M Richard
& Associates Ltd.



PARKER LANDS

2023 Community Engagement Summary Report

Prepared for: 7138793 MANITOBA LTD. // 6165347 MANITOBA INC.
Prepared by: M Richards & Associates Ltd.
September 2023

M Richard & Associates Ltd.
200 - 55 Donald Street
Winnipeg, MB. R3C 1L8
ph: 204.202.7672
www.mrichardassociates.ca

Executive Summary

This is a summary of the public engagement process completed in 2023 for the proposed Fulton Grove - Parker Lands TOD development. This process was in addition to the public engagement work that has been done over the past 11 years including:

- Stakeholder meetings with key organizations and entities
- Collaborating with various City of Winnipeg departments
- Multiple public open house events in person and online to gain community input
- Surveys in person and online to gain feedback from public on project
- Website to inform public and stakeholders on the process throughout the years.
- Hired subconsultants to conduct numerous studies and report in response to feedback from the public engagement process
- Public advertisement in local media, newspapers and mail outs to invite and update public throughout the process.

Prior to submitting the planning applications for Parker Lands this fall, we determined that it was important to go back to the public to provide an update on the proposal. As such, the website was updated, a full page ad was placed in the Winnipeg Free Press, and a feature on local news was done as well to invite residents throughout the community on the final proposal. The website included a summary of the project proposal, the benefits it will have on the City of Winnipeg, and a link to a survey. The total number of survey responses was 115. The following summarizes key topics:

Demographics - Half of the respondents identified as living in River Heights – Fort Garry. 75% of respondents were over the age of 45. Almost 2/3 of the respondents were married or in a partnership and 57.6% of the respondents did not have kids living at home.

Overall Support – There is support for the proposal with 76% if respondents in favour of the development and 5% indifferent. Only 7 respondents of the 2023 survey were not in favour of the proposal.

Housing - The surveys suggest the availability of new housing options in the city is very important, and that safety, cost of living and affordability are the top three challenges Winnipeg currently faces. A variety of housing styles (forms) and infill housing is very to extremely important (51%). 67% noted that neighbourhood amenities are very to extremely important in close proximity to infill development.

Transportation - 58% of respondents feel transit orientated development (TOD) is very to extremely important in development. 41% of respondents are travelling 15-30 minute commutes to, and from work, while 6% travel more than 45 minutes. 57% of respondents relied on their vehicle daily for transportation needs, with 9% rarely or never using their vehicle. The primary reason for use of vehicle was errands and shopping (90%) with social, recreational and visiting friends and family being 75%+. Travel to school was the lowest reason for using vehicle at 18%, which is slightly higher than the 12% of respondents that would be considered typical of post-secondary school age (18-34).

Sustainable Elements and Strategies - (60%) in favour and 76% in favour of the proposed green spaces.

1. Introduction

This report outlines the Public Engagement Teams' engagement process in 2023, as well as reflecting their commitment to gathering vital insights from the community, stakeholders, and targeted groups dating back to 2012. Emphasizing inclusivity and collaboration, our engagement strategy encompassed diverse approaches, including stakeholder meetings, well-attended public events, multiple extensive online surveys, and focused discussions with key organizations. Valuable input from these groups generally helped substantiate the proposed preliminary conceptual vision and helped inform the evolution of the design being proposed for City approval.

The data derived from the latest 2023 online surveys provides insights into demographics, needs, and community priorities concerning housing, neighbourhood services, transportation, green spaces, and more with the final proposal.

This report highlights the collective results from the 2023 survey.

1.1 Public Engagement Process

Extensive public engagement significantly influenced the final design of the proposed development. The planning process for these subject lands commenced in 2013, with public consultations on the proposed development initiated in 2016. These consultations continued, including engagements in 2018, three online engagement sessions in 2020, and as recently as July 2023.

Survey responses were gathered through digital means throughout July 2023. The online survey was launched on July 12, 2023 and closed August 5, 2023. 115 responses were received.

Ads were placed in the Winnipeg Free Press on July 15 and the engagement opportunity showcased CBC News on July 13. There was a LinkedIn blast as well to promote the survey and website. The website contained information about the vision, key features of the development, and easy-to-access links to the public survey. Within the first week of the online survey, there were 375 site visits and 103 surveys completed. 12 surveys were received in the last week of the feedback window.

The following analysis encompasses all survey results received in July 2023.

2. Results - Overall

The following section represents the total combined results from the submitted 115 online surveys.


A full analysis of the combined results can be found under Appendix C. The summary below is presented by the following themes:

- Demographics
- Housing
- Transportation
- Sustainability and Greenspace
- Other Comments

2.1 Demographics


Age

75% of respondents were over the age of 45.




Location

Half of the respondents identified as living in River Heights – Fort Garry.



Household

Almost 2/3 of the respondents were married or in a partnership and 57.6% of the respondents did not have kids living at home.




2.2 Housing Trends

When asked housing and the existing issues in the City of Winnipeg respondents noted affordability, safety and cost of living as the key factors. The majority of respondents would like to see a new housing with a diversity of types of options. The following summarizes the top three (3) answers for each of the housing questions from the survey:


Question 1 - Top three challenges you believe Winnipeg currently faces from the following:

1) Safety - 67%
2) Housing affordability - 62%
3) Cost of living - 58%




Question 2 - How important is the availability of new housing options in Winnipeg to you, considering the current housing shortage?

1) Very Important - 28%
2) Extremely important - 18%
3) Not important - 18%



Question 3: How important is variety of housing styles (duplexes, triplexes, multi-family) in a central area of Winnipeg to you?

1) Very Important - 27%
2) Extremely important - 24%
3) Moderately important - 23%




2.3 Transportation


Consistent across all results, there appears to be a need to decrease typical work commutes to less than 15 minutes, as currently 66% of the respondents travel longer than that daily. There also seems to be a trend to use a vehicle daily for common errands, recreation and social purposes. The consensus from respondents is that TOD is very to extremely important and should be factored into new development applications.

The questions regarding transportation are summarized below with the top three (3) answers for each question.

Question 4 - How long is your typical commute to work (one way)?
1) 15 to 30 minutes - 41%
2) Less than 15 minutes - 34%
3) 30 to 45 minutes - 11%




Question 5 - How often do you use a car for transportation?
1) Daily - 56%
2) Several times a week - 23%
3) Occasionally - 9%




Question 5.1 - If you use a car, please let us know why. Check off all of the answers that apply:

1) Errands and shopping - 90%
2) Social and recreational activities - 77%
3) Visiting friends and family - 76 %



Question 6 - How important is Transit-Oriented Development (integrating transportation infrastructure and land use) to you in the development of new communities?

1) Very important - 31%
2) Extremely important - 27%
3) Not important - 17%




2.4 Sustainability and Greenspace

There is strong community consensus around the need for amenities and greenspace as part of this development. The questions regarding the proposal as it relates to these concepts are summarized below with the top three (3) answers for each question:


Question 7 - Once developed, Fulton Grove is estimated to generate approximately $3 million in annual municipal revenue. How important do you think infill development is to assist the City of Winnipeg as a revenue stream?

1) Extremely important - 27%
2) Very important - 23%
3) Not important - 17%




Question 8- How important are new neighbourhood amenities (e.g., parks, recreational facilities, shopping areas) to you in close proximity to infill development?

1) Extremely important - 41%
2) Very important - 27%
3) Moderately important -14%




Question 9 - Are you in favor of the proposed sustainable elements and strategies within the Fulton development?

1) Yes - 60%
2) Unsure - 17%
3) No - 15%



Question 10 - Are you in favor of the proposed green spaces within the development?

1) Yes - 76%
2) Unsure - 11%
3) No - 6%



3. Other Comments

Additional priorities surfaced within the general comments, including questions related to access into and from the subject lands, active transportation throughout the site, proximity to connecting to amenities and services, and the need for safety within the development and surround area. Additional comments related were on development overall and environmental impact. Key words pulled from the comments are shown below with size showing words that were more comment than those that are smaller. For more insights into these priorities please consult *Appendix D: General Comments*.



4. Engagement Insights

This report with the attached Appendices presents the diligent approach of the Public Engagement Team, reflecting the team's commitment to capturing crucial insights from the community, stakeholders, and targeted groups while working collaboratively with the City of Winnipeg and approving agencies.

Over the years, the engagement strategy, rooted in inclusivity and collaboration, embraced various techniques such as multiple and diverse stakeholder meetings, well-attended public open houses, well-advertised online public engagement, extensive online surveys, and focused discussions with key agencies and municipal departments. These methods ensured a comprehensive range of perspectives, guiding the Parker Lands development.

The stakeholder sessions generated constructive dialogues and provided input on draft materials and conceptual ideas. Their guidance helped direct the public engagement process, also highlighting the importance transit-oriented development, diverse housing options, safety, and sustainable growth.

Survey data collected from the online submissions, the in-person open houses, and targeted interest group engagement provided crucial insights into demographics and community priorities spanning housing, neighbourhood services, transportation, green spaces, and more.

Information obtained from the surveys reflects the desire of the community to have the development be responsive to the needs of the neighbourhood for affordable living that is safe and accessible. The surveys, coupled with the discussions during prior in-person engagements and meetings over the last decade, also highlight the community's inclination for a development that embraces an open and aesthetically pleasing area, catering to transit-orientated development, with access to amenities.

5. List of Appendices

Appendix A – Engagement Ad
Appendix B – 2023 Survey Copy
Appendix C – 2023 Survey Original Results
Appendix D – General Comments
Appendix E – History of Engagement Process to Date
Appendix F – Sept. 2020 Engagement Summary Report



PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT - INFORMATION

FULTON GROVE DEVELOPMENT

The Fulton Grove development in Winnipeg's Parker Lands area offers an important opportunity for revitalization and growth aligned with the city's strategic vision. The development will provide a choice of housing (small lot single-family, townhome, condo and rental units) in an infill location.

FEATURES

1. **TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT** – near two rapid transit stations
2. **WALKABLE** – transit, amenities and services within a 10 minute walk with tree lined streets and pathways
3. **CONNECTED** – transit, high quality designed pedestrian and cyclist oriented pathways
4. **MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT** – optimal mix of green spaces, neighbourhood commercial and housing to encourage transit use
5. **DESIGN EMPHASIZES AESTHETICS** – human comfort and placemaking
6. **MIX OF HOUSING TYPES** – small lot single-family, townhomes, condos, and rental housing
7. **GEO-THERMAL** – heating and cooling
8. **INFILL DEVELOPMENT** – creating a vibrant and exciting new neighbourhood in the heart of the city

BENEFITS

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT


- Approx. **$127 MILLION IN GOVERNMENT REVENUE** from construction & development activities.
- Approx. **$1.1 BILLION IN ECONOMIC ACTIVITY.**
- Approx. **5,691 PERSON-YEARS** of employment.

SITE SUSTAINABILITY

- **REDUCTION OF 2,877 TONNES/YEAR** in GHG emissions.
- Reduction GHG emissions **EQUIVALENT OF REMOVING 1,129 CARS FROM THE ROAD.**

CITY OF WINNIPEG

- **$4 MILLION/YEAR** in new municipal revenue.
- **1918 NEW HOUSING UNITS.**
- **SUPPORT TRANSIT RIDERSHIP** in Winnipeg's $475 million Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor.




TOD – WHAT IS IT?

Transit-oriented development creates vibrant, livable, sustainable communities around rapid transit systems. This type of development has a high concentration of buildings, it's compact, walkable, pedestrian-oriented and mixed-use.

It assists with creating affordable housing environments as there is no need for dependency on cars and driving to get around.

This type of living arrangement can reduce driving by up to 85%.

Transit oriented development is also a major solution to the serious and growing problems of climate change and global energy security by creating dense, walkable communities that greatly reduce the need for driving and energy consumption.




Please share your thoughts

Online Survey

Online Survey will be open until August 5, 2023

For more information about the project or to access the survey, please **Scan the QR Code** to visit our website at : www.mrichardassociates.ca/fultongrove



You can scan the QR Code using the camera on your phone

HOW DID FULTON GROVE COME TO BE?

DEVELOPMENT HISTORY

OurWpg, the City of Winnipeg's official development plan, designates this site for high density mixed use development to support the development of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor adjacent to the site.

A 7 year planning process was completed in 2020, as City of Winnipeg Council approved the development application. The development was never moved forward because of a disagreement by the public service on what was approved by Council. Since 2018, the property owner initiated 6 legal challenges against the City of Winnipeg to allow the development application to proceed to a vote at Council. All legal proceedings to date were ruled in favour of the property owner.

In 2017, a resident challenged the legality of how the Parker Lands were sold by the City of Winnipeg. The challenge was discussed by the courts, indicating no procedural concerns with how the property was acquired.

WHEN WILL THE SITE BE DEVELOPED?

A new application to rezone and subdivide the site will be submitted after receiving and considering community feedback on the development plan. It is materially the same as the 2020 approved plan. This application will be considered by the City of Winnipeg through a public hearing process and ultimately must receive approval by Council.

If approval is received, a comprehensive development agreement will need to be signed. Shovels in the ground are estimated for 2024.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT SURVEY: PROPOSED FULTON GROVE DEVELOPMENT

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this public engagement survey regarding the proposed Fulton Grove development in Winnipeg. Your input is valuable in helping us work with the City of Winnipeg to bring this development to fruition to provide much needed housing in City of Winnipeg. Please answer the following questions to the best of your knowledge and provide your opinions. Your responses will remain anonymous and confidential. We estimate that this survey will take you approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

1. Please select the top three challenges you believe Winnipeg currently faces from the following:
    - Housing affordability
    - Parks and open space
    - Transit and pedestrian friendly
    - Cost of living
    - Safety
    - Other (Please specify)

2. How important is the availability of new housing options in Winnipeg to you, considering the current housing shortage?
    - Not important
    - Slightly important
    - Moderately important
    - Very important
    - Extremely important

3. How important is variety of housing styles (duplexes, triplexes, multi-family) in a central area of Winnipeg to you?
    - Not important
    - Slightly important
    - Moderately important
    - Very important
    - Extremely important

Fulton Grove is located beside a rapid transit stop and is designed to reduce resident's reliance on vehicles for all their trips. The following questions help us understand transit behaviours:

4. How long is your typical commute to work (one way)?
    - Less than 15 minutes
    - 15-30 minutes
    - 30-45 minutes
    - 45 minutes to 1 hour
    - Over 1 hour

5. How often do you use a car for transportation?
    - Daily
    - Several times a week
    - Occasionally
    - Rarely
    - Never

6. If you use a car, please let us know why. Check off all of the answers that apply:
    - Work
    - Visiting friends and family
    - School
    - Medical
    - Errands and shopping
    - Social and recreational activities
    - Other (Please specify)

Fulton Grove is estimated to generate approximately $1.2 million in annual transit revenue generated by the proposed transit-oriented development. Transit-Oriented Development is ensuring new housing and commercial are located with transit in mind to increase ridership and move away from personal vehicles for everyday use.

7. How important is Transit-Oriented Development (integrating transportation infrastructure and land use) to you in the development of new communities?
    - Not important
    - Slightly important
    - Moderately important
    - Very important
    - Extremely important

About the proposed development specifically:

8. Once developed, Fulton Grove is estimated to generate approximately $3 million in annual municipal revenue. How important do you think infill development is to assist the City of Winnipeg as a revenue stream?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Unsure
    - Indifferent

9. How important are new neighbourhood amenities (e.g., parks, recreational facilities, shopping areas) to you in close proximity to infill development?
    - Not important
    - Slightly important
    - Moderately important
    - Very important
    - Extremely important

Sustainability is a primary pillar of the Park Lands. The Fulton Grove development is looking to address sustainable development through mixed-use and residential zones, increased density near transit and approx. 30 acres of greenspace, adding new recreation space, amenities within walking distance, pedestrian-friendly streets, and district geothermal energy systems.

10. Are you in favor of the proposed sustainable elements and strategies within the Fulton development?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Unsure
    - Indifferent

11. Are you in favor of the proposed green spaces within the development?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Unsure
    - Indifferent

About you for context of your responses:

12. Age:
    - Under 18
    - 18-24
    - 25-34
    - 35-44
    - 45-54
    - 55-64
    - 65 or over

13. What part of Winnipeg do you live in?

    a) Point Douglas
    b) Mynarski
    c) North Kildonan
    d) Transcona
    e) St. Boniface
    f) St. Vital
    g) St. Norbert – Seine River
    h) St. James
    i) Daniel McIntyre
    j) Waverley West
    k) Charleswood-Tuxedo
    l) River Heights-Fort Garry
    m) Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry
    n) Old Kildonan
    o) Elmwood-East Kildonan
    p) Not a Winnipeg resident

14. Marital Status:
    - Single
    - Married/In a partnership
    - Divorced/Separated
    - Widowed
    - Other

15. Do you have children or dependents living at home?
    - Yes
    - No


16. Have any additional comments about the proposed Fulton Grove development?
_____

Thank you for your participation in this survey. Your input is greatly appreciated and will contribute to the planning process for the proposed Fulton Grove development.


Fulton Grove 2023 Survey Results




	Count
Housing affordability	73
Limited parks and open space	39
Access to reliable transit and pedestrian-friendly	44
Cost of living	68
Safety	78
Other	24




	Count
Not important	21
Slightly important	20
Moderately important	20
Very important	33
Extremely important	21




	Count
15 – 30 minutes	48
Less than 15 minutes	40
30 – 45 minutes	13
45 minutes to 1 hour	5
Over 1 hour	2




	Count
Daily	66
Several times a week	27
Occasionally	11
Rarely	9
Never	1




	Count
Errands and shopping	105
Social and recreational activities	89
Visiting friends and family	88
Medical	77
Work	62
School	21




	Count
Very important	36
Extremely important	31
Not important	20
Moderately important	16
Slightly important	11




	Count
Not important	20
Slightly important	17
Moderately important	18
Very important	27
Extremely important	32




	Count
Not important	9
Slightly important	12
Moderately important	16
Very important	31
Extremely important	47




	Count
Yes	20
Unsure	17
No	18
Indifferent	27




	Count
Yes	88
Unsure	13
No	7
Indifferent	6




	Count
Under 18	0
18 - 24	6
25 - 34	8
35 - 44	15
45 - 44	25
55 - 64	32
65 or over	30



	Count
St. Vital	6
St. Norbert – Seine River	1
St. James	0
Daniel McIntyre	0
Waverley West	9
Charleswood-Tuxedo	9
River Heights-Fort Garry	58
Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry	22
Old Kildonan	0
Elmwood-East Kildonan	0
Not a Winnipeg resident	2



	Count
Single	19
Married / In a partnership	79
Divorced / Separated	10
Widowed	4
Other	2



	Count
No	67
Yes	46

General Comments

1. Your current plans have a single point of access to Fulton Grove and will cause an increase in traffic to the existing residential area next to it. I see nothing in your plans to address this.

2. Traffic flow is not considered at all in this plan. This will be a disaster if other entrances are not added. This community needs its own vehicle access to Waverley or Taylor and pembina. This issue is being ignored by developers and is crucial. Infrastructure issues like sewage capacity needs to be addressed. This area has significant existing issues. Access to school needs to be addressed. The catchment area is on the other side of the “retaining wall”. The schools on the south side do not have room for 500+ kids. There needs to be better access to this community. Period.

3. This plan completely neglects traffic into the community- completely walled in on most of the perimeter. traffic in and out of an already stressed community street (Beaumont and windermere) will be even worse. This will ruin windermere. It is not possible to even imagine that street being able to support traffic to a 1,950 unit community... that is approx 3000 people if not more. How can that travel daily through a community. No one uses transit when they can afford a car. iIt is -25 for most of the year. You CANNOT compare to other cities with better/ covered transit and weather. That is also about 750 - 1000 children. where is the consideration for schools?! Absolutely none. It's based on profit and self serving transit figures based on other city information. These plans are atrocious. no parks community centres, consideration of school catchments or walkability to schools; "We'll use what's there". AKA invest in nothing that doesn't directly result in profit. Pitiful.

4. This development has long been in the working with many delays by city council. We would like to see the project completed. In addition the Beaumont community has seen increase in theft and vandalism over the past year. Consideration may need to take place for community security patrol.

5. There is no rail crossing so pedestrians and cyclists in Fulton Grove will not have access to the services along Taylor and Grant. This will further increase car dependency when you can't easily walk, bike, or bus these services. The developer must be responsible for a pedestrian/cyclist rail crossing. The developer must also be responsible for extending Hurst to the Pembina/Jubilee overpass. The Beaumont streets are classified as local streets, not regional streets and are only designed to support local traffic. It is insane to me that a developer can build so much residential without building the supporting infrastructure for the future residents. As typical, the costs for the supporting infrastructure will fall on the taxpayer in the future while the developer makes millions of dollars. Council needs to put their foot down and make the developer pay for the supporting infrastructure to make Fulton Grove a true complete community, or Council needs to say "no" to the developer.

6. There is already increased theft, break-ins, people camping near bushes, increased traffic, etc happening in this area & all the undesirable things that lower the appeal for living in an area

such as this proposal, since the rapid transit & walkways were built. It is no longer safe to walk in this area & never after dark. There already is increased traffic with no infrastructure to accommodate what is happening now.

7. The traffic will be a nightmare as it looks to me like there is no other way in and out other than Hurst way! I feel like the city doesn't take into account what the residents living in the area want! The whole thing was shady from the start amd it's a big mess.

8. The seeming overwhelming focus on transit has ignored other modes of transportation like walking and or cycling. The straight line proximity to shopping on Taylor at first glance looks great however to actually get there it's an enormous detour to Waverly or pembina and then back. Some sort of pedestrian corridor over the CN tracks to shopping on Taylor would go a long way towards remedying the absolute dearth of any sort of amenities in this neighborhood. As is, this neighborhood will be another grocery desert and force people to drive to the grocery store. Let's be honest no one is bringing home all of their groceries on the bus. I have not reviewed all of the material in detail however, on the map that was shared there are no call outs for Winnipeg car co-op parking spaces. Again it feels like the people working on this are overly focused on Winnipeg Transit and not on a holistic solution to transportation within the city. How will the danger of derailments be addressed?

9. The RP Project has destroyed the roads in the Fort Garry area with heavy traffic of trucks hauling in and out of the development. Promises were made by the City Councilor that repairs to the roads was in the budget of the RT project. - IT WAS NOT and our roads continue to deteriorate. If Fulton Grove development was to get the green light, I would like to see a designed route in and out of the construction site to prevent further damage to our community and upon completion of the project, these roads be restored. West Fort Garry has been neglected by the City of Winnipeg with false promises - thanks to Mr. Orlikow. Good luck pushing this project through the system.

10. The proposed development states it heavily relies on people using rapid transit however we are all aware realistically this will not be the case and there will be a huge influx of traffic on residential streets which decreases safety.
11. The Greenspace and public park space proposed is not sufficient to serve the amount of proposed residents nor is it located to be welcoming or accessible to the adjacent community.

12. The developer cites Sobeys and Taylor ave stores as amenities, yet it is well over 1 km walk each way. It is also an over 38 min bus ride each way. These are NOT walkable amenities without a legal walkover the train tracks, or, vehicle access from the north side of the development. The developer compares walking times to other new sites like Bridgewater or Prairie Point.... these are NOT toted as walkable communities, they have parking and have many entry and exit points. Comparing the walkability of these car-oriented neighborhoods vs. a neighborhood where the selling feature is walkability doesn't make any sense: "its incorrect and misleading". These plans are self serving and do not take into consideration the long term needs of this community. Also where will they go to school? General Byng is at capacity. it current services less

than 2,000 units. Where will the additional 1,900 units go to school? Winnipeg one schools are NOT accessible given the current plans.

13. The City is already plagued with a lack of infrastructure to support the TOD in the Lord Roberts area. The residential roads (some without proper sidewalks) were not intended to handle the future transportation (busses or cars). Fulton Grove traffic should be entering/exiting the development directly onto Taylor or Pembina Hwy. I read about the Fulton Groves planned parks and recreation facilities, yet a recent survey propsed a picnic shelter to replace the condemned community centre. Again there seems to be serious disconnect between this (needed) development and City infrastructure and most importantly the existing residents who will experience the most impact. It seems that a lot more thought could resolve these very important issues.

14. Sure needs better access to existing amenities. Most are not within reasonable walking distances as there are no points where you can cross the train tracks. It's a transit community yet the closest grocery store is 38 minute bus ride each way. That doesn't make sense. Most residents will stilll want access to a vehicle. Without other cards points traffic through Beaumont and winderemere will not be manageable

15. Skeptical about projects like this... project like this is tend to lead to more crime in the area. Crime has been on the rise in our neighborhood since BRT was built. Personally speaking, my garage and vehicles have been broken into more in the last few years since BRT was built than in the 23 years I've lived in the neighborhood. I am fully against a project of this scope. Not to mention the $4 million generated in taxes won't even cover the cost of policing the area.

16. Removing green spaces to put up so many homes so close to the busy noisy rail tracks. There is a lot of other vacant land spaces that you can build on.

17. Re: question 8, new developments should have their own amenities, they shouldn't rely on existing community amenities when you are considering 1,900+ new units. Parking is not considered at all in these plans. This number of units without parking will not work. Biking is the only option? Did you forget there is snow on the ground 6 to 9 months per year? That is not feasible. Even if half of the residents bike or take public transit to work, many will still want to have a car. These people will have visitors. Traffic flow is not considered at all. There is only one access point to this community via Hurst and then two ways out of Hurst. This makes absolutely not sense. You can use "strategies" to reduce car use but it is Winnipeg. You need to be realistic. You are cramming easily 3,000+ people into a walled-in community with literally one entrance. Strategies and light bike parking will not make people bike in Oct - April when there is snow on the ground in Winnipeg- that is foolish.

18. Most people will have a car. This will put strain on the neighborhood. There are a lot of cars already coming through from waverley. This will increase the traffic on residential streets. There is no access from the development to go across the railroad tracks to sobeys Walmart and other stores on Taylor. The increased number of people with no community club for activities for the

children and adults. Could some help be given from the development to help the community club add on to the building or make a splash pad?

19. Limit number of units to 1000 or less. Winnipeg is -20 half of the year. People who can afford a car stop taking transit whenever possible. Even those who use bus for school or work still use a car for other things. The proposed plan is too many units with limited access to the community. The plans have no amenities. Add parks. Add a community centre. Right now it is a walled-in cost icommunity with no amenities. People will cross the tracks. Traffic will be a problem. People will be in pedestrian accidents. It's a poor plan.

20. Just start building The whiners about Parker bush should ride the rapid transit and see the development in the lord and roberts area It is very nice My only concern is that it will not be affordable for lower income as that is who generally uses rapid transit

21. Is your development going to have direct access to Pembina? If not there's going to be a hell of a lot of additional traffic coming into the Beaumont area.

22. Incorporate accessibility into streets, roads, green spaces and ensure some accessible homes are built. Ensure pathways are wide enough to provide ample space for walking, biking, running, rollerblading, wheelchairs, etc. Hoping this will be a great community for all ages with varying price points.

23. If you are planning to add this many units, there must be a way to funnel current and expected traffic to major roadways. Sending traffic to Pembina through the current residential zone (Beaumont and Windermere) is dangerous for children in the area, and clogs what is meant to be a residential area. 1900+ new units will only add to the issue. Consider a road over the tracks to connect the new development to Taylor Ave (beside the WalMart), and also extending Hurst Way directly to Pembina Highway. If this doesn't happen, expect traffic to be a nightmare getting in and out of this area - which will (and already does) significantly impact current area residents.

24. I'd like the city to stop taking over green space within the city. The city cannot support the increased traffic and demands on healthcare, etc.

25. I think your woke bullshit is disgusting.

26. I think this is a fantastic idea - I have lived in the community for almost my whole life - and i love all the developments that are happening in our community. One thing that I often look at in a development: Is there consideration for churches in the area ? Majority of developments dont typically consider this. Yet, churches are really important for a society. - they create community - they care for the vulnerable - they establish help to new Canadians; establish soup kitchens; care for elderly and care for spiritual needs of a society - especially in the time of hardship. - They do all of this and more - at no cost to the government. Just out of the goodness of their

hearts - to make the world a better place. It doesn't look like there is a plan for that - But would the development ever consider allowing space for it? Thank you for considering,

27. I think Hurst way needs to be 4 lanes not 2.

28. I think all those people / vehicles leaving the Fulton area will congest Hurst/Parker (everyone leaving is going on to Hurst way) and the Beaumont area. It will also potentially increase the crime in the Beaumont area (which already is increasing)

29. I look forward to seeing it come together

30. I am upset with the whole development. To take down and forest and develop on one of the few a wetland / forest areas in the city makes me incredibly sad. There are plenty of areas to develop that do not require the destruction of a natural habitat of many birds and animals. The fact that this area was destroyed and left vacant for so many years is heartbreaking. Once it is developed it will make me angry every time I pass by. The traffic is already increased considerably through the quiet Fort Garry neighborhood adjacent, and crime is up since the creation of Hurst Street. I don't know why this survey talks about green space when Fulton Grove is destroying abundant free space to develop. I believe Joni Mitchell said it best- they paved paradise to put up a parking lot.

31. I am fully against the development of Fulton Grove in a previously protected and extremely sensitive wetland area. You talk about conservation, but you actually have taken it away. Well you're planning to...

32. I am EXTREMELY concerned about the amount of increased traffic this will generate down Hurst, Georgina,Parker, Beaumont, Windermere. This "shortcut route" has already increased traffic considerably after rapid trans construction. Where is all this traffic from Fulton Grove supposed to go? This is a residential area, never meant to handle this amount t of traffic. In reality, people do not use transit that much especially in winter. Mostly that won't change. I know that developers and city really don't care about the traffic concerns; that has been proven already. How about if for once someone looks past the dollar and considers how this whole development will effect the peace and quiet of this neighborhood. Think ahead and direct traffic onto Waverley where it should logically be. This is a huge concern for many residents near this proposed development. Not looking forward to more ignorant development and planning.

33. HUGE concerns about how this massive development will impact nearby schools, and the traffic will be forced to use a road not prepared to accept this amount of additional traffic. Kidding yourselves if you think there will be little traffic impact to the existing community that Fulton Grove will be Plunked in the middle of. Only have to look at new Waverley development it's literally cars upon cars upon cars parked on the street- we are noticing it already on our residential streets where infill housing has been built. the additional car traffic and street parking is impactful to communities. I agree with high density, but this is A LOT for West Fort Garry to absorb. Thinking of selling my lot to a greedy developer.

34. How do you plan to keep traffic flowing on Hurst Way? There is already an overabundance of traffic in our once quiet neighbourhood, which in turn comes the reckless drivers who don't care they are driving through a quiet neighbourhood. All your roads lead to Hurst Way. Are you going to be paying for the cost of our roads due to the increase of heavier traffic? You're trying to cram way too many houses in a small space and it's just not going to work out. We have too many infill houses going in this area as it is. If you would reduce the number of housing by half, increase the green space, and have another traffic exit elsewhere than Hurst Way I might be a bit more open to this idea. Also, you do realize how ironic it is to call this Fulton Grove when you've already gotten rid of all the trees?

35. How are you planning on having 1900 units enter and exit to hurst way. Why haven't you planned to have an exit directly to Pembina or an exit that crosses the tracks to Taylor. Seems very short sighted to have and additional 2000 people come through this neighbourhood and spill out on to one street.

36. How an earth is Hurst going to handle all this extra traffic? You can't expect everyone to take the bus. The roads around here are not built to handle this many units. Not in favour in this huge development at all. Everyone I've spoken to in this neighborhood is concerned about it's development and feels it is much too large to for the space. Overall you do not have community support.

37. Hoping for a larger park

38. Georgina street should be terminated on both sides of transit way to reduce the extreme vehicle traffic thru established the existing neighbourhood or limited to for bus use only to promote use of mass transit system for the high density development targets.

39. Even though it will be a "transit-focussed development", it will still bring extra traffic to the Beaumont neighborhood. Hurst Way and Windermere are bad enough as it is.

40. Don't need more apartments and condos and such going up. We need more access to transit, paths, green spaces. Perhaps another park or dog park?

41. Don't jack up the rent to some absurd amount. The loss of the Parker wetlands will have a massive impact on the surrounding areas even with the retention pond. Because of this there is risk of flooding in the area. The proximity to the tracks is something to keep in mind as well, in this development, it could also be a positive for the community if a functional crossing into the Taylor commercial area would improve the walk ability and reduce more traffic going into hurst way

42. development in that area is stupid. rapid transit is stupid. do not need more traffic and idiots ruining the streets due to construction.

43. Concerned with access to FG. There is already increased traffic in area due to buses that never use to come down Beaumont and other areas using our neighbor as cut through to Pembina Hwy with Hurst Way /Georgina. There needs to be an access to Taylor directly from FG. Also wondering where the sewer lines will tie in. Current increase of infill in our small area is already putting strain on our old system. I hope it connects to the west of development.

44. As long as this development has low-income options-I am all for it!! By low-income options I mean under $1000-month. People cannot live appropriately on their minimum wage salaries, and that is horrible. Please help with this!!

45. Agree with this type of development provided it has the proper infrastructure to support it. Hurst Ave and Georgina Way are only 2 lanes and currently get a lot of use from people driving to dog park and commuters cutting through Beaumont to get to Pembina (in addition to Beaumont residents). At minimum, 1918 units will add 1000 cars. This will cause a traffic nightmare. Making Hurst 4 lanes to Georgina could help get cars to and from Fulton Grove but won't solve the problem of people going through Beaumont to Pembina. Putting a traffic light at Beaumont and McGilvray would help keep cars off Windermere but have many more cars go past the General Bing school. The additional 1000 cars have more potential for pedestrian incidents. INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADES NEED TO BE IN PLACE BEFORE DEVELOPMENT IS COMPLETED, but no information is available on if this is planned or it's cost. Also the left turn lane from Waverley to Hurst is difficult to get through right now(traffic backs up on Waverley)

PARKER LANDS ENGAGEMENT PROCESS AND HISTORY

Over the past 11 years there has been substantial engagement and public consultation on the Parker Lands Development. The following breaks down the process in chronological order.

In no way is this meant to be an exhaustive list but rather a representation of the exhaustive public participation process this file has been through. Please review the Appendices for more information and the multiple engagement summary reports.

1. **2012**
    a. Sept. 2020 - Public Open House by Dillon Consulting and City of Winnipeg on Stage 2 of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor (SWRTC), Sept. 19 - 22.
    376 people attended and 331 surveys were completed.
    b. Stakeholder engagement
        i. Manitoba Hydro - emails, meetings and conference calls.
    c. City engagement
        i. City local area councillor – directly engaged, July 24.
        ii. City of Winnipeg Transit and their consultant (Dillon Consulting) for the SWRTC project – directly engaged June 21, July 11, November 7.

2. **2013**
    a. Public Open House and info session on Nov. 18 and 19 by Dillon and Landmark; update and input on station sites, bus routing, active transportation, property and mitigation, re: SWRTC.
    300+ in attendance over both days.
    b. Stakeholder engagement
        i. Manitoba Hydro - emails, meetings and conference calls.
        ii. Brenda Leipsic Dog Park users – emails and phone conversations.
    c. City engagement
        i. City of Winnipeg Transit and their consultant (Dillon Consulting) for the SWRTC project – directly engaged Feb. 16 and Oct. 18.

3. **2014**
    a. Feb. 24-25, 2014 - Public Open Houses to present further detail on SWRTC.
    b. June 3, 2014 - Public Hearing for 2nd leg of SWRTC.
    c. Dec. 2, 2014 - Public Open House by Manitoba Hydro with MMM Group Ltd.
    d. Stakeholder engagement
        i. Manitoba Hydro - consulted and dialogue. Community engagement process simultaneously, re: Harrow Station – Bishop Grandin Transmission Project which was to traverse the Parker Lands site.

ii. Brenda Leipsic Dog Park users – consulted and dialogue.
iii. Winnipeg Humane Society – consulted and dialogue.
iv. CN Rail - consulted and dialogue.

e. City engagement
    i. Technical Advisory Committee consists of representatives of the City's Public Works, Winnipeg Transit, Water and Waste, Community Services, City Naturalist, Parks, Emergency Services, and Planning, Property and Development Departments as well as the utility providers. The TAC reviewed background reports, including engineering and environmental studies, and provided comments that informed the preparation of the Plan.
    i. City of Winnipeg Parks and City Naturalist – directly engaged May 26, June 27, Oct. 17, Nov.13.
    i. City local area councillor – directly engaged Feb 7.
    ii. City of Winnipeg Transit and their consultant (Dillon Consulting) for the SWRTC project – directly engaged Jan. 15.

4. **2015**
    a. Open House on SWRTC to review proposed design and route.
    b. Update website with information to date.
    c. Mailouts to 1100 residents on Jan. 22-24 directing to website for updates.
    d. Stakeholder engagement
        i. Winnipeg Humane Society – discussions.
    e. City Engagement –
        i. Technical Advisory Committee – ongoing consultation.
        ii. City of Winnipeg Parks and City Naturalist – directly engaged January 14, February 13, March 2, March 19, April 20, December 1, December 10.
        iii. City local area councillor – directly engaged Oct. 29 and Dec. 11.
        iv. City of Winnipeg Transit and their design team for the SWRTC project – directly engaged in Nov. 2015

5. **2016**
    a. Feb. 2016 - Public Open House #1 - 100 people in attendance with media and 69 questionnaires filled out. Invitations were sent via Canada Post to all homeowners in the area plus ads in the Free Press and three (3) other major newspapers in the community.
    b. July 19, 2016 - Public Information Session by City of Winnipeg to introduce Plenary Group and PCL team for the design, construction and ongoing maintenance of SWRTC, dog park and Pembina Underpass Project.
    c. Hired EcoLogic to look at existing environmental aspects and the future development of the site. Background report done May 2016, Biophysical

Technical Report July 2016, Review of lands in relation to Ecologically Significant Natural Lands.

d. Aug. 2016 - Public Open House #2 with City Planning staff on site on the draft Secondary Plan. 70+ people in attendance with 29 questionnaires filled out. Invitations were sent via Canada Post to all homeowners in the area plus ads in the Free Press and three (3) other major newspapers in the community.
e. Open House by Dillon Consulting and City of Winnipeg on Waverley Underpass Project.
f. Engage Parker Wetland Conservation Committee with work done by EcoLogic
g. Stakeholders –
    i. Technical Advisory Committee – ongoing consultation
    ii. City of Winnipeg Parks and City Naturalist – directly engaged September 9, November 15, December 5.
    iii. City Planners December 18, 2017.
    iv. Local Area Councillor – directly engagement April 5, September 13, October 17.
    v. City of Winnipeg Transit and PP&D, and Parks – directly engaged January 28.
    vi. City of Winnipeg Transit and PP&D, and Parks, Dillon, Hydro, W&W, PW – met directly in March 30 and Sept. 2016

6. 2017
    a. Feb. 28, 2017 -Two (2) public information sessions by City of Winnipeg to share updates on SWRTC and Parker Storm Retention Basin Project.
    b. April 2017 - EcoLogic Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site Environmental Overview.
    c. July 6, 2017 - Meeting with Parker Wetlands Committee group and site owner with follow up emails.
    d. Stakeholders
        i. CN Rail - consulted to confirm calculations, re: berm setbacks and standards. Sent “Submission Guidelines for Crash Walls”, produced by AECOM.
        ii. Plenary Roads Group – meeting Jan. 25, and emailed in March.
    e. City of Winnipeg
        i. Technical Advisory Committee – ongoing consultation.
        ii. City of Winnipeg Parks and City Naturalist – directly engaged January 13.
        iii. Local Area Councillor – directly engagement June 12 and July 6.

7. 2018
    a. Ongoing responses on website (organic engagement with responding to each comment, one by one).
    b. Sept. 2018 - Engagement summary report updated

8. 2019
    a. Keep updating website.
9. 2020
    a. Oct. 2020 – Nov. 2020 - Three (3) virtual engagement sessions on Oct. 28, 29, and Nov. 1. Advertised in Winnipeg Free Press on October 20 and 28, with 417,000 readers online and in-print editions. Also advertised in local paper Oct. 21 and 28 with 38,000 readers. Website was updated with over 2,280 views (396 unique visitors) between Oct. 7 and Nov. 5. A total of 36 people attended Zoom sessions.
10. 2021
    a. Keep updating website.
11. 2022
    a. Keep updating website.
12. 2023
    a. Keep updating website.
    b. Launch new online survey with full page ad in the Free Press on July 15 and on CBC July 13, both evening and late show. 115 submissions of the survey.

Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site

ENGAGEMENT Report



Updated Sept. 2018

GEM EQUITIES INC.

Table of Contents

1.0 Stakeholders Meetings & Public Engagement Process 1

2.0 Public Engagement Process 2

2.1 Public Open House #1 2

2.2 Public Open House #2 4

2.3 Public Update – January 2018 9

3.0 Stakeholder Consultation 12

3.1 Manitoba Hydro 12

3.2 Brenda Leipsic Dog Parkers 12

3.3 Winnipeg Humane Society 12

3.4 Environmental Overview 12

3.5 Parker Wetlands Conservation 13

3.6 CN Rail 14

3.7 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) 14

3.8 City of Winnipeg Parks & City Naturalist 14

3.9 Local Area Councillor 16

3.10 Winnipeg Transit and their Consultants for the SWRTC (Stage 2) Project 17

3.11 Plenary Roads Group 18

4.0 Other Public and Private Stakeholder Forums 19

4.1 Southwest Transitway (Stage 2) by City of Winnipeg (Transit) and their Consultants: 19

4.2 Manitoba Hydro 20

4.3 Waverley Underpass Project 20

APPENDIX A.1 Open House #1 - Questionnaire & Feedback Summary 21

APPENDIX A.2 Open House #1 - Presentation Boards 33

APPENDIX B Open House #2 - Questionnaire & Feedback Summary 44

APPENDIX C Public Update January 2018 – Responses to Questions from Website 48

PARKER LANDS
MAJOR REDEVELOPMENT SITE

1.0 Stakeholders Meetings & Public Engagement Process

The stakeholders meetings and public engagement process for the Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site represents a collaborative and consultative planning process from a collective group of professionals, stakeholders, owner's representatives, City Administration, elected officials, and community members who took part in various meetings, public open houses, design charrettes and interviews throughout the planning process.

Additionally, the information found in this report as well as in the Secondary Plan has been prepared in consultation with various City of Winnipeg departments, the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres, Manitoba Hydro, CN Rail, the Division Scolaire Franco-Manitobaine, Winnipeg School Division along with other special interest groups.

Work began on the development of the Secondary Plan in early 2014 and a series of drafts were prepared by GEM Equities on behalf of 6165347 Manitoba Inc. The drafts were developed with input from a number of meetings with the City of Winnipeg's Planning department, Parks department, Public Works as well as the local area Councillor.

Informal input was also received from representatives of the Winnipeg Humane Society, the Brenda Leipsic Off-Leash Dog Park users, and people from the surrounding neighbourhood. GEM Equities and their engineering consultants, InfraCor and Morrison Hershfield, contributed ongoing schematic urban design, underground services and traffic impact analysis reports. Development of the draft Secondary Plan continued through into 2017.

The following is a representation of the engagement process led by 6165347 Manitoba Inc. as part of the developer-led Secondary Plan.

2.0 Public Engagement Process

The public consultation for the engagement process consisted of a series of open houses as well as the launch of a project website to introduce ideas and gain valuable insight, feedback and input from the community.

As of early September 2017, all updated information has been posted on the website www.fultongrove.ca to share research, reports and the latest schematics from the ongoing design process. People's inquiries from the Contact page (info@fultongrove.ca) have been responded to as represented by the sampling of questions contained in **Appendix C**.

2.1 Public Open House #1

A Public Open House was held on February 10, 2016 at the Holiday Inn South to present the initial design concepts and principles of the future Parker redeveloped site to the Beaumont neighbourhood and to get feedback from the local area residents. It was hosted by GEM Equities Inc. on behalf of 6165347 Manitoba Inc., the principal landowner of the private developable land.

Invitations were dropped off to every single resident in the Beaumont community (1277 home addresses) and advertisements were placed in both of the city's major newspapers.

A questionnaire was distributed to all who attended to give them an opportunity to express opinions and offer feedback of how a development of this type could most benefit the community (see **Appendix A.1** for a sample of the questionnaire as well as the summary of recorded responses).

Throughout the evening, the owner's representatives and consultants were engaged by a wide variety of people from surrounding neighbourhoods who expressed their opinions, comments and concerns and asked questions. Presentation boards (as found in **Appendix A.2**) were used to illustrate, explain and elaborate on the initial principles and concepts that would help to guide future development.



Figure 1: *Public discussion with developer's representatives.*



Figure 2: *Public viewing of presentation boards*

Summary

During the evening most people from the Beaumont area and the surrounding community expressed concerns with the current shortcutting traffic through the neighbourhood and whether there was anything that could be done about it. There was some opposition concerning the dog park, wetlands and existing forest by a special interest group (approximately 15 people). In addition, many people expressed their frustration for the lack of information on future city infrastructure projects to occur in the Parker Lands region and how these projects would affect the neighbourhood (like the final choice of 2nd leg of Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor, for instance). It should be noted that no city representatives were present at this event to answer some of these specific concerns. People were also asking about *what was the City's involvement going forward*?

The representatives of the developer answered general questions about the future city infrastructure projects (though the open house was meant to be specifically about the future residential development) to dispel some of the misconceptions about the various projects in the area, offered concepts and principles about the proposed development and provided a platform to keep people informed as the project would continue to evolve and unfold.

Approximately 80 to 100 people were in attendance throughout the evening with another 10 to 15 present from various media outlets.

A total of 69 people filled in questionnaires to voice their opinions.



Figure 3: *Unveiling of initial concepts for a new Transit Oriented Development at the Parker Lands*

2.2 Public Open House #2

A second Open House was hosted on Monday, August 22, 2016 between 6pm and 8pm by GEM Equities Inc. on behalf of 6165347 Manitoba Inc. along with representatives of the City's Planning, Property and Development Department. The purpose of the second Open House was to get feedback on the current state of the draft Secondary Plan (a planning document to guide future development within the Parker Lands neighbourhood) along with the proposed plans for the future residential development.

Also present to answer questions about the proposed project were a traffic consultant from Morrison Hershfield and two environmental scientists/biologists from EcoLogic who were there specifically to provide information to those concerned about the wetlands and aspen forest.

Invitations were again dropped off to every single resident in the Beaumont community and advertisements were placed in both of the city's major newspapers.

Overall the open house was well attended and people expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to ask questions of the various representatives and consultants in the room. A total of 53 people recorded their names on the sign-in sheet with about 15 to 20 others who did not register their names for a total attendance of around 70+ people through the evening.

(As an observation after the event, it was noted that of the 53 people who signed the attendance sheet, only 1 person was in common with those who attended at the first open house from February 10, 2016 so it seemed there was almost an entirely new group of residents who showed up to this engagement).

A series of 19 information boards were set up around the perimeter of the room and various consultants/representatives were present nearby to provide feedback and answer questions and concerns of the public.

In addition, a new questionnaire was distributed with open ended questions to encourage feedback, comments, interactions and ideas that the public might want to share after taking in the information and talking to the consultants. A copy of the questionnaire and summary results for Open House #2 can be found in **Appendix B.1**.

A total of 29 people responded to the questionnaire.

PRESENTATION BOARD OVERVIEW

In general, the presentation boards from the second Open House were broken up into 4 Sections as follows:

1. Secondary Planning & Planning Process Boards
2. Conceptual Design of the Proposed Development
3. Environmental Survey Information
4. Traffic Impact Analysis Information

Section 1 – Secondary Planning & Planning Process Boards

Two Senior City Planners were nearby to answer questions regarding the planning process.

The Presentation Boards consisted of:

1.1 Policy Frameworks – Design & Planning Principles

1.2 What is a Major Redevelopment Site?

1.3 Secondary Plan – Development & Adoption

1.4 Draft Policy Map – Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site

Comments from the City Planners present regarding concerns form the public:

- They received a few questions about the Southwest Bus Rapid Transit (Stage 2) project including questions about the closure of Parker and the new road connection from Parker to Hurst Way (likely to be at the historically named Georgina St.);

- They had one person comment negatively about the future retention basin's steepness.

Section 2 - Conceptual Designs of the Proposed Development

Designers/Planners/Architects and representatives from the developer were present to answer questions about the conceptual design and layout of the site.

Presentation Boards were as follows:

2.1 Conceptual Master Plan – Site Development

2.2 Residential Areas – Typologies and Densities

2.3 Residential Areas - Streetscape

2.4 Residential Areas – Street Character (medium density)

2.5 Residential Areas – Sun Shadow Studies

2.6 Public Spaces – in Hydro / Transit Corridor

2.7 Transportation Networks – Pedestrian / Cycling Active Transportation

2.8 Parkspace

2.9 Sustainable Building Strategies

2.10 Parking Integration – Strategies

Some comments that were made to the Design consultants present:

- There was a lot of interest in the project, in particular the potential for a district geothermal heating & cooling system to serve the site;
- There were some strong questions about the impact of the development and BRT but expressed in a civil way;
- A few people pointed out that Parker Avenue was the dividing line between school divisions and therefore were wondering if children from the new development will be attending Harrow or Beaumont school (are they part of Winnipeg School Division? which is to the north of Parker or Pembina Trails which is to the south?);
- Several residents talked about getting ticketed by CN (which resulted in a $204 fine) for crossing the rail tracks to get to the commercial district to the north and therefore were interested if there was an opportunity to build a pedestrian bridge across the tracks for access;
- Some people were asking about the types and values of housing being proposed and whether they were going to be for low-income bracket (in general there seemed to be a strong opinion against low income housing and that it was not going to be welcomed in the community);
- Some people were concerned about the choice of Georgina St. rather than Beaumont Street for the access to the drop-off and continuation through the neighbourhood (it would be an inconvenience for them to zig-zag in an indirect way to get home each day);
- Many people present wanted the city to assure them that there would be a naturalized edge along the storm water retention pond and NO FENCE.

Section 3 – Environmental Survey Information

Two representatives from EcoLogic, the authors of the various Environmental reports for the Parker Lands future development site, were present to answer questions.

The Presentation Boards contained summary information from the Environmental Surveys conducted on the site. Presentation Board titles were:

3.1 Environmental Information – Legislation Requirements

3.2 Environmental Information – Updated Site Surveys 2016

3.3 Environmental Information – Human Impact

A brief summary of the evening, specifically with respect to the environment:

- Outside of two attendees from the Parker Wetlands group, there were no concerns regarding the environment that were brought to the consultant's attention;
- A collection of local residents did express concerns regarding the lack of direct management on the property indicated that the standing water and abundance of out of control vegetation were breeding mosquitos and expressed their wishes for the property vegetation to be mowed and the standing water to be managed;
- Outside of this concern, the remaining comments were positive regarding their pleasure seeing the due diligence of the developer regarding the environment by having the biological surveys completed;
- Several residents indicated they were satisfied that the concerns expressed at the first open house about gaining a better understanding of the environment had been heard and surveys had been conducted;
- Several expressed their relief to know that there were no species at risk;
- Throughout the evening, local residents indicated their appreciation and understanding that the quality of the environment had changed over the years and acknowledged the present degradation of the site;
- Some residents asked questions regarding the new location for dog walking, wanting to be assured there was a place for dog walking in the area;
- A local resident, botanist, and birder commented that he felt grass species were missed. He also indicated that during his Christmas bird count in the area that additional bird species were identified during December that were not identified during the EcoLogic inventory of birds during their spring/summer surveys;
- It probably helped the majority in attendance that information was shared from the updated ecological surveys which were conducted in response to questions posed at the first open

house. The public's response to the previous questionnaire contained comments that suggested the public would like more information surrounding the ecological state of the lands to be developed which led to the developer hiring the environmental consultant to do an ecological assessment of the site and provide a report on its findings. The report was the result of extensive background work by Ecologic and a thorough site assessment.

Section 4 – Traffic Impact Analysis Information

A Traffic Engineering consultant from the office of Morrison Hershfield came to the open house presentation to answer questions as necessary on the traffic implications of the new development.

Presentation Board titles were:

4.1 Traffic Impact Analysis – Pre development

4.2 Traffic Impact Analysis – Post development

Comments from the Traffic Consultant regarding public feedback:

- As expected there was a moderate sense of concern/skepticism regarding increasing traffic and parking issues in the neighborhood (i.e. "we will wait and see what happens");
- Residents seemed unfamiliar with the potential benefits of the larger infrastructure projects in the area including the Waverley Underpass, intersection capacity improvements, SWBRT, and the positive impact that those should bring to reduce congestion and minimize shortcutting through the neighborhood. It seems that positive outcomes of these larger projects in the area could have been communicated better to the public;
- There were positive views on improving bicycle and pedestrian connections and infrastructure in and around the area;
- Some residents understand that higher intensity around the BRT station is unavoidable but would like the city to mitigate potential impacts of traffic increase and on-street parking (i.e. traffic calming on local roads);
- Further to the above, on-street parking around the station seems to be a concern. Residents believe outer transit users will park-and-ride for free around the station;
- Although unrelated to the development, Bus Rapid Transitway noise attenuation is a concern for residents immediately adjacent to the Transitway (specifically on Parker Ave).

2.3 Public Update – January 2018 and Ongoing…..

Presentation to City Planners

A presentation was given by Gem Equities and their consultants to the City Planners on Monday, Dec. 18, 2017 to introduce the latest team members and provide an update on the current site layout to discuss the changes to the previous plan that was submitted for the DASZ pre-application in March of 2017.

Jennifer Keesmaat, a well-respected Canadian urban planner and the former Chief Planner for the city of Toronto, was introduced as the latest member of Gem's consultant team.

A PowerPoint presentation was given to the assembled group to describe the latest changes and updates to the Fulton Grove site plan. Ms. Keesmaat indicated that there were several "Big Moves" that were undertaken to make improvements to the previous plan to capitalize on the desired densities and their effects towards establishing Winnipeg's first Transit-Oriented Development project.

The Big Moves consisted of:

1. Adding a commercial main street close to the transit station, as a key organizing principle to the site;
2. Moving the taller multi-family buildings to the north of the site, nearer the rail tracks so that smaller 4 to 6 storey buildings would be closer to the station at the south end of the site. This would allow less of a 'wall effect' of tall buildings as a first impression of the community at the entry of the site and would also cast less shadows on the public spaces now located at the centre of north;
3. Questioning the rationale of preserving the remaining aspen forest and instead introducing a high quality public realm composed of connected green spaces, linear parks and community gathering spaces – where people can walk within their community to visit their neighbours, run small errands, play in safe environments, and have good access transit.

(See letter by Jennifer Keesmaat on Parker Lands: Ensuring Successful Prairie TOD, included in **Section 5.1.1** of the Fulton Grove Concept Plan binder).

Public Update on Website

After the updated development plan information was presented to the city planners, a Public Update brochure was posted on the Fulton Grove website (www.fultongrove.ca) on Jan. 19, 2018 to communicate the latest changes and explanatory material to the site plan to the public and ask for comments and feedback by way of a contact button below the updated site plan.

With each visit to the website, a 'pop up' brochure would immediately be noticeable to all by appearing in the middle of the screen and could only be removed by either viewing further information within the brochure or clicking the 'close' function in the lower right hand corner.

Several methods were used to make people in the Beaumont neighbourhood and beyond aware of the updated information as presented on the website:

- Mail-out cards were dropped off at Canada Post and distributed to around 1100 homes in the Beaumont region between Monday, Jan. 22nd and Wednesday, Jan. 24th inviting people to view the website for update information on the Fulton Grove development.
- Winnipeg Free Press ads were run on Wed. January 24th and Sat. March 10th (similar image as the mailout brochure). Gem would continue to run ads every few month to keep driving traffic to the website.
- Ads promoting the website were also taken out in three community newspapers (the Lance, the Sou'Wester and the Metro) on Wednesday, Jan. 24th.
- Ongoing Media coverage of the proposed project has also contributed at times to a spike in viewership on the website.



Figure 4: *Image of the brochure that was dropped off to residents of the Beaumont neighbourhood*

Results from the Website Public Update Brochure

Since the update information went public on the website on Jan. 19, 2018 information was tracked to observe how many people viewed the information:

- Between Jan. 19 and Sept. 8, 2018 (approximately eight months) the total number of independent visits to the site (Home Page) was **2534**.
- Of the **2534** visitors, **1302** people viewed the Public Update information (i.e. they did not immediately close the window to exit out).
- The largest spike of traffic to the website for a single day occurred on Jan. 24th (the day the local newspapers ran ads, mailouts were delivered to homes in the Beaumont area, and a day after a TOD Conference was held at the University of Manitoba and was publicized on radio stations – reporting incorrectly that the conference was about the Fulton Grove project).
- The number of views for the update page on Jan. 24th was **146**.
- **41** of the people on Jan. 24th went on to enlarge the site plan map to get a closer view.
- **4** people clicked on the 'contact' button to potentially leave a remark.
- Many people continued to view previously posted information on the website beyond the update brochure.

Between the same dates of Jan. 19 to Sept. 8, 2018 a total of **17** people used the contact information option to ask for clarifications about the development project.

Questions and concerns ranged from requested updates on residential units within the new neighbourhood for purchase or rent (**10**), the aspen forest/wetlands (**3**) (Gem's response to this comment was later reposted by the recipient on the Parker Wetlands Conservation website so it has reached a larger viewing audience), questions about sustainability practices (**1**), the dog park (**1**), schools (**1**) and parking (**1**).

See **Appendix C** for some of the responses to the questions generated from the public update on the website as well as the number of website views tracked during the period.

Gem Equities will continue to run ads in local newspapers every month to drive traffic to the website to continue to update the public on changes to the development plan.

3.0 Stakeholder Consultation

In addition to the open houses and website the developer also made contact with several stakeholders and representatives within the Parker Lands:

3.1 Manitoba Hydro

Manitoba Hydro was consulted regarding the Powerlines in the Hydro Corridors that are in the Planned Area. (Note: Manitoba Hydro's Land and Property Secondary Use Application process should be undertaken in the future to determine the potential of landscaping and establishing an active transportation path in the corridor).

Several meetings, email correspondences and conference calls were conducting by 6165347 Manitoba Inc. and Manitoba Hydro between June 2012 and Dec 2014 to discuss existing circumstances and future works proposed by both sides within the Parker Lands. Various iterations of preliminary designs of the development site were presented to representatives of Manitoba Hydro. Their stance has always been that "Manitoba Hydro is strictly neutral about all development."

3.2 Brenda Leipsic Dog Parkers

Brenda Leipsic Off-Leash Dog Park (BLDP) users were consulted regarding their current and future facilities and activities in and around the Planned Area.

Several emails and phone conversations were had between representatives of the Brenda Leipsic Dog Park and 6165347 Manitoba Inc. to discuss among other things, the possible use of the private developable land by BLDP as a temporary dog park while their new park was being relocated and redeveloped to make way for the Second Leg of the Bus Rapid Transit.

3.3 Winnipeg Humane Society

Winnipeg Humane Society was consulted in the spring of 2014 and summer of 2015 regarding the current and future activities in and around the Planned Area. Discussions were also had regarding the day-to-day outdoor activities of the animals on the property adjacent to the developable land and how any future development might need to consider the potential noise disturbances (i.e. sound fences, berms or distance separation, for instance).

3.4 Environmental Overview

In response to people's concerns expressed in Open House #1 (described above) the developer retained an environmental consultant to look at all matters related to the existing forest, wetlands and green space within the private Parker Lands, as the remainder of the Major Redevelopment Site had been previously studied on behalf of Winnipeg Transit for the second leg of the Southwest Bus Rapid Transit project.

In early 2016, 6165347 Manitoba Inc. engaged an independent environmental firm, EcoLogic, to look at the existing environmental aspects of the site and the consideration of future development.

Over a period of more than a year EcoLogic produced several reports:

- An Environmental Background Report for the site in May 2016;
- A Biophysical Technical Report in July 2016 - which presented scientific methods and results of the environmental surveys conducted within the Project Study Area;
- A review of the Parker Lands in Relation to the Ecologically Significant Natural Lands Program Criteria I August 2016;
- A memo in November, 2016 regarding a Summary of Environmental Work and Required Regulatory Compliance;
- A Response to Parker Wetland Conservation Committee Comments on the Biophysical Technical Report, November 2016;
- And a Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site Environmental Overview in April, 2017 - which can be found in the **Appendix** of the final Secondary Plan.

EcoLogic provided comments and supporting documentation for Open House #1 in February 2016 and attended Open House #2 in August, 2016 to related some of their findings from their reports and to answer questions and concerns from the public.

3.5 Parker Wetlands Conservation

There were several emails and phone conversations between representatives of the Parker Wetlands Conservation group (PWC) and Gem Equities to discuss the wetlands and the aspen forest.

Two Environmental Reports of the site conducted by EcoLogic in the spring/summer of 2016 were provided to the PWC by Gem to review and provide comments before they were to be shared with the public. Requests were made by Gem to meet with the PWC to discuss the reports before the information was presented at the second open house in August, 2016 but no response was given. After Open House #2 another offer by Gem was made to PWC to meet with the Environmental consultants to discuss the results and information presented at the open house and the concerns that PWC had with the reports. No meeting was accepted by PWC as they were working on a written response.

- Nov. 7, 2016 – PWC send a response to Gem titled “Review of Oak Grove Development Project: Biophysical Technical Report” and cc’d the local area Councilor and Mayor.

- Mid Nov. 2016 – PWC posts the two Environmental Reports without permission from the owner or author of the reports.

- Nov. 30, 2016 – Gem provides written response to each of the concerns of the PWC in a report called “EcoLogic Environmental Inc. Response to Parker Wetland Conservation Committee Comments on the July 2016 Biophysical Technical Report.” A meeting request is again put forward by Gem with no response.

- July 6, 2017 – Meeting between chairman of PWC group and owner of 6165347 Manitoba Inc/Gem Equities.

- July 16 to 23 – several email correspondences between chairman of PWC group and owner of 6165347 Manitoba Inc/Gem Equities regarding discussions from the previous meeting.

3.6 CN Rail

CN Rail was consulted regarding their main line located north adjacent to the Planned Area. Processes to determine the setbacks of new residential land-uses were discussed to establish policies in the Plan.

- Mar. 20, 2014 - Conference call with the Manager of Real Estate & Business Development at CNR. 6165347 Manitoba Inc. was provided with guidelines to address future development when building next to active rail lines. 6165347 Manitoba Inc. received a draft of the “Guidelines for New Development in Proximity to Railway Operations” dated May 2013 and produced for FCM.

- Apr. 25, 2014 - Conference call to discuss design guidelines when building next to main rail lines: specifically about berms, reinforcements and fencing. 6165347 Manitoba Inc. sent preliminary site plan to CN for comments shortly after the meeting.

- Mar. 2, 2017 – Conference call with manager at CNR and Gem to confirm calculations for acceptance of Berm setbacks and standards as well as clarification on crash walls. Followed up by sending ‘Submissions Guidelines for Crash Walls” produced by AECOM.

3.7 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

The Technical Advisory Committee consists of representatives of the City’s Public Works, Winnipeg Transit, Water and Waste, Community Services, City Naturalist, Parks, Emergency Services, and Planning, Property and Development Departments as well as the utility providers. The TAC reviewed background reports, including engineering and environmental studies, and provided comments that informed the preparation of the Plan. The comments also informed the preparation of public open house presentation materials. Feedback from the TAC was solicited several times in on-going discussions dating back to 2014.

3.8 City of Winnipeg Parks & City Naturalist

In addition to being on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for review of the Plan, the City of Winnipeg Parks and City Naturalist were directly engaged for their feedback on matters relating to park dedication and the proposed location options for open green spaces.

For over a two year period extensive meetings were held between the developer and the City of Winnipeg Parks and City Naturalist to explore various options for park locations and areas to be preserved within the existing forest.

- May 26, 2014 - Meeting with City Planning, Parks and representatives of 6165347 Manitoba Inc. to discuss park dedication and proposed location options. The representatives of the developer sent the latest site plans to the City for feedback. City Planning stated that part of the Aspen Forest was to be retained as a part of the policy document (Secondary Plan) that was being worked on;

- June 27, 2014 - Meeting between City Planning, Parks and representatives of 6165347 Manitoba Inc. The representatives of the developer sent the latest site plan to City Planning for distribution illustrating concept of pocket parks in multiple locations throughout the development. Parks opinion was that they were less supportive about pocket parks and that if they were to be accepted, they would have to be a minimum of 1 acre in area;

- Oct. 17, 2014 - Meeting with City Planning, Parks and representatives of 6165347 Manitoba Inc. Parks informed the representatives that the City wanted 100% of land dedication rather than any proposed 'cash in lieu'. Looked at preliminary grading studies to see how new development and potential fill on site will affect existing Aspen forest;

- Nov. 13, 2014 - Meeting with City Planning, Parks and representatives of 6165347 Manitoba Inc. Further discussions on park requirements and park strategies;

- Jan. 14, 2015 - Meeting with Parks, City Naturalist and representatives of 6165347 Manitoba Inc. re: Park Dedication. It was identified that future grading of the developed site would affect the park area that was desired to be saved. It is the Naturalists and Parks' position that there should only be one location for a park within the entire development to maximize preserving as much of the existing forest as possible. 6165347 Manitoba Inc. expressed their concern as this would leave no dedicated park space for the multi-family area, where the majority of the population is likely to be within the new development;

- Feb. 13, 2015 - Meeting with City Planning, Parks and representatives of 6165347 Manitoba Inc. Further discussions of the Secondary Plan and potential park locations;

- Mar. 2 and 19th, 2015 - Over several meetings a working group including representatives of 6165347 Manitoba Inc. and the City of Winnipeg's Planning, Transit, Parks and Naturalist Departments developed ideas for the public reserve portion of a potential future development in the Parker Lands. Working group sessions were held over two half days working towards a solution for acceptable park dedication amount as well as best location for the proposed park area;

- Apr. 20, 2015 – Parks review of site layout with proposed park location;

- Dec. 1, 2015 - 6165347 Manitoba Inc. sent 4 park options to the City Planner, Parks and Naturalist for review and comment;

- Dec. 10, 2015 - Meeting with Parks, City Naturalist and representatives of 6165347 Manitoba Inc. regarding the four potential options for preservation of the forest area. 6165347 Manitoba Inc. is to look at a compromise of two of the schemes to create another option;

- Sept. 9, 2016 - Meeting with City Naturalist and representatives of 6165347 Manitoba Inc. to review Environmental Reports produced by EcoLogic for the site;

- Nov. 15, 2016 - Meeting with City Naturalist, Parks and representatives of Gem Equities to review preliminary grading analysis and its effect on proposed park locations.

- Dec. 5, 2016 - Site Walk Through with City Naturalist, Park Planner, City Planner, Environmental Consultants and representatives of 6165347 Manitoba Inc. to compare the City's preferred location vs 6165347 Manitoba Inc.'s preferred location and the habitat similarities and differences between each.

- Jan. 13, 2017 – 5 new options were presented by 6165347 Manitoba Inc. to the City Planner with characteristics and pros and cons about the location of the park options and how it would potentially influence future development.

3.9 Local Area Councillor

- July 24, 2012 – Meeting between Councillor and Gem Equities regarding initial project startup for proposed residential development on the privately owned land in Parker MRS; discussions about the key issues and concerns from both sides.

- Feb. 7, 2014 – Gem has a meeting with the Councillor to discuss concept of green space. Councillor states City would like to preserve as much forest as possible.

- Oct. 29, 2015 – Gem and Councillor meet to clear up what the process should be ("developer led secondary plan") – will need further input from City Planners.

- Dec. 11, 2015 – Gem, Councillor and City Planning Head meet for an update on progress of the secondary plan, steps moving forward and discuss initial preparation for public engagement process (open houses).

- Apr. 5, 2016 – Meeting between Gem and Councillor to give debriefing from Open House #1; discuss secondary plan and next steps as well as proposed locations for parks(s).

- Sept.13, 2016 – Meeting between Councillor and Gem; Gem gives further debriefing of Open House #2; discussions on park locations: now rather than in one preserved area the councilor suggests to see preliminary sketch for a linear park through the site.

- Oct. 17, 2016 – Gem and Councillor meet for an update on the design development – Councillor no longer wants linear park but rather to save the 'best' forest.

- June 12, 2017 – Meeting with Councillor, City Planners, owner of Gem Equities and owners consultants regarding Hurst Way, Secondary Plan, forest preserve area and how grading will affect potential park locations.

- July 6, 2017 – conference call between Councillor and owner of Gem Equities regarding PWC meeting regarding aspen forest.

3.10 Winnipeg Transit and their Consultants for the SWRTC (Stage 2) Project

- June 21 and July` 11, 2012 – Dillon meeting on behalf of Transit with Gem Equities to show conceptual line drawings and sketches for options of the Stage 2 SWRTC.

- November 7, 2012 – Meeting between Dillon (on behalf of Transit) and Gem to discuss ideas for development on Parker as well as latest alignment ideas for phase 2.

- February 16, 2013 – Meeting between Dillon (on behalf of Transit) and Gem to discuss preliminary design and possible coordination of Pembina Underpass;

- October 18, 2013 – Meeting with Dillon & Landmark Planning (on behalf of Transit) and Gem to discuss the SWRTC as it relates to 6165347 Manitoba Inc. land along or near the proposed alignment. The latest proposed station location was also revealed which would benefit both the existing community as well as any future development in the Parker Lands.

- January 15, 2014 - Meeting with Dillon & Landmark Planning (on behalf of Transit) and Gem to provide an updated draft functional design of the SWRTC (stage 2) and to communicate project scope and timelines in preparation of next open house. The final location of a single proposed station was communicated by Dillon as well as plans to widen Hurst Way and add new hydro lines across 6165347 Manitoba Inc. land. A message was also forwarded that `there is a mandate of the city councillor to avoid traffic and keep the dog park.

- Nov. 24, 2015 – Meeting with Transit, SWRTC design team and Gem to coordinate connection points and anticipated timelines between the proposed station and 6165347 Manitoba Inc. land. Gem forwarded current schematic plans of the proposed residential development to Transit for discussion and coordination purposes.

- Jan. 28. 2016 – Meeting between Transit, PP&D, Parks, and Gem Equities to discuss items for coordination between 6165347 Manitoba Inc. land, Transit, Hydro and Parks and to establish a preliminary timeline for continued coordination as development proceeds. Transit indicates that RFP for the SWRTC (stage 2) project will be awarded by June/16 and at that time they will have a better indication of final schedule once the contractor is chosen.

- Mar. 30, 2016 – Parker Lands Coordination #1 between Transit, Dillon, PP&D, PW, W&W, Hydro, and Gem to identify projects planned for the Parker Area between 2015 and 2019 (with a schedule and high level scope).

- Sept. 27, 2016 - Parker Lands Coordination #2 between Transit, Dillon, PP&D, PW, W&W, Hydro, Plenary Roads and Gem to identify generic areas of concerns/conflict.

3.11 Plenary Roads Group

Plenary Roads Winnipeg is the group selected by the City of Winnipeg for the construction of the Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit Corridor (Stage 2), the Pembina Highway Underpass Project (the "Southwest Transitway Project") as well as the relocated/renovated Brenda Leipsic Dog Park. Plenary Roads Winnipeg has been consulted regarding the scope of work and details of the Southwest Bus Rapid-Transit Corridor (Stage 2) and related works being constructed within and near the Planned Area.

- Jan. 25, 2017 – Gem meets with the Plenary Group Project Manager for the SWRTC (stage 2) project to discuss the various aspects of the project, projected timelines as well as expressed concerns with the future Hurst Way road (a connector for both projects).

- Mar. 2017 – email correspondences between Gem and Plenary Roads regarding questions on Hurst Way.

4.0 Other Public and Private Stakeholder Forums

In addition to the Public Open Houses for the future residential development and Secondary Plan review with the area residents, many other communications were conducted by various stakeholders or persons with interest for ongoing and future projects in the Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site properties

The following is a representation of some of the Public Engagement conducted by other stakeholders within the Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site and adjacent properties.

In no way is this meant to be an exhaustive list but rather a representation of some of the main sessions held by each stakeholder.

4.1 Southwest Transitway (Stage 2) by City of Winnipeg (Transit) and their Consultants:

Dillon Consulting Ltd. on behalf of Winnipeg Transit met with key stakeholders during the summer of 2012 to discuss conceptual line drawings and sketches for options of the SWRTC (stage 2) alignment study.

- September 19th and 22nd, 2012 - A Public Open House was held by the City and Dillon Consulting to present the alignment options presented for the Stage 2 of the Southwest Transitway. Options were analyzed based on operational, construction, financial, environmental and community impact comparisons. There was a request for public input on alignment preferences, current and future use of the land, knowledge of development opportunities and constraints beyond the project site. Opinion and feedback surveys were distributed at the open house to identify the preferred option. A total of 376 people attended with 331 surveys completed.

Further stakeholder meetings were conducted by Dillon and Landmark Planning throughout the summer and fall of 2013 to communicate project scope and anticipated timelines as well as the latest proposed station locations.

- November 18th and 19th, 2013 - A Public Open House and info session was held. While the general routing for the transitway had already been determined, the precise alignment was still being worked out. This open was held to provide updated project information and to ask for input concerning items such as station sites, bus routing, active transportation, property or other impacts and mitigation. It should be noted that leading up to this open house, the communications consultant and designers for Winnipeg Transit conducted several dozen private stakeholders meetings prior to this to get individual feedback from the specific groups. Approximately 300 people in attendance over both days.

- Feb. 24th and 25th, 2014 - A follow up Public Open House was held to present further detailed information of the SWRTC (Stage 2) project.

- June 3, 2014 - a Public Hearing was held for the 2nd leg of the SWRTC and was recommended by Council to proceed.

- May 28, 2015 – Southwest Rapid Transit Project Open House to review the latest proposed design and route.

- July 19, 2016 – Public Information Session by City of Winnipeg to introduce the Plenary Group and PCL team who were awarded the contract through an RFP for the design, construction and ongoing maintenance of the SWRTC (stage 2), dog park and Pembina Underpass projects.

- Feb. 28, 2017 – Two Public Information Sessions are held by the City of Winnipeg at Canad Inns on Pembina Hwy to share updates on both the SWRTC (stage 2) project and the Parker Storm Retention Basin project.

4.2 Manitoba Hydro

Manitoba Hydro conducted a Community Engagement Process from November 2014 to March 2015 for their Harrow Station - Bishop Grandin Transmission Project which was to traverse the Parker Lands site.

A Public Open House was held by Manitoba Hydro on December 2, 2014 for the project at the Holiday Inn South on Pembina Highway. MMM Group Limited (MMM) was retained by Manitoba Hydro to assist with the Public Engagement Program for the proposed project at the open house.

Manitoba Hydro proposes transmission line upgrades and relocations to accommodate Phase 2 of the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor. (Note: At this presentation it was discovered by the developer that more of their developable land to the west of the existing hydro lines at mid site would be required for this expansion project - no requests or previous information had been communicated to 6165347 Manitoba Inc. about this requirement.

4.3 Waverley Underpass Project

- October 6, 2016 – An Open House was held by Dillon Consulting and the City of Winnipeg to communicate the latest proposed underpass design and related information to the public.

APPENDIX A.1 Open House #1 - Questionnaire & Feedback Summary

Open House #1 Questionnaire

OAK GROVE : A PLANNED COMMUNITY *featuring* TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

Q1: Where do you live?

- ☐ Beaumont
- ☐ North of the Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site
- ☐ West of Waverley Street
- ☐ East of Pembina Highway
- ☐ Other

Q2: Currently the land to be developed is zoned "M1" and "M2", so manufacturing/Industrial development is allowed here.
Are you in favour of changing the zoning to Residential Mixed Use ("RMU") which allows mostly residential and some small-scale commercial, office and recreational uses?

Strongly in Favour	Somewhat in Favour	Neutral	Somewhat Opposed	Strongly Opposed

Q3: Do you support a future mix of residential uses in the proposed development (a variety of building types to reflect low, medium, and high density)?

Strongly in Favour	Somewhat in Favour	Neutral	Somewhat Opposed	Strongly Opposed

Q4: Do you support Transit Oriented Development (TOD) which is comprised of a range of densities of housing that allows for less reliance on automobiles due to close proximity to a transit station?

Yes / No

Q5: Is it beneficial to have physical barriers like rail lines or hydro corridor to provide separation between existing neighbourhoods and the proposed development?

Yes / No

GEM EQUITIES INC.

OAK GROVE : A PLANNED COMMUNITY *featuring* TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

Q6: The developer plans to preserve part of the existing forest as parkland. Which part of the forest would you prioritize?

The south edge, to be visually and physically accessible to the existing community
The centre, to act as a connector within the proposed development
The western edge to act as a buffer from adjacent businesses

Q7: Do you have transportation or traffic concerns due to the proposed new development?

Yes / No (comments)

_____

_____

Q8: Do you have any concerns that the future development will negatively impact the capacity of the current water and sewer within your neighbourhood?

Yes / No (comments)

_____

_____

Q9: Was this open house helpful?
Please provide us with any additional comments you might have:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

GEM EQUITIES INC.

Feedback Summary from the Questionnaire

OPEN HOUSE #1 – Questionnaire Feedback Summary

Q1: Where do you live?

29/69 (42%) of open house attendees are from Beaumont area
5/29 (7%) were North of Parker
7/69 (10%) were West of Waverley
14/69 (20%) were from East of Pembina
14/69 (20%) were Other

Note: 29 people attended from the 1277 homes where mail-outs were distributed which represent about 2.2% of the individual homes. Some showed up with two people from same address (approx. 4 or 5 couples).

Q2: Are you in favour of a zoning change from industrial to residential?

Overall Results : 43% (in favour or neutral) / 56% (opposed)
By Neighbourhood:
41% / 59% for Beaumont area
60% / 40% for North of Parker
57% / 43% for West of Waverley
22% / 77% from East of Pembina
60% / 40% for Other

Interesting results to the question. Perhaps people were unaware of the current zoning designation.

Q3: Do you support a mix of densities?

Overall Results: 40% (in favour or neutral) / 60% (opposed)
By Neighbourhood:
28% / 72% for Beaumont area
60% / 40% for North of Parker
57% / 43% for West of Waverley
28% / 71% from East of Pembina
67% / 33% for Other

Seems to be similar or more opposition from East of Pembina people. Perhaps they have an issue with the BRT not passing through Pembina Hwy.

Q4: Do you support TOD?

Overall Results: 49% yes / 51% no
By Neighbourhood:
46% / 54% for Beaumont area
75% / 25% for North of Parker
57% / 43% for West of Waverley
29% / 71% from East of Pembina
67% / 33% for Other

There is still some thought that people do not understand what TOD means in Winnipeg as they haven't been able to see the results from a built project.
Perhaps the city still needs to educate better the positive attributes of TOD and why it's beneficial to future of the city?

Q5: Is it beneficial to have physical barriers to provide separation between existing neighbourhoods and new development?

Overall Results: 43% yes / 57% no

Some liked the idea of forest/greenspace as a buffer – for certain would like to keep trees north of Parker Avenue if possible (by currently community gardens).
Would have thought people of Beaumont would have wanted this separation of BRT and hydro corridor as there would be less impact on the existing neighbourhoods.
If the CN rail to the north didn't exist that it could be seen as a good thing for the community to connect to existing shops on Taylor and beyond (a few people asked if that was still a possibility).

Q6: Which part of Park should be preserved?

Centre 17%
South 31%
All of it 41% (people added this as their own option)

Developer has been working with City Naturalist to preserve some of the forest (to identify best areas).
Some wanted a response from the City Naturalist.

Q7: Do you have traffic concerns?

Overall Results: 78% yes / 22% no

By Neighbourhood:
93% / 7% for Beaumont area
80% / 20% for North of Parker
20% / 80% for West of Waverley
83% / 17% for East of Pembina
62% / 38% for Other

Mostly Beaumont people worried about cut-through traffic – 15/29 (51%) made a specific comment about this.
2/14 (14%) East of Pembina have concerns about cut-through traffic.
There will need to be an updated traffic report done to address these concerns.
Will need to keep people informed and understanding of the consequences (present in lay-man's terms to avoid miscommunication).
Will address exiting and will try to have a consultant present at the next Open House to answer questions specifically on traffic.

Q8: Do you have water and sewer concerns?

Overall Results: 61% yes / 39% no

By Neighbourhood:
83% / 17% for Beaumont area
0% / 100% for North of Parker
25% / 75% for West of Waverley
73% / 27% for East of Pembina
20% / 80% for Other

Perhaps there hasten been enough information put forward to the public to explain the Storm Retention Basin which should help to alleviate flooding.
Request that someone from the city be at the next Open House to provide some clarifications to these concerns.

Q9: Was this Open House helpful? Comments...

22+/- people responded that the OH with the new information presented was helpful (even if they were opposed to the project and loss of wetlands/forest).

People Against the City:
9/29 (31%) of the people in the Beaumont area have specific opposition with city directed issues (i.e. infrastructure or choice of BRT route)
9/14 (64%) of the people East of Pembina have specific opposition with city directed issues (i.e. infrastructure or choice of BRT route)
2/14 (14%) of the people in Other have specific opposition with city directed issues (i.e. infrastructure or choice of BRT route)

Wetlands & Aspen Forest:
9/29 (31%) in Beaumont made specific reference to wetlands or aspen forest
3/5 (60%) North of Parker made reference to wetlands or aspen forest
2/7 (28%) West of Waverley made reference to wetlands or aspen forest
11/14 (78%) East of Pembina made reference to wetlands or aspen forest
4/14 (28%) in Other made reference to wetlands or aspen forest.

Parker Lands MRS

Open House #1 - Questionnaire

Results

	Q1 Where do you live? Responses 69					Q2 In favour of Zoning change? Responses 62					Q3 Support mix of densities? Responses 67					Q4 TOD + 65		Q5 sponses Buffer + 53		Q6 Park site priority. Responses 58				Q7 Traffic concerns		Responses 64	Q8 Water/sewer co		Responses 51	Q9 Was Open House Helpful? Comments
	Beaumont	North of Parker MRS	West of Waverley	East of Pembina	Other	Strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	Strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	Yes	No	Yes	No	south edge	centre	western edge	all	Yes	No	comments	Yes	No	comments	Comment Color Legend
						in favour 27% 17		16% 10		opposed 56% 35	in favour 24% 16		16% 11		opposed 60% 40															Traffic Concerns
	42%	7%	10%	20%	20%	16%	11%	16%	10%	47%	9%	15%	16%	9%	51%	49%	51%	43%	57%	31%	17%	9%	43%	78%	22%		61%	39%		Wetland or Aspen Forrest
	29	5	7	14	14	10	7	10	6	29	6	10	11	6	34	32	33	23	30	18	10	5	25	50	14	Comments	31	20	Comments	City Issues
	Beaumont																													Landswap Comments
1.1	1									1					1		1						1	1		too much traffic for existing Beaumont area to handle to Pembina. Only 2 exits. Beaumont is cut off from proposd dog park	1		especially if you drain the wetlands	Yes, if feedback is really heard and considered.
1.2	1														1		1	1					1	1		the area is not easily accessible	1			
1.3	1									1					1	1			1	1				1		more traffic -- detrimental to the neighbourhood		1		
1.4	1									1					1		1		1	1				1		Allowing 2000+ residents into the existing are can only come with setbacks.	1			I moved onto Jupiter Bay 5 years ago with the appeal of a quiet neighbourhood with plenty of greenspace (which my dog appreciates). If these proposed plans go forward I would have no problems considering moving out of the neighbourhood.
1.5	1									1					1		1	1		1				1		More people = more cars = more congestion + noise			don't know	The ecological study planned for spring 2016 should be repeated throughout the summer, certain plants are easier to identify in certain seasons (i.e. an endangered plant "Rough Agalinus" is only visible in Aug. when it flowers, otherwise it's impossible to find). You'll miss things with a single-season visit. - I'm disappointed by how much of the aspen forest is slated for development, either this proposed community or rapid-transit corridor. It's the best thing about this neighbourhood and the city seems determined to ruin it. -- I live on Parker and never received notification of this open house. Seems like those of us who will be affected should be notified, don't you think? - env biologist?
1.6	1									1					1		1						1	1			1		draining wetlands	Yes because it was an opportunityto express concerns.
1.7	1									1					1		1		1	1				1		don't know	1			Yes
1.8	1									1					1		1		1	1				1			1		flooding of our homes	No. Let's save some of the greenspace we have.
1.9	1														1								1	1		Too much traffic on Beaumont	1			Very biased questions. Not well done! - this is not a TOD development
1.10	1									1					1		1						1	1		Traffic, BRT, Development that makes no sense to quiet residential neighbourhood that has a "gem" of greenspace, wetlands	1		As I back onto the field I am very much concerned about basement flooding. This field retains much water & I am not confident that the retention pond will be adequate.	Nothing in this land swap/BRT has been above board & considered that the majority of residents don't want it there. It is ruining a very important part of the city. The City of Winnipeg and Gem Equities please save our "natural gem" for a better plan. Who even would want to live ina development between railway, BRT & barking dogs at WHS. Gem Equities would be better off preserving this as park space and promoting the good that developers can do.
1.11	1							1						1			1		1	1				1		Traffic - Waverley to Beaumont to Windermere to Pembina.	1			Yes but too many different answers to one question

Parker Lands MRS

Open House #1 - Questionnaire

Results

	Q1 Where do you live? Responses 69					Q2 In favour of Zoning change? Responses 62					Q3 Support mix of densities? Responses 67					Q4 TOD + 65		Q5 sponses Buffer + 53		Q6 Park site priority. Responses 58				Q7 Traffic concerns		Responses 64	Q8 Water/sewer co		Responses 51	Q9 Was Open House Helpful? Comments
	beaumont	North of Parker MRS	West of Waverley	East of Pembina	Other	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	Yes	No	Yes	No	south edge	centre	western edge	all	Yes	No	comments	Yes	No	comments	
						in favour 27% 17		16% 10	opposed 56% 35		in favour 24% 16		16% 11	opposed 60% 40																	
	42%	7%	10%	20%	20%	16%	11%	16%	10%	47%	9%	15%	16%	9%	51%	49%	51%	43%	57%	31%	17%	9%	43%	78%	22%		61%	39%		
	29	5	7	14	14	10	7	10	6	29	6	10	11	6	34	32	33	23	30	18	10	5	25	50	14	Comments	31	20	Comments	Comments
1.12	1									1					1		1		1				1	1		too much traffic and already diverts to avoid Pembina, McGillivray backup	1		I have no faith in our city to do what is right. Already they gave this land without consultation.	No- City council is not listening. Buses do not even come close to rapid transit. Infill house often turns into crack housing as seen in Lord Roberts. Most of the city has been dishonest with consultation taking place after the fact.
1.13	1								1					1		1			1					1		somewhat			I hope not	
1.14	1					1						1				1		1						1		Too close to railway lines oil tanker spills.	1			Just convinced me present plans are rediculous.
1.15	1							1				1				1			1		1			1		Beaumont has considerable traffic as flow through already. Congestion can = is = heavy on Beaumont and Windermere. Addition car services will increase the traffic load due to current bottle neck's at Point Rd and		1	This has to be properly designed and engineered.	Nice to see you.
1.16	1						1					1					1			1				1		I do not want more traffic on Beaumont	1		Sewer is already a problem in Winnipeg	Yes, the city has to do something with the road system. I will never support any option that brings more traffic through west Fort Gary. Keep to low & medium density only.
1.17	1						1						1			1			1					1			1			Is there plan of having a single detatched house?
1.18	1					1						1				1		1			1			1		It looks like there is not enough roads going to new development.	1			yes
1.19	1					1								1		1		1		1				1		There's already way too much traffic - including large trucks and Beaver buses driving right through residential areas			not sure hope not	Not really - would have liked to see the city here so we can ask more questions:- I just want low (density) - a nice middle class neighborhood to blend with the existing ones
1.20	1						1							1			1	1		1				1		No proper exit for existing community. Too much additional traffic through existing community.	1		we have had emergency pumps in the area before	How do you get to Red River College on the Rapid Transit? Need 7-11 Stops.
1.21	1							1					1			1			1	1					1			1		I don't want Parker to be developed. Keep it green space.	Don't develop Parker. Leave the trees! Nice border.
1.22	1							1					1			1			1		1				1			1			
1.23	1							1					1			1		1				1		1		The traffic is already high. This new development will make it intolerable!			That's a question for an engineer.	Partly. Until traffic concerns are addressed by the city it doesn't make sense to proceed. If the city will allow access to Oak Grove ONLY via Waverly then it's Ok by me. How about a roadway paralleling the BRT from McGillivray to John hurst / Parker

Comment Color Legend

- Traffic Concerns
- Wetland or Aspen Forrest
- City Issues
- Landswap Comments

Parker Lands MRS

Open House #1 - Questionnaire

Results

	Q1 Where do you live? Responses 69					Q2 In favour of Zoning change? Responses 62					Q3 Support mix of densities? Responses 67					Q4 TOD + 65		Q5 sponses Buffer + 53		Q6 Park site priority. Responses 58				Q7 Traffic concerns		Responses 64	Q8 Water/sewer co		Responses 51	Q9 Was Open House Helpful? Comments
	beaumont	North of Parker MRS	West of Waverley	East of Pembina	Other	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	Yes	No	Yes	No	south edge	centre	western edge	all	Yes	No	comments	Yes	No	comments	
						in favour 27% 17		16% 10		opposed 56% 35	in favour 24% 16		16% 11		opposed 60% 40																
	42%	7%	10%	20%	20%	16%	11%	16%	10%	47%	9%	15%	16%	9%	51%	49%	51%	43%	57%	31%	17%	9%	43%	78%	22%		61%	39%		
	29	5	7	14	14	10	7	10	6	29	6	10	11	6	34	32	33	23	30	18	10	5	25	50	14	Comments	31	20	Comments	Comments
1.24	1									1					1		1						1	1		area cannot handle this possible density			unknown	What guarantees to households being built for: no cracking wall and foundation - no train wrecks crash into housing - no flooded basements - sound proofing of housing - continued fixing of drainage to residents for drainage so close to the tracks for their homes.
1.25	1								1					1		1		1		1				1		increased local traffic		1		Yes. Concerns largely around environmental forest removal. Some development and beautification would benefit the park. Otherwised, opposed to development on south side of parker on empty lots opposed to tree removal along parker.
1.26	1									1					1		1	1		1				1		new development requires me back tracking in order to get onto waverly	1		dog park is a hinderance bringing other dogs from other areas congesting the small single lane to get onto waverly	Yes. I am thankful some information was shared. I am still looking for transparency from the city of winnipeg. I might suggest developers study the area more than what has been claimed to be. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to voice my opinion
1.27	1								1					1		1			1	1				1		You need to run Planet St. straight through north. Minimize easterly flow for those who want to get to Waverly	1		Too many properties will flood the sewers.	Have an RT pickup at end of Somerville Ave. Minimize stops towards Waverly. Install right turn yields in and out of Hurst way.
1.28	1									1					1		1	1					1	1			1			Little new info. - Leave greenspace as a barrier
1.29	1								1					1		1								1		Waverly to Beaumont to Windermere to Pembina is a frequent short cut through these residential neighborhoods and I believe further development would exacerbate traffic flow on		1		Sounds like the development will happen no matter what. Not happy with how city has moved forward with these projects with only "after the fact" meetings like this.
	North of Parker MRS																													
2.1		1								1					1		1		1					1		intensity of rail traffic- long, long trains will make for frustrated car drivers. Also, much oil is carried by rail -- possible explosion, and constant noise.			don't know	very thorough plan; beautiful diagrams; but in principle this whole project is unacceptable and possibly based on an illegal land transfer!
2.2		1								1					1	1							1	1		Grant Park and Taylor will not be easily accessible to the development		1		No. - It doesn't make sense to build residences close to the railway and hydro lines
2.3		1					1				1														1				hard to say	Interesting, may work if built as presented
2.4		1				1							1			1		1		1		1		1		no overpass on waverly and Taylor will make the traffic even			don't know	Keep it undevelop and designate it a natural parkland / only park. This is the only forest of it's kind in the center of the city. - the north edge of the forest is the most beautiful. Preserve this.
2.5		1					1					1			1		1						1	1		I would like to see a pedestrian / bicycle travel linking this development to "the Meeting Place" in Grant Park Pavillions		1		It would be good to see a (unreadable) too. Designate internal streets for 30 km/hr to provide safe use roads or provide protection (unreadable) Make sure all pathways are paved.

Comment Color Legend

- Traffic Concerns
- Wetland or Aspen Forrest
- City Issues
- Landswap Comments

Parker Lands MRS

Open House #1 - Questionnaire

Results

	Q1 Where do you live? Responses 69					Q2 In favour of Zoning change? Responses 62					Q3 Support mix of densities? Responses 67					Q4 TOD + 65		Q5 sponses Buffer + 53		Q6 Park site priority. Responses 58				Q7 Traffic concerns		Responses 64	Q8 Water/sewer co		Responses 51	Q9 Was Open House Helpful? Comments
	beaumont	North of Parker MRS	West of Waverley	East of Pembina	Other	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	Yes	No	Yes	No	south edge	centre	western edge	all	Yes	No	comments	Yes	No	comments	
						in favour 27% 17		16% 10	opposed 56% 35		in favour 24% 16		16% 11	opposed 60% 40																	
	42%	7%	10%	20%	20%	16%	11%	16%	10%	47%	9%	15%	16%	9%	51%	49%	51%	43%	57%	31%	17%	9%	43%	78%	22%		61%	39%		
	29	5	7	14	14	10	7	10	6	29	6	10	11	6	34	32	33	23	30	18	10	5	25	50	14	Comments	31	20	Comments	Comments
	West of Waverley																													
3.1			1							1					1		1		1					1			1			To be determined
3.2			1			1					1					1		1			1				1			1		Build it. Wetland issue is overblown. Need infill development
3.3			1			1						1				1		1			1				1			1		Very well done - thank you. It is good to have the facts presented and appreciate the opportunity to participate. I will miss walking the dog through this area but the city needs TOD to create taxes to pay for BRT. Stop urban sprall. Prefer as high density as possible to make it commercially viable.
3.4			1			1						1				1			1						1			1		Yes
3.5			1							1					1		1	1					1						Insufficient information at this point	The Parker Wetlands should be maintained as public green space
3.6			1							1					1		1		1				1							
3.7			1					1					1			1			1		1				1						
	East of Pembina																													
4.1				1						1					1		1						1	1		to me that area is not a priority for transit development. We would be better off with a more direct route to the university.	1			I am grateful to be able to voice my opinions & concerns. I have been visiting the area for a few years now and really enjoy the chance to get into nature within the city.
4.2				1						1					1		1		1				1	1		Transit corridor should go down Pembina Hwy as originally planned.			do not know	Yes - provided a good description of what is planned. Questionnaire biased toward development does not ask about remaining a natural area. - Q2 how about a natural environment option? Rezone to parkland.
4.3				1						1					1		1		1				1	1		Rapid transit should run along Pembina where there are existing needs (business, apartments)	1		I am concerned about the wetlands	If this were actual "infill" development I would be supportive. The design and planning seem fine. This is not a NIMBY issue. We need to preserve this wetland. There is nothing else like it in Winnipeg. It is an ecologically valuable system that should never had been given to GEM and GEM should do the right thing and sell it back to the city for protection
4.4				1						1			1			1			1				1	1			1		sewer system is crumbling and inadequate as is	Not really. I get the feeling the city will just ram it through regardless of opposition

Comment Color Legend

- Traffic Concerns
- Wetland or Aspen Forrest
- City Issues
- Landswap Comments

Parker Lands MRS

Open House #1 - Questionnaire

Results

	Q1 Where do you live? Responses 69					Q2 In favour of Zoning change? Responses 62					Q3 Support mix of densities? Responses 67					Q4 TOD + 65		Q5 sponses Buffer + 53		Q6 Park site priority. Responses 58				Q7 Traffic concerns		Responses 64	Q8 Water/sewer co		Responses 51	Q9 Was Open House Helpful? Comments
	beaumont	North of Parker MRS	West of Waverley	East of Pembina	Other	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	Yes	No	Yes	No	south edge	centre	western edge	all	Yes	No	comments	Yes	No	comments	
						in favour 27% 17		16% 10	opposed 56% 35		in favour 24% 16		16% 11	opposed 60% 40																	
	42%	7%	10%	20%	20%	16%	11%	16%	10%	47%	9%	15%	16%	9%	51%	49%	51%	43%	57%	31%	17%	9%	43%	78%	22%		61%	39%		
	29	5	7	14	14	10	7	10	6	29	6	10	11	6	34	32	33	23	30	18	10	5	25	50	14	Comments	31	20	Comments	Comments
4.5				1				1					1			1		1		1					1			1		Yes. Interesting discussions.
4.6				1		1					1					1			1			1		1		traffic from the development trying to get onto pembina hwy. The Point Rd / Windermere / Pembina intersection is already poor and has quite a bit of traffic. More traffic will overload the intersection.			not sure but possibly		Yes. More information is always helpful for understanding.
4.7				1				1					1			1							1			1			I believe the developer is usually responsible for providing adequate water and sewer within the development.		1	Not really. Thank you. This entire project from the Transit / Land swap has left me with a bad taste in my mouth. No fault found with the developer. The city seems determined to force this through. - Q5 Why?
4.8				1						1					1		1		1				1	1		Pembina hwy!!!	1		It's a wetland, leave it alone		
4.9				1											1		1	1		1				1		As a resident living south of the proposed development it will be an inconvenience to leave our home and get to Waverly.	1		This is a natural wetland which does what nature intended.	I'm sorry to see the green space being mutilated. Why does the city have to sell off all our greenspace?
4.10				1						1					1		1						1			this project is assinine		1		Yes. It illustrated how silly City Hall is with planning of our city. The aspen forest and wetlands need to be preserved and this area designated a park!
4.11				1						1					1		1		1				1	1		We can't keep up with current maintenance of infrastructure - why do we want more pressure on it?	1			Informative. Yes. A larger room for storyboard space would be more condusive. (too close together)
4.12				1						1					1		1		1				1	1		Traffic has already gotten heavy. This will make it worse. We're already having difficulty keeping up with current infrastructure, how can we maintain this development.	1			Yes. But the room is a little small. The street layout for the proposed division was not very clear. The proposed housing does not match with what is already there.
4.13				1						1					1		1													Wetlands are rare and valuable - (unreadable) in urban areas. No excuse to convert them to another subdivision. We need undeveloped land - pristine or not - within the city. Wetland in open area and the forest are valuable. I support transit but this location does not serve a large population here! Transit is poor location (+ unreadable) for the subdivision.
4.14				1						1					1		1		1				1	1		Why isn't it on Pembina? That is where I need it!!!	1		Very concerned. You are planning to destroy Type A Land !!!	Not at all.
	Other																													
5.1					1					1					1		1	1					1	1						
5.2					1											1			1					1		BRT should be along Pembina where the people are. Didn't do a proper study in the first place.	1		Would like to see RCMP investigation of land swap.	The city doesn't have a greenspace plan only a development plan. What do city naturalists have to say? Could we see that.

Comment Color Legend

- Traffic Concerns
- Wetland or Aspen Forrest
- City Issues
- Landswap Comments

Parker Lands MRS

Open House #1 - Questionnaire

Results

	Q1 Where do you live? Responses 69					Q2 In favour of Zoning change? Responses 62					Q3 Support mix of densities? Responses 67					Q4 TOD + 65		Q5 sponses Buffer + 53		Q6 Park side priority. Responses 58				Q7 Traffic concerns		Responses 64	Q8 Water/sewer co		Responses 51	Q9 Was Open House Helpful? Comments
	beaumont	North of Parker MRS	West of Waverley	East of Pembina	Other	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	strongly in favour	somewhat in favour	neutral	somewhat opposed	strongly opposed	Yes	No	Yes	No	south edge	centre	western edge	all	Yes	No	comments	Yes	No	comments	
						in favour 27% 17		16% 10	opposed 56% 35		in favour 24% 16		16% 11	opposed 60% 40																	
	42%	7%	10%	20%	20%	16%	11%	16%	10%	47%	9%	15%	16%	9%	51%	49%	51%	43%	57%	31%	17%	9%	43%	78%	22%		61%	39%		
	29	5	7	14	14	10	7	10	6	29	6	10	11	6	34	32	33	23	30	18	10	5	25	50	14	Comments	31	20	Comments	Comments
5.3					1										1		1													Q3: do not favour residential development
5.4					1										1		1						1	1		Don't pave paradise!				It served to further engage someone who values that forest
5.5					1				1			1							1				1			1			1	The forest was the site of a very special & magical encounter with a spirit deer who lives there. It is a truly special & powerful place and I had always fervently hoped that it would not be developed. It is very sad to hear that development plans are underway. I see this forest as a bridge to the great mystery & the eternal natural world. The spirit deer disappeared when it ran towards the houses at the edge of the forest. If there's nowhere for it to materialize — if the forest's integrity is compromised — it will be a great tragedy.
5.6					1			1					1			1		1								1			1		
5.7					1	1					1					1		1				1			1			1		Yes
5.8					1		1				1					1			1		1			1		The train tracks would make me less likely to move here. A pedestrian crossing to Taylor near Sobeys would be beneficial to new and existing neighborhood.		1		Overly conceptual and seemed designed to appease NIMBYs. Important questions left unanswered. - is ground level commercial feasible - rentals or condos - buildout timeline (Fort Rouge TOD has been delayed excessively) I used to live nearby. Can no longer afford to as a university student. Affordable rentals would be a huge game changer, especially near transit station.
5.9					1																			1		Active transportation corridor with aesthetic route by forest / wetland / retention pond must be charted. Waverly to Jubilee must be a well planned beautiful functional please.				
5.10					1				1				1			1			1		1			1		I've seen earlier plans. The collecter roads isn't located well (with respect to the collector roads in other developments)		1		
5.11					1					1					1	1		1		1	1			1		Active transportation links next to natural area must be a priority. Link Jubilee to Waverly and underpasses AT		1		Much Higher Density please. 3-5000 people ESNL Natural inventory must be done like presinct plan. Value sample ephemeral wetland and grassland and forest. Don't call it Oak Grove or Aspen Grove on Parker Parkland or something less insulting. Take down the trees and call it Oak Grove. NO! Prioritze AT routes that work and that connect next to Nature!!
5.12					1		1					1				1		1		1					1			1		Yes thank you
5.13					1			1				1					1	1				1		1		BRT is not required here. Relocate to where ridership is.	1			No - Deal is already a done deal. PARKER WETLANDS GONE
5.14					1	1					1					1		1			1				1			1		Yes thank you

Comment Color Legend

- Traffic Concerns
- Wetland or Aspen Forrest
- City Issues
- Landswap Comments

APPENDIX A.2 Open House #1 - Presentation Boards

OPEN HOUSE #1 – PRESENTATION BOARDS

OAK GROVE : A PLANNED COMMUNITY *featuring* TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT




SITE INFLUENCES

GEM EQUITIES INC.

FEBRUARY 10, 2016

OAK GROVE : A PLANNED COMMUNITY *featuring* TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT



LEGEND

- LOW DENSITY : 1 TO 3 STOREYS
- MEDIUM DENSITY : 3 TO 5 STOREYS
- HIGH DENSITY : 4 TO 12 STOREYS
- AT PATHWAYS
- NEW BRT STATION
- PHASE 2 OF BUS RAPID TRANSIT

GUIDING DOCUMENTS

OUR WINNIPEG: MAJOR REDEVELOPMENT SITE

COMPLETE COMMUNITIES: CENTRES & CORRIDORS

WINNIPEG TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD) HANDBOOK

PLANNING PRINCIPLES

1. HIGHER DENSITY NEAR STATION
2. DIRECT CONNECTIVITY AND WALKABILITY
3. URBAN INFILL STRATEGIES
4. PLACEMAKING
5. PARK PRESERVATION AND GREENSPACE

CONCEPTS AND PLANNING PRINCIPLES

GEM EQUITIES INC.

FEBRUARY 10, 2016

OAK GROVE : A PLANNED COMMUNITY *featuring* TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

1928 *CHATAWAY'S MAP OF GREATER WINNIPEG*



EARLY PLANNING

- PLANS OF WINNIPEG DATING TO AS FAR BACK AS 1908 SHOW STREET LAYOUTS FOR THE AREA NORTH OF PARKER AVENUE.
- MANY OF THESE PLANNED STREETS ("ASQUITH", "GEORGINA" ETC.) STILL EXIST AS PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY IN THE HYDRO CORRIDOR.
- TODAY MOST OF THE SITE IS ZONED FOR INDUSTRIAL USE (M1 M2- MANUFACTURING IN THE WINNIPEG ZONING BY-LAW)
- OUR PROPOSAL IS TO CHANGE THE ZONING TO RESIDENTIAL BE MORE CONSISTENT WITH THE AREA.



2016 *WITH ANTICIPATED BRT*

1947 *CHATAWAY'S MAP OF GREATER WINNIPEG*





1946 *GREATER WINNIPEG TENTATIVE RAILWAY PLAN*

HISTORICAL LAND USE

- TO THE NORTH OF THE PARKER LANDS MAJOR REDEVELOPMENT SITE, ALONGSIDE GRANT AVENUE, THE INFORMAL COMMUNITY "ROOSTER TOWN" EXISTED UNTIL 1959.
- IT HAD A SIGNIFICANT MÉTIS POPULATION AND HAS BEEN DESCRIBED AS THE LAST ROAD ALLOWANCE COMMUNITY IN WINNIPEG.
- IN THE 1950S, 30-50 PEOPLE LIVED IN THIS AREA IN MORE THAN A DOZEN SHACKS, MANY OF THEM OLD BOXCARS PURCHASED FROM THE CNR.
- THE LAST RESIDENTS OF ROOSTER TOWN WERE RELOCATED TO MAKE WAY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF GRANT PARK SHOPPING CENTRE.
- TO THE SOUTH, NEAR MCGILLIVRAY, STOOD A SMALLER INFORMAL COMMUNITY KNOWN AS "TIN TOWN."



IMAGES OF ROOSTER TOWN

SOURCES:

HTTP://DEADRIVERHEAD.WORDPRESS.COM/2011/01/18/ROOSTER-TOWN-HIDDEN-WINNIPEG-HISTORY/

HTTP://WWW.WINNIPEGREALTORS.CA/RESOURCES/ARTICLE/?SYSID=1226

WINNIPEG TRIBUNE, DECEMBER 20, 1951. "HEARD OF ROOSTER TOWN? ITS OUR LAST SLUMS."

DAVID G. BURLEY, CITY AND SUBURB HOUSING IN 20TH CENTURY WINNIPEG. WINNIPEG REAL ESTATE BOARD, 100TH ANNIVERSARY, 2001

LAWRENCE BARKWELL, COORDINATOR OF MÉTIS HERITAGE AND HISTORY RESEARCH LOUIS RIEL INSTITUTE

"THE OUTSIDERS" BY RANDY TURNER, *THE WINNIPEG FREE PRESS*, JAN. 29, 2016


HISTORY OF THE SITE

GEM EQUITIES INC.

FEBRUARY 10, 2016

OAK GROVE : A PLANNED COMMUNITY *featuring* TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

TOD STATION AREA




HIGHEST DENSITY NEARER THE STATION
THE IMMEDIATE AREA AROUND THE STATION (CORE) SHOULD GENERALLY CONTAIN THE GREATEST INTENSITY AND MIX OF USES

(WINNIPEG TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT HANDBOOK)

LAND USES AND DENSITY CONCEPTS TO ENCOURAGE NEW URBAN RESIDENTIAL INFILL

- HIGHEST DENSITY NEAR STATION
- TAPER DOWN TO MEDIUM DENSITY AT CENTRE
- LOW DENSITIES TOWARDS THE EDGES
- DEVELOPMENT TO INCLUDE A VARIETY OF HOUSING TYPES (COST, SIZE, TYPE AND DENSITIES)
- COMPACT LOTS IN LOW DENSITY AREAS
- FURTHEST DISTANCE FROM ANY DWELLING UNIT TO THE BRT STATION WITHIN THE NEW DEVELOPMENT WILL BE LESS THAN 800M AWAY (A TEN MINUTE WALK MAX)




LAND USES AND DENSITY CONCEPTS

PRINCIPLE 1 — HIGHEST DENSITY NEAR STATION

GEM EQUITIES INC.

FEBRUARY 10, 2016

OAK GROVE : A PLANNED COMMUNITY *featuring* TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT



PROPOSED STREETSCAPE FOR PRIMARY ROADS

PUBLIC ROADS TO HAVE AT LEAST ONE ACCESSIBLE SIDEWALK TO PROMOTE WALKABILITY AND CONNECTIVITY

- ALL PUBLIC ROWS WITH SIDEWALKS TO INCLUDE TREES TO FORM A BUFFER BETWEEN SIDEWALK AND ROAD.
- PUBLIC SIDEWALKS AND ROADS TO EFFICIENTLY AND EFFECTIVELY LINK PEDESTRIANS, CYCLISTS, TRANSIT RIDERS, AND MOTORISTS TO DESTINATIONS WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENT. (IE. TRANSIT STATION, EXISTING AND NEW AT PATHS)

STREET LAYOUTS TO USE A HYBRID OF AN URBAN GRID PATTERN - CALLED A "FUSED GRID" - RATHER THAN A TYPICAL SUBURBAN WINDING PATTERN

- TO LINK FROM MINOR STREETS TO MAIN STREETS
- TO ALLOW DIRECT ROUTES WHEREVER POSSIBLE (FASTER TO WALK OR CYCLE THAN TO DRIVE)
- SMALL WALKABLE BLOCKS WITHIN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD (PEDESTRIAN CUT-THROUGHS EVERY 100M TO 200M)
- PROVIDES VISIBILITY / SAFETY FOR PEDESTRIAN AND CYCLISTS WITH CLEAR SIGHTLINES FROM STREETS AND PUBLIC SPACES




PROPOSED STREETSCAPE FOR SECONDARY ROADS

TO CREATE COMFORTABLE PEDESTRIAN ENVIRONMENT THROUGH USE OF PEDESTRIAN-CENTRIC STREETSCAPING

- LINE STREETS WITH TREES
- LANDSCAPING, BENCHES, PLANTERS
- PEDESTRIAN-LEVEL LIGHTING

PROPOSED "FUSED GRID"



STREET PATTERN MORPHOLOGY

PRINCIPLE 2

DIRECT CONNECTIVITY & WALKABILITY

GEM EQUITIES INC.

FEBRUARY 10, 2016

OAK GROVE : A PLANNED COMMUNITY *featuring* TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

PROPOSED HOUSING TYPOLOGIES

LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

- 1 TO 3 STOREYS
- SMALLER LOTS AND SMALLER BUILDING FOOTPRINTS MAKES OWNERSHIP MORE AFFORDABLE
- COMPACT DESIGNS RESULTS IN MORE EFFICIENT AND RESPONSIBLE USE OF LAND AND INFRASTRUCTURE
- SINGLE DETATCHED, SIDE BY SIDES AND QUADPLEX DWELLING UNITS
- INDIVIDUAL GARAGES
- BORDERING PARK
- SIDEWALKS ON EACH STREET TO MAINTAIN PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION AND WALKABILITY
- 800M MAXIMUM DISTANCE FROM STATION TO ENCOURAGE USAGE (10 MINUTE WALK)



MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

- 3 TO 5 STOREYS
- MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNITS
- SMALL, COMPACT UNITS
- ON SITE SURFACE AND UNDERGROUND PARKING
- PARKING @ 1 STALL / UNIT MINIMUM
- BETWEEN PARK AND STATION
- ACTS AS A BUFFER SEPARATION TO NOISE FROM EXISTING CN RAIL
- APPROXIMATELY 400M FROM STATION (5 MINUTES WALK)



HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

- 4 TO 12 STOREYS
- HIGHEST DENSITIES ARE TO BE IMMEDIATELY SURROUNDING TRANSIT STATION
- HIGH STRUCTURES BECOME RECOGNIZABLE ICONS AND LANDMARKS TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND STATION
- UNDERGROUND PARKING
- ENSURE THAT ALL RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL MIXED-USE AREAS ARE TRANSIT-ORIENTED
- A SHORT WALK OF 200-400M FROM STATION (2-5 MINUTES)





OUR GOAL IS TO CREATE HOMES FOR A DIVERSE RANGE OF HOUSEHOLDS

SOME PEOPLE DESIRE FAMILY HOMES; OTHERS PREFER SIDE-BY-SIDES OR TOWN-HOUSES, SOME WANT APARTMENT-STYLE HOMES AND A MORE "URBAN" LIFESTYLE.

WE PLAN ON PROVIDING A VARIETY IN TERMS OF COST, SIZE, BUILDING TYPE AND BUILDING HEIGHT TO APPEAL TO A WIDER AUDIENCE.

EVERYONE BENEFITS AS PART OF AN INTEGRATED PLANNED COMMUNITY WITH A MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF CHOICE AND FLEXIBILITY.

PRINCIPLE 3

URBAN INFILL STRATEGIES

GEM EQUITIES INC.

FEBRUARY 10, 2016


OAK GROVE : A PLANNED COMMUNITY *featuring* TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT


DESIGN WILL BE CONSISTENT WITH TOD PRINCIPLES AND DRAW ON THE QUALITIES OF THE AREA AS AN URBAN INFILL SITE

- PROVIDES PLACES FOR GROUND FLOOR, STREET ORIENTED COMMERCIAL USES IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THE STATION.
- MIXED-USE COMBINATION OF RESIDENTIAL AND ECONOMIC ACTIVITY FOSTERS A SENSE OF PLACE.
- PROVIDES PUBLIC RESERVE AREA FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION AND LEISURE ACTIVITIES

BUILDINGS DESIGNED WITH THE CREATION OF SAFE AND HEALTHY URBAN SPACES IN MIND

- BUILDINGS TO INCORPORATE ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES THAT CONVEY A SENSE OF PLACE AND RELATE TO THE STREET AND PEDESTRIAN ENVIRONMENT
- BUILDING MASSING AND PERMEABILITY TO CREATE A GATEWAY TO THE DEVELOPMENT, SUPPORTING A SENSE OF PLACE AND PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION TO BRT STATION.





PLACEMAKING IS A MULTIFACETED APPROACH TO CREATING A UNIQUE SENSE OF PLACE SPECIFIC TO A CERTAIN AREA

PLACEMAKING FOCUSES ON A COMMUNITY'S UNIQUE ASSETS, INSPIRATION AND POTENTIAL, UNDERSTANDING THAT A PLACE IS ABOUT A COMMUNITY BEFORE IT'S ABOUT DESIGN.

IT IS ABOUT CREATING PUBLIC SPACES THAT PROMOTE PEOPLE'S HEALTH, HAPPINESS, AND WELL-BEING THROUGH A VARIETY OF STRATEGIES.

A LOCATION QUITE LIKE THIS DOESN'T EXIST ANYWHERE ELSE IN THE CITY.



STREETSCAPES DESIGNED TO WELCOME PEDESTRIANS AND MAKE BEING IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD A RICH EXPERIENCE.

- TREE-LINED STREETS, BOULEVARDS, PLAZA
- ALL PUBLIC ROWS WITH SIDEWALKS TO INCLUDE TREES TO FORM A BUFFER BETWEEN SIDEWALK AND ROAD
- BUILDING ENTRIES / WINDOWS NEAR SIDEWALK ("EYES ON THE STREET") - PROVIDE SAFETY FOR PEDESTRIANS.
- HIGH QUALITY URBAN DESIGN AND SAFE, ATTRACTIVE PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS TO CREATE A SENSE OF PLACE.



STREET SECTIONS AND PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS SERVE ALL FORMS OF TRANSPORTATION

- PUBLIC SIDEWALKS AND ROADS TO EFFICIENTLY AND EFFECTIVELY LINK PEDESTRIANS, CYCLISTS, TRANSIT RIDERS, AND MOTORISTS TO DESTINATIONS WITHIN AND AROUND THE DEVELOPMENT (IE. TRANSIT STATION, EXISTING AND NEW A.T. PATHS)
- DESIGN STREET GUIDELINES FOR PEDESTRIANS NOT CARS!
- MULTIMODAL, PEDESTRIAN - ORIENTED STREET FOR BUSES BICYCLES, CARS, AND PEDESTRIANS.

Image sources: City of Winnipeg *Complete Communities*; public domain


PRINCIPLE 4

PLACEMAKING

GEM EQUITIES INC.

FEBRUARY 10, 2016

OAK GROVE : A PLANNED COMMUNITY *featuring* TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT



GREEN STREETS: WIDE SIDEWALKS INCORPORATE ELEMENTS FOR IMPROVING WATER QUALITY BY ADDING NATURAL FILTRATION AND VEGETATION TO THE DESIGN.



PLAZZAS AND OPEN GREEN SPACES PROVIDE PROGRAMMED SPACES FOR ACTIVE AND PASSIVE USES; FOCAL POINTS AND GATHERING SPACES WITHIN THE COMMUNITY.

STORMWATER RETENTION BASIN PROVIDES AN AESTHETIC FACILITY WITH LANDSCAPED SURROUNDINGS.



OAK GROVE

400m

PUBLIC PRESERVE LOCATED CENTRALLY IN DEVELOPMENT, SO THAT IT IS WITHIN 400 M WALK OF ALL RESIDENTIAL COMMERCIAL USES; ACTS TO DEFINE THE LOW AND MEDIUM/ HIGH DENSITY AREAS (CONNECTS THE TWO AREAS), AND AS A BUFFER TO MULTIFAMILY.





ADJACENT HYDRO LANDS ACT AS AN EXTENSION OF GREEN SPACE, AND AS A BUFFER FROM BRT.

PRINCIPLE 5

PARK PRESERVATION & GREENSPACES

GEM EQUITIES INC.

FEBRUARY 10, 2016

OAK GROVE : A PLANNED COMMUNITY *featuring* TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

WHAT IS A WETLAND?

FROM THE CITY OF WINNIPEG'S DOCUMENT "ECOLOGICALLY SIGNIFICANT NATURAL LANDS STRATEGY AND POLICY" (P. 26):

A WETLAND IS A DEPRESSION OF LAND WHICH CONTAINS WATER FOR ALL OR MOST OF THE YEAR.

ARE ALL WETLANDS THE SAME?

- NO. THERE IS A WIDE RANGE OF TYPES OF WETLAND, AND A WIDE RANGE OF QUALITIES IN TERMS OF THE BENEFITS THEY MIGHT OFFER.
- A WIDELY ACCEPTED SYSTEM FOR CLASSIFYING WETLANDS IS THE STEWART AND KANTRUD SYSTEM (STEWART, R.E. AND H.A. KANTRUD, 1971.)
- THIS DIVIDES WETLANDS INTO SEVEN CLASSES (IMAGES FROM WWW.WETLANDPOLICY.CA):

CLASS VII

- FEN PONDS AND FEN VEGETATION.
- OFTEN HAVE FLOATING MATS OF VEGETATION.



CLASS VI

- ALKALI PONDS AND LAKES
- PH ABOVE 7: SALTY



CLASS V

- PERMANENT PONDS AND LAKES
- CENTRAL AREA OF OPEN WATER
- SUBMERGED AS WELL AS EMERGENT PLANTS



CLASS IV

- SEMI-PERMANENT PONDS AND LAKES
- FREQUENTLY HAVE SURFACE WATER THROUGHOUT THE GROWING SEASON
- MARSH VEGETATION



CLASS III

- SEASONAL PONDS AND LAKES
- TYPICALLY DOMINATED BY WETLAND GRASSES, SEDGES, RUSHES



CLASS II

- TEMPORARILY/PERIODICALLY COVERED BY STANDING OR SLOW-MOVING WATER
- ONLY HAVE OPEN WATER FOR A FEW WEEKS AFTER SNOWMELT, OR SEVERAL DAYS AFTER HEAVY STORM EVENTS



CLASS I

- EPHEMERAL
- SURFACE WATER ONLY PRESENT FOR A SHORT PERIOD AFTER MELT/RAIN EVENTS IN EARLY SPRING



WHAT ARE WE DOING TO PRESERVE THE ASPEN FOREST AND HABITAT?

MEETING WITH CITY OF WINNIPEG'S NATURALIST AND SPECIALISTS ON PARKS:

- NUMEROUS MEETINGS SINCE EARLY 2014
- CITY INPUT ON SIZE AND LOCATION OF HABITAT PRESERVE
- CITY OBSERVATIONS OF HIGHEST-QUALITY HABITAT IN THE SITE:



habitat type showing habitat quality

RETAINING AN INDEPENDENT ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANT TO:

- PREPARE AN INDEPENDENT REPORT ON GEM EQUITY'S LANDS
- SURVEY TO DETERMINE PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES PRESENCE/ABSENCE
- SURVEY TO BE CARRIED OUT AT OPTIMUM TIME FOR THIS RESEARCH:
  LATE SPRING (OF 2016).
- PREPARE A PLAN TO MITIGATE NEGATIVE EFFECTS (IF ANY).



THE FOREST HAS A RANGE OF QUALITY: NOT ALL AREAS ARE EQUAL, AS THE CITY'S OWN SURVEYS SHOW.

THERE ARE MANY PATHS, CLEARED SPACES, DISARDED OBJECTS AND ELEMENTS OF INFRASTRUCTURE INCLUDING CHUNKS OF CONCRETE AND METAL, AND ADJACENT RAIL AND HYDRO LINES.

FROM THE CITY OF WINNIPEG'S DOCUMENT "ECOLOGICALLY SIGNIFICANT NATURAL LANDS STRATEGY AND POLICY" (P. 27):

ASPEN FOREST HABITAT IS THE MOST COMMON NATURAL HABITAT REMAINING IN WINNIPEG AND THE SURROUNDING REGION.









WETLANDS + FOREST

GEM EQUITIES INC.

FEBRUARY 10, 2016

OAK GROVE : A PLANNED COMMUNITY *featuring* TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

WHAT IS A "NATURALIZED" STORMWATER RETENTION BASIN (SRB)?

- A STORMWATER RETENTION BASIN CREATED WITH A RICH MIX OF NATIVE PLANTINGS.
- SRBS COLLECT WATER AFTER RAINFALL OR SNOWMELT, PREVENTING OVERLOAD ON THE CITY'S WASTE WATER SYSTEM AND RIVERS.
- NATURALIZED SRBS ARE SMALL ECOSYSTEMS
- THEY SUPPORT PLANT AND SMALL ANIMAL LIFE
- THEY PROMOTE BIOLOGICAL UPTAKE OF CONTAMINANTS – CLEANING THE WATER THROUGH NATURAL MEANS.
- SUN ON OPEN WATER DECOMPOSES SOME BACTERIA , ANOTHER CLEANSING EFFECT.
- NATURALIZED SRBS ARE DESIGNED TO PROVIDE SIMILAR FUNCTIONS AS WETLANDS.
- AT 6.7 HECTARES / 16.56 ACRES, THIS SRB WILL HAVE A LARGE AREA OF OPEN WATER AS WELL AS A NATURALIZED EDGE.
- THE NATURALIZED SRB WILL BE DESIGNED WITH AN AREA OF PERMANENT OPEN WATER SURROUNDED BY WETLAND PLANTS, **SIMILAR TO A CLASS V WETLAND**

THE CITY OF WINNIPEG HAS COMMITTED TO THE CREATION OF A NATURALIZED SRB HERE:

- THE CITY'S WATER & WASTE DEPARTMENT HAS PROMOTED NATURALIZATION OF NEW SRBS FOR THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS.
- SPECIFIC TO THIS SITE, A NATURALIZED SRB IS REQUIRED BY THE CITY'S **ENVIRONMENTAL ACT LICENSE** FOR THE SOUTHWEST TRANSITWAY, WHICH SAYS:
  - *"THE LICENCEE SHALL REPLACE THE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTION OF CATTAIL STANDS AND WET MEADOW AREAS IN THE PARKER LANDS THAT ARE IMPACTED BY THE DEVELOPMENT WITH*

    NEW AREAS OF SEMI-AQUATIC VEGETATION, AQUATIC VEGETATION AND A POND HABITAT

    THROUGH ***DEVELOPMENT OF THE PLANNED PARKER RETENTION POND.***"

    CITY OF WINNIPEG - SOUTHWEST RAPID TRANSIT CORRIDOR - STAGE 2, LICENCE NO. 3121, DEC. 18, 2014, CLAUSE 12.

EXTENT OF FUTURE NATURALIZED SRB



- THIS STIPULATION OF THE LICENSE WAS PROMPTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW OF THE TRANSIT CORRIDOR, WHICH STATED:
- *"THE CITY OF WINNIPEG CONCEPTUAL AND FINAL DESIGN FOR THE PARKER RETENTION POND IS ANTICIPATING TO* ***INCORPORATE NATURAL FEATURES AND NATIVE PLANTS****, SUCH AS THOSE USED BY NATIVE PLANT SOLUTIONS (A DIVISION OF DUCKS UNLIMITED CANADA), A GROUP CURRENTLY DEVELOPING METHODS AND PLANS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF STORMWATER PONDS THAT INCORPORATE UPLAND, WET MEADOW, AND WETLAND PLANTS AND FEATURES FOR CONSTRUCTED PONDS (ROSS 2013) ...*

  ... THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PARKER RETENTION POND AS WETLAND HABITAT WOULD PROVIDE COMPENSATION FOR THE PROJECT EFFECTS ON THE WET MEADOW AND CATTAILS STANDS ... ***PROVIDE POTENTIAL AMPHIBIAN AND OTHER WILDLIFE HABITAT****, MEET REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS, AND ADDRESS STAKEHOLDER CONCERNS."*

  CITY OF WINNIPEG – TRANSIT DEPARTMENT SOUTHWEST TRANSITWAY – STAGE 2 *ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT*, APR. 2014. SECTION 18.1.19 "WETLANDS"

SIMILAR URBAN WETLANDS IN WINNIPEG

- THERE ARE OVER 60 NATURALIZED SRBS IN WINNIPEG.



- THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PARKER RETENTION POND IS TO BE CARRIED OUT BY WINNIPEG'S WATER & WASTE DEPARTMENT.
- THE DEPARTMENT HAS REITERATED *THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT* POSITION IN A REPORT TO COUNCIL, SEEING:
  - ***"THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE NATURALIZED SRB IN THE PARKER LANDS AS A MITIGATION MEASURE FOR THE LOSS OF WET MEADOW AND CATTAIL STAND AREAS."***

  AND STATING THE FOLLOWING ABOUT THE DESIGN OF THE SRB, THAT IT:
  - ***"...PROVIDES AN AESTHETICALLY PLEASING ENHANCEMENT PUBLIC FACILITY – THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SRB WILL BE LANDSCAPED TO ENHANCE THE AREA IN THE LANDS IT WILL BE CONSTRUCTED. THERE ARE OPPORTUNITIES FOR PATHWAYS AND PLEASING LANDSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS."***

  ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT *EXPROPRIATION OF LANDS – COCKBURN-CALROSSIE COMBINED SEWER AREA - DRAINAGE UPGRADE PROJECT*, REVIEWED BY CITY COUNCIL PRIOR TO THEIR VOTE CONFIRMING EXPROPRIATION OF LAND FOR THE CREATION OF THIS SRB; JAN. 27, 2016.

NATURALIZED STORMWATER RETENTION BASIN

GEM EQUITIES INC.

FEBRUARY 10, 2016

APPENDIX B Open House #2 - Questionnaire & Feedback Summary

Open House 2.0 Questionnaire Aug. 22, 2016

The map below shows a DRAFT plan of part of the Parker Lands Major Redevelopment site.
We'd like to get your opinion on some aspects of the plan:

Q1: Where would you locate playgrounds in the Planning Area?
Place an 'X' on the map where you think playgrounds would best be located.

Q2: What other amenities would you like to see in the area (e.g. community gardens, skating rink, public art or performance space, circuit training route...)?
Place an 'O' on the map where these amenities would best be located.



Q3: What would you like to see developed in the areas closest to the Transit Station?
eg: Greenspace, Playground, Medium-Density Multi-Family Housing (as indicated in the plan above), Single Family Housing, Open space for temporary activities like farmers market, other ideas.

Open House 2.0 Questionnaire Aug. 22, 2016

Q4: What is your opinion on the streets proposed at the Open House?
For example, do they do a good job of accommodating alternate modes of transportation - bikes, buses, and pedestrians?

Q5: The developer plans to retain part of the existing forest as natural parkland.
What aspects of the existing treed area would you most like to see retained?

Q6: In what ways does the information from the environmental survey presented at the Open House reflect your understanding of the site? How does it differ?

Q7: Was this open house helpful? Yes / No

Please provide us with any additional comments you might have:

Q8: To help us compile the questionnaire results, please tell us where you live (check all that apply):

[ ] Beaumont
[ ] North of the Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site
[ ] West of Waverley Street
[ ] East of Pembina Highway
[ ] Other

APPENDIX C Public Update January 2018 Responses to Questions from Website

Question #1 on January 23, 2018

"Good evening,

I am a very concerned about a few aspects of this development. The major issue I have at this point is the 'preserved forest with accessible paths'. What forest preservation tactics is the contractor using? When driving by this site there is enormous amounts of mud from different soil horizons piled up even above the tree line. It does not take an ecologist or environmentalist to realize this change of grade and increased machinery will affect this site. Who is expected to deal with the ramifications of this forest disturbance? It does not seem ethical to label on your map a 'preserved forest' when there are not really any forest preservation tactics in place. If you would like to sell the idea of having a forest in your development, shouldn't you protect it?
I also saw in the FAQ section, that a reason for decreasing woodlot in this area included invasive species. What would these be?
It also says in the FAQ section that there is a tree protection plan in place, I would be interested to know what this is as there appears to be heavy machinery close to trees, as well as change in grade to the trees. Generally, I would imagine, this is avoided in tree protection plans.
There is also a small park near here that just has some boards around the trees, with evidence of machinery driving right around them.

Describing a development as an environmentally sustainable community does hold the developer to be responsible for being environmentally sustainable. What steps is this development currently taking to be and become environmentally sustainable?
Looking forward to hearing back from you."

Response on February 5, 2018

"Thank you for your comments on the Fulton Grove development plan.

We are updating the website to incorporate the recent plan changes and apologize for any confusion caused by the information related to the old site plan which contains the preserved forest now called the "woodlot".

The plan for this site has been developed with extensive consultation and in accordance with the stated vision, plans and processes set out by the City of Winnipeg.

In your message, you raised the following issues: the preserved forest and tree protection plan, the change of grade, the invasive species and environmentally sustainable development.

As you noted, the development plan has been updated. The preserved forest or the "woodlot" has been removed to make way for open greenspace that links the site together and affords greenspace areas for children to play and people to gather. These changes were inspired by Canadian expertise in urbanism and city building. The consultant recommended that the woodlot was not a component in best practices for developing contemporary urban neighbourhoods. She instead recommended a public realm that provides

green space where people can gather and children can play. A woodlot exhibits many of the characteristics that a nationally-known design criteria, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, suggest should not be present in greenspace design.

The approach to greenspace design is a unifying public realm with safe open space for families and a linked street network that creates one overall community. The green spaces will provide safe play areas with good sight lines and in walking distance to residences. At the same time, residents would still be able to access within hiking distance the dog park to the south of the neighbourhood and the naturalized retention pond area to the east.

Changes to the site elevation are a result of discussions with the City of Winnipeg Public Works. The City set out grade requirements to enable the development's services to link to City service connections. The developer's engineering consultants designed a solution acceptable to the City that resulted in the change of elevation to the site. This engineering solution mandated by the City resulted in the elevation of the site increasing by 3 feet to as much as 12 feet in the southwest corner of the site. The elevation increases around the park area ranged from 3 feet in the east to 8 feet along the west.

The City-approved site servicing design requires changes to the elevation which will result in a "sunken" park location which would lead to access and drainage problems and divide rather than connect the development. This criteria along with the best practices in greenspace design led to re-thinking of the appropriateness of the original woodlot for this site.

For further information on potential invasive species, you can access the most recent ecological study in the website's Reports section. If you click on ecological reports and then scroll down to the last link which is called "community park retention area overview", click on that link. This report will answer your question on invasive species and also speaks to the impact of human use of greenspace sites.

Overall, revisions to the site plan are consistent with the City's vision for this parcel of land as a high density, multi-use neighbourhood. In 2010, City Council adopted the *OurWinnipe*g plan which identified this parcel of land as a Major Redevelopment Site (MRS). These MRS provide the City with the best option to accommodate population growth while limiting urban sprawl.

Infill development is environmentally sustainable. Infill developments maximize existing City infrastructure and reduce the costs and environmental impacts of constructing new roads and sewer and water lines that would be required with suburban expansion.

We have been and continue to listen to public comments on the development plans of this exciting new project."

Question #2 on January 28, 2018

"It is distressing that with all the protests by residents/community groups that we do not have any/enough clout to stop the bulldozing of the rest of the Parker Wetland forest. How this decision could even be able to be made with the well known objection from the community is mind-boggling. We as a community need to get a lesson from the Loudoun Rd residents as to a more effective way to be heard."

Response on February 2, 2018

"Thank you for your comments on the Fulton Grove development plan.

The plan for this site has been developed with extensive consultation and in accordance with the stated vision, plans and processes set out by the City of Winnipeg. As the site currently is zoned as industrial, commercial development and activities could take place without any public consultation or City approvals.

Over the past decade, the City has identified major intensive residential development as the preferable use for this property. As the City explored options to reduce urban sprawl and maximize existing infrastructure, this land was chosen as one of 11 opportunities for new urban neighbourhoods based on a complete communities model. In 2010, the Fulton Grove site was designated as a Major Redevelopment Site (MRS) when *OurWinnipeg* was adopted by City Council as the planning document to guide all future development within the City.

These "transformative areas" provide the City with the best opportunity to accommodate population growth using existing infrastructure and minimizing environmental impact. For more information, please visit the City Policies section in the www.fultongrove.ca website.

Since that City decision eight years ago, the redevelopment process has been determining the appropriate levels of intensification to fulfill the City's vision for this parcel as a transit-oriented development. The public consultation activities and stakeholder engagements that have occurred over the past three years are part of the process to follow best practices in the development of the site.

The public comments gathered during the consultation phase do not support your specific comment around the "well known objection from the community" related to this development. What has been well publicized over the past few months is that a small group of trespassers decided to occupy that land until a court ordered this illegal activity to cease.

A list of the public comments from the two open houses held in 2016 and 2017 can be found on the website.

We have been and continue to listen to public comments on the development plans of this exciting new project."

Question #3 on January 21, 2018

"Updates on residential properties being built specifically senior living."

Response on February 5, 2018

"Thank you for your comments on the Fulton Grove development plan.

The plan for this site has been developed with extensive consultation and in accordance with the stated vision, plans and processes set out by the City of Winnipeg.

In your message, you asked the following question: Updates on residential properties being built specifically senior living.

The type of residential properties being built on the site range from duplex and triplex homes to single family detached residences in an infill context. This means that these homes will have lot sizes much smaller than a traditional suburban development. Lot sizes range from 25'x100' to 36'x110' for the single family and duplex residences.

Townhomes and multi-family buildings will also be constructed on the site. The multi-family apartment buildings and condominiums will range in size from a 32-unit 4 story- building to potentially a 156- unit 13-story building. Depending on market conditions, the individual land owners will choose the size and the use, including potentially seniors living, for their site.

The concept for the site is to create a community that offers all ranges of housing options and seniors living certainly fits within that range of housing options."

……

Question #4 on February 5, 2018

"The last I read on this was there would be a wonderful dog park, also that there would be a temporary dog park in this area! Is this still true? A lot of people have been waiting to hear."

Response on February 6, 2018

"Thank you for your comments on the Fulton Grove development plan.

The plan for this site has been developed with extensive consultation and in accordance with the stated vision, plans and processes set out by the City of Winnipeg.

Please note that there never was a dog park on this site or planned for this site.

Decisions around dog parks and their locations are the responsibility of the City of Winnipeg. The Brenda Leipsic dog park, for example, has always been south of the proposed Fulton Grove development, and it is our understanding will remain in that location once the City completes construction on the bus rapid transit line. Further queries about dog parks are best directed to the City."

……

Question #5 on March 21, 2018

"This is a family friendly area. Where will the children go to school?? This is too many units for them to attend the nearest school in Fort Gary."

Response on March 28, 2018

"Thank you for your comments and interest on the Fulton Grove development plan.

Consultations with the City and Winnipeg school divisions, including Divison Scolaire Franco-Manitobaine, have indicated that there is no need for a new school for this district. These consultations took place as part of the Parker Lands Secondary Plan analysis.

Our research indicates that the Fulton Grove site is situated in south central Winnipeg and has the distinction of being located in close proximity to the boundaries of two School Divisions: the Winnipeg School Division and Pembina Trails School Division.

Fulton Grove technically falls within the catchment area of Winnipeg School Division, Ward 1. Schools located within this district are Brock Corydon (N-6), Grant Park High School (7-12), Harrow (N-6), J.B. Mitchell (N-6), Montrose (N-6) and Rockwood School (N-6). These are all across the rail tracks which bound the north edge of the site, however, with the Waverley and Pembina underpass projects underway, access to these schools will be much improved with their new dedicated Active Transportation pathways under the active rail lines.

Both Winnipeg and Pembina Trails school divisions indicate there is capacity within the existing schools, with the Winnipeg School Division citing two other schools within Ward 1 that were closed in the early 1990's (due to an aging population and declining enrolment in this district) and could represent additional capacity if deemed necessary.

There are other schools that are close by but not in the neighbourhood catchment area (in Pembina Trails School Division) where further available capacity does exist. The closest public school to Fulton Grove would be in the Beaumont Neighbourhood (at General Byng School for K-9). The associated High School in this division is Vincent Massey at 975 Dowker Avenue (grades 9-12 for immersion and 10-12 for English) which also has some capacity for older students.

Future discussions with these two neighbouring school districts will have to take place as development proceeds to determine final placement for the future students.

Question #6 on March 22, 2018

"We are interest to know if the apartments can be rented or purchased. We are interested in a two bedroom apartment possibly with a den. What would the cost be and will you put in on a waiting list? Is the apartment pet friendly, small cat?
The project looks fabulous and we can hardly wait to see it or even move in.
Thank you."

Response on March 28, 2018

"Thank you for your comments and interest on the Fulton Grove development plan.

Fulton Grove will have a variety of owner and rental housing choices with apartments representing one of many types that will be available.

There will be multiple developers building apartment units on the site and each will have their own unique character and building specifications. Unit size, unit type (bachelor, 1 bedroom, 2 bedroom , or 3 bedrooms), types of finishes within the unit, etc. will all determine the prices charged for the units. The option to allow pets into the building will also be at the discretion of each of these developers.

Please check back to the website periodically as we will post updates on the zoning approval process and news on when the first phase of residential development will begin.

Thank you again for your interest."

……

Question #7 on May 10, 2018

"Hi, I was looking at the detailed map. I just wanted to know what the blue and red dots mean? Also, will there be a path connecting to the Sobey's/Grant Park Festival location?"

Response on May 16, 2018

"Thank you for your comments on the Fulton Grove development plan.

The plan for this site has been developed with extensive consultation and in accordance with the stated vision, plans and processes set out by the City of Winnipeg.

In your message, you asked about what the dots represent on the site plan.

The red dots illustrate walking paths and sidewalks throughout the site and demonstrate connectivity as a key component in this this transit-oriented development (TOD).

The blue dots represent the walking proximity to the transit station. Transit-oriented developments define proximity as a 400 to 800 metre - or a 5 to 10 minute walk.

We recognize the value of a future connection to the Sobey's/Grant Park Festival. It is not in the control of the developer to construct a pedestrian link across the CN Rail mainline. Ultimately that decision will be made by CN and the City to the extent each party has jurisdiction to make those decisions. The developer sees merit in the pedestrian bridge and if the City and CN were amenable to it, then this option could be explored in more detail between all parties.

We have been and continue to listen to public comments on the development plans of this exciting new project."

RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

PARKER LANDS Area Master Plan **Questionnaire Results** Aug. 24, 2016

	Where do you live?					Summary of Concerns (can be positive or negative)							MF Housing South of Stn			Playground Location						Was OH Helpful?		Other Amenities Desired	Comments
	Beaumont	North of Parker	West of Waverley	East of Pembina	Other	Traffic	Public Facilities	Greenspace	Density	Commercial	BRT	Pedestrian / AT	Yes	No	N/A	Near Station	High Density Zone	In Park Preserve	In Dog Park	Near Pond	N/A	Yes	No		
	79.3%	3.4%	0.0%	10.3%	6.9%	55.2%	31.0%	75.9%	27.6%	24.1%	27.6%	58.6%	6.9%	55.2%	37.9%	13.8%	6.9%	10.3%	3.4%	6.9%	62.1%	93.1%	6.9%		
	23	1	0	3	2	8	9	22	8	7	8	17	2	16	11	4	2	3	1	2	18	27	2		
	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1						1		performance space, decent community club	sound test wanted - concerned with noise from BRT
	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1					1	1		multi-purpose community centre	concerned with cut thru traffic and noise from BRT
	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0			1				1		community gardens	agrees with environ survey; concerned with traffic
	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0			1				1		community gardens, greenspace, playground	save oaks/forest by east end of land, high traffic
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1						1	1		electric vehicle charging station	supports TOD, car-sharing, green house gas reduction
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0						1		1	place for basic retail, farmers market	need walkable community; invasive weeds in forest
	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0						1	1		land dedicated for schoo or CC, no fence at pond	dog park too big, parking to N of station, trees are scrub
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1						1	1			noise barricade btwn BRT corridor and Heatherdale
	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0		1					1		open public space bystation, not housing	traffic concerns; comprehensive env study; school div?
	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1						1	1		seniors bldgs in greenspaces; schools	congestion already of traffic; schoold div?;
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1						1	1		walking bridge over tracks	want good quality construction and exteriors
	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0						1	1		CC; spray park, soccer, playgrd not close to transit	families need open space; access to Taylor and Grant
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0						1	1		community garden, public art, performance space	nature playground - exploration and coonect w nature
	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1							1		church, convenience stores, schools	good mix of young familes with loss of seniors
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1						1	1		forest near dog park, ped connection to taylor	rename dog park; crime protection; accessability; lots of swamp
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1						1		splash park for kids	
	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0						1	1		police station	no residential; no thought gone into planning; love wild life
	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0					1		1		police,fire hall instead of BRT stn, preserve all forest	disagrees with BRT route; waste of time and money; schools?
	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0					1		1		circuit training, maintain greenbelt btwn exist and new	no develop along Parker; traffic issues; start with med density
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1						1		1	leave my forest alone	to many memories in the forst - don't tear up my childhood
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1						1	1			I do not agree with developing this part of the city
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1						1	1		leave exist piece of nature alone	this development is not readily welcomed in this neighborhood
	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0				1			1		community gardens, public art, circuit training	bike path across tracks; trees north of parker as buffer; traffic
	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0						1	1		community gardens, public art, bridge to taylor	survival of forest difficult if cut up; bird survey lacking; fen in pond
	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1						1	1		milkweed for butterflies;overpass to taylor	don't like that buses taken off pembina
	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0		1	1				1		public art , community garden, skating rink in forest	good env info; likes proposed streets and geothermal; all positives
	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1						1		skating rink, popup shops; covered market, MPR	summerland type highrise; denisty is too light; brownfield site
	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0						1	1		greenspace in all the development	waste of existing greenspace;90% under concrete!
	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0						1	1		preserve all existing forest	wasn't asked for feedback; far too many housing units

Total # of Respondants 29

Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site
Engagement Report:
Addendum to September 2018 Report

The Applicant added to the previous public engagement activities, with new sessions being held before the public meeting and public hearing set for November 16, 2020.

The previous engagement sessions, including the 2018 public engagement actions leading to up to November 13, 2018, are reported in the ***Parker Lands Major Redevelopment Site Engagement Report, September 2018***. A copy of this Engagement Report was submitted to the Winnipeg Public Service in 2018, and again on October 20, 2020.

1. Public Engagement Events 2020

Given the on-going public health environment, the Applicant aligned to current, widely accepted professional planning standards of using on-line, interactive engagement platforms to safely reach the public to deliver information about the development, solicit feedback, and respond to questions.

- A series of live, public engagement sessions were held via the on-line web platform *Zoom*.
- The Applicant's professional team made presentation on the proposed development – *see Attachment* A.
- The Applicant's professional team was available and participated in a Q. & A., post-presentation.
- Professional team members participating included:
  - accredited land development engineer,
  - accredited traffic engineer,
  - professional architect,
  - professional landscape architect, and
  - professional planner.

The events were held on;

- October 28, 2020 – 10:00 AM
- October 29, 2020 – 7:00 PM
- November 1, 2020 – 3:00 PM

Registration for the on-line Zoom meetings was accommodated at the Fulton Grove website.

https://fultongrove.ca

Members of the public also submitted questions via the website: the Applicant's professional team provided answers to each of the questions submitted directly back to the questioner.

2. Advertisement

Announcement of these events was done by advertisements in the two (2) largest daily newspapers; the weekly community newspaper; and hand delivery of flyers to nearby neighbourhood households.

Print advertising for these events was published in the Winnipeg Free Press, Winnipeg Sun and the Sou'wester – *see Attachments B,,C, D* and *E*.

The Winnipeg Free Press on October 20, 2020 and the Winnipeg Sun on October 21, 2020:

- The Winnipeg Free Press reports a weekday readership of 177,000 [print] and 225,000 [print & digital] – *see Attachment B.*
- The Winnipeg Sun reports a circulation of approximately 50,000 [print].

The Sou'wester advertisement was October 21 and October 28, 2020 with half page advertisements on each date.

- Canstar reports a circulation of 38,300 households including the neighbourhoods immediate around the Parker Lands – *see Attachment G*.

Advertising flyers were hand-delivered on October 23, 24, 25 to approximately 1800 houses in the Beaumont Neighbourhood, the Ebby-Wentworth Neighbourhood, and the eastern half of the Grant Park Neighbourhood [homes east of Nathaniel Street] – *see Attachments H & I*.

Flyers were not delivered to apartment buildings due to current health protocols.

The web site [https://fultongrove.ca] was also updated with event announcements – *see Attachment J*.

3. Participation

a) The breakdown of participants of the on-line event:

- October 28, 2020 – 10:00 AM. One (1) person.
- October 29, 2020 – 7:00 PM. Twenty-eight (28) persons.
- November 1, 2020 – 3:00 PM. Seven (7) persons.

b) The breakdown of viewers to the website are on *ATTACHMENT L - Website Stats – October 7 to November 5 2020.*

- The number of unique visitors for the timeframe *October 7 to November 5 2020* is 396.

4. List of Attachments

ATTACHMENT A – Engagement Presentations.

ATTACHMENT B - Winnipeg Free Press 20 October 2020 Advertisement.

ATTACHMENT C - Winnipeg Sun 21 October 2020 Advertisement.

ATTACHMENT D - Sou'Wester 21 October 2020.

ATTACHMENT E - Sou'Wester 28 October 2020.

ATTACHMENT F - Winnipeg Free Press Circulation**.**

ATTACHMENT G - Canstar Market Coverage.

ATTACHMENT H - Fulton Grove Flyer October 2020.

ATTACHMENT I - Flyer Distribution Map.

ATTACHMENT J - Fulton Grove Website Announcement.

ATTACHMENT L - Website Stats – October 7 to November 5 2020