APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
	SUBMITTED DURING VIRTUAL ENGAGEMENT SESSIONS (March 17, March 18 AM, March 18 PM)	
1	Are there any policies about accessibility?	Web Session 1
2	Will there be any incentives for accessible housing given that it's typically more expensive to build? Will there be any requirements for accessible housing to be built?	Web Session 1
3	Will there be any requirements for accessible housing to be built?	Web Session 1
4	Follow up to my previous 'affordable' question. I understand 'affordable' is considered 30% of income. I just did a mortgage calculator. A $350,000 mortgage at 5 year closed rate of 4.59% over 25 years is $1,954.71 a month. This exceeds an annual income of $60,000. Online google searches state an average salary in MB is $48,879 per year. WHERE ARE THESE AFFORDABLE houses being built? I've searched and it's very difficult to find a home for $350,000 that DOES NOT need upgrades or work.	Web Session 1
5	I understand 'affordable' is 30% of income. So, my quick math based on $60,000 a year income would be about $1,500 a month. So, how does someone making less than $60,000 a year afford a home?	Web Session 1
6	is there a website where we can put our household income details and see if the person is eligible?	Web Session 1
7	Should the by-law also include inclusionary zoning to ensure that infill is adding to affordable and deeply affordable units.	Web Session 1
8	We see a lot of housing going up along Pembina Hwy. With regards to 'affordable housing', can you please let us know 'what affordable housing' means in relation to dollar amount? Also, I see that frequently 'affordable housing' refers mostly to apartments. Where is there 'affordable housing' in terms of single dwelling homes? And how much in dollar amount are these SINGLE DWELLING HOMES, if any? Thank you.	Web Session 1
9	What do you consider 'affordable'? In dollar amount?	Web Session 1
10	What is the percentage of income related to affordability?	Web Session 1
11	What will be or is the most INEXPENSIVE 'affordable' housing unit to purchase?	Web Session 1
12	Why isn't the city just building affordable housing itself instead of waiting for the free market to solve things?	Web Session 1
13	why not assist with making single family housing more affordable? a lot of young people would like to have a house but are priced out of the market	Web Session 1
14	Will these 2, 3 or 4 unit complexes be for rent or for sale? If they are for sale, in dollar amount, what will they sell for? Will they be TRULY affordable for the lower middle class younger generation just 'starting out'?	Web Session 1
15	Will the city amend its building code to allow taller single staircase apartment buildings (point access blocks) like British Columbia has?	Web Session 1
16	Wondering how Landmark got hired for this project and who they are representing.	Web Session 1
17	I live in River Heights neighborhood and I'm seeing character homes disappearing and being replaced by cheap infill development that does not fit with the aesthetic of the surrounding area. This can't help but have a negative effect on property values. Why does this not seem to be a consideration?	Web Session 1
18	Will the CMHCs pre approved housing designs still be subject to public hearings or not?	Web Session 1
19	Also on page 9 is the statement "Potential impacts will be reduced through proposed zoning regulations related to built form". Where are those "proposed zoning regulations" articulated?	Web Session 1
20	Can you provide a map showing where 4 units can actually be built based on existing lot widths.	Web Session 1
21	The maps do not help people visualize as the scale is limited. Are the shaded map overlays available for Google Earth as a KMZ file?	Web Session 1
22	where are the street maps on the website?	Web Session 1
23	would this deck be shared with the people who have joined this meeting?	Web Session 1
24	Who will get max benefit - ordinary citizens, developers or investors ?	Web Session 1
25	are all areas being considered? there are some areas people have moved to specifically because they don't want density	Web Session 1
26	What is the definition of a frequent transit corridor?	Web Session 1
27	Who chose the "800 metre from frequent transit" rule? Someone in Ottawa? This is ridiculously far to walk if you don't have a car - especially in winter. No one would choose to walk 800 metres (equivalent to walking from Main Street to McPhillips) to get to transit in winter. This plan actually encourages sprawl and dependence on cars. If you want to encourage use of transit, the limit should be within 100 metres of transit.	Web Session 1
28	Will the city take into account that a front street has been designated a cycling route where infills will be built. Two years ago the city designated our front street a cycling route, 30 speed limit, speed bumps, now with 2 new infills, cycling route will be a parking lot, with much increased traffic.	Web Session 1
29	what was meant by the comment that greenspace will be preserved by building up?	Web Session 1
30	The North St. Boniface Secondary Plan was revised in 2017. As a result of community input, both Low and Medium Density Residential Policy Area will not exceed a maximum height of 35 feet. Why does the Housing Accelerator Fund proposed increasing 4-unit developments to an increased maximum height of 39 feet? Residents in the North St. Boniface area do not support this height increase.	Web Session 1
31	Comment that lots must not be designated as parkland. why would that be?	Web Session 1
32	Is the policy city wide or only in certain areas, some of the focus of the density increase has been in areas already denser? While suburbs are not targeted.	Web Session 1

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
33	Will existing infrastructure be sufficient or require upgrading, if so who will pay ?	Web Session 1
34	I'm in favour of increasing residential density, but I am concerned out our failing sewer and water infrastructure	Web Session 1
35	What is the city doing to deal with the increase in sewer and hydro requirements.	Web Session 1
36	Will developers be allowed to buy two lots side-by-side and amalgamate lot size? If so, what parameters will be implemented to ensure vacant lots are well-kept while developers wait for adjacent properties for to come sale?	Web Session 1
37	is there a detailed map that shows street names as well as the colored areas so you can tell if your house might be surrounded by 2-4 plexes?	Web Session 1
38	I would love for you to add the option to include a commercial unit on a lot. After all, some places are in need of grocery stores and third places.	Web Session 1
39	1 parking lot per unit will increase street parking, changing streets into parking lots, making cycling less safe, and dangerous for kids playing	Web Session 1
40	As ecstatic as I am about this project, I have my concerns about some restrictions. Each residential unit requires one parking space, parking spaces are a poor use of land, they're impervious, take up land, drive up prices, etc. Why is the city insisting on parking minimums when we should be moving to abolish them like Edmonton has done?	Web Session 1
41	can parking lots be assigned from neighboring properties as has been done on grosvenor and yale and approved by city?	Web Session 1
42	Is there consideration for reducing parking minimums closer to those frequent transit lines?	Web Session 1
43	The city currently has rules that if you are building new rental units with "Affordable Rents" then the parking requirements are .15 parking for each affordable rental unit. If a proposed 4 plex is built with all 4 units being affordable, then why this new minimum parking requirement of 1 parking stall per unit?	Web Session 1
44	Why do the proposed zoning changes have parking minimums when we're in an era where our contemporaries like Edmonton and Saskatoon have done away with them altogether?	Web Session 1
45	Aside from showing up to the public hearing, what are effective ways to show support for these changes?	Web Session 1
46	Can the by-law be amended for additional requirements for green space and trees?	Web Session 1
47	Can you define your use of the term "unit" Is it related to the number of bedrooms? Is it a separate walled off family space within a building?	Web Session 1
48	Does council vote on this by seriously taking into account the public's opinions? From attending previous meetings, the vast majority of people in attendance (from my viewpoint) expressed OPPOSITION.	Web Session 1
49	Downtown already very dense? On what planet?	Web Session 1
50	Easy question: How many participants are on this call?	Web Session 1
51	Hi. I understand this is a 'proposal'. By definition, 'proposal' means a 'plan or suggestion'. Is there any possibility whatsoever this 'proposal' WILL NOT go through? I'm asking the previous question, because I see condos or apartments already going up in parking lots.	Web Session 1
52	How soon will these changes be implemented?	Web Session 1
53	How were "mature neighbourhoods" selected/defined?	Web Session 1
54	I would like to know why the consultation on this is so limited in time and geographic reach. Sessions should be done in every ward with the specifics discussed for that area. You are talking about replacing a potential 150,000 public hearings with one. Assuming that hearings would generally happen in 10 of developments, it is replacing 15,000 public hearings with this one. What level of jurisdiction (province, Charter, or city) sets the rules for public consultation?	Web Session 1
55	If we support the zoning changes what is the best way to voice that support to the city?	Web Session 1
56	Is the only reason we are discussing this now is because of the Federal Governments funds are on a finite time frame? Why had Winnipeg not moved forward a on density housing before now?	Web Session 1
57	it seems to me that these houses are already being built. does that mean they need to get permission for each build.	Web Session 1
58	Once an application is approved, how long will the developer have to complete the project? How long is a building permit valid?	Web Session 1
59	Potentially, the neighbours would not be notified until the demolition team arrives. Various jurisdictions require a letter of approval from the neighbours with the application. Will the city notify neighbours when an infill application is received?	Web Session 1
60	Sorry I may have missed this at the beginning but after these engagement sessions, what are the next steps before this goes to council?	Web Session 1
61	Thanks for todays presentation! Question - do you know when the city of Winnipeg enacted their zoning restrictions that made middle housing like this illegal to build for these past decades?	Web Session 1
62	These changes appear to affect development in perpetuity. Can the as-of-right rule be removed in the future (after it has served its purpose). For example, remove it after the immediate need for housing has been met by 2026 (?). This change will affect 150,000 properties to only create a few thousand units (3000 units).	Web Session 1
63	This is not just a change to a zoning bylaw. It is fundamental change to the rights of individuals (and councillors) to have a say in development within their neighbourhoods. As such, will it require a super majority to pass Council?	Web Session 1
64	what % of the money is going to Not for Profit?	Web Session 1
65	What happens to the federal commitment if there is an election this spring and the Conservatives win?	Web Session 1

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
66	What happens when the Housing Accelerator Fund ends/gets cancelled?	Web Session 1
67	What research are is used to support the comment that it's not likely that a bungalow will be stuck between two multi-unit homes? These are already a few examples of this with in-fill homes.	Web Session 1
68	when is it going for counselor votes ?	Web Session 1
69	Where is the HAF money going on this initiative?	Web Session 1
70	Who approved the "As of Right" process? Does not appear to be democratic and lacks transparency. Was this tied to the HAF agreement from the Federal gov't. Seems to give an advantage to the developers.	Web Session 1
71	Why Is the public's right to appeal being stopped instead of managed differently to allow reasonable concerns to be voiced?	Web Session 1
72	Why isn't a public hearing required?	Web Session 1
73	Why isnt a public hearing required?	Web Session 1
74	Will neighbours be given any advance notice that the infill is about to be built? Our neighbours home has been vacant for over 1 year.	Web Session 1
75	Would anyone still be able to "apply" for a conditional approval for a four plex on a 25 foot lot as they did in the past? So not "as of right", but rather an application where the neighbors can decide if they support the application for variance or not?	Web Session 1
76	Would these rules be applied to urban reserves like Naawi Oodena?	Web Session 1
77	You didn't describe the changes in the local process for approval that make it faster?	Web Session 1
78	Your slides show really nice pink and blue buildings with porches but what has been built in Glenwood is square grey boxes. Who will be approving the designs of these infill fourplexes?	Web Session 1
79	What are the requirements for a neighbourhood to be designated as mature?	Web Session 1
80	Currently changes in zoning and subdivision trigger a land dedication or payment in lieu of land dedication. Will this as-of-right rule significantly reduce the amount of land that is dedicated for public purposes and/or payments from developers that can be used to purchase land for parks? Will the city require a land dedication payment for all properties affected by this new zoning bylaw?	Web Session 1
81	In the fourplex building, who is responsible for the maintenance of the unit and the yard?	Web Session 1
82	What will be the impact to neighbour's property value and sellabilty with a 3 to 4 unit infill, particularly a 4-story one?	Web Session 1
83	Will older homes in mature neighbourhoods suffer from lower property values compared to the newer homes built?	Web Session 1
84	Does the city have a plan to pave more gravel lanes to allow greater number of units to be built in the future?	Web Session 1
85	in areas with combined sewers are the impacts of infill housing being considered	Web Session 1
86	Over the past few years our area has lost power more than other areas of the city according to HYDRO. Will the electrical infrastructure be upgraded to support new builds?	Web Session 1
87	The North End treatment plant and the combined sewer areas of the city cannot accommodate this level of infill density. Why is the infrastructure plan only being addressed after these changes - rather than preceding these changes? This will result in taxpayers having to pay for the infrastructure to support private developments.	Web Session 1
88	Was water and sewer capacity considered when the city designed area for increased housing density? Are there any servicing capacity concerns?	Web Session 1
89	What is the city doing to deal with the increase in sewer and hydro requirements.	Web Session 1
90	Why being allowed where combined sewers are in place?	Web Session 1
91	Why does the city only consider gravel and paving for back lanes? There are innovative permeable pavement products (e.g., Ecoraster) that can stabilize lanes while allowing runoff to soak in - relieving the stress on combined sewers	Web Session 1
92	Will sewer upgrades be required for 3 & 4 units? Builders currently get around this requirement by calling them "secondary units"	Web Session 1
93	will the city pave back lanes to the areas identified where 3/4 plex can be built?	Web Session 1
94	with current heavy rains from climate change, where do you anticipate water can drain if lots are completely covered by concrete?	Web Session 1
95	Allowable distance from side property line? Will this be from the building or from an exterior staircase?	Web Session 1
96	Are 3 foot side yards going to be allowed? The renderings on pp 18 & 19 show only 3 feet.	Web Session 1
97	are new developments allowed to built up to the back alley and are balconies allowed in the back alley? eliminating any privacy of the property on the other side of the back alley?	Web Session 1
98	Are there different building fire codes for a 4-story project compared to a 3-story project? 2-story?	Web Session 1
99	Are there different building fire codes for a 4-story project compared to a 3-story project? 2-story?	Web Session 1
100	As noted on page 9 of the presentation, some properties could experience shadows cast by infill buildings. That could reduce access to direct sun especially in winter when the sun angle is lower, reducing enjoyment of sunshine by the affected home occupant and reducing solar gain (which is promoted by Efficiency Manitoba as a source of home heat). Given that, what measures will be taken to avoid causing shade on existing houses and yards?	Web Session 1
101	can you build 2 units on top of a garage?	Web Session 1
102	Could you elaborate on how a mature neighbourhood such as Tuxedo which has very wide lots could be impacted on the development changes? Curious whether you anticipate that there could be a lot of 4 unit development in a neighbourhood like Tuxedo, whether it is Old Tuxedo, Middle Tuxedo, or "new" Tuxedo, mostly because the lots are so wide.	Web Session 1
103	For the 2-units, do the current rules allow for building those with a gravel back lane or is it currently only allowed with paved back lane?	Web Session 1
104	How far will new builds be from the property line on the side of the new home? example old River Heights mature neighbourhood.	Web Session 1

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
105	I live on a 75 foot frontage lot, gravel back lane and no sidewalks in our character neighbourhood. Would 3 two up units be allowed on my lot? This would look very odd given the 1920 to 1960 builds and the character of the neighbourhood would be aesthetically ruined. Does that matter? Also with no sidewalks, isn't pedestrian safety an issue and concern by adding traffic?	Web Session 1
106	I saw that there are certain limitations regarding the design of in-fill houses. The ones on the examples were very pretty due to architectural detail. Without the balconies, verandas, etc. these new buildings might not be as nice. - Who decides on the individual design?	Web Session 1
107	In an area such as the North End, what would be the new minimum front yard set backs and the new minimum rear yard set backs please?	Web Session 1
108	In Wolseley, will there be any consideration of the character of the current homes in the area. Will the new proposed buildings be similar in style, or can the builder decide. Also, if there are currently no front drive, a paved back lane. Will that zoning be changing also?	Web Session 1
109	is there a limit on what size of lot will be considered for multiple units? the "long and skinny" look right in an older neighborhood	Web Session 1
110	Is there a minimum lot depth for a 3-plex or 4-plex on a 50' lot with a paved back lane? How close can the new structures be to existing property lines?	Web Session 1
111	is there a required set back from back alley?	Web Session 1
112	is there an interest in looking at these changes for the newer areas? a lot of the newer areas in the city have large houses (basement walkouts, houses that take up a full lot).	Web Session 1
113	our street has overhead wiring will 2-4 plexes be allowed?	Web Session 1
114	Proposed reduced side-yard setbacks further increase risk of fire spread, and limits options to have windows installed within those walls. Why reduce fire safety and resident comfort (access to daylight) by reducing side-yard setbacks?	Web Session 1
115	The house next to me is a 24 foot lot. I want to confirm they will not be able to build a two family home. This house is owned by a developer	Web Session 1
116	The rules do not provide any rules about green building design. Infill removes mature trees and covers more land with impervious structures or surfaces. What rules will mitigate these impacts (green roofs, rain gardens, rainfall capture systems, etc.)?	Web Session 1
117	there seems to be a disparity between lot coverage at around 50% and imperious surfaces around 12% . can that be explained%	Web Session 1
118	What are side lot distance requirements?	Web Session 1
119	What is the current allowable lot coverage limit?	Web Session 1
120	What is the current maximum lot coverage per zoning category?	Web Session 1
121	what is the minimum lot depth for 3 plex or 4 unit development ?	Web Session 1
122	What will be the allowable setback from the front road or sidewalk compared to neighbouring dwellings? For example, if the neighbour's home is 25 feet from sidewalk, what will be allowed for the infill next door?	Web Session 1
123	Why is the city not allowing 3 and 4 unit buildings on lots adjoining gravel lanes instead of paving the gravel lanes?	Web Session 1
124	Will the city support lot split on 50 ft wide lot on a gravel back lane ?	Web Session 1
125	In my neighbourhood there have already been many 50ft lots divided and 2 2-story buildings constructed with jut-outs on the sides of these buildings. Are these jut-outs considered to fall within the percentage of lot covered or not since they do not actually touch the ground? Are they still going to be allowed in the new rules?	Web Session 1
126	Can these be condos or rentals or both?	Web Session 1
127	How does the funding work. Who gets it. The builder. Is the intent to have the homes or rent or sale.	Web Session 1
128	So if I understand you, I could buy a house, knock it down, build a four plex, within the guidelines, and then rent these units out with no restrictions on what the charged rental fee would be? If that's the case, then how do these infills help the housing crisis? Seems the city wins with the property taxes. Correct?	Web Session 1
129	On slide 28, I don't see Ness Avenue indicated on the map. Is it not 'frequent' or higher? Would 4-storey be allowed north of Ness Avenue?	Web Session 1
130	Are trees seen as green infrastructure in this bylaw to assess the value of old trees not being replaced by planting new young small trees?	Web Session 1
131	I am concerned about potential impacts of increased density and larger building and parking footprints on mature trees (eg damage to roots and canopy, loss/removal of trees) found in mature neighbourhoods. Also, the larger building and parking footprints will reduce the land area available for growth of new shade trees. This appears to conflict with the Complete Communities Strategy 2.0 and the Winnipeg Urban Forest Strategy which notes "…a majority of Winnipeg's canopy (is) believed to occur on private land…" Given the likely adverse effects, what specific action will be taken to protect mature trees and to increase the urban forest canopy (as recommended in the urban forest strategy)?	Web Session 1
132	the reality is all trees and shrubs are removed when an infill is built. That is my observation in St. James. What policies will be in place to insure we don't loose our canopy as well as gardens.	Web Session 1
133	We live in a heavily treed neighbourhood. What are the protections for the current mature trees? Previous developments cut down mature trees and the city was given money to plant new trees.	Web Session 1
134	What landscaping plans/tree protection will developers have to follow and how do neighbours see those plans before and during construction of each project to ensure compliance? Will the City of Winnipeg staff be tracking how much green space and how many healthy trees are lost in each neighbourhood?	Web Session 1
135	Those of us who love our older, mature neighbourhoods have legitimate concerns about the loss of healthy mature trees and green spaces (side yards, backyards) and corresponding loss of biodiversity including loss of birds, butterflies, bees, rabbits etc. How will our neighbourhoods be compensated for this loss? Will there be a new public parks and mandatory tree planting in our older neighbourhoods?	Web Session 1

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
136	Those of us who love our older, mature neighbourhoods have legitimate concerns about the loss of healthy mature trees and green spaces (side yards, backyards) and corresponding loss of biodiversity including loss of birds, butterflies, bees, rabbits etc. How will our neighbourhoods be compensated for this loss? Will there be a new public parks and mandatory tree planting in our older neighbourhoods? What landscaping plans/tree protection will developers have to follow and how do neighbours see those plans before and during construction of each project to ensure compliance? Will the City of Winnipeg staff be tracking how much green space and how many healthy trees are lost in each neighbourhood?	Web Session 1
137	What about additional protection for trees and green space? Loss of area for green space puts more pressure on the sewer system.	Web Session 1
138	Could we see these zoning bylaw changes include the right to build "granny" suites/cottage units?	Web Session 1
139	You mentioned the goal is to build 14,000 houses including 20-200, 2, 3, and 4 units. How many of each size do you anticipate building? Also, where are the lots for the 2,3, 4 unit housing coming from?	Web Session 1
140	Does the city have any plans to end separation of residential and commercial use?	Web Session 1
141	how many people are in a unit?	Web Session 1
142	With the city reporting upwards of 1,000 boarded up derelict properties in areas such as the Inner city. These boarded up properties are fire traps for homeless people and use up valuable resources of our fire fighters, not to mention provide very low property tax revenue for the city. Why wouldn't four plexes be allowed in areas such as the North End on 25 wide lots to be the ONLY option for those derelict property owners to actually do something that makes financial sense with their property? Can there be a "special" rule that in order to build a 4 plex in the North End on a 25 foot lot, that all 4 rental units must have affordable rents? with the existing .15 parking requirement for each affordable unit, then 4 units would require .60 parking spots for 4 affordable rental units. This would help deal with so many challenges in the North End as an example. 4 units can even be done easily with in a 39 foot height maximum	Web Session 1
143	I live on Sturgeon Creek. Presently there are strict waterway easement rules. Will these be maintained to preserve flood plains and protect the creek and its surrounding habitat, as well as fish and animals?	Web Session 1
144	can you provide a map of high frequency bus routes and the 800m areas that would be eligible for 4 level buildings	Web Session 1
145	Further to my comment and question about potential adverse effects on mature trees and urban forest canopy, the City's Small Scale Residential Development Guidelines for Mature Communities outline provisions for "landscaping" for different types of infill residences. But as these are guidelines and the provisions use the verb "should" vs "shall" there is no requirement for proponents to comply. What specific, enforceable rules are in place or will be put in place to achieve the guidelines?	Web Session 1
146	many unused empty spaces in the city are not being used. how will you stimulate current empty unused spaces/houses/businesses, rather than destruction of adequate houses in beautiful neighbourhoods, which developers are eying to purchase and develop, since better investment. adding to increase waste.	Web Session 1
147	The North St. Boniface Secondary Plan was revised in 2017. As a result of community input, both Low and Medium Density Residential Policy Area will not exceed a maximum height of 35 feet. Why does the Housing Accelerator Fund propose increasing 4-unit developments to an increased maximum height of 39 feet? Also, will the Winnipeg Zoning By-law, Building Height, Rule of Measurement (>1:3 rise to run) remain the same? Example: A gable roof with a roof slope greater than 1:3 will measure to mean level between ridge and eave, therefore a "39ft height" could result in a 50ft ± roof peak? Residents in the North St. Boniface area do not support this height increase.	Web Session 1
148	What is currently defined as "Park land"?	Web Session 1
149	when developer buys up two or three lots , you had mentioned they need to apply to change the combined lots into a subdivision, are application for subdivision change always permitted? has it ever been denied? meaning by allowing developer to buy up lots, they basically can now by pass the 50 ft lot limit etc and build 4 plex on to street where the proposed new by law would have kept some 2,3,4 plex from building in certain area.	Web Session 1
150	Interesting that you don't mention Edmonton abolishing parking minimums, a policy that has already helped with housing in Edmonton.	Web Session 1
151	All these height restrictions just to appease people who want their neighbourhood to die with them.	Web Session 1
152	Abolish Parking Minimums	Web Session 1
153	Is the city going to address traffic violence by slowing down cars and reducing unnecessary car trips?	Web Session 1
154	All these height restrictions just to appease people who want their neighbourhood to die with them.	Web Session 1
155	And some places even have parking maximums. Abolish Parking Minimums Now!	Web Session 1
156	A 50ft 4 storey block next to two bungalows wouldn't even be ugly, it would have more character than most of the suburbs.	Web Session 1
157	visualization give very green impression. this is not my experience from infill housing in my neighbourhood: lots are maxed out, with too little parking space, no green space, trash bins on the street 7 days week.	Web Session 1
158	Public Hearings Are Actually Bad For Democracy.	Web Session 1
159	To me (and probably many others), this 'proposal' of living seems very confined and claustrophobic, lacks privacy and lacks yard space. I'm 100% completely AGAINST this 'proposal' for several reasons.	Web Session 1
160	process at city council is unaccessible for persons in workforce	Web Session 1
161	Idea: Rezone all R1, R2, RMF, and RMH to RMU. Rezone all C1, C2, C3, and C4 to CMU. Allow residents in CMU and commercial in RMU.	Web Session 1
162	can parking lots be assigned from neighboring properties as has been done on grosvenor and yale and approved by city?	Web Session 1
163	Just because people complain there isn't enough parking, doesn't mean there isn't enough parking.	Web Session 1
164	these questions are likely for the denser housing areas- are you partnering with agencies ie MMF, MITT	Web Session 1
165	You did not answer who you represent. Developers? City of Winnipeg? Winnipeg Residents?	Web Session 1
166	You said at the start that communication with people creates better results but these changes are designed to eliminate input from the local residents who know their neighbourhoods best..	Web Session 1
167	Are you going to broaden the amount of land zoned as mixed use?	Web Session 1

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
168	Comment: I reject this proposal!	Web Session 1
169	I see R1 districts owned by single families will be drastically changed especially areas that have 50 ft and wider lots.	Web Session 1
170	I don't know if the affordability piece can truly be answered without knowing cost of construction, who is building (who has ownership), price of unit or cost of rent, etc. With construction being expensive and this process now expedited , is there a concern about quality of construction?	Web Session 1
171	Are you going to address my questions? They are in the Q and A tab not the chat.	Web Session 1
172	There's no way that a 4-plex built next to a 100 year old million dollar home is going to increase property value.	Web Session 1
173	Was curious one city councillor Brian Mayes has been very critical of the zoning changes but has recently said his mind has changed a little. Can you say what made him change his mind a little?	Web Session 1
174	these very tall structures do not lend themselves to the elderly or disabled users	Web Session 1
175	That's easy developers and the city who reap the property taxes and the licensing fees	Web Session 1
176	not everyone will benefit.	Web Session 1
177	The northeast corner of the city does not have the road infrastructure (without the Chief Peguis extension) to support this level of density.	Web Session 1
178	Do you think tearing down a $350,000 house and building two narrow $750,000 houses with no backyard creates affordable housing?	Web Session 1
179	All of the above	Web Session 1
180	How can you justify the proposed guidelines when the department recommended a 6-unit, 2 story project with 9 parking stalls on a 60-foot lot backing onto a gravel back lane? RMF by-law required a 9,000 square foot lot but now you are proposing to allow on a 5,000 square foot lot.	Web Session 1
181	You do not have to go through subdivision for every amalgamation under the current legislations. FYI	Web Session 1
182	Not a question, but a serious comment. Please put yourself in the position of a landlord who purchased a home in the north end a few years ago because they wanted to help the area, and that property was vandalized by a tenant, so the owner fixed it up, and then it was vandalized again and again, until the point, that the owner had no choice but to leave it as a boarded up derelict property. Then the city dramatically lowered the "market" value of these properties by changing the rules so that owners were no subject to costs associated with fire remedial costs which dramatically lowered the value of these properties. So now that owner is "stuck" with a property that is worth so little that in some cases, the owner is "donating" it to the city, or allowing the city to take in "tax sale". My comment is that the ONLY hope for these property owners was to build a 4 plex up to 39 feet in height with a 2.5 or 3.5 feet level structure. This rule of NOT allowing 4 plexes on 25 foot lots in the North End fails.	Web Session 1
183	Do the consultants live in Winnipeg? In Manitoba?	Web Session 1
184	Most homeowners take better care of their homes than renters. 2,3,& 4 unit housing is occupied by renters.	Web Session 1
185	I'm wondering if there will ever be restrictions on how low the density can be in newly constructed neighbourhoods. It seems like new areas are contributing to enormous suburban sprawl, significantly increasing the km of roads that the city has to pay to maintain.	Web Session 1
186	you need to address loss of trees and green space. it is the number one issue for many of us	Web Session 1
187	Will older homes in mature neighbourhoods suffer from lower property values compared to the newer homes built?	Web Session 1
188	Higher population densities are actually better for green space.	Web Session 1
189	Removing mature trees and replacing them with new saplings will not replace the function of the mature trees for at least 50-80 years (e.g., shading/cooling, capture of runoff, evapotranspiration, etc.) - if at all.	Web Session 1
190	Why would the presentation propose "Facades are limited to no more than 2 materials"? Why does the City of Winnipeg feel they need to control the quantity of facade materials? Please stop controlling property owners for mundane details.	Web Session 1
191	The new suburbs get to keep their bike trails and meadows and fake lakes but we lose our small yards and trees. Not understanding this logic. This needs to be better explained.	Web Session 1
192	I have to leave but thanks very much for this presentation.	Web Session 1
193	Removing mature trees and replacing them with new saplings will not replace the function of the mature trees for at least 50-80 years (e.g., shading/cooling, capture of runoff, evapotranspiration, etc.) - if at all.	Web Session 1
194	Another thing that bothers me and I am sure many others who live in a mature area are the ones who now will have to deal with the 4 plexs. Many people who live in these areas chose these areas for trees large lot sizes and now we get to deal with no more sun and no parking	Web Session 1
195	It takes these builders years to actually build houses and they sit empty for a couple years and then the unhoused more in. This is currently happening on my street	Web Session 1
196	2' sideyards creates conflict between neighbours as the side of the building cannot be reasonably serviced or constructed for that matter without going onto the neighbouring property. Consider using a minimum of 3 feet. Less litigation and complaints.	Web Session 1
197	The problem is that parking minimums induce demand, when there are more parking spaces available, more people are gonna drive in the city. The problem with cars in the city are numerous, they use lots of space to move few people, they emit hazardous chemicals, they are loud, they create an unsafe pedestrian environment, people want to live in the city, not a parking lot. This is before bringing up climate change. Even if all cars became electric tomorrow, it wouldn't fix the problem of tire particles or dust, and all the parking surfaces would act as a massive frying pan, making the city so much hotter than the surrounding plains. In the era of oncoming climate catastrophe, encouraging more driving is the last thing you want to do.	Web Session 1
198	Thanks for sharing this information and for answering our questions.	Web Session 1
199	although 4 stories is more expensive, my experience not this is a deterrent	Web Session 1
200	Most people have moved into mature neighbourhoods because of the trees, character and community. Why is the City willing to sacrifice the character of our mature neighbourhoods which we invested our time and money in, and raised our families in?	Web Session 1
201	Thank you! Very informative.	Web Session 1
202	Thank you	Web Session 1
203	The right to light. 2 new infills beside our 750 square foot bungalow, ridiculous.	Web Session 1
204	Thank you for this. Your time and answers … and transparency … are appreciated.	Web Session 1
205	Thank you. This has been useful!	Web Session 1
206	Regarding shadows, its not just the height that is the concern but also how much the new building extends beyond the back and front of the neighbour's home. what is the back setback compared to neighbour's.	Web Session 1
207	More specifically. Where can I buy an 'affordable' home for $220,000 in Winnipeg?	Web Session 1

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
208	The increase in density is only possible because of the backlanes, which allow for more parking access to dwelling units, and thus allows for more people and cars to be crammed into the same space. The City is willing to allow the destruction of our mature neighbourhoods, essentially because we have backlanes. This isn't proposed for new neighbourhoods because they don't have backlanes. How is this considered fair that mature neighbourhoods must make all the sacrifices for housing density?	Web Session 1
209	Great job!	Web Session 1
210	thanks!! great information, very clear!	Web Session 1
211	Thank you! Very informative.	Web Session 1
212	Thank you very much for this evening's presentation and opportunity. You were all very helpful at helping us understand the new proposal.	Web Session 1
213	Thank you	Web Session 1
214	Can the Federal funding causing all these changes be restricted to supporting ONLY affordable and social housing?	Web Session 2
215	Has there been consideration to align CMHC minimum units required for their msi select program with city zoning? IE 5 plex allowed as well? This would be a welcome change for affordability!	Web Session 2
216	I understand that we are talking about infill housing, but understand that this is with accelerated housing funding and tied to affordable housing... are these infill houses actually meeting the CMHC standards/prices Hazel just mentioned? I know the ones that have already occurred in my neighbourhoods to not match this housing.	Web Session 2
217	I'm concerned that this isn't enough to get the building industry going in Winnipeg. I don't think this is enough clarity and certainty. Also doesn't really help with land price per door with our requirements for land drain water retention kicking in after 2 units.	Web Session 2
218	I'm still a little confused. From what I understood from the answer about 'affordability', these infill homes that are being talked about aren't 'affordable' for the average Manitoban's salary. But, the word 'affordable' keeps being used. Please help me understand. Thank you.	Web Session 2
219	To solve housing concerns for low-income families, what can the City do as part of the HAF project to ensure that a certain portion of the new housing is affordable for low-income families and that the fund doesn't just benefit developers?	Web Session 2
220	Why use the word 'affordable' to describe infill housing? Doing the math, these houses have to be under $250,000 for an average Manitoban to afford. Here's the math: - Yesterday's meeting said 'affordable' is 30% of income - Average salary in MB is around $50,120 - Therefore, "affordable" means NO MORE THAN $1,253 / month (30% of $50,120 is $15,036 a year divide by 12 months is $1,253) - A $250,000 infill home with a 20% down payment; Term of 25 years; interest rate of 6.571% works out to a monthly payment of $1,359.30 a month. (Noting this is STILL more than what's 'affordable' based on an average salary). - An average 1 bedroom apartment in Winnipeg is around $1,480 a month; also NOT 'affordable' for an 'average Manitoban's salary'.	Web Session 2
221	Will any of these 'affordable' housing units be under $250,000? If not, according to my math (as submitted previously), these infill homes are not affordable for the average Manitoban. So why, call them 'affordable' housing? Why not just call them 'infill housing'?	Web Session 2
222	Are there ways to encourage developers to plant and protect trees?	Web Session 2
223	As some of the diagrams showed, there is an increase in impervious layers and greenspace with these infill developments. This results in smaller lots, often with a parking spot, and a smaller front yard that does not often allocate room for trees. This directly effects Winnipeg's canopy cover, which is outlined in the City Council approved Urban Forest Strategy. How can a rezoning bylaw be proposed that directly affects another already Council approved strategy?	Web Session 2
224	Given that MOST mature trees are on private property this densification will impact the canopy - what is your response to that?	Web Session 2
225	House footprint has increased. How do you compensate for the loss of pervious surface in the face of climate change when adverse weather events? We need enhanced water management . The loss of pervious surfaces goes against this.	Web Session 2
226	Is there not a bylaw coming re: removal of trees on private property? It pertains to keeping the tree canopy no matter where the tree is located. Also effort by the city to maintain green and ecological soundness of the city. Co-development of the Greenspace Plan and Biodiversity Policy	Web Session 2
227	There are trees that are decades if not possibly over 100 yrs old in mature communities. Can there be allowances to protect these being taken down and replaced by new trees as is the current practice?	Web Session 2
228	These pictures show mature trees. Is that an accurate representation of how these areas will look when being built? About how many mature trees will be cut down to accommodate these infill houses? And will (and when) these trees be replaced?	Web Session 2

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
229	What protection will be ensured for our crucial urban tree canopy, especially for mature trees on private properties?	Web Session 2
230	With nearly all the infills in my neighbourhood yards/green spaces are eliminated for larger buildings and parking. How does this plan impact the need to preserve green/natural spaces in the community including yards and avoid having these spaces eliminated?	Web Session 2
231	a potential impact or detriment is the chonicity of construction in some neighborhoods. Being in a construction zone for 6 weeks, 6 months, 6 years is hazardous and has many negative outcomes. Is there a densification limit or end point for each area.	Web Session 2
232	can and will any of the abandoned/boarded up housing in the city be utilized for this? Or fixed up to fill some of the housing units?	Web Session 2
233	Does the city measure residential density? At what point does the city determine that a neighborhood cannot sustain any additional development?	Web Session 2
234	How many single family homes are included in this plan?	Web Session 2
235	Why has Winnipeg not reduced parking spaces per unit? Can we still recommend that to facilitate a modern city?	Web Session 2
236	Curious about how a possible change in government affects this process? Would the city (highly unfortunately) consider not implementing these changes with a different federal leadership?	Web Session 2
237	Does anyone on the board or committee who makes the final decision on whether or not to proceed on this plan work for the City of Winnipeg? If so, does anyone see this as a 'conflict of interest' since the City is presenting on this and from my perception it appears that the City is in favor of this.	Web Session 2
238	have we achieved the required home builds for the HAF	Web Session 2
239	Under what circumstances would park land be rezoned to allow for development?	Web Session 2
240	What happens when the Housing Accelerator Funds ends/get cancelled?	Web Session 2
241	What happens when the Housing Accelerator Funds ends/get cancelled? (I.e., Do all developer permissions remain if the government changes and the HAF is gone.)	Web Session 2
242	You have said “nothing is decided yet”. This is clearly a well-developed and detailed plan with many years of work behind it. What is the City actually open to adjusting?	Web Session 2
243	Can the city's sewer system handle all these?	Web Session 2
244	How does sewer/water capacity affect this “as of right” zoning approval? Can we also push for grey water recycling to be allowed in conjunction with new zoning?	Web Session 2
245	How will this increase in sewer/water use be managed by the City, that already has difficulty managing sewer and water infrastructure?	Web Session 2
246	So in most of Charleswood with ditches and chipseal roads there would be no building anything other than single family correct? Can we fix this?	Web Session 2
247	We already have a huge amount of traffic. How will increased traffic be handled?	Web Session 2
248	What happens to LDS sewer requirements for 3 units or more. Will that still stay same as it is now?	Web Session 2
249	Building shadowing/sun blocking. Why isn't there consideration for the existing homeowners when the infills are approved. The single family older home height dwellings are being entirely sun blocked in some of these situations. How does this consider any homeowners rights or does anyone care ? The infills should only be approved when this does not affect surrounding homes. I cannot see how it would increase a homes value.	Web Session 2
250	Can you define abutting (distance) rail lines.	Web Session 2
251	I'm wondering if there is any discussion on the minimum allowable size in multi-units. A simple way to make units affordable is to make them smaller. This obviously increases density and all it's associated benefits to city-living and infrastructure costs. A multiunit I was involved with years ago was required to have an average of 800 sqft/unit which essentially made it impossible to make affordable units for students/young adults, older people, etc. If you look around the rest of the world, including places with nice cities like europe, there is a huge supply of very small units..	Web Session 2
252	On 25' lots, could we build front-back duplex? Or why are those not allowed?	Web Session 2
253	When you are talking multi plexes are you referring apartments as well because i believe corner lots can easily handle up to a 12 plex i refer to Enniskillen @ Salter there are 2 and 7Oaks @ McGregor has a 4 plex on both corners	Web Session 2
254	Why are we going from 35 ft to 39 feet? is this to accommodate underground parking? This would be good as it can spare some impervious lot area.	Web Session 2

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
255	Why do your examples in the visualize infill housing slides have a traditional styled house when real infill houses are typically a very modern, spare design? Those slides are very misleading regarding how it will look. Builders, developers and designers DO NOT design houses like you have represented on those slides.	Web Session 2
256	Will changes be made to zoning and bylaws relating to detached secondary suites and when will these changes be looked at?	Web Session 2
257	So do I understand this correctly, these are not being built for helping our homeless/ low income families? Who is the targeted families for these?	Web Session 2
258	how does this rezoning project address climate resiliency	Web Session 2
259	With all the rivers & creeks in the city, with you add to the by-law that these new types of structures cannot come within 350 metres of these rivers / creeks	Web Session 2
260	Developers often come and disturb the boulevard, damaging boulevard and turf and create extra garbage and litter in the neighbourhood. Are there additional City resources allocated to try to mitigate these disturbances/damage?	Web Session 2
261	Has there been any thought given to compliance during the construction faze and ensuring the builds have been completed. Glenwood residents have had little traction on compliance and with more houses being built I expect this to only get worse with more housing being built.	Web Session 2
262	Considering the plan has a focus on Malls and corridors, is anything being done to address the problem of giant fields of parking lots, which are along all our malls and corridors? Perhaps requiring underground parking, and perhaps switching to angle parking on side streets? What strikes me most about Winnipeg, is the ubiquitous parking fields everywhere I go, which could instead fit all the high density housing we need, in exactly the location we want it. Again, we could simply look to Europe... and all the nice cities there that we like to go see.	Web Session 2
263	how would parking during snow clearing be enforced as right now too many people don't move already	Web Session 2
264	Parking concerns. When only allocating 1,2, 3 or 4 spaces per unit being built. Where are the other vehicles going to park from those units ? Typically they spill out into the front or side streets causing cm of parking overall for current residents.	Web Session 2
265	Why don't we go down to .5 though or zero like other cities?	Web Session 2
266	Were the other jurisdictions that have implemented these infill proposals like Calgary and Edmonton, did adjacent property values decline and was it difficult for homeowners to sell their homes?	Web Session 2
267	Don't we need a new sewer system already? Has the math been done to make certain the sewer system can handle the new homes?	Web Session 2
268	So, 4 plex housing needs a paved back lane. What about the back lane paved at the intersection but turns into gravel?	Web Session 2
269	are the new housing units obliged to have electrical capacity for electric vehicles?	Web Session 2
270	Are there restrictions to entrances? IE only one on front façade? None on sides?	Web Session 2
271	How many multi-unit infills will be allowed on a city block? Unlimited numbers will overwhelm infrastructure, parking, etc.	Web Session 2
272	I am hoping that we can drastically improve these zoning guidelines. 800m distances should have minimum as of right of 5 units. This will kick-start affordable housing in our city. I do not see this current proposal moving the needle a whole lot. Hoping we can step up to a more walkable city.	Web Session 2
273	Likewise, I'm curious if there is any discussion about updating firecode such that 2 exits are not required. Again, a lot of the rest of the world does not have this requirement (though the units are generally not made of wood). Not having this requirement allows much more flexible (desirable) design, and larger units that can house larger families. I feel that North America has completely missed the concept of making multiunits actually desirable to live in for reasons other than they might be all someone can afford. This is probably not the right forum, there's just a ton of work left to be done to start getting this city into a mindset where we can build nice neighborhoods with high density. And thereby one day afford decent infrastructure.	Web Session 2
274	page 24- Where in the process can you fit in an expectation that door and window placement should take neighbors home design into consideration? Eg: doors should not be directly across from the existing neighbors bedroom. This creates livabilty issues regarding noise.	Web Session 2
275	Page 31 balconies-what are the regulations. Are they limited to the front?	Web Session 2
276	Where can the landscaping requirements be found?	Web Session 2
277	Will fence allowances be increased in neighbourhoods that are increasing the height to 39 feet?	Web Session 2
278	will secondary suites be allowed in side by side units, since this was mentioned in infill guidelines as but back in the day zoning by law was not updated. pls clarify	Web Session 2
279	Will secondary suites be allowed in side by side units, since this was mentioned in infill guidelines, but back in the day zoning bylaw was not updated. Pls clarify	Web Session 2
280	Will the new Zoning Regulations provides "trade-off" between more leeway (# of units) with limits to the number and extent of variations which invariably pop up to generate precedents for more build-up mass.	Web Session 2

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
281	Will there be enforcement to ensure completion of infill projects within a reasonable timeframe to prevent the proliferation of empty dwellings awaiting demolition and partially completed projects which can last for years in my area? This issue impacts the value of adjacent properties.	Web Session 2
282	Would 4 units be permitted on a corner lot where a home has an approach onto a regional road with full range of municipal services and the side yard is on a chip seal road with ditches?	Web Session 2
283	On page 8, is the long term plan to not "allow" single family rooms as residences go on the market in the desired areas?	Web Session 2
284	Would making additional transit routes the specified types also allow the 800 meter zones to surround the new routes?	Web Session 2
285	This might have been touched on, but in new developments are these infill and density guidelines being implemented?	Web Session 2
286	My feedback is please be more drastic. We have a rare opportunity here to really move this city into the future, and develop good framework and foundations for affordable housing. I would love to talk further, but let's take further strides on this. Reduce parking restrictions, allow up to five units as a right and let's be excited about the future of a sustainable, walkable, beautiful city!	Web Session 2
287	If you are on a corner lot could you switch address from a ave to a street to accommodate a 4 plex build	Web Session 2
288	Removal of mature trees on private property to build a structure with the intent to 'replace' the mature tree lacks logic as the replacement tree will take years to do what the mature tree does for the ecosystem of Winnipeg, and health for all.	Web Session 2
289	My questions were answered. Much appreciated. Thank you.	Web Session 2
290	Thank you for taking the time to allow for a thorough presentation	Web Session 2
291	Great work everyone.	Web Session 2
292	Can you provide link to slide deck we saw, please.	Web Session 2
293	Thank you again for taking my questions. It was helpful to attend a second time.	Web Session 2
294	If there is a change in federal government and the funding program is canceled, is this zoning change still needed	Web Session 3
295	I have already read the presentation materials. What wasn't clear is if this would be a blanket rezoning for all single family properties. Previously it was said that those properties that were not on public corridors or near riverbanks would be excluded. is that still the plan?	Web Session 3
296	If a developer wants to build using the proposed infill housing rezoning, will they be required to obtain a variance and will the community have a chance to voice their concerns? or will they be approved upon application?	Web Session 3
297	You talk about width. what about properties that are narrow, but very long. Could a developer petition to have an exception to the building form requirements?	Web Session 3
298	Will this bylaw stay in place once the housing funding from the Feds is gone?	Web Session 3
299	if the plan would include all properties, and the intent is to include more affordable housing in all locations, what requirements would developers be required to fulfill to ensure that affordable housing is being met.	Web Session 3
300	Currently, the housing accelerator will create only about 900 affordable units. Yet, the federal government is putting in $120 million into this, when so few units are actually affordable to people. Is this not just a way of just allowing developers to build future housing, with few restrictions, to make money for the few who can afford it? We've seen infill examples in our neighbourhood where each of the four units built on what was a single family home is worth more than the single home	Web Session 3
301	We have seen the current infill housing going in within our neighbourhood. They already are designed where people with disabilities and seniors with mobility issues aren't able to live in them. Are we now designing a city where people with disabilities are forgotten while seniors will not be able to age in place years earlier than they do now?	Web Session 3
302	My other big request is that, when tearing down to build new - can we please make it so that builders cannot pound out old foundations while the ground is still frozen? Or change the methods, so that it minimizes the damage to surrounding homes. Damaging our existing housing stock doesn't help homeowners, or the lack of housing. IMO.	Web Session 3
303	The federal government has revised the number of immigrants and foreign students coming to Canada. Does this affect the need for future housing in Winnipeg, by how much, and how does this affect Winnipeg's current housing plan?	Web Session 3
304	Where can we find the map of mature neighborhoods?	Web Session 3
305	I am also concerned about the environmental impact where we have urban forestry and how that will be affected. it seems counterintuitive to have infill housing to reduce city expansion to protect climate, where our local urban forest will be impacted.	Web Session 3
306	This may be covered in this presentation, but my concerns are around schools & daycares, which are already bursting at the seams.	Web Session 3
307	In neighborhoods with older infrastructure, such as hydro poles and sewer systems built prior to the 1970s, who is going to absorb the impact of upgrading these infrastructures?	Web Session 3
308	What is the definition of "high frequency transit stops"?	Web Session 3
309	For a 3 or 4 plex on a lot with a back lane. What are the new front yard set backs and rear yard set backs and the side yard set backs please? Thank you	Web Session 3
310	regarding impacts, has snow loading on adjacent properties been considered? if so, will the builder be required to upgrade adjacent property if it id not structurally capable of withstanding the new load?	Web Session 3

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
311	The current infill guidelines allow for a 4 plex on a 50 foot wide lot with a back lane? So what is the change? the 39 feet in height? or is the change the set backs and lot coverage ratio?	Web Session 3
312	Can a "Unit" contain a secondary suite? for example, a 2-unit side-by-side. Each with a secondary suite.	Web Session 3
313	Why are the lot sizes for the builds smaller in areas with backlanes than in areas with front drives? Why can a 3 unit be built on a 35 ft lot width whereas it requires 60 ft lot with a front drive? This appears to put the bigger builds in the older neighbourhoods?	Web Session 3
314	Slide 10 talked about up/down or side by side. Some lots are longer than others, I assume front and back units are acceptable? Cab over suites are a good option….May be good to spell it out…	Web Session 3
315	Is this lot coverage current or proposed values?	Web Session 3
316	What are current lot coverage now vs proposed change.	Web Session 3
317	Who identified which transit routes are considered to be "frequent" transit corridors" that delineate the 800 m building zones? Are those routes based on the new transit route system that is to be implemented this year?	Web Session 3
318	Under the lot coverage rules, under R2 zoning, your presentation has the wording N/A. what does that mean? Not applicable, or not available? so any lot coverage at all? please clarify?	Web Session 3
319	I'm not familiar with the infill zoning requirements but am wondering if they include time requirements or deadlines for completing landscaping and paving (sidewalks and parking pads) relative to start of construction and/or unit occupancy?	Web Session 3
320	How much have the percentages of lot coverage increased per type of dwelling? Only the proposed new percentages are shown. And, where do 2-4 unit dwellings fall within those categories?	Web Session 3
321	I have a home in River Heights, on Brock between Kingsway and Academy. It is a 50 ft property. Paved back lane. It is in a purple zone. So I can replace the existing single family unit and build a 4 plex up to 35 ft in height?	Web Session 3
322	Do the rules regarding lot coverage percentages include both the residential building and any free-standing garage?	Web Session 3
323	In the visual samples, the buildings look similar to those already existing in the neighborhood. Will builders be required to maintain neighborhood look and feel (but larger based on 2-, 3-, 4-)?	Web Session 3
324	Where can one find what their home is listed under which zoning district?	Web Session 3
325	In mature neighbourhoods you say new multi-units builds will use existing infrastructure? These cannot accommodate the higher density in terms of sewer use, drainage, parking, increased gargage,recycling/compost bins	Web Session 3
326	What measures are being taken to ensure the recently CMHC Housing Catalogue plans can by utilized in Winnipeg?	Web Session 3
327	Are these infill units intended for individual unit ownership or corporate rental/leasing?	Web Session 3
328	does it have to be a new build or modify and existing structure?	Web Session 3
329	What are the current rules regarding setback distances for residential units? Do the rules vary depending on the neighbourhood standard? Would the proposed bylaws vary any of the current rules regarding comparable setback distances?	Web Session 3
330	Will I be informed of, and be provided input on what is being built beside my home?	Web Session 3
331	So as long as I am following the rules outlined, I don't have to consult or appease my neighbours?	Web Session 3
332	We seem to be R2 - but it says we are n/a for lot size. What does that mean? Unlimited coverage of a lot?	Web Session 3
333	How will current infrastructure be upgraded to handle the increase in population density?	Web Session 3
334	What % of the 3-year housing units target (approx 15,000 units) is expected to come from new 2/3/4-plex builds? It seems to me (a layperson) that the % will be quite small, compared to higher density builds, no?	Web Session 3
335	On lots adjacent to riverbanks, will buffer zones be created to protect riparian vegetation?	Web Session 3
336	My lot is 75x256. In Charleswood with front drive & open ditch. Can I build more than one infill house on the lot given that I have enough property?	Web Session 3
337	What will happen if the transit routes are altered, such that a particular road is no longer (or becomes) a "frequent transit" route?	Web Session 3
338	I understand the transit routes are being changed this year. Are the transit routes used in this presentation affected by this?	Web Session 3
339	Will you allow sub division of lots to be expedited as well?	Web Session 3

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
340	By increasing density on lots, there will be less land for trees, bushes and gardens, and less open land for drainage and pollinator habitat, are we not going to have far more water runoff with no place to go, flooding our sewers, and less shade as the weather heats up?	Web Session 3
341	Any restrictions on removing historic trees on a property for infill? eg. 100 yr old Oak tree	Web Session 3
342	Will you limit the number of these developments per block?	Web Session 3
343	Visualizing 'infill housing' slides starting at slide 18 have wonderful graphics and what makes them beautiful is the abundance of trees. I would like to know in reality is there any protection for our many trees in particular our mature trees.	Web Session 3
344	Who determines what is a "frequent" express lane. If the express lane only runs on weekdays from 3-5 is that considered frequent?	Web Session 3
345	Will this policy exist in perpetuity? This seems like it will be carte blanche for developers, which can very likely not achieve "affordability" goals	Web Session 3
346	My concern with the increased density in a mature area like river heights is that the sewer system is single so in time of heavy rainfall it can and has been overwhelmed in the past. How can this be mitigated? How many units are allowed per block?	Web Session 3
347	Thank you for your presentation. A few questions, here's the first … Q - What % of the 3-year housing units target (approx 15,000 units) is expected to come from new 2/3/4-plex builds? It seems to me (a layperson) that the % will be quite small, compared to higher density builds, no?	Web Session 3
348	If there is already a rule that long empty walls are not permitted then why have they been allowed for the entire length of all the infill builds? Drive down Lindsay, Renfrew, Borebank, etc. The infills are oppressive walls along residents' yards from front to lane	Web Session 3
349	Adding street parking requirements to cycle routes like Wellington Crescent seems counter-productive and like it adds more danger to cyclists	Web Session 3
350	The minimum site width for a duplex is stated as being 25', however, there are currently infill properties in the City of Winnipeg, that have been developed with duplexes on lots that are less than 25' wide (23' and 24' wide). How can we be sure that the lot width requirement will be upheld?	Web Session 3
351	If the as-of-right bylaw process is allowed, how can concerned persons raise case-specific objections? What will the procedure be?	Web Session 3
352	I live on the (redacted) block of Beaverbrook St. We have several infill housing units in our area and in our street. One of the infills units has been in the process of being built for at least 3 years. How are you going to make sure owners will follow through on building these developments. Moreover, you talked about affordability. Another infill home on our street sits empty often as it used as an Airbnb. In short, it's not affordable for people to live there consistently.	Web Session 3
353	where is the rationale of removing the zoning notification before a building can be built	Web Session 3
354	Will this apply to lots along the River as well?	Web Session 3
355	There appears to be little or no direct reference to allowable depths of 2/3/4-plexes, beyond the maximum coverage area requirements. That would be of concern to existing neighbours, especially if shading occurs. Why not specify depths of buildings?	Web Session 3
356	Will the proposed bylaws include rules regarding how close the new units can be built to the property line, and what is that distance?	Web Session 3
357	What is the procedure for lots that do not fit the fairly standard shapes and sizes expressed in the diagrams?	Web Session 3
358	In older areas that have combined water and sewer, how will the extra flow be dealt with so the danger of spillage into the river will not be increased.	Web Session 3
359	What will be the process when building multiplexes and trees in the area that may need to be cut down or any regulations related to this.	Web Session 3
360	Will you begin a parking permit process to address additional parking on streets that are already full, as they do in cities like Montreal?	Web Session 3
361	will the infill housing be rental properties owned by the builders	Web Session 3
362	What has been the impact of the zoning changes implemented in other cities? ie have they speeded up process and increased number of new builds.	Web Session 3
363	What about riverbank protection?	Web Session 3
364	Of the 3.5 million homes CMHC says we need to build in Canada by 2030, how many proportionally is Winnipeg seeking to build? And will the bylaws include provisions to end the as-of-right rules when that target is met?	Web Session 3
365	I would like to know what happens with property taxes for people living in 2-3-4 units and what happens if some units are empty?	Web Session 3
366	The coverage changes seem to eliminate virtually all tree coverage from trees in backyards - have you considered how deeply impactful this would be to the tree canopy in neighborhoods like River Heights?	Web Session 3
367	There haven't been mentions of neighbourhood disturbance bylaws. Will they be amended to cover noise, construction vehicular traffic, damage caused to existing neighbour homes and trees, etc.? I don't live in the Glenwood area but have heard there have been MANY issues in this regard.	Web Session 3
368	Currently, bylaws permit a 6 person care home on any R1 lot. When multiple units are constructed on a lot, how many personal care spots are possible. I.e., can 4 units on a lot have 6 people in each?	Web Session 3
369	is 4 units the max units? or someone could build basement and add more units?	Web Session 3

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
370	How to book for preliminary technical meeting w/ public service? Any contact info from CW? Any payment required during preliminary meeting? What does CW need to start?	Web Session 3
371	What about the shaking noise and shaking of my foundation for months while the new development gets built. What is the process for dealing with these problems in as timely a manner as this urgent need for housing?	Web Session 3
372	is there a requirement for new infill houses to “match” the style of the neighbourhood?	Web Session 3
373	When you stated high value homes in your presentation what did you mean by that?	Web Session 3
374	what about City of Winnipeg owned, vacant lots? Could they be sold and developed without public knowledge or consultation? These are not green spaces or parkland, but vacant lots that may not have been developed in the past because they didn’t conform to zoning. They may now however, should the changes to the by-law be carried out.	Web Session 3
375	What plans are in place to ensure that the housing that is built is affordable?	Web Session 3
376	Would the city consider a 1.5 parking for each unit. 1 parking spot in a garage is extremely narrow and doesn't allow for bikes, snow removal equipment, strollers etc.	Web Session 3
377	I am concerned about existing infrastructure in old neighborhoods . I realize developers will be responsible for infrastructure running from the new infill homes to the existing sewer lines. However, with up to eight bathrooms with toilets, showers and four kitchens with two infills, this will put increased pressure on old existing infrastructure. Is the developer going to have to put up money for future infrastructure renewal which will be necessary due to these new builds.	Web Session 3
378	What is the impact on garbage collection/bins? will the 4 unit buildings require dumpsters?	Web Session 3
379	Is there a maximum number of multi unit infills allowed on a city block?	Web Session 3
380	Can these new units be developed as rental units or owner-occupied homes or both.	Web Session 3
381	My concern is about electrical and sewage infrastructure that was not designed for this level of usage. With the splitting of lots we've already seen an increase of brownouts. What updates will be done to the infrastructure?	Web Session 3
382	are you taking into consideration installation of utility meters with 2' side yard?	Web Session 3
383	One purpose of these zoning changes is to streamline / accelerate the building process by eliminating the public hearing process. For local residents to obtain some information about a project they see starting in their neighbourhood, are permits required to be posted on the City's permit lookup webpage prior to commencing work on site?	Web Session 3
384	can we have copy of the presentation? Or will it be poste on city's website?	Web Session 3
385	Whose responsibility is it to test for asbestos before tearing down? Will neighbours be notified of the asbestos demolition date?	Web Session 3
386	Having walked many areas around the city, I've noticed that any infill has chocked streets with onstreet parking. It would seem reasonable to expect a dwelling (suite) to have multiple vehicles (either because of a spouse or kids or both). I have been in Edmonton and noticed that they had wider streets to accommodate parking on both sides of the street and seems to have garages set back to accommodate an adequate approach to entry. Has the city considered the impact of densification from a parking (not necessarily a traffic) stand point of view? Would they entertain a long range goal of accommodating additional vehicles?	Web Session 3
387	What is Landmark's role in all of this. Seems to be a conflict of interest when they will be profiting from development of lots.	Web Session 3
388	What about parking issues - it is idyllic they take transit but there will be more cars/parking issues/ for sure so please address this rather than just wish they take transit. Is there a parking plan/by law - will they need parking permits like Toronto or Vancouver ?	Web Session 3
389	Sorry could I get clarification on my Qn about the percentage of the 3year new builds target. What percentage of that total is expected to come from new 2/3/4-plexes VS higher density builds?	Web Session 3
390	I have a 100' x 100'. How many units would be allowed to be built on my lot if my house was taken down.	Web Session 3
391	There is already limited parking on residential streets in my neighborhood. With infill homes now being presented as duplexes, that would mean potentially four vehicles for each infill. From what I have seen, there is insufficient parking in the rear for these vehicles. Where will owners shovel their snow from their parking pads? Also where will they place their two recycling and two garbage bins. Also where do their eavestroughs drain on such small lots.	Web Session 3
392	Will there be limits on how many multi-plex infills can exist on a block? Example, can several 4 plex units be constructed in a row on a street provided each unit individually meets the required specifications?	Web Session 3
393	how does this affect the value of my single family dwelling? and the city’s assessment of it? Would go down as a SFD (less desirable)? Will I pay less property tax for helping with this development.	Web Session 3
394	Is the proposed zoning bylaw changes pretty much a done deal? What is the probability that this will not go through?	Web Session 3
395	What impact has the new IRCC rules and reduced anticipated immigration have had on the projected need for housing. There are estimates that over 2M international people will be leaving Canada due to the IRCC policy changes.	Web Session 3
396	Could a panelist provide some insight into why municipalities were required to “as of right” 2/3/4plex builds in existing neighbourhoods, given that the bulk of new housing units would come from high density builds?	Web Session 3
397	What consideration is given to mature areas with combined sewer systems that are already allowing sewage flow into rivers?	Web Session 3
398	The city has presently received sixty million but there is no guarantee that the next instalment of sixty million will be available. Will this development style continue without this money?	Web Session 3

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
399	Are the infill development guidelines (2021) no longer in use?	Web Session 3
400	If there's time, may we go back to yard requirements? particularly 2 unit side by side	Web Session 3
401	Any requirements or encouragement to reduce impermeable surfaces to reduce runoff and encourage infiltration of water, to reduce strain on wastewater systems in combined sewer districts?	Web Session 3
402	Has existing adjacent building height been considered particularly related to affect of new taller structures limiting sun light penetration to existing one story or shorter existing homes.	Web Session 3
403	Where is the input of the Indigenous peoples with regards land development? That should be integral for reconciliation. Honouring the land in the stewardship of the peoples of the lands we are on	Web Session 3
404	How is lot width determined on streets with irregular lots, eg pie shaped with wide portion at the rear, or vice versa.	Web Session 3
405	What provisions will there be to ensure, ideally enhance, green space in affected neighborhoods, particularly preserving existing trees on property?	Web Session 3
406	What considerations will be given for snow removal in the back lanes. Typically in high snow years it is difficult to remove the snow and keep in out of the lane and on the owner property.	Web Session 3
407	Hi there, not sure if this is pertinent to zoning and building, but services like daycare and schools are already bursting and, in many cases, simply not available. Is this in the plan somewhere?	Web Session 3
408	You all sound as if this is a fait accompli and it is all going ahead - is that correct?	Web Session 3
409	What is the time frame for these votes?	Web Session 3
410	Will there be limits on how many multi-plex infills can exist on a block? Example, can several 4 plex units be constructed in a row on a street provided each unit individually meets the required specifications?	Web Session 3
411	If the street doesn't have enough street parking for the per unit, does that mean that the building cannot be built?	Web Session 3
412	Can you share how many participated in tonight's call?	Web Session 3
413	Are there any studies, either conducted here in Winnipeg or other cities on the Quality of Life of neighborhood residents where infill housing has been built?	Web Session 3
414	Are there any lots in the city under 25feet wide - if so what percentage?	Web Session 3
415	If the zoning by-law won't consider school enrolment, etc., will the City be working with the provincial government to address this issue?	Web Session 3
416	On the information dissemination process … Any reason for scheduling these sessions 3 days in a row, as opposed to over a 2 or 3-week period?	Web Session 3
417	Why are only some neighbourhoods given the consideration to regulate designs? How does a neighbourhood attain such status?	Web Session 3
418	why has existing character and style not been considered? Is this not felt to be important?	Web Session 3
419	What is the definition of "high frequency transit stops"?	Web Session 3
420	Specifically, I am concerned about infill housing on properties adjacent to public parks, like St Vital, Assiniboine and Kildonan.	Web Session 3
421	A property on Jubilee received a lot of media attention, because the existing community was concerned about parking. The development still went through. Yet, this property is not fully occupied upon completion. As a test case, it does not demonstrate that in that case the infill housing solution worked. What considers are being made as a result of that property's failure?	Web Session 3
422	In mature neighbourhoods you say new multi-units builds will use existing infrastructure? These cannot accommodate the higher density in terms of sewer use, drainage, parking, increased gargage,recycling/compost bins Where will the bikes go? You say the height preserves green space? The single home infills in our neighbourhood already clear cut the lot of mature trees, shrubs and grasses romfront street to lane How will larger structures with increased shading preserve green spaces? Why do only some neighbourhoods, such as Bridgewater, have control over new build design? We have had swaths of 3-5 unattractive tall skinny houses built in a row, some on subdivided lots that were previously single dwellings They tower over neighbouring homes and do not compliment the character of the mature homes on the street and greatly outprice the other homes Affordable housing?? How will the designs be regulated of these proposed larger structures that will have even greater impact on a mature neighbourhood?	Web Session 3
423	Why are side yards are too narrow. 3' and 4' are vary narrow especially when 2 infills are side by side. My bungalow is 7' on one side and 10' on the other.	Web Session 3
424	Does maximum lot coverage include impervious surfaces? could a builder build a building up to 57% and then pave the rest of the lot?	Web Session 3

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
425	I live in Rockwood neighbourhood where many houses around mine are post-war 1.5 storey or small bungalows on 50-foot lots that are accessed by back lanes. With time I am seeing more infill houses being built. Main problems to infill that I see include the following: No Parking signs being in place for long periods (as many as five weeks' time) without any work taking place on the work site; contractor vehicles damaging trees and public sidewalks, with said damage not being repaired; contractors demolishing existing home foundations and road pavement without the use of a concrete breaker, which causes vibration (and potential damage) to adjoining homes; contractors failing to clean dirt and debris from boulevards and roads after all work has been completed.	Web Session 3
426	As many infill homes are built with 4-foot side yards, does the infill bylaw include requirements for compacting the backfill around the house foundation excavation, to minimize subsidence or settlement of the adjoining properties?	Web Session 3
427	Excellent and very clear presentation. I think that our City needs these changes.	Web Session 3
428	Wouldn't that defeat the purpose then, if affordability isn't considered?	Web Session 3
429	The visualizations were very helpful.	Web Session 3
430	After listening to the response re affordability, I must say that the two infills being built across from my home priced at $749,000 each do not seem affordable especially in the present economic situation.	Web Session 3
431	The housing stock in river heights is being purchased 300,000-400,000 houses and the developers are making 2 tall houses (some already duplexes) on the same small lot with the houses going for 800,000-900,000 each. This is not currently helping with accessibility or affordability.	Web Session 3

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
	SUBMITTED BY EMAIL (March 3 - May 7, 2025)	
1	I am looking for clarification on the events and process. Is there an opportunity for public input or is this just about informing the public of the proposed changes?	Email
2	With regards to the new zoning changes, I am in total disagreement with “taller four-unit homes” being built on 39 foot lots. I live close to a bus stop and in a smaller home and having a large home built right next to my lot would greatly devalue my home. I always thought this city was about having green space and planting trees for the good of the environment. You can't plant trees on a fully developed lot. I see them in different parts of my neighbourhood; gravel backyards (parking lot?) & nothing in the front yard.	Email
3	Also I am concerned about our sewer/water systems, street condition (very poor at best); how will it hold up?	Email
4	Why can't we have homes that look like Habitat Homes (see Albany Street in St. James). This is the type of home that makes good infill housing. I am looking forward to hearing from you and hope that there will be community input, in person, at each local community centre.	Email
5	Is there a map available of all lands affected by this proposed legislation? A visual representation of how many properties will be affected by this proposal would be extremely helpful in helping people understand how many people & properties will be impacted.	Email
6	What neighborhoods are going to be subject to the automatic approval of 4 plexes ?	Email
7	Hi, I would like to know if I could have property at (address redacted) could be rezoned to accommodate infill housing.	Email
8	Our home backs onto the Assiniboine River. There are approximately 12 lots on our Crescent (address redacted) and we are just off Portage Avenue - so clearly within 800m of a major transit route. I have some concerns with the proposal and how it might impact our Crescent. First, we already have 3 large apartment buildings backing onto our street. As the largest one doesn't have parking space to accommodate all their residents (or so I was told by the building manager), our street parking is almost always full with people parking for hours or even days at a time - despite there being a sign stating 2h parking at all times. I know our lots would be wide enough to meet requirements and the land would certainly be desirable for a multiplex developer being as it is river property. With parking already impossible on our street and population density already achieved due to the apartment blocks, would these things prevent a project from being approved on our Crescent? If it were allowed, how many parking spaces would be required within the lot?	Email
9	If multi-unit development would be seen as detrimental to the property values surrounding or out of step with the tone of the rest of the street, would either of these concerns prevent a project from streamlined approval and require the traditional variance process to be completed? I am, unfortunately, not able to attend one of the public sessions, but i would appreciate a response via email. If my questions are also used in public session, please do not use my name or any specific street identifiers to protect my privacy. Thank you for your time.	Email
10	Hello, I would like to know if the lot at (address redacted) would qualify for re zoning.	Email
11	Will the city councillors be at this meeting, specifically Janice Lukes and Evan Duncan?	Email
12	I have another event that evening. How long do you expect this will run?	Email
13	Thank you Councilor Duncan for keeping me informed about this issue. I will be attending the event of March 19 but need some info to make an informed contribution to the discussion. Please see the attached spreadsheet that details (as per the City of WPG website) the current zoning requirements for my zone (R1-L) and RMF-S. I have inserted the zoning requirements per category as best I could find on the City website but some data was missing for RMF-S such as "lot coverage % and recreational vehicle restrictions. What I need is the following: 1.Is the information I have been able to gather from the City's website about current zoning requirements for zone categories R1-L and RMF-S correct as per my attachment? 2.More importantly would you please fill in the information for the same categories for the new zoning change proposed as HAF I just received your notification about a meeting on Wednesday March 19 next week which I will attend so I would obviously need the information by that date to provide an informed contribution to the deliberations.	Email
14	Hello - I went to the Presentation Materials on the city Infill website today. The pas included are small and the neighbourhoods are not marked, it is next to impossible to interpret. Please provide citizens with large, well marked maps so we can decipher what is planned as soon as possible.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
15	I am a resident of River Heights. New/amended legislation, to be fair to existing homeowners, must include the following provisions: •New builds must not block existing natural sunlight to the front/back yards of adjacent dwellings •New builds must not be built sitting/standing proud of existing front yard sight lines •New builds must not be closer than 5 feet from property line and when/if the excavation of the new building damages the foundation of the existing adjacent building, the contractor/builder must be held 100% responsible for repairs •New builds can not situate windows/balconies such that they compromise the privacy of the pre-existing neighboring dwelling or the associated front/back yard River Heights has a legacy combined sewer and water system, the capacity of which is at risk from added density. Lack of available street parking is already an issue. Increased traffic in a quiet residential area adds to noise and environmental pollution.	Email
16	River Heights is a character neighborhood with many houses built circa 1900 - 1920s. The infill housing permitted thus far consists of narrow, three story, architecturally modern square boxes. Their presence negatively affects the character/aesthetic of the neighborhood and property values of existing dwellings, and undermines the very reason homeowners have chosen to live where craftsmanship, uniqueness and history prevailed. People who buy here do so for the most part to restore, not replace. Historically (In the 13years I have lived in my (address redacted) home), the observed track record for holding builders accountable in this neighborhood is abysmal; too tall, too wide, too close to the property line, ruining the natural light in adjacent backyards, creating foundation problems for existing dwellings….. The property department does not uniformly apply the rules that are in existence now - contractors violate them all the time with seemingly no consequence. The changes you are planning to make NEED TO BE ENFORCED as written. At present, there is little confidence the Property Department will follow through on penalizing or deconstructing violations. I speak for myself, but know my neighbors are equally concerned.	Email
17	How far will new builds be from the property line on the side of the new home?	Email
18	What is the allowable height of developments on my street?	Email
19	How many parking spaces are required for multiunit buildings?	Email
20	What does “as of right zoning” mean?	Email
21	Will I know of and be provided input on what is being built beside my home?	Email
22	Will I have the right to insist on changes to the proposed structure, if it compromises my property?	Email
23	How will the city address potential parking and traffic issues?	Email
24	How will current infrastructure be upgraded to handle the increase in population density?	Email
25	What measures will be in place to ensure the quality and compatibility of new developments with existing neighborhoods?	Email
26	Will existing trees be protected?	Email
27	I would like to know if I could have my property rezoned to help accommodate the housing shortage.	Email
28	Thank you. So i can schedule accordingly , do you know the duration of the webinar? I know the in person option was 3 hours?	Email
29	Hello I am trying to understand your maps. I live at (address redacted) and our back lane is gravel. One map shows light pink (2-plex allowed.) The next map shoes brown … fourplexes allowed. Can you please clarify?	Email
30	Can the sewer system handle all this?	Email
31	Will the city cover all the expenses of upgrades without it affecting the other residents in the area financially?	Email
32	What will this do for parking limitations on the street? Already people do NOT remove their vehicles during street clearing which causes issues for those that actually obey the rules!	Email
33	If there are 2 people (or 3) in each home that drive and all of them park on the street how does this respect other residents that live there(pay taxes) and should they have company coming to visit? their company may have to walk 3/4 blocks just to come visit them, how fair is that?	Email
34	How will it affect garbage/recycle/ green bins? 4 plexes = 12 bins per building!	Email
35	How will these infill projects impact existing infrastructure?	Email
36	Why are there so many vacant lots undeveloped while bungalows in River Heights are being bulldozed and replaced with 2 homes selling for more than 700,000$?	Email
37	I understand you're considering allowing 4 units on a 50' lot. Is 4 units the max number? Or a builder could build 8 units with secondary suites? If secondary suites won't be allowed, then how will you tackle illegal basements?	Email
38	I understand that the zoning changes to accommodate HAF will permit multiple family units, up to 4 families per unit, on properties currently zoned R1 L I would like to know the zoning regulation in regard to waste pickup. Will each unit be allowed the current 1 black and 1 blue waste/recycle bins? that would mean a total of 6 bins in front of a 60 ft lot on pick up day. Will the 4 person multiplex unit be allowed larger building metal bin s? Where will these be stored. Given the limited access in a no lane area I assume that they will be in the front yard. Your response to allay my fears will be greatly appreciated.	Email
39	Why are developers allowed to buy up multiple affordable family homes to create swaths of infills averaging $799,000; pricing out home buyers? All this under the guise of affordable housing. These homes are hundreds of thousands of dollars above the average homes in our neighbourhood.	Email
40	Why are the precious trees and green spaces, so vital to the environment, temperature control, air quality, animal life and community life allowed to be clear cut to allow for infills from sidewalk to lane? Old growth trees should be listed as "heritage."	Email
41	Why are the designs allowed for infills not regulated? The ugly three story skinny buildings that are appearing throughout our neighbourhood and throughout the city are now 2,3-5 in a row on some streets, irreparably and negatively altering the character of mature neighbourhoods. Many of these homes never appear to be occupied by families. Are these used as rentals? Air BnBs or other businesses? Families/homeowners are being priced out. The infills in no way integrate smoothly into neighbourhoods that homeowners have invested in for a lifetime. The proposed 4 story zoning changes will only make the situation more dire and only the businesses/developers will benefit from the grants. Potential home owners will be further pushed out.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
42	Why are grants and subsidies not being given to families and first time home buyers who want to renovate and upgrade existing, architecturally beautiful and unique homes. The amount of rubble and structural garbage going to the landfill is extraordinary. We recently witnessed a beautiful solid brick house being gutted and torn down, only to be replaced within days by 2 pre-fab (on a single dwelling lot), inferior 3 story ugly houses. There is no longer any trees or grass on the site which is a detriment to the health, drainage, etc. for the whole community.	Email
43	Why are the vast areas of burnt out buildings, demolished blocks and derelict buildings not the focus of affordable housing? Why is Gillingham focused on pushing through density zoning at the detriment of established neighbourhoods, trees and green spaces; neighbourhoods that lack the infrastructure for increased density? Residents are fearful every time an affordable bungalow goes up for sale.	Email
44	The proposed 4 story zoning changes will only make the situation more dire and only the businesses/developers will benefit from the grants. Potential home owners will be further pushed out.	Email
45	With crime rising in our neighborhood already, what is the plan to improve security with all these new rental properties appearing in a neighborhood where we expect and have paid to have more security? There has been an ongoing increase in property crime in River Heights that does not appear to be receiving any attention from law enforcement. How are you planning to ensure rental properties respect home owners?	Email
46	Can you please present the geological surveys that show the wet swampy clay and sand where the River Heights neighborhood exists can support this level of population and structural increase?	Email
47	Who asked for population density to increase in a neighborhood?	Email
48	Regardless of what the City currently has planned, what protections are you building into this plan to protect existing single family homes so they will NOT lose sunlight and with NOT have to deal with extra crime from lower income renters moving into the area?	Email
49	Regardless of what the City currently has planned, what protections are you building into this plan to protect existing single family homes so they will NOT lose sunlight and with NOT have to deal with extra crime from lower income renters moving into the area?	Email
50	Can you please add the perspective lines to the street view images in your pdf presentation? As someone familiar with perspective and 3d dimensional drafting and design, these images do NOT appear accurate. The other views may be better, but the shading also seems to show lighting consistent with 2pm in July. Can those also please be updated to show sunlight/shadow exposure with 2pm January lighting?	Email
51	Why do you think zoning evolution drifted away from multi-family housing units in favor of single family dwellings? Do you think that may be a reflection of the resident's desire for single family housing and NOT multi-family housing? My family moved to River Heights specifically to get away from the density we experienced off Corydon close to Osborne for years and when living right downtown before that. We worked really hard for this. Having this density and the problems coming along with it expanding into my area is NOT what we worked SO hard for and paid so much for. I fully expect my property value will drop as a result, since everyone I know in this area moved here for the same reason. This must be addressed and compensated.	Email
52	I was just on your virtual meeting. It was a great meeting. Thank you. I asked a lot of questions, more specifically about 'affordable'. It seems that 'affordable' is a 'key word' frequently used in reference to infill housing. I still have questions and concerns regarding how truly 'affordable' these houses will be. Here's an example. Google searches indicate an average MB salary is $48,879 a year. "Affordable" is 30% of your income. Based on an average MB salary, that would be $1,221.97 a month. (30% of $48,879 is $14,663.70; divide by 12 is $1,221.97 a month). A mortgage calculator states this: A mortgage amount of $220,000 at 4.59% for a 5 year closed with a 25 year amortization is a monthly payment of $1,228.67. Where can I buy an 'affordable' home based on an average MB salary for $250,000? (ie - putting down a $30,000 down payment on a $250,000 home would be a $220,000 mortgage).	Email
53	Will I be able to get a copy of the presentation?	Email
54	Since I retired six years ago I have spent dozens of hours going to meetings, writing grants, rolling up sleeves etc to get more trees planted. Because my area has lost giants to DED. I now feel that hundreds of hours of work to steward our city for the next generation is being smashed as for-profit developers move into our neighbourhoods to clear cut land and build ugly, dehumanizing boxes. The zoning changes are meant for Toronto and Vancouver, not us.	Email
55	I am writing in support of the zoning by-law amendment as detailed. Anything that we in Winnipeg can do to support multiple unit dwellings will support people in the city. In my apartment neighbourhood around Osborne Village and Wellington Crescent, there are already have many of the types of housing that would be approved as of right by the by-law amendment. It is a vibrant community that I recently joined from Toronto last winter. I am a new resident, but I can see already how great it is. It would benefit the rest of the communities and city to have housing bylaws to allow for more residential homes to be built more easily. More neighbours for Winnipeg please! Parking: Housing for people is more important than housing for cars. While acknowledging the political difficulty of this, I actually would like to see a further loosening of the proposed bylaw that would allow a 4 plex to be built with only 3 off street parking spaces required (currently says "1 off-street parking space is required per unit"). There is currently plenty of street parking availability as I see, and if we would like to convert people to more active transportation we need to create ways and means of doing so. Loosening this requirement would allow for more housing units to be built and would encourage more people to use transit, biking, and walking.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
56	Hi attended Zoom presentation last night. Someone from Urban Forestry should be on this panel. The city has committed to more green space and tree planting and that strategy has to align with zoning changes. Right now it does not. Please add a tree person to this panel.	Email
57	Thank you for the informational presentation last night. I appreciate your knowledge and polite demeanour. I left the presentation before it was over. I will check the website to see when you answer my questions submitted last night and in an email earlier in the day. You stated many times that the decision on 'as of right' infill zoning changes have not been made yet. I live on (addresses redacted). There are many of these houses being built already. Does this mean they are having longer times to get the exemptions to the current zoning? It looks like the decisions have been made.	Email
58	You brushed over how do the contractors benefit? Aside from quicker zoning process, what benefits, including financial, do the contractors get?	Email
59	Please revisit the wording in your slides if you cannot explain them. Community benefits- explain all points with concrete examples. Affordability will change with the treats from the USA. People's money will not go as far. How will you increase social interaction in this time of heightened divisiveness and fear? The report says "housing that is adequate, safe, affordable and accessible". You couldn't adequately explain any of those words. What is the average rental price of these units? typical budget suggestion is 30% of your gross budget. I think utilities may be on top of that, I do not know.	Email
60	Parking. I understand your rational for limiting parking spaces but the reality here is people will use the street as a parking lot. It happens now. Unless eve is posted and monitored restrictions on street parking, people will park there. It is a problem in the winter. I appreciate building up as a way to not take more farming land for housing. As I indicated in my previous email, there are many vacant buildings and large chunks of land ie MITT and the MINT that should be built on first.	Email
61	With all this money from the federal government, I cannot understand why it is not a priority to develop some accessible housing. You know about universal design. It is not good enough to say nothing has changed. Left to private, for profit contractors, no effort or expense will be made to accommodate anyone with a disability. Very sad for sure. I am not sure what your statements about accessible mean, as stated below.	Email
62	I attended the online presentation yesterday and appreciated it very much. As a prefab builder of highly architectural buildings and now developer, I have a bias that good infill should scale with the neighbourhood, enhance community, and look beautiful. I have some questions and comments. 1. Regarding 35' lot widths. We suggest that 33' may be a better number. We recently took 2- 50-foot lots and reconfigured into 3-33' lots. We are building 1- 20' wide houses on each 33' lot with a legal basement secondary suite in each and side yards that don't require special construction. 3 houses with 6 total living units. Our design allows us to turn that same house into 3, 2-bedroom suites (800sf each approx.) and still get parking minimum. That would be 9 units in 100 feet as opposed to 2-4plexes (8 units which masses bigger) in 100'. Our version of infill is smaller scale with more density. We also have an 18-foot-wide x 45' house as a 3 plex. That means 4 separate houses in 100 feet, but would not meet the parking minimum due to the lot width being 25'. Our projects are under 28' tall and scale with mature neighbourhoods. They have main floor wheelchair access to a bedroom, bathroom, kitchen, dining and living room.	Email
63	2. Parking minimums should be reduced. We can confirm some of our renters rely on public transit or walking. In fact, low-income housing must allow for this no-car scenario. 1 parking spot per unit and low income have, one could argue, opposite goals. Many who need affordability, can't afford the car. Parking spot requirements cost everyone more money. The neighbourhood already has everything as it is 800M from a main traffic corridor (shopping, schools, community club, parks) within a ten-minute walk.	Email
64	3. Stairs. Are external stairs being considered? I assume there is an architectural reason why not to allow them (I am not advocating for external stairs, just asking the why). How about an exterior stair to a basement suite? There would be nothing above grade that infringes on a neighbour, or is combustible, and could be built to property line with a concrete retaining wall.	Email
65	4. Stairs. Will it be allowed to have a common stair serve all levels of the house? Are decisions based on safety or architectural or something else? Understanding the why is important.	Email
66	5. Entry doors. Will there be guidelines on where entry doors will be allowed? For example, could we put 4 separate doors facing the street? (we wouldn't). Or will 1 door minimum facing the street be required? Or will there be a balanced approach legislated? I would encourage a maximum front door allowance, but not a minimum. For our designs, we don't need a front door and installed one only as it was required. We have built some houses with no front door (website redacted) and they work very well. Knowing the intent is important for us.	Email
67	6. Overall height. As was mentioned in yesterday's Q&A, builders will not be building 4 story as it is not economical, and I agree. I suggest that information gets presented early in the presentation to reduce the questions about shadows. At about 10 feet per floor-to-floor height including floor depth, it's almost impossible to build 4 stories. The 39' foot height could be argued that it helps with a design esthetic to allow a sloping roof (which would shadow less than a 4 story box).	Email
68	7. A secondary suite is very restricted in size relative to the main unit. Will there be any similar restrictions in the new program?	Email
69	8. Will entry doors be required to have a canopy, or be recessed, or to be protected from weather?	Email
70	9. We would want some clarity on architectural aesthetic. We are currently building 3 houses on three side by side by side lots, and were unsure how much architectural variance was required. We changed roof slopes a bit and added different cladding types and received no pushback from the city. We would like more certainty in advance, as we intend to inventory houses in our system for quick turnaround. Thank you for the process and hard work of moving the city we love forward.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
71	Winnipeg needs more housing, especially affordable and low income housing. We also need to take advantage of the federal funding that is available to increase our housing stock. At the same time, we need to protect and maintain Winnipeg's increasingly scarce and vulnerable biodiversity and natural areas. Our city's riverine assets cannot be allowed to continue to diminish, a likely prospect if the proposed zoning bylaw does not explicitly protect some of our cherished river corridors. Currently, development near rivers is not allowed within a flood line. While this covers a portion of our river corridors, it fails to protect large swaths of river corridor that are likely to be candidates for higher density development. Winnipeg's rivers, riparian zones and riverbanks offer highly important ecological, cultural, aesthetic, and recreational services that all Winnipeg residents and visitors to our city should be able to access and enjoy. As a result, they should be protected from private development and uses which typically precludes public use and access. In addition, our river corridors offer crucial ecological services that contribute to our city's increasingly threatened biodiversity while providing important wildlife habitat and natural corridors for wildlife movement. This is another reason they should be protected from private development to ensure continued existence and viability of these important ecological resources. As well, protecting our City's river corridor would align with the City of Winnipeg's commitment to produce a Master Greenspace and Natural Corridors Plan and a Biodiversity Policy, a major initiative that is currently underway. The proposed citywide zoning bylaw, intended to expedite housing development and facilitate securing federal housing funding, is silent on how river corridors should be treated. There is no explicit protection provided for these special and important areas. This is most unfortunate as it leaves the door open for the higher intensity development, targeted by the new zoning bylaw, to occur on river corridors, reducing the availability of and accessibly to these crucial areas. Explicit protection for Winnipeg's rivers, riparian zones and riverbanks is required in our new zoning bylaws to ensure that contemplated higher density housing development does not displace these special and potentially vulnerable areas. As advocated by (org redacted), the City needs to establish buffer zones along our main rivers and streams that preclude higher density development. The new zoning bylaw should explicitly exclude river corridors from high density zoning as follows: - on each side of the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers, establish a river corridor buffer of 350 feet - on each side of Sturgeon, Omand, Bunn's and Truro Creeks / Streams, establish a river corridor buffer of 250 feet. The length of buffer zone may be less than the maximum where extenuating local conditions exist. Some existing residential land owners may experience a loss in the potential value of their property as a result of adopting this measure. These losses may warrant compensation. I strongly encourage creation of river buffer zones in the new zoning bylaw to ensure that our much needed additional high density housing does not destroy, damage or impede access to our river corridors.	Email
72	where do you find the questions that where asked last night.	Email
73	How is the property width calculated on a pie shaped lot? All of the examples were placed on square/rectangular shaped lots.	Email
74	I am looking at a City of Winnipeg document titled: HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT I am trying to find my property on the map on page 11, but the resolution of the map in the document is very low, and I cant see it well enough. Can you send me by e-mail a higher resolution copy of this map, or else send me a to link where I can find a higher resolution copy.	
75	I didn't write you to ask a question. I wrote you to say that the map you provided in your presentation document is not of high enough resolution for users to identify which land use area their property falls into. I would appreciate it if you could send me a map with high enough resolution that it can be used for the purpose you intend it to be used for, and send it to me in tome for me to use it within your timelines.	Email
76	Please explain as to how current and well established neighborhoods will be compensated if this housing initiative goes through? Additional infill housing of 2 to 4 units may result in the following: Lower market value of existing properties. Lack of privacy Increase in Noise pollution Increased traffic on existing roads Increased parking on existing roads from residents and guests. Increased wear and tear on existing roads Increased garbage collection noise and potential mess.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
77	Hello, my name is (name redacted), and I am writing in support of more homes and smarter growth and the city's plan to allow up to four units on all lots as of right citywide. However, I have concerns about some of the restrictions the city is putting on these lots, particularly around gravel back lanes, lot coverage, and parking minimums. The zoning changes will see triplexes and four plexes without driveways banned from lots with gravel back lanes. It's completely understandable why, no one wants to live in a perpetual dust storm, but why implement this restriction instead of just paving the gravel alleyways? I get that it costs money to pave gravel alleyways, but it can be done with a more money from a bigger tax base, and allowing four units can create a bigger tax base than only allowing two. The zoning changes would require any building in R1 zones to not exceed anywhere from 42.5% to 57.5%, limiting the usable area on the lot by a hefty amount. From what I understand this is for preservation of pervious surface, a noble goal indeed, but there are many other ways to preserve or even resurrect pervious surfaces, for example, not extending Chief Peguis Trail, removing all the massive parking lots throughout the city, discontinuing suburban sprawl, replacing asphalt with street-bricks or turf stone, reducing the size of roads, and I must stress, getting rid of parking minimums. Parking spaces aren't pervious surfaces, and yet developers will be required to provide at least one off street parking space per unit. Other prairie cities, like Edmonton and Saskatoon, are getting rid of these archaic rules, so why does the city of Winnipeg insist on clinging on to them, especially for a rather flood prone city? The whole point of the rezoning is to make housing more affordable, something you just can't do with parking minimums, there's no such thing as free parking, you are paying for it one way or another. Of course, I am aware there are many people who think the city doesn't have enough parking, but it's not true, and more importantly, there shouldn't be enough parking, we don't want people driving. Cars are bad for the urban fabric, they're space inefficient, they generate greenhouse gases, they fill the air with noxious gases and particulate matter from tires, they are loud, they make the city hotter in summer, they damage their own infrastructure, they are terrible for the environment, they are isolating, they encourage sedentary lifestyles, they kill and seriously injure people, and they perpetuate racial and economic inequality. It is time that the city of Winnipeg consigns car centric design to the dustbin. Instead of continuing these requirements for parking that makes everything more expensive and large swaths of our city absolute eyesores, we should move to abolish parking minimums altogether, let the developers decide how much parking is needed, if any, since we really should be moving away from the automobile as the primary means of travel in Winnipeg. It is one rule to change, but a huge one that my generation and future generations will appreciate. While I do approve of the rezoning and see it as a big game changer for the city, it could be a whole lot better. We as a city must move past the suburban experiment and towards an actual community, for the sake of us the younger generations, for the city's culture, and for its finances too	Email
78	Is the city willing to pave gravel back lanes instead of limiting housing?	Email
79	Is the city willing to lift lot coverage restrictions?	Email
80	Is the city willing to abolish parking minimums and get in line with the other prairie cities?	Email
81	Is the city willing to end the strict separation of residential and commercial development to allow dépanneurs/corner stores in residential areas?	Email
82	Is the city willing to move away from the automobile as the preferred mode of transportation?	Email
83	Is the city willing to create safer streets for the people outside of cars by slowing them down through traffic calming?	Email
84	This site is 55 ft by 105 ft, R1 Zoned-M, unpaved backlane (gravel), lies within 100m to Pembina Highway. Can u kindly clarify how many units as per the attached presentation will be allowed here if the attached rules are passed without any changes. This site is more than 50 ft wide and less than 60 ft wide, would it be possible to build a 3 plex here.	Email
85	How will the City of Winnipeg ensure the affordability of the homes to be built under the proposed changes to the bylaws to allow duplexes,triplexes and 4 unit homes on existing city lots? Will there be incentives to those developing the properties to ensure affordable housing? To leave the development to settle prices on the open market would defeat the goal of affordable housing. I look forward to hearing from you.	Email
86	This site is 50 ft wide by 125 ft deep with paved backlane. Can u kindly confirm if this falls within the area where 4plex will be allowed as of right if the attached rules are passed. The maps are little bit blurry, so I just want to confirm, the are is (lord Roberts, south Osborne.	Email
87	I looked over the presentation for the new infill regulations and am wondering if our beautiful old trees will ever be protected and appreciated by the city. Living in Old St. Vital I can see daily the disregard for big, old beautiful trees and the destruction of the neighbourhood feel of this area due to infill houses that don't fit the area at all. Will developers be required to protect trees on properties or at least replace cut down trees by planting/financing boulevard trees we lost? How does the loss of even more trees make sense in the light of climate change? Why should we as citizens pay for additional trees and participation in the million tree challenge if the city couldn't care less about the big trees in our mature neighbourhoods? Are current green spaces, golf courses and playgrounds protected from infill or will they be next? Are there any plans to convert unused office space into apartments instead of dragging everyone back downtown for work? Please send me detailed information how the city is planning on saving our trees and what the plans are for a hotter climate.	Email
88	I'd like to ask why only 3 consecutive days of sessions - could there not have been any over a 2 or 3 week period. This is a highly contentious issue that deserves more citizen input.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
89	In addition to the questions I submitted yesterday, I've compiled further questions based on today's meeting. When you say "your" lot width, it sounds like you're missing the point that most current resident's are concerned with NEIGHBORING lot widths because we don't want the property that we value so much to be negatively affected by developments on neighboring lots. Who else remembers when that doctor on Brock Street rented his house to some folks who did not have the same quality of life standards as the rest of the homeowners in our area? It started to get ugly when they were parking on the front lawn, leaving garbage in the front yard, backyard, AND backlane, tied their dog up to the front steps from where it got loose while unattended and bit a neighborhood child. In the context of the above example, that I've personally experienced, what protections are available to neighbors of 2, 3 and 4 unit infill housing to ensure the tenants have similar quality of life expectations, value the neighborhood, and respect the area?	Email
90	What measures are being taken to prevent builders from putting up big unaffordable units that become derelict and empty serving no purpose because no one can afford the rent?	Email
91	What measures are being taken to prevent delinquent or inattentive and slumlords from creating structures that may have negative affects on neighboring houses if the upkeep and maintenance is neglected?	Email
92	What funding is being held to support existing homeowners with legal costs when they're forced to take developers to court over structural and infrastructure damage or devaluation resulting from large new rental structures being built on soft, swampy land like we have in the River Heights area?	Email
93	What is the process for residents of neighboring properties to oppose a duplex, tri-plex or quad-plex? This would typically involve 4 - 6 neighboring properties, which may not have the financial resources to leverage existing legal processes that require lawyer fees in advance in comparison to a large, possibly international, development corporation. How would the city assist current residents when entering legal proceedings related to unwanted development against a large corporation?	Email
94	Will there be limits on how many multi-plex infills can exist on a block? Example, can several 4 plex units be constructed in a row on a street provided each unit individually meets the required specifications?	Email
95	Regarding lot width, is the width applied to the lot's frontage? What about irregular shaped lots, such as a pie lot with a short frontage width but widens as it goes back? How are irregular shaped lots measured under this bylaw change?	Email
96	There are two 8-plexus across from my home on (address redacted). We protested for 6 months prior to them going up but to no avail. When dealing with the builders and the city, we were ASSURED these buildings would be 4-plexus and here they are 8-plexes! So angry because they are HUGE and they took down two lots of beautiful, established trees, also declared by the builder that only two trees would come down. The city doesn't monitor these builders, and so once construction had started and we realized the footprint was HUGE, the builder said: "We're in construction already so the city can't do anything." Any response? What good do these meetings do, if nothing transpires in favour of citizens? Please answer my questions- don't fob me off as there's another lot on my street and I fear it will house an infill home that will block out the horizon like that ugly monster on (address redacted).	Email
97	I attended an online session and have the following feedback. 1.)Will the city be providing better maps so taxpayers can actually see the various zoning criteria that their homes fall under?	Email
98	2) We were concerned about the use of the word " shouldn't ", "we don't think" or we don't suspect " , "developers likely won't…" etc. When it comes to where 3 and 4-plexes can be built, taxpayers deserve full transparency and at this stage the city should have a solid plan for the various multi family proposals.	Email
99	3.) If 4-plexes will be the "anomaly" due to the specific criteria then why not remove them completely? I live in an area with very large lots so if I will no longer have say in what gets built beside me, at least let me know for certain what can be built there v.s leaving it up to the whim of developers or city planners. Having a 3rd party tell me "there likely won't be many 4 plexes built " doesn't give me any comfort.	Email
100	As I am unable to attend the in-person meeting tonight, and tried to register for the virtual meeting yesterday but was unsuccessful, is there another way or time to participate?	Email
101	Why are you doing this, this way? It does not make any sense! I would be easier to redact ALL the Anti Affordable Housing Bylaws that are on the books right now. So why would you not do this? All of these Anti Affordable Housing Bylaws are the biggest stumbling block. To build more Affordable Housing. Many Organizations have told you this over and over again since the late 1970s..... You might also want to stop all Financialization of Housing. LLC, Hedge Funds, Corporations, etc., from buying, and/or building homes/apartments.... Then only rent them. This is the second reason why we have a affordable housing shortage. So why are you not banning this? Another thing you might want to bring back... Multi-use buildings.... Like the downtown at the turn of the century.....1900s. Business on the first floor.... Housing on the floors above. Why not bring this type of zooning back?	Email
102	How close to the property line can these infills be build?	Email
103	With the only one car park allocated to these infill units, as these new occupants will be parking on the already full residential street, will illegal parking be enforced? blocking driveways, parking in front of fire hydrant?	Email
104	on sidewalks, also garbage pick up days, where will the extra bins go for the new infills? if all are to be parked on the street?	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
105	I attended 2 of the virtual meetings. The presentation was very informative and thank you for acknowledging that the new proposed infill housing will NOT be "affordable" for the average Manitoban based on average salary. 1. Based on that, WHO are these homes being built for?	Email
106	2. The people who will be living in these new homes; where are they living now?	Email
107	3. When these new homes are being "squeezed" around existing homes; who is accepting liability for damage to the existing homes' foundations?	Email
108	4. I really would appreciate an answer to this question. IF this proposal is NOT passed, then what's Plan B?	Email
109	Many of the lots in our area are larger than any of your examples in the presentation we watched. Ours is 75 x 256. We were wondering if the lot is big enough would it be permissible to build more than one 2,3, or 4 unit building on a single property?	Email
110	It is difficult to assess how this affects any one neighborhood with the term “High Frequency Transit Stop” being defined. Is it once ever 3 Minutes? 5 Minutes? 10 Minutes? Are these frequencies average figures throughout bus service hours or peak stops per unit of time? I look forward to this information	Email
111	Thank you for the opportunity to attend the Zoom session on the Zoning Bylaw Amendment being proposed for the city of Winnipeg. We found the session informative as to “The requirements” but due to the small size of the maps “Infill Housing” , “Building heights” and “Transit Corridor Walksheds” presented, we still don’t know if our home will be affected by infilling. We could not find the same maps on the city of Winnipeg website to zoom in to actually see the street names. With over 200 questions submitted, only a selected handful were answered during the session, leaving most unanswered. The most distressing take away from the meeting is that we, the residents of the suburbs affected, will have no ability to challenge a building permit when a developer chooses to build a three or four story building next door or on either side of our home. A decision affecting this many city residents should have been voted on by the people affected not decided by a few people in city hall in order to secure federal housing funding. So we are assuming we will be affected and submit the following comments: 1. We chose to make our home in St Vital over 50 years ago because it was a low-density suburb with a diverse community to support our growing family. We purchased a rundown house and have over the years renovated it into our home. Now we are happy to find ourselves in a “mature community” with many services to help us “Age In Place”. We are looking forward to spending the rest of our lives in our home where we can continue to enjoy the peace & quiet of our fully landscaped yard and the birds and wildlife that frequent the area. We have a large garden that supplements our diet as food prices continue to challenge our pension income.	Email
112	2. Infill housing would drastically decrease our quality of life by doubling, tripling or quadrupling the number of people living “next door” and in our community. - This will increase the noise pollution and make peace & quiet hard to find. - Building of three & four story homes possibly on either side of us will block the sun from our yard. The 5-hour window of sun left, mentioned in the presentation is not enough to grow vegetables which require at least 12 hours of sunlight per day, therefore preventing us from growing our own food, - Requiring 1 parking spot on site for each unit of a three or fourplex is not sufficient as most families have two cars if not three. These extra cars end up parked on the street. Parking on the street is already a problem in the winter due to the poor snow clearing reducing the street width and leaving dangerous icy ruts to navigate the one-way road darting in & out between the parked cars. - Our home is an investment in our future and an inheritance for our children. A home dwarfed beside or between three & fourplexes will lose value compared to the current area with single family homes. - The current sewer system is inadequate to support current housing resulting in a sewer spill into the Red River. How will it handle the proposed increased density?	Email
113	3. We recognize the need for more affordable housing for younger generations but Inserting three & fourplexes into “Mature Neighborhoods” makes the older generation “pay the Price” with decreased quality of life and decreased property values. This same generation has paid taxes to the city for many years which has supported all the infrastructure that we currently enjoy. We are also the volunteers that have made community clubs for hockey, soccer & other supports possible. In Summary: We hope City Council will be wise enough to continue to allow current residents to challenge building permits and not allow three & fourplexes as-of-right (without resident consultation), in our mature established neighborhoods for the reasons stated above. We think most of the current residents could support building duplexes in our community as the impact would be substantially less than three & fourplexes. We suggest that it would be a far better use of federal funds to build housing on the many downtown lots with derelict houses that catch fire regularly. That would also help to remedy homelessness for those who chose to live downtown. Thanks for listening; hopefully we will see resulting changes in the Zoning Bylaw Proposal.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
114	Absolutely atrocious that you announced the meeting on social media only 3 hours before it was set to occur. Not only that, you're holding it downtown, in the middle of rush hour, when there will be no parking and it will be more difficult to arrive on time. I also heard you didn't hear any opinions live, only written questions. These choices are a perfect way of telling your citizens you don't care about their feedback. Do we need more housing in this city? Yes. Is infill housing, or multi-dwelling homes that are 39ft+ high the way to do it? Absolutely not. How many homeowners will have their beautiful yards blocked by these high houses, this getting very little natural light? They will be in shade all day. How many homeowners will not feel they have privacy in their back yard, because their infill neighbors will have direct view into said yard? How many neighborhoods will have a beautiful aesthetic of old, historical houses absolutely ruined by these ugly new houses? I'm a resident of Beaumont, in Fort Garry, and I see all of this happening already. The old, historic homes in this lovely neighborhood are now being dotted with these huge monstrosities that completely ruin the historical pride we once were able to take in our houses and our streets. I've spoken to many homeowners who are no longer able to garden or grow their own food because the infill houses next to them are blocking their sunlight into their yard, and these same homeowners rarely spend time in their yard anymore due to the feelings of lack of privacy. What we need are normal, single family homes. Like the ones (company name removed) built all over the city in the 70s and 80s. These new zoning changes should absolutely NOT be approved and move forward, although I doubt you will listen to your citizens about this.	Email
115	We participated in the recent Virtual Meeting regarding the proposed Infill Plan. A comment was made regarding exceptions made for railway adjacent properties. Our home on (address redacted) backs onto (rail line name redacted) CP rail lines. We are looking for clarification as to whether this exception affects our property (and others along the length of (address redacted)) and, if so, in what way.	Email
116	Thank you for a great in-person session yesterday. It was great to see how many people came out for it, and in particular all the great city staff support for the event. I really appreciate everyone's time and commitment to seeing this through. I am completely supportive of the proposed changes. I think they provide a very positive, and gentle, step towards building a more sustainable city. The proposed changes can easily be called "gentle densification". Allowing property owners to increase the number of dwelling units they are allowed to provide on their single property, as of right, will allow for incremental increase of housing, both in quantity and variety. You have put together a good proposal that should get the political support required, and assuage fears that people have about density. A couple of specific comments on the proposal: 1) It wasn't clear to me as to whether a front drive would be allowed, if an owner has the property width, in order to get 4 units. I would strongly recommend that it be clear that under no circumstances can a front drive be added to a property that doesn't have one.	Email
117	2) It would be great if there was a mechanism to remove any front drives that would be existent when someone redevelops from a single dwelling to multi dwelling. One of the benefits highlighted on the boards was walkability. I agree completely, the increase in density supports greater walkability. But, having a front drive along a residential street that might go from 1 unit to 4 units increases the number of cars that would be crossing the sidewalk/bike lane. That increases the potential vehicle/pedestrian conflicts and makes the environment inherently more hostile to pedestrians and cyclists. This would go counter to one of the benefits of your proposed changes. So, removing a front drive as part of redevelopment would be a positive.	Email
118	3) I am flummoxed by the exclusion of gravel lanes and mature communities. Okay, that is an overstatement, I am not flummoxed by it. I know why. But is there a planing rationale for this exclusion, other than political expediency? I can't see one. I would remind you that we have already compromised some good planning work (the Infill Guidelines) for political expediency, resulting in a pretty terrible result. And, I would also remind you that it is only one vote on a council of 16 votes.	Email
119	4) I would love to see some examples of the RC-G land use in Calgary on your boards. That is an incredibly successful land use within R-1 & R-2 districts that provides a great built form. It is exactly what you are working towards. As such, I wish that you had boards that showed what a 4 unit town could look like on a corner lot. (The original intent of the RC-G). It seems to me that corner lots are particularly suited to 4 units, it would be great to see some examples of that. Please check out the Calgary example of RC-Gs. I wish we were doing more open houses and had them spread across the city. These are important and are a great way to get the information out to residents. We shouldn't hide from sharing what they might not like. Doing these kinds of events and open houses is a great way for us to engage everyone in the discussion of what our city can and should look like in the future. I don't think only one open house, in the downtown, is enough. Thanks for all the work you do!	Email
120	Thank you for the opportunity to ask questions about zoning changes to accommodate Infill Housing. I have just read through your online materials - they are very helpful. In the Spence Neighbourhood we have about 70 vacant lots - I know this because a friend and I took pictures of each one and prepared a report showing them. We have lost a lot of housing in our neighbourhood in the last 10 or so years and about 500 people have been made homeless because of these losses. My questions are: 1) What can you do to encourage the owners of these 70 properties to develop this new infill housing? Property owners are sitting on these lots and this 'speculation' on their part does not help our neighbourhood. Rather, it creates a 'gap-toothed' look that makes it feel neglected and abandoned.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
121	2) Is the Spence neighbourhood viewed negatively or unworthy by the city? I ask because I understand that the City often has to send its services into our neighbourhood so they could have a negative impression of Spence. But please, do not see this as a reason to leave us out of development plans. I have lived in Spence for over 30 years and it is a great place to live. (Close to everything, reasonably priced, great transport links, Indigenous and international in flavour. If young people want to feel like they actually live in a big city - this is where they would choose to live.) I fear that Spence will be left out of this new building initiative and will come to fulfil the negative stereotypes that many already hold. We often worry about gentrification - but our neighbourhood is so far from being gentrified that it is laughable! We just need good, simple housing - the kind you appear to want to build. I suspect that the resistance you find in other communities will not be present here. Please, do not forget about Spence. Thank you and I look forward to your answers,	Email
122	A couple questions / comment: 1) Will the city enact the long awaited private tree by-law in tandem with the new zoning …..or will community residents also have no say on the trees as well? We keep hearing " other cities have adopted the zoning change that the Fed Govt is mandating to get the HAF" - "other cities" also have a private tree by-law but we don't hear about that. 2.) Could a developer put 2 - duplexes on a 60' or 60+' lot? If so the city should set a limit to "one structure only" .	Email
123	Hi, my name is (name redacted) I live at (address redacted) I would like to see a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Streams to be exempt from high density zoning as per current bylaws and commitment to the Master Greenspace Plan and Biodiversity Policy.	Email
124	My name is (name redacted), I am a soon to be student at the (school name and project redacted) and I have a few questions. Why is the city insisting on not abolishing parking minimums? At the virtual event on the 17th, one of the speakers said it was because of citizens constantly saying there isn't enough parking, but just because everyone says it doesn't make it true. A little under half of Downtown is parking lots and parkades while CF Polo Parks parking is almost thrice the size of the mall. Not only that, but the city shouldn't want "enough parking" parkades and surface lots take away land that can be used for other purposes such as housing, which this whole rezoning is all about. Parking lots are also impervious, making any possible floods worse in an already flood prone area. https://www.strongtowns.org/parking	Email
125	Why is the city still using lot setback minimums? I understand why front setbacks exist in theory, they're supposed to create a buffer between the street and your house, meaning if someone goes off the road, your house shouldn't get hit. In practice however, it makes drivers perceive the street as being wider than it actually is, leading to higher speeds. If you don't want cars crashing into buildings, you should be slowing vehicles down by narrowing travel lanes, implementing traffic calming measures, placing modal filters, etc. Side setbacks are bad in that it reduces the usable land and prevents the construction of lots with shared walls, which means heat escaping from all sides, driving up heating costs. Just require that party walls have adequate soundproofing and your set. https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2017/10/23/the-problem-with-setbacks	Email
126	Why is the city restricting triplexes and four plexes from lots with gravel back lanes instead of just paving the gravel alleyways? We need housing more than ever, why is this restriction being placed instead of just paving the back lanes? I wouldn't want to live in a perpetual dust storm, but I also don't want to live somewhere that forces me to drive.	Email
127	Why isn't the city looking into revising its building code to allow taller single staircase buildings (point access blocks)? The second egress requirement makes building anything taller than two storeys with one staircase illegal, no other place in the world is strict. I implore you to raise the height limit on single staircase buildings aka point access blocks, to at least six storeys, or to abolish it altogether. Doing this can open up the opportunity for more multi bedroom apartments for families in buildings more appealing than what we currently have. The reason usually given is fire safety, but in all truth, point access blocks aren't really any less safe than multi family buildings with two staircases. https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/reports/2025/02/small-single-stairway-apartment-buildings-have-strong-safety-record Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
128	I understand the urgency of securing federal Housing Accelerator Funding and recognize the importance of addressing our growing need for affordable housing. However, I also strongly believe that sustainable development must include a deep commitment to environmental protection—particularly when it comes to safeguarding our waterways and urban tree canopies. These natural assets are critical to our city's resilience, biodiversity, and long-term livability. In support of (org redacted) efforts, I respectfully request that the City incorporate protective buffer zones into its rezoning framework to ensure the preservation of these vital areas. Specifically, I urge you to consider: •A 350-foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •A 250-foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •The retention of existing zoning for properties currently within these proposed buffer zones. This approach offers a balanced path forward—one that meets our housing needs without compromising the health and integrity of our natural landscapes. I hope the City will take this opportunity to lead by example, demonstrating that progress and preservation can go hand in hand. Thank you for your attention to this important matter.	Email
129	I understand the need for some level of infilling in Winnipeg. However not asking or listening to the immediate homeowners that will be affected by the change is wrong. I use to live at (address redacted) and often wished we were still there. I had a beautiful garden that was about 4 feet wide by 20feet long. Now that a monster of a house was build beside it that back yard doesn't get the sun it use to. Not to mention with the huge home and all the large windows face the north which is (address redacted) back yard, there is a huge loss of privacy. Both the loss of sunshine and privacy I can't help but feel sorry for the current home owners. I don't think the current home owners expected they would end up with such a monster house beside them. I no longer think how wonderful it would be if we were still there. So please build where or so it will not negatively affect the neighbors who put there hard earned money into their dream home. Keep neighborhoods beautiful	Email
130	As Winnipeggers we are extremely fortunate to have so many rivers and streams within our city. But we haven't done a great job in the past to protect these valuable resources. I have a few comments in regards to the Zoning Bylaw Amendment as it relates to infill housing. Firstly, I stand with (org redacted) in calling for a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and La Salle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks to be exempt from high density zoning as per current bylaws and commitment to the Master Greenspace Plan and Biodiversity Policy. Building too close to the waterways would negatively impact these spaces for citizens, wildlife, and trees.	Email
131	Secondly, highly valuable mature forests, such as Lemay Forest, should never be considered as infill land. Despite what some developers try to push, building affordable housing is possible while maintaining a livable, sustainable, climate resilient city. The City needs to step-up its protect of valuable greenspaces and waterways.	Email
132	Finally, I think infill housing should not allow livable single dwelling houses to be demolished in one (predominantly single dwelling) neighbourhood in order to build multi-unit housing, whilst single dwelling houses continue to be built in other neighbourhoods - it should be restricted to replacing derelict houses in this situation.	Email
133	I definitely support infill housing as a way to increase density in our city. However, the policy MUST include: 1. 350 foot buffer zones along the Assiniboine, the Red, the Seine & the LaSalle Rivers. 2. A 250 foot buffer zones along Omand's, Sturgeon, Bunn's, & Truro Creeks. 3. Existing properties along these waterways to retain their current zoning.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
134	Good Afternoon, If I've read this correctly and interpreted the imagery provided; A 4 plex with an attached garage in an R2 zoned district is allowed to have unlimited lot coverage, be 39 feet high, be 4 foot from the side property lines, and span from the front yard all the way to the rear of the attached garage. Infill guidelines have some rules about attached garage offset from the rear yard, but we haven't been told what's being modified in that regard. On a typical R2 120' length lot this would completely remove the breeze way of the existing neighbourhoods and neighbours will essentially have a massive wall erected beside them. (see attached) Side note. Provided imagery is extremely misleading. Superimposed 3d buildings are extremely out of scale. They are about half as tall as they would be in real life. I am a proponent of more infill, but not sure this is the way to go about it.	Email
135	Hello: could the zoning bylaw be a ONE year pilot project? Then the city could assess impacts (negative and positive) with public and developer input and make changes as needed. What bothers many of us is the finality of handing over our neighbourhoods to developers with zero public input going forward. We just don't trust the process. Hi (name redacted) I am well hope you are too! Yes I know but hopefully we can have a made-in-Winnipeg-for Winnipeg bylaw. Take care,	Email
136	Hi. If the new zoning changes go through would they apply city wide in R1 zoning areas?	Email
137	There is public resistance to infill. That is based on past experience. City Council is caught between an aggressive push for easing regulations to allow more infill housing, and constituents in their wards who have experienced the impact of bad infill projects, and have become skeptical about any and all infill projects. Councillors, city staff and the industry are each responsible to some degree for bad infill experiences which cause people to say "not in my back yard". The city needs to work with the construction industry to achieve a new standard of behaviour. Research suggests: "thoughtful planning, community engagement, and sustainable practices can help overcome neighborhood resistance to infill development by addressing environmental concerns, preserving historical elements, and creating attractive community spaces." Passing the proposed R1 zone changes without changing infill development behaviour will trigger increased resentment and resistance in all affected wards as bad infill experiences proliferate in those neighbourhoods. Councillors will experience increased resentment. Council can mitigate adverse impacts on their constituents by requiring the infill building industry to implement considerate builder standards within the industry. In this era of "corporate social responsibility", various regulatory authorities are implementing "performance-based regulation" and other schemes to link regulatory benefits to high standards of performance. The basic approach is to work with industry associations to establish standards of performance, and to reward businesses that meet those standards with incentives such as faster processing of applications and access to government procurement tenders. There is no need to re-invent the wheel, a methodology has been established for the construction industry in the UK: the "Considerate Constructor Scheme" [ccscheme.org.uk] . A key concept was that through teamwork the construction industry could delight its customers. Government and industry leaders set out to change industry practices, to increase efficiency and to replace the bureaucratic, wasteful, adversarial atmosphere prevalent in most construction projects with one characterized by openness, co-operation, trust, honesty, commitment and mutual understanding among team members.	Email
137 con't	Industry associations established a voluntary Code of Considerate Practice, committing those in the Scheme to "care about appearance, respect the community, protect the environment, secure everyone's safety and value their workforce". Construction sites and companies voluntarily register with the Scheme and agree to abide by a Code of Considerate Practice. Over 100,000 sites all over the UK have registered with the Scheme. •The government commits itself to being a best practice client, and •develops quality registers of approved contractors, sub-contractors and consultants. …. It addressed citizen concerns without significant government expenditures, and without significantly slowing down permitting. Winnipeg councillors need to address infill behaviour to address the concerns of their constituents and to reduce public opposition to infill. This is a proven and practical way to do it.	continued from above

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
138	I attended the zoom meeting re; the infill housing in Winnipeg, on March 17/25. I have some questions for the committee. 1. What is the city planning on doing to address the parking issues related to infill houses that are slated to be built on a city designated cycling route, namely (addresses redacted).? This cycling route will soon become a parking lot. My concern is for the safety of all cyclists. Warsaw Ave. has a speed limit of 30 and speed bumps were also created. The infill homes that will take over a single family home that is currently at (address redacted). is slated to have (company redacted) build 2 homes on that lot.	Email
139	2. How does the city consider 2 new infills, listed at $749,900 each, affordable housing? This is not affordable for most Winnipeg families.	Email
140	3. Will neighbours be given any notice that a demolition is about to begin? Currently, the single family home at (address redacted). has been vacant for over 1 year. (company redacted) owns that home.	Email
141	I have a couple of questions about the proposed changes to the zoning bylaw. 1.Will the proposed changes exclude the legal subdivision of a single large property into two or more smaller properties (each with a detached building)?	Email
142	2. Is there a maximum number of detached buildings that can be built on one large residential property (e.g., main home plus one detached granny suite)?	Email
143	3. If approved, residents will lose their right to object to the plans for a single property. Will the city replace public hearings (prior to approval) with a robust and inclusive process for reporting issues that arise as the new bylaw is implemented in specific neighbourhoods (after-the-fact)? In other words, how will the larger impact of the changes be monitored?	Email
144	Could property at (address redacted) be rezoned?	Email
145	My name is (name redacted). I live at (address redacted) I have been reading through the slide show material for the open houses on Infill guidelines. I am hoping you can help me understand the potential implications of this proposal on my property We own the first house on (address redacted). I think we would be considered a mid block property as there are properties to the north of us that face Roblin. My questions relate to what could I possibly build on my property if the guidelines come into effect. The lot size is 75x256. If I wanted to maximize the opportunity for infill housing development on my lot what would that look like? Thanks for your help!	Email
146	While we may be unable to attend the meeting(s), (names and address redacted) are noting their support for more infill housing in the city. This should not even be a matter for public debate. Successful, walkable, sustainable cities that are financially stable are dense - full stop. Please stop wasting resources asking the public for reactionary NIMBY opinions they're not qualified to share. Just build the damn housing and save our city money already. We don't need to waste more time and money on studies and public consultation. We need housing, and we need it yesterday. Thank you for your time.	Email
147	I'm so happy that I get to speak up about this subject because it really hits home hard. Last year I was forced to sell my house and because of the money that I would be getting I thought it would be easy to find a rental property for me and my two children along with my late sister's two children. Let me tell you, I sent messages and call over 100 places, even a small two bedroom because I was running out of time. I was forced to take a 5 bedroom home for $2700 a month!!! I barely bring that home in a month, and I'm a single parent so now I'm not only struggling to pay rent but now I barely feed my family as well. My mom helps me now. She should be enjoying her retirement that she deserves but nope - she needs a job to help me and she is over 70 years old!!! Life shouldn't be this hard for anyone, especially senior citizens. Please whoever is in charge of this department should really get the ball rolling and start now! Thank you for the opportunity to voice my concerns.	Email
148	I very much think that more than the majority of Winnipeggers, do we not like these houses at all, Considering they're putting them in the most ridiculous places between houses that had been there for decades or a hundred or so years, I also would suggest maybe to take a vote. So we can stop these ugly homes and for the people that don't like those places might very well be harassed. By the neighbors in which they are placed in between.	Email
149	We have 2 on our street that the occupants take up our entire street with parking! Every family has at least 2 or 3 cars, and do not have enough parking for 1 family, never mind two or 4. There is nowhere for our company to park on street!! That is causing a lot of hard feelings and leading too cramped living. We are CANADIANS not Africa, India, Equador, Ukraine, Russia, or Mexico. Those of us with single family homes, are disgusted that you are pushing us to that! Bad enough our businesses are all being sold to specific cultures, let us at least enjoy OUR homes and neighborhoods. You are leading to a downgrade of our cities, by forcing other people to share what we thought of as a CANADIAN home!!! You are also leading to increased crime, and increase theft, but most of all VERY crowded neighborhoods! There has to be a limit on every street. That should be a very important rule!! A very unhappy concerned Winnipeger! Thank you for listening.	Email
150	My concern living in River Heights is the prospect of a multiplex in the neighbourhood that is already " impacted by combined sewers". I hope that the City has established some restrictions on where these multi-storey/family homes can/cannot be built in this area as the City is aware of the impact on the existing combined sewer areas. If the City been able to rectify the sewer lines to eliminate the combined sewers, this may not impact River Heights as we know and the city knows this is a reality and needs to be included in any approvals for builds and not a free for all for anyone to just build wherever! I would like to see the limitation in writing to prevent serious to disaster from occurring because of multiplex builds here.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
151	I may be working, but I'd like to try to attend the virtual event on March 18 at 7pm. I believe the Q&A period begins after those meetings, but in case I forget, I wondered if I can present a couple of other suggestions/concerns here. I am someone who actually believes that we need this. I will miss my neighbourhood the way I knew it, but we have a housing crisis, and we need to densify. I wish that other areas that aren't already densely packed would get addressed first, but we have back lanes, so I understand. I do have several concerns though, some of which are already being considered. Things like old infrastructure, increased traffic & lack of parking (so please, PLEASE encourage and improve our transit programs to reduce car density), protecting our trees etc. These are important, obviously. Others that I'd mention would be things like school and daycare spots. Schools are already bursting at the seams, so where would these new kids in the area go? Daycare in River Heights just isn't a thing. I've been on the lists since I was 2 weeks pregnant - my son turns 4 in a few weeks. We have no hope. What I'd like to suggest is that, if they're allowing 4 storey buildings on corners or busy corridors, the main floor should be commercial use as a daycare. We have nowhere else to build daycares in this already-densely-packed-and-developed neighbourhood. Another stipulation that I'd like to make about any infill, really, is to PLEASE stop pounding out the old foundations of the tear-downs in the winter, when the ground is frozen. I work in real estate - I understand why they do this, to allow them to focus on building in the warm months. But, when they hammer and pound out old foundations in frozen ground, it transfers the vibrations and stress much further - if (company redacted) is building a house nearby, 12 homes prepare to have new cracks and possible structural concerns. If infills and buildings are going to increase and this isn't addressed, the existing housing stock and much beloved homes will be needlessly damaged. I will endeavor to be at this virtual meeting, but thank you for letting me rant.	Email
152	In efforts to improve housing affordability I would like to see more high density housing in places that are zoned for single family dwellings. I live in charleswood in a single family home and I support high density housing being zoned into more places in my neighborhood. Please make decisions that support affordability for all Winnipeggers.	Email
153	A lot of the duplexes around my area of River Heights and also in St Vital are being bought to be used as Air B and B and short term rentals so not doing much good for affordable housing	Email
154	Just wanted to say that it is very disappointing that there is only one in -person session and that it is downtown at the Convention Centre. You have to pay for parking and this is so inconvenient for senior citizens like ourselves. There are many other places where these meetings could be held. I really don't think our point of view makes a difference and the city will do what it wants anyways. I am surrounded with RENTAL housing all around me in River Heights and the area is becoming so run down that a lot will eventually be in-filled anyways.	Email
155	You have to read (personal info redacted) .. Urban Land Use Policy And Energy Use..U Calgary 1980.. Highly compact dense urban population is the preferred option to manage urban energy use and reduce GHG emissions. Ok you just read the bottom line. CO2 concentration data (about 250 ppm in 1750)	Email
156	We need our existing zoning permits, variance permits to keep control of districts appearances and property landscapes for space and uniformity. Also these permits are revenue for the City Of Winnipeg. Without these permits , the taxes payers will be paying more on property taxes for some one else's development projects. Mismanagement building projects and improper building's structure will be the outcome not having building permits. Inviting slum districts and slum landlords.	Email
157	Keep the Trees for a healthy city.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
158	Wouldn't it be wonderful if the shores of the Rivers (-as yet unclaimed as private land -) could be left as natural beauty. Do not allow more private ownership of property along the two rivers that flow through the city. Why can't the riverbeds be public land as is already the case in public parks? Do people along Wolseley and Assiniboine Avenue, for example, really "own" up to the riverbank? Some people who own property along River Road and Victoria Crescent have installed fencing right down to the Red River. This practice should be banned; city surveyors could fine people and force them to remove fencing up to the Rivers. Increase the walkways along the Rivers wherever possible. (Such a shame to note during the fires in Los Angeles that homes had been allowed on the oceanfront.) Thank You for your consideration	Email
159	I am writing today regarding the consultation process that will lead to recommended zoning bylaw changes for increasing density in areas that are close to public transportation. Our current one story house is mid block from a city bus stop. Our street has numerous one story homes. Our current home enjoys the sunshine afforded to homes that are all the same height. At the present time we live next to a single story ranch style home that we believe will come on the market in the next few years. We have significant concerns about this home being demolished and an infill multiplex home replacing it. Given the current recommendations this home is within 800 metres of a high frequency bus stop and the lot size is 50 feet wide allowing for a four unit structure. We would like to express our concerns that the current proposals would not allow us to exercise our right to oppose this size of development. We believe the following changes need to be incorporated in your recommendations. A zoning bylaw requirement for front and side land allowance that cannot be infringed upon for all large new builds. This should apply from the property line on the front and side of these types of new builds to ensure limited impact on adjacent home foundations and tree canopies. It should be scaled to the size of the new build meaning that the larger the new build the larger the allowance required. A zoning bylaw requirement that allows for the right of appeal when a multiplex is being built between 2 one story homes and is not in character with the makeup of homes on the street. We believe we already live in a densely populated area. The majority of homes on our street have 25 foot frontages and are one story homes. We have concerns about losing the right to influence the size and impact of large build projects next to small homes as well as the impact of these builds on existing older foundations. I hope that your recommendations will mitigate these concerns.	Email
160	I am personally calling for a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks to be exempt from high density zoning as per current bylaws and commitment to the Master Greenspace Plan and Biodiversity Policy. Winnipeg can meet its commitment to density housing without sacrificing, forever our disappearing green spaces! For the people forced to live in a more and more crowded city these buffer zones will be what keeps the peace. The calming effect of natural spaces has long been established and the city must honor the commitment it has made on paper to improve and maintain the meagre natural areas we have!	Email
161	Regarding the impending zoning bylaw changes being considered for increased infill housing by the City of Winnipeg, I am alarmed that under this plan there are no contingencies published that pledge to protect our bio-diverse natural greenspaces adjacent to Winnipeg's waterways. Winnipeg is one of the cities that have signed on to the Montreal Pledge to protect Bio-diversity. The Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework is a historic agreement committing nations to halt and reverse nature loss by 2030. It is concerning and dismaying to learn that there is very little to prevent developers of infill housing from encroaching upon and destroying yet more of our dwindling natural areas which have been neglected, threatened and disappearing for years now. I would ask the City to consider keeping its word as a signatory city of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity pledge by implementing measures and rules to protect the trees and bio-diversity along river and creek banks. Doing so could include: creating a 350-foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250-foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks to be exempt from high-density zoning as per current bylaws and commitment to the Master Greenspace Plan and Biodiversity Policy. We all recognize the great need for increased affordable housing but, once nature is gone, it's gone. Thank you for your time and consideration.	Email
162	Please don't do this . It is a huge mistake that can never be reversed. We should have been preserving our river bank trails for public access. We have only twice in my long lifetime had two mayors who had any vision & we certainly don't have one now. Come on counsellors. Can you imagine how beautiful our city would have been without the condos, apartments, houses, businesses etc on the river banks. We now have wildlife living on the few that are left & a number of bird species nesting in the trees. Give your heads a shake. You are destroying nature. Only a creton would want to destroy the trees & all the vegetation. Who mostly lives along the riverbanks.....the wealthy. Give the rest of us a break. Walking along a river trail is good for mental health. We have enough stresses to deal with. Give us a break....	Email
163	No 4 housing units on one lot just plain stupid but then no future planning done by city like other canadian cities	Email
164	Hi (name redacted) is asking if the sessions will be recorded and available to view later. Thanks	Email
165	Thank you for your reply. Id like to request a recording of todays session as it turns out i will not be able to make it.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
166	Is there any tape we can view? I'm sick and wasn't able to watch	Email
167	Can you please tell me where i can access a recording of this session?	Email
168	Could you please advise what is the next step now in this process, after the three meeting city had. And what is the City approx deadline to finalize these new changes.	Email
169	I attended the Open House on the City's plan to re-zone the entire city which was recently held at the RBC Convention Centre. Thank you for providing this information and for providing an opportunity to send feedback to the people who will ultimately be making decisions affecting thousands of Winnipeggers. I am submitting comments in a document that you will find attached to this email. I look forward to hearing back from someone who can address my concerns.	Email
170	Feedback for Housing Accelerator Fund Proposed Zoning By-Law Change Thank you for hosting the Public Event on March 19 at RBC Convention Centre. I spoke with several city representatives and would like to be express here my continued concerns regarding this project. Please note for your records: I am firmly against this new sweeping zoning change. Here are my concerns and questions which I would appreciate being addressed: 1. P.4 - The City needs to build 14,000 housing units in 3 years to get the $122 million from the HAF: • How many housing units are expected to be built just from the Malls and Corridors Parking Lot development plan? • If a good proportion of these 14,000 units will be met through the Malls and Corridors Development Plan, why do we need to re-zone the entire city? (Other than it being the only way to procure the HAF money, which, frankly, is a mere pittance. Why is it a stipulation that every city needs to re-zone completely to get this money anyway?). • If there are already areas zoned for 2 or 3 housing units, why do we need to change the whole city? Could we not simply develop more in those zoned areas? • It sounds like the only reason to be re-zoning the whole city is because the Federal Government has dangled some money in front of City Hall and told them to do it or they can't have the money. This money is not remotely sufficient to build/fix/renew the infrastructure that the city is in desperate need of doing. And my understanding is that the lion's share of that money is designated to incentivize developers into building these multi-unit dwellings and is not going to be used for infrastructure. In summary, it is the Federal Government who is pressuring/incentivizing this whole project, it is not necessarily what is best for the city. 2. P.5 - "Required Zoning Amendments" - there are 8 requirements listed, but for some reason this presentation only focuses on the first 2. This is already a problem and a convenient way to postpone publicizing future difficulties inherent in this plan. How is adding more bureaucracy when the city is in debt going to save money for the city? • Requirements 3 through 8 all require money - "establish a Capital Grant Incentive Program" (someone needs to run this and create the infrastructure to make it function), "establish a land enhancement office" (either needing to have its own office space or carve out space to rent somewhere, presumably will be hiring employees), "introduce a concierge for affordable housing service" (again, presumably requires employees, office space, some way of making it function), "Digitize and facilitate faster development and permit approvals" (again, there is cost in salaries involved here or in contracting this job out), "conduct a Housing Needs Assessment" (conducting assessments always costs lots of money and takes more time and more man-power than expected). • So we have multiple new bureaucratic entities being formed to carry out the tasks required by the HAF which is only giving the City a pittance of $122 million. Why is this a good idea? 3. P. 5 - "Conduct a Housing Needs Assessment" - why isn't this the first thing that is done rather than the last thing that is done? Shouldn't we be assessing the needs we have in our own city first, and then determine if it is even a good idea to take the equivalent of bribe money from the Federal Government to push an identical policy in cities across this country despite regional differences and differences in needs? Why is the federal government pushing its own agenda down the throats of local communities this way? By doing this assessment first, it would reveal if there is truly a need and where this need is located and the best way to address this need for our city. I recognize that this current document references Our Winnipeg 2045. But even Our Wpg explicitly states that the whole document is written to implement the United Nations 2030 Sustainable Goals, not written to meet needs that are local to us specifically.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
170 con't	4. P. 6 - You seem to want to use the "everyone is doing it" mantra, which I am seeing more and more being touted across this Country, Province, and local communities by government. We teach our children (or should at least) that this is not a good way to live your life or make decisions, and yet the people running this city, province, country think it is a good way to run Canada. That is crazy and we need to rethink this. • Interestingly, the four cities you wish to emulate as having already accepted the Government "carrot" of HAF funds and have made zoning changes to accommodate this, Surrey, Edmonton, Calgary, and Mississauga, all have coincidentally also signed the Global Covenant of Mayors, pledging allegiance to following the wishes of un-elected global entities rather than their own people. (Much like the Our Winnipeg 2045). 5. When is the City going to deal with the current water/sewage/alleys/roads/basic infrastructure needs, never mind adding more density to the mix before this current shortage in infrastructure maintenance is even dealt with? According to comments I found in the Complete Communities 2.0 document, one concerned person stated regarding combined sewer in Mature Communities, "Increased [housing] density violates Provincial Environment Act License No. 3042 section 8: the licensee shall not increase the frequency or volume of combined sewer overflow in any sewer shed due to new and upgraded land development activities." If this is true, then sewer upgrades must be done first. • P.9 - "development will be subject to capacities for water and waste servicing." Does this mean in a place like Wolseley, where raw sewage is regularly dumped into the Assiniboine River to deal with the lack of sewage capacity, that this kind of density-increasing in-fill housing WON'T be allowed until sewers are upgraded? Yet Wolseley is a community near major transit routes and therefore is particularly targeted for increased density. Wolseley is not the only area of the city that has water and waste issues. How is the (in-debt) City going to deal with this contradiction? • I actually spoke to a zoning guy at the Public Event and asked him how they were going to deal with this in my neighbourhood and my understanding from that conversation is that decisions to allow infill housing in an area will be about lot widths and location, not sewer specifically. Also, there is no intention to upgrade sewer in these combined sewer systems first. They might require some remedial sewer stuff by developers, but as all these discussions will only take place behind closed City doors if this is passed, then I guess we'll never know as residents. • P.9 - How will this plan "greatly reduce the cost of infrastructure" and reduce cost of services when more strain will actually be placed on this infrastructure? Is the plan to increase taxation to bring in more money? If so, shouldn't the City be upfront about this? The only way I see that it will "greatly reduce the cost of infrastructure is by ignoring infrastructure and just collecting more tax money due to the increased density. • P.9 - How will improving access to public transit and cycling reduce commute times? Does this simply mean that the "haves" will have an easier time driving their cars because the "haves nots" will be squeezed into areas more densely and not be able to have vehicles? (See "C-40 Cities" document below). Commuting by bus isn't exactly fast and is often not very convenient. And cycling in the winter? How many City employees and City Councillors bike to work all winter? 6. Potential Negative impact that is curiously not listed - reduction in property value of single family home neighbourhoods.	continued from above
170 con't	7. Nowhere in the document is the term "Mature Communities" defined. I had to go searching in other City documents and finally found a map showing those areas in Our Winnipeg 2045. Being a Mature Community doesn't seem to mean anything for Wolseley, the whole neighbourhood being given a 39 foot height restriction almost universally on your map (p.12). Seeing as most of Wolseley also has smaller lot widths, that should mean lower heights (and max 2 units for most places) but because it's close to transit it gets the highest height limit. This makes no sense and is confusing. Which category does it fall into? 8. P.18 - "Visualizing Infill Housing" - it looks like these new developments will basically get no yard, no personal green space. Nowhere to have a garden, for example. How does this benefit the health and well-being of people? • There was no "visual" example for places like where I live, where the lots are barely 25 feet wide. There will be no green space, no yard at all, no real frontage. Why was there no visual for this when these areas are often near major bus routes and already barely have a yard. I'd like to see what a place like that will look like. In speaking with a City representative, he indicated my area is zoned R2 (I believe) which meant there were no percentage-of-lot maximums. So this means for my area that in-fill housing will likely fill the whole lot, as I have seen done already under our current rules. 9. P.24 - "As Of Right" - this means that the people will no longer get any say into what their communities look like, that "City Officials" get to decide what is best for a community despite not living there and not knowing anything about the nature of the community. And as City Planners change their ideas, or are told what to do by unelected bureaucrats such as the WMR or the UN, less and less will be done that reflects the desires of the communities. We are outsourcing all City planning ultimately to Federal and Global influences at the expense of the people who actually live there and understand their communities. (P.12 of Our Winnipeg 2045 explicitly states that the document is based on UN 2030 goals, not necessarily what will work for Winnipeg, or what meets our unique situation and needs, but what foreign entities say we should do and how to do it. It's the "everybody's doing it" mantra once again.) • Who will be the ones making the actual decisions about specific projects in specific neighbourhoods? Will it be unelected public service workers? Will it be our elected representatives? Will it be an unelected WMR board? Will it be other global entities? I would really like to know in order to understand how these changes will practically impact my community. City Hall is already notorious for its lack of transparency. Now decisions will be made solely between developers and City Hall employees behind closed doors with no recourse for people living in the neighbourhood. I don't like it. 10. In a nutshell this is how the zoning change proposal appears: The people give up all rights to say what is best for our own communities. This new re-zoning plan seems to square quite nicely with WMR's Plan 2050 density plan, serving to side-step the issue of opposition to Plan 2050 expressed by hundreds of affected people. Back in October 2024 I sent an email thoroughly describing the loss of control City Council would experience if Plan 2050 is implemented. I only received a cursory acknowledgement of my concerns, not answers. Has any one read over my concerns and will I finally get some answers? Furthermore, I am wondering if anyone at City Hall has read either the Global Covenant of Mayors Companion Guide for Canada document or the C-40 Cities document. I have attached screen shots from the C-40 Cities document below to highlight for you the fact that it is not a joke, a conspiracy theory, or an overstatement when I said above that unelected global forces wish to make decisions at local levels which remove the autonomy of the people living there. Mayors around the world, including many Canadian Cities now taking the government money to re-zone themselves, have sworn allegiance to globalist goals through signing the Global Covenant of Mayors. As stated above, the four cities you highlight as having already made these zoning changes have, coincidentally, also already signed the Global Covenant of Mayors.	continued from above

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
170 con't	And according to C-40 Cities, the following changes are expected to be implemented at the Municipal level according to globalist ideology (I did not vote to hand over my rights to global entities). 1) The “Ambitious” Target for 2030 is to have zero cars on the road. The more “moderate” goal is to have only 190 cars per 1000. I guess this works for dealing with cars in dense areas (see my #5 above). Remember, these are goals for Mayors, being written by unelected global entities) 2) The “Ambitious” Target for 2030 is to allow zero meat and dairy (nor dairy alternatives) to be consumed and a maximum daily caloric intake to be 2500 calories per person. These globalist initiatives are expected to be carried out by local Mayors. 3) The “Ambitious” Target for 2030 is to allow only 3 new pieces of clothing per person per year, again to be carried out by Mayors. Try raising children when only 3 new clothing items are allowed per year. These are just a few of the things that our “elected officials” seem to be moving toward by following orders, not from a mandate given to them by voters, but from unelected global bodies who want to control what is happening at the local level, or in this case, from the Federal Government which is also following orders from unelected global entities. Why is a tiny city like Winnipeg, located in a vast wilderness we call Manitoba, expected to follow the exact program that huge mega-cities in crowded countries are following without doing a thorough assessment of what our exact contribution is to the global problem? We should be looking at what we should and need to do given our experience, our contribution, our location, etc., not doing some “cookie-cutter” response because some unelected bureaucrat in Geneva says everyone has to do it. It makes no sense. These are the reasons I am against these new Zoning by-law changes. Local changes need to start from local issues, not be imposed on us from people who don't even live where we live. Thank you for taking the time to read this.	continued from above
171	To all City Planning Committee Staff regarding Infill Housing in Winnipeg, I am a long-time resident of Old St. Vital. I originally purchased my home here because of the lush forested areas that line the riverbanks at both ends of our street, (address redacted). My concern is, the tree density has been drastically reduced with the dense infill-housing builds over the past 10 years and now the threat of river lots being stripped of the natural, 60-100 year old forests that line them. The forested areas not only support natural wildlife and produce clean air but also serve as areas that promote mental health wellness and inner serenity... a vital component in my ((and my husband's) personal mental health maintenance. In this chaotic world of uncertainty and economic stressors, we all need these places of sanctuary in our lives that are free, easily accessible and close to home so we can escape there year-round to de-toxic and de-stress. Please protect our green-spaces! Please help protect the green-spaces that nurture our minds and souls and refresh our bodies so we can be find balance in this noisy, busy, hectic life of this country's and the world's disturbing events. I support the efforts by community groups that call for: • 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a • 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand’s, Bunn’s, and Truro Creeks to be exempt from high density zoning as per current bylaws and commitment to the Master Greenspace Plan and Biodiversity Policy.	Email
172	I have a question on the map below, which I believe the portion of Kenaston Blvd (route 90) between Academy Road and Corydon should also be categorized as the purple zone. 1) Because there's very condensed bus lines, than any other area of the city. 2) And also the route 90 expansion project with City of Winnipeg, going to widen that part of route 90 also justified the high traffic needs, which should be categorized as the purple, which is beneficial to have 4-plex for easier access of Winnipeggers without car.	Email
173	I had attended one of the virtual meetings and I was told that all of the questions would be available online with the answers. I cannot seem to find these questions. Where are the questions and answers?	Email
174	Thank you for your quick reply, I gather from your response that not all questions will be answered, only those that are most frequent. I understood that all of our questions at the virtual meeting would be addressed and that the answers would be available online. I would appreciate it if you would provide all of the questions and their answers online prior to any decision deadline. At the end of the virtual meeting there were 260 questions of which the majority were not answered.	Email
175	I attended one of the virtual meetings. In a multiplex housing unit such as a fourplex, who owns each of the units. During the presentation it was mentioned that each unit would be privately owned as opposed to a rental unit. Given private individual ownership, who is responsible for the maintenance of common areas and the exterior of the building? The designs presented had shown a single large building with a single driveway to a four door garage. Who shovels the snow? Who paints the exterior? Who mows the grass (what little there will be given the size of the building)? These units can become unsightly and not maintained. I am having trouble understanding how a multiplex unit that shares the building and grounds will work. I can see how the many side-by-side units present in the city work given they only share a common wall but have their own building and yard to maintain. Can you clarify.	Email
176	What is lot coverage, total lot coverage? pervious surfaces? The numbers don't add up? Example of lot coverage on p. 20 Thank you.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
177	Hello, my name is (name redacted), I'm a soon to be student at the (school redacted) studying environmental design. I have a question I'd like to keep asking, because it is so important to me as an aspiring urban planner and a fan of great cities. Why isn't the city of Winnipeg looking to abolish parking minimums? This is a serious question I want answered, there is no reason to keep parking minimums when they are known to be disastrous for the environment and housing affordability. Parking minimums create more impervious surfaces, makes construction more expensive, wastes land, encourages driving, lowers tax base density, and places undo burdens onto small businesses. Other Canadian cities have gotten rid of them, like Edmonton, Regina, and Saskatoon, all three of which are very similar to Winnipeg, so saying Winnipeg is just different is not a valid excuse for keeping parking minimums. Also, with the current political climate with the states, we should be moving away from the American style of building our city for the car, and start building for the people, like European cities. Thank you for taking the time to read this. Sources: https://www.cbc.ca/amp/1.7500760 https://assets.cmhc-schl.gc.ca/sf/project/archive/housing_organizations4/impact-of-parking-requirements-on-housing-affordability_final-report.pdf https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2018/7/2/3-major-problems-with-parking-minimums https://www.strongtowns.org/journal/2024/2/7/the-best-argument-for-parking-mandates-is-still-wrong https://reason.org/commentary/why-parking-minimums-are-holding-back-housing/ https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0965856499000075 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0967070X23000574	Email
178	I was unable to attend this event due to illness. Is there a presentation or meeting minutes available?	Email
179	I attended the in-person event at the convention centre on March 19th. Speaking to one of the planners, it became clear that the information presented in regard to building height and setbacks does not adequately describe the extent of the proposed changes. I feel both of these proposed changes need to be presented in a clearer way to the public if the City really wants to have a legitimate public consultation. For context, I live in Wolseley which is zoned R2 and is within 800 meters of a transit corridor. My 1.5 storey house is located on a 33' x 91' lot. My comments refer to panel 10 that compares existing permitted building heights to proposed building heights, and to panels 18 to 23 where examples of possible 2, 3 and 4 unit developments are provided. Building height - panel 10: It is stated that proposed building heights will be unchanged (28-35 feet) for 2 unit buildings, increased a little to 30-35 feet for 3 unit buildings, and increased to 39 feet for 4 unit buildings in the 800 meter zone. As an R2 area, my neighbourhood has an existing 35 feet permitted building height so the proposed increased height will only apply in the case of 4 unit buildings in the 800 meter zone. This makes the proposed change appear to be minimal. What is not stated is that the existing permitted building height of 35 feet is only allowed within an area contained within the setbacks - that is, the location of the principal structure. Small accessory structures, such as detached garages, are permitted within the rear yard but they are limited to a maximum permitted height of 13 feet. Further rules governing lot coverage and separation from the house prevent a garage from filling the entire back yard. Only after examining panels 18 to 23, does it become clear there will be a large change in permitted building height (from 13 feet to 39 feet) in the rear yard of any given lot. Setbacks - panels 18 to 23: The only information regarding proposed changes to setbacks is in the form of thin dashed lines on the Building Placement plans on panels 18 to 23. The dashed lines are not labelled so many persons won't understand what they refer to. A planner at the event confirmed that the dashed lines indicate proposed setback lines. Dimensions on the plans consistently show 10 feet front yard setbacks, 3 or 4 feet side yard setbacks and 2 feet rear yard setbacks for 2 to 4 unit buildings. For the front yard setback, the planner stated that generally 'alignment' would be the standard for front yards, not 10 feet, but didn't clearly elaborate on when the 10 feet dimension would apply. In my neighbourhood the currently required R2 setbacks are: 'alignment' for the front yard, 3 to 4 feet for the side yards, and 25 feet for the rear yard. Small structures such as detached garages are permitted within the rear yard and may be located minimum 2 feet from the rear lot line and minimum 2 feet from a side lot line. This arrangement produces a large building volume in the middle of the lot (maximum 35 to 39 feet high as per above) and a small building volume in the rear of the lot (maximum 13 feet high as per above).	Email
179 con't	While the proposed front and side yard setbacks will remain consistent with the existing zoning, the proposed reduction of the rear yard setback from 25 feet to 2 feet is a significant change that is not clearly indicated in any of the information panels. This change will have a major impact on the livability of adjoining properties. With the proposed rear yard setback being reduced from 25 feet to 2 feet, the maximum permitted building height of 35 to 39 feet will extend from the 'alignment' front yard setback all the way back to within 2 feet of the back lane. In essence, there will be no back yard and a single (up to 4 storey) building covering approximately 3/4 of the lot. This will lead to long side walls, with few windows due to the narrow side yards, extending approximately 3/4 of the lot depth. 39 feet high buildings, only 2 feet from the lane, will loom over it. Depending on lot orientation, like the east/west orientation of most of the lots in my neighbourhood, this will also lead to a large shadow covering much of a north-side neighbour's back yard for much of the day. Mitigating the impact on the rear 25% of a lot is needed. It is these related changes (height and setback in the rear yard) that I feel have not been adequately explained in the current public consultation material and will lead to some surprised and possibly angry residents when the first such projects go up. The planning department needs to address this gap in public information and address the negative impacts on neighbouring lots.	continued from above

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
180	I am an 80 year old property owner in Winnipeg. I have seen what were once wonderful areas to live in; deteriorate to the crime ridden core . I have seen street maintenance and street conditions deteriorate although property taxes have steadily increased over time. There was little to no thought put into the planned refurbishment of deteriorating sewer and water systems; no thought put into properly planning parking requirements and enforcement. The city of Winnipeg created an area to accommodate a criminal element, which eventually ruined a large portion of the North end of Winnipeg. The same identical scenario is now unfolding in many other newer areas as well . Imagine lots with single family dwellings being demolished and a 4plex being built in its place. Now there are 4 homes in the same space one occupied. Now instead of 2 vehicles, there are 8 vehicles at least ? Instead of sewer and water requirements for perhaps 2-4 people; there are now requirements to accommodate the demand of 10 - 15 people; or more ? The same old city sewers and water systems; which in most cases are nearing the end of their life cycle; now are expected to handle this great increased demand. Imagine 100 properties like this in the same area ? Now imagine the parking congestion; the demand for same transportation on these old narrow streets; with no parking for vehicles at many residences ? What happens in a few years when utilities must be replaced, and upgraded ? No old sewer has the capacity nor the ability to handle this increased demand for any length of time . The city are occupied expanding outward with new developments; This costs each and every property tax payer money, for the infrastructure of these new developments. There are roads; and streets; and utilities required of which the normal resident shares in the cost to some degree. These streets must be cleared and maintained etc.. It is this type of incompetent planning that has put Winnipeg in the financially strapped position it finds itself today. Why doesn't the city look at owning and developing and refurbishing a portion of the North end ; there are many abandoned properties which should be seized and developed into this type of housing. Imagine the impact constructing or refurbishing 100 old homes in the North end would have on the entire city; and how the crime rate would be impacted ? This small enterprise alone could help thousands of people find a respectable home i which to live affordably. Why deface and degrade well established neighbourhoods in this city; when in reality all that is being done is in many instances; new slum type; crime ridden areas will be created. I can see this now beginning to unfold in the St. Vital - St. Boniface areas. Not something that any councillor or mayor should be proud of ? I really have faith that more thought will be put into this proposed new undertaking for building infill housing . A lot of peoples lives will be impacted; and a lot of great inhabitants will be uprooted, not of their choice. This is a certain way to create a new much larger problem; while attempting to solve a housing issue. A great idea with an entirely wrong approach.	Email
181	Question: What will be done to expedite permit processing in relation to adding secondary suites? We recently went through this process and experienced the following delays waiting for permits: Development permit - 2 months Building permit - 2 months (delayed further by Christmas break) Verification of use letter to facilitate hydro dual connection - 3 weeks Water meter permit/issuance of meters - 4 weeks What made these delays even worse is that we had to wait for the development permit before we could apply for the building permit. We then had to wait for the building permit to apply for electrical/plumbing permits. What was really irritating was that we had to apply separately for a the verification of use letter, that basically verified that the development permit, which we had just received, was in place and valid. In summary, out of the 7 months this project took, 5 months of the project were awaiting permits/letters/etc. In this particular case it resulted in an additional $20,000 in carrying costs. Needless to say, if the permitting process is not streamlined, we will not be taking on another project of this type.	Email
182	I have a question about the potential changes that the City of Winnipeg may be implementing in order to increase the housing stock in Winnipeg. Most (all?) of what I have seen has been targeted towards new construction. For example, it appears as if everything is to accommodate buying an existing property and tearing down the existing house and building a new, multi-unit building. My question is about renovating existing structures. There are a number of neighbourhoods that have large (generally older) houses that could accommodate a significant renovation of the existing shell to convert the structure to a multi-family building. For example, I used to own (address redacted). This was a 1905, two and half story house. It was converted from a single family dwelling to a six unit "apartment" of self contained one bedroom suites. This was done while meeting all building code requirements that were in place at the time of the renovation. This property has an R2 RESMC - Multifamily Conversion status which allowed this conversion from single family to multi-family to take place. With the proposed changes, will it be possible to convert any single family (R1) house to multi-family? I believe that the ability to convert an existing structure (while meeting the new requirements on lot size, parking, etc.) would be a quicker and more cost effective manner of increasing housing density in our city.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
183	Protect Winnipeg's Waterways and Trees by adding the following to the Infill Housing Rezoning bylaw 1.Implement a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Streams to be exempt from higher density zoning; [1] [2] [3] [4]. Existing properties within these buffer zones to retain their current zoning;[5] 2.Ensure decisions reflect the knowledge gained from the "Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy" (nearing completion) for stewardship of natural assets and reconciliation - support the "Urban Forestry Strategy" goal to expand the urban tree canopy - uphold the Montréal Pledge signed in 2023 to take action for biodiversity - honour the 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland; 3.Refrain from selling city-owned riverside land and instead preserve it for parkland; 4.Clearly mark all rivers and streams on the Infill housing maps	Email
184	Thanks for this information. I attended a virtual session and some questions were not answered. I am unable to attend these other in person events as I will be out of town, but am still concerned with a few things: 1. It was said numerous times by the presenters that "no one seems interested in four unit homes" "developers seem like they won't build 4 unit homes". My questions is, if it is not likely to happen and 4 plexes are a concern (they seemed to be in the meeting I attended), why is it on this bill and can 4 plexes be taken off then ? 2. The concern of trees was brought up, the presenters referenced a tree by law. This is not in effect so I don't think it is relevant to be referenced. These new builds extend the building foot print and often have parking in the back which removes front yard and back yard trees. This goes against the previously passed urban forest strategy for canopy cover that was previously approved by council. It was also stated that there are landscaping specifications the developer has to follow, but these could not be provided. What is the plan to maintain and increase canopy cover in these proposed areas for development ? 3. The combined water and sewer systems are a big concern for me. We (as a City) have been polluting fresh water systems with raw sewage and I don't know if these older systems can handle the increased amount of flow. This question kind of went unanswered in the presentation I attended. 4. Obviously the character of these developments. Is there a way to keep the increased tax revenue from these new builds and put a portion of it directly back into the neighborhoods that are affected ? I am sure you have noticed that many of these neighborhoods (grant park. Rockwood, Beaumont, Maybank) have infrastructure and maintenance that needs to be done (road work, sewer upgrades, community development, park upgrades, tree planting, etc.) And often have lower cost homes associated with them. It would be good to put the additional taxes generated to use directly in the neighborhoods it effects. 5. This was talked about and kind of (in my opinion) brushed off at the meeting I attended. There are many of these new builds in my neighborhood that are about 40 percent more than my older home. This is not affordable housing in my opinion and should not be lumped in with affordable housing. Would you or someone from your team be able to find some answers to these questions or bring these questions to one of the meetings ?	Email
185	Stop ruining old neighbourhoods by adding these light-speed ugly houses. Come up with a better looking design that fits into the areas your "infilling" instead of dropping 2 of these (redacted) into 1 lot. It's all a scam	Email
186	Where can I find a map or a list of streets with more detailed information on the streets that are affected by this proposal. As well what streets are eligible for 2 unit, 3 unit and 4 units based on average lot sizes on the street. Also will affected streets be notified that they may be affected?	Email
187	I had two questions I was hoping to get answered. 1) The term "affordable housing" comes up a lot, what price points are being defined as the price tag range for this? I ask because most infill housing that's built in say, the St. James area is hovering around 510-550k. And I'm not sure most people would define that as affordable, unless they wanted to be a landlord, and even then. 2) Why are certain neighborhoods absent from the proposed infill housing plan? Tuxedo and some of the more expensive older areas are not included, but have the larger lots which could allow for larger multi family units, rather than trying to squeeze more units on smaller lots in other parts of the city.	Email
188	I understand the importance and the value of infill housing in our city; however, increasing the density of human impact on the environment comes with issues. Therefore, I ask that the considerations listed below be taken into account as planning is undertaken. Also, when infill housing is designed it MUST NOT negatively impact existing houses (structures) on either side or around them. The design must fit into the existing style of the street/neighbourhood. And, maybe above all, any infill housing MUST NOT overpower by size or block light from existing houses/structures. Protect Winnipeg's Waterways and Trees by adding the following to the Infill Housing Rezoning bylaw 1.Implement a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Streams to be exempt from higher density zoning; [1] [2] [3] [4]. Existing properties within these buffer zones to retain their current zoning;[5] 2.Ensure decisions reflect the knowledge gained from the "Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy" (nearing completion) for stewardship of natural assets and reconciliation - support the "Urban Forestry Strategy" goal to expand the urban tree canopy - uphold the Montréal Pledge signed in 2023 to take action for biodiversity - honour the 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland; 3.Refrain from selling city-owned riverside land and instead preserve it for parkland; 4.Clearly mark all rivers and streams on the Infill housing maps [1] Waterways and Watercourses Regulations 2005https://legacy.winnipeg.ca/ppd/Documents/CityPlanning/Riverbank/Best-Management-Practices-Handbook-for-Activities-In-and-Around-the-Citys-Waterways-and-Watercourses.pdf [2] Species at Risk, Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation 2024https://mbhabitat.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/SAR_Booklet_LandownersGuide.pdf [3] Complete Communities 2.0 p. 137 2022 [4] Ecologically Sensitive Land Strategy 2007https://legacy.winnipeg.ca/publicworks/parksopenspace/NaturalistServices/PDF/ESNL.pdf	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
189	I took a look at your high-res map online and it looks like our home in Riverview (address redacted) is outside the 800m boundary of a regular transit route. Is this correct? Admittedly, I'm not a map person and without street names I wanted to make sure. The 895 runs near us, but it is not very regular and does not run all week. If we're outside, we will not attend the public open house, so any information you can provide is appreciated!	Email
190	In page 10 of the Presentation Materials, it is indicated that a Side by Side with a Front Drive will be allowed for a lot with a Width of 50 feet compared to a Side by Side with a Backlane where the required Width is only 40 feet. Our client has a lot with a Width of 45.2 ft and is seeking clarification if he would still be allowed to build a Side by Side with a Front Drive on this lot. We understand that there is usually an allowance of +(-) 5 Feet that may be used by the City in looking at having substantial compliance with the regulations so that the Width of 45.2 feet may still be considered compliant. Thank you and we look forward to hearing from you on the above.	Email
191	What a disaster you are creating. The Feds offer money and you fools will destroy everything to get it. Congestion, crime, service. Immigration is killing this province. You're getting 4.7 billion from the Feds an running 2 billion deficits while raising every tax. The more you immigrate, the worse it gets.	Email
192	If the City of Winnipeg is holding additional public consultation sessions on infill housing, where are these consultations being held?	Email
193	Does your office have ANY information, or at least concern, regarding the condominiums that were SUPPOSED to be built (they originally said by 2021) north of the (address redacted) SINCE your department has concern about the need for more housing, is there any concern about the empty land that was supposed to have, originally, 48 condos, then changed to only 36 condos. Phase 2 had sold about 75%+ if the condos. Then THAT developer was basically foreclosed on, and a NEW owner developer HAD tried to build 78 mixed RENTALS, but required the agreement of at least, I believe, 80% of the Phase 1 owners. It was turned down 100%. I am NOT asking for legal advice, but what YOUR department's position is on the land where Phase 2 was supposed to be built. It is currently nothing but dirt, gravel, and an obvious "eye sore". ANY information you have as to your department's knowledge and/or position on this empty land will be very appreciated.	Email
194	Please protect our water and green spaces. Natural areas are so important for so many reasons. The science is clear. Let's get this right for us and for all those who will come after us. (Name redacted) ASKS Protect Winnipeg's Waterways and Trees by adding the following to the Infill Housing Rezoning bylaw 1. Implement a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Streams to be exempt from higher density zoning; [1] [2] [3] [4]. Existing properties within these buffer zones to retain their current zoning;[5] 2. Ensure decisions reflect the knowledge gained from the "Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy" (nearing completion) for stewardship of natural assets and reconciliation - support the "Urban Forestry Strategy" goal to expand the urban tree canopy - uphold the Montréal Pledge signed in 2023 to take action for biodiversity - honour the 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland; 3. Refrain from selling city-owned riverside land and instead preserve it for parkland; 4. Clearly mark all rivers and streams on the Infill housing maps	Email
195	Please send me link to access infill housing zoning	Email
196	Implement a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Streams to be exempt from higher density zoning; [1] [2] [3] [4]. Existing properties within these buffer zones to retain their current zoning;[5] 2. Ensure decisions reflect the knowledge gained from the "Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy" (nearing completion) for stewardship of natural assets and reconciliation - support the "Urban Forestry Strategy" goal to expand the urban tree canopy - uphold the Montréal Pledge signed in 2023 to take action for biodiversity - honour the 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland; 3. Refrain from selling city-owned riverside land and instead preserve it for parkland; 4. Clearly mark all rivers and streams on the Infill housing maps	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
197	I have lived in, or right beside, old St Vital for a long time, and I have watched many many infills be built into the area. While I do not believe a little structural renewal and densification are a bad thing, the problem that is manifesting through the prioritization of building multifamily infill housing is the reinforcement of systemic oppressions. Overwhelmingly, the infill structures that have been built in my area are duplexes with an average cost of approximately $600,000, which is obviously not affordable for most. I think it is also important to note here that I haven't seen any truly affordable single family homes built anywhere in our city in years. Based on the infill zoning bylaw proposal presentation materials on your website, it seems that we think the housing crisis can only be fixed by shoehorning as many new multifamily units as quickly as possible into older neighborhoods, and into other places that more privileged people are never expected to live. Why are we so scared to build truly affordable single family homes in city expansion areas like Sage Creek or Bridgwater Forest? Also, why isn't it mandatory for many of these large new homes in these new areas to be built as duplexes to help with densification? Why aren't the people who live on residential lots in these areas also expected to live on top of each other, with only a tiny patch of front yard grass to share? Why do we expect marginalized people to live in places that they cannot own and build equity in for themselves? Why do we think it is okay that their hard earned dollars should always go towards building equity for someone else? Why do we expect marginalized people should work multiple jobs and more than 40 hours per week to keep a roof over their head? Do they not deserve rest and recreation? Why do we expect marginalized people to live so close together and/or in rundown buildings? Why do we expect marginalized people to live in places where only the landlord gets to decide if and when appliances need to be replaced, what type of improvements will be made, the paint colour on the walls, etc? Why do we expect marginalized people to live close to noisy traffic corridors? (I live right along St Mary's Rd. Trust me, it is truly unpleasant in a way that quite literally has had a negative impact on my health. I would love to move, but quieter spaces are not affordable)	Email
197 con't	Why do we expect marginalized people to live in places that do not allow them a bit of private yard to play with their children in, to garden in, to relax in, etc? Why do we expect marginalized people to live in places where their home can be taken away so easily by unethical landlords? Your proposed infill bylaws do not fix these unfair and oppressive expectations, nor do they ensure improved access to good affordable options. They only serve to continue to tell marginalized people that their housing needs and home enjoyment are not important. These proposed infill bylaws only continue to reinforce the terrible cultural notion we have that marginalized people deserve the least and the worst. We can and should do better than this. The powerful oppression of capitalism will always find ways to funnel money away from marginalized people and into the pockets of the privileged. It is the duty of all levels of government to find ways to ensure that capitalism doesn't grind our communities so far down that the only option for many is to live in a tent on the edge of a river. Here's an article interview that is worth reading featuring Michael Storper, an economic and urban geographer who teaches at the University of California (UCLA), Sciences Po and London School of Economics - https://www.planningreport.com/2019/03/15/blanket-upzoning-blunt-instrument-wont-solve-affordable-housing-crisis And here is a powerful quote by Howard Zinn, an American historian, playwright, philosopher, socialist intellectual and World War II veteran - "Give people what they need: food, medicine, clean air, pure water, trees and grass, pleasant homes to live in, some hours of work, more hours of leisure. Don't ask who deserves it. Every human being deserves it." We all deserve a good place to call home. It doesn't have to be big or fancy, but it should be affordable, comfortable, functional, well built, safe, quiet, hopefully energy efficient, and never something that shackles us to a life of poverty. Privileged people will continue to be very okay even if we make some political choices that do not benefit them. It is time to shift our priorities and start doing the hard political work towards equity. Especially in this time when we can look south of us and see very clearly what happens if we don't.	continued from above

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
198	I am addressing concerns I have with the intent of the zoning changes being proposed to allow two-unit, three-unit and four-unit homes in various neighborhoods. Some units to be as tall as up to 39 feet. Winnipeg's Older neighbourhoods are made up of many smaller peace time/war time and bungalow homes. Most of these neighbourhoods are well maintained and cared for. Bringing new development of these large homes will change and most likely bring the value of these neighbourhoods down. My concerns are: 1. Will the homes (units) being built represent and blend in the neighbourhood. -For example: -Neighbourhoods of bungalows, 1 1/2 story and bungalow homes only having two-unit homes built there. -Neighbourhoods of 2 1/2 story homes having two and three-unit homes built. -New neighbourhoods with the HUGE HOMES have the four-unit homes (up to 39 feet) built. (they may actually blend in) -Will the larger four-unit homes be built in the proposed vacant parking lots, perhaps in the vicinity of new apartments being built?? 2. Will the homes (units) be rented properties or condos (purchased by the home owner). 3. If the homes (units) are to be rented will the City consider to put in place an incentive to RENT TO OWN. *As most realize, that if you own something, you take PRIDE* 4. Who will be the Developer, Who will own these Homes (UNITS), Who will Profit from these developments?? Who is accountable for the state/condition (up keep of these homes/units if they are RENTALS) ????	Email
198 con't	5. The Zoning Changes: ** IF THIS PASSES, DOES THIS MEAN THAT ALL BUILDING, MOVING FORWARD, DOES NOT HAVE TO BE POSTED TO HAVE RESIDENTS KNOW WHAT IS OCCURRING IN THEIR NEIGHBOURHOOD, AND NOT ALLOW US, THE EXISTING HOMEOWNERS OUR INPUT. *THAT WE COULD WAKE UP TO A HOUSE BEING TORN DOWN AND *WHATEVER* BEING BUILT BESIDE US, OR ON OUR STREET** 6. 800 meters to a frequent transit route, encompasses MANY of the older areas of Winnipeg. I realize that there have been a few Sessions made to give information to residents of Winnipeg, and the recent on line info of the upcoming Open house schedule. There should be more Public Notice of this intent so that the Residents of Winnipeg are made aware of the UPCOMING ZONING BYLAW CHANGES and are able to have input into these decisions which could and will change their neighbourhoods. Whether this be done by Radio, TV ADS, Flyers etc. Most people I talk to about the Open Houses Schedule, and the Zoning Bylaw Changes, are UNAWARE of it.	continued from above

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
199	I'm reaching out to you to ask the city to consider preserving public space along the riverbanks as they move towards increased infill housing. The four specific asks are that you consider adding these to the bylaws: 1.Implement a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Streams to be exempt from higher density zoning. Existing properties within these buffer zones to retain their current zoning; 2.Ensure decisions reflect the knowledge gained from the "Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy" (nearing completion) for stewardship of natural assets and reconciliation - support the "Urban Forestry Strategy" goal to expand the urban tree canopy - uphold the Montréal Pledge signed in 2023 to take action for biodiversity - honour the 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland; 3.Refrain from selling city-owned riverside land and instead preserve it for parkland; 4.Clearly mark all rivers and streams on the Infill housing maps Winnipeg is a unique river city, home to diverse ecosystems that contribute to biodiversity, climate resilience, and community well-being. While building affordable housing is essential, it must be approached in a manner that complements, rather than compromises, our natural environment. Approving high density along waterways will compromise progress toward the environmental goals and actions and commitment to reconciliation outlined in the Master Greenspace and Natural Corridors Plan and Biodiversity Policy, due for completion in 2026. Preserving riverside green space will: - keep valuable riverbanks and river views for the public's health and enjoyment;preserve urban ecosystems that contribute to a climate-resilient city; - demonstrate that Winnipeg is making responsible decisions to protect biodiversity. - protect owners from erosion, flooding, and overland flooding due to climate change; -preserve trees to reduce 'urban heat island effects', especially important in areas of the city with limited greenspace and boulevard trees; The proposed buffer zone distances of 250' and 350' are derived from Winnipeg - Best Practices Handbook for Activities in and around the City's Waterways. The guidelines specifically identify the riverbed and lands extending 350 feet on each side of the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and La Salle Rivers and the creek bed and lands extending 250 feet on each side of Bunn's, Omand's, Sturgeon and Truro Creeks as Ecologically Sensitive Areas requiring protection.	Email
199 con't	This area is consistent with provincial legislation and guidelines and most consistently matches the edges of the ecologically valuable riparian areas if they were allowed to exist. Is consistent with La Petite Fourche National Urban Parks Proposal - Waterways Conservation Framework. In contrast to the best practices handbook, the Winnipeg Waterway by-law allows development in the buffer zones . The combination of advanced engineering and financial investment has facilitated construction on floodplains and along eroding waterways at the cost of natural vegetation, protective ecosystems and public access. The absence of ecological considerations for permits under the Waterway by-law is an omission that undermines long-term environmental goals such as the Greenspace Master Plan and Biodiversity Policy and Montréal Pledge which aim to preserve and enhance natural corridors. I wish you much success in creating more housing, but ask that rights to public access of nature and the needs of non-human life be protected in the new wording.	continued from above
200	I read in the Winnipeg Free Press several weeks ago that there was a proposal by an organization to limit infill development on lots bordering public parkways. Has this concept been included in the current version of the guidelines? Could you share the name of the group/organization making the proposal?	Email
201	I heartily support building higher density homes in our city, however I believe that protecting our rivers and streams is essential to ecosystem health, biodiversity, erosion prevention, flood and drought prevention, and human wellbeing. Riparian buffer zones will add beauty to our city, increase much needed green spaces and protect our tree canopy. I urge you to implement protection for the rivers and streams while addressing the new for additional homes. Sincerely, (Name redacted) Protect Winnipeg's Waterways and Trees by adding the following to the Infill Housing Rezoning bylaw 1.Implement a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Streams to be exempt from higher density zoning; [1] [2] [3] [4]. Existing properties within these buffer zones to retain their current zoning;[5] 2.Ensure decisions reflect the knowledge gained from the "Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy" (nearing completion) for stewardship of natural assets and reconciliation - support the "Urban Forestry Strategy" goal to expand the urban tree canopy - uphold the Montréal Pledge signed in 2023 to take action for biodiversity - honour the 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland; 3.Refrain from selling city-owned riverside land and instead preserve it for parkland; 4.Clearly mark all rivers and streams on the Infill housing maps	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
202	Please Protect Winnipeg's Waterways and Trees by adding the following to the Infill Housing Rezoning bylaw: 1. Implement a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Streams to be exempt from higher density zoning; [1] [2] [3] [4]. Existing properties within these buffer zones to retain their current zoning;[5] 2. Ensure decisions reflect the knowledge gained from the "Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy" (nearing completion) for stewardship of natural assets and reconciliation - support the "Urban Forestry Strategy" goal to expand the urban tree canopy - uphold the Montréal Pledge signed in 2023 to take action for biodiversity - honour the 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland; 3. Refrain from selling city-owned riverside land and instead preserve it for parkland; 4. Clearly mark all rivers and streams on the Infill housing maps Thank you, for including my asks in your Infill Housing Rezoning bylaw. I am looking forward to your response.	Email
203	We reside at (address redacted). Already in our one back lane stretch, five 50 ft properties have been split into two 25 ft properties resulting in 10 builds by the time all are completed, perhaps by the end of this year. 4-unit single structures on 50 ft lots would be preferable. My question: 1. Is there a maximum limit on the number of property splits that can occur on one block of back lane? Suggestion: Do not allow hardscaping with gravel instead of sod. Within one year, weeds grow through the landscaping fabric and can only be eradicated with chemicals or weed burners. Gravel does not suit our neighbourhood.	Email
204	The biggest problem I have with your new proposal is the silencing of the people. The last thing we need now is to copy the people south of us. If someone is living on a street with bungalow's new housing should match it. If I am on a street in a bungalow and my yard is facing north - south and you allow a lot to the west of me to get filled with two large two stories, what happens to my sunlight in my yard? It is gone. I feel this would decrease my property value and should get a tax reduction. I don't like the way city planners are planning now. This new proposal will make it worse. I have previously asked questions to city planners with regards to some developments in the Osbourne village area. Answers given to me were out of a textbook. No common sense applied. The Lemay forest situation is an embarrassment. Long ago there should have been a no go zone applied to the grave yard area. Thumbs down all around for me.	Email
205	I support the position of Ours Winnipeg on this matter and urge that the following be incorporated into the Infill Housing Rezoning bylaw. (name and address redacted) 1. Implement a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Streams to be exempt from higher density zoning; [1] [2] [3] [4]. Existing properties within these buffer zones to retain their current zoning;[5] 2. Ensure decisions reflect the knowledge gained from the "Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy" (nearing completion) for stewardship of natural assets and reconciliation - support the "Urban Forestry Strategy" goal to expand the urban tree canopy - uphold the Montréal Pledge signed in 2023 to take action for biodiversity - honour the 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland; 3. Refrain from selling city-owned riverside land and instead preserve it for parkland; 4. Clearly mark all rivers and streams on the Infill housing maps _____ [1] Waterways and Watercourses Regulations 2005 https://legacy.winnipeg.ca/ppd/Documents/CityPlanning/Riverbank/Best-Management-Practices-Handbook-for-Activities-In-and-Around-the-Citys-Waterways-and-Watercourses.pdf [2] Species at Risk, Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation 2024 https://mbhabitat.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/SAR_Booklet_LandownersGuide.pdf [3] Complete Communities 2.0 p. 137 2022 [4] Ecologically Sensitive Land Strategy 2007 https://legacy.winnipeg.ca/publicworks/parksopenspace/NaturalistServices/PDF/ESNL.pdf	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
206	IS THIS PART OF THE 15 MINUTE CITIES?	Email
207	I support the purpose and main thrust of this program. However I do not see evidence supporting the 800 m distance from frequent transit stops. This seems to me too far to expect many to walk to transit in Winnipeg conditions. If so, hi-rise development at the extremes would be spotty and more disruptive of local neighbourhoods. The objectives of the program might be well met by a shorter distance, maybe in the 400-500 m range. I expect this would make the program more acceptable to more residents. I suggest this should be a co-equal objective of the program design. The present design appears to me to be unbalanced in this regard. This could be a strategic error - one that leads to failure of the program.	Email
208	Attached is our response to the PPD public engagement process for Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing. This letter outlines our request and rationale for the establishment of buffer zones to exempt waterways from being rezoned for higher-density development. We strongly urge your thoughtful consideration of the need to include protection of waterways and preserve vital tree cover. Waterways and Trees (org redacted) voices its concern regarding the inclusion of waterways for high-density infill zoning by default, under the Housing Accelerator Fund. We strongly advocate for the city to exclude its waterways from such zoning. Establishing a protective buffer zone for waterways, similar to the 800-metre buffer zone created for four-story houses, would safeguard these vital natural assets and align development practices with the city's commitment to ecological preservation and reconciliation. As a distinctive river city, Winnipeg boasts diverse ecosystems that are crucial for biodiversity, climate resilience, and the overall health of the community. While the city is laser focused on infill housing, striking a balance between urban development and ecological conservation is key to safeguarding these benefits and securing a sustainable, thriving future for generations to come. Approving high-density housing along waterways will result in tree loss, reduced pervious surfaces, and negative impacts on biodiversity, climate resilience, and community well-being. These waterways are the city's most biodiverse lands, with densest tree cover and are intercontinental bird flyways and ancient trails for people and wildlife. The city's plans and laws have led to the approval of development on riverside land over preserving it for the public good. In Winnipeg, about 7% of land is designated as parkland, with the majority of greenery situated on private property. Approximately 90% of the urban forest canopy exists on private land. Alarmingly, it is estimated that less than half of Winnipeg's riverbank property is publicly owned, and this number continues to decline. Recently, the city authorized the sale of several publicly owned riverbank properties—integral to the Greenspace and Natural Corridors Plan Bylaw and Biodiversity Policy—for high-density housing development. Under the recently approved HAF Malls and Corridors plan, riverside treed lands along commercial zones were rezoned for high-density housing with minimal green space requirements, even on eroding riverbank sections. Even city owned parkland was sold.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
208 con't	Approving high density housing on the waterways weakens the city's environmental objectives and its promise to reconciliation. Moreover, it jeopardizes the implementation of the Master Greenspace and Natural Corridors Plan and Biodiversity Policy ahead of its anticipated completion by end of 2026. The City of Winnipeg and Indigenous partners joined together to co-develop the Greenspace Plan and Biodiversity Policy. This collaborative effort not only supportsenvironmental goals but also strengthens their commitment to reconciliation and respect for the land. This commitment must be honoured. Why is the city so resistant to plan for and set aside natural areas? Residents care deeply about natural areas and have repeatedly stepped up to defend natural assets—be it Harte Trail from becoming a regional road, Save Our Seine's efforts for Bois des Esprits, the protection of 700 acres of golf lands, Parker Lands, Lemay Forest, and numerous smaller sites and now safeguarding riparian areas from rezoning to higher-density housing by default. Building on that sentiment, we propose the city stand up to its commitments to greenspace preservation and reconciliation and add the following four amendments to the Infill Housing rezoning by-law: Protect Winnipeg's Waterways and Trees by adding the following amendments to the Infill Housing Rezoning bylaw 1. Implement a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Streams to be exempt from higher density zoning; [1][2][3][4]. Existing properties within these buffer zones to retain their current zoning; 2. Ensure decisions reflect the knowledge gained from the "Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy" (nearing completion) for stewardship of natural assets and reconciliation - support the "Urban Forestry Strategy" goal to expand the urban tree canopy - uphold the Montréal Pledge signed in 2023 to take action for biodiversity - honour the 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland; 3. Refrain from selling city-owned riverside land and instead preserve it for parkland; 4. Clearly mark all rivers and streams on the Infill housing maps Preserving riverside green space will: •keep valuable riverbanks and river views for the public's health and enjoyment; •preserve urban ecosystems that contribute to a climate-resilient city; [5] •demonstrate that Winnipeg is making responsible decisions to protect biodiversity. [6] •protect owners from erosion, flooding, and overland flooding due to climate change; •preserve trees to reduce 'urban heat island effects', especially important in areas of the city with limited greenspace and boulevard trees;	continued from above
208 con't	Buffer Zone The infill plan already establishes a precedent for buffer zones, with an 800-metre zone marking proximity to transit routes. Similarly, a designated buffer zone for waterways would align with this approach, supporting ecological preservation and balanced urban development. Single-family homes on treed lots provide vital ecological benefits, including preserving green spaces, maintaining biodiversity, and supporting natural water absorption through pervious surfaces. However, higher-density developments lead to extensive tree removal, the reduction of permeable surfaces, and the loss of critical habitats, significantly diminishing these essential environmental assets. Winnipeg - Best Practices [7] The buffer zone distances of 250 feet and 350 feet are based on guidelines outlined in Winnipeg's "Best Practices Handbook for Activities in and around the City's Waterways." These distances provide a foundation for establishing protective measures to safeguard the integrity of the city's waterways and adjacent natural environments. The guidelines specifically identify the riverbed and lands extending 350 feet on each side of the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and La Salle Rivers and the creek bed and lands extending 250 feet on each side of Bunn's, Omand's, Sturgeon and Truro Creeks as Ecologically Sensitive Areas requiring protection. This area is consistent with provincial legislation and guidelines and most consistently matches the edges of the ecologically valuable riparian areas if they were allowed to exist. Also, it is consistent with La Petite Fourche National Urban Parks Proposal - Waterways Conservation Framework. [8] Winnipeg Waterway By-law 5888/92 9 Unlike the guidelines outlined in the Best Practices Handbook, the Winnipeg Waterway by-law permits development within buffer zones. While advanced engineering and financial investment have enabled construction on floodplains and along unstable waterways, this has come at the expense of natural vegetation, vital protective ecosystems, and public accessibility to these areas.	continued from above

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
208 con't	Align city waterways decisions with key environmental commitments: We urge the city to reconsider its stance on high-density zoning near waterways and ensure that rezoning amendments are consistent with key environmental goals and policies. This approach will help protect and preserve critical natural resources for the benefit of current and future generations. 1. Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy - Commitment to Reconciliation Creation of the Greenspace Plan and Biodiversity Policy are directed by Council through OurWinnipeg 2045, Complete Communities Direction Strategy 2.0,and the Winnipeg Parks Strategy. New Release June 17, 2024 - City of Winnipeg and Indigenous partners join together to co-develop Greenspace Plan and Biodiversity Policy. [10] “By integrating Indigenous knowledge and urban planning, we can ensure our greenspaces and natural corridors are preserved and enhanced for generations to come. This collaborative effort not only supports our environmental goals but also strengthens our commitment to reconciliation and respect for the land." - Mayor Scott Gillingham, City of Winnipeg “I am pleased that the City reached out to the AMC to co-develop its greenspace plan and biodiversity policy. This approach is essential for reconciliation and creating solutions together that recognize First Nations, including their treaty lands within Winnipeg. I look forward to other co-development initiatives with the City of Winnipeg." - Grand Chief Cathy Merrick, Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs 2. Urban Forestry Strategy The city’s modest goal to increase the urban canopy from 17% in 2018 to 20% by 2045 (17,000 trees per year) will not be achieved without including private land. Waterways, which represent some of the city's most densely treed regions, face a significant risk from higher-density rezoning, directly undermining the goal of a 7% canopy increase over 20 years. Furthermore, with an estimated 90% of the city's trees situated on private land, particularly along river corridors, the absence of a tree bylaw to protect them presents a critical gap in achieving this goal. 3. Montréal Pledge In 2023, City Council committed to the Montréal Pledge, signifying its dedication to addressing the decline of urban biodiversity. This pledge emphasizes proactive measures to not only halt biodiversity loss but also safeguard and enhance it within the city. Ensuring that policies and development decisions align with this commitment is key to maintaining progress toward these vital goals. 4. 1000 acres of additional parkland In 2022, City Council approved an amendment to OurWinnipeg 2045 to expand the city's greenspace by 1,000 acres by 2045 (in 20-years), a commitment to fostering environmental sustainability and enhancing the quality of urban life for its residents.	continued from above
208 con't	5. Parks Strategy Increase parkland as density grows. Natural resources are critical for the city’s biodiversity. 6. Ecologically Sensitive Natural Land Strategy (ESNL) Riverbank areas are extremely important for aesthetics, erosion control, water quality, aquatic and terrestrial habitat, corridors, greenways and maintaining ecosystem health. “They are therefore always considered Ecologically Significant Natural Lands.” [11] (p. 33) The river bottom forest generally consists of three sections (ESNL p. 28). 1. Riverbank is the gently sloping area right next to the edge of the river, stream or creek. 2. Relatively flat floodplain, above the riverbank. 3. Terrace lies above the floodplain, on the highest elevation within the river bottom forest, farthest from the river, grasslands and trees. Many species thrive by accessing a mix of two or three interconnected habitats, as it fulfills their diverse needs for shelter, food, and reproduction. Best Practices Handbook for Activities in and around the City’s Waterways and Watercourses (2004) [12] “The City is committed to the protection and stewardship of the important natural assets and values represented by its waterways and adjacent lands.” Riparian zones provide: • Erosion Control: Riparian vegetation is known to stabilize channel banks and reduce erosion, protecting fish from the harm caused when eroded sediment clogs gills, covers spawning grounds, and obstructs or displaces food sources. • Filtering Function: Riparian vegetation serves as a filter for surface water, protecting water quality by trapping contaminants and sediments contained in runoff and reducing inputs of unwanted nutrients and other pollutants to the watercourse. • Dissipation Function: Riparian areas help to dissipate the energy of floods by storing floodwaters and helping to retain water in soils. • Climate Control: Riparian vegetation provides temperature regulation by shading waterways, keeping them cool for fish during hot weather. • Habitat Function: Mature trees adjacent to the stream, in addition to being a source of terrestrial insects that serve as fish food, create habitat diversity for songbirds, raptors, small mammals and other wildlife species through woody debris accumulation, vertical snags, nest and perch sites and winter and summer dens. • Sustainability Function: Riparian zones support aquatic and terrestrial food webs for both fish and wildlife. • Corridor Function: Riparian zones serve as integral travel and migration corridors between habitats for many wildlife species	continued from above

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
208 con't	Allowing construction too close to rivers and streams and disregarding the contribution of these natural assets leads to poor riparian management. Examples include: • Over engineering riverbanks with concrete, disrupting ecosystems and worsening erosion. • Removing vegetation and trees, increasing sedimentation, harming habitats, and raising water temperatures. • Ignoring the flood-controlling benefits of wetlands and treed areas, which leads to severe damage during heavy rains. • Construction activities causing erosion, destabilizing banks, and lowering water quality. Photos – Building too close to the river Examples of disastrous riparian management, vegetation and tree removal, and attempts at river bank stabilization • View from Bonnycastle Park, Assinboine River • St Mary's Road, Red River • Formers Shriners's Hospital site, Wellington Crescent on Assinboine River Please feel freed to contact us to discuss this further. (name redacted) [1] Waterways and Watercourses Regulations 2005 https://legacy.winnipeg.ca/ppd/Documents/CityPlanning/Riverbank/Best-Management-Practices-Handbook-for-Activities-In-and-Around-the-Citys-Waterways-and-Watercourses.pdf [2] Species at Risk, Manitoba Habitat Heritage Corporation 2024 https://mbhabitat.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/SAR_Booklet_LandownersGuide.pdf [3] Complete Communities 2.0 p. 137 2022 [4] Ecologically Sensitive Land Strategy 2007 https://legacy.winnipeg.ca/publicworks/parksopenspace/NaturalistServices/PDF/ESNL.pdf [5] Prairie Climate Centre, Building a Climate Resilient City https://prairieclimatecentre.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/pcc-brief-climate-resilient-city-urban-ecosystems.pdf [6] Montreal Pledge https://portail-m4s.s3.montreal.ca/pdf/vdm_montreal-pledge_2022.pdf [7] Winnipeg - Best Practices Handbook for Activities in and around the city's Waterways p. 24 https://legacy.winnipeg.ca/ppd/Documents/CityPlanning/Riverbank/Best-Management-Practices-Handbook-for-Activities-In-and-Around-the-Citys-Waterways-and-Watercourses.pdf [8] Waterways Conservation Framework https://www.wpglittleforks.com/downloads [9] Construction Regulations along City Waterways https://legacy.winnipeg.ca/ppd/CityPlanning/Riverbank/ConstructionRegulationsAlongCityWaterways.stm	continued from above
208 con't	[10] City of Winnipeg and Indigenous partners join together to co-develop Greenspace Plan and Biodiversity Policy June 17, 2024 https://www.winnipeg.ca/news/2024-06-17-city-winnipeg-and-indigenous-partners-join-together-co-develop-greenspace-plan-and-biodiversity [11] Ecologically Sensitive Natural Lands Strategy p. 23 (2007) https://legacy.winnipeg.ca/publicworks/parksopenspace/NaturalistServices/PDF/ESNL.pdf [12] Best Practices Handbook for Activities in and around the city's Waterways p. 3 https://legacy.winnipeg.ca/ppd/Documents/CityPlanning/Riverbank/Best-Management-Practices-Handbook-for-Activities-In-and-Around-the-Citys-Waterways-and-Watercourses.pdf	continued from above
209	I have recently reviewed the infill housing. I agree with the need to utilize the empty spaces in all of Winnipeg I am concerned about affordability. In the River Heights area there have been infills completed, to the tune of $550,000-750,000 per each unit developed on one old lot. No where in this " infill" project, does the word or concept of affordable housing arise. Affordability is the key issue with the types of building. High rises are not for families, and since rent has increased exponentially a 2-3 bedroom is now unaffordable for many. The average salary for Manitoban's is $52,000.00 , using the 2/3, 1/3 rule who can afford housing. I look forward to the development and I hope the city council review the word affordability.	Email
210	Please protect Winnipeg's Waterways and Trees by adding the following to the Infill Housing Rezoning bylaw: 1. Implement a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Streams to be exempt from higher density zoning; 2. Ensure decisions reflect the knowledge gained from the "Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy" (nearing completion) for stewardship of natural assets and reconciliation - support the "Urban Forestry Strategy" goal to expand the urban tree canopy - uphold the Montréal Pledge signed in 2023 to take action for biodiversity - honour the 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland; 3. Refrain from selling city-owned riverside land and instead preserve it for parkland; 4. Clearly mark all rivers and streams on the Infill housing maps;	Email
211	I have an old house with lot size 60x125 behind northgate mall, i am looking to subdivide this property and want to build 2 units + 2 units on each lot. How much does it cost for subdivision? and who do i contact to start my application.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
212	If there is an effort to increase density I wanted to ask if the city would consider lowering its maximum db threshold for overnight noise. Other more densely populated cities in Canada and overseas have a maximum db level of 45db. Multi unit buildings may have multiple competing air conditioners and heat pumps or larger air exchange systems. I believe a lower db level will help improve livability in established neighborhoods and help prevent developers from installing systems in poorly positioned locations on the properties. Thanks for your time, (name redacted) p.s. I don't know if this email address is tracking general opinion on the infill proposals, but incase they are I will say that I have many concerns. I feel that there are a lot of options available to the City that could be addressed without compromising the unique character of individual neighborhoods. Giving more access to a capitalist entity such as a developer will not (in my opinion) result in positive change. I also feel like this proposal is eroding trust in our city leaders before they have had a chance to build much good will with the citizens. As a member of the community I find it a hard pill to swallow when past city/developer corruption scandals are still fresh in people's minds and in news cycles.	Email
213	With Winnipeg having meet the requirements for the infill fund and exceeded it. Why are we still allowing the affordable homes the average person can afford being bought up and torn down to build two skinny homes. You go into new areas and large homes are still out pacing multifamily homes or even skinny homes on 25' lots. Even though the prices are quite high for all these homes. Certainly not for first time or low-income families. Yet you take river Heights Charles wood etc. small bungalows, great starter homes and affordable are being torn down and lot split and building $750,000 up to around 1.2-million-dollar homes. These homes are not affordable don't suit or blend into the areas at all. Putting the extra strain on the amenities and the streets weren't designed for this and can't handle the extra cars or traffic. We just had our streets cleaned every street within blocks in river Heights had no parking for the cleaning, yet the new homes or the proposed new multi plex's don't require enough parking spots for the owners. There were lots of cars on the street as it is so sweepers just went around them. This soon will be a waste of tax dollars to do street sweeping as homeowners will not or required too have enough parking spots on their own lots. It takes for ever to get onto Academy now that the two lanes are reduced to one on Academy especially near (street redacted) from the new 4 plex that was built, and they park on that street. The new skinny homes on (Streets redacted) that have been for sale for quite some time $850,000 have removed the sale signs and are now for rent. The rent is still out of reach for most and the poor bungalow's having to deal with the shading and massive walls they now get to enjoy seeing every day. Try driving down the street and say we made the right decision for the area they fit right in and look fantastic and ask the neighbor how proud they are of the city for allowing this to happen. Just think about how you can continue this. But we still have lots of areas to get things right and build homes that PEOPLE CAN AFFORD before you destroy existing neighborhoods that we have invested in. You still can build a home on the original lot with an income suit that will blend into the neighborhood. Remember we need affordable homes and bungalows for the newcomers and the aging. Stop taking them down. I would like to age in River Heights but I'm sure in few years the bungalows will be torn down and replaced and will look outside the city to get away from this or maybe sooner depending on your next move of destroying the neighborhoods with the new plan.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
214	I have some feedback and questions regarding the upcoming public information sessions about infill housing. I've grouped them into two categories: 'General,' relating to feedback or questions about process, and then 'Specific,' regarding questions directly about the HAF Zoning By-law Amendment document that has been shared with the public. Thank you for taking the time to read and respond! (name redacted) General: 1. My feedback concerns the location of the information sessions. I think one ought to be located more centrally, such as something like: between Portage and Logan, and Main and Route 90. 2. What is the purpose of the public information sessions? Clearly, one is to inform the public of recommended changes. I think this is a really good idea. More specifically, I am wondering if a member of the public has feedback, recommendations, objections or what-have-you, is there some mechanism for recording, enumerating, and conveying them? 3. In the HAF Zoning By-law Amendment, it is noted that we are at Round 2 Open House; followed by 'Finalizing' of 2, 3, and 4 unit rules; and then a Public Hearing, which is anticipated 'late Spring.' a) Why would the public hearing be after and not before finalizing the rules?... What is the purpose of the public hearing if it isn't to provide feedback for consideration and amendment? c) When is the public hearing scheduled for and how will it be advertised? d) What happens and when, after the public hearing? e) My feedback is also, that there should be more than one hearing. One hearing severely limits public participation and the democratic process. Specific to the HAF Zoning By-law Amendment document For context, I am a on a street zoned R2, with lots that are 30 feet wide, that have a paved back lane, and most-to-all (including my own) that are within 800 metres of frequent public transit. I understand this means that a developer will be able to build a 2 unit 'up-down' structure on these lots. (The exception would be lots that have already been designated for higher density because they are on a corridor. I am not asking about these.) 4.a) Can a developer potentially purchase two 30 foot-wide, side-by-side properties to qualify to build 3 or 4 unit dwellings? b) And if they can, does this ultimately mean that the dwellings on my street that are within 800 metres of a frequent public transit could reach 39 feet high (11.0 metres)? 5. On page 14 of the document, referencing 'Maximum lot coverage,' there is an "n/a" for R2 zoning. a) What does this mean? I.e. Does this mean a developer can build up the entire lot without leaving any setback or yard space? b) I believe this is a change from what was previously allowed. I did look this up previously when I thought a house beside me might be torn down to build a new home, and I recall being relieved that there were setback expectations. Please share the specific changes the document allows with regard to maximum lot coverage in R2 zoning. c) Please also explain how this contrasts with the various R1 limitations.	Email
214 con't	d) Please also confirm that the illustrations on pages 18 - 23 are 'best case scenario' R1E ~ 43% maximum lot coverage, and therefore, not representative of any of the other R1 coverages, least of all R2. 6. On page 15 of the document, it reads "One off street parking space is required per unit," and that they must be paved. On our very narrow 30 width lots, two parking spaces nearly eliminates backyard greenspace. a) Could more than 2 parking spaces be allowed? How? b) Our backlane is a disaster of potholes and lumpy quick-fix asphalt/stone/gravel fixes. Could development be connected to prioritizing repaving of the associated streets and backlanes? c) My feedback is that the temperature in the city core in the summer is already very high, due in part to greater pavement area and tree loss. Many people cannot afford air conditioning. We should be looking at less paving, not more. 7. I do not understand what is meant on page 29 about additional building attachments to the primary mass in the form of 'wings' or 'projections.' Please explain and provide examples. Lastly I do support creating more dense housing and specifically not continuing to build the city 'out,' which is costly for infrastructure, ecologically irresponsible, and not sustainable. And I think all neighbourhoods need to contribute in some way. But as you can see from my questions, I am also concerned about the narrow lot size on my street and streets nearby. When I clean my eaves, I can stand with my feet on my neighbour's roof and my hands on mine. I am concerned we are going to lose what small green space we have in our front and back yards, to buildings and pavement. There certainly isn't much public green space in our old neighbourhood. We should densify here as elsewhere, but wisely.	continued from above

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
215	So, Parker lands is a no go. The city is pushing for more housing, you say we need it and that is why you are pushing for 3 & 4 plex's and splitting lots in mature areas. These areas are well developed for the areas and the infrastructure that is in place. Remember the sewers and water and streets were planned for what is in place now. Telling the residents that we have no say and what we have invested in our properties doesn't matter to you and our privacy in our yards. I wish someone like the mayor would go look at the 4 plex that is on the corner of Lindsay and Academy and go down the back lane and see what the neighbors now get to see. How would you like to own that house and be in your back yard and seeing all the neighbor's windows facing your back yard 3 feet from the fence. Then say that the parker lands is over developed for the lot it was to be built on. It meets all the requirements for your housing you say we need and what more can you ask for. Designed for the area water waste roads tons of homes and apartments condos and right beside rapid transit. Sure, goes beyond what you say we need. But tell us we no longer have a say in mature areas because you know what we need and will voice and jam you housing plan down our throats. Think you really need to rethink your plans or at least say what are we doing because we have really got double standards happing and we are not in a housing crunch. Do the math we have exceeding the numbers and much more homes are being built and new areas coming up. You just need to wake up and see the only thing we need is affordable homes not homes on 25' lot selling for $700,000 plus and congesting the mature areas that are facing congested streets, Overtaxed sewer systems. Limits on basement insurance because of the aging systems.	Email
216	I love that there are going to be more dense housing options for our city, but as someone who has lived for years in a new duplex infill, I think there is one huge flaw. These new builds are not required to have any soundproofing between the two units. This wouldn't be a deal breaker if it was purely your own family's noise, but this was very grating and was the main reason why I am going to be purchasing a single family home in the future. If we are supporting infill development, we MUST address the concerns of people who are going to be living in the infills. We need the building plans to include soundproofing requirements!	Email
217	How do I get a detailed map so I can see if my address could be effected? The map you are offering is high level with little details!	Email
218	(name redacted) has been dogging me recently re: one of the details in the slide deck for the Infill Housing Zoning amendments – specifically the detail showing a fourplex with a 10' driveway and four garages on slide 23, shown as follows: The issue the (name redacted) brought up, and (redacted) have checked using sweep path analysis is that if this is how the site is laid out, for larger (or even mid-size) vehicles, they won't be able to drive up that driveway and pull into the garages, it appears it becomes too tight for vehicles to navigate. The design may need tweaking to play around with the width of the driveway and the specs on the size of the individual garage stalls. I was just wondering where this design was sourced, e.g. if there are real world examples of this design (e.g. that have been built in other cities that I can be shown, say on Google Street View) that show that vehicles can successfully park in the garages without conflicting with one another. Has PP&D done their own sweep path analysis on vehicles using the garages in this concept? I am worried that if the design doesn't work that vehicles won't use the garages (they will use the garages for storage) and the cars will take over the on-street parking, creating parking issues and pushback from neighbours where these homes are built. Can someone get back to me on this?	Email
219	Below are my questions with regards to proposed infill housing: •What are the requirements for maintaining green space and existing mature trees on properties with infill projects? •What are the requirements for developing new green space and planting trees if a property is cleared before development? •Is there a timeframe where development of green space (planting grass/landscaping) must be done? •Are there any penalties or fines if not complying to adding green space? If you review the area south of munroe / north of Johnson / in between Henderson Highway and Watt Street you will see many infills that have gravel front and back yards. These properties were once home to mature trees and greeny yards. Elmwood/East Kildonan is losing existing mature trees and existing green space (front yards) for these infills and they are not being replaced. Ensuring there is a requirement for infills to have green space/trees planted will ensure mature areas do not lose any more existing trees, since we are already losing many to disease which are not being replaced.	Email
220	Mtg on May 2 -Don't need the toilet houses with multi suites taking over our neighbourhoods where Houses -actual houses were. Needs to be stopped tearing down decent houses and installing these cheap ugly houses crammed in the space . Brings down our neighbourhood . Also I live in East Kildonan and resent being lumped into area without East Kildonan identity ! Thank you . Unable to attend but want this brought up. I'm against all these multi shacks .	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
221	Affordable housing for singles, seniors, young couples vanishing in Glenwood, as do the yards and trees. Please see these two current listings: Sorry the second link did not work now it does. … This is what is replacing affordable housing throughout Glenwood neighbourhood. Note the small back yards are now cement parking pads. Many of the tiny front yards are river rock. (Seriously with no new dedicated parks in mature neighbourhoods, where are kids and dogs supposed to play?) We keep asking these questions but nobody answers them.	Email
222	I am very concerned about the proposed residential zoning bylaw amendments. Infill housing, if thoughtfully done, can be a good thing. However, as proposed, most of the city will be at the whims of developers who have no interest in building better communities. I have strolled through many infill neighbourhoods, including my own (St. James), and infill housing does not look at all like the slides in the City's presentation. In particular, all mature trees are cut down and there is often no remaining greenspace; the land not covered in buildings is turned into a parking lot and gravel beds. This is contrary to the City's commitment to biodiversity. At a minimum, I request the following changes be made to the proposed bylaws: • Implement a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Streams to be exempt from higher density zoning. Existing properties within these buffer zones to retain their current zoning; • Ensure decisions reflect the knowledge gained from the "Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy" (nearing completion) for stewardship of natural assets and reconciliation - support the "Urban Forestry Strategy" goal to expand the urban tree canopy - uphold the Montréal Pledge signed in 2023 to take action for biodiversity - honour the 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland; • Refrain from selling city-owned riverside land and instead preserve it for parkland; and, • Clearly mark all rivers and streams on the Infill housing maps.	Email
223	With respect to the proposed infill (as-of-right) by-law: 1) The proposed bylaw strips local residents of their right to comment on development that will occur in their immediate community, in return for a pittance (relative to the loss of our rights) in federal monies. A simple by-law hearing process, for which the outcome has already been pre-determined by council, is inappropriate given the loss of resident rights and the wide-ranging impacts the proposed by-law will have. A city-wide referendum is the most appropriate venue to determine the fate of this proposed by-law. 2) Instead of open and transparent city governance we will have decisions made behind closed doors. This does not encourage public trust and should not be acceptable to any government. 3) The by-law fails to provide for the maintenance of the distinctiveness of neighborhoods of unique character, Bourkevale and Charleswood for two. It will lead to the loss of diversity of lifestyle opportunities and result in the homogenization of the city. This will only encourage the growth of satellite communities with more friendly single family policies. 4) The maximum height of 39' within the 800m belt along high-frequency traffic routes is inappropriate for existing R1 communities. Private properties will be cut off from sunshine and families will face loss of privacy. Where 4-plexes are expected in existing R1 neighborhoods, maximum height should be no more than the current maximum height prescribed for existing R1 neighborhoods. 5) To respect recent zoning decisions where public hearings have been held within, say, the last five years, there should be a carve-out that exempts those properties from the provisions of the proposed by-law for a prescribed period (I would suggest 15-20 years). Failing to abide by recent decisions disrespects the participation and efforts of local communities that have been working hard to maintain their community' character and heritage. 6) The proposed by-law will result in local drainage and other services being overwhelmed due to increased wastewater production and reduced infiltration of water in unpaved areas. Where we live, at (address redacted), we have already been advised by folks from Water and Waste that the local catch-basin acks the capacity to manage drainage from the existing community, which results in significant street, sidewalk and property flooding during larger rain events. And this is while there are still a number of vacant parcels of land behind our property that act as stormwater retention areas (water backs up from the flooded street and overwhelmed sewers through the ditch along the side of our house into the rear properties, from which it is slowly released when street flooding subsides). Flooding will further worsen with the development of the vacant properties and then be exacerbated as local density increases as a result of this by-law and the overall decrease in the infiltration of precipitation that accompanies it. Where they are already known to occur, such issues must be resolved BEFORE further intensification is permitted. 7)There is no accompanying acknowledgement that additional greenspace will be needed as density increases, to compensate for increased population and loss of trees on private property. Protection of Assiniboine Forest and other existing large treed greenspaces, such as LeMay Forest, including on currently privately held lands where development may still be years or decades away should be specifically included in this by-law. Overall we expect this by-law will result in a significant "de-greening" of the city to the detriment of all residents.	Email
224	I am concerned about the effect of proposed In-Fill housing on the Seine River Greenway. Please ensure that these important habitats and trees are protected and that the public is made aware of all measures to preserve lands along and adjacent to the urban Seine River. These lands must be protected from high-density development.	Email
225	Is there a minimum depth of the lot that is required to allow the infill housing?	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
226	RE: Comments on Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing, Public engagement, April-May, 2025 Needed amendments: Protect Winnipeg's waterways and trees by adding the following to the proposed Infill Housing Rezoning bylaw under current review: 1.Exclude higher density zoning within buffer zones of 350-feet on either side along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers, and 250-feet on either side along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Streams. [1] •Existing zoning within these buffer zones remain as is. •New 2-unit, 3-unit, 4-unit, and 4-storey dwellings are excluded on lots partially within these buffer zones. 2.Exclude selling city-owned riverside land and preserve it for public use and river access, and for parkland. 3.Base development approval decisions to include intent of the "Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan By-law and Biodiversity Policy" under development by the City and partners for stewardship of natural assets and reconciliation [2] ; the "Urban Forestry Strategy" target to increase the urban tree canopy; and the City Council commitment in 2022 to add an additional thousand acres of greenspace. 4.Ensure all rivers and streams with buffer zone delineations are clearly shown on Infill Housing Maps. 5.Require a minimum of 15 feet of soft ground (softscape) from road/sidewalk (hardscape) to dwelling unit face on a lot 25-feet wide to allow for healthy growth and survival of a large tree species (e.g., Manitoba maple, American Elm, Basswood) to help with shade and to maintain/increase the city tree canopy.[3] 6.Ensure citizens are not being misled by showing side yard setbacks (3' and 4' on lots < 50 ft wide, and 4' and 4' on lots ³ 50 ft wide) in the official public presentation slides, while there has been some indication the intent is to actually reduce these side yard setbacks to 2' and 3' after public review. [1] This would be consistent with the Best Management Practices Handbook for Activities In and Around the City's Waterways and Watercourses 2005 that considers lands within these areas as ecologically sensitive and important (p. 24). https://legacy.winnipeg.ca/ppd/Documents/CityPlanning/Riverbank/Best-Management-Practices-Handbook-for-Activities-In-and-Around-the-Citys-Waterways-and-Watercourses.pdf. These buffer zone sizes are consistent with the City of Winnipeg Waterway By-law 5888/92 that regulates construction activities based upon engineering evaluations to prevent uncontrolled activities (in particular, depositing of any fill and dumping of waste material) leading to riverbank failures and waterway obstructions. Ecological considerations for permits within these buffer zones also need to be considered, otherwise long-term environmental goals such as the Greenspace Master Plan and Biodiversity Policy and Montréal Pledge which aim to preserve and enhance natural corridors are undermined. [2] City of Winnipeg and Indigenous partners join together to co-develop Greenspace Plan and Biodiversity Policy, June 24,2025 https://www.winnipeg.ca/news/2024-06-17-city-winnipeg-and-indigenous-partners-join-together-co-develop-greenspace-plan-and-biodiversity	Email
226 con't	[3] City guidelines indicate that a large mature tree species on a 25 foot wide yard with a standard of 3 foot soil depth would need about 15 feet softcape surface between a hardscape surface to a building face. Tree Planting Standards, Details and Specifications - Downtown Area and Regional Streets (p. 18) List of large tree species common in Manitoba and recommended for planting on city property can be found in: PW-Recommended_Tree_Species_0.pdf	continued from above
227	This email is to make a few comments about the proposed in fill program. First, your map was purposely done to avoid having citizens see to what extent their area will be included in the program, shameful. Second, it is also shameful that the City of Winnipeg administration and the council are in favour of this policy. You are removing citizens property rights to appease the Liberal government who have made a mess of Canada's immigration policy. Why should citizens of Winnipeg cover for an irresponsible Federal Liberal government. Third, you know that these developments will go in areas that have lower valued properties, older neighborhoods, like St. Vital and not upper income neighbourhoods. You will remove single family houses from the market. Fourth, with a four plex you could have 4, to 8 cars on a standard City of Winnipeg lot, defeating the purpose of having them located by transit corridors. Shameful	Email
228	I'm glad that steps are being taken to deal with affordable housing, but please don't go about it in ways that damage special environments. Please consider including the following protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. 3.Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
229	Please consider including the following 3 protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. 3. Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps	Email
230	I enjoy so many special times with my grandchildren, 4 and 9, and with my friends as we walk along the Seine River Path, the Bunn's Creek Path, Steven Juba Park, the paths along the rivers at St Vital Park, Kings Park, Assiniboine Park and Kildonan Park, I am so grateful for the city planners of many years ago and the advocates of recent years who have saved this land not only for my use but to maintain the environment for the diversity of plants and animals that somehow still manage to thrive in these small pockets in our city. If we don't continue to protect our waterways and the land, the buffer zones, now, what will my grandchildren be able to enjoy in the years ahead? Please consider including the following protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw. 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. 3.Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps. Why Protect Buffer Areas Decisions regarding the Infill Housing bylaw, to be voted on June 2, 2025, will take precedence over the "Greenspace and Natural Corridors Plan and Biodiversity Policy", which is to be finalized in 2026. Buffer zone is the area within: •350 feet of rivers or 250 feet of creeks. •Properties in buffer zones would maintain their current zoning and be exempt from new infill housing designations.	Email
231	Increased housing density along waterways would: •Maximize lot coverage (buildings, driveways, sheds). •Reduce shade, vegetation, and stormwater retention. •Lead to tree loss, decreased biodiversity, and compromised riverbank stability	continued from above

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
232	1.Why is the City selling Riverside land for infill housing when it should be preserving access to the rivers for its citizens? We are the only major city in western Canada that has not saved its riverbanks for its citizens. This is shameful and should not be tolerated. 2.Why is the City even contemplating allowing infill housing greater than a single-family dwelling in the current buffer zones surrounding our river ways? We've already been told that the new zoning would allow high density dwellings in these areas, so there is no use pretending that it's not going to happen. There should be a mandatory 350 foot buffer zone on the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. We know that the banks of the rivers are being eroded more quickly now with fluctuating water levels due to overland flooding. It's appalling that the city would ignore its own regulations in order to squeeze housing on to these areas. It is further egregious that this would be allowed when every property built on the river would be expensive housing catering to high-end buyers. and we know what happens with condos already on the river - the developers build and then sell and the poor owners left behind will be stuck with the bill to try and mitigate the problems from erosion. 3.How is this major rezoning going to accommodate green space? You don't want to be substantially increasing the population without increasing the amount of parks and green space that people can enjoy. We are already seeing a degradation in the condition of our parks due to overcrowding. 4.How is this going to accommodate the upcoming Master Green space and Natural Corridors plan and Biodiversity Policy? 5.How is this rezoning going to accommodate the Urban Forest Strategy which intends to expand the urban tree canopy which is fast disappearing due to pests and drought and flooding? 6.How will this rezoning affect the city Council's commitment to add a thousand acres of parkland? 7.How will this rezoning affect city councils 2023 commitment to the Montréal Pledge actions for biodiversity? 8.Why are rivers not labelled on the infill housing maps? Their absence does not assist citizens to understand what is going on. 9.Why is the city showing 3 foot and 4 foot setbacks on side yards, when they are intending to decrease that to 2 feet and 3 feet? 10.Why is the city allowing developers to chop down all the mature trees on properties that are getting infill housing? 11.Why is the minimum amount of setback from city sidewalks or roads not at least 15 feet to allow for large trees to be planted in the front yards?	Email
233	I have read a lot of comments on social media. The overall consensus is that infill housing is good; but building huge monstrosities is bad. Could you just plan and approve housing that fits into existing neighbourhoods? 2 1/2 , 3 stories multi-family dwellings look horrible in our old neighbourhoods. Why can't you just approve buildings that don't overpower our areas? My next move will be out of this city because we lose the character and heritage of our neighbourhoods with these huge houses. I also think that this is not affordable housing. It's priced out of the range of people that actually need it. I've seen these houses purchased and used as air bnbs. That's not really contributing to community spirit. Please consider my comments as well as many others online.	Email
234	Please consider including the following protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers./ Sumka Property/Parc Vermette Park/ rivière Seine river •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. 3. Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps.	Email
235	I recently attended a presentation of (name redacted) concerning the unfortunate timing of the intended bylaws, the Infill Housing Rezoning bylaw and the Greenspace and Natural Corridors Plan and Biodiversity policy. If the Infill Housing bylaw is passed without amendments before the other commitment there may be encroachments on the areas intended for green space in that plan. Therefore, I join with (name redacted) in asking for the following amendments to the Infill Housing Rezoning bylaw: 1. Implement a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's and Truro Streams to be exempt from higher density zoning. Existing properties within these zones to retain their current zoning. 2. Ensure decisions reflect the knowledge gained from the Master Greenspace and Natural Corridors Plan and Biodiversity Policy (nearing completion) for stewardship of natural assets and reconciliation; supporting the Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy; upholding the Montreal Pledge (2023) to take action for biodiversity; honouring the 2022 City Council commitment to add 1000 acres of parkland. 3. Refrain from selling city-owned riverside land and instead preserve it for parkland 4. Clearly mark all rivers and streams on the infill housing maps Infill housing is clearly an important need in our community. But it must be balanced with our need to make our city a healthy and liveable place by preserving and increasing the natural features which make it so. These amendments will protect that need.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
236	Our Earth is dying, and it is our duty and responsibility to protect green spaces for the sake of climate crisis mitigation. Our Premier has stepped up to save the Lemay Forest. Now the City of Winnipeg must do its share. Please consider including the following 3 protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. 3. Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps.	Email
237	Please consider including the following 3 protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: □ 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. 3. Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps.	Email
238	Please consider including the following 3 protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: □ 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan andBiodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. 3. Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps. Why Protect Buffer Areas Decisions regarding the Infill Housing bylaw, to be voted on June 2, 2025, will take precedence over the "Greenspace and Natural Corridors Plan and Biodiversity Policy", which is to be finalized in 2026. Buffer zone is the area within: •350 feet of rivers or 250 feet of creeks. •Properties in buffer zones would maintain their current zoning and be exempt from new infill housing designations. Increased housing density along waterways would: •Maximize lot coverage (buildings, driveways, sheds). •Reduce shade, vegetation, and stormwater retention. •Lead to tree loss, decreased biodiversity, and compromised riverbank stability	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
239	I strongly oppose infill housing along Winnipeg rivers. Biodiversity and greenspace needs more priority than infill housing. Please consider including the following 3 protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. 3. Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps.	Email
240	I cannot make tonight's meeting and have several comments/questions that I would like a response to: 1. I think it is absolutely adorably deceptive as to how your artists visualize the new housing with lovely green yards with full growth trees. Great imagination there folks because I am pretty sure all trees will be gone with no requirement to replace. 2. What are the privacy requirements affecting those balconies overlooking the neighbor's yards? 3. What are the requirements to install fencing to keep the new unit residences to their 3 feet of space and not tromp all over the neighbor's yard? 4. Are there building guidelines/rules about use of metal roofing on these units and where the snow build up will land as the roofing warms? Just checking because I happen to know the danger of walking next to a one story house when the snow releases. With one of your supersize units, it would be deadly – literally. 5. If a lot is chosen by a developer for infill, what are the requirements for timely completion of a new unit and who enforces the requirements? i.e., how long do I have to live with hammering and smashing next to me. 6. Sorry but I don't understand how this makes for "better pedestrian connectivity and more walkable neighborhoods." I am confused as to how you can assure me that my neighborhood will be more walkable with a big batch of new people. 7. Also pretty funny that you list 'greater social interaction" as a benefit. Get real. Those of us who chose this neighborhood because there was privacy and quiet and may not be looking for 'social interactions" so don't play mind games with 'benefits'. 8. Since there parking spaces do not need to be attached to all the units, there will lead to massive build up of cars on the streets. What are the options for neighbors who have visitors with mobility/accessibility issues and can't walk a few blocks? Keep in mind since these are older neighborhoods that you are targeting. 9. How is the city going to monitor this development given that you are unable to deal with all the dead and decrepit lots in the west end where neighbors would love to see the city take some responsibility. 10. What are the costs associated with this need for increased staffing and resources to oversee all this development and who pays for it? What kind of tax increases can we expect to cover these initiatives? 11. How many of the city councillors live next to lots that are eligible for infill housing?	Email
241	Please consider including the following 3 protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. 3. Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
242	Please find attached my input on the above and request for further clarification and response to questions. I am a resident in a mature community with a combined sewer system. I am not in opposition to new infill development as it can certainly have positive environmental and social effects. My intention would be to see that it is done reasonably and appropriately. I attended a public engagement session April 29 at the Outlet Mall in Winnipeg. Detailed answers to some of my questions was not available at the session. Attached below are my comments and questions based on information provided for the zoning amendment review. Please enter this into the record for this public engagement process. I would appreciate a response to my questions and comments. Here is the link to City Presentation Materials referenced in my response to the public engagement process. https://www.winnipeg.ca/sites/default/files/2025-04/PresentationMaterials_InfillHousingZoningAmendment.pdf Submission to the City of Winnipeg Zoning Amendments Review Areas of Concern Related to New Amendments to the Zoning Bylaw • Capacity of the existing combined sewer system to take additional wastewater and land drainage without increasing wet weather flow (WWF) and subsequent combined sewer overflows (CSO) • The potential exacerbation of water quality impacts on local rivers and Lake Winnipeg from CSOs • Ability to meet requirements of Clause 8 of Manitoba Environment Act Licence No. 3042 for the operation of combined sewers and overflow structures in the City of Winnipeg • Building restrictions and impacts on adjacent properties • Site inspection and requirement for follow-up Questions and Comments Regarding the Above Areas of Concern 1. Will the draft bylaw identify how site control of land drainage or wastewater will be accomplished to meet Clause 8 of the Environment Act Licence for combined sewers? 2. Slide 9 of City public engagement materials indicates “development will be subject to capacities of water and waste servicing”. How will that be determined? Has the City done modeling to determine impacts on CSO frequency and volume for various levels of development in CS neighbourhoods? If so, what did those results show? How many individual applications for building permits or zoning variance have been screened for hydraulic capacity of sewers in CS areas?	Email
242 con't	3. For a typical scenario in a mature neighbourhood where a single family dwelling (SFD) on a 50’ lot is divided and 2 new infill houses are built with 2 units each, the wastewater flow potentially increases by 4x for that lot. If that is done to 20 % of a block that results in a 60% increase in wastewater flow. If 50% of a block is converted in the same way that results in a 250% increase in WW flow. Since that flow doesn’t stop during WWF events it is necessary to include wastewater (or land drainage) storage into lot and building design so as peak land drainage flow does not increase in the CS. This was offered up by the City to address Clause 8 of the ME Act Licence No. 3042 in a letter of June 2017 to Manitoba Environment (attached). The letter indicates there would be a requirement for developers to reduce WWF from lots. What does this look like for storage and containment design on individual lots? It is incumbent on the City to incorporate requirements for reduction in WWF from new infill in CS areas into the amended zoning bylaw. 4. Slide 13 indicates 3 and 4 unit development must have a full range of infrastructure including “piped land drainage”. What does this mean? Would it exclude CS areas in which case 3 and 4 unit developments would not be permitted? This needs to be clarified. 5. How many small-scale infill developments have been required to reduce wastewater or land drainage on-site? How many developments have been reviewed for increases in WWF? 6. Do current CSOs result in acute toxicity to fish at the point of discharge? Is this monitored? 7. Have as-built inspections been conducted on all new infill housing? How many inspections in past 5 years? Has there been non-compliance in building size, height and setbacks? What is the non-compliance rate? What action has been taken on non-compliance or over-built developments? 8. Slide 13 – 3 and 4 unit infills must have a full range of municipal infrastructure including “piped land drainage”. Does this mean separated sewers? Or what does it mean? 9. Slide 19 – the aerial view does not match the plan view. 10. Slide 19- the depiction is exactly what existing R1 residents are concerned about. It turns adjacent backyards into courtyards because the new house is allowed to extend at max height into backyard. Height restrictions that conform to adjacent yards need to be in place for rear of properties. 35’ height along whole depth of lot from front is not acceptable. Also, any garage or outbuilding should be restricted in height well below the 35’ maximum. 11. Interesting that the depiction of infill housing for 2, 3 and 4 units in slides 19-22 show lot coverages of the structures less than the maximum proposed in slide 14. Why is this? 12. What does “impervious area” entail in slides 19-22? Are not the buildings themselves considered impervious? Requested Actions of the City of Winnipeg 1. Respond to the questions and comments above prior to final drafting of zoning bylaw amendment. 2. Commit to release of public engagement summary prior to final drafting of zoning bylaw 3. Commit to reasonable timeline for public review of the draft bylaw amendment. 4. Address how WWF will not be increased by ongoing infill housing development. The City needs to demonstrate that new infill development will not exacerbate basement flooding or sewer back up in CS areas. 5. Include design guidelines in the amended bylaw for providing temporary wastewater or land drainage storage on lots approved for new infill housing. 6. Amend building restrictions to reduce impact on privacy and sun exposure by limiting building height to 15' or less beyond a maximum footprint of 800 ft2 for 2 units on a 25' lot width.	continued from above

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
243	Please consider including the following 3 protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. 3. Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps	Email
244	Has this rezoning already been approved?	Email
245	Subject: Protect Winnipeg's Waterways and Trees - Suggested Revisions to Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw Please consider including the following protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: 1.Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2.Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. 3.Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps.	Email
246	Protect Winnipeg's Waterways and Trees by adding the following to the Infill Housing Rezoning bylaw 1.Implement a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Streams to be exempt from higher density zoning; [1] [2] [3] [4]. Existing properties within these buffer zones to retain their current zoning;[5] 2.Ensure decisions reflect the knowledge gained from the "Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy" (nearing completion) for stewardship of natural assets and reconciliation - support the "Urban Forestry Strategy" goal to expand the urban tree canopy - uphold the Montréal Pledge signed in 2023 to take action for biodiversity - honour the 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland; 3.Refrain from selling city-owned riverside land and instead preserve it for parkland; 4.Clearly mark all rivers and streams on the Infill housing maps	Email
247	Protect Winnipeg's Waterways and Trees by adding the following to the Infill Housing Rezoning bylaw 1.Implement a 350 foot buffer zone along the Red, Assiniboine, Seine and LaSalle Rivers and a 250 foot buffer zone along the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Streams to be exempt from higher density zoning; [1] [2] [3] [4]. Existing properties within these buffer zones to retain their current zoning;[5] 2.Ensure decisions reflect the knowledge gained from the "Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy" (nearing completion) for stewardship of natural assets and reconciliation - support the "Urban Forestry Strategy" goal to expand the urban tree canopy - uphold the Montréal Pledge signed in 2023 to take action for biodiversity - honour the 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland; 3.Refrain from selling city-owned riverside land and instead preserve it for parkland; 4.Clearly mark all rivers and streams on the Infill housing maps	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
248	I very much hope that you will consider including the following protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: 1. Establish buffer zones - that is protect treed areas along our waterways from higher-density zoning: o 350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. o 250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. o Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. These buffer zones are consistent with the Best Management Practices Handbook for Activities In and Around the City's Waterways and Watercourses 2005 that considers lands within these areas as ecologically sensitive and important (p. 24). https://legacy.winnipeg.ca/ppd/Documents/CityPlanning/Riverbank/Best-Management-Practices-Handbook-for-Activities-In-and-Around-the-Citys-Waterways-and-Watercourses.pdf. The buffer zone sizes, as indicated above, are also consistent with the City of Winnipeg Waterway By-law 5888/92 that regulates construction activities along our riverbanks. These buffer zones are essential to protect the city's wildlife corridors and also play a key role in preventing bank erosion. Many governments now consider trees and vegetation as the first and most important line of defence in preventing shoreline erosion. 2. Align land-use decisions with: o The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. o The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. o The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. The Montreal Biodiversity Pledge 3. Clearly label: all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps.	Email
249	Please consider including the following protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: □ 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. 3. Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps.	Email
250	Please continue to reserve/preserve/conserve some land for "no housing", creating smaller green areas. in within as presently along Chief Peguis there is parkland/ trees/ walk/bike corridors, planning will ensure similar development on its extension. Preserve considerable green space as more and more in-fill housing is created. Wherever it is possible as you plan, consider creating more small and large reserves. I presume that, as presently along Chief Peguis there is parkland/ trees/ walk/bike corridors, planning will ensure similar development on its extension. •Is there a possibility of creating more parkland (large or small), especially northward from downtown? . •In the suburbs certainly it is easier to reserve land already not filled with housing. But continue to create "green" recreational areas where there is some older housing. •Enable students in high schools to plant trees on their school grounds and within their schools' vicinities. •Keep what we have and create more. •Plant trees along Aminoji Mickanah westward from Pembina. Create another "Greenway" along the creek. Do not allow housing along the border of that creek. •In St. Vital Pulberry area, I certainly agree with (name redacted) suggestion of minimum 66 feet lots for 4 plexes. •I wonder about Shirley Render park, opposite St. Vital Park. Plant trees in there; no housing. Continue to create denser housing, yes, but keep "human space" too. Thank you for your service for the community.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
251	I have a question regarding the infill zoning changes and was hoping that I could get an answer. I've cc'd all members of the PP&D committee just to make sure they know this is a huge issue for infill. My question is -- why do we still have parking minimums in the update? They are based on junk sciences and completely destroy project feasibility for most infill lots. If we want to have a serious discussion about affordability and sustainability we have to include removal of parking minimums in the zoning code. I've included a list of comparable Canadian and American cities that have already done so, to no great deterement to the city. Note, the last two -- Minneapolis/St. Paul and Ann Arbor, actually implemented a parking maximum in their code at the same time. Both the current Transportation Master Plan and the draft updated master plan talks about vehicles as mode shares. It seems counterproductive to force storage of vehicles on property owners when not all property owners own vehicles. If we want Winnipeg to be taken seriously as a city of tomorrow we have to do this now.	Email
252	Please consider including the following 3 protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. 3. Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps. Why Protect Buffer Areas Decisions regarding the Infill Housing bylaw, to be voted on June 2, 2025, will take precedence over the "Greenspace and Natural Corridors Plan and Biodiversity Policy", which is to be finalized in 2026. Buffer zone is the area within: •350 feet of rivers or 250 feet of creeks. •Properties in buffer zones would maintain their current zoning and be exempt from new infill housing designations. Increased housing density along waterways would: •Maximize lot coverage (buildings, driveways, sheds). •Reduce shade, vegetation, and stormwater retention. •Lead to tree loss, decreased biodiversity, and compromised riverbank stability	Email
253	Subject: Protect Winnipeg's Waterways and Trees - Suggested Revisions to Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw Please consider including the following 3 protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: □ 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. •Winnipeg - Best Practices Handbook for Activities in and around the city's Waterways 3. Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps. Thank you for your consideration of this important issue.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
254	I would like to know who oversees the decisions made by Property and Planning. In the Question Period, Propery and Planning said “developers could not just build ANYTHING they want, but must follow the guidelines”. In the past, Propery and Planning often granted variances to developers for projects that were outside the guidelines, which affected neighbours could then appeal. Since there is no longer any appeal process for neighbours, how are citizens guaranteed that Property and Planning will never approve anything outside the guidelines, will never have any conflict of interest with a project, will never make a mistake, and can be completely trusted to make correct decisions on every project. Who does Property and Planningn actually answer to , or do they have complete carte blanche in their decision making? I look forward to your response.	Email
255	I am communicating my thoughts about the currently proposed re-zoning plans that have been presented for public reaction and comment. Over the past six years I have been actively participating in variance committee hearings regarding infill development in my River Heights neighbourhood where I have lived and owned homes for half a century. I am attaching my last such presentation and photographic illustrations from a little over a year ago which go into considerable detail about the impact the existing regulations have contributed to reduced housing affordability and availability in my neighbourhood. If anything, the most current proposals would further exacerbate these deleterious trends. I hope you take the time to review that presentation as River Heights would be impacted heavily were the re-zoning plans under discussion to be implemented. In more general terms I am alarmed at a number of aspects of the entire process triggered by the federal government's Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF) initiative which seemed to be designed primarily to alleviate pressure in vote-rich eastern Canadian urban areas which were dissatisfied at the very real housing crisis triggered by poorly researched and recklessly implemented unprecedented immigration increases. This miscalculation was basically admitted by the federal government last year as this plan was rolled out for individual municipality acceptance and implementation. Ideally, the proposed funding would have been offered for each municipality to make use of to match their particular and unique needs. Instead the feds dictated the priorities and re-zoning requirements with a one-size-fits-all indiscriminate template that runs rough-shod over the planning departments administered under local municipal government authority. This federal incursion into what has been appropriately under municipal jurisdiction can only be viewed as an attack on the development of individual, autonomous planning priorities by the level of government elected, and best qualified, to devise them. The assumption that housing needs and planning and zoning priorities of the GTA, Vancouver, Saskatoon and Halifax are identical and can be best adjudicated and implemented from Ottawa is patently absurd. Rate-paying homeowners are doubly disenfranchised by this process as their most immediate level of representation has been superseded and, to add insult to injury, their right of appeal has also been removed by federal fiat. So much for the jurisdictional and democratic process issues involved in HAF. As outlined in detail in the attached document, in practice these initiatives seem to be decreasing both availability and affordability as they are unleashing increasing speculative acquisition of affordable single family dwellings for resale as oversized new luxury custom homes or as revenue-generating multi-unit rental dwellings. In River Heights, St. Vital, Fort Garry, St. James and elsewhere, families looking to purchase an existing dwelling compete against developers intent on demolition and new construction. As I outline in my attached presentation this practice disrupts the fabric of these historically desirable and cohesive neighbourhoods and creates gentrification rather than densification. Now individuals or families interested in ownership in these neighbourhoods must overpay to acquire them or become landlords - with all the attendant pressures and vagaries that entail - to pay for an overpriced home with a rental suite.	Email
255 con't	While this is being forced on unsuspecting neighbourhoods as being absolutely essential to prevent supposedly unsustainable urban sprawl, Council has recently approved an expenditure of $900 million (which absolutely dwarfs the HAF funding) to extend Chief Peguis Trail to facilitate, you guessed it, more residential housing development. So we are proceeding with plans to dramatically intensify lot use against the wishes of the tax-paying homeowners of established, desirable neighbourhoods to prevent urban sprawl on one hand and committing the same tax-payers' cash to create more "urban sprawl" on the other. Meanwhile, the oldest residential neighbourhoods at the city's centre which should be the primary targets for renewal and densification continue to be undesirable, problem-riddled centres of neglect, waste and collective hand-wringing. My wife and I participated in the March 18 online presentation and were disappointed that none of the salient points raised by residents at the variance hearings I have participated in or followed were addressed. Obviously, the most telling indication that the issue of affordability in the current infill debate was not being considered seriously was the repeated assertion that "affordability" means different things to different individuals. I doubt that anyone thinks the solution to our so-called housing crisis is to increase the number of homes selling for between $800,000 and $1.2 million in River Heights. Instead of offering more liberal zoning and permission incentives to the development community so they can pick low-hanging fruit in desirable neighbourhoods and drive up housing costs and reduce availability, serious plans need to be undertaken to invest in the less profitable task of creating actual affordable housing in the actual areas of the city where it is actually needed. A locally developed, targeted and responsive plan, rather than a vote-grabbing ill-conceived concept dictated from Ottawa is what is called for.	continued from above
256	I attended the infill housing open house at the Dakota C C on May 1/25, and expressed my concerns and non-support of this initiative by filling out the comment sheet provided. I inadvertently ticked a box on the back page in support and I wish to clarify. I would attend a public hearing to support those who would be attending that would be expressing concerns, since in speaking with many in attendance, they have similar concerns, but would be more well-spoken. This is what was in my thoughts when I filled that portion. I am not in support of this by-law amendment whatsoever. It would be interesting to know exactly who is behind this initiative. If that information would be provided, I know many others would like to know as well.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
257	There are so many benefits to spending time in nature and to everyday accessible recreation that it is hard to name them all in an email. To be brief, our family highly values living in a city that has beautiful trees and natural spaces. We paddle on the Seine and LaSalle rivers, and when our kids are at Scouts, they love to walk along the Seine. Of course there are also practical benefits for regulating the temperature of the city environment, and maintaining the health of our rivers and lakes by protecting the riparian areas all along the course of the river including in the city. That is why we strongly support the proposed protections that we learned about at OURS Winnipeg and we ask that you: Please consider including the following protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: 1.Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: 1.350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. 2.250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. 3.Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 4.Align land-use decisions with: 5.The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. 6.The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. 7.The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland 8.Winnipeg - Best Practices Handbook for Activities in and around the city's Waterways (350' and 250' zones) 9.Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's maps. Thank you so much for asking for our input. Increasing housing density is overall a good idea, but preserving and increasing our green spaces is essential for nature and for Winnipeggers like us.	Email
258	Attached please find our submission for your review. Looking forward to the answers from the questions we have asked throughout our submission. Please consider including the following protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. 3. Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps. Increased housing density along waterways would: •Maximize lot coverage (buildings, driveways, sheds). •Reduce shade, vegetation, and stormwater retention. •Lead to tree loss, decreased biodiversity, and compromised riverbank stability	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
258 con't	Building quality, compliance, site safety, builder/developer behavior Glenwood has seen over 240 homes built as part of infill over the last decade. Some developers and builders have operated good building sites and others have not. Poor builders create safety hazards, grossly impose on the residents, endanger their employees, and likely build at a lower quality. These infractions comprise the main complaints about infill lodged by residents as documented in surveys and presented at community meetings. Residents and the GNA have tried to assist the City by alerting them to the infractions, but the response has been inadequate and the infractions have continued through the years. With increased construction under HAF, this situation is unlikely to improve without a new approach. Manitoba has a well-established trade association, the Manitoba Home Builders Association, that looks after these kinds of issues with its members. Some infill developers are members, but many are not. The GNA has corresponded with (name redacted). He replied: (response redacted) The GNA recommends that the City of Winnipeg require that any builder/developers who participate in HAF supported infill developments be members of the MHBA. The GNA believes this would significantly reduce the "bad behavior", improve the quality of the developments, and provide greater safety for the workers and residents. The GNA believes that this would also significantly reduce the costs of enforcement for the City, improve the infill experience for residents and provide a better infill product into the future. Future savings would more than compensate for any costs required to put this plan in place. Distribution, density and pacing of infill development. The distribution, density, and pacing of infill development in Glenwood, resulting in construction of over 240 new homes over the last decade has been "controlled" only by the willingness and rate of individual lot owners to sell their properties to developers. This is not planned infill. As a consequence of this approach, some streets are overloaded with development and others have little or none. The unpredictable timing is hard on residents, both existing and prospective, because they cannot know the character of area in which they will live or when it will be disrupted by development. This random approach has and will continue to pose more technical issues for the neighborhood (see below). The HAF proposal to allow all infill up to fourplexes "as of right" will only exacerbate the problems. In 2019 the GNA requested a Secondary Plan for Glenwood supported by a petition of more than 600 signatures. It was not carried out by the City. In 2023 a motion to deliver a Secondary Plan was presented to City Council by area councilor Brian Mayes, through the Riel Community Committee. That motion was paired with the adoption of the Residential Infill Guidelines and passed by Council. However, the Department of Planning and Property Development instead delivered the Glenwood PDO (Plan Development Overlay). The PDO adjusted development rules, but specifically did not address the issues of distribution, density or pacing. Now the Glenwood Neighborhood is faced with increasing infill pressures due to HAF. The GNA is not and has never been opposed to infill, it has simply argued that it should be done in an efficient and planned manner that will address the needs of the community and more effectively help to achieve the goals of the City. The lack of a plan for distribution has resulted in a large percentage of infill homes being built 400-800 meters from the transit routes on St. Mary's and St. Anne's Roads. Community observations clearly show that most of these inhabitants do not walk to transit. Wouldn't it make more sense to first prioritize, and perhaps incentivize infill in the 0-400 meter band and on the transit corridors? This would also be consistent with recommendations by environmental groups like OURS Winnipeg to preserve a buffer area near the Seine River. Much of the 400-800 meter zone overlaps with those buffer zones.	continued from above
258 con't	Infill in Glenwood has substantially decreased the area of private recreational space, especially back yards, due to the increased requirement for parking off the back lanes. Many of the front yards, especially in rental properties, are covered with landscape fabric overlain with broken rock to reduce maintenance. Children in these homes have no space to play outside and now frequently play in the street. Increasing residential density at the cost of private recreational space must be paired with a program to provide public recreational space within children's walking distance and safety. Development characteristics Described below are a number of design characteristics for the infill developments that have been inadequately addressed or mistakenly applied in the proposed HAF information. Height of fourplexes. From page 10 of the City of Winnipeg presentation material on Zoning bylaw changes to accommodate infill development Proposed Maximum Building Height 39 ft. if within 800 meters of a high-frequency transit stop. Otherwise 30-35 ft. in mature neighborhoods, and 35 ft. everywhere else Current Maximum Building Height 28-35 ft. in mature neighborhoods 30-35 ft. in mature neighborhoods, 35 ft. everywhere else 35 ft. everywhere else (no change) 35 ft. everywhere else (no change) The proposed allowable height for fourplexes in zones within 800 meters of transit (39 ft.) is higher than in areas farther away. This makes no sense. If a fourplex can be successfully built at lower heights, that should apply in all cases. This is particularly true for Glenwood, essentially all of which is within 800 meters. The GNA has fought successfully against unnecessary excess height of R1 infills that used to be 35 ft. The Glenwood PDO lowered this to 28 ft. A number of infill builders have very successfully built voluntarily at near 25 ft. Height makes a big difference when the infill building can be next to a bungalow or 1 ½ story home, like most in Glenwood. Glenwood is a mature neighborhood. Fourplexes in Glenwood should not exceed 30-35 ft. Parking. The City of Winnipeg is operating under the false assumption that most residents in infill homes in an area like Glenwood and more that 400 meters from transit will have fewer than 1-2 vehicles per household. This may be a long-term objective but it is not presently or likely to be reality in the short term. Parking off the back lane on a 50 ft. wide lot is suitable for a maximum of 4 vehicles. Even this density is challenging because it leaves little space for cleared snow. The typical infill development in Glenwood has two buildings with four living units (nominally 2 base units and two rentable suites but in many cases all units are rented). From our observations this has frequently resulted in more than four vehicles per lot. The extra vehicles are now use street parking that was intended for visitors in the Glenwood layout with back lanes. The lack of private recreational space due to the conversion of the back yards to parking and the additional use of the street for parking and driving endangers children who have been force to play on the streets.	continued from above

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
258 con't	Reducing Fossil Fuel Use. The City has made commitments to the reduction of fossil fuel use. However, natural gas is still being installed to infill homes. These homes will last for 50-100 years and if a changeover to electricity is imposed in the future it will be expensive and likely strongly opposed by residents. Switching to electricity at construction will be much simpler. Canada and Manitoba are promoting conversion to electric vehicles. Most electric vehicle users can for most operation adequately charge their cars using only a plug at their home. This is the cheapest way to charge with respect to convenience, infrastructure, and cost. HAF should include requirements that the charging capabilities be included in the new developments. Also, related to the parking problem, how are the residents who have been forced to park on the street due to lack of space going to charge their vehicles at home? Equipment for solar energy and solar heat panels is decreasing in cost and being used cost effectively in many jurisdictions. Manitoba Hydro has had promotions of solar installations in the past and likely will be involved in using this source in the future. If roofs slopes on homes are oriented north/south leaving a clear south face, the installation of solar panels is much cheaper and easier. There should be an incentive or requirement for housing built under the HAF program to be designed to make the use of solar energy easy and cheap in the future. What about trees and permeable surfaces Infill development in the Glenwood neighborhood has led to significant tree canopy loss, reduced biodiversity, and diminished permeable surfaces, all of which adversely impact climate resilience. This will likely be the case city wide when we consider 4plex as of right development. According to the Urban Forest Strategy the department of Planning, Property and Development (PPand D) has a role to play From City of Winnipeg | Urban Forest Strategy FINAL DRAFT adopted December 14, 2023 The department of Planning, Property and Development (P, P and D) works with the Urban Forestry branch with the following service interactions “Zoning, urban design, park planning, development permit landscape review, planning checklists, inspections, tree planting securities, tree protection and preservation, land acquisition and sale, leases, easement (regarding Real Estate Division - which may impact or preserve trees); secure parkland dedication, impose conditions of development for boulevard tree planting (Land Development Branch).” Mayoral and councilor candidates have also signed a Trees Please Pledge during the 2022 civic election that emphasized the goals of 1. Plant, 2. Maintain, and 3. Protect. When it comes to infill development on private property and the advent of 4plexes as of right, the same priorities apply, perhaps in a different order. 1. Protect Existing trees should be prioritized in development planning, including: •Arborist Report: Mandate a comprehensive count of all existing trees within the development area. •Tree Protection Plan: Implement an arborist-led plan to prevent loss and damage, including root zone protection. •Directional Drilling: Use techniques to minimize damage to mature tree roots and preserve sidewalks, ensuring cost-effectiveness and pedestrian safety.	continued from above
258 con't	2. Plant Landscaping Compliance, P, P and D development permit landscape review Plant the shrubs and trees according to the submitted plan. Developers are required to adhere to landscaping requirements, and their permits should not be closed until the trees and shrubs indicated on the building elevations are planted. Consider imposing fines for non-compliance. Urban biodiversity can be enhanced by incorporating green spaces and landscaping that support native flora and fauna, avoiding crushed rock for entire yards. 3.Maintain Enforce the care and maintenance of the planned trees for 2 years, Watershed Management and Pervious Surfaces Effective watershed management is critical for retaining water where it falls. This can be achieved by using pervious surfaces for walkways, parking areas, and green landscaping. Infill development has resulted in substantial tree canopy loss and the replacement of vegetated areas with zones where nothing grows. Maintaining permeable surfaces is essential for managing stormwater and reducing runoff. Developers should be required to incorporate pervious materials in walkways, driveways, and parking areas. These materials facilitate water infiltration into the ground, replenishing groundwater and reducing the burden on stormwater systems. In Conclusion Protecting trees from infill development is crucial for maintaining urban biodiversity and climate change resilience. By implementing comprehensive tree protection plans, preserving permeable surfaces, and enforcing landscaping requirements, we can mitigate the adverse effects of development and enhance the health and sustainability of our urban environments. This is summarized by the following recommendations: Recommendations •Mandatory Arborist input: Require developers to submit reports with detailed tree protection plans for existing mature trees. •Directional Drilling Regulations: Implement regulations mandating the use of directional drilling to protect mature tree roots, ensuring safety and cost savings while minimizing sidewalk disruption and protecting pedestrians. •Landscaping Standards: Establish minimal landscaping standards for developers, ensuring that trees and shrubs are planted as per submitted plan. Permits should remain open until the vegetation requirements are met. •Pervious Surface Requirements: Enforce the use of pervious materials in walkways, parking areas, and green landscaping, eliminating crushed rock to allow for vegetation growth.	continued from above

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
258 con't	We ask that the City consider hiring more compliance staff. The City of Winnipeg is looking at a new proposal to expand offences that are eligible for penalties through the Municipal by-law Enforcement Act, through which the city issues tickets for a variety of parking, livability and building bylaw offences. We support this proposal however if the city doesn't spend money on increasing their bylaw officer compliment to issue the tickets this is to no avail. The city has pitched hiring 13 new staff to shorten capacity reviews by waste and water department. This is to help developers get permits faster by shortening building review times. This helps developers to build faster but without new bylaw staff this will only create more chaos. There is also a building Canada Strong liberal housing plan in the works and if this takes off we will be left with many more housing projects and no more compliance staff to regulate the industry. Infrastructure There is lack of clarity and transparency on readily accessible City information and documents to provide the necessary context of the distribution of infrastructure support within areas targeted for densification, or specificity of what infrastructure support will look like and how it will function. There is no information of how HAF will be linked to Capital projects, Local and Residential Street Renewal programs, including Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) and other underground infrastructure improvements. The City's 2024 adopted budget includes annual expenditures between 2024 and 2027 consistent with the Housing Accelerator Contribution Agreement but provides no linkages between any other departments. We would like a clear approach to effectively communicate how infrastructure projects are tied to the Housing Accelerator Fund (HAF), without having to cross-reference budgets, listings of present and future capital projects, construction maps, and listings of approved funding through the HAF. The City has noted that as of right development would have limitations and exclusions related to 3 or 4-unit dwellings having a full range of municipal services, such as urban standard roadway, piped land drainage, sewer and water. The City has also noted that two units may be developed on lots fronting chipseal roads. What consideration and criteria would be developed for a street like Egerton within the Glenwood neighbourhood that does not meet the urban standard roadway and underground infrastructure requirements and consists of a chipseal road? The intent for development is not entirely clear along this road as it ties back to page 11 of the City's presentation materials. It appears that the west side of the street may consider densification, though limitations may be imposed for the east side of the road. It is also unclear whether the City is considering street and underground infrastructure renewals and improvements in anticipation of densification within impacted neighbourhoods. Will localized renewals and repairs be undertaken to accommodate increased damage to roadways due to construction and increased vehicle loading? Will underground services renewals be prioritized in advance of densification within a neighbourhood? Where construction does take place, the Glenwood neighbourhood has experienced disruption of sidewalk, road, and boulevard facilities because of construction activities. We understand that there is coordination that occurs between City departments for restoration of these facilities. We have observed that sidewalks, or roadway patches can take up to five years for replacement/restoration of a given facility. This should not be the case, especially where the City is prioritizing and encouraging active transportation and transit usage. Areas are left uncompleted that do not meet accessibility requirements.	continued from above
258 con't	Planning surface and underground works projects to complement corridor densification activities. Within the St. Vital area, there have been past infill limitations on St. Anne's and St. Mary's Road due to inadequate sewer capacities. We recognize that planning, engineering, and construction of renewals and upgrades will be necessary to facilitate densification along corridors. We recognize that this process takes time but must be implemented in advance of corridor densification. It appears that some of this process may already be in place for recently awarded grants in other wards of the City, but this information is not readily available and was accessed only through cross-referenced searches on the City's site, based on prior knowledge and understanding of the City's departmental documents. Recommendations 1. Provide information (text, maps, tables) for the public on the City's HAF website to show and demonstrate linkages to planned renewal works within specific areas where densification is planned and/or taking place. This can allow residents and neighbourhood committees to be better informed of impacts, limitations, advantages, and potential opportunities. 2. Provide information (text, maps, tables) to the public about capacities and limitations with existing neighbourhood infrastructure. 3. Provide an interactive City map that shows where as of right construction is taking place, that could link to additional information to the public about construction specifics and resources. 4. Provide an in-depth distribution to the public of where HAF resources are being allocated and focus areas. This is provided for many other departments such as Public Works and Water and Waste Departments. 5. Implement prompt timelines where impacted infrastructure (roadways, sidewalks, boulevards, plantings, etc.) is renewed within two years of construction. This coordination is requirement between multiple departments and can often lag 3-5 years for a simple sidewalk slab replacement or roadway patch where underground work has taken place. Communications and Interactions with Nearest Neighbours We understand that the as of right development will not mandate communications/engagement with nearest neighbours as part of the application and permitting process. The City's prior process for variance applications did include the submission of Letters of Support to provide evidence of written support or signatures of support from adjoining property owners who may be adversely affected by the proposed development. This was a useful tool for initiating communication between the developer and impacted neighbours or encouraging engagement by a third party. While the PDO may have general provisions in place for best practices of window/door positioning, placement of mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and heating services, there are still likely to be points of conflict that may adversely impact an adjoining property owner, which will have permanent impact. This has been Glenwood resident's experience over the past decade of infill development. With no avenue for communication, or advance notification, residents are limited to action that they may take of how an infill construction will directly impact their living environment and access to their property.	continued from above
258 con't	Recommendations 1. Mandate communications/coordination with nearest neighbours as part of the application and permitting process, where property specifics and impacts are identified, with mitigation strategies implemented to minimize long-term negative impacts to adjacent property owners. 2. Mandate signage through construction for all infill development that provides the public with access to information about the development, builder, and housing plans. This information could be accessible electronically, in a similar fashion to information conveyed to residents during variance processes. 3. Provide an interactive City map that shows where as of right construction is taking place, that could link to additional information to the public about construction specifics and resources.	continued from above

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
259	More housing and infill housing is really important to our City. But - this can take place without jeopardizing our crucial waterways and tree corridors. We need our protected riverbanks and tree corridors to support people, wildlife, plant life, and of course keeping the land stable. This past winter, I have watched the progress of the large development on the Assiniboine River by the Maryland bridge (address redacted). During the winter, the developers (with -name redacted-) scraped the full property, completely removing all vegetation except for 3 lone trees by the front sidewalk. This is very sad to see. They say they will plant 17 trees and shrubs, but those take time to grow, and more importantly, this will, in no way, be a real habitat for birds and wildlife. And will not protect the riverbank. Please consider including the following protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. 3. Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps. In closing, we must protect our waterways and not allow any development within the 350 feet, for the rivers and 250 feet for the creeks at least, and having even more greenspace is better. Developing would mean stripping all the plant life, mature trees, willows and so on, from the river banks and riparian zones. Our city did commit to the Montreal Pledge for biodiversity, and rivers and riparian zones are extremely rich zones of biodiversity. We are undergoing a massive loss of birds and insects. Insects are highly underappreciated but of huge value to humans. We must honour the pledge and protect habitat.	Email
260	There are so many benefits to spending time in nature and to everyday accessible recreation that it is hard to name them all in an email. To be brief, our family highly values living in a city that has beautiful trees and natural spaces. We paddle on the Seine and LaSalle rivers, and when our kids are at Scouts, they love to walk along the Seine. Of course there are also practical benefits for regulating the temperature of the city environment, and maintaining the health of our rivers and lakes by protecting the riparian areas all along the course of the river including in the city. That is why we strongly support the proposed protections that we learned about at OURS Winnipeg and we ask that you: Please consider including the following protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: 1.Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: 2.350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. 3.250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. 4.Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 5.Align land-use decisions with: 6.The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. 7.The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. 8.The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland 9.Winnipeg - Best Practices Handbook for Activities in and around the city's Waterways (350' and 250' zones) 10.Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's maps. Thank you so much for asking for our input. Increasing housing density is overall a good idea, but preserving and increasing our green spaces is essential for nature and for Winnipeggers like us.	Email
261	Will our sewer systems in older areas be able to accommodate adding the extra washrooms and sinks? Why are we not just looking at ending bidding wars on homes making them unattainable for the average person? Tons of abandoned homes in the north end. Why are they not being looked at redoing and using as housing?	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
262	Thank you for educating the public and being open to feedback and sessions on: Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing. Even though there is much opposition to these four plexus, given concerns over safety, environment and sanitation, it is a good opportunity. Working with the Province: Disability and Existing Housing: Has the City considered enhancing existing infrastructure - to support people with low income and disabilities to get adequate housing? e.g. Manitoba has a Home share program - the government provides funding for vulnerable citizens to live with host families. About the program and funding: https://www.gov.mb.ca/fs/clds/pubs/home-share-faq.pdf Enhancing Home Stay/Neighbors Program: Would the Province be willing to work with us to enhance this program? e.g. I live with multiple disabilities, have a low income and want to support friends who are in worse situations than myself - homeless, hungry and with no supports? Willing Sacrifice/Benefits: Even though I live in a 1 bedroom apartment, if there is a vacant lot, could the program/I pay this person/family to be a live-in support for me? e.g. They would understand their work: assist with cooking, driving, reading things, accompanying me to appointments, or whatever ways they can manage? Thank you for hearing our feedback and considering ideas.	Email
263	I have a few major concerns with infill housing, regarding grading of infill lots (particular in older neighbourhoods) and acceptable landscaping materials. I was at the community come and go information session at Canad-Inn May 6th. I spoke with one of your staff, as well as city councillor Devi Sharma, and city department head. All three asked me to send an email detailing my concerns on infill housing. I have infill housing on both side of me. Grading of infill houses in existing / older neighbourhood must be done with neighbouring properties in mind. City grading can not be standardized across the city, because when older areas of the city where being developed grading bylaws didn't exist. Now when infill housing is implemented in older areas with what supposedly is city grading regulations it causes runoff onto neighbouring / houses. Landscaping Materials - There needs to be by-laws regarding unacceptable landscaping materials. Poly should not be allowed as underlayment because it directs the flow of water onto neighbouring property and does not allow for absorption of water into the immediate ground. Not only does poly underlay cause pooling of water but also raising the ground water level on neighbouring properties which in turn affects neighbouring weeping tile, etc. Stagnant water is also a breading ground for mosquitos. Secondly Poly is not environmental friendly, and causes issues with ground water conditions and harms the environment. Quarter down should also not be an acceptable ground covering as it compacts and inhibits proper water absorption even without poly underlay. However the two combined makes matters worse. Of Note: When the in-fill housing was being built to the east of us (address redacted) I contacted the city regarding grading and was informed it was to code. I also contacted the city regarding the landscaping material that was used and was informed the their are no by-laws regarding the material used to landscape with, apart from tree and scrubbery requirements and that quarter down was not recommended. There also needs to be more regular and consistent checks. We also had issues with fencing around the properties being developed. On the side were I have the above issues they didn't initially have fencing up, I had to phone the city as people (not just kids) were in the yard. When the inspectors first came out they said there was fencing, however they were looking at the construction site to the west of us. The inspector called me I informed him it was the wrong lot he came back. Fencing was put up but didn't encompass the full lot, wasn't always closed up at night, fencing wasn't secure, several times it fell over, a few times it fell across the city sidewalk. We also had issues with construction crews at this property working starting before 6 am, working past 9 pm even on Sundays. They knew nothing is going to be done because inspectors don't work at those hours or on weekends. One construction work every said so and gave us the finger.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
263 con't	I'd also like to know: - Beside demolition permits are there regulations regarding demolition of older home (asbestos, lead) removal? - Is there a time limit to build a infill house once the foundation is poured. The 2 infill homes on the west side of us was demolished in 2018, the lot subdivided and foundations on the "newly divided" lots poured. The lots with foundations were eventually sold and houses completed in 2022. Thus the foundations sat for about 4 years, even with fencing (which initially didn't encompass the entire yard - there was a gap) Thus people were in the yard. If changes are made to regulations on acceptable landscape materials I'd greatly appreciate if existing lots could be required to have it removed due to run-of / drainage and environmental concerns. I am attaching several photos the infill house in question regarding the grading slope, run-off / drainage concerns is at (address redacted). I have also included a image (from google maps) that show the grading of the house /lot that was there before the infill house was built. Having issues with the building of infill housing and having to go through 311 was ridiculous, I worked at the time, wait times calling 311 and then waiting for all the info to be taken down was time consuming and frustrating. What would be better is if neighbouring houses could be given a contact person particularly if there is more than one legitimate complaints. Prior to the house at (address redacted) being demolished we had many call to the city regarding the weeds and tall grass. The by-law officer gave us his card with direct line we found this so helpful. We weren't on hold not had to go through a longer than necessary call while everything was recorded. The by-law officers gesture of giving us his business card made our lives so much better. When there are numerous concerns existing neighbour start getting upset and angry. On a positive note thus far there have been good tenants at (address redacted), On the other side at (address redacted) we've had a couple of good tenants and a couple not so good. Of NOTE: - The City assessment that is available online is NOT accurate on (address redacted) They have the Year Built as 1912 and Basement Finish: No (when in fact the house was demolished including basement and a new place built it was completed approx. 2022 and it also has a finished basement. - The grade of (address redacted) is such that water from the sump pump and water run-off causes water to form on the city sidewalk, in spring this causes a build up of ice in front of (address redacted). This is a hazard for people walking down the street. Thank you for your time in this matter. I hope something can be done so others don't have these type of issues.	continued from above
264	First of all, congratulations on all the hard work you are doing to make Winnipeg a great city! I am a supporter of increasing urban density. I am writing for you and your colleagues to consider one small concern / piece of feedback regarding the HAF Zoning Bylaw Amendment prior to presentation to City Council. For context, I live on Sherburn Street, on a 30-foot wide lot, ~ 500 metres north of Portage. I am less concerned about my own house, but more broadly concerned about the impact a large, over time increase in impermeable surfaces, could have on small R2 lots (or similar) in terms of drainage and urban island heat. That said, I think very small adjustments to the recommended changes could help mitigate these. I believe the width of my home's lot (30 feet) is typical for my street; perhaps also for the neighbourhood? (I don't know, though you will.) When I imagine someone building impermeable structures and parking spots (minimum 2 for a duplex) within the currently recommended guidelines, I can easily imagine there will be little room for permeable surfaces to absorb drainage and heat. This seems especially the case in backyards, where a combination of the primary mass and paved parking, or primary and secondary mass would be setback by a minimum of 2 feet from the back lane. When I duplicate this imagined scenario to similar lots up and down the street (again, a future scenario), I become more concerned about basement flooding and urban island heat (both of which are already concerns). I am aware some people are advocating for less required parking per dwelling, such as 0 or 1/2, instead of 1. I think that is one option. At the moment though, it is very difficult to get parking on my street. That said, it would be nice to feel like the city is moving toward a greener future by planning for current needs without making it difficult to make changes down the road. So my suggestions are either of the following with a preference for 'a:' a. Parking space (however many per dwelling) be made of porous layers, such as gravel, with permeable pavers, or b. Paving in parking spaces be limited to the wheelpath only to decrease the overall impermeable surface I have been told that neither the city nor developers will do 'a' because of either a lack of familiarity or additional bylaws that would be required. Given however that 'b' was listed on page 16 of the HAF Zoning Bylaw Amendments, I presume that this is something both are prepared to do. In either case, these suggestions drain and don't pool, de-ice faster, keep the city cooler, and can be more easily fixed/maintained (or perhaps one-day be undone). Please consider this suggestion at minimum for communities with small properties like mine, for the reasons explained above. Again, thank you kindly for all your hard work!	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
265	There has been a drastic reduction to Winnipeg's tree canopy due to infill housing. The areas near and on the banks of waterways and the tree corridors must be protected. Any reduction in trees, foliage, grass lands, ground absorption, and greenspace would be detrimental to waterway bank erosion, carbon absorption, the canopy, and increase overland flooding Please consider including the following 3 protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: □ 1. Establish buffer zones exempt from higher-density zoning: •350-foot buffer zone for the Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle Rivers. •250-foot buffer zone for the Sturgeon, Omand's, Bunn's, and Truro Creeks. •Ensure existing properties in these areas retain their current zoning. 2. Align land-use decisions with: •The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. •The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. •The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. •The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. •Winnipeg - Best Practices Handbook for Activities in and around the city's Waterways 3. Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, LaSalle) and creeks (Omand, Truro, Bunn's, Sturgeon) on the City's infill housing maps. Thank you for your consideration of this important issue. Sincerely (name redacted)	Email
265 con't	PS, please consider Why Protect Buffer Areas Decisions regarding the Infill Housing bylaw, to be voted on June 2, 2025, will take precedence over the "Greenspace and Natural Corridors Plan and Biodiversity Policy", which is to be finalized in 2026, tree bylaw in development. Zoning amendments and considerations should not be made until after this policy is completed and approved. Buffer zone is the area within: •350 feet of rivers or 250 feet of creeks. •Properties in buffer zones would maintain their current zoning and be exempt from new infill housing designations. These buffer zones are consistent with the Best Management Practices Handbook for Activities In and Around the City's Waterways and Watercourses that considers lands within these areas as ecologically sensitive and important (p. 24). Zoning amendments in these areas should not be considered as they would contradict the handbook. Increased housing density along waterways would: •Maximize lot coverage (buildings, driveways, sheds). •Reduce shade, vegetation, and stormwater retention. •Lead to tree loss, decreased biodiversity, and compromised riverbank stability	continued from above
266	Please consider including the following protections for Winnipeg's waterways and tree corridors in the Infill Housing Rezoning Bylaw: · Establish meaningful buffer zones along river and tributary corridors to be exempt from higher-density zoning. · Align land-use decisions with: · The upcoming Master Greenspace and Natural Corridor Plan and Biodiversity Policy. -The Urban Forestry Strategy goal to expand the urban tree canopy. -The 2022 City Council commitment to add 1,000 acres of parkland. -The city's 2023 commitment to the Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity. · Clearly label all rivers (Red, Assiniboine, Seine, and LaSalle) and tributaries (Omand's, Truro, Bunn's, and Sturgeon creeks) on the City's infill housing maps.	Email

APPENDIX C - Compiled Questions and Comments from Public Engagement (Zoning changes to accommodate infill housing)
Received between March 3 - May 7, 2025

#	COMPILED QUESTIONS & COMMENTS	SOURCE
267	1. Add rivers and creeks to the infill maps. The rivers (except Red and Assiniboine) and creeks are missing from the maps. They are place makers and direction finders that need to be added to city maps. 2. Remove “Preserved green spaces by building up rather than out” as a benefit to greenspace (Slide 9 POTENTIAL BENEFITS INCLUDE) A benefit to greenspace is when the city plans for and sets aside land. In the process of Infill development trees and pervious surfaces are lost. 3. Add: Loss of trees and their shade as a potential impact. (Slide 9 POTENTIAL IMPACTS INCLUDE) 4. Add Limitation - Lots that are partially within 350 feet of a river and 250 feet from a creek are excluded from duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes as-of-right city-wide. (Slide 13 LIMITATIONS & EXCLUDED LOTS) Properties in buffer zones would maintain their current zoning and be exempt from new infill housing designations. Waterways are ecologically sensitive, highly treed and biodiverse areas. They are prone to flooding and erosion. Waterways are extraordinary land and require unique consideration for protection. Greenspace and Natural Corridors Plan bylaw and Biodiversity Policy, and Tree bylaw are not complete and their knowledge will be over ridden by the Infill housing bylaw due to be complete first. Greenspace plan has a commitment to reconciliation as part of co-planning process with Indigenous groups. Other plans to support protection of waterways – Urban Forestry Strategy, Montreal Pledge Actions for Biodiversity, Ecologically Sensitive Lands Strategy, Best Practices Handbook for Activities in and around the City’s Waterways 5. Show examples of lots with 100 ft depth (Slides 19 – 23 VISUALIZING ‘INFILL HOUSING) Amount of lot coverage is significant. Less lot coverage increases stormwater retention and provides options to plant or preserve shade trees and other vegetation. All the Lot Coverage examples in Slides 19 to 25 show lots that with 115, 125 127, 130ft lot depth, This gives the appearance of lower percent of lot coverage by 15 to 30 % than if most common depth of 100 ft was used.	Email
268	When will you be posting the questions from the public and answers on your website?	Email