areas and Area 2 closer to the employment lands.	9/21/2020 2:40 PM
272	these criteria sound very good	9/21/2020 2:13 PM
273	all good stuff	9/21/2020 12:12 PM

274	Higher density housing should be put in areas that like Fort Garry, and areas along the new transit corridor and not squeezed on to a corner lots in mature areas where there are less amenities like parks, shopping centers, and other services.	9/21/2020 11:39 AM
275	I think the City of Winnipeg needs to be more flexible in their thinking and do what they can to help reduce regulation that prevents growth to the city.	9/21/2020 10:02 AM
276	Again, these units should be optioned to be built throughout high income areas, not just the lower income/tax brackets. Charleswood/Tuxedo should have always been some of the first areas to be targeted as their lot sizes allow for more growth/more units to be put in. As well as rental buildings and renters to move into the area.	9/21/2020 9:43 AM
277	Providing an opportunity to accommodate low to moderate density infill development within existing neighbourhoods	9/21/2020 8:27 AM
278	Home owners whose properties would be dwarfed or overlooked down into, losing their privacy within their own back yards, has to be respected. Profits for builders and developers within areas where homes will lose privacy, from a scaled up three unit building, light, parking should be in the hands of a consensus from the neighbourhood that would be affected. Unless there is a direct door to door consultation with home owners, infill on corner lots immediately adjacent to single detached homes is totally unacceptable. Three unit housing is only appropriate where there is already other three unit housing in existance on the street.	9/21/2020 12:04 AM
279	Same as previous	9/20/2020 6:33 PM
280	Multi-family dwellings are not part of the neighbourhoods character.	9/20/2020 5:28 PM
281	Agree with above suggestions	9/20/2020 3:31 PM
282	Provide an active involvement of any street/area residents when a new in fill application is made by a developer to ensure that only appropriate units are built.	9/20/2020 1:46 PM
283	Good idea! Higher density closer to public transportation is a fantastic idea.	9/20/2020 1:39 PM
284	Definition of 'strategic areas' could be clarified	9/20/2020 1:33 PM
285	Removing modern housing options	9/20/2020 10:24 AM
286	They shouldn't be located in Area 1 neighbourhoods and be limited in Area 2's. St. Boniface for instance does not have nearly enough greenspace as it is.	9/20/2020 1:06 AM
287	Make it easier to increase density in all neighbourhoods.	9/19/2020 10:55 PM
288	Not a fan for 3 unit housing in the location.	9/19/2020 10:22 PM
289	Be clear. No "should".	9/19/2020 5:36 PM
290	remove all requirements. Add platinum standard for green buildings	9/19/2020 5:31 PM
291	Also consider up/down triplexes, similar to 108 Nassau St N.	9/19/2020 4:38 PM
292	See previous comment	9/19/2020 3:43 PM
293	Be explicit and specific about restrictions related to footprint, height, etc. Allow no exceptions. Hire more city inspectors to ensure what is applied for on the permit is actually what is built.	9/19/2020 2:42 PM
294	Parking Requirements on property, not city streets	9/19/2020 2:07 PM
295	Stop catering to developers' by giving them "opportunities". Stop gaslighting residents' concerns. South Osborne is already dense, esp Lord Roberts. Never allow duplexes, or any other infill, to be taller than the neighbours'. Stop implying that old housing is decrepit, not modern, and needs to come down.	9/19/2020 1:57 PM
296	No subdivisions	9/19/2020 12:57 PM
297	I generally agree with these points.	9/19/2020 11:10 AM
298	Once again, too vague.	9/19/2020 10:49 AM
299	Too big	9/19/2020 10:39 AM
300	Again. Sounds okay	9/19/2020 10:21 AM

301	These could go in many more places in area 1 if they meet area guidelines	9/19/2020 9:57 AM
302	Parking requirements	9/19/2020 9:37 AM
303	Make sure the design and size matches the neighborhood	9/19/2020 9:20 AM
304	Acceptable	9/19/2020 8:53 AM
305	Don't allow them to fill up so much of the lot that they have no where for their own snow. Shovelling it onto the lane should not be an option	9/19/2020 8:51 AM
306	Three unit houses should not be allowed within Area 1 neighbourhoods. They do not suit the neighbourhoods of Area 1 and will cause irreparable harm to the existing community.	9/19/2020 8:26 AM
307	Again: I think it’s super important and makes sense... but how are you going to get buy in from Developers? Monetary incentive comes to mind. Can they get back 3%(?) of City admin fees if/after build is inspected & they follow through/comply with guidelines?	9/19/2020 8:02 AM
308	Still do not support.	9/19/2020 6:21 AM
309	Stick to the character of the neighbourhood and don’t build more three units	9/19/2020 12:24 AM
310	Don't think could be improve	9/18/2020 8:56 PM
311	Not building on lots smaller than 33ft wide	9/18/2020 8:28 PM
312	Please read my previous responses to this exact same kind of question. You are literally making me angry with how poorly designed this survey is.	9/18/2020 8:09 PM
313	Too much. Two unit only	9/18/2020 8:01 PM
314	Ditto	9/18/2020 7:37 PM
315	Point one frankly makes this too loose. I’ve seen so many requests for variances already in the area. Most are are fine. But some houses going up here. Seriously. Using the larger lots and building stem to stern. The character of the area is being lost. There are lots of buses in the new areas where the huge single dwellings are going. I’m aware of mixed use communities. Make them more so.	9/18/2020 5:58 PM
316	housing on corner lots has become dangerous in my neighborhood as you cannot see past the new infill homes, corner lots require special consideration for this.Sizing is essential and more in line is not suitable, in line with current homes is the only acceptable statement	9/18/2020 5:10 PM
317	same	9/18/2020 3:06 PM

Q14 How do you think the location criteria for four-unit housing could be improved?

Answered: 305 Skipped: 469

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	- Do not put them on corner lots or anywhere unless there is yard space or a park within 300 meters. - Any projections or balconies need to be included in the set backs. -	10/22/2020 11:24 PM
2	See previous note: A lot coverage of 30% is still almost twice as big as the average lot coverage in most mature communities.	10/22/2020 11:20 PM
3	All would help if they followed.	10/22/2020 10:32 PM
4	Existing infrastructure such as roads and sewers would have to be upgraded to handle the extra volume. Building such housing should not only fall to developers but be allowed to be done by the current owners of the property.	10/22/2020 9:16 PM
5	These should not be just in corner lots. There are big houses in some of theses areas and a four-unit house could be build to replace one single family home. Some people want to live is smaller spaces to reduce their carbon footprint and others want to downsize.	10/22/2020 7:14 PM
6	I don’t know	10/22/2020 5:21 PM
7	Dependent on the type of community housing already existing .	10/22/2020 4:08 PM
8	Four-unit housing , would be an area where I am concerned that green space allotment may be neglected to force a larger structure and sacrifice too much green space/tree canopy.	10/22/2020 1:50 PM
9	Abolish single family zoning to allow greater ease of a variety of infill developments. Allow more flexibility in lot width requirements to allow a variety of infill densities in existing mature neighbourhoods.	10/22/2020 11:46 AM
10	4-units should not be restricted to busy streets, near transit, corner lots. All forms of housing will see residents including families who benefit from the same locations as single family detached. Treat renters as equal to house owners. Do not restrict heights and sizes too excessively. These forms of housing are just as valid as others and should not be compromised to fit in with small, low density housing.	10/22/2020 11:37 AM
11	Make them one unit bungalows.	10/22/2020 11:30 AM
12	Just eliminate it already	10/22/2020 10:00 AM
13	it is not possible to introduce these types of structures into neighbourhoods without altering the existing character of these areas. Do not force a square peg into a round hole.	10/21/2020 10:28 PM
14	Corner lots only	10/21/2020 10:14 PM
15	Need more discussion of how many bedrooms will be built in to accommodate families. Need to specify accessibility. standards. The online engagement last week mentioned that the bigger 3 and 4 family buildings will be limited to street corners. I am concerned that this will drive up the cost through scarcity and prime real estate.	10/21/2020 8:34 PM
16	Same as with 3 unit housing. Don't put on single unit housing streets. Consider the too small sewers and the lack of parking for all of the streets residents.	10/21/2020 7:24 PM
17	Don't want it in single family neighbourhood to keep my investment from dropping.	10/21/2020 7:11 PM
18	unsure	10/21/2020 3:51 PM
19	Wait until the entire block is 3 unit before replacing it when it is sold by 4 unit housing.	10/21/2020 1:10 PM
20	Owners should prove that they cannot renovate instead of tearing down. Do not allow the footprint to be larger than what’s being replaced. Do not allow buildings as high as proposed in the guidelines. Build smaller square footage per dwelling. People do NOT need ensuites, walk-in closets, islands plus dining tables for eating. Live smaller - as in Europe.	10/21/2020 1:04 PM
21	no opinion	10/21/2020 10:37 AM
22	I don’t support lot splitting for four unit housing builds in area 1 and 2 zones	10/21/2020 10:21 AM
23	Not in River Heights!	10/21/2020 7:44 AM
24	These should not exist	10/20/2020 11:33 PM
25	Limit the amount in one neighborhood.	10/20/2020 7:55 PM

26	No	10/20/2020 6:04 PM
27	Scrap this	10/20/2020 5:16 PM
28	By putting them in areas that have homes that look similar	10/20/2020 3:43 PM
29	No opinion	10/20/2020 3:27 PM
30	As before, anything under 4 or 5 units should just be allowed with next to no restrictions. Remove the distinction between Areas 1 and 2... it only further serves to entrench existing socio-economic divisions. Remove lot size requirements... density needs walkability to be livable, and walkability needs narrow lots. Therefore, intensification needs to be allowed to happen on all lot sizes. On limiting the sizes of buildings to be "compatible", anything under 4 storeys should simply be allowed... anything that is scaled to a person walking is compatible. The goal isn't density, it's walkability (even though walkable places will be dense, dense places aren't always walkable).	10/20/2020 3:07 PM
31	We should strive to achieve balance in established neighbourhoods. Not overload them with overcrowding and homes that stick out.	10/20/2020 2:23 PM
32	RESTRICT FOUR UNIT HOUSING TO CORNER LOTS.	10/20/2020 2:09 PM
33	See previous comment.	10/20/2020 10:48 AM
34	Don't ruin my neighbourhood.	10/19/2020 11:57 AM
35	Limit this type of housing to neighborhoods with similar size split homes, this should not be permitted to be placed on streets with single family homes.	10/19/2020 9:46 AM
36	How in the world is infill an opportunity? Can we not find more productive ways for city staff to spend their time? Listen to the people. They don’t want this.	10/18/2020 9:15 PM
37	There would need to be ample off street parking options and areas for green space and enforceable height restrictions.	10/18/2020 7:15 PM
38	no	10/18/2020 3:46 PM
39	There is insufficient attention to implications for parking in the neighbourhood, including providing access to plugging in block heaters in the winter. More attention needs to be paid to providing and/or maintaining options for a range of income levels. Some of these neighbourhoods have been places where young people can afford their first homes as well as places with larger more expensive housing. Also, there is insufficient attention to trees, whether existing or new plantings. Many usual measures to protect existing trees are insufficient, and the trees end up dying within a few years of the construction. The construction of new foundations for example will likely to significant damage to any large mature trees on the property. Winnipeg's tree canopy has in the past been a matter of great pride and also has ecological value. Someone needs to be responsible for monitoring the health of both existing and newly planted trees for these sites. Perhaps builders might put down a guarantee deposit to be refunded after 5 years if the trees survive. Planting two trees for killing one large mature one is insufficient. Tree list might be expanded. The setback specification "or portion of block" allows for too much wiggle room. What does that really mean? The entire block should be considered in that average.	10/18/2020 11:08 AM
40	Well not within the scope of this project there needs tp be an addition for a set of rules regarding the protection of the structural integrity of adjacent properties and buildings. with increased density in these areas the issue of street parking becomes a major issue. Perhaps introduce parking passes as a pay for service.	10/18/2020 10:37 AM
41	Trees, Traffic calming, Parking, Regulated access on to main roads.	10/17/2020 8:30 AM
42	Sounds good	10/16/2020 11:57 PM
43	Housing kept to neighbourhood size should be kept affordable.	10/16/2020 11:19 PM
44	apply to areas with secondary plans	10/16/2020 8:04 PM
45	How about if Area 1 residents don't want any change in their communities, they move to east St Paul? These are mature communities where we need to increase our housing density. Change happens, and must happen to combat climate change. Get over it.	10/16/2020 7:29 PM

46	Parking and noise by laws enforcement	10/16/2020 7:06 PM
47	By revising the location criteria to be located within new communities, rather than mature ones. Unless the plan is to rezone all of Winnipeg's mature communities (Westgate, Wellington Cres) then why pretend that all " "middle class" neighborhoods have an obligation to allow these??	10/16/2020 6:19 PM
48	same	10/16/2020 2:52 PM
49	Same, not in single home neihbourhoods	10/16/2020 2:24 PM
50	You need adequate parking.	10/16/2020 2:03 PM
51	No changes to suggest.	10/16/2020 1:21 PM
52	Lower the rent and don't put these cheap, ugly apartment buildings in a residential neighborhood.	10/16/2020 9:17 AM
53	Not to be developed in Glenwood.	10/15/2020 10:41 PM
54	locating on transit network	10/15/2020 9:58 PM
55	I'm not sure. I don't think it should be done at all	10/15/2020 9:05 PM
56	This is scary. There seems there is a consistent goal to pack and stack people in neighbourhoods just outside of the 'inner city'. Has the City of Winnipeg thrown in the 'proverbial' towel on the inner city? Packing and stacking people a few blocks away just changes the location of the same problem. In a few short years there will be yards with cars, refrigerators and old school buses. And kids without a yard to play in.	10/15/2020 7:58 PM
57	If such a structure is one of the largest buildings in a given block home owners within the affected area should be informed in a clear and transparent manner.	10/15/2020 5:42 PM
58	Explicitly consider utility loads and do not split 50' wide lots.	10/15/2020 5:24 PM
59	Do not allow 3 and 4 unit housing to Infill any mature neighborhood.	10/15/2020 4:46 PM
60	I have no suggestions on improvements though I would prefer if preference were given to fourplexes on large enough lots rather than a lot-split with two up/down houses. This would have the benefit of energy efficiency. A single structure where half of the walls are always interior walls.	10/15/2020 3:14 PM
61	The maximum density should be allowed in Areas 1 and 2.	10/15/2020 2:38 PM
62	n/a	10/15/2020 12:42 PM
63	Larger lot sizes	10/15/2020 12:28 PM
64	More should be allowed!	10/15/2020 10:22 AM
65	Pembina?	10/15/2020 9:01 AM
66	It will just force people to sell and take a finacial loss, but then again isn't that the goal!	10/15/2020 8:43 AM
67	See answer to #13.	10/14/2020 11:00 PM
68	Same as answer 13	10/14/2020 9:42 PM
69	Remove the clause that requires building design to be in character with the neightbourhood. Let design professionals do their job and don't force such prescriptive requirements. Also, with increased density, an opportunity for smaller scale commerce exists. Has this been considered? Corner stores etc on the triplex/fourplex lot situations.	10/14/2020 7:51 PM
70	Same comment as for question 12.	10/14/2020 6:35 PM
71	Put the four-unit housing in new developments.	10/14/2020 4:23 PM
72	Use all neighbourhoods	10/14/2020 3:26 PM
73	Allow no encroachments. Facade must be in line with neighbours. Keep height low. No lot-line-to-lot-line building. No Tandem parking.	10/14/2020 2:55 PM
74	again guidelines must be followed but will they	10/14/2020 1:11 PM

75	Make the first, third and fourth bulleted criteria the MAJOR criteria. The last criteria can be achieved without building four-unit housing...maybe lot splitting . Always, the character and pattern of the "mature" neighbournood should be paramount.	10/14/2020 10:41 AM
76	Similar to single-family and two-unit up-down.	10/14/2020 10:33 AM
77	Keep them on major streets not residential streets	10/14/2020 10:08 AM
78	Should be accepted by neighborhood before it goes ahead.	10/14/2020 9:09 AM
79	This should not be permitted in any infill strategy	10/14/2020 9:04 AM
80	Craft different guidelines for mature neighbourhoods that take into account the typically narrower lot sizes. Make is MUCH easier to add lane suites or secondary suites.	10/14/2020 7:58 AM
81	In all cases, priority should be given to the rehabilitation and renovation of existing structures. If infill was permitted only in cases where the new construction matched nearby existing homes in size, style, exterior materials, and lot footprint, there would be much less resistance to new infill in existing neighbourhoods.	10/13/2020 10:21 PM
82	Allow it everywhere.	10/13/2020 8:53 PM
83	The guidelines are not specific enough for home buyers or existing residents to know what may be acceptable in their neighbourhood or on their street in terms of new-build building size. Their are broad guidelines as to what may be acceptable, but these are not nearly specific enough for those who are not experts in housing and construction development to be able to set reasonable expectations. This is especially frustrating, considering the very large sections that are considered 'Area 1' or 'Area 2'. How can anyone expect to be able to plan for what may be acceptable on their own street when the guidelines are written so generally?	10/13/2020 8:34 PM
84	Keep it limited to corner lots, unless it's possible to be set back to match neighbouring homes, and not taller either. Should look similar.	10/13/2020 5:55 PM
85	Again, I think even in area 2 neighbourhoods, there should be consideration given to proximity to transit (or at least future transit as outlined in the new transit masterplan) as I think fourplexes on a lot of that size work best when supported by transit and active transportation options. Otherwise, a 4, 2-car families are like to be effectively taking up 4 on-street parking spaces at all times when the vehicles are at the home which is almost certainly wider than the 50 ft lot width specified as a minimum.I think requirements for fourplexes should be much more in line with the townhome requirements in Area 2.	10/13/2020 4:26 PM
86	by maintaining the character of the existing neighbourhood and stringently enforcing guidelines for developers.	10/13/2020 4:21 PM
87	limit the number of these that can be put in a multi-block area. for example Dollard, Bertrand, Thomas Berry from Kenny to Richot limit the number of 4-plexes to 2 per block	10/13/2020 2:53 PM
88	ugh	10/13/2020 12:19 PM
89	eliminate situation where developer purchases homes at a premium to develop into multifamily units which changes dynamic of neighbourhood. Height limits should be based on neighbouring properties and not bylaw limits. Multifamily units should be encouraged on "feeder" streets with single family behind them.	10/13/2020 12:16 PM
90	just in the new areas	10/13/2020 11:39 AM
91	This type of housing should not be added to mature areas that only have single family dwellings	10/13/2020 8:53 AM
92	same as fro 3 unit. With the neighbors approval.	10/13/2020 6:58 AM
93	Build to the lot Potential	10/12/2020 9:35 PM
94	Short of egregious and potentially illegal situations property owners ought not to be unreasonably constrained....	10/12/2020 7:16 PM
95	Same answer!	10/12/2020 6:48 PM
96	Please do away with parking minimums. Dense, walkable neighbourhoods with amenities and good transit connections (like Winnipeg's core neighbourhoods) don't need individual car ownership, especially not now that Winnipeg has such a vibrant and useful car coop.	10/12/2020 3:58 PM

97	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	10/12/2020 9:20 AM
98	Make sure there is sufficient land for gardens, and play areas. Make sure there is sufficient area for a garage onsite and parking. Make sure the view of neighbours isn't blocked when these units are built. DO NOT BUILD IN ST B PLEASE. They do not fit in. Turn infill into small squares or parks where neighbours can meet, read a book, enjoy a social space.	10/11/2020 9:02 PM
99	Enforce current zoning by-laws	10/11/2020 8:38 PM
100	no comment.	10/11/2020 3:32 PM
101	WE DO NOT WANT THEM	10/11/2020 3:25 PM
102	Accessibility	10/11/2020 12:02 PM
103	More green space whether for individual units or a common green space.	10/11/2020 11:16 AM
104	Take into account parking and traffic availability. St. Vital cannot handle more population density. St. Annes and St. Marys road get gridlocked regularly - more population will only make it worse.	10/10/2020 9:50 PM
105	They are too large, to close together, create too much traffic, not enough street parking.	10/10/2020 3:58 PM
106	Less	10/10/2020 11:02 AM
107	why not build them in new areas like bridgewater , sage creek.. and by the way make sure they build them right beside a single family home, see if the owner enjoys that	10/10/2020 8:51 AM
108	Don’t built them at all	10/10/2020 7:52 AM
109	See previous comment.	10/9/2020 11:07 PM
110	No four unit housing in area 1 its not just compatible with and ruining the feel of neigbourhoods. Instead of using weak terms such as "providing an opportunity" there should be specific guidelines and restrictions that must be followed builders	10/9/2020 1:50 PM
111	Don't build them in older mature areas where the old trees are being taken down and replaced with houses that don't fit in the area build them in the newer areas.	10/9/2020 11:10 AM
112	They should mot be allowed in single family areas.	10/9/2020 9:04 AM
113	same as previous	10/8/2020 8:05 PM
114	no infills!	10/8/2020 3:41 PM
115	By putting a moratorium on this practice or eliminating it entirely. The whole idea is a step backward in the improvement of these areas and an insult to these areas Heritage.	10/8/2020 2:54 PM
116	Same as previous,, do not invade the area of the single family home area.	10/8/2020 2:30 PM
117	Build them closer to the perimeter, stay away from Munroe !!!

126	Four-unit housing should not be allowed in area 1. Four-unit housing should only be allowed in area 2 if a street already has this type of housing.	10/6/2020 9:42 PM
127	Close proximity to the primary transit network should be more limited about 200 or 250 metres.	10/6/2020 8:00 PM
128	They should not be built in our neighbourhoods.	10/6/2020 6:00 PM
129	As long as built out of residential streets as no and again I say no parking no room	10/6/2020 3:48 PM
130	See previous comment	10/6/2020 3:24 PM
131	First, do a test-run in an area like Tuxedo and see how that works out.	10/6/2020 3:03 PM
132	same as previous comment	10/6/2020 2:36 PM
133	Leaves homes alone	10/6/2020 11:17 AM
134	reasonable	10/6/2020 7:49 AM
135	Consider street density (parking, traffic, sewer congestion etc) when changing a single family lot into multi-family units.	10/5/2020 9:13 PM
136	No opinion	10/5/2020 6:02 PM
137	Do not agree with multi-unit housing in Area 1 where community/ block is primarily single family homes.	10/5/2020 1:49 PM
138	I am okay with this as long as there are bus routes and we are using existing services.	10/5/2020 12:31 PM
139	Maybe as businesses are torn down and emptied, put them on the main streets.	10/5/2020 12:30 PM
140	The site and building design guidelines does not, and needs to include regulations and protection to the adjacent existing structures (such as foundations, fences, garages, unpaved back lanes, sidewalks, etc.) especially within these mature neighbourhoods. Current bylaws allow excavation to the property line - causing damage to existing structures. This is negligent of the city to know of these issues and approve infill developments, at the cost of and without protecting existing properties. The city could also be opening itself to financial liability. Homeowners who have their houses seriously damaged by construction on a neighbouring property, could sue the city for failing to protect them. In other Canadian jurisdictions, temporary retaining walls and additional supports are required in mature neighbourhoods. It is also included in their guidelines to developers that any damage incurred as a result of the construction of the property will be the responsibility of the land owner to repair. It is essential that these guidelines also include: Safety as a priority. Ex. The construction site must be kept safe for both neighbours and workers, and must be properly fenced. Noise in the Neighbourhood. Include specifics on the bylaw permits of operation of construction equipment. Respect for Neighbours. Include guidelines on portable toilets, maintenance of weeds and unkept grass, site litter and debris, and parking permits for construction vehicles to ensure lanes, streets and sidewalks are not blocked. Communication with Neighbours. Including building plans, estimated time of construction, contact information if they have concerns about the project, and scheduled access to their properties if required during construction. Other jurisdictions have created a Infill Conversation Toolkit as a resource. Addition of a Contact and Enquiries section. Including the Residential Infill Department, Community Standards Bylaw, and 311 for issues and complaints relating to infractions of the City Bylaws. In addition, it is essential that a process is outlined in the development guidelines specific to the accountability of developers to follow these guidelines. If required, new bylaws need to be enacted to ensure the city has jurisdiction to enforce the requirements of this strategy. Currently, without such a process, commitments are made by developers at the initial stages of application to the City and then not completed on site. This includes such commitments as landscaping, parking structures, saving existing trees, and building fences. It also includes infractions to site safety, cleanliness, noise, traffic and neighbourhood liveability bylaws. The enforcement of development permits needs to become the responsibility fo the city and not an adjacent property owners responsibility. In addition, new guidelines should include that final inspection by the City is required before occupancy and/or use. The current bylaw is 0.8 cars per unit in mature neighbourhoods. That figure needs to be updated based on recent research, and not outdated information. With densification, there is an increase need for parking.	10/5/2020 12:15 PM
141	Make majority community approval mandatory.	10/5/2020 11:12 AM
142	See comments on first question	10/4/2020 10:45 PM

143	See previous comments	10/4/2020 9:55 PM
144	This is one of the better conditions - the fact that it is confined to corner lots.	10/4/2020 5:57 PM
145	I believe that this looks good as is	10/4/2020 4:10 PM
146	careful consideration of the other homes adjacent to the proposed site	10/4/2020 1:18 PM
147	The focus on design and aesthetic requirements is unnecessary and counterproductive. Neighbourhoods change, and artificially preserving the predominant built form/aesthetic character of a neighbourhood at the expense of gentle density, increased walkability, and the efficient use of existing infrastructure is poor city planning.	10/4/2020 10:15 AM
148	Only single unit buildings in existing neighborhoods with single family housing.	10/3/2020 7:53 PM
149	They will not suit area 2	10/3/2020 7:31 PM
150	It can’t. Totally against this.	10/3/2020 7:25 PM
151	Disallow	10/3/2020 4:09 PM
152	Part of diversity is that our city has neighbourhoods with diversity of lot/yard sizes. Not everything that now needs to be constructed has to have very little yard/green space. Having neighbourhoods with large trees, grass, space on the street to park (that isn’t someone’s driveway), should also be valued - not just whether there is all ranges of economic accessibility, family sizes and ages that can live in a neighbourhood.	10/3/2020 2:13 PM
153	No comment	10/3/2020 1:05 PM
154	If housing like this could allow for seniors to afford to remain in their neighbourhoods.	10/3/2020 11:00 AM
155	Bringing proposed new 'more in line' and 'more in character' are too subjective & weak; consider simply 'in line' and 'in character'	10/3/2020 10:55 AM
156	Because many blocks/area classified as Area 2 do not have existing mixed height/large size buildings, some criteria for four unit dwelling for Area 1 should be extended to Area 2: specifically the minimum lot area of 5,000 SF and corner site requirement UNLESS the builder can show existing mixed dwelling size on that particular block.	10/3/2020 10:55 AM
157	As well as changes to bylaws for development, it is important to consider other bylaws. For example, the city appears to have required fewer and fewer sidewalks in residential neighbourhoods. I suspect this is due to the fact that the city still has responsibility for snow removal. A good neighbour or clean property bylaw needs to be put in place so that we can have sidewalks in as many residential neighbourhoods as possible. people can be expected to clear snow from public sidewalks; afterall the city expects us to maintain boulevards that belong to the city. Removing snow from a sidewalk along our properties is no different.	10/3/2020 10:33 AM
158	Lots should not be allowed to be split into smaller lots uncharacteristic of the existing neighbourhood. For example, In a neighbourhood where the smallest existing lot size is 50', a 75' lot could NOT be split in half, but two adjacent 75' lots COULD be split into three 50' lots. New buildings could not exceed the mass and height of buildings immediately adjacent.	10/3/2020 10:23 AM
159	Only next to commercial buildings and existing apartments	10/3/2020 9:33 AM
160	Not having secondary suites for rent	10/3/2020 9:20 AM
161	no change	10/3/2020 8:22 AM
162	Do not allow in predominantly home owner residences which are lived in by the home owner.	10/3/2020 7:59 AM
163	They should be permitted on 40' lots.	10/2/2020 10:06 PM
164	No criteria could convince me that 4 unit houses should go in Area 1 communities	10/2/2020 3:06 PM
165	Limit to downtown.	10/2/2020 2:27 PM
166	No comment	10/2/2020 2:12 PM
167	does not apply in my situation	10/2/2020 1:36 PM
168	Four-unit housing is just another cash grab by the city and developers	10/2/2020 10:14 AM

169	Parking issues should be addressed.	10/1/2020 8:27 PM
170	Allow for maximum greenspace. Survey neighbourhood residents. Owners/developers should live in the area in which they are building.	10/1/2020 5:15 PM
171	These Areas are exclusionary and have more to do with socio-economic class and keeping NIMBY's at the bay more than anything.	10/1/2020 4:40 PM
172	Do not allow very many of these in Area 1 areas.	10/1/2020 4:29 PM
173	sizing in larger lots	10/1/2020 4:11 PM
174	That's a lot of people living on a tiny lot.	10/1/2020 3:30 PM
175	Allow only if their are existing apartments, similar style/height buildings on the street. Also, that they don't impede on the privacy of existing homes. i.e. No chance of Peeping Toms to impede backyard and house privacy.	10/1/2020 3:29 PM
176	no comment	10/1/2020 1:19 PM
177	Limiting the size of new buildings to bring them more in line with the scale of existing homes	10/1/2020 11:49 AM
178	I don’t think these limitations are appropriate. I support larger multi-family dwellings being built even if they don’t “fit in” in the existing neighbourhood. I think this is more environmentally friendly and also prevents classism in neighbourhoods.	10/1/2020 11:15 AM
179	Again, Allow enough room for parking and increased traffic. Locate in an area that won't negatively affect the existing local traffic, and isn't stuck right next to single homes; It affects their property value when increased traffic is now next to them, when it used to be a quiet home. Perhaps offer financial compensations to people who's home values are impacted by a development.	9/30/2020 7:57 PM
180	Is this infill plan being developed for developers? I was hoping the focus was on individuals who would like to remain or move to an area but want to live in a newer home. I would have stayed in my area of Windsor Park years back if their was incentive to tear down my older home and rebuild on the lot but the incentive wasn't enough for us to make that decision so we ended up buying in Sage Creek.	9/30/2020 3:30 PM
181	Only single family housing	9/30/2020 2:57 PM
182	Not be allowed if the lot is zoned single family residential	9/30/2020 2:20 PM
183	What does the existing livability neighbourhood plan say?	9/30/2020 12:56 PM
184	same answer	9/30/2020 8:34 AM
185	restriction against them becoming rentals within the first 10 years anything over 3 units should include parking on site for all units	9/29/2020 3:33 PM
186	same	9/29/2020 1:44 PM
187	They can't, and should simply stick to the existing Neighbourhood Plan.	9/29/2020 1:32 PM
188	the city needs to be open to keep old neighbourhoods as a place for people to want to live.	9/29/2020 1:25 PM
189	If there's space, build it.	9/29/2020 9:44 AM
190	see all previous.	9/29/2020 8:34 AM
191	For unit housing should only be built on a quadruple lot. 200 feet wide.	9/28/2020 9:51 PM
192	Four unit housing would not fit into a heritage neighbourhood.	9/28/2020 12:54 PM
193	Limiting size of new buildings and distance between. Not removing mature trees. Above all make sure the homes blend in with the existing neighborhood!	9/28/2020 11:34 AM
194	Conduct surveys and community meetings with the affected communities, in order to lay out the proposed plan and respond to concerns that might arise from current community members.	9/28/2020 9:49 AM
195	There is a 2 story 4 plex built on Dubuc that replaced a single story clapboard home that completely obliterated the light in the entirety of the neighbour's yard. How was this allowed?	9/28/2020 8:24 AM

	Because it benefited the developer to maximize profit on that lot. They will always push any regulations to their benefits.	
196	Again, listen to the community and take concerns seriously.	9/28/2020 8:24 AM
197	Needs to fit the area. Doesn't fit rural suburbs	9/28/2020 12:36 AM
198	Area 1 neighbourhoods should have diversified housing options as broad as in Area 2. Level up Area 1, make the requirements less onerous to provide fourplexes!	9/27/2020 11:58 PM
199	Restrict the size and number fo trees a developer can cut per lot. Enforce guidelines on protecting trees on infill lots during construction. The city is focusing on mature neighbourhoods for its infill strategy which could result in a significant loss to Winnipeg's canopy. Please consider this inevitable loss as diminishing to the character of these mature neighbourhoods.	9/27/2020 8:12 PM
200	no way	9/27/2020 2:36 PM
201	nothing beyond 2 units	9/27/2020 2:24 PM
202	The infrastructure that is 100 years old in Old St. Vital CANNOT handle 3 or 4 unit dwellings on 25 foot lots. (Oh look another brick wall.)	9/26/2020 4:31 PM
203	Limits to the size of new buildings must be reasonable. Mature neighbourhoods already contain a range of sizes, and larger buildings are often appropriate on corner lots and a long thoroughfares. Building design requirements do not guarantee good design and potentially hinder it.	9/26/2020 3:11 PM
204	Single home on current property - SINGLE home should be built.	9/26/2020 12:21 PM
205	DO NOT ALLOW	9/26/2020 11:13 AM
206	No to these in mature neighbourhoods.	9/25/2020 6:23 PM
207	I think limiting the size of four unit housing to match the scale of housing in the neighborhood will make it too difficult to increase these kind of units.	9/25/2020 5:03 PM
208	These new "infill" housing seem to be packed in awfully close together, or joined to each other - I worry for the fire/fire-spreading risks involved.	9/25/2020 2:39 PM
209	Please see 11. Consider parking availability. established parking should be mandatory.	9/25/2020 12:51 PM
210	Scrap: limiting the size of buildings to bring them in line with existing buildings, site and building requirements that are more in the character with the neighborhood, introducing minimum lot size requirements. Get rid of minimum parking spaces.	9/25/2020 9:36 AM
211	same	9/25/2020 8:38 AM
212	Same answer	9/25/2020 8:33 AM
213	Location decision should be left to the owner.	9/25/2020 1:13 AM
214	Not in area 1	9/24/2020 8:46 PM
215	Stop ripping down current homes that are affordable and replacing them with poor quality cookie-cutter expensive houses.	9/24/2020 7:38 PM
216	https://fortune.com/2020/07/21/black-housing-neighborhoods-economic-opportunity/	9/24/2020 7:11 PM
217	not build them.	9/24/2020 5:20 PM
218	Consider the context of each site and neighbourhood instead of "clear cutting" and "plopping" off the shelf plans on to the sites	9/24/2020 4:12 PM
219	NO four unit buildings in residential neighborhoods	9/24/2020 12:43 PM
220	There should be limits on how many four-unit houses are constructed in mature neighbourhoods unless these are build on newly vacant large plots of land.	9/24/2020 10:12 AM
221	Why only on corner lots, etc? Why must they be the same size as other houses? Where do this criteria come from?	9/24/2020 9:42 AM
222	as per previous response applies to this question as well	9/24/2020 9:20 AM

223	Go and look at the area and the existing structures, needs to be more of an individual decision. Be more upfront with the designs of the newer structure when posting signs in neighbourhoods	9/24/2020 8:46 AM
224	Same pros and cons as the others.	9/24/2020 7:31 AM
225	They shouldn't be built in area 1 at all.	9/24/2020 12:45 AM
226	It looks good. 'Strategic locations' should be further explained.	9/23/2020 9:51 PM
227	Locate units in areas with busy streets and where they can intrude on other people's privacy. Should not shade out neighbor. Choose locations that are not next to small homes.	9/23/2020 9:16 PM
228	I think parking needs to be considered when putting up new housing. Where parking needs to be included in the lot. Take into account the surrounding area and by cutting down old big trees your taking away from the maturity of the neighborhood.	9/23/2020 9:06 PM
229	I see an opportunity to expand the location criteria to improve density and land usage to less mature neighborhoods. One way is to set criteria for any new developments for more mixed usage	9/23/2020 8:39 PM
230	same	9/23/2020 8:19 PM
231	St. Boniface lots are smaller in scale and can't adequately accomodate three and four unit housing types. That is the reason there is always community opposition. Just because the are is desirable does not mean it is suited for three and four unit infills squeezed onto the lots with little green space and circulation around the building. Infill for increased residential density should only be permitted in large scale and corner lots. They should not be squeezed into existing lots or split lots. Infill needs to consider gravel lanes, garbage and recycling requirements and snow clearing. Design standards should also consider neighbourhood context. There should be equal greenspace for new developments as for existing residential units - e.g. backyards and front yards	9/23/2020 6:55 PM
232	Only on large lots where these types of units are the norm - there is no way to integrate a big unit into a sleepy side street	9/23/2020 6:34 PM
233	no four-unit housing in infill lots	9/23/2020 6:20 PM
234	We cannot handle more density in Kingston crescent with current Parking infrastructure and power grid failures	9/23/2020 5:55 PM
235	Buy 4 homes, year them down then you can build a 4 plex that has a yard that fits it	9/23/2020 5:43 PM
236	See my previous comments. This type of development only benefits developers who can outbid first-time buyers for a piece of property, tear down an old house, and put in a multi-unit structure and charge people three times the price. This type of development should not be allowed.	9/23/2020 5:26 PM
237	Corner only, not overlooking adjacent properties. Very careful consideration on whether to allow this in Area 1.	9/23/2020 4:57 PM
238	Guidelines make sense	9/23/2020 4:34 PM
239	as with previous comments	9/23/2020 4:21 PM
240	n/a	9/23/2020 4:17 PM
241	Add exceptions for specific neighborhoods of particularly unique and historic significance, such as Armstrong's point, and old Crescentwood.	9/23/2020 4:12 PM
242	Not allowing them in neighborhoods or on streets that are primarily single family dwellings	9/23/2020 3:49 PM
243	same as previous	9/23/2020 2:14 PM
244	Build em anywhere and everywhere. Don't hold back, baby!	9/23/2020 11:56 AM
245	Look at the parking on the lot and the effect of more people parking on the street; the size garages on smaller lots need to be reduced/restricted and set back from lane to allow for snow / garbage pick up	9/23/2020 11:14 AM
246	Good as is.	9/23/2020 9:37 AM

247	keep out of single family areas	9/23/2020 9:13 AM
248	See previous	9/22/2020 8:02 PM
249	Stop flooding strategic locations in Area 1 neighbourhoods with new builds. Instead, prioritize renovation and renovation to create "modern housing" and give Crescentwood/River Heights and Earl Grey/Fort Garry a chance to maintain its historic character. (Put the apartments inside of old homes if you must insist on densifying it all.) Fix all the aging infrastructure and stop dumping sewage in the rivers...it's not like our mature neighbourhoods can take this increased load. Stop insisting we must demolish old homes with quality construction in order to make more cubist buildings on small lots. Value green space and affordable housing over these targeted new builds that simply price out existing residents from the neighbourhoods. Already, I feel lot sizes are small in parts of our neighbourhoods...halving these lots and densifying everyone's living space will not increase neighbourhood liveability. Further, Winnipeg's noise bylaws and other zoning do not protect residents who must live in denser neighbourhoods. Beef up your enforcement if you expect people to coexist in tighter quarters. Big cities (like DC or NY) don't allow dumpsters to be emptied in the middle of the night or loud parties or bonfires...and these laws are enforced. If you want Winnipeg to be that densely populated, start by making better laws and enforcing them, too.	9/22/2020 2:22 PM
250	See responses to #11, #12 and #13 above.	9/22/2020 1:46 PM
251	As previously mentioned, you need neighbourhood consultation with this type of housing. We are tired of ugly, in our city.	9/22/2020 1:37 PM
252	Abandon this stupid infill housing idea NOW!	9/22/2020 1:36 PM
253	All neighborhoods should provide access to people who can only afford multi-family housing.	9/22/2020 11:45 AM
254	Fourplex should only be allowed on major arteries or corner lots. Should only be allowed on lots with frontage that is consistent with adjacent developed lots.	9/22/2020 1:00 AM
255	Where will they park?	9/21/2020 6:48 PM
256	By maintaining the neighborhoods charm & keeping it single dwelling. If you want duplexes, triplexes etc etc, put them in your nice tidy neighborhood and see what happens	9/21/2020 6:25 PM
257	Limiting the size of new buildings to bring them more in line with the scale of existing homes Too late ... the city has already ruined our neighbourhood by allowing this type of development. How about you start doing this in Tuxedo and the newer upscale neighbourhoods. Oh wait .. I forgot .. the wealthy people don't want THEIR neighbourhoods ruined !!! Carry on.	9/21/2020 4:56 PM
258	Bring down property values in single-family neighborhoods.	9/21/2020 4:49 PM
259	Perhaps lot size and adjacent use	9/21/2020 4:41 PM
260	There is no improvement.	9/21/2020 3:03 PM
261	Allow for GREENSPACE and for PARKING of at least two vehicles for each unit.	9/21/2020 2:53 PM
262	Let's try to keep Three-unit housing and larger out of Area 1. Most lots in Area 1 aren't big enough for large mutli-family units to fit in with the property sizes, consider focusing the larger units into the Secondary areas and Area 2 closer to the employment lands.	9/21/2020 2:41 PM
263	make sure the garbage area and collection does not have a negative impact on neighbours	9/21/2020 2:14 PM
264	thumbs-up	9/21/2020 12:12 PM
265	No opinion	9/21/2020 11:41 AM
266	Should be located in suburbs that have lots of family services not inner city areas.	9/21/2020 11:41 AM
267	I think the City of Winnipeg needs to be more flexible in their thinking and do what they can to help reduce regulation that prevents growth to the city.	9/21/2020 10:02 AM
268	Again, these units should be optioned to be built throughout high income areas, not just the lower income/tax brackets. Charleswood/Tuxedo should have always been some of the first areas to be targeted as their lot sizes allow for more growth/more units to be put in. As well as rental buildings and renters to move into the area.	9/21/2020 9:44 AM
269	Providing an opportunity to accommodate low to moderate density infill development within	9/21/2020 8:27 AM

	existing neighbourhoods	
270	Four unit housing infil, location in proximity to how that building will affect the light for the surrounding homes, over view back yards from balconies, represents loss to established home owner enjoyment of their residences, and all of those people must be brought into the discussion before any housing of that size is considered.	9/21/2020 12:07 AM
271	Same as previous	9/20/2020 6:33 PM
272	Multi-family dwellings are not part of the neighbourhoods character.	9/20/2020 5:29 PM
273	Agreed with above suggestions	9/20/2020 3:32 PM
274	Provide an active involvement of any street/area residents when a new in fill application is made by a developer to ensure that only appropriate units are built.	9/20/2020 1:46 PM
275	Make sure there's a safe bike route network nearby to encourage mode shift.	9/20/2020 1:39 PM
276	Again, better define 'strategic locations'	9/20/2020 1:33 PM
277	Remove modern housing options	9/20/2020 10:24 AM
278	They should not be located in Area 1 neighbourhoods and seriously limited in Area 2's..	9/20/2020 1:06 AM
279	Make it easier to increase density in all neighbourhoods.	9/19/2020 10:55 PM
280	Absolutely NO thankyou [four-unit housing in the location]	9/19/2020 10:24 PM
281	See previous comment	9/19/2020 5:36 PM
282	remove all requirements. Add platinum standard for green buildings	9/19/2020 5:31 PM
283	Expanding location possibilities to include lots which abut parks	9/19/2020 4:46 PM
284	See previous comment	9/19/2020 3:43 PM
285	Be explicit and specific about restrictions related to footprint, height, etc. Allow no exceptions. Hire more city inspectors to ensure what is applied for on the permit is actually what is built.	9/19/2020 2:42 PM
286	Parking Requirements on lot, not city streets	9/19/2020 2:07 PM
287	This is meaningless because Planners put in over-size/ugly infill, then cite that as precedent over existing mature housing. Stop gaslighting residents' concerns. South Osborne is already dense, esp Lord Roberts. Never allow duplexes, or any other infill, to be taller than the neighbours'. Stop implying that old housing is decrepit, not modern, and needs to come down.	9/19/2020 1:58 PM
288	No subdivisions!	9/19/2020 12:57 PM
289	More clarification in the criteria.	9/19/2020 11:11 AM
290	You'll have to be more specific, these generalizations are what drive people mad.	9/19/2020 10:50 AM
291	Too big	9/19/2020 10:39 AM
292	Sounds good	9/19/2020 10:22 AM
293	This sounds good	9/19/2020 9:58 AM
294	Parking requirements	9/19/2020 9:37 AM
295	Fine.	9/19/2020 8:53 AM
296	Four unit houses should not be allowed within Area 1 neighbourhoods. They do not suit the neighbourhoods of Area 1 and will cause irreparable harm to the existing community.	9/19/2020 8:26 AM
297	Again: I think it's super important and makes sense... but how are you going to get buy in from Developers? Monetary incentive comes to mind. Can they get back 3%(?) of City admin fees if/after build is inspected & they follow through/comply with guidelines?	9/19/2020 8:02 AM
298	Definitely do not support.	9/19/2020 6:21 AM
299	Stick to the character of the neighbourhood.	9/19/2020 12:25 AM
300	Don't think could be	9/18/2020 8:57 PM

301	Not building on lots smaller than 33ft wide	9/18/2020 8:28 PM
302	Reduce to two unit	9/18/2020 8:02 PM
303	Too big	9/18/2020 7:37 PM
304	You are contradicting the intention of area one as described earlier with this question. No. In area one. No. Can't be improved. It's ludicrous.	9/18/2020 5:59 PM
305	The larger the housing being built the tighter the guidelines need to be to maintain the current beauty and character of the neighborhoods. In fill housing has had a serious eye sore impact on the city	9/18/2020 5:11 PM

Q15 How do you think the location criteria for multi-unit/apartment/townhouse (fiver or more unit) housing could be improved?

Answered: 311 Skipped: 463

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Do not put them on corner lots next to a smaller home. - there needs to be yard space or a park within 300 meters. - Any projections or balconies need to be included in the set backs. - At least one visitable unit	10/22/2020 11:27 PM
2	Existing infrastructure such as roads and sewers would have to be upgraded to handle the extra volume. Building such housing should not only fall to developers but be allowed to be done by the current owners of the property.	10/22/2020 9:16 PM
3	Townhouses could be located not just on corner lots or near arterial streets. Make them integrated within the neighbourhood. This will get people used to higher density, which we need in this city!	10/22/2020 7:16 PM
4	Probably no one is reading this anyway, you guys have already decided what you want to do	10/22/2020 5:22 PM
5	More consideration for landscaping and studies of psychological implications of people's well being and enhancement of existing neighbourhoods.	10/22/2020 4:10 PM
6	Only allow these units in established neighbourhoods on a case by case basis, where an existing building can be converted... i.e. Academy Bowling lanes building	10/22/2020 4:04 PM
7	Multi-unit/townhouses should be restricted to corners except on arterial streets	10/22/2020 2:33 PM
8	(multi-unit/apartment/townhouse) as long as green space / tree canopy is not sacrificed in pursuit of this type of build	10/22/2020 1:51 PM
9	Abolish single family zoning to allow greater ease of a variety of infill developments. Allow more flexibility in lot width requirements to allow a variety of infill densities in existing mature neighbourhoods.	10/22/2020 11:46 AM
10	Same answer as previous. Do not limit allowable locations within either Area 1 or 2.	10/22/2020 11:38 AM
11	Make them one unit bungalows .	10/22/2020 11:30 AM
12	Keep these developments in areas where they are already in existence as opposed to trying to force a development into a neighbourhood where they are not.	10/21/2020 10:40 PM
13	Conrner lots only	10/21/2020 10:14 PM
14	Need more discussion of how many bedrooms will be built in to accommodate families. Need to specify accessibility. standards. The online engagement last week mentioned that the bigger multi family buildings will be limited to street corners. I am concerned that this will drive up the cost through scarcity and prime real estate.	10/21/2020 8:35 PM
15	Make sure they have more visitor parking than they have. Do not squeeze these onto lots that formerly had only two houses. There is an example of this on Henderson Hwy. The sewers are not adequate for this and people don't get to know their neighbours. It makes a cold unfriendly atmosphere with no parking for visitors, no privacy for neighbours etc. These work best in designated areas for multiplexes where they are not part of single unit residential streets.	10/21/2020 7:27 PM
16	Don't want it in single family neighbourhood to keep my investment from dropping.	10/21/2020 7:11 PM
17	unsure	10/21/2020 3:52 PM
18	More yard area, more parking onsite. More set-back area from existing houses.	10/21/2020 1:11 PM
19	Build everything smaller and lower, so it blends into the landscape. Bigger is NOT better; smaller is better.	10/21/2020 1:05 PM
20	no opinion	10/21/2020 10:37 AM
21	I don’t support lot splitting for multi unit housing builds in area 1 and 2 zones	10/21/2020 10:22 AM
22	Not in River Heights!	10/21/2020 7:44 AM
23	These should not exist unless they are going up next to existing apartment units.	10/20/2020 11:33 PM
24	Limit the amount in one neighborhood.	10/20/2020 7:55 PM
25	No	10/20/2020 6:04 PM

26	Hate infill.	10/20/2020 5:16 PM
27	I think if they are put beside other big buildings, not beside a small house	10/20/2020 3:45 PM
28	No opinion.	10/20/2020 3:27 PM
29	Remove the distinction between Areas 1 and 2... it only further serves to entrench existing socio-economic divisions. Remove lot size requirements... density needs walkability to be livable, and walkability needs narrow lots. Therefore, intensification needs to be allowed to happen on all lot sizes. On limiting the sizes of buildings to be "compatible", anything under 4 storeys should simply be allowed... anything that is scaled to a person walking is compatible. The goal isn't density, it's walkability (even though walkable places will be dense, dense places aren't always walkable).	10/20/2020 3:07 PM
30	We should strive to achieve balance in established neighbourhoods. Not overload them with overcrowding and homes that stick out. Large units should be placed on Main Streets, as residential areas don't need large buildings blocking out the sun.	10/20/2020 2:24 PM
31	No opinion	10/20/2020 2:09 PM
32	See previous comment	10/20/2020 10:48 AM
33	Don't do it. Infill is a mistake	10/19/2020 11:57 AM
34	Limit this type of housing to neighborhoods with similar size buildings, end units or former commercial lots as possible locations. This should not be permitted to be placed on streets with single family homes. there should be green space buffers, as well as mandatory setbacks and an allowance required for minimum green space per building and for adequate parking lots.	10/19/2020 9:48 AM
35	Give it a rest. Infill is a dated idea. Move on to more pressing issues. Don’t ruin neighbourhoods.	10/18/2020 9:16 PM
36	How would you bring the size of these buildings in line with the scale of bungalows???? Not possible. There would not be enough green space and trees.	10/18/2020 7:17 PM
37	no	10/18/2020 3:47 PM
38	There is insufficient attention to implications for parking in the neighbourhood, including providing access to plugging in block heaters in the winter. More attention needs to be paid to providing and/or maintaining options for a range of income levels. Some of these neighbourhoods have been places where young people can afford their first homes as well as places with larger more expensive housing. Also, there is insufficient attention to trees, whether existing or new plantings. Many usual measures to protect existing trees are insufficient, and the trees end up dying within a few years of the construction. The construction of new foundations for example will likely to significant damage to any large mature trees on the property. Winnipeg's tree canopy has in the past been a matter of great pride and also has ecological value. Someone needs to be responsible for monitoring the health of both existing and newly planted trees for these sites. Perhaps builders might put down a guarantee deposit to be refunded after 5 years if the trees survive. Planting two trees for killing one large mature one is insufficient. Tree list might be expanded. The setback specification "or portion of block" allows for too much wiggle room. What does that really mean? The entire block should be considered in that average.	10/18/2020 11:08 AM
39	Well not within the scope of this project there needs tp be an addition for a set of rules regarding the protection of the structural integrity of adjacent properties and buildings. with increased density in these areas the issue of street parking becomes a major issue. Perhaps introduce parking passes as a pay for service.	10/18/2020 10:37 AM
40	Trees, Traffic calming, Parking, Regulated access on to main roads.	10/17/2020 8:30 AM
41	Ensuring more space to surrounding homes.	10/16/2020 11:58 PM
42	Should not be in Area 1 neighbourhoods. Would consider in high traffic areas of Area 2 neighbourhoods	10/16/2020 11:20 PM
43	apply to areas with secondary plans	10/16/2020 8:04 PM
44	Just don't attach parking requirements to it.	10/16/2020 7:29 PM
45	Parking. Noise	10/16/2020 7:06 PM

46	By revising the location criteria to be located within new communities, rather than mature ones. Unless the plan is to rezone all of Winnipeg's mature communities (Westgate, Wellington Cres) then why pretend that all " "middle class" neighborhoods have an obligation to allow these??	10/16/2020 6:19 PM
47	same	10/16/2020 2:52 PM
48	Leave our neighbourhoods as single family dwellings in line with existing Life styles	10/16/2020 2:25 PM
49	You need adequate parking.	10/16/2020 2:03 PM
50	No changes to suggest.	10/16/2020 1:21 PM
51	Tear down blocks to make room for affordable housing, like $500/month affordable or don't build at all.	10/16/2020 9:18 AM
52	Not to be developed in Glenwood.	10/15/2020 10:41 PM
53	proximity to commercial areas	10/15/2020 9:59 PM
54	See previous comment about townhouses.	10/15/2020 9:19 PM
55	I'm not sure. I don't think it should be done at all	10/15/2020 9:05 PM
56	Explicitly consider utility loads and do not add these before significant utility upgrades.	10/15/2020 5:24 PM
57	This is ridiculous.	10/15/2020 4:47 PM
58	There should be no requirement that the property both abuts an arterial street and a lane. Though preference should be given to these cases, having a parking pad on the lane would abet most of the parking issues, even with the additional density.	10/15/2020 3:19 PM
59	The maximum density should be allowed in Areas 1 and 2.	10/15/2020 2:38 PM
60	n/a	10/15/2020 12:42 PM
61	Larger lot sizes	10/15/2020 12:28 PM
62	The city needs to start thinking about historic form that works well in other parts of the cities. Take Crescentwood, where most street intersections are occupied by small apartment buildings that allow for an increase of density without drastically altering the overall composition of streets.	10/15/2020 10:22 AM
63	Pembina?	10/15/2020 9:01 AM
64	The city of Winnipeg and the owner of the 5 plex next to me has taken away all sense of security, both finacially and mentally, but hey somebody got a bit richer.	10/15/2020 8:45 AM
65	See answer to #13.	10/14/2020 11:10 PM
66	They don't belong in single family housing	10/14/2020 9:43 PM
67	Remove the clause that requires building design to be in character with the neightbourhood. Let design professionals do their job and don't force such prescriptive requirements. Also, with increased density, an opportunity for smaller scale commerce exists. Has this been considered? Corner stores etc on the triplex/fourplex lot situations.	10/14/2020 7:51 PM
68	Same comment as for quesstion12.	10/14/2020 6:36 PM
69	Put them in new developments.	10/14/2020 4:24 PM
70	Use all neighbourhoods	10/14/2020 3:26 PM
71	Allow no encroachments. Facade must be in line with neighbours. Keep height low. No lot-line-to-lot-line building. No Tandem parking.	10/14/2020 2:55 PM
72	they must be very limited	10/14/2020 1:12 PM
73	Make the first, third and fourth bulleted criteria the MAJOR criteria. The last criteria can be achieved without building four-unit housing...maybe lot splitting . Always, the character and pattern of the "mature" neighbournood should be paramount.	10/14/2020 10:42 AM
74	Similar to single-family and two-unit up-down.	10/14/2020 10:33 AM

75	Same as question 13 and 14	10/14/2020 10:08 AM
76	no comment	10/14/2020 9:09 AM
77	Should not be permitted in any infill strategy to replace a single family home.	10/14/2020 9:05 AM
78	The existing system of apartments could never be re-built under these new guidelines, when more of them should be encouraged.	10/14/2020 7:59 AM
79	I object to the focus on eliminating existing structures on corner lots. Corner lots anchor residential blocks, and converting these lots to high density infill leads to the erosion of the character of the entire neighbourhood. In all cases, priority should be given to the rehabilitation and renovation of existing structures. If infill was permitted only in cases where the new construction matched nearby existing homes in size, style, exterior materials, and lot footprint, there would be much less resistance to new infill in existing neighbourhoods.	10/13/2020 10:24 PM
80	Allow these on all collector streets, adjacent to all commercial streets by flankage or rear lane and enable it to happen in both areas 1 and 2.	10/13/2020 8:54 PM
81	The guidelines are not specific enough for home buyers or existing residents to know what may be acceptable in their neighbourhood or on their street in terms of new-build building size. Their are broad guidelines as to what may be acceptable, but these are not nearly specific enough for those who are not experts in housing and construction development to be able to set reasonable expectations. This is especially frustrating, considering the very large sections that are considered 'Area 1' or 'Area 2'. How can anyone expect to be able to plan for what may be acceptable on their own street when the guidelines are written so generally?	10/13/2020 8:34 PM
82	Continue to be set back from sidewalks, and make it not possible to be changed with a variance.	10/13/2020 5:55 PM
83	The location criteria for multi-unit housing is too restrictive. People who live in apartments shouldn't be excluded from desirable neighborhoods based on whatever was built 50-100 years ago. Streets with 1 or 2 storey height restrictions should be allowed to evolve by allowing taller middle density housing.	10/13/2020 5:46 PM
84	by maintaining the character of the existing neighbourhood and stringently enforcing guidelines for developers.	10/13/2020 4:22 PM
85	limit the number of these that can be put in a multi-block area. for example Dollard, Bertrand, Thomas Berry from Kenny to Richot limit the number of 4-plexes to 1 per block	10/13/2020 2:54 PM
86	slap your head	10/13/2020 12:19 PM
87	eliminate situation where developer purchases homes at a premium to develop into multifamily units which changes dynamic of neighbourhood. Height limits should be based on neighbouring properties and not bylaw limits. Multifamily units should be encouraged on "feeder" streets with single family behind them.	10/13/2020 12:16 PM
88	not to bad.	10/13/2020 11:40 AM
89	with neighbors approval	10/13/2020 6:58 AM
90	if you have the room that it should be allowed if the services can support the project.	10/12/2020 9:36 PM
91	Probably better on corner lots, as opposed to middle block locations	10/12/2020 7:17 PM
92	Same answer!	10/12/2020 6:48 PM
93	What is the pandemic showing us about what it takes to live in a nice residence? Consider how outdoor access (private doorways that don't require going through a central lobby OR at minimum a balcony for everyone) can be integrated into buildings while ensuring density and good design.	10/12/2020 3:59 PM
94	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	10/12/2020 9:20 AM
95	For units of this size there needs to be a parking plan for each unit - banking on street parking is unacceptable when we live in such a car-centric city.	10/11/2020 11:27 PM
96	Make sure there is sufficient land for gardens, and play areas. Make sure there is sufficient area for a garage onsite and parking. Make sure the view of neighbours isn't blocked when these units are built. DO NOT BUILD IN ST B PLEASE. They do not fit in. Turn infill into small	10/11/2020 9:05 PM

	squares or parks where neighbours can meet, read a book, enjoy a social space. If you really have to build something large like these, try to integrate multipurpose spaces that serve community - restaurants, cafes, bakeries etc. What you have done in the northern park is truly disgraceful - a bedroom community in prime area. Those living in the buildings on tache only come to St B to sleep and do not contribute to the neighbourhood. Those areas are no longer family-friendly residential areas along the river. We missed an opportunity to do something lovely there.	
97	no comment.	10/11/2020 3:33 PM
98	WE DO NOT WANT THEM	10/11/2020 3:25 PM
99	Accessibility	10/11/2020 12:02 PM
100	A Multiunit or apartment should never be higher than the number of stories already in the neighbourhood. For example, a apartment block of five stories in a neighbourhood that has only single story houses is stupid and invades the privacy of the folks already living there, often your decades.	10/11/2020 11:18 AM
101	Take into account parking and traffic availability. St. Vital cannot handle more population density. St. Annes and St. Marys road get gridlocked regularly - more population will only make it worse.	10/10/2020 9:50 PM
102	They are too large, to close to property line.	10/10/2020 3:59 PM
103	Less	10/10/2020 11:02 AM
104	No five Plexes or town housing and residential side streets	10/10/2020 9:18 AM
105	why not build them in new areas like bridgewater , sage creek.. and by the way make sure they build them right beside a single family home, see if the owner enjoys that	10/10/2020 8:51 AM
106	Don’t build them at all	10/10/2020 7:52 AM
107	See previous comment.	10/9/2020 11:07 PM
108	The language being used is wishy-washy. Its political speak. The character that made our mature neigbourhoods unique and welcoming are being slowly destroyed by the demolition of existing homes for large multifamily homes.	10/9/2020 1:54 PM
109	Build them in the newer areas they don't fit in the older areas.	10/9/2020 11:11 AM
110	Multi-unit/apartment/townhouse should not be allowed in single family areas unless they are on major streets.	10/9/2020 9:05 AM
111	same as previous	10/8/2020 8:05 PM
112	no infills!	10/8/2020 3:41 PM
113	Should not be allowed to happen. A detriment to the character and history of Winnipeg.	10/8/2020 2:55 PM
114	Same answer as previous question.	10/8/2020 2:31 PM
115	Build them closer to the perimeter, stay away from Munroe!!!

125	City planners need oversight re criteria-see Osborne Village	10/7/2020 10:27 AM
126	Multi-unit/apartment/townhouse should not be allowed in area 1. Multi-unit/apartment/townhouse should only be allowed in area 2 if a street already has this type of housing.	10/6/2020 9:44 PM
127	Close proximity to the primary transit network should be more limited about 200 or 250 metres.	10/6/2020 8:01 PM
128	They should not be built in our neighbourhoods.	10/6/2020 6:00 PM
129	One was placed on a single family residential street near me and it destroyed the street such poor planning	10/6/2020 3:50 PM
130	see previous comments - with no low density infill yet -- I am not seeing much success here with middle level infill housing initiatives.	10/6/2020 3:25 PM
131	First, do a test-run in an area like Tuxedo and see how that works out.	10/6/2020 3:03 PM
132	same as previous comment	10/6/2020 2:36 PM
133	Don't infill	10/6/2020 11:18 AM
134	support	10/6/2020 7:49 AM
135	No opinion	10/5/2020 6:02 PM
136	Do not agree with multi-unit/ apartments being built in Area 1 or communities that are predominately single family homes. Daughter is living 3 houses down from an apartment block and continually having problems with noise, garbage bins overflowing, and lack of parking for apartment tenants (so they cannot park in front of their own homes). Many of these tenants have vehicles even though they are outside a bus stop, but no where to park.	10/5/2020 1:52 PM
137	If there are bus routes in the vicinity I am okay with this.	10/5/2020 12:31 PM
138	Zones that work and not on the residential homes.	10/5/2020 12:31 PM
139	The site and building design guidelines does not, and needs to include regulations and protection to the adjacent existing structures (such as foundations, fences, garages, unpaved back lanes, sidewalks, etc.) especially within these mature neighbourhoods. Current bylaws allow excavation to the property line - causing damage to existing structures. This is negligent of the city to know of these issues and approve infill developments, at the cost of and without protecting existing properties. The city could also be opening itself to financial liability. Homeowners who have their houses seriously damaged by construction on a neighbouring property, could sue the city for failing to protect them. In other Canadian jurisdictions, temporary retaining walls and additional supports are required in mature neighbourhoods. It is also included in their guidelines to developers that any damage incurred as a result of the construction of the property will be the responsibility of the land owner to repair. It is essential that these guidelines also include: Safety as a priority. Ex. The construction site must be kept safe for both neighbours and workers, and must be properly fenced. Noise in the Neighbourhood. Include specifics on the bylaw permits of operation of construction equipment. Respect for Neighbours. Include guidelines on portable toilets, maintenance of weeds and unkept grass, site litter and debris, and parking permits for construction vehicles to ensure lanes, streets and sidewalks are not blocked. Communication with Neighbours. Including building plans, estimated time of construction, contact information if they have concerns about the project, and scheduled access to their properties if required during construction. Other jurisdictions have created a Infill Conversation Toolkit as a resource. Addition of a Contact and Enquiries section. Including the Residential Infill Department, Community Standards Bylaw, and 311 for issues and complaints relating to infractions of the City Bylaws. In addition, it is essential that a process is outlined in the development guidelines specific to the accountability of developers to follow these guidelines. If required, new bylaws need to be enacted to ensure the city has jurisdiction to enforce the requirements of this strategy. Currently, without such a process, commitments are made by developers at the initial stages of application to the City and then not completed on site. This includes such commitments as landscaping, parking structures, saving existing trees, and building fences. It also includes infractions to site safety, cleanliness, noise, traffic and neighbourhood liveability bylaws. The enforcement of development permits needs to become the responsibility fo the city and not an adjacent property owners responsibility. In addition, new guidelines should include that final inspection by the City is required before occupancy and/or use. The current bylaw is 0.8 cars per unit in	10/5/2020 12:15 PM

	mature neighbourhoods. That figure needs to be updated based on recent research, and not outdated information. With densification, there is an increase need for parking.	
140	No comment.	10/5/2020 11:12 AM
141	See comments on first question	10/4/2020 10:45 PM
142	See previous comments	10/4/2020 9:55 PM
143	One of the most important changes would be to limit heights to five or seven stories. It is also possible to have high density at low rises.	10/4/2020 5:58 PM
144	I believe that this looks good as is	10/4/2020 4:10 PM
145	Reduce parking requirements and/or encourage car-free options (e.g. bike usage facilities)	10/4/2020 1:20 PM
146	careful consideration of the other homes adjacent to the proposed site	10/4/2020 1:19 PM
147	The focus on design and aesthetic requirements is unnecessary and counterproductive. Neighbourhoods change, and artificially preserving the predominant built form/aesthetic character of a neighbourhood at the expense of gentle density, increased walkability, and the efficient use of existing infrastructure is poor city planning.	10/4/2020 10:15 AM
148	Multi unit apartments should not be approved	10/3/2020 7:55 PM
149	They will not suit area 2, area 2 is nice because of the open space and not being crammed in	10/3/2020 7:31 PM
150	It can’t. It’s wrong to allow them in single family neighborhoods.	10/3/2020 7:26 PM
151	Disallow	10/3/2020 4:09 PM
152	Part of diversity is that our city has neighbourhoods with diversity of lot/yard sizes. Not everything that now needs to be constructed has to have very little yard/green space. Having neighbourhoods with large trees, grass, space on the street to park (that isn’t someone’s driveway), should also be valued - not just whether there is all ranges of economic accessibility, family sizes and ages that can live in a neighbourhood.	10/3/2020 2:13 PM
153	Nocomment	10/3/2020 1:06 PM
154	8-5 hours	10/3/2020 11:37 AM
155	Elevator access required would allow seniors even into two floor apartment buildings... but also families with strollers etc which walk ups complicate. Making units mixed rather than senior only makes for a healthier integration of all ages all life stages...	10/3/2020 11:04 AM
156	Areas 1 and 2 criteria should be the same unless contractor can demonstrate other, similar buildings mid-block in Area 2 where construction will occur.	10/3/2020 10:59 AM
157	Bringing proposed new 'more in line' and 'more in character' are too subjective & weak; consider simply 'in line' and 'in character'	10/3/2020 10:55 AM
158	Because there is a lot of talk about the transit network, transit needs to be required to do a better job in creating routes. Recent changes had the focus of feeding the one and only BRT line in Winnipeg. This has created huge gaps in service. For example it didn't consider the number of people that go to U of W, hospitals andshopping centres (malls) in their neighbourhoods. Big box stores are not the same as a mall. When walking or using public transit big box stores are problematic. If we want to reduce private vehicle traffic we need people to plan transit routes who actually use the service.	10/3/2020 10:36 AM
159	Lots should not be allowed to be split into smaller lots uncharacteristic of the existing neighbourhood. For example, In a neighbourhood where the smallest existing lot size is 50', a 75' lot could NOT be split in half, but two adjacent 75' lots COULD be split into three 50' lots. New buildings could not exceed the mass and height of buildings immediately adjacent.	10/3/2020 10:24 AM
160	only next to existing commercial buildings or apartments	10/3/2020 9:33 AM
161	Not having secondary suites for rent	10/3/2020 9:20 AM
162	no change	10/3/2020 8:22 AM
163	Only allow in predominant rental areas.	10/3/2020 8:00 AM

164	No comments	10/2/2020 10:06 PM
165	no no criteria could convince me that these should go in Area 1 neighbourhoods	10/2/2020 3:07 PM
166	Limit to downtown, Tuxedo or Wolseley areas.	10/2/2020 2:28 PM
167	No comment	10/2/2020 2:13 PM
168	N/A	10/2/2020 1:36 PM
169	Again parking concerns	10/1/2020 8:27 PM
170	Allow for maximum greenspace. Survey neighbourhood residents. Owners/developers should live in the area in which they are building.	10/1/2020 5:15 PM
171	These Areas are exclusionary and have more to do with socio-economic class and keeping NIMBY's at the bay more than anything.	10/1/2020 4:40 PM
172	Focus on "much larger" apartments along major bus routes. Larger townhouse collections are okay, but really just mean all house prices keep going higher (you pay the same, for less, and old-style single family houses get more expensive)	10/1/2020 4:31 PM
173	in with scales of other houses	10/1/2020 4:12 PM
174	no comment	10/1/2020 3:32 PM
175	Only if multiple similar building are on the street. Also not beside lower homes, to preserve privacy and safety.	10/1/2020 3:30 PM
176	no comment	10/1/2020 1:19 PM
177	Limiting the size of new buildings to bring them more in line with the scale of existing homes	10/1/2020 11:49 AM
178	I don’t think these limitations are appropriate. I support larger multi-family dwellings being built even if they don’t “fit in” in the existing neighbourhood. I think this is more environmentally friendly and also prevents classism in neighbourhoods.	10/1/2020 11:15 AM
179	Do not approve or support this type of this housing plopped in the middle of any street in any mature neighborhoods.	9/30/2020 10:54 PM
180	Make sure they have green space!!! and give the community a chance to submit opinions on the design before foundations are poured.	9/30/2020 7:59 PM
181	Again I think there needs to be precedence on the street to allow this type of building. But I don't think this program should be completely focused on developers buying up single dwelling homes on neighbourhood streets to build multi-unit building on them... But it figures this is the way the program is being designed.	9/30/2020 3:38 PM
182	Can’t be improved.. to big for the area	9/30/2020 2:57 PM
183	Should not be allowed if the lot is zoned single family residential	9/30/2020 2:20 PM
184	What does the existing livability neighbourhood plan say?	9/30/2020 12:56 PM
185	same answer	9/30/2020 8:34 AM
186	impose by-laws which have the ground floor become small scale commercial space anything over 3 units should include parking on site for all units	9/29/2020 3:33 PM
187	same	9/29/2020 1:44 PM
188	They can't, they shouldn't, and it is preposterous to imagine that this is a good idea. Completely shameful of dictators to push their money-generating idea on the comfort and homes of established communities. The Neighbourhood Plan concept exists for a reason.	9/29/2020 1:33 PM
189	the city needs to be open to keep old neighbourhoods as a place for people to want to live.	9/29/2020 1:25 PM
190	Mandate high performance building only to reduce carbon emissions and drive innovation. Relax zoning for Passive House certified buildings.	9/29/2020 8:35 AM
191	These units should not be built in small residential neighbourhoods where bungalows presently exist. The units are way too big for older neighborhoods.	9/28/2020 9:52 PM

192	This would never fit into a Heritage neighbourhood.	9/28/2020 12:55 PM
193	Limiting size of new buildings and distance between. Not removing mature trees. Above all make sure the homes blend in with the existing neighborhood!	9/28/2020 11:34 AM
194	Conduct surveys and community meetings with the affected communities, in order to lay out the proposed plan and respond to concerns that might arise from current community members.	9/28/2020 9:50 AM
195	see previous comments	9/28/2020 8:25 AM
196	Again, listen to the community and take concerns seriously.	9/28/2020 8:25 AM
197	More city centre	9/28/2020 12:36 AM
198	You need to diversify housing opportunities in all neighbourhoods in Area 1 as well as Area 2.	9/28/2020 12:00 AM
199	Allow these everywhere, but especially on corner lots (throughout the city, this should be automatic).	9/27/2020 11:03 PM
200	As in all categories, ensuring that there is enough infrastructure, especially storm sewers (separate from domestic sewers) to accommodate the increased residential density is necessary.	9/27/2020 5:04 PM
201	no way	9/27/2020 2:36 PM
202	Not in my neighborhood. The only place semi suitable is St. Mary's or St. Anne's Roads however the depth of the lots is very limiting.	9/26/2020 4:32 PM
203	Limits to the size of new buildings must be reasonable. Mature neighbourhoods already contain a range of sizes, and larger buildings (like apartment buildings) are often appropriate on corner lots and a long thoroughfares. Three story walk-ups are a established building type in many mature neighbourhoods. Building design requirements do not guarantee good design and potentially hinder it.	9/26/2020 3:13 PM
204	REPLACE whatever structure is currently on the property with the same type of structure.	9/26/2020 12:21 PM
205	DO NOT ALLOW	9/26/2020 11:13 AM
206	These should only be on busy main streets.	9/25/2020 6:23 PM
207	not sure	9/25/2020 2:39 PM
208	See 11. Require parking.	9/25/2020 12:51 PM
209	Scrap: limiting the size of buildings to bring them in line with existing buildings, site and building requirements that are more in the character with the neighborhood, introducing minimum lot size requirements. Get rid of minimum parking spaces.	9/25/2020 9:36 AM
210	Same. The apartment built on my street last year does not meet any of your criteria. Perhaps you should admit that developers can build whatever they want because : (i) they designed the rules with you, (ii) they use variances for the final changes.	9/25/2020 8:41 AM
211	Same answer	9/25/2020 8:33 AM
212	Location decision should be left to the owner.	9/25/2020 1:13 AM
213	Not in area 1	9/24/2020 8:46 PM
214	Stop ripping down current homes that are affordable and replacing them with poor quality cookie-cutter expensive houses.	9/24/2020 7:38 PM
215	https://fortune.com/2020/07/21/black-housing-neighborhoods-economic-opportunity/	9/24/2020 7:11 PM
216	not build them.	9/24/2020 5:20 PM
217	Consider the context of each site and neighbourhood instead of "clear cutting" and "plopping" off the shelf plans on to the sites	9/24/2020 4:12 PM
218	against any criteria unless parking is taking into consideration	9/24/2020 12:44 PM
219	There should be more consideration of creating parks/green/play spaces and overall neighbourhood planning when constructing such homes. Such units should be built away from the mature homes to preserve the character of the neighbourhood. Moreover, having new	9/24/2020 10:17 AM

	infrastruture should be a primary concern and not drawing on the older infrastructure. Increased traffic flow should be considered, such as building more arterial streets to lead to these areas rather than depending on the mature streets to accommodate the traffic, which creates wear-and-tear on older roads.	
220	as per previous questions applies to this one as well	9/24/2020 9:20 AM
221	Go and look at the area and the existing structures, needs to be more of an individual decision. Be more upfront with the designs of the newer structure when posting signs in neighbourhoods	9/24/2020 8:46 AM
222	Same issues.	9/24/2020 7:31 AM
223	Again, this type of housing does not belong in a residential neighbourhood consisting of single family homes.	9/24/2020 12:45 AM
224	Looks good	9/23/2020 9:51 PM
225	Location choice to busy streets and away from smaller housing	9/23/2020 9:16 PM
226	I think parking needs to be considered when putting up new housing. Where parking needs to be included in the lot. Take into account the surrounding area and by cutting down old big trees your taking away from the maturity of the neighborhood.	9/23/2020 9:06 PM
227	I see an opportunity to expand the location criteria to improve density and land usage to less mature neighborhoods. One way is to set criteria for any new developments for more mixed usage	9/23/2020 8:40 PM
228	Ensuring green space is maintained for these people and for the people in the community. I'm not talking about some rocks on the ground with a couple cedar trees in it. People get upset because they acknowledge the nature around them. We know it is important for mental health	9/23/2020 8:35 PM
229	Allow townhouses everywhere.	9/23/2020 8:26 PM
230	same	9/23/2020 8:19 PM
231	St. Boniface lots are smaller in scale and can't adequately accomodate multi-unit/townhouse housing types. That is the reason there is always community opposition. Just because the are is desirable does not mean it is suited for three and four unit infills squeezed onto the lots with little green space and circulation around the building. Infill for increased residential density should only be permitted in large scale and corner lots. They should not be squeezed into existing lots or split lots. Infill needs to consider gravel lanes, garbage and recycling requirements and snow clearing. Design standards should also consider neighbourhood context. There should be equal greenspace for new developments as for existing residential units - e.g. backyards and front yards	9/23/2020 6:55 PM
232	look at green space versus density	9/23/2020 6:40 PM
233	NOT in the neighborhood - unless the lot size accommodates at least one parking spot for each apartment - on a big lot	9/23/2020 6:35 PM
234	no multi-unit/apartment.townhousew housing in infill lots	9/23/2020 6:20 PM
235	Buy all the old dumpy farm homes on Henderson and build the new multi plex homes there	9/23/2020 5:44 PM
236	This type of development is great so long as it is done in appropriate areas, i.e. along major corridors.	9/23/2020 5:27 PM
237	Do not allow tall apartments in Zone 1 or 2 unless it is tearing down existing multi-residential or on a highway. Rezoning current single family properties for tall apartment buildings (more than 3 storeys) should not be allowed). Town houses or low rise 3 storey apartments would be better, but only where adjacent properties' privacy and quality of life is not impacted.	9/23/2020 5:01 PM
238	Guidelines make sense	9/23/2020 4:34 PM
239	as with previous comments	9/23/2020 4:21 PM
240	n/a	9/23/2020 4:17 PM
241	Add exceptions for specific neighborhoods of particularly unique and historic significance, such as Armstrong's point, and old Crescentwood.	9/23/2020 4:12 PM
242	Restricting them to areas that are primarily multi-unit housing.	9/23/2020 3:50 PM

243	If there is already an increased population density due to already approved and built infills, adding more will have ramnifications on everything from traffic congestion, increased noise, blocking out sunlight, decline in house values, parking issues....	9/23/2020 3:46 PM
244	same as previous	9/23/2020 2:15 PM
245	Build em anywhere and everywhere!	9/23/2020 11:56 AM
246	Look at the parking on the lot and the effect of more people parking on the street; the size garages on smaller lots need to be reduced/restricted and set back from lane to allow for snow / garbage pick up ; Also more set back needed from front streets inline with other buildings that are existing	9/23/2020 11:15 AM
247	Including parking on private property	9/23/2020 10:46 AM
248	Good as is.	9/23/2020 9:37 AM
249	provide new road access away from existing neighborhoods	9/23/2020 9:13 AM
250	See previous	9/22/2020 8:02 PM
251	See all my other comments, they are still applicable here. Existing residents and home owners feel bulldozed by these developments. Yes, it's great to make better guidelines, now consider prioritizing the neighbourhoods we have and maintaining and encouraging restoration and renovation instead of demolition and waste.	9/22/2020 2:23 PM
252	See responses to #11, #12, #13 and #14 above.	9/22/2020 1:47 PM
253	As mentioned, use the Grace Hospital model. Scale it down. You will have a different inner city.	9/22/2020 1:37 PM
254	Abandon this stupid infill housing idea NOW!	9/22/2020 1:36 PM
255	All neighborhoods should provide access to people who can only afford multi-family housing.	9/22/2020 11:45 AM
256	Townhouse development should allow for mixed-use as the standard. Encourage commercial/office and/or retail units on the ground floor.	9/22/2020 10:06 AM
257	Should only be allowed on major arteries and only on lots that are consistent in frontage with adjacent developed lots.	9/22/2020 1:01 AM
258	Parking has to be thought about.	9/21/2020 6:49 PM
259	By maintaining the neighborhoods charm & keeping it single dwelling. If you want multi unit apartments & townhouses, put them in your nice tidy neighborhood and see what happens!	9/21/2020 6:29 PM
260	Further pressure to create transit/ commercial/ medium residential density hubs within or at the borders of more Area 1 neighborhoods.	9/21/2020 5:29 PM
261	Only allow them in areas of already established large unit dwellings. Do NOT cram them in areas with predominantly single family homes.	9/21/2020 4:57 PM
262	Same as previous.	9/21/2020 4:49 PM
263	Impossible	9/21/2020 3:03 PM
264	Allow for GREENSPACE and for PARKING of at least two vehicles for each unit.	9/21/2020 2:53 PM
265	It is important to keep multi-unit/apartment/townhouses within 5 minute walking distance of grocery stores and retail, as many people in these buildings don't have access to cars to travel long distances to shopping. Also it is important to locate such buildings closer to employment lands, rather than embedded deep into old neighborhoods far from workplaces.	9/21/2020 2:44 PM
266	ensuring no negative impact from garbage/recylcing and its collection will not negatively impact neighbours	9/21/2020 2:15 PM
267	very good	9/21/2020 12:12 PM
268	Should be built in suburbs not in older parts of the city that are already crowded. Any high density housing must address the fact that people also need parks and places to walk and	9/21/2020 11:48 AM

	play that are pleasant . Adding high density housing to an area high density with not enough services like shopping, health care, parks, schools etc. is not a good idea.	
269	Ensuring the infrastructure can support this type of housing. We had to move our children from their existing school because increased population density meant their school was at capacity and could no longer be our school of choice.	9/21/2020 11:43 AM
270	I think the City of Winnipeg needs to be more flexible in their thinking and do what they can to help reduce regulation that prevents growth to the city.	9/21/2020 10:02 AM
271	Again, these units should be optioned to be built throughout high income areas, not just the lower income/tax brackets. Charleswood/Tuxedo should have always been some of the first areas to be targeted as their lot sizes allow for more growth/more units to be put in. As well as rental buildings and renters to move into the area.	9/21/2020 9:44 AM
272	Providing an opportunity to accommodate low to moderate density infill development within existing neighbourhoods	9/21/2020 8:27 AM
273	In the Area 1 and 2 , only within the area of neighbourhoods where there is the pre-existence of Multi-unit apartment and townhouses can any further constuction of that size be considered. Again, the affect of those buildings to surrounding streets must be a part of the consultation.	9/21/2020 12:10 AM
274	'limiting sizes' effectively kills this option. There is nothing wrong - and plenty right - with existing 5-6 storey 100-year old apartement buildings in West Broadway, for example. Every neighbourhood should have the opportunity to have buildings like that.	9/20/2020 9:12 PM
275	Same as previous. Give neighbourhoods a choice in whether infill happens.	9/20/2020 6:34 PM
276	Multi-family dwellings are not part of the neighbourhoods character.	9/20/2020 5:29 PM
277	Do not build these in the single family homes area.	9/20/2020 3:32 PM
278	all multiunit housing should incorporate renewables and solar technology. We need to start to build with sustainability in mind	9/20/2020 2:03 PM
279	Provide an active involvement of any street/area residents when a new in fill application is made by a developer to ensure that only appropriate units are built.	9/20/2020 1:46 PM
280	Bike lanes.	9/20/2020 1:40 PM
281	multi unit apartment townhouses should not be located in area 1 neighbourhoods	9/20/2020 1:06 AM
282	Make it easier to increase density in all neighbourhoods.	9/19/2020 10:55 PM
283	No thank you. M/A/T’s in this location=spoiler alert	9/19/2020 10:28 PM
284	See previous comment	9/19/2020 5:36 PM
285	make whole city area 2. remove all requirements. Add platinum standard for green buildings	9/19/2020 5:32 PM
286	As much as possible, parking should be encouraged to be underground and surface lots should be discouraged. Mixed-use should be encouraged, particularly street-level retail space.	9/19/2020 4:47 PM
287	See previous comment	9/19/2020 3:44 PM
288	Do not allow any more of these monstrosities to be built next door to single family houses....especially along streets like St. Mary's Road between St. Anne's and Dunkirk. The surrounding neighbourhoods are being ruined by these abominations. Also, do not allow Air BnB to occupy these buildings, which has been the case along St. Mary's Road between Fermor and Hull. Transient tenants cause too many problems and do not have a sense of citizenship about the neighbourhood.	9/19/2020 2:45 PM
289	Parking requirements for the lot, not city street reliance	9/19/2020 2:08 PM
290	Stop assuming mature neighbourhoods need to have more traffic. Very bad idea. Very insensitive. Very old-fashioned. Stop gaslighting residents' concerns. South Osborne is already dense, esp Lord Roberts. Never allow duplexes, or any other infill, to be taller than the neighbours'. Stop implying that old housing is decrepit, not modern, and needs to come down.	9/19/2020 1:59 PM
291	As long as it’s no subdivisions a	9/19/2020 12:57 PM
292	More clarification and not too restrictive	9/19/2020 11:11 AM

293	Diversifying the opportunities for these housing types in all neighbourhoods at strategic locations Area 1 neighbourhoods and more broadly in Area 2 neighbourhoods, subject to immediate surrounding context This just sounds like a blanket statement for permission to do anything anywhere just like the current practices.	9/19/2020 10:52 AM
294	Too many rentals	9/19/2020 10:39 AM
295	Sounds good	9/19/2020 10:22 AM
296	None	9/19/2020 9:58 AM
297	Parking requirements	9/19/2020 9:37 AM
298	Not build these units in residential neighborhoods	9/19/2020 9:22 AM
299	I'm not sure how 3 story blocks backing single family dwellings fits with the neighbourhood at all. 6 or 7 car parking as opposed to one or two car parking; basically blocking out the sky from neighbouring houses; renters who don't care and have no stake in the neighbourhood (speeding in the lane, not cleaning up after their pets, throwing garbage from their cars, parking anywhere they want, shovelling their snow onto the lane instead of keeping it on their own property, etc); with four such buildings already on our lane the residents in them are already approaching the population numbers of the rest of the block none of whom have a stake in the neighbourhood at all since they are renters. One of the 4 blocks on our lane seems to be AirBNB suites with different ppl coming and going all the time. I've had some of them try to cause fights!! With four already on our lane we can't handle any more of these blocks, there has to be a limit. All the rest of the houses on the 791 and up block of St. Mary's Rd. have been bought by developers hoping to cash in on these huge monstrosities and have fallen into utter disrepair. Limit the number per block, please	9/19/2020 9:05 AM
300	Fine	9/19/2020 8:53 AM
301	Multi unit houses / apartments and townhouses should not be allowed within Area 1 neighbourhoods. They do not suit the neighbourhoods of Area 1 and will cause irreparable harm to the existing community.	9/19/2020 8:27 AM
302	Again: I think it’s super important and makes sense... but how are you going to get buy in from Developers? Monetary incentive comes to mind. Can they get back 3%(?) of City admin fees if/after build is inspected & they follow through/comply with guidelines?	9/19/2020 8:02 AM
303	See earlier comments.	9/19/2020 6:21 AM
304	Stick to the character of the neighbourhood.	9/19/2020 12:25 AM
305	Having a rent control so people stay in our neighborhoods longer and become better established	9/18/2020 10:14 PM
306	Don't think could be.	9/18/2020 8:57 PM
307	Not building on lots smaller than 33ft wide	9/18/2020 8:28 PM
308	No	9/18/2020 8:02 PM
309	Very too big	9/18/2020 7:37 PM
310	Absolutely no in area one.	9/18/2020 5:59 PM
311	same as prior	9/18/2020 5:12 PM

Q16 Overall, how well do you think the draft guidelines will address the following goals?

Answered: 520 Skipped: 254




transit and...
Make more efficient us...
Increase population...
Respect and enhances the...
0%
10%
20%
30%
40%
50%
60%
70%
80%
90%
100%
Recommendations are not likely to achieve the goals
Recommendations will help somewhat to achieve the goals
Recommendations will likely achieve the goals
I am not sure

	RECOMMENDATIONS ARE NOT LIKELY TO ACHIEVE THE GOALS	RECOMMENDATIONS WILL HELP SOMEWHAT TO ACHIEVE THE GOALS	RECOMMENDATIONS WILL LIKELY ACHIEVE THE GOALS	I AM NOT SURE	TOTAL
Provide a diversity of housing options for all residents, at all life stages, in all neighbourhoods	38.49% 199	33.66% 174	18.57% 96	9.28% 48	517
Maintain a balanced mix of housing within each neighbourhood	42.91% 221	33.59% 173	15.73% 81	7.77% 40	515
Distribute additional residential density amongst mature neighbourhoods	35.21% 181	34.24% 176	21.21% 109	9.34% 48	514
Contribute to the physical renewal and revitalization of older neighbourhoods	41.28% 213	32.95% 170	19.96% 103	5.81% 30	516
Support transit and maximize walkability	40.16% 206	28.65% 147	20.47% 105	10.72% 55	513
Make more efficient use of existing municipal infrastructure and community facilities	35.83% 182	27.76% 141	27.56% 140	8.86% 45	508
Increase population levels to support retention of neighbourhood schools, commercial areas and main streets (i.e. Urban Mixed-Use Corridors)	30.14% 154	36.20% 185	25.64% 131	8.02% 41	511
Respect and enhances the character of existing neighbourhoods through compatible development	50.10% 256	22.90% 117	18.59% 95	8.41% 43	511

Q17 How do you think the guidelines could be improved to achieve these goals?

Answered: 350 Skipped: 424

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	DO NOT distribute additional residential density amongst mature neighborhoods. That is disrespectful of the citizens who chose that local for its lower density and larger lots	10/23/2020 7:29 AM
2	There is no discussion of the composition of a complete community matrix or how often a survey of housing and other community assets will be completed so that goals can be established and housing built to meet a community's needs. Increased density, traffic and no green space or parks decrease quality of life and it will increase mobility in and out of a community. If there are no homes with multiple bedrooms, there will be fewer families to use the schools.	10/22/2020 11:41 PM
3	I believe that not only should the guidelines be more strict with regard to what can be built, where, but again, what style and size of building can be constructed. In addition, the implementation of the guidelines requires more focus. Builders must conform to the guidelines and the city must ensure that they do, to ensure that all parties are pleased with the outcome.	10/22/2020 11:34 PM
4	The "secondary considerations" give the impression that planners may take into account the immediately surrounding built form on a case-by-case basis. etc. But will they, really? Or will developers and planners and Board of Adjustments point to the new guidelines and ignore the immediately surrounding built form?	10/22/2020 11:20 PM
5	I think the guidelines need to be actually enforced. We need more protection for mature trees.	10/22/2020 10:42 PM
6	These mean nothing unless the developers are held to the guidelines. I think this would be a great improvement IF they are strictly followed. Currently developers can simply get variances and ignore most rules and I fear that will continue and these new guidelines will be sidestepped. As well, are these rules or guidelines? Recommending something means nothing unless you enforce it. There needs to be more of an emphasis on retaining mature trees. They are a part of the whole neighbourhood; removing them isn't “in keeping” with the area style. If trees need to be removed, the developer/owner should have to pay to have a tree planted somewhere (if not on the property then replace some lost boulevard trees!).	10/22/2020 10:35 PM
7	Build in neighbourhoods that are close to transit,	10/22/2020 9:18 PM
8	Since I'm not an expert in urban planning, I feel I can't comment on too many of the aspects of the guideline. But what I do think is that there needs to be incentives and disincentives to be able to increase the density of this city.	10/22/2020 7:50 PM
9	Communicate applies for a variance with the neighbourhood before the developer. Hire an arbourists who would be able to recommend what kind of tree is suitable.	10/22/2020 5:38 PM
10	People don't want to take the friggin'bus. They want to have a vehicle. There is already not enough street parking available in mature neighborhoods. Especially in the winter when you can't park on snow routes. Yet you want to increase the population density here?!	10/22/2020 5:28 PM
11	Please read my previous staements.	10/22/2020 4:18 PM
12	Every neighbourhood should not be responsible to provide housing for residents at all life stages. The developers are not attempting to do this in River Heights. They are maximizing square footage and profitability. Not providing affordable housing. Existing infrastructure is taxed to the limits. Neighbourhood schools are full.	10/22/2020 4:14 PM
13	City councillors need to stop approving all variances, need to listen to the residents instead of the builders.	10/22/2020 3:30 PM
14	The city should be developing a local area plan that addresses the cumulative effect of future developments. As presented there is no reference to increasing density and the implication of more housing and more people on city infrastructure. What are the potential cumulative effects on parks schools, libraries, roads and the sewer and water systems? One by one, lot by lot the guidelines will allow the area to change without comprehensive planning. These potential increases are foreseen in the document. eg. "The preferred location criteria for three-unit within Area 2 are being recommended as a means to introduce this form of housing into neighbourhoods that are already established with a variety of housing types and zoning is conducive" i.e. this is just a lead in for more development. It is just a matter of time. So when do the implications of increasing density on infrastructure and the overall character of the neighbourhood get addressed. The guidelines in themselves are not enough. We need a local area plan so residents can have a real say in the planning of their own neighbourhood.	10/22/2020 2:52 PM

	Currently there is only one small area identified on the map that is subject o a local area plan. Why is that?	
15	Do not allow lot splitting in mature neighborhoods like River Heights. Building two tall skinny eyesores on what was formerly one lot is ruining our neighborhood. These new buildings tower over their next door neighbors and look terrible.	10/22/2020 2:44 PM
16	I would challenge developers/ designers/ investors to start from an assumption of green space and tree canopy be included, added or preserved. I met a man who bought a large lot with a small house on it, he subsequently built a Massive house against the property line on one side. When I asked him about his choice he explained, his long game was to buy the adjacent property on the opposite and split the 2 properties and build another 2 house ultimately. This would surely result in a massive reduction of the trees on those 2 well wooded lots. If he knew there were expectations of how much green was desirable prior to building he may still build this way but incorporate these guidelines into his designs.	10/22/2020 2:10 PM
17	Require the consultation with and approval of owners of adjacent dwellings and owners of other dwellings on the same street block	10/22/2020 12:12 PM
18	Abolish single family zoning to allow greater ease of a variety of infill developments. Allow more flexibility in lot width requirements to allow a variety of infill densities in existing mature neighbourhoods.	10/22/2020 12:01 PM
19	Make them one family bungalows.	10/22/2020 11:32 AM
20	Limit number of rental properties in area. Maybe that is a bit harsh but when owners live in their house, things tend to be in better repair. Maybe holding landlords more accountable is the way to go. Not sure! But I can tell you its always the rentals on our street that bring it down.	10/22/2020 11:26 AM
21	Ensure practical, affordable, reliable, and desirable housing options are being built - not just homes built to line the pockets of developers with prices that are out of reach for people who live in the area or who could have afforded the original home. Ensure environmental impacts are addressed - such as proper removal of contaminants such as lead, asbestos, etc., as well as removing and donating/reusing materials (doors, windows, cabinets, bathroom fixtures, light fixtures, etc.) before demolition. Ensure capacity exists and repair infrastructure in mature neighbourhoods before adding more density to already overwhelmed, aging infrastructure such as sewers and back lanes.	10/22/2020 11:25 AM
22	See my earlier comments on back lane usage and snow clearing. We can't pretend winter doesn't exist	10/22/2020 10:22 AM
23	By conducting more extensive reviews on potential infill properties that are brought before committees for deliberation.	10/22/2020 10:02 AM
24	city has no jurisdiction over retention of schools , completely dishonest question	10/22/2020 10:00 AM
25	Do not allow lot splitting in mature neighbourhoods as this practice destroys conformity and existing character of existing neighbourhoods.	10/21/2020 10:46 PM
26	The main goal should not be lot division to maximize density and profits for developers. People do not move to suburbs and urban sprawl to live in a duplex with no yard. If there was more incentive for people to infill a nice new single family home in a more mature area rather than moving to somewhere like Bridgewater older neighborhoods would revitalize, taxes would still increase and residents would be happier.	10/21/2020 10:18 PM
27	I am concerned about affordability. Affordability may still be a barrier to truly diverse housing.	10/21/2020 8:37 PM
28	As old housing gets torn down, it is better to replace it with new housing on the same size lots. Reducing the lot size to 20 feet wide is not going to bring a community feel to an area. People have no yard or room to spend time outdoors, thus they will not interact with neighbours.	10/21/2020 7:34 PM
29	These will encourage developers to completely change a neighbourhood for their profit alone and are just a signal by the city administration that is the leading purpose. When we bought a house in our neighbourhood 40 years ago, we liked the single family aspect, the space for trees, and room to manage our parking and snow accumulation.	10/21/2020 7:25 PM
30	From what I've seen to date infill homes have had a negative impact on the quality and character of neighbourhoods. Include architects and designers in the process, not only developers.	10/21/2020 4:03 PM

31	The site and building guidelines need to more accurately reflect the style, size and character of current homes.	10/21/2020 3:53 PM
32	Start with areas where housing is dilapidated, not those where houses maintained. Tearing down a house with new shingles, recently re-done kitchen, etc. is WASTEFUL and against Greenhouse reduction, etc. Mandate geothermal heating be part of infill. Mandate repair of street/sidewalk destroyed by developer.	10/21/2020 1:17 PM
33	Don't allow black exteriors or walls with no windows so the building looks like a jail - as many do now.	10/21/2020 1:15 PM
34	Retain single family areas. New construction should remain similar to existing housing.	10/21/2020 11:35 AM
35	as stated- do not allow lot splits, reduce allowable lot coverage, -pay attention to the other houses in the neighorhood- respect the neighbourhood- take into consideration the building mass, heights, lot coverage, setbacks etc and do not let developers shoe-horn massive houses onto small lots- damaging neighbouring houses, reducing property values of neighbouring houses, and destroying the overall character of neighbourhoods	10/21/2020 10:46 AM
36	I do not support lot splitting for the purposes of infill land development within mature neighbourhoods	10/21/2020 10:26 AM
37	Abandon them and start over.	10/21/2020 7:45 AM
38	They could not allow for infill to be anything other than replacing a single family home with a single family home. That would be best.	10/20/2020 11:38 PM
39	Reverse the priorities, put compatibility and character before density and diversity. I believe the goals listed can already be achieved under the existing by-laws, and these new changes really only speed up that process by increasing the ROI to the developers. But it is nice to see the extra attention given to the height and mass of the buildings.	10/20/2020 10:39 PM
40	If you make it too difficult builders may stop. If you make it too relaxed builders won't blend in as much as areas seem to want. Limiting roof heights, limited Main floor heights. Limiting side yard minimums, limiting front setbacks all seem like good goals.	10/20/2020 9:58 PM
41	Do not allow granny-suites or duplexes on lots 30 feet or less and do not allow builders to max-out the building sizes on 30' or less lots. Do not allow the builders to remove mature trees from the back yards (as well as your new requirements for trees in front yards).	10/20/2020 8:02 PM
42	Keep neighborhood s the way they are . Single homes in one area Multi homes in areas only where they are now	10/20/2020 6:07 PM
43	By having rules they cannot put these any where they like, where they look out of place.	10/20/2020 3:48 PM
44	No opinion	10/20/2020 3:30 PM
45	Loosen many of the restrictions, especially for 4plexes or less. The guidelines as is will limit infill to certain neighbourhoods, prevent regular Winnipeggers from participating in small scale development in their own neighbourhoods (including single family homes), and add density without walkability. The opposite of the goals of OurWinnipeg.	10/20/2020 3:14 PM
46	ELIMINATE LOT SPLITTING FOR STREETS WITH UNPAVED (mud, gravel) LANES. I have no ideological problem with infill, but my backlane is an unpaved mess at the best of times. I spent 15k on a new garage last year, and it was nearly unusable over the winter due to ruts and deep ditches in the middle of the lane. In the spring, we end up with a literal pond, nearly a foot deep, that we refer to with disdain as Lake Fernwood. Adding further desity to streets with unpaved back lanes will cause undue damage to an already nearly unusable lane from the construction needs, and will reduce the amount of time it remains usable after grading due to the increase in residential traffic.	10/20/2020 2:11 PM
47	Put the housing in areas that need revitalization, rather than destroying Kingston Cres and Elm Park	10/19/2020 10:05 PM
48	Don't ruin my neighbourhood.	10/19/2020 11:57 AM
49	Limit this type of infill housing to neighborhoods with similar size split homes, this should not be permitted to be placed on streets with single family homes. There should be mandatory minimum green space for each home or unit, minimum parking stalls per house or unit should be maintained. not just pave over back yards, maintain lot setbacks of area, side yard	10/19/2020 9:53 AM

	clearances increased from existing homes to prevent encroachment and damage and protect an retained existing trees.	
50	This is a very deceptive “survey”. Do bureaucrats have nothing better to do than scheme and manipulate public opinion?	10/18/2020 9:22 PM
51	There is NO connection to retention of schools apparent in the guidelines. Absolute application of theory from textbooks. Where are the schools that are shutting down? LRSD proposed closure of DW Penner - miles outside of mature communities boundary. No data given to support this assertion. No evidence of any school closure. Windsor Park has two closed elementary schools - so we densify? NO ! we pretend it's not a mature community. No basis in reality.	10/18/2020 8:43 PM
52	Increase the areas for development, look at all age groups and take into account plans for empty nesters and seniors.	10/18/2020 8:32 PM
53	There should be limited to the amount of infill on any given street and withing each community.	10/18/2020 7:28 PM
54	There needs to be limits placed on the amount of lots that are approved for infills. My street has had 14! variances approved. Yes, some were past their prime but many were simply small. When these houses are removed, it becomes more difficult for first-time home-owners to afford this neighbourhood. Instead they will be forced to rent or buy elsewhere.	10/18/2020 5:21 PM
55	no comment/don't know	10/18/2020 3:48 PM
56	Specific criteria for demolition of existing housing on 50 foot lot ie, just because a house is 60 years old doesn't mean it needs to be demolished. Encourage revitalization development on lots less than 50 feet frontage to replace older housing in need of refurbishing	10/18/2020 11:16 AM
57	Address the following: There is insufficient attention to implications for parking in the neighbourhood, including providing access to plugging in block heaters in the winter. More attention needs to be paid to providing and/or maintaining options for a range of income levels. Some of these neighbourhoods have been places where young people can afford their first homes as well as places with larger more expensive housing. Also, there is insufficient attention to trees, whether existing or new plantings. Many usual measures to protect existing trees are insufficient, and the trees end up dying within a few years of the construction. The construction of new foundations for example will likely to significant damage to any large mature trees on the property. Winnipeg's tree canopy has in the past been a matter of great pride and also has ecological value. Someone needs to be responsible for monitoring the health of both existing and newly planted trees for these sites. Perhaps builders might put down a guarantee deposit to be refunded after 5 years if the trees survive. Planting two trees for killing one large mature one is insufficient. Tree list might be expanded. The setback specification "or portion of block" allows for too much wiggle room. What does that really mean? The entire block should be considered in that average.	10/18/2020 11:09 AM
58	dont do it	10/17/2020 11:44 AM
59	Increasing density is a great goal but not at any cost. If you don't work with communities then putting in infill will not lead to cohesive and cooperative neighbourhoods.	10/17/2020 12:02 AM
60	Developers are currently building cheap cookie cutter homes in our area. I am not sure that these guidelines will fix that. Yes, they are tearing down old houses, but putting cheap houses in their place is a short term solution.	10/16/2020 11:29 PM
61	apply to areas with secondary plans	10/16/2020 8:05 PM
62	Maybe less priority on keeping things the same, and a more liberal and open approach to infill.	10/16/2020 7:30 PM
63	Traffic and parking consideration noise enforcement	10/16/2020 7:10 PM
64	By actually addressing the flaws as identified by larger population centers that have been creating so many new low quality buildings, increasing the strain of the miscalculated load upon city infrastructure, and ultimately changing the aspects of the community that made it desirable in the first place.	10/16/2020 6:26 PM
65	Developers will split lots wherever there are opportunities, clustering them instead of distributing. Spread them out first. There are side by sides side to side and front to front in a street!	10/16/2020 3:17 PM
66	No more infills	10/16/2020 2:26 PM

67	I don't believe in any infill housing unless the rent is under $500/month. Anything more than that and we are clearly working slaves.	10/16/2020 9:22 AM
68	Structural assessments and justification as to why a single-family residence needs to be replaced should be provided by an architect and engineer. In light of the emissions associated with demolition over restoration, employment opportunities associated with refurbishment of mature buildings in mature neighborhoods, and the role of mature buildings in preserving the history and defining the character of our neighborhoods and city, efforts should be directed towards restoring and refurbishing existing homes in mature neighborhoods. Furthermore, density will be increased with restoration of numerous vacant buildings throughout the city for affordable housing, an option that is now available to municipalities with the federal Rapid Housing Initiative.	10/15/2020 11:38 PM
69	New Director of planning is required.	10/15/2020 10:41 PM
70	limit height, width, and depth of structure.	10/15/2020 10:10 PM
71	Follow the guidelines, instead of always granting variances.	10/15/2020 9:54 PM
72	Physical renewal in most neighbourhoods appears to be due to fire or dilapidation, which creates an available lot, or due to rising property values that suddenly makes it financially viable to replace a smaller house in good condition with a larger house. Most/many areas aren't built to their current maximum zoning.	10/15/2020 9:28 PM
73	guidelines are fine...but what the end result will be is the question	10/15/2020 8:52 PM
74	1st. Embrace the term "Winterpeg" 2nd. Have faith in the propensity of electric vehicles. Humans tend (eventually) to move forward, and are not likely to go back.	10/15/2020 8:16 PM
75	Recognize that density is an integral part of maintaining neighborhood character and that green space on properties also enhances neighborhoods and is critical for carbon capture. These plans seem to be heavily biased to legitimizing acceptable development away from this, as evidenced by similar developments that have occurred in our neighborhood.	10/15/2020 5:32 PM
76	"Guidelines", "recommendations" and incentives (ie incentive offered to keep nature trees) are flimsy words at best and chosen to keep the citizens happy. There are no teeth to your proposed guidelines.	10/15/2020 4:55 PM
77	I would like to see the city promote future-forward green initiatives in these new infill guidelines. One example would be to require that a 240 volt, 50 amp electrical outlet be installed near a parking pad. This would allow a future homeowner or landlord to quickly and easily install an electric vehicle charger in the future. Given Manitoba's clean power generation, I believe this initiative would be a great promotional tactic if nothing else.	10/15/2020 3:32 PM
78	The proposed guidelines are to restrictive and will not achieve it goals but the exact opposite will happen. It should be less restrictive to allow a real development in those neighbourhoods.	10/15/2020 2:44 PM
79	Make Larger lot sizes fir more green space	10/15/2020 12:56 PM
80	n/a	10/15/2020 12:44 PM
81	This infill strategy needs to be aligned with the updated transit strategy to see real progress on building a more sustainable Winnipeg.	10/15/2020 10:23 AM
82	To provide diversity in housing there has to be requirements of affordability and variation in housing type. We have a poverty crisis, we need to keep housing affordable. I can not state this enough. To contribute to the renewal and revitalization of existing neighbourhoods you would need to provide funding for or require developers to provide funding for public lands and existing businesses or home owners to renew their existing properties and not just build new around already falling-down infrastructure. I did not see any mention of incentives for new businesses or mention of infill in geographical relation to transit in these new requirements. Building more housing will only bring more people and add more housing. the City and the Province MUST DO THEIR PART to bring the opportunity of new business and more public transit to pre-existing neighbourhoods.	10/15/2020 9:11 AM
83	Which builder and city councillor put this together?	10/15/2020 8:48 AM
84	I answer unsure to all these questions because there are too many unknowns, and the answers could vary significantly between mature neighborhoods. Some neighborhoods do not	10/15/2020 6:50 AM

	need any "improvement" on certain points, they are already optimal for human welfare. But most of this will ultimately depend on case-by-case specifics and city enforcement of the guidelines.	
85	Apply guidelines to new developments and leave existing neighbourhoods alone.	10/14/2020 11:18 PM
86	How would steps outlined in these design guidelines maximize walkability?	10/14/2020 7:55 PM
87	Unless better sidewalks are planned into the design, it won't help much. The road along Egerton is used a lot for walking and biking but sees quite a bit of traffic, especially by drivers trying to avoid the stop signs on Des Meurons. There are no sidewalks at all in some sections along Youville which is dangerous. Please fix that as one of many examples.	10/14/2020 5:58 PM
88	I am very negative on the way that this infrastructure is taking place in my neighbourhood. I am not against infill but the way it is happening is not my idea of keeping or making the neighbourhood better, quite the opposite.	10/14/2020 4:30 PM
89	Follow-up inspections of all builds to ensure guidelines are followed and enforced	10/14/2020 4:03 PM
90	Consider infill housing as a design and compatibility issue rather than a densification issue. Housing cannot solve Transit issues, better Transit planning can.	10/14/2020 2:59 PM
91	I have answered not likely to acheive the goals because many of the goals are the problem plus enforcing them probably won't happen	10/14/2020 1:17 PM
92	already answered	10/14/2020 12:44 PM
93	Respecting and enhancing the CHARACTER of existing neighbourhoods through COMPATIBLE development (the last fill-in question above) should be paramount.	10/14/2020 10:49 AM
94	Respect the existing homeowners. If a large sun blocker goes up beside you then the effected party deserves a large tax break.	10/14/2020 9:12 AM
95	A single family home should be replaced by a single family home.	10/14/2020 9:10 AM
96	There should be a requirement to consult with and consider input from neighbours. I'm not opposed to infill, per se, but am concerned about builders maximizing profit with no regard for the effects on neighbours. They have done a lot to damage trust throughout the city by building in inconsiderate ways. They may not wish to consult with neighbours, but infill would go much more smoothly if they did.	10/14/2020 8:57 AM
97	In all cases, priority should be given to the rehabilitation and renovation of existing structures. If infill was permitted only in cases where the new construction matched nearby existing homes in size, style, exterior materials, and lot footprint, there would be much less resistance to new infill in existing neighbourhoods.	10/13/2020 10:35 PM
98	guidelines will probably be ignored or more studies for another 20 years	10/13/2020 10:25 PM
99	They are far too conservative and aimed at making sure existing neighbourhoods do not transform. The result will be more slow growth, incremental development that will be out paced by an aging population in mature communities and an aging housing stock that cannot compete with greenfield amenities and prices per square foot. Nothing about these guidelines are visionary. The idea that anyone who wrote these can use the phrase “building up instead of out” when you are decreasing allowable site coverage and building heights from the current zoning allowances deserves sober second thought. This is going to turn into such a prescriptive, grey area filled process that these guidelines might actually negatively impact infill development further. The guidelines were not written to enhance, build up, or expand existing areas. They were designed to keep them uniformly the same in all facets of height, context and built form.	10/13/2020 9:05 PM
100	Should set limitations on the percentage of properties in a given area/street that can be split for any property development to minimize the impact to existing properties and residents. More evenly distributing the influx of new residents/builds around the areas in question so as not to have certain streets in a constant state of disrepair due to continuous new construction.	10/13/2020 8:40 PM
101	Just make sure the contractors abide by the rules and build sound homes.	10/13/2020 8:23 PM
102	Ultimately, these guidelines only work if the planning and permitting process sticks to them in a firm way - variances from these guidelines should be the extreme exception, rather than the norm. I also think that there are a number of factors outside of this policy that may affect it,	10/13/2020 4:37 PM

	such as people purchasing the new units as investment properties, without actually living in them, or people purchasing them to use as short-term rental properties. This needs to be complemented by appropriate bylaws and property tax rules designed to minimize either of the above scenarios since neither contributes to the development and maintenance of stable communities. I also would like to see the city develop neighbourhood specific guidelines that make it easier for developers to stay in alignment with the character of the neighbourhood and help minimize conflict with existing residents. Similarly, if population density increased significantly in an existing area, it would be good to see a coordinated strategy related to active transportation or transit infrastructure so that existing residents would not suddenly become underserved.	
103	by maintaining the character of the existing neighbourhood and stringently enforcing guidelines for developers.	10/13/2020 4:24 PM
104	Stop ripping down homes that are in good condition to build 4 and 6 plexes on lots that should only be single or duplexes. Don't get "fancy" with rooflines make them similar to the rest of the community. Make sure that these infill homes have green space around them would help as well	10/13/2020 2:58 PM
105	The city will just ignore the guidelines. City hall always puts developers profits first.	10/13/2020 2:31 PM
106	If I knew what they were, I'd tell you.	10/13/2020 12:19 PM
107	Start all over as it has failed miserably.	10/13/2020 11:43 AM
108	Look at the the houses on the street & the immediate neighbors property to ensure that the property value will not be affected before approving the design of the build. Mature areas are owned by long term residents that purchase because of the beauty of the neighborhood.	10/13/2020 9:04 AM
109	Have the right people doing the job that look at the bigger picture. If you want to increase density than you have to be able to develop all areas of the city. This includes older areas with mature neighborhoods. The city will only benefit from lot splitting and building houses on for tax revenue.	10/12/2020 10:03 PM
110	Need a shift in the direction of more infill ….	10/12/2020 7:22 PM
111	No upper decks...it is a total invasion of privacy! No variances for any of the guidelines you put into place! It is sickening how the city grants these variances and break bylaws by doing it.They dont care about current homeowners only about the revenue their department can generate for the city.Meanwhile current home owners quality of life is totally jeporized from costs incurred to mental health!	10/12/2020 7:02 PM
112	Make it easier to build multi-family homes across Winnipeg's mature communities. Encourage building up rather than out to keep our city from sprawling -- this is both an environmental issue and a tax sustainability issue. These technical standards if followed to the letter require professional developers to build instead of ordinary neighbours, the latter whom are much preferable builders since they actually care about the place they will live. These guidelines make it hard for homeowners to renovate their properties & add suites. These guidelines entrench the status quo. Flexible zoning is what is needed to make resilient cities for future flourishing.	10/12/2020 4:05 PM
113	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	10/12/2020 9:24 AM
114	These guidelines are subject to interpretation - what is "progress" to one is "destruction" to another. More transparency in who is getting the contracts, what the sales prices are, etc, would ensure that there truly is proper mixed housing and not just the luxury monstrosities that eat up the land. We need way more humanity and way more creativity - more exploration of what is being done in cities that are balanced.	10/11/2020 9:14 PM
115	Make the guidelines enforceable - change guideline wording from "should" and "consider" to "must" and "will". Using words such as "consider" allows the topic to be noted as being addressed, but not does not give the City any ability to enforce it.	10/11/2020 8:46 PM
116	Ensure contractors are following health and safety policies.	10/11/2020 3:38 PM
117	By not building them	10/11/2020 3:26 PM
118	Make it more readable. The contrast on the PDF is poor, the font is small, the text is dense and filled with jargon. My feeling is that this has been intentionally done to discourage the	10/11/2020 12:04 PM

	public from engaging with it or providing feedback.	
119	By allowing a more diverse group of people to be able to purchase these homes. Affordability and accessibility	10/11/2020 12:04 PM
120	We need more density but more important, we need more green space.	10/11/2020 11:20 AM
121	infill houses are terrible for mature areas. They are too large, too close to property lines, look out of place, create too much traffic, remove all the mature trees and are replaced with smaller ones, construction traffic destroys roads, and destroy the character of mature areas.	10/10/2020 4:04 PM
122	just don't do it	10/10/2020 8:52 AM
123	Allowing more freedom to home builders. Why should landscaping be a factor when it isn't for existing homes. If there are too many rules to build I wouldnt personally want to move into an older community.	10/10/2020 8:36 AM
124	Do not intrude neighborhoods with these builds No one wants them except greedy landlords/ developers. They don’t care about our neighborhoods	10/10/2020 7:55 AM
125	I think many of these goals are misguided and are things that, if achieved, are likely to be detrimental to the quality of life in these neighbourhoods. For example, the "all life stages" goal: does 80 year old granny really want to live next door to 18 year old Marlon Brando and his Harley? The "residential density" goal: just another way of saying knock down one nice house to build two or four cheap ones that will probably be occupied by people from a lower socio economic background than that of the existing residents. This will inevitably cause problems.	10/9/2020 11:23 PM
126	No lot splitting	10/9/2020 6:51 PM
127	listen to existing neighborsw	10/9/2020 2:52 PM
128	If one of the guideline goals is to increase population to support neigbhourhood school, then homes being build must include a green space for children. filling every square inch of a lot doesn't lend to the livability of a neigbourhood. Look to some of the older apartments in Cresentwood area, they include a green space/court yard in the front of their buildings	10/9/2020 2:22 PM
129	Steep fines for contractors/developers who do not adhere to these goals throughout the entire build with frequent inspections.	10/9/2020 11:51 AM
130	Maybe by using some of the suggestions from residents that are already having to live with the in fill situations.	10/9/2020 11:16 AM
131	They should should not allow mixed housing in single family neighborhood.	10/9/2020 9:09 AM
132	Have more clear recommendations with actual tangible measurements and outcomes	10/8/2020 9:12 PM
133	Take a look at other older areas....downtown...bring people downtown	10/8/2020 8:08 PM
134	This practice should be curtailed until a more appropriate plan is in place to make Winnipeg a city with more History and Character, not Less.	10/8/2020 3:00 PM
135	As I've said, if we need to grow, and make Winnipeg a great place to live and visit.. improvements to all the roads... I have lived in my house here in wig for 15 years, my taxes went from 1600.00 to 3200.00... but my street has seen about 5 shovels of filler, and kildare say a few meters a few years ago. DEFINITLY, make improvements to the city roads everywhere.. make sure you keep people honest... making improvements that will make us all proud.. remember the senior generation needs the business area available to get to.. etc. Don't mix single fam homes with big pieces... clean up the waterfront... Travelling with Hand transit, means you are out for 3 tom4 hours for a half hr. Appointment.. not enough drivers. Taxi cost 30 to 40 dollars to go to HSC... If your committee consists of well to do people, with nice houses and no huge complexes beside them, and saving a dollar for the city by making life hard for the rest of us....they should replace themselves... see , are you sorry you asked.. Jean	10/8/2020 2:56 PM
136	NO!!!!! stop lot splitting, you are ruining neighbourhoods.!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	10/8/2020 2:12 PM
137	Respect the old neighborhoods by not allowing commercial developers to build the cheapest fastest duplex and multi family residences and the middle of the street which loose their value after every single tenant change and depreciate the value of the entire community	10/8/2020 2:03 PM

138	Contractors need to be accountable for damage to adjacent properties when building.	10/8/2020 11:10 AM
139	Listen to what the home owners in existing neighborhoods are saying. Maybe ask them outright: "Would you like a 4 plex next door?" Maybe see what happen if you try this proposal in Tuxedo or Linden Woods. I suspect you would meet insurmountable resistance.	10/8/2020 10:14 AM
140	Maintain the neighborhood architecture.	10/8/2020 8:47 AM
141	Work with new home builders and make sure they are on the same page as the new guidelines. Some builders (i.e. paragon design build) are simply building the same homes at an incredibly fast rate and they are extremely tall and all are the same.	10/7/2020 7:57 PM
142	Moving to more restrictive infill requirements will reduce the amount of infill.	10/7/2020 6:10 PM
143	Schools are already overpopulated, how does increasing density factor in as a good thing? Have a closer look at infrastructure capacity in terms of street safety, increased parking needs of multiple houses on a previous one house property. Decreases street safety due to increased traffic and parking blind spots. No consideration of where children would play in the developed property as not much outside left.	10/7/2020 3:05 PM
144	As I have already stated, there should be no split lots greater than two units (with a second suite) and only on corner lots or oversized lots for the specific street. Lanes should be improved to accommodate the increase in traffic. Lanes are poorly maintained as is and the increase in traffic will make their condition worse.	10/7/2020 12:21 PM
145	Stop infill housing. Stop lot splitting.	10/6/2020 9:46 PM
146	They should not be built in our neighbourhoods.	10/6/2020 6:01 PM
147	Stop lot splitting and packIng us in like sardines More inspections on these builds more accountability and listening to the people who's lives you affect	10/6/2020 4:03 PM
148	1.Allow for the development of flexible guidelines for specific unique neighbourhoods: consider allowing neighbourhoods to develop secondary plans when the infill guidelines are way out of whack for that neighbourhood. 2. more focus on ALL forms of infill - including secondary suites, garden suites, semi-detached etc. In informal discussions, many people in our neighbourhood are convinced the City plans to hand the keys to developers and we will have poorly constructed, cheap duplexes on lots 1/2 the size of current lots. I don't think it has to be bad infill - but we need more community buy in to develop the rules to fit here. Do you have any examples of top notch infill on streets with one sided river property? Please share those examples, as the only ones people here have seen have been hotly contested by the people who live in those neighbourhoods (i.e. Glenwood) 3. Place more focus on impact of tree canopy destruction -- especially in neighbourhoods that have been working hard to re-forest. There will be immense opposition to any developer (actually home owners too) who wish to chop down heritage elm and oak trees that are hundreds of years old. 4. Invest in proper consultation neighbourhood by neighbourhood - like they have done in Edmonton: Slow it down to allow for proper input from neighbourhoods. It feels like we are just learning about the infill guidelines (nobody I know had any involvement from workshops or one of the 5 public events from a year ago. Reading the summary of those recommendations, it is clear that participants said neighbourhoods needed the opportunity to develop Secondary Plans. So is this off the table? Can we develop one for our neighbourhood? The decisions being made will apply for another generation, and I don't think they are robust enough, nor is the community buy-in in place to move anything forward. It is a shame that a more robust community consultation was not possible here -- since I think that many residents in neighbourhoods will be throwing the baby out with the bathwater and simply oppose all infill, rather than being part of developing a neighbourhood specific infill plan that promotes regeneration, increases housing options, reduces urban sprawl, and supports vibrant growth in a neighbourhood. Please allow for engaged citizens to actually engage. Too bad all the in-person meetings had to be cancelled but of course I understand why. 5. do an inventory of the existing infrastructure that is actually required to support more housing, and determine what those minimums must be... i.e. electrical grid, road conditions of Main Street and back lanes, water and sewer, flood risk, traffic, lack of sidewalks etc. On all points, our neighbourhood has comparatively poor access. So much of the infrastructure will have to be fixed in order to support serious infill. (Our power goes out for 1-3 hours every few weeks, and sometimes it goes out for days, as it is still above ground, and suspectible to failure every time it rains or there is wind.)	10/6/2020 3:47 PM
149	First, do a test-run in an area like Tuxedo and see how that works out.	10/6/2020 3:09 PM

150	Management of the proposed guidelines would be required to ensure developers adhere to them. I've watched asphalt being poured on neighbouring properties without consent as well plans that dictate specific items that were not undertaken.	10/6/2020 2:45 PM
151	many questions with no answers really to help me formulate an informed opinion until I get the answers Too case by case which will create more uncertainty than clarity and not serve what these guidelines were set out and intended to do simplify them and be bolder in renewing older neighbourhoods so they do not age in place and deteriorate and see house value depreciation as has happened before and will happen now and in future	10/6/2020 7:56 AM
152	Unsure	10/5/2020 6:15 PM
153	Respect the rights of single family units who chose to live in a neighborhood of single family units.	10/5/2020 1:55 PM
154	Don`t bother with it. It ain`t broke...	10/5/2020 12:34 PM
155	After guidelines are in, residents should not be allowed to appeal development as long as the developers are following the rules set out.	10/5/2020 12:33 PM
156	The physical renewal and revitalization of older neighbourhoods, should not be at the cost of existing properties. More needs to be done by the City to protect adjacent structures and their property value. Densification of mature neighbourhoods does not lead to less cars and therefore a support of transit and walkability. The current bylaw is 0.8 cars per unit in mature neighbourhoods, and that is not based on recent research but rather outdated information. Respect and enhancement of existing neighbourhoods cannot come without the involvement of those it is set up to serve. More needs to be done in speaking directly to property owners who live next to infill developments in order to better understand not just the benefits, but also the inherent costs of infill developments.	10/5/2020 12:21 PM
157	Include community and neighborhood approval as an essential component of the approval process. Force developers to obtain petitions of support for projects from the neighbors before projects can proceed.	10/5/2020 11:20 AM
158	Reduce the restrictions.	10/5/2020 9:50 AM
159	See comments on first question	10/4/2020 10:47 PM
160	See my previous comments.	10/4/2020 9:57 PM
161	It is essential for these rules to be embedded in a greater planning framework. It is also essential for an effective and meaningful public consultation process and appeals process to take place. Infill for infill's sake is not enough. It can be done badly or well. To date, there are some good examples but many real stinkers.	10/4/2020 8:43 PM
162	There needs to be enforcement of these guidelines. Do not allow Builders to circumvent the system	10/4/2020 4:12 PM
163	A high threshold to allow variances from these guidelines. Follow up to ensure compliance beyond initial building permit issuance (i.e. Did the developer maintain adherence to guidelines after occupancy permit granted? After 2 years? After 5 years?)	10/4/2020 1:33 PM
164	remember that Winnipeg has winter most of the year and adding housing will these neighbourhoods will have an impact on snow dumping in the back lanes	10/4/2020 1:21 PM
165	The focus on "the character of existing neighbourhoods" runs contrary to the other goals articulated in these proposed guidelines. Winnipeg has geographically expanded at an unsustainable rate, and the city must encourage intensification in mature neighbourhoods. This will increase the municipal tax base, encourage the use of active and public transportation, and it will make more efficient use of existing municipal infrastructure. By creating unnecessary aesthetic and design restrictions, the city is impeding the natural processes of neighbourhood change in order to protect unsustainable forms of city living. In this time of climate crisis, preserving single family homes (and the carbon-intensive lifestyle they facilitate) under the guise of "neighbourhood character" is simply unacceptable.	10/4/2020 10:23 AM
166	My answers to the above are for Kingston Crescent. Our community must continue as single family with lot splitting not to be permitted.	10/4/2020 9:53 AM
167	The guidelines reference 2 previous planning documents for the city. Not sure if these are updated on a regular basis or where this infill document fits within the priority of the 3	10/3/2020 10:16 PM

	documents. The guidelines contain information overload. Need executive summary or formatted in a way where the information pertains to my immediate location. My priority is my street and surrounding area (2-3 blocks) not an area 2-3 km away. You did mention protected areas such as the Armstrong Point. Is this an option to control development?	
168	Maintain neighborhoods of single family homes as these neighborhoods were not designed for multi-unit buildings, and there are many existing older homes that are being torn down instead of owners having to maintain, restore and renovate older homes.	10/3/2020 8:04 PM
169	Ensure new homes fits mature neighbourhoods style	10/3/2020 8:02 PM
170	Infill homes cannot tower over existing homes and take up the whole lot	10/3/2020 7:33 PM
171	Shelve the project.	10/3/2020 7:27 PM
172	Force developers to actually construct structures that integrate into the existing neighbourhoods. Place value on green space. Place value on current residents/taxpayers in these Winnipeg neighbourhoods.	10/3/2020 2:17 PM
173	I would favour criteria that will increase densification and promote a mix of contemporary and traditional housing. I believe that architects should be engaged by builders to improve aesthetics.	10/3/2020 1:11 PM
174	More inspections	10/3/2020 11:42 AM
175	Ensure developers can’t get around the system!!!	10/3/2020 11:13 AM
176	Require contractors to submit an area evaluation along with proposal to ensure the project fits within the new guidelines.	10/3/2020 11:07 AM
177	The City must add needed resources to support appropriate review to these processes.	10/3/2020 10:59 AM
178	They need to take a more wholistic approach. Reduced speed limits in and around schools and play grounds need to be in place year-round 24/7. This will create better understanding and help form good habits. More sidewalks are needed and people need to begin helping clear snow as is done in other winter cities around the globe. More use of traffic enforcement technologies need to be used, stop looking at U. S. companies to support them and bring it in house to allow for a more nimble application. More BRT routes need to be put in place. Stop having so many public consultations. Our electic officials and city staff need to have the courage to not be so concerned with the vocal minority. Change the rules for public transit making it safer for people to use. Don't rely on operators to enforce rules, use outside enforcement officials to randomly go on and off the buses to help get rid of the concept where people refer to transit as the loser cruiser. make it useable by everyone like they do in other cities like Toronto, Ottawa, Calgary etc. Be tough on landscaping. Stop using grasses that need a lot of watering and care. Lets put in trees, gravel, local flora (Manitoba clover), etc. Include active transportation for bike and walking pathways. Continue to make use of accessible pedestrian signals and start using yellow detectable warning surfaces properly. Although I am not a fan of public consultations, ask the people who use them, not people from organizations who are buddies with city staff. Have the currage to stand up to big developers who bully us into urban sprawl.	10/3/2020 10:53 AM
179	Lots should not be allowed to be split into smaller lots uncharacteristic of the existing neighbourhood. For example, In a neighbourhood where the smallest existing lot size is 50', a 75' lot could NOT be split in half, but two adjacent 75' lots COULD be split into three 50' lots. New buildings could not exceed the mass and height of buildings immediately adjacent.	10/3/2020 10:26 AM
180	I don't agree with most of these guidelines. Unless the neighbourhood is deteriorating, there is no need to change it. These guidleines seem to exist only to allow developers to make money.	10/3/2020 9:37 AM
181	Not integrate at all	10/3/2020 9:29 AM
182	no change	10/3/2020 8:23 AM
183	Stricter rules against contractors/companies to protect surrounding properties from damage due to demolition and construction.	10/3/2020 8:06 AM
184	Ensuring that if put in place, city staff at PP&D are strongly adhering to them.	10/3/2020 7:01 AM
185	Looking at all options for housing including smaller homes=more space for parking.	10/3/2020 12:51 AM

186	Need to give consideration to economic impacts of what is being proposed. Take lesson from the impact fees that were rushed to be introduced without properly consulting with home building community first.	10/2/2020 10:11 PM
187	Less rules. If having "character" is the driving force for our decision making at the cost of increasing density, then mission accomplished. Low renewal rates of the housing stock leads to uniformally impoverished neighbourhoods that decrease in value year over year.	10/2/2020 3:54 PM
188	DOn't do it! not for area 1 If we don't have busses and grocery stores and gas stations - then why would more hoses be crammed in Area 1 neighbourhoods. There are so many house developments around Winnipeg. Why destroy existing established neighbourhoods to get more houses in?Narrow thinking. Surely we can think out of the box!	10/2/2020 3:11 PM
189	Immediate implementation of guidelines. Their is always time to tweak after. You will never get back the mature neighborhoods once they are gone.	10/2/2020 3:07 PM
190	Take all these infill ideas and apply them downtown, Tuxedo or Wolseley areas.	10/2/2020 2:35 PM
191	The City should listen to the people on the street that is affected by these houses	10/2/2020 2:09 PM
192	Illustrations to show what you're describing.	10/2/2020 11:52 AM
193	stop splitting 50 foot lots	10/2/2020 10:21 AM
194	Allow for maximum greenspace. Survey neighbourhood residents. Owners/developers should live in the area in which they are building.	10/1/2020 5:16 PM
195	reduce the technicalities. streamline the process, make it easier for a young couple that wants to buy a home and build a new one on their lot not just have developers capable of doing it.	10/1/2020 4:43 PM
196	Focus on larger blocks of apartments close to major bus routes. Apartments with good green space, modern structure and amenities.	10/1/2020 4:43 PM
197	simplicity	10/1/2020 4:12 PM
198	There don't seem to be guidelines in place to preserve the safety of the closer buildings, nor the privacy and freedom to enjoy the backyards, by existing home owners. Are there enough firehalls/safety support systems in the city, in these areas, to accommodate these increases and more at risk multiple home dwellings in the more dense neighbourhoods?	10/1/2020 3:35 PM
199	Locate housing near community clubs that are operating and not shut down or near shut down. Respect the character of the neighborhood .	10/1/2020 1:50 PM
200	currently the size of the homes are huge compared to lot size and surrounding areas, i feel like these potentially could make the houses fit in more.	10/1/2020 1:24 PM
201	nothing	10/1/2020 11:50 AM
202	These guidelines do not hold landowners or developers accountable for providing low income housing	10/1/2020 11:14 AM
203	We all know this is about generating tax dollars through property taxes.	10/1/2020 6:31 AM
204	Unless the plan is clear on height, design principles, zoning, infill enforcement and financial penalties. As well as a surety requirement when a permit is issued for damages to existing and old infrastructure. It will be the same old circus, where the contractors are running the PPD and residents are not heard at all.	9/30/2020 11:07 PM
205	I think the planners need to look at a much larger view of the city and review what their plans will do to neighbourhoods when you increase traffic. Winnipeg is a car town, that hasn't changed in 40 years, consistent sidewalks are a challenge when you go shopping from one development to another, developers haven't talked to each other, they expect people to just drive in.	9/30/2020 8:23 PM
206	I do believe guideline are necessary but I would hope that the infill program is meant to retain single dwelling homes on the lot. This program sounds more interested in ensuring developers can buy up a number of lots and build multi-unit buildings where single dwelling homes existed. I can't see too many people living next to these being very happy.	9/30/2020 3:47 PM
207	Only single family housing	9/30/2020 2:58 PM

208	I believe the guidelines in place where sufficient, the neighbourhood livability plan regarding infill housing was adequate.	9/30/2020 12:58 PM
209	treat mature areas with respect.	9/30/2020 8:35 AM
210	Need to be cognizant of cost of lot, including demolition and asbestos abatement and the ability of a builder to put a new home on that lot that allows for a profitable build, that still fits the neighborhood.	9/29/2020 11:39 PM
211	Institute a roof-pitch and window-coverage requirement for single-family and duplex buildings - because flat roofs and windowless walls bring a much more commercial character to the neighbourhood	9/29/2020 5:47 PM
212	There should be no lot splitting and infills should be limited to single family homes to help with homes that are reaching the end of their life cycle. For more housing options, and diversity in types of housing available, developers should build in new developments or outside the city.	9/29/2020 4:09 PM
213	Mandate personal outdoor space on buildings with more than 2 units. anything over 3 units should include parking on site for all units	9/29/2020 3:36 PM
214	Walkability requires changes in the roads and paths; drop local speed limits, reduce cut-through traffic, improve crossings at arterial and connector roads, provide pedestrian/cyclist short cuts. There has to be a fundamental change to development to achieve compatible development; Now, a developer buying a neighbouring lot is a worst case bad neighbour; they are there to exploit the land, not to make the neighbourhood better; the more they build on the lot, the bigger the sale, a house that presents well is their goal, not a house that will suit the neighbourhood in the long run. They will build, sell and leave the new owner to sort things out. If they have to plant one tree, they will plant one tree, regardless of how many trees they have cut down or damaged with their machinery. This is what is going on now, that has upset many residents in some neighbourhoods. When the city approves -- or encourages -- this kind of development, it builds resentment toward the city and the local councillor. Great cities and great neighbourhoods have much stronger aesthetic and compatibility standards; These guidelines will not result in developers respecting and enhancing the character of existing neighbourhoods... they will do as little as they have to do to modify what they have been doing, because that is the business they understand. Without changing the fundamental model that is causing the resentment, you won't change the result. Can't set up city-wide rules in a city with such diverse neighbourhoods; you will have to do neighbourhood plans.	9/29/2020 2:08 PM
215	Completely changing an established area from one classification of dwellings to a completely different and opposite classification, is shameful and harmful to all of the current landowners in said established area.	9/29/2020 1:38 PM
216	Ensure tallness of structure doesn't ruin people's sun-hitting spaces.	9/29/2020 9:49 AM
217	The city is focusing on the wrong priorities - we need to densify and build better. Passive House is a verified method to drastically reduce carbon emissions but it is severely limited by the lot setbacks, single unit zoning, incentives for lot splitting and restricted land ownership - only a few giant developers have access to new developments.	9/29/2020 8:40 AM
218	Number one, actually listen to the residents of these neighborhoods. You have done similar surveys countless times yet nothing changes! Number two, enforcement. Hold builders accountable. If they break a single infill guideline make them tear it down and stop approving their variances! Set some boundaries with builders who go knocking on doors offering people less than fair market value to sell their property during a world crisis. Shame on them.	9/28/2020 9:59 PM
219	- Make sure there is enough parking for the new developments. - zmaller lots and smaller houses equals sinfle or childless couples. Once they have children they will move out of the area to bigger houses or houses with yards. Therefore density goals are not achieved and schools become less full because families don't stay in the area	9/28/2020 6:47 PM
220	This question has been answered by above selections.	9/28/2020 1:11 PM
221	Listen to people and take their concerns seriously. When 26 complaints are connected to one developement (90pilgrim) and the appeal is still denied, the residents concerns are not being heard.	9/28/2020 8:33 AM
222	Tearing down older, affordable houses and replacing with new does not make housing accessible to all income levels. New home buyers should be able to access older, smaller, less expensive houses.	9/28/2020 8:29 AM

223	Need to keep in mind each unique neighbourhood and what made them unique in the first place and don't ruin it by infill	9/28/2020 12:38 AM
224	I think the guidelines need to be much less restrictive, particularly on lot coverage. The requirements also increase opportunities to access multi-family homes in ALL mature communities and should NOT leave Area 1 neighbourhoods off the hook for providing more homes.	9/28/2020 12:05 AM
225	They should recommend removal of parking requirements. They should enable four storeys at all corner lots. They should recommend no unit limits - regulate built form not density. They are not permissive enough to support population growth.	9/27/2020 11:05 PM
226	Encourage builders to renovate existing character homes instead of only building new homes.	9/27/2020 8:18 PM
227	listen to homeowners who have to live with these things	9/27/2020 2:38 PM
228	affordability not mentioned	9/27/2020 2:27 PM
229	Do not allow lots to be sub-divided.	9/27/2020 2:16 PM
230	No lot splitting; no multi-dwelling units in Area 1 neighbourhoods.	9/27/2020 9:55 AM
231	In recent years there has been an upswing of female home buyers looking for affordable houses in safe spaces. Reassessing safety is important. Improved safety could include adding more police to patrol neighbourhoods; creating and or supporting safe watch community groups; or adding more speed bumps to control traffic; and create spaces, parks, landscaping with benches. Instead of car-centric think people centric. Unfortunately the biggest problem with housing is the need to address and tackle poverty and crime and reestablish pride in young people and broken families most especially the indigenous.	9/26/2020 8:15 PM
232	Listen to the residents! Take into account their own research and conditions. Once you have proper guidelines, ENFORCE THEM! Do NOT allow money hungry developers to line the pockets of Council and government in order to further their own goals to the detriment of the neighbourhood.	9/26/2020 4:38 PM
233	Diversity of housing types in all neighbourhoods is unlikely. Low density residential neighbourhoods are typically extremely resistant to adding density. Better information and education about proposed development should be provided to neighbourhoods, and incentives for accepting it where appropriate. Do not be specific about architectural forms required when building infill. Faux-edwardian, colonial motifs, etc. are difficult to realise well, architecturally, and can detract from the visual appeal of a neighbourhood.	9/26/2020 3:24 PM
234	Do not allow any multi units besides a duplex. They DO NOT fit in the neighborhoods	9/26/2020 11:16 AM
235	I think these guidelines are designed to lower quality of life in working class and poorer neighbourhoods by increasing density and reducing greenspace. Meanwhile increased tax revenue will be funnelled to richer areas.	9/25/2020 6:31 PM
236	Stop trying to cram as many houses together in an area just to make money. Take into account the increasing loss of green spaces, which are important not only to the enjoyment of people, but also the environment.	9/25/2020 2:45 PM
237	Some of the above questions are loaded. For example, the last question suggests compatible develop will be achieved - I have seen little evidence that the "guidelines" and criteria will result in compatible development.	9/25/2020 1:02 PM
238	Less limitations to density, does not contemplate eradicating parking minimums	9/25/2020 9:38 AM
239	(i) don't allow developers to write them for you. (ii) enforce them.	9/25/2020 8:45 AM
240	Give residents preferances more weight than developers	9/25/2020 8:36 AM
241	Single family neighbourhoods should stay the way they are, I don't see benefits in the above goals	9/25/2020 1:21 AM
242	I don't think multiple family homes should be in quiet residential neighbourhoods	9/24/2020 8:48 PM
243	Residents of mature neighbourhoods were never consulted on the whole IDEA and now it is presented like a done deal, we are allowed to move the chairs around the deck on the titanic and that's it. This is a terrible process of imposing from the top down onto taxpayers.	9/24/2020 7:41 PM

244	not likely, it has be legislated.	9/24/2020 7:16 PM
245	Consider the context of each site and neighbourhood instead of "clear cutting" and "plopping" off the shelf plans on to the sites	9/24/2020 4:12 PM
246	The guidelines are fine as long as they are followed.	9/24/2020 12:49 PM
247	There should be increased and continual monitoring of how many infill houses are being constructed in a mature area and compliance with codes, such as ensuring that there will be landscaping and planting of trees. Too many infill houses within a mature neighbourhood will destroy the character of the area.	9/24/2020 10:24 AM
248	I think the proposed guidelines are well-thought out.	9/24/2020 9:53 AM
249	These are not so much bad changes as hopelessly inadequate ones. They reflect a political pandering to NIMBY desire to perpetuate a status quo that is financially and environmentally unsustainable. Other cities are doing better. We can do better. The best cities in the world are filled with walk up apartments mixed with small islands of single family dwellings. Our density per hectare is completely absurd in any comparison across time or cultures.	9/24/2020 9:47 AM
250	need to take a step back and ensure that these are not just suggested guidelines for the developers to follow. do not allow for variances and ensure better oversight and inspection of developers who are building these ugly cookie cutter homes. EVERY area of the CIty should be included in this including Tuxedo.	9/24/2020 9:26 AM
251	plan for future not just pack buildings onto lots.	9/24/2020 9:05 AM
252	Go and look at the area and the existing structures, needs to be more of an individual decision. Be more upfront with the designs of the newer structure when posting signs in neighbourhoods	9/24/2020 8:52 AM
253	It won't work unless there's citizen/neighborhood oversight and approval. At this point, there's no confidence in the developers or the civic leaders who've enabled them to do what they've already done. It's depressing.	9/24/2020 7:44 AM
254	I think they look good.	9/23/2020 9:53 PM
255	I think if these guideline are to be effective there needs to be enforcement and real adhere to them. It's a good step I'm just concerned it will be there and not followed...	9/23/2020 9:27 PM
256	I think that the guidelines are a good start but need to be followed through and developers need to follow them. I also think communities need to be have the opportunity to be consulted and shown the plans. I think the guidelines strongly need to consider the impact to existing infrastructure and parking. These guidelines also need to address the impact on the natural environment such as old growth trees	9/23/2020 9:11 PM
257	Mature neighborhoods need some support to review infrastructure (roads, water lines etc.) to address the increased density.	9/23/2020 8:42 PM
258	Be strict with developers on what is required.	9/23/2020 8:38 PM
259	More townhouses. More density. This proposal is barely a baby step forward.	9/23/2020 8:27 PM
260	Again, if you increase density, fine. However you must also increase safe, beautiful green space in a walk-able distance.	9/23/2020 8:23 PM
261	Large scale four unit and multi-unit residences should be restricted to large lots and main corridors. St. Boniface lots are smaller in scale and can't adequately accomodate three and four unit housing types. That is the reason there is always community opposition. Infill for increased residential density should only be permitted in large scale and corner lots. They should not be squeezed into existing lots or split lots. Infill needs to consider gravel lanes, garbage and recycling requirements and snow clearing. Design standards should also consider neighbourhood context. There should be equal greenspace for new developments as for existing residential units - e.g. backyards and front yards	9/23/2020 6:59 PM
262	They need to be much stricter. The guidelines suggest these homes to be of better quality but there is nothing specific. Most homes infill homes in my area of the city are ugly, cheaply made homes which are an eyesore and reduce surrounding property values significantly.	9/23/2020 6:39 PM
263	They should be RULES, enforceable, punishable by having the structure demolished if the RULES are broken, not guidelines as guidelines are being broken constantly	9/23/2020 6:38 PM

264	no infill housing at all.	9/23/2020 6:21 PM
265	Zoning application process should still include public consultation instead of automatic lot splitting- that way character of the neighborhood can truly be take. Into consideration	9/23/2020 5:57 PM
266	Flow the guidelines that were already there and quit ruining g the city	9/23/2020 5:47 PM
267	These guidelines should primarily focus on improving the lives of Winnipeggers and not enhancing developers' profits.	9/23/2020 5:28 PM
268	Simple - replace what was there with same!	9/23/2020 4:39 PM
269	Already responded	9/23/2020 4:36 PM
270	Somehow create a fail-safe so that builders don't build first and ask for forgiveness later, leaving the neighbourhood with poorly built / repetitious house designs. It is still unclear how enforceable these guidelines are.	9/23/2020 4:20 PM
271	Make exceptions for Historically significant areas (e.g, Heritage Conservation Districts), which have their own restrictions.	9/23/2020 4:16 PM
272	Your objectives are simply wrong. In reading the overly wordy and vague draft, my impression is that the City's intent is to increase population density regardless of the affect on existing homeowners and renting residents.	9/23/2020 3:55 PM
273	they can't	9/23/2020 3:49 PM
274	only allow in areas of already diverse housing	9/23/2020 2:16 PM
275	I think the 50% of city-wide growth target in mature neighbourhoods needs to be increased to 75%. The suburbs can grow more slowly. We'll be okay, I promise you. I think the neighbourhood placement restrictions of higher density buildings are too cautious. Look at how Wpg grew in the 1910's? There are old apartment blocks everywhere, and the city is better for it. More of that please.	9/23/2020 12:01 PM
276	Community Committees that have an overall plan and control of what is build in a neighborhood is needed. The goals to increase neighborhood density may be good for the City but may not be good for the residents that are living in that neighborhood.	9/23/2020 11:51 AM
277	Tree protection, think about how a building will affect neighboring properties (ex don't put a window looking directly into someone else's window), less stucco (doesn't match mature areas), increased density goes with increased parking, private properties need to account for this	9/23/2020 10:48 AM
278	Good as is.	9/23/2020 9:38 AM
279	There is nothing in this plan to support transit and walkability. If the city continues to put multi-plexes in existing neighbourhoods, it is just going to increase car traffic and parking demands.	9/23/2020 9:23 AM
280	if you mess with mature neighborhoods - the mature will leave and relocate where it wouldn't be allowed	9/23/2020 9:16 AM
281	need to limit the size and character/design of the property. needs to match adjacent properties.	9/23/2020 9:04 AM
282	How do you ensure safety and property Values will not be negatively impacted , more clarity on parking and traffic, need for green space, light And increased noise pollution	9/22/2020 8:06 PM
283	Not sure	9/22/2020 3:37 PM
284	-Prioritize sustainability by reusing and renovating existing housing so families want to move into these historic neighbourhoods. -Create affordable options that don't look cubist and modern. Stop giving developers free rein to jack up prices. -Create setbacks that allow old homes on either side to stay safe during rebuilds -Alert neighbours to all infill construction and prioritize their needs so they will stay in the neighbourhood. -Many families choose to leave River Heights because they want bigger homes or less construction--encourage these families to renovate and stay in place rather move to outlying suburbs -Pour money into infrastructure as it's failing in mature neighbourhoods (sewage, lead in soil, pipe repair, poorly maintained roads, etc.)	9/22/2020 2:34 PM
285	Several of the questions above are worded in ways that do not make sense. Is "diversity of housing options" different from "diversity of housing"? Why is "diversity of housing options" of	9/22/2020 1:59 PM

	any importance in a well-established, stable neighborhood? What is a "balanced mix of housing" and why is it desirable? Why would current residents/taxpayers in a stable, well-established neighborhood see it as necessary or desirable to "Distribute additional residential density amongst mature neighbourhoods."	
286	THESE GUIDELINES ARE A JOKE!!! THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS A JOKE!!!!! IT IS BIASED IN FAVOUR OF THE IDIOTS WHO CAME UP WITH THESE STUPID IDEAS!!!!!!!	9/22/2020 1:44 PM
287	You cannot have the city run by developers!	9/22/2020 1:44 PM
288	All neighborhoods should provide access to people who can only afford multi-family housing.	9/22/2020 11:47 AM
289	Need to be clear where development of two, three and four unit development will not be considered so it is clear for residents and developers when purchasing property.	9/22/2020 1:08 AM
290	Consider parking issues.	9/21/2020 6:52 PM
291	Quit picking on the mature neighborhoods! We are happy just the way we are! Look at your own neighborhood to make these kinds of changes, or start a new neighborhood.	9/21/2020 6:40 PM
292	I think if you are a middle income earner of most ages Winnipeg will continue to provide an affordable array of options for homeownership. I do think that the infill projects that are happening and continue to spring up sadly neglect renters of all incomes, seniors, and low income households. I am not sure how or if it is appropriate to have these guidelines for infill include rules for what I mentioned above however there is indeed a lack of leadership and set of guidelines provided by Winnipeg to renters, seniors, and low income households.	9/21/2020 5:44 PM
293	Halt more of the division of lots that split them in half of what the area had previously been. Eg .. do NOT allow a 50 ft wide lot to be split into two 25 ft lots.	9/21/2020 5:05 PM
294	Listen to the residents you are destroying the neighborhood.	9/21/2020 3:33 PM
295	Allow for GREENSPACE and for PARKING of at least two vehicles for each unit.	9/21/2020 2:54 PM
296	These guidelines don't have much to do with the above points. The guidelines in their current state are more focused on building geometry, size, and looks. The guidelines should now be rehashed to also include improved functionality - including much more specific rules regarding other social and environmental aspects, such as proximity to schools, proximity to workplaces, proximity to transit, proximity to highways, proximity to grocery and retail, proximity to existing municipal infrastructure, reduction of roadway use and pavement renewal costs, etc....	9/21/2020 2:51 PM
297	maximum heights in most categories should be lower	9/21/2020 2:24 PM
298	Make sure older neighborhoods have more than sufficient services like policing, shopping, green spaces, health facilities, programs to fix existing housing and buildings senior programs and care, etc before packing high density into the mix.	9/21/2020 12:10 PM
299	Guidelines will need reinforcement or incentive for them to be followed. Builders don't seem to have a lot of respect for their neighborhoods nor do they want to be part of the community	9/21/2020 11:46 AM
300	I think there needs to be stronger guidelines around tree replacement and landscaping.	9/21/2020 11:07 AM
301	I think the City of Winnipeg needs to be more flexible in their thinking and do what they can to help reduce regulation that prevents growth to the city.	9/21/2020 10:03 AM
302	If built near transit locations, general shopping then availability will be there for the people who move into the areas provided. As for families and increasing use and retention, it's not the new units with a lack of yard space/green space that will draw them in. It will be existing homes/mature homes that will do that. The new units will most likely feed the rental industry as the high price of the homes initially will be too much for certain income levels to meet.	9/21/2020 9:49 AM
303	you are just dumping low income / multi unit housing into existing long established neighbor hoods. Congesting roads and over burdening areas.	9/21/2020 8:48 AM
304	The infill should meet the character of the already existing neighbourhood and block	9/21/2020 8:31 AM
305	The guidelines offered, appear to take the process of infill to increase density as acceptable for mature communities. The community of River Heights, well known to this respondant would not be advantaged with density infill structures.	9/21/2020 12:24 AM

306	'the character of existing neighbourhoods' is effectively coded racist language that opposes the provision of housing to people of colour, recent immigrants, and Indigenous people. Eliminate 'character' as a concept.	9/20/2020 9:13 PM
307	Why not focus on neighbourhoods that want to achieve these goals. Some of us would prefer to keep the character and landscaping of the existing structures	9/20/2020 6:40 PM
308	The regs need to be tighter, properly respecting the neighbourhood.	9/20/2020 5:38 PM
309	must look at the density of homes on the street before approving lot splits, as most new development does not provide adequate parking on the lot	9/20/2020 4:29 PM
310	Plan approval should be based on the strict guidelines later than a political decision.	9/20/2020 3:37 PM
311	why don't we build more housing beside the blue line of the transitway to encourage more citizens to live closer to transit and use it. This city is pretty backwards compared to all others. If you build it they will come.	9/20/2020 2:04 PM
312	Provide an active involvement of any street/area residents when a new in fill application is made by a developer to ensure that only appropriate units are built.	9/20/2020 2:02 PM
313	Make sure that the city builds bike infrastructure near high density buildings. A lot of concern is that nature neighborhoods will be overrun with private vehicles but many people can get away with one or no cars if there’s reliable and freaken transit nearby and protected bike infrastructure	9/20/2020 1:44 PM
314	Maximizing walkability as well as bike access is a prime objective; the guidelines should set out how this will be done.	9/20/2020 1:34 PM
315	A key factor in the process and experience for existing residents is dealing with the builder/developer of a new home (where an owner is not yet identified). The guidelines need to be upheld, as in my experience, the builders will continue to look to exploit these for their own gains (to the detriment of the existing residents and neighbours).	9/20/2020 12:28 PM
316	By building outside of established neighborhoods.	9/20/2020 8:45 AM
317	Do not locate multi family apartments and townhouses in Area 1 neighbourhoods	9/20/2020 1:06 AM
318	Your attempt to include every possible senerio will never be of any use.	9/20/2020 12:48 AM
319	Make it easier to increase density in all neighbourhoods.	9/19/2020 10:56 PM
320	The guidelines you’ve established are straightforward. Exciting!	9/19/2020 10:33 PM
321	Loss of mature trees is still a concern to me. I would prefer to see a monetary value applied to mature trees similar to Toronto. It is very expensive to remove them there and this has been a disincentive to developers to remove them. I don't think your proposal goes far enough.	9/19/2020 7:44 PM
322	As mentioned the yard requirements are great. The height is discriminatory to people who choose to build new which is wrong and restricts market demand. Fascade and cladding is not something the city should be dictacting.	9/19/2020 7:03 PM
323	Focus on increased density everywhere.	9/19/2020 5:34 PM
324	Ensure developers follow guidelines. Currently they are causing damage to neighbouring homes and nothing being done. Also should ensure developers stick to plans proposed	9/19/2020 5:32 PM
325	- "Support transit and maximize walkability" has to be complemented with coherent active transport and public transit plans	9/19/2020 4:59 PM
326	Guidelines are only good when they are adhered. If a guideline can be squashed by a variance make variances more stringent and difficult to obtain. I live on LaRiviere street and have witnessed first hand the horrible new construction going on in my area and south to Old St Vital. I am actually looking to build a new house on my existing lot in 1 to 2 years and absolutely welcome the changes proposed in the draft. I want my new home to blend in with my neighbours so they can continue to enjoy their homes and environment as they always have.	9/19/2020 3:53 PM
327	Address the issue of Air BnB rentals. Too many of the multi-unit structures are turned into short term rentals, which is anathema to the sense of community.Transient tenants cause too many problems and do not have a sense of citizenship about the neighbourhood.	9/19/2020 3:03 PM

328	Add Parking Requirements on lots over single family to eliminate street level parking density Limitation on stucco use, to many basic stucco homes with no design	9/19/2020 2:12 PM
329	If they were written based on residents' evidence, they would not rely on lofty philosophy and idealism or cater to developers.	9/19/2020 2:01 PM
330	Less restrictions and liberal interpretation of the guidelines in favour of new developments and infill housing.	9/19/2020 11:19 AM
331	I think you need actual standards. They need to be specific and clear.	9/19/2020 10:56 AM
332	Size and design should be further restricted	9/19/2020 10:41 AM
333	education to neighbourhoods about how increased density isn't bad.	9/19/2020 9:59 AM
334	Instead of allowing more parking spots than suites for multi-story, multi-unit buildings, allow less spots if you want to increase transit use	9/19/2020 9:29 AM
335	Demand them to fit into neighborhood styles with no Lea way to put modern structures in character neighborhoods	9/19/2020 9:26 AM
336	Guidelines aren't enough. Need to have more clout.	9/19/2020 8:57 AM
337	Stricter understanding of unique neighbourhood styles and architectural features to ensure the protection of existing neighbourhoods and their character. When someone purchases a single family home in a quiet residential area, they should not have to worry about infill development changing the neighbourhood around them.	9/19/2020 8:31 AM
338	Developers will need exact examples of architectural articulation, ie. diagrams. Ie. existing mature house next to infill house. Please, no more attempts at developers trying to be designers (asymmetrical roofs fo not equal articulation.	9/19/2020 8:06 AM
339	New project must equal all adjacent properties. Unless all adjacent properties are multi-unit properties then do not approve the new project.	9/19/2020 6:25 AM
340	More consideration is needed to ensure the character of neighbourhoods is maintained.	9/19/2020 5:37 AM
341	Tear down derelict buildings and create affordable housing in the core. Leave mature neighbourhoods alone and don't change them with ugly squeezed in infills.	9/19/2020 12:31 AM
342	Be sure to continue to seek public input	9/18/2020 9:01 PM
343	Not building on lots smaller than 33ft wide	9/18/2020 8:31 PM
344	As I have repeatedly stated in this survey, the city should simply advise citizens and developers how much housing can be built on a given sized lot. The market will then determine the kind of infill development that will be constructed and what kind of neighbourhood character evolves	9/18/2020 8:12 PM
345	I would be happier if the city were targeting the empty parking lots in downtown Winnipeg where nothing exists instead of proposing a reckless march into existing successful neighbourhoods, thereby destroying the reason for living there. If the proposals give developers license to start buying and trashing existing homes as they have done in this neighbourhood and then proposing development, it will be a very sad day.	9/18/2020 7:44 PM
346	Put car sharing and access to transit as more of a priority	9/18/2020 6:59 PM
347	Not answering above as these are skewed. There needs to be a plan for growth and infill APPROPRIATELY - the rules so to speak are SO loose it seems they apply for all regions outlined despite your 1,2,3,4 ranking of areas. And NONE of this solves downtown. Do we need less sprawl? Yes. Has there been issues populating downtown? Yes. Figure that out. When you tear down buildings downtown, build AFFORDABLE housing as you describe here. Are you modeling after a city and saying "oh look that worked for them!"? OR looking at what we ARE and building on Winnipeg. I see zero ingenuity and let's make the old plan better here.	9/18/2020 6:07 PM
348	How are you going to limit the architectural monstrosities being built on corner lots? Totally not in keeping with neighbourhood character.	9/18/2020 6:02 PM
349	These guidelines must be more specific and also enforced to ensure the neighborhoods benefit. The guidelines are very loose and there are many areas where the builder can skirt around them to develop the current type of eyesores that are occuring	9/18/2020 5:18 PM

350	Some of the older neighborhoods have the ability to hold a lot more density today and it makes absolutely sense to let them have it - they already have infrastructure in place to support it, bus line....makes absolutely sense to put a condo in one of these areas than in a place like Bridgwater?! Sage Creek? Like whyyyyy are we even building those in place where people can't walk anywhere?!	9/18/2020 4:48 PM

Q18 Is there anything else you would like to add?

Answered: 336 Skipped: 438

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Respect that not everyone wants to be packed into high density housing like feedlot cattle. It is wrong to design a city so that only very rich citizens can afford lots that give them space to live comfortably with their neighbors.	10/23/2020 7:29 AM
2	The beauty of this neighborhood, is the yards to enjoy with your family, friends and neighbors, this is getting lost in all this dividing of lots. Yes our density will be greater but at what cost.	10/22/2020 11:53 PM
3	Without ongoing oversight with measurable goals and a comprehensive review every five years in concurrence with other City planning documents these guidelines will not work.	10/22/2020 11:41 PM
4	Trees take DECADES to reach the same level of beauty and CARBON CAPTURE that mature trees provide. Please re-think the far-too-lax 'landscaping' requirements.	10/22/2020 11:20 PM
5	There should also be programs to help lower income people to maintain their existing houses. While increasing density is all well and good for helping reduce greenhouse gases, the most environmentally friendly home is the one that already exists. I know the city gets more money from these mcmanisons that are built in these infills but they are absolutely ridiculous. There needs to be a balance and i am happy to see these guidelines, but would now like to see them approved and enforced. People and community over profit.	10/22/2020 10:42 PM
6	I live in an older neighbourhood and there has been constant renewal of homes and with that, diversity. Since it is an older neighbourhood with an aging sewer system increasing density should not happen until sewer upgrades happen.	10/22/2020 9:18 PM
7	I would add in the guide incentives and disincentives to encourage people/developers to build higher density buildings. There could be extra fees as a disincentive for people/developers for the demolition waste for small homes in good condition and the fees being higher if the new home is only a single-family home. I like seeing single lots being split in two...and it would be even better if they would become duplexes (creating 4 homes instead of 1 in one space). Also, there needs to be a balance between higher density and green spaces. I believe higher density can free up space to have more green spaces. From what I noticed in the document, "energy performance" is only mentioned for multi-family units. I would add "energy performance" for all types of buildings including single family homes and duplexes etc.. Energy performance would help with climate mitigation which would align with your Climate Change plans. Also, designs should encourage new construction to locate larger windows facing the south to take advantage of solar gain. I see condo buildings that are built on corner streets and they could have better design using concepts of Passive House when possible. Also, as mentioned earlier, I did attend an online session which I thought was really great. However, my questions were not answered due to the lack of time. We were told that a city staff would send us the answers by email but I did not receive answers to my questions. I live in a single family detached home but I want to now live in a multifamily unit because I want to reduce my carbon footprint, which aligns with my values. I hope this guide will encourage more multi-family housing development, such as cohousing and coops. Multi-family housing usually helps with affordability as well.	10/22/2020 7:50 PM
8	I do not recall anything mentioned about additional fire hydrants for the safety of all. Could appeals meetings be limited to a maximum number of hours with councillors present who are interested in their neighbour that they represent? Being on a cellphone, hidden below the table with head bowed and fingers moving is not a sign of being interested or very respectful. An emergency phone call is another issue!	10/22/2020 5:38 PM
9	Stop adding to Winnipeg’s population! Our crappy roads already cannot handle the volume of traffic that we have. Work on making Winnipeg more like Calgary. Then you can add more people.	10/22/2020 5:28 PM
10	I wish us all luck and "success" for all , in carefully creating considered and timeful steps in this process of growth, for the well being of all residents in our fair city.	10/22/2020 4:18 PM
11	Could not help but notice that old Tuxedo, which is a very low density neighbourhood, is not experiencing lot splits, multiunit housing development. Should they not participate in this Distribution of Residential density?	10/22/2020 4:14 PM
12	Mostly I oppose the splitting of lots in single family bungalow areas into two narrow lots and then building tall Gumby shaped structures that tower over the neighboring property, and bring down the property values	10/22/2020 3:52 PM

13	Developers appear to have "carte blanche" and are not held accountable when building infills in mature areas, lots are often not secured, untidy. Personally find most infills' design do not "mix in" with the rest of the housing on the streets. Concerned about old, existing infrastructure to support these new multi dwelling builds. Very concerned our mature trees being clear cut to accommodate these infills. Loss of privacy because of the proximity and height of the new builds is also unacceptable.	10/22/2020 3:42 PM
14	I bought my house in a quiet, quaint neighbourhood that has now been totally transformed. I can't even recognize streets that were once familiar, and I am tired of the constant sound of construction, shaking of my house, road closures, and higher traffic due to infill.	10/22/2020 3:30 PM
15	I appreciate the citys efforts to try to develop concrete guidelines for infill development. I recognize the difficulties of communication during COVID times but must say that I found it hard to absorb so much information in digital format. The zone map was not clear enough to be useful e.g. there were no identify features such as street names. There was no mention of improving the variance appeal process which has been inconsistent and seemingly arbitrary and politically biased in favour of developers. This should be addressed. One final point is that there should be a timeline for completing a building project. There is a neighbour on our street wo has an unfinished house (from the outside) but the family has been living there for over ten years. Where is the inspection	10/22/2020 2:52 PM
16	Do not allow lot splitting in mature neighborhoods.	10/22/2020 2:44 PM
17	I met a man who bought a large lot with a small house on it, he subsequently built a Massive house against the property line on one side. When I asked him about his choice he explained, his long game was to buy the adjacent property on the opposite and split the 2 properties and build another 2 house ultimately. This would surely result in a massive reduction of the trees on those 2 well wooded lots. If he knew there were expectations of how much green was desirable prior to building he may still build this way but incorporate these guidelines into his designs. I know this is not exactly the scenario for infill housing but I would point to a Habitat project, which was actually a very successful project. However this Habitat for Humanity project was proud to speak of building almost 3 dozen new homes in 1 square block and not one square foot was set aside for green space. With many of the families moving into these beautiful new homes having children and being adjacent to a major thoroughfare on one side of the block a single (peanut park) area would I'm sure be very popular. Sadly to no avail. Nothing! If this was considered it would have a significant impact.	10/22/2020 2:10 PM
18	Any infill development should be dependent on the approval of neighbouring homeowners and respect the wishes such homeowners, far and above the wishes of any developer. People do want renewal in their neighbourhoods, but not if it means they lose the view of the sky, sunshine in their yards, and a clear green space view outside the windows on the sides of their homes, if when they bought their homes those criteria were in place.	10/22/2020 12:12 PM
19	I live in East Fort Garry, a neighbourhood that is primarily zoned single family, except for a few exceptions where institutional sites have been redeveloped/rezoned to allow for multi-story multi-family residences or side-by-side townhouses (e.g. former Wildewood Club site and at Riverwood & Lyon). These guidelines make it extremely difficult to further increase the density of a neighbourhood well served by Transit and cycling infrastructure and planned transit and cycling infrastructure, which in turn will not enable further intensification of development along Pembina Highway in the neighbourhood. These guidelines will only serve to allow the replacement of existing single family homes that have passed their useful lives with larger more expensive single family homes rather than multi-family developments which the city needs in its mature neighbourhoods in order to reduce sprawl, congestion, etc. and to meet its climate change goals.	10/22/2020 12:01 PM
20	St. Vital is turning into a ghetto.	10/22/2020 11:32 AM
21	More public outreach - direct communications to neighbourhoods where this is happening would be great. More notification to somehow inform people within a radius around a new build/infill...is there somewhere we could look online to see what is happening in our neighbourhood by address? If it weren't for the odd poster a well meaning community member tapes up on the mailbox I would have no idea about any of these engagement opportunities. Could PPD corroborate with say, Water and Waste department, put a flyer into the water bills to increase public engagement? There would be direct communication with residents and they are already doing mailouts - so why not slide something in that envelope!? Wouldn't cost anything!? You need more of these surveys, more improvements, we love our downtown adjacent community but hate to see it getting hacked up by ugly/terrible designs, chopping	10/22/2020 11:26 AM

	trees, massive looming buildings towering over the old little ones. Lots of good stuff in your recommendations so keep going, update often so the next time its not such a massive overhaul. Thanks for the opportunity. I appreciate your public service. It is not easy. Take care.	
22	Much more needs to be done to address issues during the demolition and building process.	10/22/2020 11:25 AM
23	Admit that existing planning in areas like Glenwood has been a failure, and there needs to be actual "PLAN" as to how to regulate speed of change. Instead all I see here is "infill is wonderful in all ways all the time" . YOu are planners , try to actually plan the way that any street will change	10/22/2020 10:00 AM
24	Our mayor is encouraging growth and enhancement of the city's tree canopy, while the property/planning department is negating this initiative with developers removing trees to build out of scale houses on small lots that do not allow for adequate landscaping.	10/21/2020 10:46 PM
25	The main goal should not be lot division to maximize density and profits for developers. People do not move to suburbs and urban sprawl to live in a duplex with no yard. If there was more incentive for people to infill a nice new single family home in a more mature area rather than moving to somewhere like Bridgewater older neighborhoods would revitalize, taxes would still increase and residents would be happier.	10/21/2020 10:18 PM
26	We should think about including food security measures through urban agriculture, either with more community gardens or on-site gardening facilities.	10/21/2020 8:37 PM
27	Building new housing in old neighbourhoods is a good thing if the lots are not split. Having multiplexes on the main routes also is fine. But it is not good to mix these on a street with only single unit or two unit houses. No one likes to have people on a balcony looking down at them, while they are outside. It also blocks the sun thus reducing the ability to have gardens etc.	10/21/2020 7:34 PM
28	The by-laws for residential zones such as single family R1 should have a specific low percentage of multi-family dwellings allowed. This percentage should be less than 5%. Currently, a developer will do what they want and the city will cave if pressed. These guidelines may help a little for conscientious developers but not when money is on the line.	10/21/2020 7:25 PM
29	no	10/21/2020 3:53 PM
30	The current infill seems not to be fairly distributed. Each area in the zone should have a maximum based on other areas so that no one area gets all the grief at once. So, if River Heights gets 5% infill in year 1, St. Vital should have a maximum of 5% that year, too.	10/21/2020 1:17 PM
31	Don’t allow the new dwelling to be the largest on the street. Create some one-storey homes for seniors. Plan for some affordable homes that don’t have the trendy stuff like ensuites and expensive countertops, to attract families and seniors.	10/21/2020 1:15 PM
32	Adding rental multi-family units with limited yard space & parking will not revitalize established single family neighbourhoods	10/21/2020 11:35 AM
33	These guidelines basically allow developers to continue doing exactly what they have been doing. Developers helped to draw up the guidelines, so it is no surprise. The city has no true planning ambitions, and is willing to let developers dictate what they can do- I think the city is only interested in getting more tax revenue from larger homes , and has no interest at all in maintaining the character of mature neighbourhoods.	10/21/2020 10:46 AM
34	Prevent the continuation of infill building incentives in mature neighbourhoods. The integrity and character of our neighbourhoods are being compromised through your financial incentives to profit hungry building contracting companies.	10/21/2020 10:26 AM
35	What a waste of taxpayers money	10/21/2020 7:45 AM
36	Infill is bad. I will be selling and moving outside of the city the second I see an infill monstrosity going up my neighbourhood. The infill houses are being built cheap and dirty and often fall apart very quickly. They also ruin the foundation of neighbouring properties, neighbours should be intitled to compensation for property damages caused by infil projects, they should be compensated for lower property values. They should be compensated for the additional noise and traffic in the mature neighbourhood which most people have bought in for peace and quiet. They should be compensated for constant construction noise. Infill will ruin the city and it already has ruined certain neighbourhoods.	10/20/2020 11:38 PM
37	The wording sounds nice, even smart. Like "efficient use of infrastructure", but the city has	10/20/2020 10:39 PM

	shown no evidence that any consideration has been given to how the new smaller sewers installed inside of the old one will handle the increased rainwater run off due to reduced soil area, combined with the increased water consumption of increasing the population. "Enhancing the character" is a FAIL when mature trees are being destroyed to make way for parking pads, and the quietness is lost to doubling the vehicular traffic. I could go on, but I'm sure you get the idea.	
38	I think letting a potential developer know all of this before they start applying for variances, etc, would be great. If they could be informed before lot purchase that is even better. I still think infills are a 50/50 with good and bad currently going in. A lot of the mature areas have combined sewers which isn't great when you try and increase density and factor in the City's drainage license (clause 8)). I think you shouldn't be able to build a house that is 5' higher than any other house on the block built before 2005. I think this alone would help in a lot of cases to blend in a little more.	10/20/2020 9:58 PM
39	28 feet should be the max. height for any single/duplex building! Snow/ice dangers and damages are frequently experienced in this area now, (with the new 30-35' builds) especially last winter!	10/20/2020 8:02 PM
40	Dumb infill idea. Hate it	10/20/2020 5:17 PM
41	no	10/20/2020 3:48 PM
42	No opinion	10/20/2020 3:30 PM
43	The planning department should focus on their job of providing "good planning policy", rather than "planning policy that will be palatable to Council". Let the politicians do the politicking, you just provide good policy and let the politicians wear their own misguided changes.	10/20/2020 3:14 PM
44	ELIMINATE LOT SPLITTING FOR STREETS WITH UNPAVED (mud, gravel) LANES. I have no ideological problem with infill, but my backlane is an unpaved mess at the best of times. I spent 15k on a new garage last year, and it was nearly unusable over the winter due to ruts and deep ditches in the middle of the lane. In the spring, we end up with a literal pond, nearly a foot deep, that we refer to with disdain as Lake Fernwood. Adding further desity to streets with unpaved back lanes will cause undue damage to an already nearly unusable lane from the construction needs, and will reduce the amount of time it remains usable after grading due to the increase in residential traffic.	10/20/2020 2:11 PM
45	the "mature" neighbourhoods provide homes at a price point that makes them affordable to families who are trying to step onto the property ladder, as well as older residents who are down-sizing. The infill properties are higher priced with minimal yards, taking them out of the achievable reach of young families. Understandably, the developers are going for maximum space, maximum profit but makes the houses too big and too expensive for those wishing to down-size.	10/20/2020 11:41 AM
46	This survey was difficult to follow.	10/20/2020 10:54 AM
47	It is clear no one involved in this project has ever been on a gravel lane in St Vital	10/19/2020 10:05 PM
48	Don't ruin my neighbourhood.	10/19/2020 11:57 AM
49	Densification is not a good goal in itself, it should be balanced with respect of people and communities. Essentially this plan is selling access to established neighborhoods people want to be in while developers profit at expense of the communities quality of life.	10/19/2020 9:53 AM
50	This is a rushed embarrassing idea. Infill is a white privileged colonialist idea. You think you can come in and resettle any neighbourhood you want. What about my rights as a homeowner and citizen? You should be ashamed of yourselves for foisting this garbage legislation on low income neighborhoods and people who lack the resources to find back. Colonialism 2.0 at city hall. I thought the mayor was better than this.	10/18/2020 9:22 PM
51	Need to look at individual neighbourhoods, not just the broad brush to 1/2 of city and leave 1/2 of city untouched. But height limit and side yard stuff is good.	10/18/2020 8:43 PM
52	I am extremely frustrated with the infill housing in the EK area where I grew up and where my family continues to reside. The new homes are build too tall, too cheaply and too close together without any landscaping or yard space. The home owner vehicles are all parked on the steet and there have been numerous issues during construction that the city has failed to address in a timely and responsible manner (running/brown water and noise pollution every day	10/18/2020 7:28 PM

	of the week) and builders that are challenging to contact with issues. The majority of mature homes are beautifully well cared for bungalows with large yeards and ample parking in the rear of the homes; therefore, these in-fill homes do not respect the character and care of the neighbourhood.	
53	Developers should have to pay for an engineer to inspect the neighbouring homes before and after demolition/construction. The site beside us caused cracks in our foundation, causing a flood this spring and over $8000 of damage to our finished basement. There should also be a time-limit for the completion of construction. We had to deal with on-going stress from construction for close to a year. There needs to be better oversight of the companies building on these lots. It should not be up to residents to be constantly phoning in workplace safety, parking and trespassing issues.	10/18/2020 5:21 PM
54	no	10/18/2020 3:48 PM
55	no	10/18/2020 11:16 AM
56	dont do infill in established neighborhood	10/17/2020 11:44 AM
57	Respect for Trees, Traffic calming, Ample Parking, Regulated access on to main roads.	10/17/2020 8:32 AM
58	I think there needs to be some acknowledgement that right now there is not an equitable system in place. Rich areas never have lots split. These rules only apply in areas that already have less of a footprint.	10/17/2020 12:02 AM
59	The city of Winnipeg needs to listen more to residents immediately impacted by infill and less to large developers who built only for profit without considering the impact the infill type, size, etc. has on local residents and the neighbourhood.	10/16/2020 11:22 PM
60	The city is in dire straights, largely due to urban sprawl. Fixing that comes before people worried about the aesthetic of their neighbourhood. Stop asking us how to do it and just do it.	10/16/2020 8:56 PM
61	I think the landscaping requirements are ridiculous in not considering more options for sod substitutions. And I love trees but requiring large trees close to houses is questionable. On larger lots it should be required but on smaller ones they aren't great.	10/16/2020 8:05 PM
62	This was an awful survey.	10/16/2020 7:30 PM
63	One of those things that looks cool but as long as it's not in my neighborhood. A lot of people probably feel this way so maybe not the most popular idea.	10/16/2020 7:10 PM
64	Pass the guidelines, implement it.	10/16/2020 3:17 PM
65	Time for a change at city Hall. Stay out of our neighborhood. Quit subdividing. Too much urban traffic. No place to park.	10/16/2020 2:26 PM
66	Tear down all high crime areas, build any kind of housing that is under $500/month. Evict tenants who screw up. No second chances. Clean up the city!	10/16/2020 9:22 AM
67	The planning department and the mayor have seriously failed infill housing development. Infill is necessary, but what is the city going to do with what has happened in our neighbourhood. The area is DESECRATED!! We have builders that have put residents at risk because (9 Vivian) they left a crushed house unfenced for a whole weekend. Any kid could have walked into the basement. How about the builders who accidently built the house 5'6" away from the designated site, conveniently giving them extra backyard space (on Imperial). City does NOTHING	10/15/2020 10:41 PM
68	trees on lots need to be protected more.	10/15/2020 10:10 PM
69	no	10/15/2020 8:52 PM
70	There has been mention of a "transit system". In Winnipeg it's just called busses. We are not Toronto or whatever city(s) the writers of the 'guidelines' have been attending conventions in (I suspect U.S. cities).	10/15/2020 8:16 PM
71	The Area definitions seem overlook some "mature" neighborhoods in a manner that seems related to socioeconomic biased.	10/15/2020 5:32 PM
72	I do not like the appearance of the skinny ugly buildings in st.vital. They appear cheaply built and tower above other homes and yards blocking views and sunlight. Moreover, how can	10/15/2020 4:55 PM

	building height and size be restricted when these infill places are often subdivided properties with a 25 foot frontage and maybe 80 feet long. The only place to build is up. Look at Calgary.	
73	Something that I'm afraid hasn't been considered enough is the availability of affordable housing in mature neighborhoods. These guidelines are a good first step towards that goal but unfortunately many of these new houses are still out of reach for a single-income earner. There have been classist comments from the local interest groups like the Glenwood Neighborhood Association decrying rental properties. Councilor Brian Mays has aligned himself with this group. As a Millennial bordering on Gen-Z, I have been heartbroken to find that I am priced out of the neighborhood in which I grew up, and where I want to have my own life. I would welcome the city's guidelines on infill promote modest, smaller, high density such as quadplexes and townhouses so that I can have a modest home in the neighborhood I care so deeply about.	10/15/2020 3:32 PM
74	Too many limitation, restriction and requirements which makes it very complicated for the majority of the developers to achieve and still make the project profitable. Most of the limiting restriction have to be changed in order to make the infill development possible.	10/15/2020 2:44 PM
75	Lot sizes need to be increased, not decreased. This is just a greedy tax grab for the city to get more residential tax dollars!	10/15/2020 12:56 PM
76	Some of my neighbours in the Kingston Crescent and Kingston Row area seem anxious about lot splitting and infill housing. I am not opposed to it. My opinion is that increased density in Winnipeg is preferable to urban sprawl. I will not personally oppose the creation of a duplex or triplex etc. on my street. The neighbourhood already has old houses next to new houses, some big and some small. Some folks paint their houses light colours; others opt for dark colours. It's not my place to criticize their choices because of my notion of the neighbourhood's character. I've seen infill properties on the other side of the Red and in Glenwood. They seem pretty nice, although I'm not an architect, building inspector or city planner.	10/15/2020 12:44 PM
77	Hire more university students as consultants on these projects. We need the experience and you (the government) needs to make better decisions for its people and their wellbeing. Life is not a game. People need housing to live. Children are suffering, literally. We have a child and family poverty and homelessness crisis in our city and our province. This is not a game. It is time to start building real relationships and partnerships and helping your citizens attain proper housing.	10/15/2020 9:11 AM
78	Yes I would like to send a big thank you to the City of Winnipeg and Joel Burr(Renotech) for destroying my home, finances and security, good job boys I hope it feels good to stomp on another tax payer!	10/15/2020 8:48 AM
79	I notice that the guidelines do not prioritize conservation of existing properties. Many old buildings are still good; developers should be prohibited from the environmentally unsound and wasteful practice of tearing down still-habitable, refurbishable properties.	10/15/2020 6:50 AM
80	Their home is the most expensive and thoughtful purchase of their lives and if they wanted to live in crowded, ugly neighbourhoods, they would. Increased traffic is a danger to everyone. If Charleswood can block lot splitting and ugly infills, the same consideration should be applied to all mature neighbourhoods. Build like for like, fine. I understand this is an emotional appeal, but enough already. Thank you.	10/14/2020 11:18 PM
81	The city should stop lot splitting to collect 2 taxes on one lot.	10/14/2020 9:48 PM
82	We need more infill, we don't necessarily need for it to be as paint by numbers as this guideline mandates. Let's tell people, this is what we're doing, and give them the time to adjust. Winnipeggers need to be told this is what is going to happen, just mandating that a duplex next to them is going to have a facade with two different materials is not going to make them inherently happy.	10/14/2020 7:55 PM
83	Keep working at it. We need safe bike and walking paths and environmentally friendly communities.	10/14/2020 5:58 PM
84	A perfectly good albeit old school was torn down, the lot was left vacant for many years which we as tax payers paid for, finally sold and now we need a new school in the area as older people have left and new young families have moved back into the area. Is that progress? The planning seems to be very flawed.	10/14/2020 4:30 PM
85	Pictures were very lovely but did not portray the real picture of impact of many of the infills on	10/14/2020 4:03 PM

	the adjacent properties. The mass destruction of the 100's of mature trees and the environmental impact of building these infills did not really seem to be an important issue.	
86	stop squeezing two units on small lots that could house 4 families instead of one	10/14/2020 1:17 PM
87	I would like to not see any more of these homes go up in our neighborhood.	10/14/2020 12:44 PM
88	The owners who have made these "mature" areas over time had a dream of property ownership which included space to allow their children to play on their yards and make neighbourhood friends; be the antithesis of the crowded city. Lets not merely move the "crowded city" into the suburbs	10/14/2020 10:49 AM
89	More input from existing homeowners in all areas of the city.	10/14/2020 9:12 AM
90	The area in which I live is littered with infill housing. The constant construction, questionable work practices (observing workers wearing flip flops in summer months) and disregard for the integrity of the neighbourhood is apparent. What is not understood is that the residents of these areas AREN'T OPPOSED to infill as a concept. We are opposed to land occupied by a single family home being converted into being occupied by up to four families. These multi-unit homes is what we are opposed two. Generally homes are crammed into narrow lots resulting in increased traffic and homes being very close to one another (fire hazard). I have seen single family homes replaced by new single family homes and the result is wonderful! It results in a beautification of the area and filled with long term residents that ultimately integrate and contribute to the betterment of the community. When a single family home is replaced by multi-unit homes, it results in much more transient residents with little regard to the betterment or wellness of the community - loud parties, overcrowding of street parking and back lane access.	10/14/2020 9:10 AM
91	The biggest two challenge are nimbyism, and a distrust of developers. It might be useful for the city to establish densification targets for each specific neighbourhood. Neighbourhoods and residents need to ba answering the question of where the density will go - rather than whether or not they want density in their neighbourhood.	10/14/2020 8:03 AM
92	I object to the premise that all housing types should be available in all neighbourhoods, or that a balanced mix of housing types in every neighbourhood is desirable. Cities are structured such that different parts of the geography are dedicated to different functions, and people choose where to live on the basis on which home features and amenities they prefer. Some people like new homes, some like character homes, some like small or inexpensive homes, and some like larger or more expensive homes. People make choices accordingly. Having a city policy that deliberately attempts to scramble up all of those features is only going to make nearly everyone unhappy. Some may choose to leave the city entirely. The upheaval caused by infill in my neighbourhood is causing my family to consider moving. Since we have no assurance that any neighbourhood we choose in Winnipeg might be similarly disrupted by infill in the future, I am actively seeking a new job outside of Winnipeg and outside of Manitoba. The planning department needs to understand that many of the people who actually live in Winnipeg truly hate what infill in doing to disrupt their communities and that this misguided policy will have longterm negative effects on Winnipeg's growth and population.	10/13/2020 10:35 PM
93	The idea that we are going to design the housing in our mature communities to be contextually sensitive to the last hundred years of built form means that some of our best opportunities for growth and expansion will be limited to mediocre outcomes that will prove to be far too conservative. The City of Winnipeg owes it to the MAJORITY of its residents and citizens to capitalize on maximizing the assessed value and tax base for the benefit of the majority of the Citizens in the City, not the minority Negatively affected within mature communities. The Province deserves to receive the maximum potential assessment value for their school taxes, as well and should find alternative ways to fund this should the City fail to maximize this revenue source for the aging schools in these areas. These guidelines are a service to the vocal minority, a few loud city councillors and a disservice to the majority of councillors who should be representing their constituents best interests by maxing out the development of our mature communities to the overall benefit of all citizens.	10/13/2020 9:05 PM
94	In the 6 years that I've lived on my street in St Vital, which will be considered 'Area 1', we have seen 7 properties on our immediate street be split into multi-property dwellings. There have also been multi properties split on streets immediately adjacent to ours. This has greatly increased the amount of traffic on ours and adjoining streets, and has limited access to street parking for all residents of the street. I would strongly recommend limiting the percentage of properties in a given area that can be split and enforcing this strictly. This percentage would	10/13/2020 8:40 PM

	also need to consider properties that have been split over the past number of years and not just those from the implementation of these guidelines going forward.	
95	infill housing does not improve our neighborhood at all	10/13/2020 8:32 PM
96	The changes must not discourage development. Without it, we will continue to have many derelict properties. Quicker response times for permits from city, zoning changes, all area required to be faster to incentivize neighbourhood change. Must continue to fit with overall look of neighbourhood.	10/13/2020 5:58 PM
97	Scrap the plan to reduce single family lot coverage from 30% to 45%. If people are complaining that houses on 25 foot lots are too close together, it's probably because the frontages are too large.	10/13/2020 5:49 PM
98	I would like to see more secondary avenue zoning/planning strategies, so that streets immediately next to major commercial corridors (for example, Thomas Berry/Horace along Marion/Goulet) are prioritized for mixed-use development in such a way that positively extends the commercial area and provides for a greater walkable commercial area, much as one might see in a limited way at Corydon/Lilac, or as is commonplace in other major cities. I do think that residents in Area 2 neighbourhoods will likely find these guidelines to be a bit loose for multi-unit development.	10/13/2020 4:37 PM
99	guidelines need to be made into laws that are stringently enforced.	10/13/2020 4:24 PM
100	I mentioned not ripping down homes that are in good condition. There are homes that are torn down that really need to be but having the city okay putting in 4 or 6-plexes without consideration for the neighbours makes them not wanted.	10/13/2020 2:58 PM
101	I think you know where I stand.	10/13/2020 12:19 PM
102	Based on multiple encounters with council committees about inappropriate development, I have no confidence in council to follow their own recommendations/bylaws.	10/13/2020 12:18 PM
103	Don't let cardboard box looking house be built.	10/13/2020 11:43 AM
104	Don't ruin a mature neighborhood by trying to build 2 houses on small lots with no yards. There are plenty of new areas being developed with those types of houses. Maintain the beauty of the mature areas & stay consistent with the style of housing & yards.	10/13/2020 9:04 AM
105	Here is an example of what I mean. I have a house on a river lot that is 89 feet wide by 305 river lot on Scotia street on the high side that has never flooded. I pay 6200.00 a yearly taxes on this property taxes. I wanted to split this lot but was told that I could not be cause my lot size would be smaller than my neighbors next to me. The lots across the street are 35 feet wide and my lot split would be 36,5 feet wide. There are 4 house on lots that a 33 feet wide on the river side up the street that are zoned the same as mine. So the city instead of getting around 13000.00 dollars a year for the lot if I split it and built on it will now get 6200.00 a year. So over a 20 year period this is a loss to the city 6800.00 x 20 years = 138,000.00 by not allowing me to split my lot. The people in charge of planning need to run it more like a business and allow development to occur.	10/12/2020 10:03 PM
106	Stop trying to please everybody, 9in which case you'll end up pleasing very few.... And remember taxpayers need increased density to slow the sprawl and increased taxation that inevitably follows	10/12/2020 7:22 PM
107	Should be a timeline from start to finish.Fines should be handed out for every 30 days it goes over ...no extensions ! I have been listening to sawing and hammering for almost 2 years now with the infill beside me.More inspections need to be done.From what I have seen go on during the process next door it is a bomb waiting to go off.Homeowner thought he could build it himself and cheaped out every step of the way from hiring people for cash with no insurance and have them hanging off the 35 roof trying to put housewrap up to people off the street to build crooked fences.Quite honestly there needs to be more accountability for the builder.I am personally concerned with the fire hazard and would like to see the approved paperwork by the fire marshall for the garage that is 3 feet away from mine.	10/12/2020 7:02 PM
108	Please listen to concerned citizens like Elmwood Guy (https://www.dearwinnipeg.com/2020/10/07/everything-you-always-wanted-to-know-about-infill-but-were-afraid-to-ask/) and YIMBY (https://www.yesinwpg.com/2020/09/22/first-thoughts-on-the-draft-residential-development-guidelines-infill-guidelines/)	10/12/2020 4:05 PM

109	Any new builds should have to be approved for design to be any keeping with existing homes in neighborhoods	10/12/2020 9:24 AM
110	Winnipeg is currently too reliant on cars. Build off the "village" model by weaving living and commercial spaces. Make it easy to walk to amenities (doesn't hurt if you're walking by interesting, well landscaped houses); be mindful of traffic concentrations.	10/11/2020 11:33 PM
111	When Urban Ridge asked me to support the fourplex, I agreed. I thought it would be in keeping with the other low four-plexes on the street. Instead, they've built a monstrosity that could fit 8 units, towers over the houses, cuts the sunlight, etc. There's no land left for grass and gardens and play areas. It's suffocating. Add to that the months and months of intermittent construction work, shoddy safety work, garbage (I have plastic hanging in my tree from the worksite, neighbours all have their garbage in their yards) and clay-covered sidewalks. I don't actually believe my city councillors and do not trust this initiative to meet its goals. I think we will look back at this time as the great destruction of St B. Those fancy houses at Whittier park just can't find their resell value and sit empty... they were overblown, overpriced and there to feed egos. Now, no one knows what to do with them. Turn our infill spaces into parks, social areas, little "squares" as they have in Europe and big cities. Bring in the arts. Find homes for the homeless... so much can be done to attract people to Winnipeg. And most of all = be honest with people when you go door to door - stop trying to pull a fast one.... btw, if someone can come clean up Lariviere Street - they are at 376 - young parents in the neighbourhood would appreciate being able to go for walks without slipping in the mud and on the equipment left about. Also, seriously, now that I've shared my frustration, thank you for letting me vent - before you assume we want to live in boxes, it might be useful to wait out the pandemic. Everything is pointing to a trend where people want more home space, more yards, more sprawl... this pandemic may fundamentally change the way we are as workers, families, etc. and I think it would be worthwhile to pay attention to that.	10/11/2020 9:14 PM
112	The guidelines should be enforced equally and fairly thoughout all neighbourhoods of the City. All others items such as zoning being the same; if it is not allowed in Tuxedo, it should not be allowed in Fort Rouge. All neighbourhoods should be provided with the same amount of respect, consideration and care regardless of the economic and social aspect of that neighbourhood. The guidelines need to be enforced and the Board of Adjustment needs to have better oversight as to what variances they allow.	10/11/2020 8:46 PM
113	Limit the number of construction sites per year. During construction season, limit the number of construction sites in one area. for example construction should not be authorized in two lots, at the same time, in a 10 block radius. This will limit the number of large trucks, construction vehicles; this will limit the noise and destruction to smaller areas of neighborhoods and an easier transition for people in the communities.	10/11/2020 3:38 PM
114	No one wants them here.	10/11/2020 3:26 PM
115	Accessibility guidelines.	10/11/2020 12:04 PM
116	I am a resident of a mature neighbourhood, and I welcome these recommendations, would these new rules apply to modifications of an existing structure? Or just new construction. In my case I am not permitted to reopen a historical window that has plywood & vinyl over it as it might be too close to the property line ~ 4 ft. On a narrow lot like mine (25ft) the proposed sideboard set back is 3ft? Currently this is thought to be a fire hazard. I am fine with the proposed 3ft, I just wonder if there is a safety issue.	10/10/2020 10:54 PM
117	You could also take into account whether the neighbourhoods can handle an increase in density - rush hour traffic is already unbearable in St. Vital. Increasing the density should not be considered until this is addressed.	10/10/2020 9:54 PM
118	Put pressure on suburbs to increase density not mature areas. Stop allowing developers to run this city and have some balls for once.	10/10/2020 4:04 PM
119	We have too many on Pilgrim ave	10/10/2020 11:04 AM
120	I am against infill housing that densifies living in mature neighborhoods. I’ve lived in a dense neighborhood and worked hard to afford moving to a less dense neighborhood on a 50 ft lot. I do not support the idea of densifying my neighborhood for any reason or with any plan.	10/10/2020 10:57 AM
121	Before city approval on development, ask the people who live on the street if they want this project next-door	10/10/2020 9:20 AM

122	why not build them in new areas like bridgewater , sage creek.. and by the way make sure they build them right beside a single family home, see if the owner enjoys that..leave older neighbourhoods alone, they damage the lanes, lower the price of homes they are directly beside.	10/10/2020 8:52 AM
123	There seriously has to be guidelines against building anything other than a home that “fits” in the neighborhoods. You can clearly see which ones don’t . Stop ruining our city.	10/10/2020 7:55 AM
124	I understand the residential sprawl problem that Winnipeg is facing but these proposed changes are not the way to address it. They will simply serve to ruin existing pleasant neighbourhoods. You cannot start shoe horning low income housing into higher income areas and expect all to be well. It strikes me that these planned changes will serve greedy developers far better than they will serve the residents of Winnipeg.	10/9/2020 11:23 PM
125	Property destruction when basement are too close to existing homes	10/9/2020 6:51 PM
126	The areas mapped out in the plan are too broad. There are differences in neigbhourhoods that must be respected and lumping them all in together doesn't address those differences. Winnipeg needs to stop letting real estate speculators and developers dictate what is done in our city. Wellington Crescent area is perfect example of a neigbourhood losing its character. Instead of beautiful street with stately homes. its turning into a street with gaudy Mcmansions and homes designed that look like prisons. In the Cresentwood and Osborne area homes are purchased and then allowed to fall apart, bring down the neigbourhood, then torn down to build some multi-family dwellling that doesn't fit into the neighbourhood. t	10/9/2020 2:22 PM
127	Hopefully the planners will start to listen to some of the suggestions	10/9/2020 11:16 AM
128	I am totally against subdividing lots.	10/9/2020 9:09 AM
129	I was impressed reading through all the material. This is a great step forward! I have nothing to add.	10/9/2020 8:24 AM
130	I think you live in a certain neighbourhood because you like the culture/lifestyle there. Maybe that's why people don't like infill housing. It clashes.	10/8/2020 11:58 PM
131	Respect and hear our concerns	10/8/2020 8:08 PM
132	Put a moratorium on this practice or eliminating it entirely. The whole idea is a step backward in the improvement of these areas and an insult to these areas Heritage. Perhaps offer programs or incentives for existing Home Owners to have access to, to improve the existing Structures and Property and beautify Winnipeg.	10/8/2020 3:00 PM
133	Just do the right things for the people of Winnipeg please…Thank you	10/8/2020 2:56 PM
134	Stop lot splitting you are tearing down beautiful trees and ruining our neighbourhoods, We don't want them. Too many people, too much traffic, parking problems, safety issues, fires etc. WE DON'T WANT IT !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!! STAY AWAY FROM MUNROE !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!	10/8/2020 2:12 PM
135	A duplex went up next to my house and within 2 months of it being complete the WPS tactical unit raided and arrested the tenants. Since then the latest tenants have been walking all over my lawn and letting their dogs poop wherever it pleases. So I am bitter and probably to the best person to fill this survey out however is used to work in the construction industry and these new in fills are for the most part built to the lowest possible standard and as cheap as possible. I have never seen a building inspector come around and the developers only want to make a quick dollar and have no regard for the neighborhood because they don’t live in it themselves.	10/8/2020 2:03 PM
136	Your survey is designed in the favor of your proposal and is not designed to hear the real feedback of residents in existing neighborhoods. I'm very disappointed in the leadership of our municipal representatives.	10/8/2020 10:14 AM
137	Does the government really listen or is this a typical waste of time and money?	10/8/2020 8:47 AM
138	I'm pretty much ready to move out of the city to a bedroom community. The mediocre-quality infill housing that soaks up lots and removes trees is not enhancing anything in mhy neighbourhood. The roads are still bad, more congested, and the sidewalks are old poorly maintained. Cycling is more dangerous with increased traffic, so we don't so much of that anymore.	10/7/2020 8:58 PM
139	These guidelines reflect a health middle ground between the two sides of the argument.	10/7/2020 7:52 PM

	Ensuring up down duplexes are not created on 25 foot lots is a huge step forward.	
140	Just because Winnipeg identifies as a less dense City than others, does not mean that is a bad thing at all, if anything that is what increases the quality of life in our City. Density has a negative effect on neighbourhood communities as we see in these more densely populated Cities. It is SAD our City is caving in to the greedy demands of developers who do not care about the City communities they impact. The vast majority want to buy cheap, build big and line their pockets. This is the reason this survey even exists and our City needs to stand up for residents. Stop comparing Winnipeg to other City's as those Cities have huge density issues because they let their developers drive their expansion policies. Embrace Winnipeg and try to have responsible development that allows a "right to light" attitude to existing residents, is sympathetic to surrounding housing to keep our neighbourhoods balanced and keeps the quality of life for indoor and outdoor activities on properties thriving for generations.	10/7/2020 3:05 PM
141	This program is a money grab by the city and nothing more. Based on the current new home constructions and renovation levels and the dubious history of the permit and inspection department of the city, it is impossible for each project to receive a proper and accurate inspection, therefore the buyer of these homes is taking a large risk. Many of the homes that have been replaced were suffering from sinking foundations which were possibly the result of poor building methods and lack of inspections. I have walked by some of these newly built homes and have seen new steps and porches separating from the homes they were attached to. Wooden steps can been seen to day that are crooked and not level. Quality should prevail over a cash grab.	10/7/2020 10:43 AM
142	Guide lines are great if only they are followed. See Osborne Village-a dogs breakfast!	10/7/2020 10:29 AM
143	People have purchased their homes and invested in upgrades over the years to maintain their homes and infill housing can wreck an area. To much traffic. Leave existing neighborhoods alone.	10/6/2020 9:46 PM
144	They should not be built in our neighbourhoods.	10/6/2020 6:01 PM
145	I’ve lived on my property for my whole life. I rebuild my home to city requirements even swept the street for a block after dump trucks when being built. I ve maintained my propertty Followed all the rules And am now being rewarded by lot splitting and towering sun blocking monsters and no parking. Powerless to fight this nonsense	10/6/2020 4:03 PM
146	Thanks for trying. I wish you had a bigger budget to do proper consultations -- because I fear your goals for infill (which I agree with) will not be met because of the 'one size fits all' nature of the guidelines -- so people will oppose all of it, instead of embracing the concept and working to develop infill that works. Thanks for trying!	10/6/2020 3:47 PM
147	The City has totally ruined existing neighbourhoods with the current in-fill program. New house are too high, crowding out older homes with lack of sunshine, trees being removed so it now looks like a bare new development that has distracted from the uniqueness of older neighbourhoods, ruining the characters of these older areas that use to have an old Europe flair to them.	10/6/2020 3:09 PM
148	I have a 6-plex built recently behind my R1 home where no resident that I am aware of is taking transit yet that was part of the pitch and now I'm dealing with almost 12 vehicles behind my garage when only 7 parking spaces were asphalted. Not to mention public lane is crazy with traffic now. So much for my mature neighborhood!	10/6/2020 2:45 PM
149	NIMBY thinking does not help renew our city and make it more fiscally viable in the future. Property taxes will have to increase to pay for lack of new development and increased assessment base values in city	10/6/2020 7:56 AM
150	Guidelines must be in place to protect neighbouring houses from harm caused by construction (broken windows, cracked foundation, etc) The tree canopy must be maintained in all areas of residential development. Currently we are seeing too many trees cut down, especially in lot splits - and this needs to stop.	10/5/2020 9:20 PM
151	There should be direct consultation with the residents of the neighbourhood being "revitalized"...the people who live in the area should have major input into (a) how their neighbourhood develops, (b) issues that may affect the investment they have made in their homes, (c) and that process should be simplified and accessible, (d) the final decision should rest with the residents.	10/5/2020 6:15 PM

152	Infrastructure in many older neighbourhoods insufficient to handle extra parking, sewer, traffic, etc. Must be considered before adding any units. Don't want a multi-unit structure forced on me by overzealous developers and cash hungry city administration.	10/5/2020 1:55 PM
153	Yes, make sure that Bryan Mayes gets a copy of this response, and I know that I speak for our household and several others to leave it alone.	10/5/2020 12:34 PM
154	Lot Area coverage for Bi-Leve Homes should be 37%. Nobody wants to buy a house that is less than 900 sq ft anymore. There is no market for that.	10/5/2020 12:33 PM
155	My name is Kristin Collins. I am in support of infill development in mature neighbourhoods. I live next to 3 recent infill developments and would be willing to provide my feedback to better serve the City of Winnipeg's Infill Strategy. I can be reached at Kristin_Collins@shaw.ca	10/5/2020 12:21 PM
156	Infills to date SUCK!	10/5/2020 11:20 AM
157	I am on Carter Avenue and have experienced damage to my foundation as a result of infill housing. I called the city to complain and was told my only recourse was to go to Court...hardly the response that a tax paying citizen expected.	10/4/2020 10:47 PM
158	I would like the City to listen to its citizens living in those neighborhoods that have been hit hard by infill. But that won't happen.	10/4/2020 9:57 PM
159	There is a fundamental issue here that needs to be considered - aside from the City of Winnipeg's revenue challenges. It is often assumed that property values always going up is a good thing for everyone: homeowners "investment" goes up, increased assessments mean higher revenues for the city and density means that services can be delivered more efficiently. Ever-increasing property prices are good for lenders and developers, and people who bought in early, but not for renters, or new home buyers. Consider that in every other area in society, we tend to look at things getting more expensive as a problem - but not for real estate. The more expensive housing is, the more people are spending for a basic necessity of life. It increases the cost of living, of doing business, of mortgage and interest payments. Many of the promises made by developers, or theorists, about development "paying for itself" do not happen. What happens instead is that there are new neighbourhoods and old ones lose services and maintenance. Replacing an old affordable home with one that is new and unaffordable is not an improvement.	10/4/2020 8:43 PM
160	Perhaps guidelines for construction operations in established neighbourhoods (access, cleanliness, damage to adjacent properties etc.) Maybe a damage/liability deposit with the building permit to address neighbours' concerns, refundable at occupancy.	10/4/2020 1:33 PM
161	not at this time	10/4/2020 1:21 PM
162	The landscaping requirements could be strengthened by adding specific rainwater absorption targets	10/4/2020 10:23 AM
163	It would make sense to designate commmities that are to remain as single family at the outset of the new in fill guidelines. There are neighborhoods that are amenable to in fill and others that are not, for example; Old St.Vital - Infill, Kingston Crescent - Single Family.	10/4/2020 9:53 AM
164	input from neighbors prior to final approval	10/3/2020 10:16 PM
165	I do not think that “infill” will allow the preservation of family oriented neighborhoods. It will change traffic flow, community needs, value of homes, desire to stay in existing neighborhoods, integrity of architecture, drainage, street parking for visitors... Please ensure that these neighborhoods are preserved.	10/3/2020 8:04 PM
166	Do not allow multi family homes in predominantly single family areas	10/3/2020 8:02 PM
167	The idea of infill is very good to maximize space and utilities ot just needs to be done correctly.	10/3/2020 7:33 PM
168	DO NOT MAKE WINNIPEG A COOKIE CUTTER CITY.	10/3/2020 2:17 PM
169	I would like to thank you for the opportunity to respond to a well thought out survey. I recently responded to a survey on open streets that was so biased it was laughable.	10/3/2020 1:11 PM
170	Ever since they tore down a house across the street, our city sidewalk has sunk. I've seen two people fall. My sewer line under the street is crushed. My house, land and boulevard are all sinking and leaning forward. It isn't fair. They also like to build until 10 or 11 at night.	10/3/2020 11:42 AM

171	Ensure those her permit zoning changes or do inspections etc are held accountable and not bought off by developers... that greed cannot overrun a good intention system... neighbourhoods must take priority over developers greed. Find ways to incentives for developers working outside the old boxes... they MUST find new climate change building methods for ALL projects... we are in Climate crisis so materials used, reused, repurposed MUST become a priority in ALL planning... we cannot keep just expanding our infrastructure in a time of world climate crisis... incentives for climate mitigation must become incorporated into all future builds!!	10/3/2020 11:13 AM
172	There should be a document on how contractors should go about construction of these projects with respect to neighboring properties during construction to minimize intrusion and inconvenience to others. For example: hours of heavy equipment operation (noise), prevention of damage to neighboring homes, fencing and land, parking (they should not be working from a back lane, blocking garages), refuse disposal, worker sanitation (portable toilets should be required on site). Although many projects are completed quickly, some are not and existing homeowners face a long time of disruption.	10/3/2020 11:07 AM
173	It is unacceptable when infill rob neighbors of sunlight and are completely out of scale with them; this should never have happened; these eyesores could have been prevented with real third party design review	10/3/2020 10:59 AM
174	Again, this should not take place in isolation. The proper governments need to be engaged to ensure that our elected officials live in the areas they represent. Having lived in different areas in Winnipeg I know that it is not possible to fully understand an area unless you live in it.	10/3/2020 10:53 AM
175	Although there are certainly areas in which lot splitting would be acceptable, please do not allow lot splitting in mature, low density neighbourhoods.	10/3/2020 10:26 AM
176	Firsty, drive around the areas 1 and 2 and see what is happening already. Visualize what is already in place with the mis-match of single dwellings and side by side modern rocket ships. Lets see how it looks to you when there is a classic tree lined street feel that emerges into the 21st century with modern, edgy town houses. Secondly, the multi dwelling side by side setup, Is too much for one lot. 4x dwellings is a lot of traffic that is added to back lanes and frontage of houses. You add another few lots like this the influx of people,traffic and etc goes up. What was once a quiet street is now buzzing with action.	10/3/2020 9:29 AM
177	No	10/3/2020 8:23 AM
178	Nope. Because the people who transfer over these comments are too chicken shit to share the actual input people put. They're nothing but two bit thieves for beaurecrats and business. They'll do/say anything for money.	10/3/2020 8:06 AM
179	With infill lots becoming more and more popular, special attention needs to be paid to the aging infrastructure around the infill. Sidewalk, curb, boulevard, and back lanes are more easily damaged with the developers and builders taking little responsibility. Damage deposits collected for these locations currently are not sufficient enough to hold the developers or builders accountable.	10/3/2020 7:01 AM
180	Quality of life is important like having a yard with a home. Otherwise it's just an apartment. Keeping houses with yards is a good thing. Small business use, hobbies, gardens, etc... Making sure neighborhoods maintain their roles in lifestyle is important.	10/3/2020 12:51 AM
181	As a City we need to place more weight on what's "good planning" as opposed to the voices of few "NIMBY's" who don't want to see change regardless of what it looks like, and of the politicians who are given to great of a voice in the approvals process and are politically motivated to not upset anyone even if it's considered good planning and will have a net positive benefit for the City in the long run.	10/2/2020 10:11 PM
182	Moratorium on new developments in the suburbs. Encourage infill and multi family conversions by taking away some of the bureaucracy, rules and fees for applications. If we want to increase density, we have to make it easier for owners to do so. Get a permit, get it inspected and you're done. No applications, no variances.	10/2/2020 3:54 PM
183	DOn't do it... as a policy. Developers love it. The neighbourhoods do not love it. If you did this is area 1 neighbourhoods, then the character of some of Winnipeg's most beautiful and long standing neighbourhoods would look like 'Box stores''. No thank you	10/2/2020 3:11 PM
184	This is no joke. What I see is a movement to destroy the character and value of homes in	10/2/2020 2:35 PM

	older established neighborhoods.Try this in Wolseley. They'll go nuts.	
185	they’re building these houses with a detached garage which leaves no yard or any place to shovel snow. This situation applies to me, across the back lane behind my garage, they shovel their snow up against my garage. The house next door to me is planned to be demolished. The owner went to the City with - the old house is full of asbestos. What are the laws/restrictions of tearing down an existing home with asbestos?? Can they just tear it down allowing asbestos to freely float around the neighborhood??!! So myself & my dogs can breathe it in?! I have yet to see them safely remove it. The City says this is affordable housing??? Really? They’re selling them at 400,000? How is this affordable for a lot of people? Now if the old house sold for fair market value then it can be renovated and more affordable for many young people. And they would have a yard. I just retired and finally after 34 yrs working shift work I can finally, finally be able to enjoy my backyard...but nope! There’ll be two TALL houses built beside me so no more sunsets OR sun for that matter. I’ve been in my house for 20 yrs, some of my neighbours just as long if not longer. They too are opposed to these houses. We have all signed a petition against it. However, the City does not care. The have raised our property tax stating “we need to repair roads” well this year they came once to grade the gravel back lane that was so full of potholes I really don’t know how the garbage trucks didn’t blow an axel! It was SO BAD that the graders had to come twice. It used to be done in the spring then again in the fall plus they’d spray to keep the dust level down. That was not the case this year. Recently a tall two story went up right behind my house. They poured the basement then proceeded to build within five days...idk when I had my garage pad poured 20 yrs ago it took a week to cure. Then I was awoken one night account the house was on fire. Luckily the fire department got it under control so the homes now so close together were not affected. That said, when building the house they damaged the existing home beside it. That neighbour now has a lawsuit against them. Can we say headache??!! Sure he could make a claim but this will go against him, raising his house insurance and all for what?? Greed. Greed for the shady builders own benefit. Oh btw...they just did quick repairs on the house, basically just put masking tape repairs on it (I have pictures)	10/2/2020 2:09 PM
186	increase overall green space in all areas	10/2/2020 10:21 AM
187	I’m not sure how this could be incorporated into the guidelines but overall finish should be compatible. I face an infill house currently being constructed which seems to meet the guidelines but whose finish is @ At least 80% pure black stucco which does not suit the neighborhood. It’s a corner lot so the black stucco on the Street side and garage is very dominant. 2 other infill houses on my block are suited to the neighborhood.	10/1/2020 8:37 PM
188	Hire dedicated infill staff. PP&D has a small amount of staff as compared to cities like Edmonton. Especially if you desire to keep guidelines so technical and the process so arduous. It's not fair to the department employees either.	10/1/2020 4:43 PM
189	The city needs more modern, affordable housing. Not affordable because it is poorly built, or because it's in a terrible area. Affordable because the design is efficient, open-concept, and conserves resources; and a lot of competition and innovation is needed to get to that point. As soon as our adult children can afford to move out of our house (if ever?) we have to downsize in order to get expenses under control. (mortgage + property tax + house insurance + electricity + natural gas + sewer and water + internet and cell phones + sidewalk/garage/roof/toilet repair) If there are no affordable large sized dwelling spaces in the city, then we have no choice but to move out of the city, likely to another province where commuting makes sense; no free-ways in Winnipeg mean commuting from outside the perimeter is silly.	10/1/2020 4:43 PM
190	make it easy for the regular person to read and understand.	10/1/2020 4:12 PM
191	Overall, many good considerations in place, but Privacy and Safety are concerning.	10/1/2020 3:35 PM
192	n/a	10/1/2020 1:50 PM
193	Happy to see new "rules" are being implemented. The sooner the better.	10/1/2020 1:24 PM
194	Would like new infill guidelines to: 1) developers and construction workers to better manage waste - many times these developers let their building supplies and the plastic packaging of building supplies and insulation to blow around and into neighbouring properties and public areas (such as sidewalks, park area, and forest areas). Beyond the building supplies, the contractors can be horrible with disposing their lunches - coffee and slurpee cups and straws on the ground, McDonalds wrappers and burger packages, granola bar wrappers, yogurt	10/1/2020 1:20 PM

	containers - the infill guidelines should require that all development sites have garbage cans for workers and that the workers are instructed to use the garbage cans, and a clause that city inspectors can fine the developer on random inspection or if a neighbor complains about garbage and construction materials not being properly disposed. 2) the infill guidelines should have a clause which clearly holds the developers and owners of the property under development responsible for any damage to adjacent properties and buildings. For example, if the work causes shifting ground which collapses a fence or part of a building. And especially for vibrations - often large machinery, excavators, and digging equipment, concrete trucks, and even skid-steer / bob cat - can cause harmful vibrations to surrounding buildings which can crack foundations, crack stucco finishes, break interior features such as flooring, and also resulting in collapse of suspended features (ex. ceiling and wall). Digging and moving soil can also result in shifting of the ground - which can cause building to sink and crack - especially where the ground has lots of clay. The infill guidelines should have clear clauses which assign responsibility to the developers for any such damage to adjacent property. 3) The infill guidelines should prohibit changes in variances and distance of building from property lines for features added onto buildings. For example, if the wall of the house is required to be 6 feet from the property line - then it should not be allowed for the addition of a deck or window-wells or other concrete or wood features extended out from the building - which can cause the 6 foot distance to be only 2 feet. 4) Tree roots must be clearly protected in the infill guidelines, too often large machinery maneouvers very close to trees and developers also pile heavy weight of soil and gravel and building supplies close to trees - even if the tree is not hit, the weight of the materials and machinery can easily crush and kill the roots. Recently there was a property which lost several (~10) trees as a result of the roots being crushed. Smaller equipment such as skid-steer are less likely to cause root damage - so the guidelines should make it clear that wherever possible, the developer should be required to use smaller machinery to do the job. For example an excavator should only be used to excavate - not to move earth between various points on a property. A demolition bulldozer should only be used for demolition, not for regular use to do the work of a skid steer. And Semi-trucks and other dump trucks should not be moving back and forth on the properties - these machines already weigh enough to crush roads, so why are they being driving over yards with trees and not expect the roots to be crushed?	
195	no	10/1/2020 11:50 AM
196	Put more pressure on the province to invest in infill housing for social housing. Give preference to organizations seeking to solve housing issues when selling city-owned lots	10/1/2020 11:14 AM
197	There are some neighbourhoods where developers move in and don't understand the culture of the neighbourhood around them. We nurture our trees and green space. Where we are, three new developments moved in and either cut mature trees down, or damaged to roots beyond repair. Some areas, like Wellington Crescent, don't seem to be getting affected by this, please explain why this is? There are better areas in Winnipeg to densify. One broad statement saying all mature neighbourhoods need to densify is a rather short sighted, in that if you've not been to the neighbourhood, or understand its culture, it's green space around buildings is part of the culture we choose to move into. To densify it would mean the loss of its original value. Does the city plan on compensating home-owners if the value of their home goes down after this is finalized? Also where we live there is one road to get in and out, if you densify this neighbourhood the traffic jam daily will be horrendous.	9/30/2020 8:23 PM
198	I guess at this point it is a tough not to focus on developers as they would be the only ones to afford buying up this land for re-development.	9/30/2020 3:47 PM
199	How is a new homeowner supposed to get into the market when developers are purchasing the perfectly good homes that they could afford in order to rip them down, subdivide and sell two homes in its place? I agree that neighbourhoods can be revived by replacing old and dilapidated houses, but that’s not what seems to be happening. Continually approving new neighbourhoods in outlying suburbs is likely one of the main reasons why older neighbourhoods are languishing.	9/30/2020 3:34 PM
200	Stop the madness	9/30/2020 2:58 PM
201	I thought we got away from developers running city hall?	9/30/2020 12:58 PM
202	Most or all of the draft guidelines can already be achieved with existing bylaws, so I don't understand the reasoning for these new guidelines except as a reaction to NIMBY neighbours.	9/30/2020 12:01 PM
203	Make the process as seamless as possible when it come to permitting and inspections.	9/29/2020 11:39 PM

204	the ability for a lot owner to split their parcel of land should be made easier. firecodes and by-laws should be pushed onto the development lot and not requested to retrofit exisiting houses.	9/29/2020 3:36 PM
205	Understood that the city wants density for economic reasons. There are dense cities that are very nice places to live; but this light touch is not the way they got there... Winnipeg developers are used to operating with a very low level of concern for the communities they impact; when criticized by people who have invested the majority of their life savings in their homes; they argue that they are following the rules, and try to deflect the anger to the City... Not a good situation for the city. Time to create standards for everyone in the development process that require sustainability, responsiveness to community, compatibility. The UK has developed the Considerate Constructor Scheme; an industry initiative which governments promote by requiring constructors to abide by the rules to be eligible for government benefits such as contracts, permits, etc... https://www.ccscheme.org.uk/ Time for the local design and build businesses to get on board a code of ethics along those lines	9/29/2020 2:08 PM
206	The wording of these questions, let alone the line of questioning in itself is insulting to the actual people whom are affected by this situation. On top of that, it is known that only the 'positive' responses will be accepted and used to further your agenda, and any 'negative' and/or 'true' responses will be 'lost in the system' and completely ignored by the dictators.	9/29/2020 1:38 PM
207	I live in a house that is an infill at Guya and Youville. I am continually harassed by neighbours and have had the by law officer out numerous times because certain neighbours do not like the fact that I am in an infill house. The neighbourhood has a few great people, but there is a large group of very loud and annoying people that continue to call by law on me and my house.	9/29/2020 1:27 PM
208	Thank you for asking infill owners their opinion. I live in old Transcona and see new infills go up all the time. 99% of the time they're replacing an absolute dump. Most people who build infill aren't knocking down a solid, nice home. Winnipeg has sprawled to the permimetre and infill is the future of keeping the old city alive. Toronto, Vancouver, Edmonton all have infill homes go up all the time. As long as we listen to people who put their money where their mouth is, i.e property owners, then we're doing our job as a community. If neighbours whine and dislike the look of a building, they can collectively pay to upgrade it. If they don't want to, they should be told: tough luck.	9/29/2020 9:49 AM
209	The “goals” do not align with the desires of the neighbourhood residents, only urbanists and developers. No one wants these god awful giant buildings in their nice old neighborhoods	9/29/2020 9:48 AM
210	The city needs to rethink this strategy with carbon emissions, rather than developer and "citizen" appeasement in mind.	9/29/2020 8:40 AM
211	While I am really happy to see a survey, I have filled enough of these out, and seen enough 30 to 40 feet structures continue to go up in my neighbourhood of Glenwood, that I just don't believe this city is serious about enforcement when it comes to infills. I think it's all about the property taxes, and I don't think you care about long-term existing taxpayers in these neighbourhoods at all. I'll believe it when I see it at this point. Surprise me.	9/28/2020 9:59 PM
212	This survey appears to be geared towards a developer and not a resident in a mature neighbourhood. The wording of the questions does not give us a choice to not want the infill housing.	9/28/2020 1:11 PM
213	The guidelines sound great but when are they going to be put in place. In my Glenwood neighborhood houses with double lots are being torn down along with mature trees & big ugly boxes are being thrown up at lightning speed. Let's get going!!!	9/28/2020 11:37 AM
214	The entire Variance appeals process is a massive waste of time, tax payer $ and rarely listens to the existing community members opinions. People are being forced out of their own Neighbourhood because of these developements and even after spending days defending what rights they think they have, will not be fairly considered.	9/28/2020 8:33 AM
215	I realize that both the City and developers benefit from maximizing profits from city lands, so the likelihood that these changes will be applied to benefit the community are small.	9/28/2020 8:29 AM
216	Many cities are moving to end exclusionary, single-family-only zoning across their whole jurisdiction. Winnipeg should be moving in this direction at least when it comes to mature communities.	9/28/2020 12:05 AM
217	Restrict the size and number fo trees a developer can cut per lot. Enforce guidelines on protecting trees on infill lots during construction. The city is focusing on mature	9/27/2020 8:18 PM

	neighbourhoods for its infill strategy which could result in a significant loss to Winnipeg's canopy. Please consider this inevitable loss as diminishing to the character of these mature neighbourhoods.	
218	allowance for greenspace	9/27/2020 2:27 PM
219	You are destroying neighbourhoods. Trees are disappearing. Houses that are built do not blend in with mature neighbourhoods.	9/27/2020 2:16 PM
220	Yes. Your Q. 16 presupposes that a respondent agree with your stated goals. The question is flawed.	9/27/2020 9:55 AM
221	Please consider building new traditional-like houses with basements under 1000 square feet near transportation to integrate into the more traditional neighbourhoods with attention to design construction and smart landscaping. As well please stop with the sloppy pieced-together asymmetrical cookie-cutter home build monsters. The new developed houses in Fort Gary South near the UofM are an example. What makes older houses appealing is their hominess, personalities and uniqueness of design. Please no more mod cookie cutter houses.	9/26/2020 8:15 PM
222	Please for the love of all that is good in the world, listen to the current residents. We are not just a bunch of complainers resistant to change. We have valid concerns and wise persons have done the research. These new homes are not all they are cracked up to be.	9/26/2020 4:38 PM
223	Until this last summer I have never experienced an in-fill being build close to my home. But I have certainly walked, cycled and driven by many, many homes in older neighbourhoods that I feel are far too large for the lot and there is little to no redeeming character to the design of the new house. They simply look like homes suitable for new developments rather than fitting in with older neighbourhoods. I would like to end this by saying that my experience with the infills now currently being built near my home has not been a pleasant one. Crew are coming on to the site after the cut off time (10 pm) and just this morning (Sept.26) the crew working on the in-fill behind me where out before 8am with a 'Bob-cat' removing garbage off the site. Also lost a mature elm tree in my backyard when the contractor, who owns the property next door to me, excavated the new site so close to my fence that the entire root system on one side of my tree was removed making the tree unstable. I tried to get compensation for the damage done- by having this contractor pay for the tree to be removed- by contacting a lawyer. But was told that unless the removal of the elm tree decreased my property value (it doesn't) I could expect no compensation and it is now my responsibility to pay for the removal of the tree before it topples. If this contractor had damaged a mature elm on the boulevard he would be paying damages to the city, but he is off the hook when it comes to damages done to private property ! I shouldn't have pay for someone else's carelessness.	9/26/2020 4:21 PM
224	My neighbourhood, Wolseley, has a minimal infill development and a population in chronic decline. It is extremely opposed to any increases in density and actively resists development proposals that would increase density. NIMBYism needs to be overcome in neighbourhoods like Wolseley with sensible, sensitive policy, to ensure that it remains viable in the long term.	9/26/2020 3:24 PM
225	Do not allow any multi units besides a duplex.	9/26/2020 11:16 AM
226	These policies seem to me a radical improvement over the haphazard development and infill eyesores that are the status quo.	9/25/2020 11:43 PM
227	I have little faith in this as I attended an appeals meeting on a lot split in my neighbourhood and the board was rude and dismissive as was councillor Matt Allard. Over twenty letters from neighbours were never even looked at and only the developer was listened to. The process is designed to appear to listen to residents while not actually doing so. Developers are violating building codes, promising one thing and doing another, destroying neighbouring properties and the City looks the other way. The City talks about environmentalism all while destroying our urban forest and increasing the load of cars, and On infrastructure In our neighbourhoods that are lower income.	9/25/2020 6:31 PM
228	While I accept the fact that change happens, and housing is a need, I don't like the idea that current neighbourhoods need to be changed - ie - I moved into my house because I liked the neighbourhood as it is/was. I don't appreciate the entire look and character being changed by the addition of new modern look houses and/or houses that look like trailer homes crammed into every available space.	9/25/2020 2:45 PM
229	I believe in infill housing and new development in established neighbourhoods there are several examples of beautiful developments in River Heights - where I live. But there are also	9/25/2020 1:02 PM

	examples of terrible developments which have compromised the integrity and beauty of my neighbourhood. Please do better to set criteria for things that you have not described as "secondary considerations". Also I laughed when I read the questions about increasing population levels to retain schools and services and encouraging transit use - I suggest not approving massive suburban developments which require new schools, services and lots of time spent in cars.	
230	Who pays for infrastructure upgrades that are required to accomodate the new housing. On my street, the developer refused to pay, so the City transferred the costs to the current residents. Clearly, the developers control this City.	9/25/2020 8:45 AM
231	Typically the developer says whatever they need to to get what they want , then do whatever the hell they want . Residents concerns are placated	9/25/2020 8:36 AM
232	Go back to the drawing board and hold meaningful consultations with real residents (not urban planners) once this pandemic is over. In the meantime, put everything on hold. Shame on you for ramming this through during a pandemic when we are already stressed to the max.	9/24/2020 7:41 PM
233	Winnipeg is very racially segregated, this needs to also be addressed while addressing city planning. My thought is lower property taxes, provide incentives within areas of the city, discourage suburbs.	9/24/2020 7:16 PM
234	At one time for a new infill was a 50' foot lot. Now that has even changed. The lots are smaller then 50' yet the infill goes thru. So not sure if the city actually enforces any guileless	9/24/2020 12:49 PM
235	Do not build infill developments near railways, such as in the Fort Rouge area! And most certainly, consider the increased traffic when building entire developments. The Fort Rouge Yards should have had a tunnel for vehicular, pedestrian, and bike traffice built, leading from the yards to Pembina Highway to reduce the traffic issues on South Osborne and Jubilee. This was a grievous oversight. Moreover, the Fort Rouge Yards should never have been built where it is because of the dangers associated with train derailments. Further development of the Yards should cease.	9/24/2020 10:24 AM
236	Yes, I would like to underscore the great need in this city for affordable housing. I have lived in River Heights all of my life, and I believe that there should be the opportunity for individuals/families of all financial means to be able to afford to live here. Especially in multi family dwellings, I would like to see a mix of market and affordable housing, not just high end condo type dwellings.	9/24/2020 9:53 AM
237	It just isn't enough. It will not achieve your stated goals. It will not make our city financially or ecologically sustainable. Read 'Elmwood Guy' and ioin YIMBY	9/24/2020 9:47 AM
238	New infill housing is a necessary development. What is lacking has been the negative impact on existing homeowners who at times can be unreasonable.	9/24/2020 9:32 AM
239	It is interesting that on the map the CIty didn't list all the neighbourhoods so that people can actually see where these guidelines will be put in place. I note that Tuxedo was not mentioned as a "mature community" but River Heights, St Boniface, St Vital are. Why are the mature neighbourhoods with the smaller lost the target of increasing densities? why are other communities with the larger lots and generally larger houses not included? will splitting a 150 ft lot to two 75 lots not be in keeping with the neighbourhood? if thats the case its even more so for a neighbourhood with predominantly small 50 foot lots being split to 25 foot lots. I really don't want my neighbour to be able to see into my backyard nor wave at them in the morning when I am brushing my teeth.	9/24/2020 9:26 AM
240	Get quality, qualified builders with vision. Stop adhoc development by small or individuals who are after quick profit.	9/24/2020 9:05 AM
241	I do feel as though clearer guidelines are important but firmly believe that these decisions cannot be made from an office and still need to have each property and area looked at individually. My experience with the signage is it’s generally pretty vague so there’s an onus on the neighbourhood to become more involved in the research behind what is actually going on.	9/24/2020 8:52 AM
242	Developers make buildings to generate cash, not to improve neighborhoods - so, it's the cheapest buildings possible sold at the highest prices in the most-desirable locations. It's a recipe for disaster and the reason these guidelines need citizen and/or neighborhood oversight. Sign me up!	9/24/2020 7:44 AM
243	Need more bike paths thru these areas to prevent car congestion	9/23/2020 10:29 PM

244	Thanks for doing this. It is needed. I wish you the best and I hope whoever is on the team will consider some of the concerns mentioned in this survey. I'm all for replacing disfunctional old wrecks, but to fill these entire footprints with massive boxes really has so many negatives for the neighborhood. Developers are not looking out for the interests of the community as I have witnessed in mine.	9/23/2020 9:27 PM
245	This needs to be considered/expanded to less mature neighborhood developments and capitalize on improving density and diversity in new new neighborhoods with defined criteria	9/23/2020 8:42 PM
246	More townhouses. More density. This proposal is barely a baby step forward.	9/23/2020 8:27 PM
247	The process and consultation is not extensive enough and does not include design scenarios and design recommendations to promote an incremental approach to infill development and community context/character.	9/23/2020 6:59 PM
248	keep greenspace ratio high	9/23/2020 6:42 PM
249	There should be a requirement that grading of the property does not adversely affect the surrounding properties, destruction of surrounding properties by construction is not addressed.	9/23/2020 6:39 PM
250	Be strict - so far your approach is ruining my River Heights neighborhood and lowering the value of my home - into which I have poured a SUBSTANTIAL investment	9/23/2020 6:38 PM
251	no infill housing.	9/23/2020 6:21 PM
252	I would like the city to be aware of developers and real estate agents who are attempting to skirt around the rules. We almost bought a house that the real estate agent and the owner were selling on a 50 ft lot, but wait, they were only selling the house and 25 feet of the lot. The owner was attempting to retain the 'other lot' (which was not officially divided) in order to build on it. How can the owner and agent conspire to do this and not be acting illegally?	9/23/2020 6:08 PM
253	Winnipeg has gone down hill and over the edge of the cliff since Glenn Murray's departial . It's been run by money grubbing greedy back door dealing business men ever since	9/23/2020 5:47 PM
254	These guidelines should primarily focus on improving the lives of Winnipeggers and not enhancing developers' profits.	9/23/2020 5:28 PM
255	Mandatory tree planting should be part of the plan.	9/23/2020 4:43 PM
256	Questions are misleading and will distort the overall perceptions of people!	9/23/2020 4:39 PM
257	No	9/23/2020 4:36 PM
258	It is good to see the quantity of trees and shrubs 'required' in this document.	9/23/2020 4:20 PM
259	no	9/23/2020 4:16 PM
260	Start over and ask the people who live in the affected neighborhoods what their ideal process for updating or upgrading their neighborhood might be, and what they believe their future neighborhood should look like.	9/23/2020 3:55 PM
261	I worry that the city will favour development over community concerns and will just give lip service to legitimate worries.	9/23/2020 3:49 PM
262	Remove all parking requirements. Let all buildings go deeper into lots. This document is a very light touch, when a stronger vision for change and density is needed.	9/23/2020 12:01 PM
263	On a personal note, I lived in a mature neighborhood for over 30 years (700 block of Rosedale Ave.). We were going to stay there for life. Then about 18 years ago, houses that had been there since we moved into the neighbourhood were torn down, lots split to 25ft lots and tall narrow houses went up that did not "fit" our neighborhood house style. Their garages build almost to the lane. Our backlane was a nightmare with their snow being dumped on the lane and no room left for their garbage cans for pick up. Parking on our street became hard as there were more cars for each new house. Then we found out that there was a proposed condo development (many stories) to be built on the baseball diamond across from our house. More changes. More cars parking on our street. It felt like a war zone with all the construction around us. It didn't feel like our neighborhood anymore...the neighbourhood my kids went to school from Nusery to Grade 12...we had been invaded by these developers that wanted to make a buck with no regard to who was living in our neighborhood. We felt powerless to have any input on all these developments. When we went infront of the property board about one	9/23/2020 11:51 AM

	such development our concerns were brushed aside. Just powerless! Sad to say this was just too much change for us. We sold our much loved home and moved to a new development (which I thought I would never do). I believe in improving all neighbourhoods but local residents who live there need to have more control on what happens. The majority of the infill developers do not have the area residents and the neighbourhood best interests in mind. They tear down, split lots, build, sell then move on. We need more long range neighborhood plans developed to maintain the livability of the neighboods, new and mature. Thank you	
264	No.	9/23/2020 9:38 AM
265	The City might want to consider limiting the hours that construction companies can work on infill projects. People are trying to live in these neighbourhoods and sometimes work from home. It's unfair to make people endure construction noise on weekends and evenings while people are trying to relax and enjoy their homes.	9/23/2020 9:23 AM
266	infill housing ruins neighborhoods -	9/23/2020 9:16 AM
267	I'm concerned with the Area 1 and Area 2 zoning, and that it'll be difficult to build more density into Area 1. As long as these guidelines will be updated in the next few years, this is a good place to start. But I think the city just has to really make up a lot of time to avoid completely missing our Climate Action goals, never mind the health and financial well-being of the community.	9/22/2020 10:20 PM
268	Personally I would like to see more senior independent living apartments within residential neighborhoods, that allow small pets(proven health benefits)	9/22/2020 3:37 PM
269	Please make it easier for us to build a granny suite behind our duplex for my mother and father in law to live in. We need them closer to home.	9/22/2020 2:40 PM
270	We strongly suspect that our corner lot, 100 year old home, with Eaton interiors, will likely be demolished as a result of this kind of guideline. Further, as a 'tear down'--we'll get less for it and be told it's not valuable because of these guidelines that emphasize corner lots in River Heights/Crescentwood. There's absolutely no emphasis placed on valuing the homes that are here, the families who chose to settle in mature neighbourhoods, or the need to renovate and reuse our historic housing for sustainability reasons. I've just watched the house next door be torn down with no salvage done whatsoever. Radiators, old growth lumber, leaded glass, and more--all destined for the landfill. The demolition caused us pest issues, cracked our foundation and plaster walls--few efforts were made to protect us and there was a digger 18" from our dining room window. This kind of infill situation (single family to single family, no variances) was entirely legal under the current regulations and it was wasteful and unnecessary. None of the neighbours knew when it would start or how much damage it would cause--people had walls crack halfway down the street. Make it financially viable for people to salvage and restore homes and re-vision our neighbourhoods without simply just tearing it all down. How can we teach future Winnipeggers about our past when the guidelines emphasize how we can rip down housing stock in order to build dense replacements at three times the cost? It's wasteful and unnecessary. Pour money into infrastructure, historic renovation and value the neighbours who are already here. As a result, young families will want to move back in. Right now? They can't afford to, and nobody wants these expensive condos...it takes years to sell them in some cases. Not everyone worships at the font of new new new. Add value to the old neighbourhoods in Winnipeg by helping neighbours with old homes keep their assets intact.	9/22/2020 2:34 PM
271	This survey is an effort to co-opt respondents into helping the City to continue on an unjustified and wrongheaded path. Its questions assume that respondents have already accepted the need or rationale for these actions.	9/22/2020 1:59 PM
272	YOU BET. BUT THERE IS NOT ENOUGH ROOM HERE TO EXPRESS MY AND MY NEIGHBOURS' ANGER, FRUSTRATION AND DISGUST WITH THE CITY IN EVEN THINKING UP THIS RIDICULOUS IDEA OF INFILL HOUSING!!!!!! ARE YOU TRYING TO DESTROY WINNIPEG?????!!!!	9/22/2020 1:44 PM
273	I live in the inner city. There are so many beautiful architecturally different homes. Work with that. Work with the trees. Don’t cut them down for 2 25 foot lots, which don’t add any character to the inner city. Start preserving and restoring. After all, we fly off to Rome and Paris and Florence and ooh and aah about the old architecture and no cars, only pedestrians, then come here and tear down and build houses that are square, box-like to fill as many homes as possible in an area. We are so hypocritical!	9/22/2020 1:44 PM

274	All neighborhoods should provide access to people who can only afford multi-family housing.	9/22/2020 11:47 AM
275	I support infill where it makes sense but residents also need assurances when purchasing a family home that they will not find themselves next to a fourplex. Also it should be clear for developers as well so they don't have to right residents to get development done where it makes sense. Providing a policy that states that development will be considered on a case by case basis provided no clarity for residents or developers and creates an adversarial environment where residents and developers are locked in constant development battles.	9/22/2020 1:08 AM
276	Do a review of some builds partially done and I suggest not allowing huge monsters that are three floors high and built next to each other to continue.	9/21/2020 6:52 PM
277	This is not a survey to see what the community wants, this is a survey to trick me into agreeing with what you all ready want to do! Mayor Bowman, you are the worst thing to happen to Winnipeg! Stop this now!	9/21/2020 6:40 PM
278	I am a home owner in Lord Roberts and have first hand seen the pros of infill in my neighborhood and how it can further enhance and maintain the quality of life and services I come to enjoy and expect living in Winnipeg. I too have seen infill projects not respect the scale and diversity of the neighborhood. New and affordable rentals are hard to come by and overly large mini mansions squeezed onto lots stretching from back lanes to the front street diminish the quality of life greatly for adjacent smaller homes. It is however a welcome step that Winnipeg is continuing to evolve its policies and procedures for infill.	9/21/2020 5:44 PM
279	Yes. The infill development has totally changed my neighbourhood. It doesn't even feel like "home" anymore. Any of the long time residents hate the way the neighbourhood is changing. Initially, the sub division of lots was opposed but people gave up when they saw it did no good to try and stop them. We showed up for one of the meetings for a zoning variance to find a document on the table labelled "Conditions for Approval" already printed. The decision was already made. NOTHING we said would matter. Why even post notices asking for the public to come if nothing they say will even be considered ? This city is a joke. People need space or they go crazy but I guess that doesn't line up with any of the Agenda 21 plan does it ??	9/21/2020 5:05 PM
280	Homeowners who buy property in character neighborhoods do so because they appreciate the aesthetics of same. Homeowners who desire modern accommodations have modern neighborhood options. Builders who want to build ugly infill homes have other location options and are gradually ruining character neighborhoods. Allowing and promoting this type of development is short-sighted, benefits developers and disregards existing homeowners in our neighborhoods.	9/21/2020 4:58 PM
281	I am a long term resident of River Heights and I have an older home but I see these infills as a positive	9/21/2020 4:43 PM
282	Listen to the residents of the mature neighborhood they are living proof of the affects.	9/21/2020 3:33 PM
283	Allow for GREENSPACE and for PARKING of at least two vehicles for each unit.	9/21/2020 2:54 PM
284	Please add a requirement for multi-family buildings to make available onsite composting and shared garden space. Thank you.	9/21/2020 2:51 PM
285	developers and contractors must respect existing neighbours/neighbourhood during construction -- noise reduction strategy; litter/garbage containment; clean mud from sidewalks, streets; repair damage to existing infrastructure -- sidewalks, curbs, trees, boulevards, light fixtures, etc. An infill development should not unreasonably affect the quality of life of people already living there nor negatively impact the neighbourhood as a whole during construction.	9/21/2020 2:24 PM
286	the guidelines are good. implementation is key. We need to ensure ward councilors don't bend to nimby objections.	9/21/2020 12:15 PM
287	Affordable housing is badly needed but there are not enough builders adding it to new developments in the suburbs. It should be mandated that all new developments build housing that is more basic and affordable to all. Houses do not need attached garages, granite counter tops etc.	9/21/2020 12:10 PM
288	Many of the established neighborhoods identified in Area 1 are suffering from insufficient and overburdened infrastructure - crumbling streets, unstable hydro and poor water. Before infill projects can be pursued, significant investment needs to be made in the infrastructure to support additional population density.	9/21/2020 11:46 AM

289	I think the City of Winnipeg needs to be more flexible in their thinking and do what they can to help reduce regulation that prevents growth to the city.	9/21/2020 10:03 AM
290	In fill housing fits on large double lots or very large lots. But, is it improving a neighborhood or adding to them? No. They are not cheaper, they give you less for paying the same price or higher for new areas with more offered in those new areas. The only people who truly benefit from these constructions are the developers themselves. Unless something is done about restricting prices (Not going to happen, I am aware) then this won't change and people are going to continue to be gouged.	9/21/2020 9:49 AM
291	I worry that developers will push back on the draft guidelines and that the City will give in and water them down. We need to encourage development but not at the expense of existing residents.	9/21/2020 9:34 AM
292	too many shopping centers that do not contribute to tax base. City builds apartments to house low income, but big shopping centers do not pay enough for their workers to pay for their own housing.	9/21/2020 8:48 AM
293	More guidelines about construction for exisiting residents. Things like parking, times etc.	9/21/2020 8:31 AM
294	Forcing density infill to neighbourhoods where it is not wanted, will not offer any change in the quality of life in already beautifully livable walking communites, where the prices of those properties have risen as a result, and is only about profitieering. Enhancing will natually happen in these areas, because the value of the home will be passed to those who appreciate the area, as it is. Forced enhancing by density infill is counter intunitive for those kinds of neighbourhoods.	9/21/2020 12:24 AM
295	I think forcing neighbourhoods to accept infill housing is bad policy. Some people would prefer to maintain the character of the neighbourhood. Some streets in mature areas are already strained in terms of infrastructure, road space, etc.	9/20/2020 6:40 PM
296	I am concerned about the seeming arbitrary application of requirements in development. Demonstrably, the city has a TERRIBLE record in protecting neighbourhoods from the dubious dealings of large-scale developers. These "guidelines" will be abused once again, to the detriment of the neighbourhoods and the people who live in them.	9/20/2020 5:38 PM
297	need also to look at the older areas in terms of combined sewer/runoff capacity. Less green space is contributing to higher volume of water in the back lane and on the street as the new homes discharge sump drainage and eaves drainage directly onto sidewalks and back lanes	9/20/2020 4:29 PM
298	Decrease the approval process time. Between design approval to permits, it just talking way too long. Once approved, please allow longer time construction to happen rather than applying extensions. Extensions are nothing but money grab.	9/20/2020 3:37 PM
299	All Councilors should be more realistic regarding in fill housing as some ONLY SEE the quick additional revenue that they bring the city instead of involving existing neighbors of these developments in designing units that enhance the existing residents satisfaction and profitability.	9/20/2020 2:02 PM
300	I live in Glenwood and I’m so happy that infill is helping revitalize our community. These guidelines will help quell a lot of the negative feedback about some houses (like being too tall), but I encourage the city to be a bit more vigilant with enforcement of bylaws during construction, such as blocking sidewalks, debris, damage to neighbouring property’s lawn and such.	9/20/2020 1:44 PM
301	I am particularly focused on the single detached dwellings, as I have had the (misfortune) of living between two infills within the last 18 months. I am fully in support of infills, having elected to make my life in a mature community (St. Boniface). However, the experience dealing with the developer/builders, the damage to my own property and the resulting homes has soured this period of time in my Home. I can only say I am relieved it is over, though one infill remains in a state of construction and neither have been landscaped with any care, and my own boulevard has been left in a state of disrepair. Developers/builders need to be held accountable; the look out only for themselves and their bottom line.	9/20/2020 12:28 PM
302	Yes, please stop.	9/20/2020 8:45 AM
303	Consult widely with residents and think carefully before you drastically increase density in Winnipeg's beautiful tree lined mature neighbourhoods. You will lose trees, green space and character -filled healthy neighbourhoods that you will never be able to replace when Winnipeg	9/20/2020 1:06 AM

	is finally over it's bulldozer/tear down and then rebuild phase. In 20 years developer driven city planning will be over and you will long for what you have lost. Look to Europe(esp. Germany) for better and more well thought out models for development and renewal in very old neighbourhoods with large populations.	
304	Build new infill houses to match existing homes.	9/20/2020 12:48 AM
305	Make it easier to increase density in all neighbourhoods.	9/19/2020 10:56 PM
306	No.	9/19/2020 10:33 PM
307	I hope that these is re looked at to be more fair to all people and not just to make hearing easier or appease a few vocal residences	9/19/2020 7:03 PM
308	Nothing there on stricter green guidelines. All new houses should be net zero	9/19/2020 5:34 PM
309	Clearer guidelines or information are required regarding the increased load on existing utilities and services. E.g. how is sewer or power being upgraded to accommodate increased population in these areas?	9/19/2020 5:27 PM
310	Education and communication is more important building restrictions for convincing neighbours of the merits of infill. Consider the debacle over 667 Kildonan Drive - residents opposed it based on the worst version of what they imagined it might be rather than any real concerns grounded in reality. The city and the developer told residents about the constraints and requirements for infill, but opposing residents assumed that either these constraints were going to be ignored and/or there was some kind of corruption involved in approving the project. Neighbours see infill as unwelcome change tinged with classism, not as a way of keeping tax burdens low, preserving city services, and improving neighbourhood vibrancy.	9/19/2020 4:59 PM
311	My name is Pam Bosko 204 226 1140 pamelabosko@hotmail.com 455 Rue LaRiviere. Thank you for creating this survey.	9/19/2020 3:53 PM
312	I reitterate the importance of banning permanent Air BnB rentals in these multi unit buildings. I am fine with a family renting out their own living space for a short term Air BnB rental while they are away, but fundamentally against the idea of full time Air BnB units, which do exist, and the CoW is turning a blind eye to. PLEASE address this and solve the problems Air BnB bring to our neighbourhoods.	9/19/2020 3:03 PM
313	Require builders to complete building including landscaping(grass/stone) and exterior in order to pass inspection . To many buildings with tyvek/typar and no finished landscaping for sale.	9/19/2020 2:12 PM
314	MAKE PLANNERS COMPLY WITH ALL LAWS AND BY-LAWS. MAKE PLANNERS STOP LYING, CHEATING AND MISLEADING RESIDENTS. MAKE PLANNERS BE SENSITIVE TO RESIDENTS!	9/19/2020 2:01 PM
315	We should improve the trail network and riverfront access, bike trails, and add more regular bus service. Need to have a more pro business and pro development attitude at the city to attract business and new residents, and renew the city. Friends that have visited Winnipeg commented “don’t you ever build anything new there, every building is so old there?” This was someone from Ontario that is well travelled across Canada and North America.	9/19/2020 11:19 AM
316	This is very disappointing.	9/19/2020 10:56 AM
317	New builds do not equal affordable rentals	9/19/2020 10:41 AM
318	This actually sounds a lot better than I expected	9/19/2020 10:24 AM
319	We want to see continued growth in the population of the City. I would recommend the City the area of Marda Loop in Calgary. It illustrates very well how a older inner city community can be revitalized. With amenities in walkable distances	9/19/2020 9:36 AM
320	I believe wholeheartedly in infill housing and it is working very well in our neighbourhood of single family dwellings with new, larger homes being built that fit in with the flavour of the neighbourhood. BUT the sheer number of multi-story, multi-unit buildings being built per blco on main routes such as St. Mary's Road really negatively impacts the existing residents. The buildings bring in large numbers of renters with no stake in the neighbourhood, the buildings don't in any way blend with the existing neighbourhood neither in character or in the type of residents it attracts. Renters are not contributors to the neighbourhood, they are only takers. The big blocks being built in formerly single family dwelling neighbourhoods take away the enjoyment of the neighbourhood from existing residents by introducing undesirable neighbours,	9/19/2020 9:29 AM

	blocking the view of the sky, taking away the privacy from the properties around them (how would you feel with 6 suites overlooking your back yard?) There are two of these blocks 3 story buildings next to each other on our lane and the typically young, rowdy residents have the older ppl behind them so scared they don't use their yards any more.But they bring in huge tax dollars so does the collateral damage of the olders peoples loss matter to the city? It appears not. The houses on the north sides of these huge buildings have lost all sun on their yards, even in the summer. More collateral damage. What a shame to damage the quality of life of the existing neighbours for more tax dollars for the city. The city must limit the number of these huge monstrosities per block. Yes, I agree with infill housing but the city must also consider the effect on the existing residents of the neighbourhood. The rest of our neighbourhood is maximum two stories, keep the new buildings to two stories.	
321	Do a better job of approving contracts that do not enhance neighborhoods	9/19/2020 9:26 AM
322	There should be no shitty developers, but without tough enough requirements the bad developers will not have a reason to improve.	9/19/2020 8:57 AM
323	Infills should only be allowed within strictly defined areas of the city with existing higher density housing. For example, infill housing is great for around Osborne Village or West Broadway, but harms neighbourhoods like River Heights and Garden City. Strict guidelines must be set and neighbourhoods should have a say if they want to allow infill housing within their neighbourhood or street, as it forever changes their area. When you buy a home in a mature neighbourhood, you are buying into a lifestyle and character. Otherwise if I wanted a tall narrow house next door, I would purchase in a new development where all the houses look like that.	9/19/2020 8:31 AM
324	Please hire an architectural firm(a) to provide suitable articulation diagrams. They should be incorporated into the final document. Be very specific. Aesthetic really matters. Tnx!	9/19/2020 8:06 AM
325	Thanks for seeking input from the community.	9/19/2020 6:25 AM
326	I’m afraid beautiful neighbourhoods with historic homes on large lots will be reduced to a series of duplex infills.	9/19/2020 5:37 AM
327	Fix downtown and the core first before expanding through infills.	9/19/2020 12:31 AM
328	I don’t know who will even listen to these recommendations. Contractors are constantly lying and setting up granny suites where they weren’t supposed to. There seems to be no help or interest from city hall to make these builds more appropriate for the communities in which they are built.	9/18/2020 11:29 PM
329	Not building on lots smaller than 33ft wide stop killing mature healthy trees For crappy stick buildings without building codes. They are fire traps.	9/18/2020 8:31 PM
330	Stop asking the exact same question multiple times in the same survey! The only reason this survey supposedly takes around 20 minutes to complete is because you are asking me to answer the exact same question repeatedly	9/18/2020 8:12 PM
331	I don’t want this in my neighborhood (Kingston Crescent)	9/18/2020 7:59 PM
332	Neighbourhoods have particular histories and the reasons for their success are often unique. Imagining a citywide plan that is good for all is very shortsighted. You need to figure out the strengths of neighbourhoods before you decide on the remedies for imagined deficits.	9/18/2020 7:44 PM
333	Nope. This is short sighted.	9/18/2020 6:07 PM
334	So far personal experience with the infill housing has been terrible, there also has been no assistance or response from the city or the city inspectors when issues have arose, there needs to be a number or a specific way to contact someone to report concerns or issues	9/18/2020 5:18 PM
335	This survey was brutal.	9/18/2020 4:52 PM
336	I understand the need to listen to the folks that live in these older area, BUT we need to consider what’s best for the city and growing density (like we are doing around Osborne) make absolutely sense even if some of the new buildings aren’t quite the same style as the old bungalows. We must allow this modernization to occur so millennials and Z can move in.	9/18/2020 4:48 PM

Q19 Which of the following applies to you? (Please select all that apply)

Answered: 523 Skipped: 251



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
I'm a neighbour of a current infill construction site	26.58%	139
I am a neighbour of an infill property that has been completed within the last 2 years	20.84%	109
I am planning to build or buy an infill property in the near future	4.78%	25
I have completed building or have purchased an infill property within the last 2 years	3.25%	17
I am not a direct neighbour but there are infill constructions happening in my neighbourhood	53.35%	279
None of the above	14.91%	78
Total Respondents: 523		

Q20 What housing type best describes the type you live in?

Answered: 524 Skipped: 250



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Single family detached home	88.93%	466
Duplex/side-by-side	2.67%	14
Triplex/fourplex	0.19%	1
Small scale apartment or condo (4 stories or less)	3.05%	16
Other (please specify)	5.15%	27
TOTAL		524

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	13 story apartment building.	10/23/2020 8:26 AM
2	mobile home	10/16/2020 2:11 PM
3	Single family with secondary suite	10/15/2020 2:38 PM
4	Converted large Victorian house into 4 units in Crescentwood.	10/15/2020 10:25 AM
5	High-rise apartment (over 10 storeys), previously single detached houses	10/13/2020 5:51 PM
6	apartment or condo over 5 stories	10/12/2020 4:07 PM
7	Large condo	10/5/2020 9:51 AM
8	Existing large condo building	10/3/2020 8:05 PM
9	I own a single family in-fill home which I built in 2008.	10/3/2020 1:15 PM
10	Apartment block downtown which was built with a small footprint which is so much more pleasant and home feeling than long corridors of most apartment blocks.	10/3/2020 11:20 AM
11	Apartment building with more than 4 stories.	10/3/2020 10:55 AM
12	Single family home with a full side lot	9/29/2020 3:37 PM
13	Large scale condo	9/25/2020 9:39 AM
14	I bought an infill over 5 years ago	9/24/2020 7:18 PM
15	Apartment, 5+ stories.	9/23/2020 9:55 PM
16	Single-family homes, old established neighborhood	9/22/2020 2:01 PM
17	Life lease that is great	9/22/2020 1:48 PM
18	Lived in many.	9/21/2020 2:53 PM
19	mid-size condo complex	9/21/2020 2:26 PM
20	My house is a 700 square foot bungalow on a 27 foot lot built in 1927	9/21/2020 12:12 PM
21	apartment	9/21/2020 11:07 AM
22	Aparatment	9/20/2020 2:06 PM
23	Side by side 3 story town house, 10 units	9/20/2020 1:35 PM
24	co-op	9/19/2020 10:57 PM
25	Single family detached 1955 bungalow	9/19/2020 10:36 PM
26	Apartment	9/19/2020 10:21 AM
27	High rise apartment	9/18/2020 8:05 PM

Q21 Do you own or rent?

Answered: 521 Skipped: 253



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Own	91.36%	476
Rent	8.64%	45
TOTAL		521

Q22 How many people live in your home?

Answered: 492 Skipped: 282

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	4	10/23/2020 8:26 AM
2	4	10/23/2020 7:31 AM
3	4	10/22/2020 11:54 PM
4	two	10/22/2020 11:43 PM
5	2	10/22/2020 11:37 PM
6	2	10/22/2020 10:43 PM
7	2	10/22/2020 10:37 PM
8	2	10/22/2020 9:20 PM
9	1	10/22/2020 7:51 PM
10	2	10/22/2020 5:41 PM
11	1	10/22/2020 5:31 PM
12	2	10/22/2020 4:17 PM
13	2	10/22/2020 3:53 PM
14	2	10/22/2020 3:46 PM
15	1	10/22/2020 3:31 PM
16	2	10/22/2020 2:52 PM
17	Three	10/22/2020 2:46 PM
18	2	10/22/2020 2:11 PM
19	4	10/22/2020 12:03 PM
20	2	10/22/2020 12:02 PM
21	2	10/22/2020 11:44 AM
22	2	10/22/2020 11:37 AM
23	2	10/22/2020 11:33 AM
24	2	10/22/2020 11:32 AM
25	5	10/22/2020 11:26 AM
26	2	10/22/2020 11:26 AM
27	3	10/22/2020 10:22 AM
28	3	10/22/2020 10:02 AM
29	2	10/22/2020 10:00 AM
30	2	10/22/2020 12:06 AM
31	2	10/21/2020 10:48 PM
32	2	10/21/2020 10:18 PM
33	two	10/21/2020 8:38 PM
34	Two	10/21/2020 7:27 PM
35	4	10/21/2020 4:04 PM
36	3	10/21/2020 3:54 PM
37	3	10/21/2020 1:19 PM

38	2	10/21/2020 1:17 PM
39	3	10/21/2020 11:55 AM
40	2	10/21/2020 10:47 AM
41	4	10/21/2020 10:27 AM
42	5	10/21/2020 7:46 AM
43	2	10/21/2020 7:29 AM
44	4	10/20/2020 11:40 PM
45	2	10/20/2020 10:43 PM
46	3	10/20/2020 9:59 PM
47	2	10/20/2020 8:04 PM
48	2	10/20/2020 6:08 PM
49	two	10/20/2020 3:50 PM
50	2	10/20/2020 3:36 PM
51	5	10/20/2020 3:15 PM
52	3	10/20/2020 2:25 PM
53	2	10/20/2020 2:12 PM
54	1	10/20/2020 11:42 AM
55	3	10/20/2020 10:55 AM
56	3	10/20/2020 9:32 AM
57	3	10/19/2020 10:06 PM
58	2	10/19/2020 3:31 PM
59	5	10/19/2020 9:55 AM
60	4	10/18/2020 10:13 PM
61	4	10/18/2020 8:44 PM
62	1	10/18/2020 8:35 PM
63	2	10/18/2020 7:30 PM
64	4	10/18/2020 5:22 PM
65	2	10/18/2020 3:50 PM
66	2	10/18/2020 11:18 AM
67	2	10/18/2020 11:14 AM
68	1	10/18/2020 11:11 AM
69	2	10/18/2020 10:39 AM
70	3	10/18/2020 10:19 AM
71	4	10/17/2020 11:46 AM
72	3	10/17/2020 8:33 AM
73	4	10/17/2020 6:32 AM
74	4	10/17/2020 12:03 AM
75	3	10/16/2020 11:30 PM

76	3	10/16/2020 11:23 PM
77	1	10/16/2020 8:06 PM
78	4	10/16/2020 7:31 PM
79	8	10/16/2020 6:30 PM
80	4	10/16/2020 3:19 PM
81	2	10/16/2020 2:28 PM
82	2	10/16/2020 2:28 PM
83	two	10/16/2020 2:11 PM
84	5	10/16/2020 1:24 PM
85	4	10/16/2020 11:27 AM
86	2	10/16/2020 10:22 AM
87	2	10/16/2020 9:23 AM
88	1	10/15/2020 10:41 PM
89	2	10/15/2020 10:14 PM
90	4	10/15/2020 9:55 PM
91	3	10/15/2020 9:30 PM
92	2	10/15/2020 8:54 PM
93	1	10/15/2020 5:44 PM
94	2	10/15/2020 5:33 PM
95	2	10/15/2020 4:56 PM
96	4	10/15/2020 3:47 PM
97	3	10/15/2020 3:33 PM
98	7	10/15/2020 2:47 PM
99	3 + 1	10/15/2020 2:38 PM
100	2	10/15/2020 12:57 PM
101	3	10/15/2020 12:45 PM
102	5	10/15/2020 10:27 AM
103	2 in this unit, 9 in total across all units in the house.	10/15/2020 10:25 AM
104	3	10/15/2020 9:12 AM
105	1	10/15/2020 8:48 AM
106	4	10/15/2020 8:28 AM
107	1	10/14/2020 11:20 PM
108	2	10/14/2020 10:58 PM
109	2	10/14/2020 9:50 PM
110	2	10/14/2020 7:57 PM
111	3	10/14/2020 6:38 PM
112	2	10/14/2020 5:59 PM
113	2	10/14/2020 4:31 PM

114	2	10/14/2020 3:00 PM
115	3	10/14/2020 2:53 PM
116	2	10/14/2020 1:18 PM
117	2	10/14/2020 12:46 PM
118	2	10/14/2020 10:51 AM
119	3 (currently)	10/14/2020 10:34 AM
120	3	10/14/2020 10:22 AM
121	3	10/14/2020 9:12 AM
122	2	10/14/2020 8:04 AM
123	4	10/13/2020 10:36 PM
124	One	10/13/2020 9:08 PM
125	3	10/13/2020 8:41 PM
126	2	10/13/2020 8:35 PM
127	one	10/13/2020 8:24 PM
128	2	10/13/2020 7:35 PM
129	2	10/13/2020 5:59 PM
130	2	10/13/2020 5:51 PM
131	4	10/13/2020 4:38 PM
132	2	10/13/2020 4:32 PM
133	2	10/13/2020 4:25 PM
134	5	10/13/2020 2:59 PM
135	2	10/13/2020 2:32 PM
136	4	10/13/2020 1:58 PM
137	2	10/13/2020 12:21 PM
138	3	10/13/2020 12:20 PM
139	3	10/13/2020 12:19 PM
140	2	10/13/2020 12:09 PM
141	1	10/13/2020 11:45 AM
142	1	10/13/2020 9:06 AM
143	2	10/13/2020 7:00 AM
144	4	10/12/2020 10:05 PM
145	2	10/12/2020 9:08 PM
146	2	10/12/2020 8:22 PM
147	two	10/12/2020 7:23 PM
148	3	10/12/2020 7:03 PM
149	2	10/12/2020 6:17 PM
150	two	10/12/2020 4:07 PM
151	2	10/12/2020 9:25 AM

152	2	10/12/2020 6:31 AM
153	Two adults in the bottom, a family of three in the top unit	10/11/2020 11:35 PM
154	2-4	10/11/2020 9:15 PM
155	2	10/11/2020 3:39 PM
156	2	10/11/2020 3:27 PM
157	5	10/11/2020 12:37 PM
158	3	10/11/2020 12:05 PM
159	2	10/11/2020 12:05 PM
160	one	10/11/2020 11:21 AM
161	3	10/10/2020 10:55 PM
162	1	10/10/2020 9:55 PM
163	2	10/10/2020 7:48 PM
164	2	10/10/2020 4:05 PM
165	One	10/10/2020 11:06 AM
166	2	10/10/2020 10:59 AM
167	1	10/10/2020 10:15 AM
168	2	10/10/2020 9:37 AM
169	3	10/10/2020 9:22 AM
170	4	10/10/2020 8:38 AM
171	4	10/10/2020 8:31 AM
172	2	10/10/2020 7:56 AM
173	2	10/9/2020 8:13 PM
174	4	10/9/2020 6:52 PM
175	2	10/9/2020 4:31 PM
176	2	10/9/2020 4:15 PM
177	two	10/9/2020 2:56 PM
178	3	10/9/2020 2:23 PM
179	1	10/9/2020 1:10 PM
180	2	10/9/2020 11:52 AM
181	2	10/9/2020 11:18 AM
182	1	10/9/2020 9:10 AM
183	2	10/9/2020 8:25 AM
184	1	10/9/2020 1:28 AM
185	3	10/9/2020 12:00 AM
186	6	10/8/2020 9:14 PM
187	1	10/8/2020 8:09 PM
188	2	10/8/2020 3:21 PM
189	N/A	10/8/2020 3:02 PM

190	3	10/8/2020 2:58 PM
191	NONE OF YOUR BUSINESS	10/8/2020 2:14 PM
192	2	10/8/2020 2:04 PM
193	2	10/8/2020 2:03 PM
194	3	10/8/2020 1:07 PM
195	Two	10/8/2020 11:12 AM
196	6	10/8/2020 10:29 AM
197	2	10/8/2020 10:16 AM
198	1	10/8/2020 8:48 AM
199	3	10/8/2020 6:41 AM
200	5	10/7/2020 9:00 PM
201	2	10/7/2020 7:57 PM
202	2	10/7/2020 7:52 PM
203	2	10/7/2020 6:11 PM
204	3	10/7/2020 3:06 PM
205	2	10/7/2020 3:04 PM
206	2	10/7/2020 12:22 PM
207	2	10/7/2020 10:31 AM
208	6	10/7/2020 9:58 AM
209	5	10/6/2020 10:24 PM
210	2	10/6/2020 8:05 PM
211	2	10/6/2020 6:02 PM
212	Three	10/6/2020 4:05 PM
213	4	10/6/2020 3:48 PM
214	2	10/6/2020 3:10 PM
215	one	10/6/2020 2:50 PM
216	2 altogether	10/6/2020 7:58 AM
217	4	10/5/2020 9:21 PM
218	2	10/5/2020 6:17 PM
219	4	10/5/2020 1:56 PM
220	2	10/5/2020 12:35 PM
221	2	10/5/2020 12:21 PM
222	2	10/5/2020 11:21 AM
223	200+	10/5/2020 9:51 AM
224	4	10/5/2020 8:18 AM
225	2	10/4/2020 10:48 PM
226	3	10/4/2020 9:58 PM
227	6	10/4/2020 8:43 PM

228	2	10/4/2020 4:22 PM
229	2	10/4/2020 4:13 PM
230	2	10/4/2020 1:35 PM
231	1	10/4/2020 1:22 PM
232	2	10/4/2020 9:56 AM
233	2	10/3/2020 11:05 PM
234	4	10/3/2020 10:16 PM
235	Two	10/3/2020 8:05 PM
236	3	10/3/2020 8:03 PM
237	3	10/3/2020 7:28 PM
238	2	10/3/2020 4:15 PM
239	5	10/3/2020 2:19 PM
240	4	10/3/2020 1:15 PM
241	2	10/3/2020 11:43 AM
242	2	10/3/2020 11:20 AM
243	4	10/3/2020 10:59 AM
244	2	10/3/2020 10:55 AM
245	2	10/3/2020 10:27 AM
246	2	10/3/2020 9:38 AM
247	3	10/3/2020 9:32 AM
248	2	10/3/2020 8:23 AM
249	3	10/3/2020 8:07 AM
250	1	10/3/2020 7:02 AM
251	2	10/3/2020 12:52 AM
252	3	10/2/2020 10:12 PM
253	4	10/2/2020 3:55 PM
254	2	10/2/2020 3:12 PM
255	2	10/2/2020 3:07 PM
256	2	10/2/2020 2:37 PM
257	2	10/2/2020 11:53 AM
258	2	10/2/2020 10:23 AM
259	1	10/1/2020 10:24 PM
260	One	10/1/2020 8:38 PM
261	1	10/1/2020 5:17 PM
262	5	10/1/2020 4:50 PM
263	4	10/1/2020 4:44 PM
264	3	10/1/2020 4:13 PM
265	2	10/1/2020 3:36 PM

266	2	10/1/2020 3:34 PM
267	3	10/1/2020 1:52 PM
268	2	10/1/2020 1:25 PM
269	1	10/1/2020 11:51 AM
270	6	10/1/2020 11:32 AM
271	2	10/1/2020 11:15 AM
272	4	10/1/2020 11:04 AM
273	2	10/1/2020 6:31 AM
274	4	9/30/2020 11:26 PM
275	2	9/30/2020 11:02 PM
276	4	9/30/2020 8:25 PM
277	1	9/30/2020 7:10 PM
278	5	9/30/2020 6:54 PM
279	Four	9/30/2020 3:49 PM
280	2	9/30/2020 3:35 PM
281	2	9/30/2020 2:59 PM
282	2	9/30/2020 2:23 PM
283	4	9/30/2020 12:59 PM
284	2	9/30/2020 12:03 PM
285	2	9/30/2020 8:36 AM
286	5	9/29/2020 11:41 PM
287	4	9/29/2020 11:11 PM
288	4	9/29/2020 8:51 PM
289	2	9/29/2020 5:49 PM
290	5	9/29/2020 4:10 PM
291	three	9/29/2020 4:04 PM
292	3	9/29/2020 3:37 PM
293	2	9/29/2020 2:08 PM
294	3	9/29/2020 1:39 PM
295	1	9/29/2020 1:28 PM
296	2	9/29/2020 12:12 PM
297	3	9/29/2020 9:51 AM
298	2	9/29/2020 9:50 AM
299	2	9/29/2020 8:41 AM
300	2	9/28/2020 10:00 PM
301	4	9/28/2020 9:26 PM
302	6	9/28/2020 6:48 PM
303	2	9/28/2020 1:14 PM

304	2	9/28/2020 11:38 AM
305	4	9/28/2020 9:53 AM
306	3	9/28/2020 9:43 AM
307	4	9/28/2020 8:35 AM
308	1	9/28/2020 8:30 AM
309	3	9/28/2020 12:39 AM
310	One person lives in my one-bedroom apartment. Two dozen in the entire building, maybe?	9/28/2020 12:07 AM
311	1	9/27/2020 11:06 PM
312	4	9/27/2020 8:20 PM
313	2	9/27/2020 5:06 PM
314	2	9/27/2020 2:40 PM
315	2	9/27/2020 2:28 PM
316	1	9/27/2020 2:17 PM
317	6	9/26/2020 8:16 PM
318	1	9/26/2020 4:40 PM
319	two	9/26/2020 4:22 PM
320	5	9/26/2020 3:24 PM
321	6	9/26/2020 11:17 AM
322	5	9/25/2020 11:45 PM
323	2	9/25/2020 5:06 PM
324	1	9/25/2020 2:47 PM
325	1	9/25/2020 1:05 PM
326	1	9/25/2020 9:39 AM
327	relevance?	9/25/2020 8:47 AM
328	3	9/25/2020 8:37 AM
329	1	9/25/2020 7:28 AM
330	4	9/25/2020 6:53 AM
331	1	9/25/2020 1:22 AM
332	2	9/24/2020 7:42 PM
333	1	9/24/2020 7:18 PM
334	2	9/24/2020 4:13 PM
335	4	9/24/2020 1:25 PM
336	2	9/24/2020 12:51 PM
337	3	9/24/2020 12:34 PM
338	3	9/24/2020 10:26 AM
339	one	9/24/2020 9:54 AM
340	4	9/24/2020 9:48 AM
341	2	9/24/2020 9:33 AM

342	2	9/24/2020 9:27 AM
343	3	9/24/2020 9:07 AM
344	Two	9/24/2020 8:53 AM
345	Two	9/24/2020 7:45 AM
346	2	9/24/2020 12:48 AM
347	4	9/23/2020 10:47 PM
348	1	9/23/2020 10:30 PM
349	4	9/23/2020 10:08 PM
350	3	9/23/2020 9:55 PM
351	2	9/23/2020 9:28 PM
352	2	9/23/2020 9:14 PM
353	3	9/23/2020 9:11 PM
354	2	9/23/2020 8:44 PM
355	4	9/23/2020 8:39 PM
356	4	9/23/2020 8:28 PM
357	1	9/23/2020 8:25 PM
358	3	9/23/2020 7:01 PM
359	2	9/23/2020 6:43 PM
360	3	9/23/2020 6:39 PM
361	1	9/23/2020 6:39 PM
362	none of your damned business	9/23/2020 6:23 PM
363	2	9/23/2020 6:09 PM
364	2	9/23/2020 5:57 PM
365	5	9/23/2020 5:48 PM
366	2	9/23/2020 5:30 PM
367	2	9/23/2020 5:03 PM
368	2	9/23/2020 4:44 PM
369	3	9/23/2020 4:43 PM
370	2	9/23/2020 4:39 PM
371	2	9/23/2020 4:39 PM
372	one	9/23/2020 4:23 PM
373	4	9/23/2020 4:21 PM
374	3	9/23/2020 4:18 PM
375	3	9/23/2020 3:56 PM
376	1	9/23/2020 3:50 PM
377	4	9/23/2020 2:17 PM
378	3	9/23/2020 12:02 PM
379	5	9/23/2020 11:52 AM

380	2	9/23/2020 10:48 AM
381	3	9/23/2020 10:11 AM
382	4	9/23/2020 9:40 AM
383	4	9/23/2020 9:24 AM
384	family of 6	9/23/2020 9:17 AM
385	2	9/23/2020 9:05 AM
386	3	9/23/2020 9:05 AM
387	4	9/22/2020 11:40 PM
388	2	9/22/2020 10:21 PM
389	1	9/22/2020 8:13 PM
390	Six	9/22/2020 8:07 PM
391	4	9/22/2020 7:48 PM
392	2	9/22/2020 4:28 PM
393	1	9/22/2020 3:39 PM
394	7	9/22/2020 2:43 PM
395	4	9/22/2020 2:36 PM
396	2	9/22/2020 2:01 PM
397	1	9/22/2020 1:48 PM
398	2	9/22/2020 1:46 PM
399	3	9/22/2020 11:47 AM
400	4	9/22/2020 10:08 AM
401	4	9/22/2020 8:32 AM
402	4	9/22/2020 1:09 AM
403	Three	9/21/2020 6:53 PM
404	1	9/21/2020 6:42 PM
405	2	9/21/2020 5:46 PM
406	1 -3 (varies)	9/21/2020 5:06 PM
407	2	9/21/2020 4:59 PM
408	2	9/21/2020 4:48 PM
409	3	9/21/2020 4:45 PM
410	3	9/21/2020 4:44 PM
411	3	9/21/2020 3:35 PM
412	3	9/21/2020 2:56 PM
413	1	9/21/2020 2:26 PM
414	five	9/21/2020 12:16 PM
415	1	9/21/2020 12:12 PM
416	4	9/21/2020 11:47 AM
417	2	9/21/2020 11:07 AM

418	3	9/21/2020 10:04 AM
419	4	9/21/2020 9:50 AM
420	2	9/21/2020 9:35 AM
421	4	9/21/2020 8:49 AM
422	2	9/21/2020 8:32 AM
423	2	9/21/2020 7:39 AM
424	Three	9/21/2020 12:26 AM
425	5	9/20/2020 10:51 PM
426	4	9/20/2020 9:14 PM
427	3	9/20/2020 6:41 PM
428	4	9/20/2020 5:40 PM
429	1	9/20/2020 4:30 PM
430	5	9/20/2020 3:38 PM
431	2	9/20/2020 2:06 PM
432	4	9/20/2020 1:45 PM
433	1	9/20/2020 1:35 PM
434	1	9/20/2020 12:29 PM
435	4	9/20/2020 8:46 AM
436	3	9/20/2020 6:59 AM
437	two	9/20/2020 1:06 AM
438	only 2 now	9/20/2020 12:50 AM
439	1	9/19/2020 10:57 PM
440	2 retirees	9/19/2020 10:36 PM
441	2	9/19/2020 9:45 PM
442	2	9/19/2020 7:45 PM
443	2	9/19/2020 7:04 PM
444	4	9/19/2020 5:40 PM
445	3	9/19/2020 5:35 PM
446	2	9/19/2020 5:33 PM
447	3	9/19/2020 5:27 PM
448	2	9/19/2020 5:01 PM
449	1	9/19/2020 3:54 PM
450	2	9/19/2020 3:04 PM
451	2	9/19/2020 2:13 PM
452	1	9/19/2020 2:02 PM
453	2	9/19/2020 1:56 PM
454	2	9/19/2020 1:45 PM
455	2	9/19/2020 12:59 PM

456	4	9/19/2020 11:21 AM
457	2	9/19/2020 10:42 AM
458	Two now	9/19/2020 10:26 AM
459	2	9/19/2020 10:21 AM
460	3	9/19/2020 10:20 AM
461	3	9/19/2020 10:12 AM
462	2	9/19/2020 10:00 AM
463	2	9/19/2020 9:46 AM
464	3	9/19/2020 9:37 AM
465	2	9/19/2020 9:30 AM
466	2	9/19/2020 9:27 AM
467	2	9/19/2020 8:58 AM
468	3	9/19/2020 8:32 AM
469	4	9/19/2020 8:08 AM
470	4	9/19/2020 6:26 AM
471	2	9/19/2020 5:39 AM
472	2	9/19/2020 12:35 AM
473	2	9/19/2020 12:33 AM
474	2	9/18/2020 11:29 PM
475	2	9/18/2020 10:53 PM
476	2	9/18/2020 10:15 PM
477	1	9/18/2020 9:02 PM
478	2	9/18/2020 8:32 PM
479	4	9/18/2020 8:16 PM
480	3	9/18/2020 8:13 PM
481	1	9/18/2020 8:05 PM
482	3	9/18/2020 8:00 PM
483	2	9/18/2020 7:46 PM
484	2	9/18/2020 7:19 PM
485	4	9/18/2020 7:00 PM
486	2	9/18/2020 6:09 PM
487	2	9/18/2020 6:03 PM
488	2	9/18/2020 5:18 PM
489	2	9/18/2020 5:13 PM
490	2	9/18/2020 4:52 PM
491	4	9/18/2020 4:49 PM
492	2	9/18/2020 3:09 PM

Q23 What street do you live on?

Answered: 436 Skipped: 338

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Beliveau Rd	10/23/2020 8:26 AM
2	Pepperloaf Crescent	10/23/2020 7:31 AM
3	Hill Street	10/22/2020 11:54 PM
4	Warsaw	10/22/2020 11:43 PM
5	Polson	10/22/2020 11:37 PM
6	Renfrew	10/22/2020 10:43 PM
7	Renfrew	10/22/2020 10:37 PM
8	Kingston	10/22/2020 9:20 PM
9	Dubuc St.	10/22/2020 7:51 PM
10	Dunrobin Ave.	10/22/2020 5:41 PM
11	Trashcona	10/22/2020 5:31 PM
12	Borebank St.	10/22/2020 4:19 PM
13	Niagara Strteet	10/22/2020 4:17 PM
14	Kingswood	10/22/2020 3:53 PM
15	Essex	10/22/2020 3:46 PM
16	Essex Ave	10/22/2020 3:31 PM
17	Egerton Rd	10/22/2020 2:52 PM
18	Lanark St.	10/22/2020 2:46 PM
19	Union Ave west	10/22/2020 2:11 PM
20	Egerton Rd	10/22/2020 12:03 PM
21	Somerset Ave	10/22/2020 12:02 PM
22	Aubrey	10/22/2020 11:44 AM
23	Lansdowne Avenue	10/22/2020 11:37 AM
24	Berrydale Ave	10/22/2020 11:33 AM
25	Fernwood	10/22/2020 11:32 AM
26	Pilgrim Ave	10/22/2020 11:26 AM
27	Haney	10/22/2020 10:22 AM
28	Lanark Street	10/21/2020 10:48 PM
29	Broadway	10/21/2020 8:38 PM
30	4	10/21/2020 7:35 PM
31	Semple Avenue	10/21/2020 7:27 PM
32	Centennial	10/21/2020 3:54 PM
33	Elm street	10/21/2020 1:17 PM
34	Havelock Avenue	10/21/2020 11:55 AM
35	Lanark Street	10/21/2020 10:47 AM
36	Lindsay street	10/21/2020 10:27 AM
37	Lanark	10/21/2020 7:46 AM

38	Lanark Street	10/21/2020 7:29 AM
39	Poplarwood	10/20/2020 11:40 PM
40	Guay Avenue	10/20/2020 10:43 PM
41	Dupont	10/20/2020 9:59 PM
42	Guay Ave	10/20/2020 8:04 PM
43	N/a	10/20/2020 6:08 PM
44	Lennox Ave	10/20/2020 3:50 PM
45	Poplarwood Avenue.	10/20/2020 3:36 PM
46	Cobourg	10/20/2020 3:15 PM
47	Kenny Street	10/20/2020 2:25 PM
48	Fernwood Ave	10/20/2020 2:12 PM
49	Humboldt Ave	10/20/2020 11:42 AM
50	Egerton	10/20/2020 10:55 AM
51	Blvd	10/19/2020 3:31 PM
52	Bruce	10/19/2020 9:55 AM
53	Meadows West	10/18/2020 8:35 PM
54	Pilgrim Ave	10/18/2020 5:22 PM
55	Wordsworth Way	10/18/2020 3:50 PM
56	imperial	10/18/2020 11:18 AM
57	Bank Avenue	10/18/2020 11:14 AM
58	Egerton Road	10/18/2020 11:11 AM
59	Cordova Street	10/18/2020 10:39 AM
60	Frederick Ave	10/18/2020 10:19 AM
61	portland ave	10/17/2020 11:46 AM
62	Varennes	10/17/2020 8:33 AM
63	Kinston crescent	10/17/2020 6:32 AM
64	Glenthorne Crescent	10/17/2020 12:03 AM
65	Varennes Ave	10/16/2020 11:30 PM
66	Corydon Avenue	10/16/2020 11:23 PM
67	Dumoulin	10/16/2020 8:06 PM
68	In Wolseley	10/16/2020 7:31 PM
69	Grosvenor	10/16/2020 6:30 PM
70	Parker Ave	10/16/2020 3:19 PM
71	Poplarwood Ave	10/16/2020 2:28 PM
72	Poplarwood Ave,	10/16/2020 2:28 PM
73	Sandale Drive	10/16/2020 2:11 PM
74	Larchwood Place	10/16/2020 1:24 PM
75	hosmer	10/16/2020 11:27 AM

76	Poplarwood Ave	10/16/2020 10:22 AM
77	Fleet	10/16/2020 9:23 AM
78	Essex	10/15/2020 10:41 PM
79	Clonard ave.	10/15/2020 10:14 PM
80	Patricia Avenue	10/15/2020 9:55 PM
81	Wolseley	10/15/2020 9:30 PM
82	bank ave	10/15/2020 8:54 PM
83	Egerton	10/15/2020 8:20 PM
84	glenlawn avenue	10/15/2020 5:44 PM
85	Poplarwood	10/15/2020 5:33 PM
86	Riverbend avenue	10/15/2020 4:56 PM
87	Alex Taylor Drive	10/15/2020 3:47 PM
88	Humboldt Ave.	10/15/2020 3:33 PM
89	Larsen	10/15/2020 2:47 PM
90	Burnaby	10/15/2020 12:57 PM
91	Kingston Crescent	10/15/2020 12:45 PM
92	Winona	10/15/2020 10:27 AM
93	McMillan	10/15/2020 10:25 AM
94	Edison	10/15/2020 8:48 AM
95	82 Blenheim Avenue	10/14/2020 11:20 PM
96	Pilgrim Avenue	10/14/2020 10:58 PM
97	Blenheim ave	10/14/2020 9:50 PM
98	Cherrier Street	10/14/2020 7:57 PM
99	Stranmillis	10/14/2020 6:38 PM
100	Egerton	10/14/2020 5:59 PM
101	Pheasant	10/14/2020 3:00 PM
102	2 Longstone place	10/14/2020 2:53 PM
103	handyside ave	10/14/2020 1:18 PM
104	Bank Ave	10/14/2020 12:46 PM
105	Stranmillis Av	10/14/2020 10:51 AM
106	Spruce	10/14/2020 10:34 AM
107	Cambridge	10/14/2020 10:22 AM
108	Would rather not disclose	10/14/2020 9:12 AM
109	Jessie Avenue	10/14/2020 8:04 AM
110	Dorchester Avenue	10/13/2020 10:36 PM
111	2	10/13/2020 10:27 PM
112	I live in River Heights but do not want to say street	10/13/2020 9:08 PM
113	Havelock Ave	10/13/2020 8:41 PM

114	humboldt avenue	10/13/2020 8:35 PM
115	Stranmillis ave	10/13/2020 8:24 PM
116	Havelock	10/13/2020 7:35 PM
117	Sprague Street.	10/13/2020 5:59 PM
118	Donald Street	10/13/2020 5:51 PM
119	Enfield Crescent	10/13/2020 4:38 PM
120	Bannerman	10/13/2020 4:32 PM
121	Cordova	10/13/2020 4:25 PM
122	Thomas Berry Street	10/13/2020 2:59 PM
123	St Vital rd	10/13/2020 1:58 PM
124	Hill	10/13/2020 12:21 PM
125	Warsaw	10/13/2020 12:20 PM
126	Bertrand	10/13/2020 12:19 PM
127	St John's Avenue	10/13/2020 12:09 PM
128	FERRY RD.	10/13/2020 11:45 AM
129	Harold ave west	10/13/2020 9:06 AM
130	greenwood pl	10/13/2020 7:00 AM
131	Scotia street	10/12/2020 10:05 PM
132	Ruby	10/12/2020 9:08 PM
133	Portland Ave.	10/12/2020 8:22 PM
134	egerton rd	10/12/2020 7:23 PM
135	Rosedale Ave	10/12/2020 7:03 PM
136	Oakview Ave.	10/12/2020 6:17 PM
137	edmonton	10/12/2020 4:07 PM
138	303 Wildwood Park	10/12/2020 9:25 AM
139	Deschambault	10/12/2020 6:31 AM
140	Ferry Road	10/11/2020 11:35 PM
141	Lariviere	10/11/2020 9:15 PM
142	Haig	10/11/2020 3:39 PM
143	Essex	10/11/2020 3:27 PM
144	ellesmere	10/11/2020 12:37 PM
145	Glenview Avenue	10/11/2020 12:05 PM
146	St Jean Baptiste st	10/11/2020 12:05 PM
147	Chelsea Ave	10/11/2020 11:21 AM
148	Lipton	10/10/2020 10:55 PM
149	Pilgrim Ave.	10/10/2020 9:55 PM
150	Clonard	10/10/2020 7:48 PM
151	Pilgrim ave	10/10/2020 11:06 AM

152	Waterford Ave	10/10/2020 10:59 AM
153	st louis	10/10/2020 10:15 AM
154	Havelock Avenue	10/10/2020 9:37 AM
155	Frederick Ave	10/10/2020 9:22 AM
156	Ellesmere	10/10/2020 8:38 AM
157	Berrydale avenue	10/10/2020 7:56 AM
158	St Vital (general area)	10/9/2020 11:25 PM
159	Springside Drive	10/9/2020 8:13 PM
160	Ash	10/9/2020 4:31 PM
161	HAIG AVE.	10/9/2020 2:56 PM
162	Dorchester	10/9/2020 2:23 PM
163	Regal av	10/9/2020 1:10 PM
164	Bronstone Blvd	10/9/2020 11:52 AM
165	Humboldt Ave.	10/9/2020 11:18 AM
166	Maralbo	10/9/2020 9:10 AM
167	Berkley Street	10/9/2020 8:25 AM
168	Guay	10/9/2020 1:28 AM
169	Notaxhance	10/8/2020 9:14 PM
170	Vivian Ave	10/8/2020 8:09 PM
171	Stranmillis Ave.	10/8/2020 3:02 PM
172	Parade	10/8/2020 2:58 PM
173	Moncton	10/8/2020 2:14 PM
174	Havelock	10/8/2020 2:04 PM
175	Avondale Rd	10/8/2020 2:03 PM
176	havelock	10/8/2020 1:07 PM
177	Humboldt	10/8/2020 11:12 AM
178	Nichol Ave	10/8/2020 10:16 AM
179	Salter	10/8/2020 8:48 AM
180	Larche ave west	10/8/2020 6:41 AM
181	Somerville Ave.	10/7/2020 9:00 PM
182	Centennial	10/7/2020 7:52 PM
183	Beresford Ave	10/7/2020 6:11 PM
184	Crystal	10/7/2020 3:06 PM
185	Glen Ave.	10/7/2020 12:22 PM
186	Stradbrook	10/7/2020 10:31 AM
187	Royal Oak Drive	10/6/2020 10:24 PM
188	Sadler Ave	10/6/2020 6:02 PM
189	Crystal avenue	10/6/2020 4:05 PM

190	Kingston Crescent	10/6/2020 3:48 PM
191	Sadler Avenue	10/6/2020 3:10 PM
192	merriam boulevard	10/6/2020 2:50 PM
193	Kingston Row	10/6/2020 7:58 AM
194	Frederick Avenue	10/5/2020 6:17 PM
195	Bertrand	10/5/2020 12:35 PM
196	Edgewood Street	10/5/2020 12:21 PM
197	Frederick Avenue	10/5/2020 11:21 AM
198	Hargrave Street	10/5/2020 9:51 AM
199	Neptune	10/5/2020 8:18 AM
200	Carter	10/4/2020 10:48 PM
201	...	10/4/2020 9:58 PM
202	Wentworth Street	10/4/2020 8:43 PM
203	Polson Ave	10/4/2020 4:13 PM
204	Clifton	10/4/2020 1:35 PM
205	Fernwood Ave	10/4/2020 1:22 PM
206	KINGSTON CRESCENT	10/4/2020 9:56 AM
207	Queenston st.	10/3/2020 10:16 PM
208	St. Louis Rd	10/3/2020 8:03 PM
209	Dunkirk Place	10/3/2020 7:28 PM
210	Bank	10/3/2020 4:15 PM
211	Kingston Cr	10/3/2020 2:19 PM
212	Arnold Avenue	10/3/2020 1:15 PM
213	Roseberry	10/3/2020 11:43 AM
214	Garry St	10/3/2020 11:20 AM
215	Mulvey	10/3/2020 10:59 AM
216	Wellington Crescent	10/3/2020 10:55 AM
217	Kingston Crescent	10/3/2020 10:27 AM
218	Crystal Ave	10/3/2020 9:32 AM
219	Haverhill crescent	10/3/2020 8:23 AM
220	portland avenue	10/3/2020 12:52 AM
221	Fernwood Avenue	10/2/2020 10:12 PM
222	Noble ave	10/2/2020 3:55 PM
223	Kingston	10/2/2020 3:12 PM
224	Lorette Ave	10/2/2020 3:07 PM
225	Havelock Avenue	10/2/2020 2:37 PM
226	Stranmillis Avenue	10/2/2020 2:11 PM
227	Lipton Street	10/2/2020 11:53 AM

228	Kingston Row	10/2/2020 10:23 AM
229	Ashford Dr	10/1/2020 10:24 PM
230	Cordova street	10/1/2020 8:38 PM
231	Langside Street	10/1/2020 5:17 PM
232	Airlies St.	10/1/2020 4:50 PM
233	Scotswood Dr S (Scotswood Meadows)	10/1/2020 4:44 PM
234	Charleswood	10/1/2020 4:13 PM
235	Adsum Drive	10/1/2020 3:36 PM
236	Clifton South	10/1/2020 3:34 PM
237	Centennial Street	10/1/2020 1:25 PM
238	Pritchard	10/1/2020 11:51 AM
239	Humboldt	10/1/2020 11:32 AM
240	Norwich Ave	10/1/2020 11:15 AM
241	CLONARD	9/30/2020 11:26 PM
242	Tache	9/30/2020 11:02 PM
243	Kingston Crescent	9/30/2020 8:25 PM
244	Walker Ave	9/30/2020 7:10 PM
245	Tallgrass Crescent	9/30/2020 3:49 PM
246	Cabot Cres	9/30/2020 3:35 PM
247	Guay ave	9/30/2020 2:59 PM
248	Polaris Avenue	9/30/2020 2:23 PM
249	Buckingham rd	9/30/2020 12:59 PM
250	Kildonan Drive	9/30/2020 12:03 PM
251	hethrington	9/30/2020 8:36 AM
252	Laidlaw	9/29/2020 11:41 PM
253	895 Warsaw Ave	9/29/2020 11:11 PM
254	Sylvia	9/29/2020 8:51 PM
255	Campbell	9/29/2020 5:49 PM
256	Kingston Crescent	9/29/2020 4:10 PM
257	Newman	9/29/2020 3:37 PM
258	Harvard ave	9/29/2020 2:08 PM
259	Argue.	9/29/2020 1:39 PM
260	Guay Avenue	9/29/2020 1:28 PM
261	Stranmillis	9/29/2020 12:12 PM
262	Harvard Ave E	9/29/2020 9:50 AM
263	Arnold Avenue	9/29/2020 8:41 AM
264	Clonard Avenue	9/28/2020 10:00 PM
265	Kingston Crescent	9/28/2020 9:26 PM

266	St. Thomas Rd	9/28/2020 6:48 PM
267	Kingston Crescent	9/28/2020 1:14 PM
268	Imperial	9/28/2020 11:38 AM
269	Tidal Cove	9/28/2020 9:53 AM
270	Beechwood Place	9/28/2020 9:43 AM
271	Pilgrim ave	9/28/2020 8:35 AM
272	Deniset	9/28/2020 8:30 AM
273	Young	9/28/2020 12:07 AM
274	Varennes Avenue	9/27/2020 11:06 PM
275	Lamont	9/27/2020 5:06 PM
276	elmhurst road	9/27/2020 2:40 PM
277	rita	9/27/2020 2:28 PM
278	colby	9/26/2020 8:16 PM
279	Essex Avenue	9/26/2020 4:40 PM
280	Rosedale Avenue	9/26/2020 4:22 PM
281	Raglan Road	9/26/2020 3:24 PM
282	Worthington	9/26/2020 11:17 AM
283	McAdam	9/25/2020 11:45 PM
284	Marjorie Street	9/25/2020 2:47 PM
285	Lanark	9/25/2020 1:05 PM
286	Nassau st n	9/25/2020 9:39 AM
287	Ravelston Ave. West	9/25/2020 8:47 AM
288	Lindsay	9/25/2020 8:37 AM
289	Garfield	9/25/2020 7:28 AM
290	Lindsay	9/25/2020 6:53 AM
291	in old St. Vital	9/24/2020 7:42 PM
292	Stanier (east kildonan)	9/24/2020 7:18 PM
293	Egerton Road	9/24/2020 4:13 PM
294	Victoria	9/24/2020 1:25 PM
295	Pilgrim Avenue	9/24/2020 12:51 PM
296	Wolseley	9/24/2020 12:34 PM
297	Rosedale Avenue	9/24/2020 10:26 AM
298	Borebank	9/24/2020 9:54 AM
299	Langside	9/24/2020 9:48 AM
300	Glenlawn Ave	9/24/2020 9:33 AM
301	Handyside Ave	9/24/2020 9:27 AM
302	1862 Ross ave	9/24/2020 9:07 AM
303	Lachine	9/24/2020 8:53 AM

304	McMillan	9/24/2020 7:45 AM
305	Helmsdale	9/24/2020 12:48 AM
306	Egerton	9/23/2020 10:47 PM
307	St Mary's	9/23/2020 10:30 PM
308	Millfield	9/23/2020 10:08 PM
309	Balmoral	9/23/2020 9:55 PM
310	Essex	9/23/2020 9:28 PM
311	Essex	9/23/2020 9:14 PM
312	Tyndall Avenue	9/23/2020 9:11 PM
313	strathcona st	9/23/2020 8:44 PM
314	Mind your own business	9/23/2020 8:39 PM
315	Toronto St.	9/23/2020 8:25 PM
316	archwood neighbourhood	9/23/2020 7:01 PM
317	Cauchon	9/23/2020 6:43 PM
318	Cordova Street	9/23/2020 6:39 PM
319	see #22	9/23/2020 6:23 PM
320	Kingston crescent	9/23/2020 5:57 PM
321	Tweed ave	9/23/2020 5:48 PM
322	Lipton	9/23/2020 5:30 PM
323	Strathcona Street near Wellington	9/23/2020 4:44 PM
324	Morier avenue	9/23/2020 4:43 PM
325	Collegiate	9/23/2020 4:39 PM
326	Haig	9/23/2020 4:39 PM
327	Aubrey Street	9/23/2020 4:23 PM
328	Avonherst Street	9/23/2020 4:18 PM
329	Buckingham	9/23/2020 3:56 PM
330	glasgow	9/23/2020 3:50 PM
331	Borebank St	9/23/2020 2:17 PM
332	Banning Street	9/23/2020 12:02 PM
333	38 Brookstone Place	9/23/2020 11:52 AM
334	Somerville Ave	9/23/2020 10:48 AM
335	Langside	9/23/2020 10:11 AM
336	Beliveau Rd	9/23/2020 9:40 AM
337	Dorchester	9/23/2020 9:24 AM
338	na	9/23/2020 9:17 AM
339	Oxford st	9/23/2020 9:05 AM
340	Pilgrim	9/22/2020 11:40 PM
341	Wolseley	9/22/2020 10:21 PM

342	Lennox AVe	9/22/2020 8:13 PM
343	Brock	9/22/2020 8:07 PM
344	Greenwood Place	9/22/2020 7:48 PM
345	Kylemore	9/22/2020 4:28 PM
346	Enfield Crescent	9/22/2020 3:39 PM
347	Claremont	9/22/2020 2:43 PM
348	Dorchester Ave.	9/22/2020 2:36 PM
349	Kingston Crescent	9/22/2020 2:01 PM
350	Vaughan	9/22/2020 1:48 PM
351	KINGSTON CRESCENT	9/22/2020 1:46 PM
352	Corydon	9/22/2020 11:47 AM
353	Niagara Street	9/22/2020 10:08 AM
354	Regal Ave.	9/22/2020 8:32 AM
355	Kingston Crescent	9/22/2020 1:09 AM
356	Portland Avenue - backlane to Havelock Avenue	9/21/2020 6:53 PM
357	Government Ave	9/21/2020 6:42 PM
358	Beresford Ave	9/21/2020 5:46 PM
359	Moncton Ave	9/21/2020 5:06 PM
360	Waverley	9/21/2020 4:59 PM
361	Girton Blvd	9/21/2020 4:48 PM
362	Thurby Road	9/21/2020 4:45 PM
363	Centennial	9/21/2020 4:44 PM
364	Ellesmere Avenue	9/21/2020 3:35 PM
365	I do not live on a street. I live in a house.	9/21/2020 2:56 PM
366	waterfront drive	9/21/2020 2:26 PM
367	Oxford	9/21/2020 12:16 PM
368	Sherburn	9/21/2020 12:12 PM
369	Kingston Cres	9/21/2020 11:47 AM
370	McDermot	9/21/2020 11:07 AM
371	Troy Avenue	9/21/2020 10:04 AM
372	Roseberry	9/21/2020 9:50 AM
373	Cavell Drive	9/21/2020 9:35 AM
374	Elm Street	9/21/2020 8:32 AM
375	goldthorpe crescent	9/21/2020 7:39 AM
376	Waverley	9/21/2020 12:26 AM
377	Kingsway	9/20/2020 10:51 PM
378	langside	9/20/2020 9:14 PM
379	Kingston Crescent	9/20/2020 6:41 PM

380	Beaumont	9/20/2020 5:40 PM
381	Harrowby Ave	9/20/2020 4:30 PM
382	Wentwood cres.	9/20/2020 3:38 PM
383	wilkes ave.	9/20/2020 2:06 PM
384	Handyside Ave	9/20/2020 1:45 PM
385	Stradbrook	9/20/2020 1:35 PM
386	Ritchot Street	9/20/2020 12:29 PM
387	Riverbend avenue	9/20/2020 8:46 AM
388	Kelvin Blvd	9/20/2020 6:59 AM
389	Morier Avenue	9/20/2020 1:06 AM
390	pritchard	9/20/2020 12:50 AM
391	Arlington	9/19/2020 10:57 PM
392	Albany Street	9/19/2020 9:45 PM
393	St. Mary's Rd.	9/19/2020 7:45 PM
394	Not wanting to disclose	9/19/2020 5:40 PM
395	Helmsdale	9/19/2020 5:35 PM
396	Humboldt	9/19/2020 5:33 PM
397	Handyside Avenue	9/19/2020 5:27 PM
398	Stradbrook Avenue	9/19/2020 5:01 PM
399	LaRiviere	9/19/2020 3:54 PM
400	St. David Road	9/19/2020 3:04 PM
401	Hespeler Ave.	9/19/2020 2:13 PM
402	In Lord Roberts	9/19/2020 2:02 PM
403	balmoral	9/19/2020 1:56 PM
404	Kildonan drive	9/19/2020 1:45 PM
405	Lanark	9/19/2020 12:59 PM
406	Strathcona st.	9/19/2020 11:21 AM
407	Ingersoll	9/19/2020 10:42 AM
408	Rosemount Avenue	9/19/2020 10:26 AM
409	Archibald	9/19/2020 10:21 AM
410	Lipton	9/19/2020 10:20 AM
411	Rosedale Ave	9/19/2020 10:00 AM
412	Ashland	9/19/2020 9:46 AM
413	Campbell Street	9/19/2020 9:37 AM
414	St. David Rd.	9/19/2020 9:30 AM
415	Cathedral Ave	9/19/2020 8:58 AM
416	Forest Park Dr	9/19/2020 8:32 AM
417	Kingston	9/19/2020 5:39 AM

418	Hull Avenue	9/19/2020 12:35 AM
419	Whitehall Blvd.	9/19/2020 12:33 AM
420	Harrowby	9/18/2020 11:29 PM
421	Valour	9/18/2020 10:53 PM
422	Des Meurons	9/18/2020 10:15 PM
423	Pritchard	9/18/2020 9:02 PM
424	Grenfell Blvd	9/18/2020 8:13 PM
425	Goulet	9/18/2020 8:05 PM
426	Kingston Crescent	9/18/2020 8:00 PM
427	Harvard	9/18/2020 7:46 PM
428	Burnell	9/18/2020 7:19 PM
429	Chestnut	9/18/2020 7:00 PM
430	Montgomery Avenue	9/18/2020 6:09 PM
431	Niagara Street	9/18/2020 6:03 PM
432	harrowby	9/18/2020 5:18 PM
433	Hawthorne	9/18/2020 5:13 PM
434	Clayton	9/18/2020 4:52 PM
435	Kingsway	9/18/2020 4:49 PM
436	Fleet	9/18/2020 3:09 PM

Q24 What is your age?

Answered: 504 Skipped: 270



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Under 18	0.00%	0
18 - 34	16.47%	83
35 - 55	42.86%	216
55-64	21.43%	108
65+	19.25%	97
TOTAL		504

Q25 How did you hear about this project? Please check all that apply.

Answered: 514 Skipped: 260



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Newspaper	19.07%	98
Public Engagement Newsletter	27.24%	140
Facebook	25.10%	129
Twitter	7.00%	36
Website	13.42%	69
Word of mouth	25.29%	130
Other (please specify)	25.49%	131
Total Respondents: 514		

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	City email	10/22/2020 11:43 PM
2	Community group against poorly regulated infill.	10/22/2020 10:37 PM
3	Mailer card	10/22/2020 5:31 PM
4	CBC radio	10/22/2020 2:11 PM
5	Online CBC article	10/22/2020 11:26 AM
6	CBC News App	10/22/2020 11:26 AM
7	leaflet	10/22/2020 10:00 AM
8	Nature, environmental, tree group meetings	10/21/2020 7:27 PM
9	walking in area and seeing grotesque new erections	10/21/2020 1:19 PM
10	Neighborhood group with concerns	10/21/2020 1:17 PM
11	Flyer in mailbox	10/21/2020 11:55 AM
12	TV news	10/21/2020 10:47 AM
13	Resident Group Meetings	10/20/2020 8:04 PM
14	information came the mail regarding lot spitting. to which I say Definite NO!	10/20/2020 3:36 PM
15	By chance, saw on website	10/19/2020 9:55 AM
16	Contacted city regarding infill and lot splitting and how to find locations ahead of development.	10/18/2020 8:35 PM
17	TV	10/18/2020 7:30 PM
18	Instagram	10/18/2020 5:22 PM
19	The Metro (local neighbourhood paper)	10/18/2020 3:50 PM
20	A neighbour giving out flyers	10/16/2020 3:19 PM
21	email	10/16/2020 2:11 PM
22	mail flyer	10/15/2020 10:41 PM
23	email newsletter	10/15/2020 9:30 PM
24	personal observations from bike rides	10/15/2020 8:54 PM
25	Neighbourhood Association	10/15/2020 2:38 PM
26	Shawn Nason postcard	10/15/2020 12:57 PM
27	Sustainable Building MB	10/15/2020 9:12 AM
28	I believe it was an items on the news.	10/14/2020 11:20 PM
29	It came in the mail.	10/14/2020 10:58 PM
30	Sustainable Buildings Manitoba Newsletter	10/14/2020 7:57 PM
31	mail	10/14/2020 4:05 PM
32	mailer	10/14/2020 1:18 PM
33	brochure in mail	10/14/2020 12:46 PM
34	My councillor, Brian Mayes	10/14/2020 10:51 AM
35	News	10/14/2020 10:34 AM
36	My city councillor!	10/14/2020 9:12 AM
37	personal blogs	10/14/2020 8:04 AM

38	Participant.	10/13/2020 9:08 PM
39	Direct mail notice	10/13/2020 8:41 PM
40	Radio	10/13/2020 4:25 PM
41	Email	10/12/2020 7:03 PM
42	TV	10/12/2020 6:17 PM
43	advocacy campaigns from pro density organizations	10/12/2020 4:07 PM
44	Instagram ad	10/11/2020 11:35 PM
45	card circulated by councillor Brian Mayes	10/11/2020 12:05 PM
46	Community FB page	10/11/2020 12:05 PM
47	Canada Post card from City Councillor	10/10/2020 7:48 PM
48	I live it everyday.	10/10/2020 11:06 AM
49	We live it	10/9/2020 6:52 PM
50	CBC radio	10/9/2020 2:23 PM
51	mail from Brian Mayes	10/9/2020 1:10 PM
52	TV	10/9/2020 11:52 AM
53	By watching it in my neighborhood	10/9/2020 9:10 AM
54	radio	10/8/2020 3:42 PM
55	Card in the mail	10/8/2020 2:58 PM
56	signs posted	10/8/2020 2:14 PM
57	Instagram	10/8/2020 2:04 PM
58	flyer	10/8/2020 1:07 PM
59	Brian Mayes	10/8/2020 10:16 AM
60	CJOB radio	10/8/2020 8:48 AM
61	YIMBY	10/7/2020 6:11 PM
62	Neighbour	10/7/2020 3:04 PM
63	Card in mailbox.	10/7/2020 12:22 PM
64	Souwester	10/6/2020 8:05 PM
65	Brian mayes	10/6/2020 6:02 PM
66	Notification Brian Mayes	10/6/2020 4:05 PM
67	Brian Mayes mailer	10/6/2020 3:10 PM
68	Mailer from City Councillor; saw an article online on CBC local news	10/5/2020 6:17 PM
69	Bryan Mayes sent it in the mail.	10/5/2020 12:35 PM
70	Community	10/5/2020 12:21 PM
71	City employee	10/5/2020 8:18 AM
72	Instagram ad	10/4/2020 4:13 PM
73	News outlet	10/4/2020 1:35 PM
74	city councillor	10/4/2020 1:22 PM
75	Card in mail	10/3/2020 4:15 PM

76	CBC news	10/3/2020 11:43 AM
77	Finding out about Mezzo homes and talking about my wish to have been able to find such a setting in my establihed neighbourhood would be so lovely...established neighbourhood only offer stairs and not ground floor living which forces seniors out!	10/3/2020 11:20 AM
78	email	10/3/2020 8:23 AM
79	News app - CBC	10/3/2020 7:02 AM
80	Brian Mayes mailout.	10/2/2020 2:37 PM
81	watching the news	10/2/2020 2:11 PM
82	Email	10/2/2020 11:53 AM
83	E-Mail	10/1/2020 3:36 PM
84	emailed the survey	10/1/2020 1:25 PM
85	email	10/1/2020 11:32 AM
86	residents concerned 1	9/30/2020 11:26 PM
87	emailed to me after i completed the bike survey.	9/30/2020 3:49 PM
88	Professional duty	9/30/2020 12:03 PM
89	CBC news website	9/29/2020 5:49 PM
90	Sustainable Buildings Manitoba Newsletter	9/29/2020 8:41 AM
91	It’s currently destroying our yard, street and everything that brought us to this area.	9/28/2020 8:35 AM
92	My city councillor's office	9/26/2020 4:22 PM
93	I forget	9/26/2020 3:24 PM
94	Email	9/25/2020 5:06 PM
95	email	9/25/2020 2:47 PM
96	City Counsellor\s assistant	9/25/2020 1:05 PM
97	tv	9/25/2020 1:22 AM
98	Neighborhood App	9/24/2020 12:51 PM
99	Email from a South Osborne community group.	9/24/2020 10:26 AM
100	neighbourhood association	9/24/2020 9:27 AM
101	tv	9/24/2020 9:07 AM
102	Radio	9/23/2020 10:30 PM
103	news story on cbc	9/23/2020 8:44 PM
104	media cbc	9/23/2020 7:01 PM
105	radio	9/23/2020 6:39 PM
106	My Councillor	9/23/2020 6:39 PM
107	online news article	9/23/2020 6:09 PM
108	News feed	9/23/2020 5:48 PM
109	CBC RSS feed	9/23/2020 3:56 PM
110	city-wide email	9/23/2020 10:48 AM
111	Through CityNet	9/23/2020 10:11 AM
112	Work, email	9/23/2020 9:40 AM

113	Member of the TAC	9/22/2020 10:21 PM
114	Instagram	9/22/2020 2:36 PM
115	Been interested for a long time, watching the deterioration of downtown, while the outer limits are so unnecessary	9/22/2020 1:48 PM
116	Email from City Councilor	9/21/2020 4:59 PM
117	CTV News	9/21/2020 2:53 PM
118	Think it was CTV Morning Live this morning	9/21/2020 12:12 PM
119	email	9/21/2020 10:04 AM
120	TV	9/21/2020 8:32 AM
121	Townhall	9/20/2020 1:06 AM
122	Social media	9/19/2020 5:40 PM
123	CTV news app	9/19/2020 3:54 PM
124	reddit	9/19/2020 1:56 PM
125	Reddit	9/19/2020 12:59 PM
126	CTV news	9/19/2020 11:21 AM
127	News	9/19/2020 10:26 AM
128	Reddit	9/19/2020 10:12 AM
129	Internet search	9/19/2020 6:26 AM
130	Email	9/19/2020 12:33 AM
131	Television	9/18/2020 6:09 PM

Q26 Please provide the first three characters of your postal code.

Answered: 475 Skipped: 299




R3H
R3J
R3K
R3L
R3M
R3N
R3P
R3R
R3S
R3T
R3V
R3W
R3X
R3Y
Other (please specify)
0%
10%
20%
30%
40%
50%
60%
70%
80%
90%
100%

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
R2C	2.53%	12
R2G	1.26%	6
R2H	4.42%	21
R2J	1.89%	9
R2K	2.74%	13
R2L	1.47%	7
R2M	36.84%	175
R2N	2.11%	10
R2P	0.42%	2
R2R	0.84%	4
R2V	1.26%	6
R2W	1.68%	8
R2X	1.05%	5
R2Y	0.21%	1
R3A	0.00%	0
R3B	0.84%	4
R3C	2.74%	13
R3E	0.63%	3
R3G	5.89%	28
R3H	0.00%	0
R3J	2.74%	13
R3K	0.21%	1
R3L	4.63%	22
R3M	7.37%	35
R3N	6.74%	32
R3P	1.68%	8
R3R	1.68%	8
R3S	0.42%	2
R3T	3.37%	16
R3V	0.00%	0
R3W	0.42%	2
R3X	1.26%	6

R3Y	0.42%	2
Other (please specify)	0.21%	1
TOTAL		475

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	R2M	9/30/2020 8:25 PM

Q27 Please indicate your gender.

Answered: 506 Skipped: 268



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Prefer not to say	15.22%	77
Man	40.71%	206
Woman	41.90%	212
Other	2.17%	11
TOTAL		506

#	OTHER	DATE
1	Raging grandmother who wants children to be safe in their front or backyard and do not to play in the street or a driveway for a tiny car!	10/22/2020 5:41 PM
2	Bryan Mayes Councillor	10/20/2020 3:50 PM
3	comment	10/16/2020 7:31 PM
4	Amorphous aqueous angst	10/16/2020 6:30 PM
5	Does not have any baring on this matter.	10/8/2020 3:02 PM
6	none of your business	10/8/2020 2:14 PM
7	Human	10/7/2020 3:04 PM
8	Why does this even matter? Get with it. It's 2020. Jeez.	9/25/2020 1:05 PM
9	both genders live in our house.	9/25/2020 8:47 AM
10	THIS QUESTION IS NOT RELEVANT AND SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED.	9/23/2020 7:01 PM
11	R2H	9/22/2020 3:39 PM