The following text file was produced in real-time and may contain inaccuracies. A complete and corrected Hansard document for this meeting is being produced and will replace this document when completed. To verify any parts of this document in the meantime, please visit www.winnipeg.ca/clkdmis to listen to a complete Electronic Hansard of this meeting.

THANK YOU. CAN EVERYONE HEAR ME OK?

MADAM SPEAKER: YES, WE CAN.
THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER THROUGH YOU TO THE COUNCILLOR. YES, WE DID DOUBLECHECK THIS. THE INTENT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT FOR THE OSBORNE PLAN ARE STRICTLY ASSOCIATED WITH THE VILLAGE LOW DENSITY POLICY AREA, WHICH IS A MUCH SMALLER POLICY AREA WITHIN THE GREATER OSBORNE VILLAGE PLAN. THE POLICIES FOR THE EIGHTS STORIES WHICH WERE RECENTLY AMENDED LAST YEAR ARE NOT CHANGING. IT WILL STAY IN EFFECT. WITH MASS SETBACKS AND HEIGHTS OF BUILDINGS, THIS IS LOCATED IN A CHARACTER POLICY THAT REFLECTS THE DESIGN. THIS POLICY SECTION, IS A GENERAL POLICY SECTION, BUT PLANS TO ALL AREAS THROUGHOUT THE OSBORNE VILLAGE PLAN. AND IT SPECIFICALLY TARGETS INCREASING AND ALLOWING THE PEDESTRIAN NATURE OF THAT PLAN TO PERSIST IN ACCORDANCE WITH THAT CHARACTER AREA. NOW WE HAVE REMOVED A COUPLE OF SECTIONS THAT DO RELATE TO MASSING SETBACKS AND HEIGHTS, BUT WE DON'T VIEW THIS IN ANY WAY AS BEING RESTRICTIVE ON POTENTIAL HEIGHTS THAT MIGHT BE SOUGHT THROUGHOUT THE PLANNING AREA. IT'S MOSTLY A RECOGNITION THAT WE ARE INTRODUCING THROUGH THE ZONING AMENDMENTS SOME DIFFERENT BUILDING TYPEOLOGY, SOME DIFFERENT HEIGHT REQUIREMENTS AS WELL AND IT'S A RECOGNITION BUT YOUR ASSUMPTION AND WHAT WE HAVE STATED EARLIER HOLDS TRUE THAT IT'S NOT GOING TO EFFECT THE BUILDING HEIGHTS THROUGHOUT THE PLANNED AREA. THEY CAN STILL GO UP 8 STORIES.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. COUNCILLOR WYATT?

COUNCILLOR WYATT: JUST SO I UNDERSTAND THE PROCESS. AT THIS POINT, MADAM SPEAKER OR MADAM CHAIR, THE PUBLIC SERVICE TO MY HERE, THE QUESTIONS IN TERMS OF THE APPLICANTS' APPLICATION?

MADAM SPEAKER: YES. ANY QUESTIONS OF CLARIFICATION FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE. AND THEN CERTAINLY AFTER, THAT WE'LL BE HEARING FROM MR. JOHN KIERNAN THE APPLICANT.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: AND I'LL HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK AGAIN.

MADAM SPEAKER: THAT'S RIGHT.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: THANK YOU. THE QUESTION I HAVE IS WHEN YOU TAKE EVERYTHING TO ITS LOGICAL CONCLUSION IN TERMS OF WHAT IT'S DOING HERE TODAY, AND IF I UNDERSTAND IT CORRECTLY, WE HAVE A PUBLIC DO THIS LARGE AMENDMENT TO THE ZONING BYLAW BASICALLY TO PERMIT PRETTY MUCH EVERYWHERE TWO, THREE-UNIT AND FOUR-UNIT DWELLINGS. IS THAT FAIRLY ACCURATE IN A SENSE? ONE OR THE OTHER. EITHER A TWO-UNIT, THREE-UNIT, OR FOUR UNIT DEPENDING ON SIZE.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. HAZEL?

MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU TO THE COUNCIL. YES THAT'S CORRECT. BUT THAT'S R-1 SINGLE FAMILY, R-2.

SORRY. I DIDN'T HEAR THE FIRST PART.
THAT IS ACCURATE WE'RE CONTEMPLATING ALLOWING UP TO TWO, THREE, AND FOUR-DWELLING UNITS BASED ON IF IT'S NOT IN ONE OF THOSE LIMITED AREAS LIKE AIRPORT VICINITY OR PROXIMITY TO RIVERS AND CREEKS FOR INSTANCE. WOULD BE ENABLING UP TO FOUR DWELLING UNITS BASED ON IF THERE IS A MINIMUM LOT SIZE AVAILABLE TO SUPPORT THAT, AND FULL INFRASTRUCTURE AVAILABLE TO SUPPORT THAT BUT THE ZONING DISTRICTS IN ADDITION TO THE R-1 SINGLE FAMILIES THAT YOU MENTIONED IS AN R-2, WHICH IS CURRENTLY TWO FAMILY, AND MATURE COMMUNITIES UP TO THREE-FAMILY. AND ALSO AN RMFS, WHICH IS RESIDENTIAL MULTIFAMILY SMALL. SO THE THREE ZONING DISTRICTS ARE R-1, R-2, AND RMFS.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: RIGHTS, AND IT HAS TO DO WITH OTHER AREAS THAT ARE RESTRICTED OR CERTAIN LOT SIZE. SO IS IT BEING THAT IT'S A DRAMATIC CHANGE, A PERMANENT CHANGE BEING DONE FOR A TEMPORARY FEDERAL PROGRAMME OF MONEY, THAT THIS WILL ALSO BY AND LARGE FOR ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES, LIMITED NOW PERMANENTLY THE R-1 DESIGNATION ON ANY FUTURE APPLICATIONS COMING FORWARD. FOR ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES. DOES IT REALLY MEAN THE R-1 CATEGORY HAS BASICALLY BEEN WIPED, DE FACTO? BECAUSE HOW CAN WE APPROVE A NEW SUBDIVISION COMING FORWARD WHEN WE ARE DOING THIS SECTION SOMEWHERE ELSE, I GUESS. THAT'S MY QUESTION.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. HAZEL?

SO WHAT WE'RE DOING TODAY, FIRST OF ALL, NO ZONING IS EVER PERMANENT. THE NATURE OF ZONING IS OVER THE YEARS, IT GETS AMENDED FOR A VAST NUMBER OF REASONS TO RESPOND TO THE MARKET CONDITIONS. THAT'S THE WAY ZONING GENERALLY OPERATES. HOWEVER, ONCE YOU HAVE GIVEN ADDITIONAL RIGHTS TO A PROPERTY, MOST CITIES DON'T CHOOSE TO REMOVE THOSE RIGHTS AND THE MAJORITY OF CONDITIONS. HOWEVER, IT'S IMPORTANT TO SAY UNTIL THE R-1 ZONING CATEGORY, YOU WILL STILL BE ALLOWED TO BUILD. YOU WILL STILL BE ABLE TO BUILD A DETACHED SINGLE-FAMILY HOME WITH ALL THE RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES THAT THE R-1 ZONING DISTRICT CURRENTLY HAS TODAY. WHAT WE'RE CONTEMPLATING HERE IS AN ADDITIONAL SCHEDULE TO THE ZONING BYLAW THAT

WOULD DEAL WITH THE SITUATIONS WHERE THE OWNER WOULD LIKE TO BUILD EITHER TWO, THREE, OR FOUR-DWELLING UNITS ON THEIR PROPERTY. SO THE R-1 ZONING DISTRICT IS DIFFERENT THAN THE R-2 ZONING DISTRICT, AS FAR AS THE UNDERLINING ZONING GOES. SO WE ARE NOT CONTEMPLATING ANY CHANGES TO THOSE UNDERLYING ZONING DISTRICT OF R-1 AND R-2. THOSE WILL EXIST INTO THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: OK. MAYBE I'LL REPHRASE THE QUESTION. I HEAR WHAT YOU'RE SAYING. THE ZONING DISTRICTS WILL REMAIN R-1 AS WE KNOW IT. HOWEVER, AS WE KNOW, THE PUBLIC SERVICE RECEIVES APPLICATIONS FROM THE APPLICANTS. PUBLIC SERVANTS DO NOT IS TO NECESSARILY AGREE. THE PUBLIC SERVICE CAN PUSH BACK, AS IT DOES SOMETIMES. I BELIEVE THAT'S THE ROLE OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE TO BRING FORWARD THEIR PROFESSIONAL OPINION WHEN APPLICATIONS ARE MADE AND WHEN POLICIES ARE BEING PROPOSED TO COUNCIL OR BEING FORMULATED FOR COUNCIL'S CONSIDERATION. IS IT FAIR TO SAY THAT THE POSITION OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE TODAY BE ONE THAT WOULD PROBABLY PUSH APPLICANTS TO CONSIDER APPLICATIONS WITH LESS R-1 SO THAT WE CAN BE CONSISTENT ACROSS THE CITY WITH WHAT WE'RE DOING TODAY?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE?
NO. WE ARE UNLIKELY TO PUSH APPLICANTS TO LESS R-1. APPLICANTS BRING FORWARD WHATEVER THEY FEEL IS THE BEST USE OF THEIR LAND, BASED ON THE REGULATIONS THAT THE CITY HAS ADOPTED. SO THEY STILL HAVE FULL FLEXIBILITY TO BUILD ANY OF OUR ZONING DISTRICTS, PROVIDED THAT EITHER THEIR LAND IS CURRENTLY ZONED TO ENABLE THAT, OR THAT WHEN THEY BRING EVERY ZONING FORWARD TO COUNCIL THAT IT SUPPORTED.
OK.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: I'LL PLAY THE DEVIL'S ADVOCATES. HERE WE ARE THE CITY. THE ONLY REASON A LOT OF THESE CAN'T COME FORWARD WITH A SUBDIVISION BECAUSE WE AS COUNCILLORS ARE SPENDING BILLIONS TO UPGRADE OUR TREATMENT PLANT. WE'RE CONSTANTLY UNDER PRESSURE TO BUILD EXPRESSWAYS TO DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY TO THESE NEIGHBOURHOODS. WE'RE CONSTANTLY PUSHED FOR A FIRE HALL, A LIBRARY TO SERVICE ALL THESE AREAS. IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THESE NEIGHBOURHOODS DON'T PLUCK DOWN OUT OF THE AIR ONTO EARTH, THEY REQUIRE A LOT OF INFRASTRUCTURE, SOFT AND HARD, TO SUPPORT THEIR ACTUAL ABILITY TO EXIST. IS IT NOT POSSIBLY THE NEED OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG PUBLIC SERVICE TO SAY WELL, WE WANT TO SEE WHEN IT COMES TO THE USE OF WHAT I WOULD CALL LAND, PRECIOUS LAND. YOU KNOW, AS MY FATHER WOULD SAY NOT MAKE ANY MORE OF IT. THE ONLY LAND WE HAVE IN THE FACILITY -- IN THE CITY BUT IT'S SHRINKING EVERY YEAR. AND SO IN LIGHT OF THAT, COULD THERE NOT BE A POLICY ARGUMENT, I GUESS, TO BE MADE THAT WOULD SAY LOOK, WE ARE MAKING THESE INVESTMENTS. WE WOULD EXPECT A WISE USE OF LAND, ESPECIALLY GREENFIELD LAND WHEN IT COMES FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE FUTURE? AND THAT MEANS -- DO YOU GET MY QUESTION?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE?

SURE. PLANNING PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT IS TASKED WITH IMPLEMENTING THE POLICIES THAT COUNCIL ADOPTS, SO BECAUSE COUNCIL HAS ADOPTED THE POLICY OF 50% OR A MINIMUM OF 50% OF NEW DEVELOPMENT BEING INFILLED. FOR INSTANCE, WE CAN -- COUNCIL HASN'T ADOPTED ANY MEASURES THAT SAY THE PUBLIC SERVICE SHOULD ONLY APPROVE HIGHER DENSITY LAND USES. UNTIL COUNCIL ADOPTED SOME SORT OF DIRECTION LIKE THAT, NO, WE WOULD NOT BE ENCOURAGING DEVELOPERS TO -- IN A SPECIFIC DIRECTION, OTHER THAN WHAT THEY ARE CURRENTLY ALLOWED TO DO.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: BUT IN THE SENSE THAT IF WE ADOPT THIS TODAY, I WOULD SUGGEST POSSIBLY THAT THIS REPRESENTS A POLICY DEVELOPMENT OR A POLICY CHANGE, A POLICY SHIFT OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG, AND THAT THAT REPRESENTS A COUNCIL DIRECTION TO SIGNAL THAT COUNCIL IS ON THE PAGE OF ENSURING THERE'S GREATER DENSITY AND THAT FOR ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES, THE R-1 DOESN'T EXIST. THE TYPE OF MONEY WE'RE HAVING TO SPEND ON THE SERVICES REQUIRED TO SERVICE NOT ONLY THE LAND, BUT ALSO PEOPLE LIVING THERE, WHO EXPECT A CERTAIN LEVEL OF SERVICES.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE?
NO. WE SEE TODAY AS A REGULATORY DOCUMENT, NOT A POLICY DOCUMENT, AND THIS REGULATORY DOCUMENT IS, IN FACT, SUPPORTED BY COUNCIL-ADOPTED POLICY. FOR INSTANCE, THE JANUARY, 2021 SMALL SCALE AND LOW-RISE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES FOR MATURE COMMUNITIES. THE GUIDELINES HAS A LOT OF THE POLICY THAT IS SUPPORTED HERE EVEN WITH RESPECT TO TWO, THREE, AND FOUR-DWELLING UNITS PER LOT ALSO OUR WINNIPEG 425, AND THE PREVIOUS OUR WINNIPEG BEFORE THAT, WHICH GOES BACK TO 2009 WAS THE BEGINNING OF THAT PROCESS. AND THEN MULTIPLE ADOPTIONS OF THAT, AS COUNCIL ADOPTED POLICIES THAT DIRECT US TO ALLOW A VARIETY OF HOUSING TYPES WITHIN PROXIMITY TO SERVICES WITH RESPECT TO EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE. WHERE TO YOUR POINT, ALL OF THOSE POLICIES THAT COUNCIL HAS ALREADY ADOPTED THROUGH OUR WINNIPEG AND COMPLETE COMMUNITIES 2.0 AND THE INFILL GUIDELINES WERE NOT FULLY IMPLEMENTED IN THE ZONING REGULATION, EVEN THOUGH THE POLICY WAS ESTABLISHED, THE BUY RIGHT REGULATION WAS NOT ESTABLISHED. SO TODAY JUST BRINGS THOSE TWO CLOSER TOGETHER AND IMPLEMENTS THE THINGS THAT COUNCIL HAS DIRECTED, BEEN DIRECTING FOR A LONG TIME. BUT UNTIL NOW, HAVE BEEN ONLY APPROVED ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS THROUGH A PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: IS IT FAIR TO SAY -- ONE LAST QUESTION. IS IT FAIR TO SAY -- I HEAR WHAT YOU'RE SAYING, HAZEL. IS IT FAIR TO SAY THE NEXT ROUND OF OUR WINNIPEG PROCESS, WHICH WE'RE REQUIRED TO DO BY PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION, THAT THIS POLICY DOCUMENT OR THIS ZONING AMENDMENT WILL DEFINITELY PLAY A MAJOR ROLE AND INFORM THAT PROCESS WITH REGARDS TO FUTURE -- THE FUTURE PLAN OF WINNIPEG, WHATEVER THAT MAY LOOK LIKE?
YES, DEFINITELY. THAT IS DUE FOR RENEWAL TO BEGIN IN JUNE OF 2027. SO AS YOU

MIGHT REMEMBER, THE FULL ZONING WRITE. COUNCIL IS COMMITTED TO BE CONTRACTED WITH A CONSULTANT FOR THAT BY DECEMBER 15 OF THIS YEAR. THAT IS ANTICIPATED TO BE A TWO-YEAR PROCESS WITH A FULL RIGHT, A REWRITE UP FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION, HOPEFULLY, BY YEAR END OF 2027 IF ALL GOES AS PLANNED. AND SO CERTAINLY, BECAUSE THAT DRAFT WOULD BE WELL UNDER WAY BY THE TIME OUR WINNIPEG STARTS ITS RENEWAL AND UPDATING PROCESS. CERTAINLY, IT IS CONSTANT FEEDBACK BETWEEN POLICY AND REGULATION, AS THE CITY MOVES TOWARD BECOMING MORE MARKET RESPONSIVE AND COGNIZANT OF HIGHER RETURN ON INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: I HAVE ONE LAST QUESTION. A QUICK PREAMBLE. WE KNOW WHAT WE HAPPENED IN THIS COUNCIL BACK -- WE KNOW WE LOST THE CASE IN COURT BECAUSE IT WAS NOT DEDICATED TO A SPECIFIC AREA OR A SPECIFIC SERVICE IT WAS SUPPOSED TO SUPPORT. IT WAS A GENERALIZED FUND. HOWEVER, WE DO KNOW MUNICIPALITIES LITERALLY ON THE BORDER OF THE CITY HAVE THE SAME IMPACT. THE SUM OF $50,000 A LOT. SOME MUCH HIGHER. THAT GO DIRECTLY INTO BUILDING A ROAD, A FIRE HALL, OR WHAT HAVE YOU IN THAT MUNICIPALITY. KNOWING THAT THIS IS NOT PART OF THIS EXERCISE, IS IT FAIR TO SAY THAT WITH THIS CHANGE, IT DOES TWO THINGS. NUMBER ONE, IT RAISES THE ISSUE ONLY BECAUSE AS THE MAYOR HAS QUOTED IN THE PAST, OUR CITY HAS GROWN BY 70,000 PEOPLE IN THE LAST THREE YEARS. IF WE WERE GOING TO TRY TO ACCOMMODATE THAT FUTURE GOING FORTH IN EXISTING NEIGHBOURHOODS, THERE IS A DIRECT CONNECTION TO THE SERVICES OF THOSE NEIGHBOURHOODS. HAPPENED TO BE PROBABLY INCREASED, OR AT LEAST ENHANCED TO ADDRESS FUTURE DENSITIES AND POPULATIONS THAT WILL GROW. FOR EXAMPLE, COMMUNITY CENTRES THAT WILL BE TOO SMALL OR TOO OLD, THAT ARE RUN DOWN, THAT NEED BETTER SERVICE, A BETTER LIBRARY. ALL OF A SUDDEN, YOU HAVE ALL THESE NEW PEOPLE COMING IN. IS IT FAIR TO SAY THIS REALLY PUTS THIS BACK ON THE TABLE? EVEN THOUGH IT'S NOT BEING ADDRESSED AS PART OF THIS, THAT THIS IN AND OF ITSELF DOES NOT PRECLUDE THE ISSUE OF HAVING AREAS CHARGED, IMPACT CERTAIN FEE -- WHATEVER YOU WANT TO CALL IT -- AS HAS BEEN DONE AND PRESENTLY THE CASE IN MUNICIPALITIES WHETHER IT BE EAST ST. PAUL OR MCDONALD'S ON THE BOOKS, WHO ARE CHARGING THEM AND COLLECTING THEM FOR THE PEOPLE IN THOSE AREAS WITHOUT BEING CHALLENGED IN COURT?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE.
THROUGH YOU TO THE COUNCILLOR, COUNCILLOR WYATT. THAT WHOLE DISCUSSION WOULD BE AT THE DIRECTION OF COUNCIL. THIS IS NOT THIS DISCUSSION TODAY.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: YEAH, BUT IT DOESN'T PRECLUDE IT, I GUESS IS WHAT I'M SAYING.

MADAM SPEAKER: MOVING ON. COUNCILLOR ROLLINS FOLLOWED BY COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW.

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: MADAM SPEAKER, MY VOICE IS NOT GETTING ANY BETTER. WE HEARD FROM A VARIETY OF SPEAKERS FROM DELEGATIONS. ON ONE HAND, I BELIEVE WE HEARD FROM FOLKS DENYING THE REALITIES OF CLIMATE, CLIMATE CHANGE. ON THE OTHER HAND, WE HEARD FROM FOLKS REALLY WANTING THE TOOLS AND IF I CAN QUOTE DIRECTOR HAZEL LAWRENCE, A SPONGY CITY. I WANT THE ADMINISTRATIONS MADAM SPEAKER, TO RESPOND THOUGH TO MR. GARY, WHO CAME FOR INFORMATION, NOT FOR, NOT AGAINST, BUT CAME FOR INFORMATION WITH A VARIETY OF CONCERNS PERTAINING TO COMBINED SEWER AND WATER STORAGE. AND I'M HOPING THAT THE ADMINISTRATION COULD SPEND SOME TIME AND REALLY DISCUSS THE PARTNERSHIP WITH WATER AND WASTE, THE REALITY OF THE URBAN FORM, THE LOT, AND THE MASSING THAT THEY HAVE PROPOSED, REFLECTING ON THAT. AND WHAT COMES UP IN DEVELOPMENT OFTEN WHICH IS THE NEED TO MITIGATE AROUND OUR COMBINED SEWER SYSTEM.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE?
THANK YOU. PUBLIC SERVICE IS CONCERNED ABOUT THAT AND WE'RE CONCERNED ABOUT IMPROVING OUR SPONGINESS. SO WITHIN THE REGULATIONS WE HAVE RECOMMENDED, WE HAVE ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS AROUND PERVIOUS SURFACE, AROUND DOING DRIVEWAYS THE RIBBON IDEA, AS WELL, LANDSCAPING REQUIREMENT THAT'S WE'RE BRINGING FORWARD. ALSO EVERY BUILDING PERMIT DOES GO THROUGH WATER, WASTE AND REVIEW. AS WE MENTIONED YESTERDAY FOR ANY THREE-UNIT OR FOUR-UNIT DEVELOPMENT, THEY WILL BE REQUIRED TO ADHERE TO CLAUSE EIGHT, THE PROVINCIAL REQUIREMENTS ON EXCESS FLOW OF DRAINAGE FROM PRIVATE PROPERTIES INTOS. SO WE CAN CONTINUE TO GET BETTER ON THAT, AND IN THE NEW ZONING BYLAW REWRITE AS WELL. THAT'S GOING TO BE A BIG PRIORITY FOR US. BUT WE FEEL THESE REGULATIONS WERE PUTTING FORWARD TO DATE DO ADDRESS A LOT OF THOSE CONCERNS. AND PROVIDE US WITH A LITTLE MORE COMFORT FOR A SPONGY CITY.

MADAM SPEAKER, JUST TO FOLLOW UP. SO TO PROVIDE GREATER CONTEXT FOR WINNIPEGERS AND MR. MCGARY WHO MIGHT BE LISTENING. I WONDER IF YOU CAN POINT TO THE INSTANCES AND THE DEVELOPMENTS OF THIS SCALE BECAUSE WE'RE NOT TALKING ABOUT OTHER SCALES, YOU KNOW, OF THIS GENTLE DENSITY SCALE WHERE STORAGE HAS BEEN A FACTOR. WHERE AND WHEN STORAGE HAS BEEN A FACTOR, AND I APPRECIATE YOU MIGHT NOT HAVE THAT THAT MIGHT COME LATER, AS WE GO THROUGH MORE QUESTIONS. BUT TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL CONTEXT, I THINK THAT'S IMPORTANT TO HAVE THE REALITY AND SOME SENSE OF THE SCOPE OF THE FILES THAT WE HAVE AT THIS SCALE, WHERE WE THEN REQUIRE WATER AND WASTE THEN REQUIRES THAT IT'S ADVISABLE NOT TO BUILD ABOUT DENSITY BUT TO STORE ON THE PROPERTY. SO I'M PARTICULARLY CONCERNED WITH FOUR, LET'S SAY. IF YOU CAN PROVIDE DATA WITH ON HOW MANY INSTANCES THIS HAS HAPPENED IN THE PAST SO WE CAN HAVE, OR PERHAPS MR. MCGARY SOME ASSURANCE OF THE FUTURE.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE?
YES, MADAM CHAIR, TO THE OF A COUPLE OF INSTANCES RIGHT OFFHAND. THERE WAS A PROJECT IN DORCHESTER, JUST CLOSE TO LILAC. THEY PROVIDE THE ON-SITE

STORAGE SYSTEMS. WHAT IT ENDS UP LOOKING LIKE IS THE LOT IS GRATED WITH GRASS AND INTO SORT OF A PRIVATE MANHOLE COVER THAT GOES INTO AIS IS ATTORNEY, WHICH STORES THE WATER AND THEN RELEASES THE WATER INTO A COMBINED SYSTEM AT A RATE THAT IS REGULATED BY CLAUSE 8 OF THE PROVINCIAL GUIDELINES. SO THERE'S ONE ON DORCHESTER. GET SOMETHING FEEDBACK. THAT'S WHY I PAUSED.

-- IS A LOT. DO YOU RECALL?
I DON'T RECALL OFFHAND. IT'S JUST SOUTH OF THE PANAMA COURT. 785 DORCHESTER. IT'S THE LOT SOUTH OF 785.

SOMEONE CAN GET IT. GO AHEAD. YOU MENTIONED ANOTHER ONE.
YEAH. ON GROVENER AS YOU'RE PROBABLY AWARE, THERE'S BEEN SEVERAL SMALLER INFILLS JUST NORTH OF STAFFORD ON THE WEST SIDE OF GROVENER AND THOSE AS WELL, INSTALLED ON THOSE ON-SITEIS IS ATTORNEYS. AND LANDSCAPE THE PROPERTY, SO THE GRATING WILL TRICKLE DOWN.
YOU CAN GET ME THE LOT SIZE OF THOSE PROPERTIES AS WELL?
I DON'T HAVE IT OFFHAND.
NO, OF COURSE AND THE FULLNESS OF TIME. SO JUST OFF THE TOP, THERE'S SEVERAL EXAMPLES. AND THERE HAS BEEN EXAMPLES WHERE THEY WERE TOLD ABOUT THE REQUIREMENT FOR CLAUSE 8 AND THE FACT THEY HAD TO STORE WATER. IT BECAME ECONOMICALLY UNVIABLE FOR THE PROJECT, TOO. SO THERE HAVE BEEN PROJECTS WHICH WE GOT INQUIRIES ON. THE THE INQUIRY STAGE WHERE THEY DIDN'T END UP GOING FORWARD WITH THE DEVELOPMENT BECAUSE OF THE STORAGE REQUIREMENTS.

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: YOU CAN GIVE ME THE SIZE AND SCOPE OF THESE? BECAUSE TYPICALLY, IN THAT AREA, THEY WOULDN'T BE FOUR. THESE WOULD BE SIXES.
YEAH, AND THOSE INQUIRY LEVEL LIKE THE PHONE CALL PLANNING AND DISCUSSION ON THE REQUIREMENTS COULD HAVE BEEN A PREAPPLICATION, THINGS LIKE THAT. I KNOW THAT'S HAPPENED. BUT AGAIN, I DON'T HAVE THE SPECIFICS OF THOSE.

MADAM SPEAKER: ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS, COUNCILLOR ROLLINS?

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: JUST A LAST ONE, MADAM SPEAKER. REFLECTING ON MR. MCGARY'S PRESENTATION, DO YOU HAVE ANY FURTHER RESPONSES TO WHY, YOU KNOW, HE CAME TO TALK ABOUT WATER, WASTE AND ANYTHING FURTHER?
AS WE KNOW, IT'S A BIG ISSUE. WE KNOW THIS IS AN ISSUE IMPACTING ADJACENT RESIDENTS SOMETIMES WHEN INFILL GOES IN AND DRAINAGE ONTO EXISTING PROPERTIES. SO WE DO KNOW THAT IT'S A CRITICAL ISSUE OF INFILL. THAT'S WHY WE PUT IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE REGULATION WITHIN THE PROPOSED BYLAW. SO YEAH, WE HEAR THE PUBLIC AND UNDERSTAND, AND WE'RE LOOKING AT A VARIETY OF WAYS TO MITIGATE THAT. ALSO, A WINNIPEG CONTEXT AS WELL. MADE FOR WINNIPEG SOLUTIONS.

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: I APOLOGIZE, MADAM SPEAKER. AND THESE ARE TO DO WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SURFACE WATER? LIKE DRIVEWAYS APPROACHES BECAUSE OF THE STANDING WATER THAT OFTEN RESULTS IN THE RIGHT OF WAY, RIGHT ADJACENT TO THE PROPERTIES. VERY FEW ARE TO DO WITH WHAT WE HAVE EXISTING I.E., THE STORAGE WE WERE JUST TALKING ABOUT ON THE PROPERTY.

CORRECT.

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: DID YOU CONTEMPLATE ANYTHING FURTHER WITH RESPECT TO STORAGE, WATER AND WASTE?
WE MAY HAVE. NOTHING COMES TO MIND.

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: THAT'S OK.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. NEXT IS COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. JUST COMMENTS I HEARD FROM RESIDENTS MOSTLY ON THE SUPPORT SIDE. HOMEOWNERSHIP IS A CRITICAL PIECE OF THIS -- THESE CHANGES. I STILL DON'T SEE IT. CAN YOU CLARIFY FOR ME THAT THIS IS THE ANY HOMEOWNERSHIP? I CAN SEE RENTALS. BUT I DON'T SEE -- WHEN I HEAR "OWNERSHIP" CERTAINLY A CONDO OR TWO. BUT AM I OFF ON THIS? WHERE WOULD THE HOMEOWNERSHIP PART OF THIS COME FROM, RATHER THAN JUST, SAY, I THINK A HOME IS GRAVE. I HAVE A SHELTER. AN APARTMENT IS -- GREAT. AN APARTMENT IS NO PROBLEM, BUT THEY REALLY BELIEVE THIS WILL PROVIDE THEM AN OPPORTUNITY TO BUY A HOME. I DON'T SEE HOW IN IT THIS MODEL.
THE NONPROFIT CRITICAL ALLIANCE OFTEN TALKS ABOUT FORM FOLLOWS FINANCE FOUR PLEX. BECAUSE WHO DOESN'T LOVE ALLITERATION. AND SO A PART OF THAT IS BEING ABLE TO QUALIFY FOR A LOAN TO ACTUAL FOUR-PLEX. AND SO HAVING AN OWNER-OCCUPIED. CLEARLY, ZONING CANNOT ADDRESS TENURE, WHETHER SOMETHING IS OWNED OR RENTED. HOWEVER, WHAT COUNCIL COULD CONSIDER ARE DIFFERENT INCENTIVES FOR HOMEOWNERSHIP. PLACES LIKE THE STATE OF MINNESOTA, SOME OF THEIR CITIES ACTUALLY ENCOURAGE AN OWNER-OCCUPIED MULTIFAMILY DWELLING OF THIS MISSING METAL OF A PROGRAMME THEY CALL PACE. P-A-C-E. I CAN'T REMEMBER WHAT THE ACRONYM STANDS FOR, BUT THEY PROVIDE THE LOAN TO THE HOME OWNER IF THEY DO AN OWNED OR OCCUPIED MULTIOWNER ON THEIR OWN PROPERTY, AND THE OWNER PAYS BACK THAT KIND OF MORTGAGE ON THEIR MONTHLY PROPERTY TAX BILL. ALSO THE CITY OF MANITOBA IN THE PAST HAD SOMETIMES -- ABOUT DIFFERENT INCENTIVES THAT EXISTED HERE IN THE PAST FOR OWNER OPERATED. BUT THE SIMPLE ANSWER IS ZONING CAN'T DO THAT, BUT OTHER INCENTIVES CERTAINLY COULD.
THE ANSWER IS NO.
WE DO THIS TODAY. A WHOLE BUNCH OF PEOPLE, MAY BE LATER BUT THIS BYLAW IS NOT DEALING WITH THIS ISSUE YET.
KIND OF YES AND KIND OF NO. THIS BYLAW DOESN'T KEEP PEOPLE HAVING AN OWNER OPERATED. YOU CAN ARGUE DO DEVELOPERS WANT TO BE IN THE SMALL-SCALE RENTAL MARKET. IS IT BETTER FOR THEM AND BIGGER RETURN ONS TO BE IN

BIGGER BUILDINGS? SO IT'S PRONE TO BE MORE HOMEOWNER-BASED. THESE TRIPLEXES, DUPLEXES. SO IT'S THINK IT'S AGNOSTIC ON THIS TOPIC. ANOTHER THING YOU MIGHT SEE WITH FOUR-PLEXES AND SOMETHING YOU SEE IN A COTTAGE COURT CONTEXT AS WELL, ARE PEOPLE WITH CO-HOUSING. IT'S A COMPANY THAT OWNS THE BUILDING AND THEY EACH OWN A QUARTER SHARE IN THAT COMPANY. SO THOSE SORTS OF TYPEOLOGYIES ARE THINGS WE SEE WITH SIMILAR ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENTS.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: THAT'S FINE. SECOND QUESTION. LAND VALUES FOR MY LITTLE HOUSE THAT'S AFFORDABLE. WE HAVE AFFORDABLE HOUSING. I BROUGHT THAT UP, WHY THIS PROGRAMME SEEMS TO BE A LITTLE OFF BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE THE SAME PROBLEMS AS OTHER CITIES. WE HAVE AFFORDABLE HOUSES. $300,000 HOMES. WILL THIS CHANGE THE IMPACT OR ABILITY FOR THE $300,000 HOMES TO STILL EXIST, BASED ON THE FACT THERE'S MORE UNITS, BUT ALSO MORE PROFITS. THAT WILL DRIVE THOSE HOUSES AWAY AND OTHER PEOPLE MAYBE HOMEOWNERS WHO HAVE A FOUR-PLEX. I HAVEN'T SEEN THAT YES. DUPLEXES. MAYBE I'M WRONG. SO I WORRY IS THAT WHEN WE DO THIS, MAYBE YOU CAN GIVE ME ASSURANCE THIS WON'T HAPPEN ARE ABLE TO AFFORD A $370,000 HOUSE WILL NO LONGER BE EASILY ABLE TO FIND THAT BECAUSE OF THE DEMAND OR THE PROFITABILITY OF RIPPING DOWN THAT HOUSE AND BUILDING SOMETHING BIGGER. FOR EXAMPLE, LOTS. BUT YOU GO FROM A $350,000 PROPERTY, SPLIT IT INTO TWO. THEN YOU HAVE NOW TWO PROPERTIES. NEW PROPERTIES BOTH ASSESSED AT $750,000. SO $350,000 FOR ONE PROPERTY. NOW YOU'VE GOT $750,000 MINIMUM, PLUS TWO, GREAT FOR THE CITY WITH TAX REVENUE. BUT I'M WORRIED ABOUT WHETHER THIS WILL BE COUNTERINTUITIVE TO KEEP OUR STOCK IN PLACE. MY FEAR IS WRONG, OR WHERE AM I AT ON THAT? THANK YOU FOR YOUR RESPONSE.
YEAH, MADAM CHAIR, TO THE COUNCILLOR. ACROSS THE BOARD, THESE CHANGES AREN'T GOING TO BE HAPPENING TO EVERY LOT IN EVERY NEIGHBOURHOOD AT THE THERE WILL STILL BE A VARIETY OF HOUSES THAT ARE IN PLACE, THAT AREN'T GOING TO BE SWITCHING OVER TO FOURS AND THREES. THERE COULD BE SOME AS TIM MENTIONED, THERE COULD BE SOME INCREASE TO VALUE ON SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES. BUT WE DON'T SEE THIS ACROSS THE BOARD. THAT'S WHAT'S HAPPENING. I THINK ANOTHER THING THAT'S IMPORTANT ON THIS TOPIC IS THE NUMBER OF READAPTIVE REUSE SCENARIOS THAT WE'VE SEEN IN THE LAST FOUR YEARS OF EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES THAT HAVE BEEN RENOVATED INTO TWO, THREE, FOUR, SOMETIMES EVEN UP TO NINE-UNIT DWELLINGS OF THESE LARGER SOMETIMES, YOU KNOW, HISTORIC HOMES THAT OF WINNIPEG'S LIST OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES, THAT ARE GETTING ADAPTIVELY REUSED INTO MULTIFAMILY. IN THESE SITUATIONS WHERE THE YOUNGER GENERATIONS JUST CAN'T AFFORD OR ARE NOT INTERESTED IN THESE LARGER SCALE HOMES AND THE EXISTING HOMEOWNERS WOULD OTHERWISE HAVE MORE TROUBLE SELLING THEM. WE ARE SEEING A LOT OF THAT. SHOULD COUNCIL CHOOSE TO PASS WHAT'S BEFORE YOU TODAY. ALL OF THAT ANALYSIS AND KIND OF INSPIRATION WILL BE PART OF THE USER'S GUIDE FOR THIS DOCUMENT

THAT WOULD BE SIMILAR TO THE USER'S GUIDE YOU'VE SEEN FOR MALLS AND CORRIDORS. ANOTHER THING I FAILED TO SAY EARLIER, THAT THE SEMI-DETACHED DUPLEX DOES ENABLE OWNERSHIP. SO INTRODUCING SEMI-DETACHED ON EQUAL FOOT WILL-FAMILY DETACHED LOTS SPLITS, AS WE PROPOSED DOES GIVE THAT GREATER VARIETY AND THEORY, AND THAT GREATER OPPORTUNITY TO OWNING A FORM OF HOUSING THAT'S NOT CURRENTLY OFFERED.

CAN WE TURN UP THE MIKES, MADAM SPEAKER? I CAN'T HEAR ANYTHING.

MADAM SPEAKER: JOSH, THE SOUND, PLEASE. THANK YOU.
I WOULD ADD TO THE AFFORDABILITY QUESTION WHAT COUNCIL IS CONSIDERING TODAY IS ONE MEASURE TO INCREASE HOUSING SUPPLY. THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS AMENDMENTS THAT WERE PASSED A FEW MONTHS AGO IS ANOTHER MEASURE. WHAT WE'VE SEEN IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS ACROSS NORTH AMERICA IS THE MORE AMENDMENTS YOU MAKE THROUGH ZONING TO INCREASE SUPPLY. THAT DOES NOT INCREASE HOUSING COSTS. IT DOESN'T ALSO NECESSARILY DECREASE HOUSING COSTS. BUT WHAT IT DOES IS SLOW OR STOP GROWTH INCREASE IN TERMS OF HOUSE COSTS. SO MINNEAPOLIS IS THE BEST EXAMPLE THAT HAS UNDERTAKING A NUMBER OF ZONING AMENDMENTS, BOTH THE TWOS, THREES AND FOURS, AND UP TO FIVE OR SIX AS WELL AS MORE HOUSING ON CORRIDORS. AND THEY HAVE SEEN A DRAMATIC SLOWING OF THEIR RENT INCREASES, SALES PRICES AND REDUCTION IN HOMELESSNESS.
AGAIN, I THANK YOU FOR ALL THOSE OTHER POINTS. MY POINT WAS THE $350,000 ENTRY FEE FOR AN AFFORDABLE HOMEOWNERSHIP. SO I AGREE WITH YOU. THOSE ARE ALL VALID POINTS EVERYBODY IS MAKING. OK. MY LAST QUESTION, YOU BROUGHT IT UP SO I WANT TO FOLLOW ON IT. IF I MAGICALLY MADE A MOTION TODAY TO SAY I WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THE TWOS, THREES, AND FOURS REQUIRE HOMEOWNER OCCUPIED. COULD I DO THAT?
ZONING CANNOT -- MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU TO THE COUNCILLOR. ZONING CANNOT REQUIRE TENURE. SO IT CAN'T SAY OWNER OR RENTAL. THAT'S NOT WITHIN ITS PURVIEW.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. NEXT QUESTION. COUNCILLOR WYATT.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: JUST TO FOLLOW UP ON THAT LAST QUESTION, ZONING CAN'T DO THAT, HOWEVER, WE HAVE USED A SYSTEM IN THE PAST WHEREBY A -- HAS BEEN PLACED ON SOME PROPERTIES BY THE CITY, AS IN SOME CASES, BY DEVELOPERS REQUIRING CERTAIN CONDITIONS TO BE MET BY THE OCCUPANT. IN LIGHT OF THE FACT CERTAINLY, CONDITIONS COULD BE REQUIRED OF AN OCCUPANT WHETHER IT'S OWNER OCCUPIED OR NOT. THE THEORY, THE SAME COULD BE APPLIED AND THE ONUS COULD BE RESTORED BACK. POSSIBLY WITH PROVINCIAL LEGISLATIVE CHANGES NEEDED, ALBEIT, TO DEMONSTRATE AN OCCUPIED VERSUS RENTAL, IN THEORY. IN THEORY.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE.

SORRY. COULD YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION?

COUNCILLOR WYATT: IN THEORY, WE HAVE THE ABILITY TO PLACE -- ON PROPERTIES FOR VARIOUS REASONS. NOTHING TO THE EXTENT WITH REGARD TO THE EXTENT OF OWNER-OCCUPIED VERSUS RENTAL, BUT WE HAVE PLACED, FOR EXAMPLE, A BACK FENCE WHICH BACKS ONTO A ROAD, WHICH FACES A MAJOR ARTERIAL OR COLLECTOR'S -- THAT'S THE OWNERS OF THE PROPERTIES THAT MAINTAIN THAT, A BORDER ON ACTUAL LAND. THINGS LIKE THAT. THE DEVELOPER WILL SOMETIMES DO IT. QUALIFYCO DOES IT QUITE A BIT AND THE STIFF WINNIPEG WILL PLACE A CAVEAT. SO IN THEORY CAVEAT MECHANISM CAN BE USED WHEREBY IT WOULD BE THE ONUS IS REVERSED WHEN THE PROPERTY OR THE OCCUPANT WOULD HAVE TO DEMONSTRATE. THAT WOULD BE BACKED UP WITH DOCUMENTS LIKE THEIR TAX RETURN. EVEN UTILITY BILLS, THIS IS WHERE THEY LIVE. THIS IS WHO THEY ARE. AND POSSIBLY, IT MAY NEED PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION. I DON'T KNOW. BUT IN THEORY, IT COULD BE DONE BASED ON THE CAVEAT SYSTEM WE HAVE RIGHT NOW.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: IN THEORY.

MADAM CHAIR THROUGH THE COUNCILLOR. THE CITY WILL ON OCCASION PUT CAVEATS ON LARGER SCALE SUBDIVISIONS WITH MANY PROPERTIES BEING CREATED. LAND TITLES IS VERY STRICT ABOUT WHAT THE CAVEAT CONTAIN, ETC. SO IN THIS AS OF RIGHT DEVELOPMENT, THERE WOULDN'T BE A MECHANISM FOR US TO PUT A CAVEAT ON THESE PROPERTIES. HOWEVER, IN THE FUTURE, THERE MAY BE A MECHANISM, LIKE YOU SAY. THERE WOULDN'T BE AN ABILITY FOR THE CITY TO PUT A CAVEAT ON THESE CITIES AS DEVELOPMENTS.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: IS THAT -- YOU WANT TO TAKE UP THE -- [INAUDIBLE]

CERTAINLY CAN.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: OK, THANK YOU. I GUESS THE OTHER QUESTION I HAVE WAS THAT WE'RE GOING TO BE RECEIVING ALL THESE APPLICATIONS COMING, IN I'M ASSUMING, POSSIBLY, TO IDENTIFY THE LAND FOR A BUILD. IS IT POSSIBLE FOR PULLING PERMITS? IS IT POSSIBLE AT THIS POINT THOUGH, ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE CAN DO THAT WOULD ACT AS MAYBE NOT AN INCENTIVE, BUT TAKE AWAY THE DISINCENTIVE. LET'S SAY DOWN THE ROAD RIGHT NOW THE BASE -- LET'S BE FRANK. THE MARKET RIGHT NOW IS ONE WHERE YOU DON'T REALLY SEE CONDOMINIUMS AS CORPORATIONS BEING CREATED LIKE YOU ONCE DID. WHATEVER FOR VARIOUS REASONS. WHERE FOR ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES, THE R-2S, THE R-3S, THE THREE-PLEXES AND FOUR-PLEXES WILL MOST LIKELY BE RENTAL PROPERTIES. BUT ONE OF THE KEY THINGS TO ALLOW FOR ESPECIALLY IF THE PROPERTY IS BEING LAID OUT IN A CERTAIN WAY FOR DEVELOPMENT, IS FOR PROPERTY LINES TO BE CREATED NOW. AND I GUESS THE ONLY WAY -- I'M A VERY

VISUAL PERSON. I SHOW YOU EXAMPLES OF A FOUR-PLEX. IF YOU LOOK AT THE FOUR UNIETS HERE, ALL YOU HAVE TO DO IS HAVE TO REQUIRE, RIGHT? AND WE DO IT NOW. THAT IN THE EVENT A FOUR-PLEX LIKE THIS OR THREE-PLEX OR R-2, WE INCLUDE NOW -- THE SUBDIVISION NOW. THERE BY, WHAT THAT DOES IN THE EVENT THEY WISH TO TAKE THIS PROPERTY AND CREATE A SEPARATE TITLE WITH ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES, IS DONE. THAT CAN BE DONE AT THIS STAGE.

MADAM SPEAKER: THE RESPONSE, HAZEL?
THAT FORMAT WOULD BE SUPER HARD. I MEAN, THAT WOULD POTENTIALLY WORK -- THAT DEFINITELY WORKS FOR A SIDE-BY-SIDE DUPLEX, WHICH I WAS MENTIONING EARLIER REALLY WELL. BEAUTIFULLY. ON A FOUR-PACK, UNLESS YOU HAVE AN INCREDIBLY WIDE LOT, THEN IF THE LOT IS WIDE ENOUGH AND YOU HAVE A SKINNY ROW HOUSE, THAT IS CERTAINLY A POSSIBILITY. REGARDING THE CAVEAT ENFORCEMENT WOULD BE DIFFICULT THAT YOU CAN'T ADD A CAVEAT ON A -- AS OF RIGHT ZONING LIKE JAMES SAID. SO IN A DASZ SITUATION WHERE YOU ARE DOING YOUR REZONING, THAT WOULD WORK.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: I'D BE CURIOUS TO KNOW HOW TO WRITE SOMETHING TO CHANGE IN EFFECT THIS, AND ALLOW IT TO BE DONE, SO THAT IT DOESN'T PRECLUDE OWNERSHIP IN THE FUTURE. BUT IT GIVES THE ABILITY FOR OWNERS IN THE FUTURE. THE ONLY IMPACT FROM MY OWN EXPERIENCE DEALING WITH THESE IS THAT IT WOULD REQUIRE BASED ON BUILDING CODES, THE WALL SEPARATIONS TO BE BUILT, ACCORDING TO FIRE WALL STANDARDS BASED ON THE UNITS. BUT I BELIEVE THAT'S THE CASE ANYWAY POSSIBLY. AND A BETTER FIREWALL IS NOT NECESSARILY A BAD THING. WHAT WOULD THAT LOOK LIKE FOR US TO DO TODAY? SO THAT WE DON'T ELIMINATE THE ABILITY IN THE FUTURE IF A PROPERTY -- IF SOMEBODY HAS A, YOU KNOW, WANTS AN OPPORTUNITY OR THEY NEED CASH FLOW FOR EXAMPLE, ALL OF A SUDDEN, THEY ARE IN A SITUATION FINANCIALLY WHERE THEY NEED TO SELL ONE OF THEIR UNITS IN R-2 TO MEET A LIQUIDATE -- LIQUIDATION ISSUE THEY MAY HAVE. THEY ARE NOW HAVING TO FILE FOR A SUBDIVISION TO THE CITY TO DO THIS BECAUSE IT'S ALREADY DONE. HOW DOES THAT WORDING LOOK? IS THAT SOMETHING THAT OFFICERS COULD HELP US ON? BECAUSE I THINK IT DOES NOT PRECLUDE ONE SIDE OR THE OTHER: THE RESPONSE.

MADAM CHAIR TO THE COUNCILLOR. THE PUBLIC SERVICE WOULDN'T RECOMMENDED TRYING TO TACKLE SOMETHING LIKE THAT TODAY AND PUTTING IT INTO THIS BYLAW. IT'S MORE COMPLICATED PROCESS TO LOOK AT. IT'S JUST SOMETHING I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD TRY TO TACKLE TODAY AND PUT INTO THIS ZONING BYLAW AT THIS TIME.
BUT WE'RE HAPPY TO STUDY IT GOING FORWARD. ONE OF THE THINGS FOR EVERY SINGLE THING IN THE BYLAW BEFORE YOU TODAY, WE SAT WITH THE CONSULTANT TEAM OF MULTIPLE ARCHITECTS AND DREW EVERY IDEA AND FLOOR PLAN TO ENSURE THAT IT ACTUALLY WOULD WORK. I'M JUST HAVING A HARD TIME IMAGINING THAT WOULD HAVE TO BE A REALLY WIDE LOT TO MAKE ALL THOSE.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: OH, NO. I DON'T DISAGREE. I DID THAT. IF WE'RE GIVING IT

RIGHT NOW, WHY CAN'T WE INCLUDE THAT AS A RIGHT? IT'S JUST A QUESTION OF THE WORDING, I SUPPOSE. THAT IS REALLY WHAT I WAS ASKING FOR.

MADAM SPEAKER: ANY FURTHER RESPONSE?
WE WOULD BE DELIGHTED TO STUDY THAT AND BRING IT BACK FOR POTENTIAL FUTURE AMENDMENT THAT WOULD ENABLE SOMETHING ALONG THOSE LINES.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: I DON'T THINK THIS PRECLUDES WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS REQUESTING IN ANY WAY, SHAPE OR FORM.
I AGREE, YES.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? COUNCILLOR WYATT?

COUNCILLOR WYATT: I GUESS ON THE -- THE ISSUE MENTIONED OF THE CAVEAT THERE, JAMES. COULD WE GET -- OR MAYBE IT WAS HAZEL WHO FOLLOWED UP ON THAT ONE. IS IT POSSIBLE TO GET THE RESPONSE FROM THE LEGAL DEPARTMENT'S CHAIR OR COUNCIL IN TERMS OF THEIR COMMENTS ON THAT?
AS YOU, THROUGH THE CHAIR, OFTEN, WE WOULD GO IN CAMERA FOR COMMENTS FROM LEGAL.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: LOOK, I DON'T KNOW HOW THAT WOULD BE -- I'M SORRY. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT A CAVEAT THAT'S NOT -- I MEAN, WE'RE NOT EVEN TALKING SPECIFICALLY -- WE'RE TALKING THE WHOLE CITY, BASICALLY. SO IT'S NOT LIKE WE'RE PUTTING ANYBODY IN A POSITION WHERE ONE ADVANTAGE OVER ANOTHER BECAUSE EVERYBODY IS IN THE SAME BOAT ON THIS ONE. I'M NOT A LAWYER.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. COUNCILLOR MAYES?

COUNCILLOR MAYES: I THINK TO PLANNING STAFF THROUGH YOU. THE DOCUMENT INDICATES THAT THE REMAINING -- THE AGRICULTURAL RURAL RESIDENTIAL FIVE AND RESIDENTIAL TWO ZONING DISTRICTS ARE EXCLUDED BECAUSE THESE ZONES ARE TYPICALLY LOCATED IN RURAL SURFACED AREAS. SO IF THERE'S ONE POINT OF COMMENT -- ONE POINT I HAD IN COMMON WITH THE DIRECTOR IS ALL ZONING IS EXCLUSIONARY TO ONE EXTENT OR ANOTHER. SO WE ARE CONTINUING TO EXCLUDE AGRICULTURAL RURAL RESIDENTIAL FIVE, RURAL RESIDENTIAL TWO FROM THESE PROVISIONS.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE.
YES, ROBERT CAN RESPOND AS WELL. BUT COUNCILLOR, THOSE AREAS ARE TYPICALLY UNSERVICED. NOT SUITABLE FOR INFILL. BUT ROBERT?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU, ROBERT?
THROUGH THE SPEAKER. THOSE ARE TYPICALLY WITHIN RURAL POLICY AREAS IN THAT SERVICING, BUT THAT'S THE PRIMARY CONSIDERATION. THAT'S NOT THE PLACE FOR INTENSIFICATION.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: SOME PARTS OF THE CITY ARE EXCLUDED. WE HEARD FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ABOUT HOW WE LEGALIZED HOUSING. WE WERE NO LONGER EXCLUSION VISIONARIES. BUT WE'RE STILL INCLUDING.

CORRECT. WE NOTICED THAT AT LEAST IN SOME OF THE ONES WE REVIEWED IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS, IT HAS SERVICES AS WELL.
THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR EADIE?

COUNCILLOR EADIE: THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER AND THE OPPORTUNITY TO STAND UP. SO WE HEARD FROM TWO DIFFERENT DEVELOPERS WHO WERE WORKING IN NEIGHBOURHOODS WHERE WE REALLY REQUIRE NEIGHBOURHOOD REVITALIZATION. I'M GOING TO GIVE A SCENARIO JUST TO MAKE SURE IT'S CLEARED TO THE PUBLIC. MR. LOPEZ, FOR EXAMPLE, OWNS A LOT THAT'S 50 BY 150. SO WE'VE GOT, WHAT, 7,500 FEET. SO IT'S AN R-2, FOUR UNITS. BUT JUST TO BE CLEAR, WHAT'S THE MAXIMUM CONDITIONAL USE THAT THEY COULD ASK FOR BEFORE ASKING FOR A VARIANCE?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE. ROBERT?
YES. SPEAKER, IF IT'S THE CONDITIONAL USE, IT WOULD BE ONE UNIT PER 800 SQUARE FEET OF LOT AREA. SO THE LOT AREA DIVIDED BY 800 WOULD BE THE ANSWER.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: SO 7,200 SQUARE FEET. SO THAT WOULD BE NINE SUITES, RIGHT? NINE TIMES EIGHT, 72. SO YEAH. SO WE ALSO HEARD IN THESE NEIGHBOURHOODS THAT NEED REVITALIZATION, I THINK THESEDDS NEED A LITTLE MORE HOMEOWNERSHIP AS WELL BECAUSE THE BALANCE. EVERY NEIGHBOUR SHOULD HAVE A BALANCE OF RENTALS AND OWNERSHIP. BUT WE HEARD AN EXAMPLE MANY LOTS ON MANITOBA, FOR EXAMPLE, PRITCHARD. THEY WILL HAVE 33 ON THE FRONT, AND SO TECHNICALLY, I DON'T KNOW WHERE YOU WOULD FIND 35 FEET FOR FRONTAGE BECAUSE THEY HAVE BACK LANES. SO THEY REQUIRE 35, BUT THE LOTS ARE 33. THAT'S HOW THEY WERE SUBDIVIDED A LONG, LONG WAY. WHATEVER. SO SO JUST TO BE CLEAR, IF MR. LOPEZ WANTED TO BUILD A TRIPLEX HE WOULD NEED A VARIANCE?

MADAM SPEAKER: ROBERT, THE RESPONSE?
YES, MADAM SPEAKER. CORRECT.

MADAM SPEAKER: NEXT QUESTION.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: YES, SO I BELIEVE THE 800 SQUARE FEET WOULD APPLY IN A TRIPLEX PERSPECTIVE. SO THESE LOTS ARE AROUND 33 BY, LET'S SAY, 100 TO A BIT MORE. SO WE HAVE 3,300 SQUARE FEET. SO TECHNICALLY, 4 TIMES 8 IS FOUR UNITS. AND I BELIEVE THAT OWNERS CAN ASK FOR CONDITIONAL USES. WOULD IN THE CASE OF A 33 BY FOOT DEEP, WHAT CAN YOU TELL ME WHAT KIND OF VARIANCES WOULD HAVE TO BE APPLIED FOR? I GUESS THE CONDITIONAL USE

WOULD, SAY, THAT THERE'S 3,200 SQUARE FEET. IS THERE ANYTHING THIS ASIDE FROM GETTING A VARIANCE OF 2 FEET THAT WOULD DECISION ALLOW TO BUILD FOR VARIANCE?
THE RESPONSE. ROBERT?

SORRY. THROUGH THE SPEAKER. THEY WOULD HAVE TO FOLLOW THE PROPOSED BYLAW FOR FOUR UNITS. WHATEVER THEY WOULD BE APPLYING FOR WOULD BE VARYING TO THAT DEGREE. IN THAT CASE, IT WOULD BE A 50-FOOT WIDE LOT. THAT WOULD BE THE VARIANCE, FOR EXAMPLE. THANK YOU. NEXT QUESTION.
I'M GOING TO MOVE ON, AND I APPRECIATE THE PUBLIC SERVICE WAS LISTENING TO ME AND TO OTHERS ABOUT BUILDING, ESPECIALLY WHEN IT COMES TO FOUR STORIES OR EVEN AS FOUR UNITS ALONG OUR RIVERS AND CREEKS WITHIN WINNIPEG. SO THE FIRST THING I WANT TO ASK IN REGARDS TO THAT, THIS SITUATION. SO YOU GOT A 25-FOOT REAR YARD SETBACK FROM THE RIVER BANK. WHEN COMING UP WITH THIS, DID YOU LOOK AT FOLLOWING CREEKS LIKES OMEN'S CREEK, OR BUN'S CREEK OR OTHERS? THE 25 FEET. HOW DID WE COME UP WITH ONLY 25 FEET? OTHERS ARE ASKING FOR MORE.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE?
IT'S MAINTAINED AT ITS CURRENT SETBACK, WHICH IS 25 FEET IN THE ZONING BYLAW. SO WHAT WE DID WAS IT'S ACTUALLY FROM THE REAR PROPERTY LINE, AND THAT'S CURRENTLY WHAT THE STANDARD IS TODAY.
I'M SORRY. CAN YOU JUST REPEAT THAT. I'M HAVING TROUBLE HEARING? I'VE GOT THIS ON.
NO PROBLEM. THROUGH THE SPEAKER. IT'S MAINTAINED AT 25-FOOT SETBACK FROM THE REAR PROPERTY LINE, AND THAT'S CURRENTLY THE STANDARD FOUND IN THE ZONING BYLAW TODAY. SO WE DIDN'T EFFECTIVELY CHANGE THAT STANDARD.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: OK. JUST FOR CLARIFICATION THEN, SO WHEN YOU'RE IN -- LIKE I'LL USE EXPOSURE FOR AN EXAMPLE, BECAUSE I'M VERY FAMILIAR WITH IT. SO THERE'S A YEAH WHERE THERE'S A PRIMARY DIKE. YOU GO UP A HILL AND THEN THEY ARE NOT REALLY -- THE PROBLEM ISN'T FLOODING. THE PROBLEM IS RIVER BANK EROSION OR WHATEVER. SO JUST FOR CLARIFICATION, IF I WAS LOOKING AT SCOTIA AT THE FLOOD ZONE AREA WHICH I LIVE BEHIND THE DIKE. THERE ARE FLOOD ZONE SETBACKS FROM THE RIVER, RIGHTS? -- RIGHT?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE?
YES, THROUGH THE SPEAKER. CORRECT. YOU WOULD STILL NEED TO APPLY FOR A WATERWAYS PERMIT FOR DEVELOPMENT WITHIN, I BELIEVE, IT'S 350 FEET FROM ONE OF THE RIVERS THAT ARE LISTED, OR 250 FEET FROM THE LISTED CREEK IN THE WATERWAYS BY LAW. SO THERE WOULD STILL BE TECHNICAL REVIEW.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: OK. SO NOW I'M JUST THINKING, WOULD THERE BE ANY -- DO YOU HAVE ANY IDEA WHAT EFFECTS MIGHT HAPPEN IN WE SAID THE SETBACK WAS 50 FEET.
THROUGH THE SPEAKER. THAT WOULD HAVE TO BE REVIEWED ON A BASE-BY-CASE

BASIS. THE LOT VARIATION AND SHAPE, IT CHANGES QUITE DRASTICALLY, BE IT ON THE RED RIVER FOR SCOTIA, FOR EXAMPLE, PARTICULARLY, ON THE SHORTEST DISTANCE FROM THAT WHERE THERE MIGHT BE AN ANGLE -- AN ANGLED REAR PROPERTY LINE. SO THE EFFECT COULD BE PRETTY SUBSTANTIAL IN SOME CASES, OR IT WOULD HAVE TO BE REVIEWED.

MADAM SPEAKER: NEXT QUESTION.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: YEAH. PROBABLY IN MOST OF THE CITY ALONG RIVERS BELIEVE MOST OF THAT WOULD BE ZONED R-1 I THINK. I KNOW ON SCOTIA, IT'S ZONED R-1. SO I WOULD LIKE YOU TO PLEASE JUST OWE THROW ARE PEOPLE THERE THAT ARE QUITE CONCERNED. IS THERE A POSSIBILITY TO BUILD TRIPLEXES AND FOUR-PLEXES ALONG R-1 RIVERWAYS?

MADAM SPEAKER: THE RESPONSE?

CURRENTLY. SORRY, THROUGH THE SPEAKER. -- ROBERT. CURRENTLY, THE RESTRICTION IS THAT A THREE-UNIT WOULD NOT BE ALLOWED IN AN R-1 DISTRICT. A FOUR-UNIT DWELLING WOULDN'T BE ALLOWED ON THAT -- ON ANY OF THOSE THOSE CREEKS. SO THREE OR FOUR UNITS WOULD BE RESTRICTED, AS PROPOSED IN SECTION 3.1 AND SECTION 3.2 OF THE LAST BYLAW.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: THAT'S IT FOR ME, MADAM SPEAKER.

MADAM SPEAKER: WE'RE NOW GOING TO TAKE A SHORT HEALTH BREAK, AND I WOULD LIKE EVERYONE TO RETURN FOR 11:05 SO WE CAN GET MOVING WITH THE DAY. THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: TAKE YOUR SEATS, PLEASE.

MADAM SPEAKER: READY TO GO. COUNTDOWN, PLEASE. GOOD MORNING. I'D LIKE TO RECONVENE OUR SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING OF JUNE 4TH, 2025, AFTER A SHORT RECESS. WE ARE ON THE SECTION OF QUESTIONS TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS OR WE CAN MOVE TO REBUTTAL. COUNCILLOR SANTOS?

COUNCILLOR SANTOS: OK, SO I HAVE A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS. FIRST ONE, I JUST WANT TO GET SOME CLARITY AND UNDERSTANDING OF PROCESSES. BECAUSE MY UNDERSTANDING, OF COURSE, AS OF RIGHT IS DIRECTOR APPROVAL. LET'S START OFF WITH THAT. IS THAT CORRECT? THAT THE DIRECTOR LEVEL OF APPROVAL THE?

MADAM SPEAKER: THE QUESTION ONCE AGAIN?

COUNCILLOR SANTOS: SO JUST FOR CLARITY AND FOR UNDERSTANDING, I'M TALKING ABOUT PROCESSES, DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES WHEN PEOPLE, DEVELOPERS COME AND APPLY, ETC. AS OF RIGHT WHAT THAT MEANS, IS THAT IT'S AT THE DIRECTOR LEVEL WHEN SOMEONE APPLIES. IS THAT CORRECT?

MADAM SPEAKER: NOT THE DIRECTOR LEVEL.
LIKE THE CHAIR SAID AT THE ADMINISTRATIVE LEVEL.

COUNCILLOR SANTOS: AT THE ADMINISTRATIVE LEVEL. OK. SO THAT MEANS -- WHAT WILL IT MEAN, SAY, IF A DEVELOPER COMES IN AND WANTS TO CHANGE THE THINGS THAT ARE HERE IN THE ZONING BYLAW LIKE A VARIANCE, BECAUSE I'M ASSUMING THAT A DEVELOPER IS GOING TO COME IN AND WANT TO VARY SOMETHING IN THE ZONING BYLAW. DOES IT COME THEN TO A HEARING HEARING PROCESS FOR THAT? AND WHAT COMMITTEE DOES THAT COME TO?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE?

MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. ANY VARIANCES OF THIS SORT TO THE ZONING BYLAW ARE SEE VARIANCE, WHICH IS OUR DIRECTOR. DIRECTORS DELEGATE. SO IT WOULD COME THROUGH ADMINISTRATION. WE WOULD REVIEW IT, BUT AS WITH MALLS AND CORRIDORS, WE'RE BEING VERY STRICT ON ANY CHANGES TO MALLS AND CORRIDORS ZONING BYLAW. YES, IT WOULD BE ADMINISTRATION APPROVAL OF VARIANCES. HOWEVER, THEY WOULD BE POSTED AND THERE WOULD BE AN APPEAL PERIOD.

COUNCILLOR SANTOS: OK, SO THEN THERE WOULD BE AN APPEAL PERIOD. OK. THAT WOULD COME TO COMMIT WOULD BE THE APPEAL COMMITTEE.

COUNCILLOR SANTOS: THERE'S A LOT OF APPEAL COMMITTEES. I WANT CLARITY. DOES IT COME TO COMMITTEE HEARING?

SORRY. IT'S JUST CALLED THE APPEAL COMMITTEE IT. DOESN'T GO TO STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE.

MADAM SPEAKER: THE APPEAL COMMITTEE THAT'S ROTATIONAL FOR COUNCIL.

COUNCILLOR SANTOS: GOT IT. OK. I JUST WANTED TO UNDERSTAND PROCESS. NOW I WANT TO MOVE ON TO TALK KIND OF MORE AT LARGE THE PLANTING STANDARDS. I THINK THERE'S A COUPLE OF PAGES HERE WITH RESPECT TO PLANTING TREES, PRESERVATION OF EXISTING TREES. I HAD POSED THE QUESTION ABOUT LITTLE FORKS, WHICH IS A VERY LARGE THAT IF APPROVED, COULD BE A NATIONAL URBAN PARK HERE IN THE CITY OF WINNIPEG. AND, OF COURSE, WITH THAT RESPECT, OF COURSE, IT OPENS AND UNLOCKS FEDERAL DOLLARS FOR PRESERVATION. PROBABLY RIVER BANKS CIVILIZATION, ETC., ETC. AND I KNOW -- I GUESS, DURING THE CONVERSATION, THERE WAS AT ONE POINT IN TIME, TALKING ABOUT RIVER BANK STABLIZATION. IS THAT CORRECT? OK. SO WITH THIS MAP IF APPROVED, HOW WILL THAT AFFECT OUR CURRENT -- THIS CURRENT MAP THAT WE HAVE WHEN IT TALKS ABOUT THE RIVER BANKS?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE?

PERHAPS, COULD YOU REPHRASE THE QUESTION? SO THE NATIONAL URBAN PARK HAS A MAP.

COUNCILLOR SANTOS: THAT OUTLINES THE SEINE RIVER, THAT OUTLINES POINT DOUGLAS, THAT OUTLINES BASICALLY, A LOT OF THE RIVER BANKS. THAT WILL BE CONSIDERED IF APPROVED, A NATIONAL URBAN PARK. BASICALLY, THAT CREATES A PARK, RIGHT? SO HOW WILL THAT AFFECT HERE WITH THE ZONING? DOES THAT CHANGE MAPS? WILL YOU NEED TO REVIEW IT TO CHANGE THE MAPS OF RIVER BANKS? WHAT CAN AND CANNOT BE ALLOWED FOR BUILDING? AM I LOSING YOU GUYS HERE? I FEEL LIKE I'M LOSING PEOPLE THAT DON'T KNOW WHAT I'M TALKING ABOUT.

MADAM SPEAKER: ROBERT, TO RESPOND.
YES. THROUGH YOU, SPEAKER. PERHAPS IT'S THE SAME ANSWER I GAVE TO.

COUNCILLOR EADIE WITH THE RESTRICTIONS ON THE RIVER BANK PROPERTIES, WHICH WE LISTED IN SECTION THREEED I'LL READ IT OUT ONE MORE TIME. SO THOSE RESTRICTION THERE'S THAT A THREE-UNIT DWELLING CANNOT BE LOCATED ON A LOT THAT'S ZONED R-1 AND ABUTS ANY LISTED RIVER. SO THE ASSINIBOINE OR LASALLE RIVERS. OMEN'S CREEK AND A DWELLING WOULDN'T BE ESTABLISHED ON AN R-1 OR R-2 PROPERTY LISTED ON THOSE CREEKS. SO THE CHANGE IS SUBSTANTIVE IN THE SENSE THAT WE'VE ALREADY ALLOWED DWELLINGS IN THE MATURE R-2 COMMUNITIES. WE ALREADY ALLOWED SINGLE FAMILY WITH ACCESSORY SUITES. SO SOME WOULD CONSIDER THAT TWO FAMILIES, BUT IT'S NOT. BUT TECHNICALLY, A LOT OF PEOPLE WOULD THINK OF THAT AS TWO UNITS IN THE R-1 DISTRICT. SO THERE IS A RESTRICTION IN PLACE ON THE R-1 AND R-2 ZONES ALONG THOSE RIVERS AND CREEKS. ARE PROPOSED IN THE DRAFT. SORRY.

MADAM SPEAKER: NEXT QUESTION.

COUNCILLOR SANTOS: IT WAS BROUGHT UP ONE POINT IN TIME THAT THIS BYLAW DOESN'T GO FAR ENOUGH TO PROTECT TREES. THERE WAS THE QUESTION ABOUT WHAT WAS THE PERCENTAGE OF PRIVATE TREES, VERSUS PUBLIC TREES. I THINK WE GOT OUR EMAIL BACK CONFIRMING THAT 90% OF OUR CANOPY IS ON PRIVATE PROPERTY. SO WITH THAT BEING SAID, COULD YOU WALK ME THROUGH TO HELP ME BETTER UNDERSTAND HOW WE ARE PROTECTING PRIVATE TREES IN THIS PARTICULAR SECTION 21.1, ALL THE WAY TO 29 OR SORRY, 29.1, ALL THE WAY TO 29.5.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE?

SURE. MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. THESE PLANTING STANDARDS -- WELL FIRST OF ALL, THE PUBLIC SERVICE HAS NOT CONFIRMED THAT 90% OF ALL TREES -- IT WAS SOMEBODY AS A DELEGATE. YES. SO THAT NUMBER HAS NOT BEEN AFFIRMED FROM THE SERVICE PERSPECTIVE. HOWEVER, IT IS VERY IMPORTANT, BOTH FOR STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AND PASSIVE COOLING ENVIRONMENTS, AND CARBON CAPTURE, AND JUST LIVABILITY IN GENERAL TO ENSURE THAT OUR TREE

CANOPY, WHICH IS ONE OF THE BEST OF URBAN FOREST OF ANY NORTH AMERICAN CITY IS MAINTAINED AND PROTECTED. SO AS YOU MENTIONED THAT THE PLANTING STANDARDS IN SECTION 29 INTENDS TO DO THAT. IN ADDITION TO SECTION 29-4, THAT INDICATES THAT LOTS MUST CONTAIN NO LESS THAN ONE TREE AND FOUR SHRUBS FOR LOTS THAT ARE 35 FEET OR LESS IN WIDTH. SO THAT'S ON PRIVATE PROPERTY, NOT INCLUDING THE STREET TREES AND THE PLANTING STRIP. BUT THEN THAT WOULD BE IN ADDITION TO ANY STREET TREES THAT EXIST IN THE PLANTING STRIP, TO ARE THAT MIGHT BE PLANTED THERE. AND THEN ITEM B OF 29-4, THAT TWO TREES AND 6 SHRUBS ARE REQUIRED FOR LOTS GREATER THAN 35 FEET, BUT LESS THAN 50 FEET IN WIDTH.

COUNCILLOR SANTOS: I DON'T MEAN TO CUT YOU OFF. JUST TO CONFIRM, THESE ARE NEW PLANTINGS?

MAYBE. IT'S A MINIMUM OF THAT. HOWEVER, IN SECTION 29.5, BECAUSE WE UNDERSTAND THE PRESERVATION OF EXISTING HEALTHY TREES IS VERY IMPORTANT, AND THAT THEIR CARBON CAPTURE AND PASSIVE COOLING AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT BENEFITS ARE SIGNIFICANTLY MORE THAN A NEWLY PLANTED TREE. SO IF EXISTING TREES ARE SUCCESSFULLY PRESERVED AND THAT THEY ARE AT LEAST 7.75 INCH MINIMUM CALIBRE AT BREAST HEIGHT, THEN THAT WILL COUNT FOR TWO OF THE MINIMUM TREES REQUIRED AND THOSE OTHER EITHER TWO OR THREE -- ONE, TWO, OR THREE TREES REQUIRED DEPENDING ON HOW WIDE THE LOT IS.

COUNCILLOR SANTOS: YOU'RE GOING TO GET AN EXAMPLE HERE. NEW PLANTINGS IN 29.4, EXISTING TREES IN 29.5. DEVELOPERS COME TREES ON THERE. AND THE MINIMUM CALIPER, 7.75 INCHES. LET'S JUST SAY, AND YOU'RE SAYING IT CREATES A CREDIT. LIKE TWO TREES IN THE NEW PLANTING. SO IF IT -- IF MINE IS -- IT MINUSES OFF THE NEW TREES REQUIRED FOR PLANTING.
THAT'S RIGHT. BECAUSE IF IT'S ONLY A 35 TO 50-FOOT LOT, THAT WOULD COMFORTABLY SUPPORT TWO GROWN TREES. AND SO IF THEY ARE PRESERVING THEIR EXISTING TREES, THAT WOULD COUNT TOWARDS THOSE MINIMUM TREES THAT REQUIRED ON THAT LOT.

COUNCILLOR SANTOS: OK. SO WE HEARD FROM SOME OF THE DELEGATES SAYING THEY WANT ANN ARBORIST REPORT. I HAD IT IN MY NOTES. I DO SEE HERE IN SECTION 29.5, IT'S SAYING HERE PLANTING REQUIRES IMPOSED UNDER SECTION FOUR MAY SERVING TREES ON A LOT SUBJECT ON IT ARBOURIST'S REPORT IDENTIFYING HOW THESE TREES WOULD BE PRESERVED. ARE YOU STATING THAT YOU WILL NOT BE ISSUING PERMITS UNLESS AN ARBOURIST'S REPORT IS CONDUCTED.
THAT'S RIGHT. IF PEOPLE ARE WANTING TO HAVE THEIR EXISTING TREES CREDITED TOWARD THEIR MINIMUM TREE PLANTING REQUIREMENT, THEY WOULD NEED TO PROVIDE AN ARBOURIST'S REPORT, BOTH IDENTIFYING HOW THESE TREES WILL BE PRESERVED AND PROTECTED TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE CITY. SO THOSE ARBOURIST REPORTS TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE CITY MEANS THAT THE

ARBOURIST WOULD NEED TO CONFIRM THAT YES, THOSE TREES ARE HEALTHY, AND, YOU KNOW, GOING FORWARD, THEY ARE GOING TO BE MEANINGFUL CONTRIBUTORS.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. NEXT QUESTION. COUNCILLOR EADIE?

COUNCILLOR EADIE: THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER. I'M GOING TO PROVIDE -- I'VE GOT TWO LINES OF QUESTIONING HERE. I WANT TO START WITH, COUNCILLOR SANTOS BROUGHT UP A VERY IMPORTANT POINT IN TERMS OF WHAT IS BEING PROPOSED TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, WHO SAID SUPPOSEDLY, THERE'S MONEY AVAILABLE TO ESTABLISH AN URBAN NATIONAL PARK. AND WHILE THERE'S TWO PROPOSALS, SOMEBODY FROM ASSINIBOINE FOREST, WHICH I DON'T THINK IS LEGIT BECAUSE THE CITY IS NOT GOING TO BE SELLING THAT OFFER OF HOUSING. BUT THIS NEW PROPOSAL, IT GOES FROM NORTH POINT DOUGLAS, ESSENTIALLY, ALL THE WAY DOWN, I THINK, SOUTH TO EVEN SOUTH OF THE ASSINIBOINE. IT WILL GO DOWN EITHER SIDE OF THE RED RIVER. SO I THINK PUBLIC SERVICE MIGHT THE SALZBURY AND SENIORS HOUSING THAT WAS BUILT A NUMBER OF YEARS AGO. SO ESSENTIALLY, I JUST WANT TO EXPLAIN WHEN YOU COME AROUND THE ACTUAL POINT WHERE THE POINT OF POINT DOUGLAS, WHICH BASICALLY DIVIDES SOUTH BECAUSE OF THE WHEN YOU'RE IN MINE AND COUNCILLOR SANTOS' WARD IS ZONE N. MUCH OF IT IS RESIDENTIAL. THE FURTHER YOU GET AWAY ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE RIVER IN ELMWOOD, FOR EXAMPLE, MOST OF THAT IS -- IF YOU GO UP THE ASSEAN I BELIEVE, MOST OF THAT IS RESIDENTIAL, ALTHOUGH SOME WANTED RESIDENTIAL. SO THE QUESTION IS, WILL WHAT WE'RE DOING TO THE ZONING BYLAW HAVE AN EFFECT ON THESE NON-R-1, R-2 PROPERTIES?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. YOUR RESPONSE?
NO. THE NON-R-1, R-2, AND RMFS PROPERTIES WILL HAVE NO EFFECT FROM TODAY'S PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENTS.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: COUNCILLOR SANTOS AND I ARE FUNDING A SECONDARY PLAN, OR A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY OVER IN NORTON, SOUTH POINT DOUGLAS AREA. I GUESS THAT WILL -- PLAN WILL PUT INTO CONSIDERATION WHAT WE'RE PASSING TODAY IN THE ZONING BYLAW?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE THROUGH THE CHAIR TO YOU, COUNCILLOR. YES, COUNCILLOR. ANY FUTURE SECONDARY PLANS WILL BE IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE EXISTING ZONING BYLAW OF WHAT IS PASSED TODAY. AND TYPICALLY, SECONDARY PLANS ARE, AS YOU KNOW, A HIGHER LEVEL OF POLICY IN REGULATION. SO IT WILL BE IN ALIGNMENT.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: OK. MY SECOND LINE OF QUESTIONS ARE, I WAS CONCERNED. WE HEARD FROM THE GLENWOOD NEIGHBOURHOOD TWO OR THREE PEOPLE. THE EXPERIENCE WITH INFILL IN THAT SAFE HIGHLY DESIRABLE NEIGHBOURHOOD, THE MAJORITY OF THOSE NEW BUILDS ARE RENTALS, ARE RENTALS. MUCH OF THIS, WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT TODAY WILL BE -- WILL BECOME RENTALS. NOT ALL OF IT, I'M SURE. THERE WILL BE SOME OPPORTUNITIES FOR SOME CONDOS AND

HOPEFULLY, SOME COOPERATIVES WILL LOOK AT BUILDING SOME COOPERATIVE MULTIUNITS. AND I HEARD THAT MINNESOTA, THEY HAVE SOME SORT OF BANKING PROGRAMME. BUT IS THERE ANYTHING THAT WOULD PREVENT US FROM, SAY, ESTABLISHING THROUGH PERMIT OR WHATEVER, ESTABLISHING SOME SORT OF FEED THAT WOULD GO INTO A RESERVE THAT, SAY, HABITAT FOR HUMANITY COULD USE? THEY ARE BUILDING OWNERSHIP PROPERTIES. THAT'S WHAT THEY ARE BUILDING. IT'S OPPORTUNITIES FOR OWNERSHIP. AND THERE ARE SOME OTHER NGOS OUT THERE, WHO ARE DOING THAT. IS THERE ANYTHING TO PREVENT US AT ESTABLISHING A RESERVE THAT, SAY, HABITAT FOR HUMANITY OR HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES. ALTHOUGH, I THINK THEY HAVE GONE UNDER ALREADY. GIVEN THE COST OF BUILDS AND STUFF NOWADAYS. BUT IS THERE ANYTHING PREVENTING US FROM ESTABLISHING SOMETHING LIKE THAT? THIS CITY OF WINNIPEG ISN'T GOING TO GET INTO THE BANKING INDUSTRY AND PROVIDE MORTGAGES. SO IS THERE A POSSIBILITY?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE?
THROUGH THE SPEAKER TO THE COUNCILLOR. THE ZONING BYLAW THAT YOU'RE CONSIDERING TODAY IS NOT NECESSARILY OR LIKELY THE PLACE TO CONSIDER SUCH A PROGRAMME SUCH AS THAT. BUT AS YOU'RE AWARE, WE HAVE THE LONG-STANDING HOUSING REHABILITATION INVESTMENT RESERVE AND THE HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ZONES THAT FOCUS ON FUNDING FOR PROJECTS SUCH AS HABITAT, AS WELL AS OTHER AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROS AND OUR TEAM IS REVIEWING THAT PROGRAMME RIGHT NOW -- HOUSING PROJECTS. IT'S BEEN IN PLACE FOR OVER 20 YEARS. THE OTHER PIECE OF WORK WE'RE DOING IS IN ON STUDIO LANDS, MANY OF WHICH ARE IN YOUR WARD, COUNCILLOR. LOOKING AT PROVIDING THOSE TO NONPROFITS TO BUILD HOMEOWNERSHIP, DUPLEXES, TRIPLEXES, AND WILL BE BRINGING FORWARD A PLAN ON THAT INITIATIVE THIS FALL LIKELY UNDER THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: OH, OK, THANKS. I WASN'T AWARE OF THAT.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. NEXT SPEAKER. COUNCILLOR WYATT FOLLOWED BY COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER. I'M GOING TO PICK UP WHERE COUNCILLOR, YOU LEFT OFF THERE. IN LIGHT OF I'LL MAKE A CASE IN A PREAMBLE TO MY QUESTION. I WOULD ARGUE I THINK OBLIGATION AS A CITY TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF WILL THE ABILITY OF HOMEOWNERS, MAINLY, I'M THINKING OF FIRST-TIME HOME BUYERS WHO IN THE PAST, LET'S BE HONEST -- OFTEN COULD NOT OF AFFORD A PROPERTY IN ONE OF THE NEWLY CREATED SUBDIVISIONS THAT WERE CREATED. SO WHERE WOULD THEY GO? THEY WOULD GO TO AN EXISTING NEIGHBOURHOOD. THEY WOULD GO TO AN EXISTING NEIGHBOURHOOD THAT WOULD FEEL SAFE. THEN B, CAN MEET THEIR PRICING. I WOULD ARGUE THAT WAS THE REASON -- TAKING AND HEARING. IN FACT, THERE ARE ELEMENTS AND ENTITIES WITHIN THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN THE DEVELOPMENT INDUSTRY, PREPARING TO BASICALLY DO THE SAME THING, BUT ON A LARGE SCALE. TO GO AND ACQUIRE THE

VERY SAME PROPERTY. THEY WOULD BE IN A SENSE -- THEY WOULD BE THE VERY FIRST HOME BUYERS. EXCEPT THEIR POCKETS ARE A LOT DEEPER. AND THE OPTION A LOT OF FIRST-TIME HOME BUYERS HAVE, WHICH I WOULD ARGUE IS THE BASIS OF THE MIDDLE CLASS IN MAINTAINING THE POSITION OF MIDDLE CLASS, VERSUS DROPPING DOWN. ACQUIRE A HOME WHICH ALLOWS THEM TO BUILD EQUITY, IS GOING TO BE EFFECTIVE. AND THAT'S WHERE I FEEL THERE HAS TO BE A MORAL OBLIGATION THEN TO SOMEHOW ADDRESS THAT. AND I DON'T KNOW WHAT THAT ANSWER IS. COUNCILLOR MENTIONED, WE DO HAVE A POLICY. I KNOW THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS SAID THEY DON'T WANT ANY NEW FEES. BUT WE DO HAVE AND WE HAVE APPLIED THE LVR FEE FOR THE SAKE OF CASH IN LOUGH FOR PAR. WOULD BE APPLIED AS AN OPTION TO CREATE A FUND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING INSTEAD IN LIGHT OF WHAT'S HAPPENING HERE. I REALLY DO BELIEVE THAT A LOT OF THE NEIGHBOURHOOD THAT'S WILL BE TARGETED BY THE DEVELOPERS PART OF THE PLAN IS SOMETHING THAT IS A REAL CONCERN. AND I DON'T WANT TO PUSH THOSE FIRST-TIME HOME BUYERS TO THE OTHER SIDE OF THE CITY BECAUSE THAT'S WHERE THEY WILL GO. THEY WILL GO TO WEST ST. PAUL. THEY WILL GO TO OTHER PLACES, AND WE LOSE A WHOLE GENERATION OF NEW FAMILIES COMING UP AND EVERYTHING ELSE. OR BECAUSE A LOT OF THEM WILL NOT WANT TO RENT. THEY WANT TO OWN. AND YOU CAN'T SAY THAT ALL THESE UNITS ARE GOING TO BE RENTALS. I WOULD ARGUE THAT THAT IS PROBABLY GOING TO BE 90% THE CASE.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU, COUNCILLOR WYATT. THE RESPONSE?
YOU KNOW, THIS INITIATIVE BEFORE YOU TODAY ONE OF EIGHT HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND INITIATIVES, PLUS A NUMBER OF OTHER HRIR AND OTHER SOURCE OF FUNDING HOUSING SUPPORTS THAT THE CITY COUNCIL HAS PUT IN OVER TIME TO SUPPORT THE SORTS OF SCENARIOS THAT COUNCILLOR WYATT IS DESCRIBING. AND CERTAINLY, YOU KNOW, OVER TIME, THE HOW'SING ACCELERATOR FUND APPLICATION ANTICIPATES THAT THE MAJORITY OF LARGE DEVELOPER ACTIVITY FOR THE ZONING REFORMS THAT COUNCIL IS CONSIDERING ENABLING BOTH THIS AND THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS THAT THE MAJORITY THOSE NEW UNITS THAT ARE LARGER DEVELOPER ARE DRIVEN WOULD BE REALIZED ALONG THE MALLS AND. IN FACT, WE ARE RECEIVING A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS THROUGH THAT ZONING AMENDMENT THAT BECAME EFFECTIVE AT THE END OF JANUARY. SO THAT IS STILL THE TREND THAT WE ARE SEEING NOW. WE HAVE NOT HEARD IN OUR MANY HOUSING ROUND TABLES THAT WE HAVE BEEN HOSTING OVER THE LAST SIX TO NINE MONTHS ON TODAY'S TOPIC. WE HAVEN'T HEARD A STRONG INTEREST FROM LARGER DEVELOPMENT GROUPS FOR THIS INITIATIVE. SO THAT IS THE MARKETS DIRECTION WE'RE HEARING AT THE MOMENT. WE CERTAINLY DO NOT ANTICIPATE ALL STARTER HOMES BEING SNAPPED UP AND AS DUPLEXES, TRIPLEXES, AND FOUR-PLEXES. IN FACT, A LOT OF THE TRENDS WE'RE SEEING NOW REDACTIVE USE OF EXISTING STRUCTURES, WHICH IS ENCOURAGING BECAUSE WE DON'T REALLY BELIEVE WE'LL BE ABLE TO HIT OUR CLIMATE ACTION GOALS WITHOUT ADAPTIVE REUSE OF THOSE STRUCTURES AND MAKING USE OF EMBODIED ENERGY AS WELL.
YEAH. I WOULD JUST THANK YOU FOR THE RESPONSE. JUST HAVING BEEN ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE TABLE NOT TOO LONG AGO FROM THE INDUSTRY, I HEAR WHAT

YOU'RE SAYING IN TERMS OF WHAT WE'RE SEEING NOW IN TERMS OF MALLS AND CORRIDORS. HOWEVER, THE PRODUCT THAT I'M MOST CONCERNED ABOUT IN TERMS OF COMPETITION FOR LAND AND HOUSING STOCK ON EXISTING -- IN EXISTING NEIGHBOURHOODS WILL BE WHEREBY A FOUR-PLEX CAN BE CONSTRUCTED BECAUSE THE COST DEMOLITION OF AN EXISTING PROPERTY, AND THE ASSEMBLY OF THAT LAND WOULD HAVE TO BE TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION. NUMBERS START TO WORK WITH A FOUR-PLEX OR MORE. AS WE KNOW ONCE THIS IS OWNEDS THEY COULD FILE FOR A SIMPLE CONDITION AND HIGHER DENSITY, WHICH IS NOT AS A RIGHT, BUT COULD BE FILED FOR. AND THAT IS MY CONCERN THAT WE'RE GOING TO SEE A TREND DEVELOP DEVELOPED WHEREBY YOU'RE GOING TO SEE ACTIVITY TO DO EXACTLY. THAT I REALIZE THIS IS A PLANNING EXERCISE, BUT WE CAN'T IGNORE THROUGH THIS PLANNING EXERCISE THE IMPACTS WITH REGARD TO THE ABILITY TO FAMILIES. I THINK WE WANT TO ATTRACT FAMILIES AND YOUNG FAMILIES, YOUNG ENTREPRENEURS, YOUNG INDIVIDUALS STARTING OUT THEIR LIFE, YOUNG PROFESSIONALS WHO LIVE IN THE CITY WHO WANT TO ACQUIRE A PROPERTY, BUT MAYBE FEEL LIKE THEY CAN'T COMPETE OR BID AGAINST THE VERY INDIVIDUALS BECAUSE THEY ARE PLANNING TO LIVE IN THAT HOUSE AS A SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSE. BUT A ENTREPRENEURIAL BUSINESS PERSON SLASH DEVELOPER WILL COME ACTUALLY PREPARED TO PAY MORE. I'M PREPARED TO PAY A BIT MORE BECAUSE I'M ACTUALLY NOT GOING TO LIVE IN THERE -- SINGLE-FAMILY HOME LIKE A FIRST-TIME HOME BUYER WOULD. I'M GOING TO REDEVELOP IT, AND I COULD HAVE VALUE UNDER THAT AND PAY MORE UP FRONT TO ACQUIRE THAT PLAN. THAT'S THE TREND I'M CONCERNED ABOUT HERE. THE MORAL OBLIGATION WE HAVE TO SOMEHOW ADDRESS THAT BECAUSE WE MIGHT BE CUTTING OFF OUR NOSES IN SPITE OF OUR FACE IN THE SENSE OF BUILDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU, COUNCILLOR WYATT. THE RESPONSE?
THANK YOU, MADAM CHAIR THROUGH YOU TO THE COUNCILLOR. THE SITUATION THAT YOU ARE DESCRIBING IS ALREADY HAPPENING TODAY. AND WHEN WE WERE LOOKING AT ESPECIALLY THE THREE AND FOUR-DWELLING UNITS PER LOT THAT HAVE BEEN BUILT ACROSS THE CITY OF WINNIPEG OVER THE LAST SIX YEARS. THE GREAT MAJORITY OF THOSE OCCURRED WITHOUT A REQUIRED REZONING, JUST AS THE COUNCILLOR IS DESCRIBING NOW. AND SO, IN FACT, THERE WERE 324 DWELLING UNITS THAT OCCURRED IN THIS WAY OVER THE LAST SIX YEARS, WHICH IS SINCE THE MAJORITY OF THEM DID NOT REQUIRE REZONINGS. THAT'S WHY THEY ALSO DID NOT CONTRIBUTE TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT RESERVE. SO A FEW OF THEM DID REQUIRE REZONINGS AND THE RDR CONTRIBUTIONS WERE $13,125 PER YEAR. SO WHEN WE LOOK AT WHAT THAT IS PER WARD, IT RANGED BETWEEN ZERO TO $1300 PER WARD PER YEAR, UP TO THE LARGEST WARD FOR THE AREA WHICH WAS, ON AVERAGE, $6500 PER YEAR. SO DYNAMIC IS ALREADY HAPPENING TODAY. THE ONLY DIFFERENCE THAT WHAT GOES BEFORE COUNCIL TODAY WOULD DO WOULD JUST MAKE THIS MORE PREDICTABLE, MAKE IT TAKE LESS TIME AND MONEY. AND REDUCE THE BARRIERS OF ENTRY FOR SOME FOLKS WHO MIGHT WANT TO GO THAT ROUTE? THANK YOU FOR THE RESPONSE. I WOULD JUST ADD QUICKLY THAT I THINK IT WOULD BE VERY NAIVE OF US TO THINK THAT THIS IN AND OF ITSELF, THIS

MASSIVE EXERCISE THAT WE CROSS THE CITY WILL IN AND OF ITSELF DRIVE OFF DRIVE UP THE PRICE OF LAND AND DRIVE UP THE PRICE OF HOMES. IF INTEREST RATES REMAIN RELATIVELY STABLE WOULD BE VERY NAIVE. THE OTHER THING I WANT TO SAY OR ASK, THIS IS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR US AS A CITY TO MAYBE ENSURE CERTAIN THINGS WITH THIS. I WANT TO PICK UP WHERE COUNCILLOR SANTOS LEFT OFF. THEY PLANT TREES ON THE BOULEVARD. WE REQUIRE -- REQUIRES A WARRANT BE APPLIED ON THOSE TREES. A MINIMUM OF TWO YEARS. IN OTHER WORDS, IT ENSURES GREATER SURVIVAL OF THE TREES AND LANDSCAPING THAT'S TAKING PLACE IN THAT DEVELOPMENT. IS A WARRANT SYSTEM GOING TO BE USED HERE ON PRIVATE PROPERTY TO ENSURE THAT THE SAID TREES THAT ARE BEING PLANTED WILL ACTUALLY BE MAINTAINED AND DEVELOPED? ACTUALLY, IN A SITUATION WHERE A TREE IS PLANTED AND IT'S LIKE A TWIG. LIKE MY PINKY FINGER IS BIGGER THAN THAT TREE. A WARNING SYSTEM WOULD ENSURE THAT. THAT IS SOMETHING WE CAN DO AS PER OUR EXISTING POLICY WITHOUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RAISING ITS IRE, SAYING THAT'S A NEW CHART. NO, IT'S NOT. IT'S A REQUIREMENT. IT SIMPLE AMENDMENT TO THIS PROCESS TO ENSURE PROPER LANDSCAPING OCCURS ON PRIVATE PROPERTY SINCE THAT IS OUR INTENT TO ENSURE ANYWAY.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE?
YES. THAT HAVING AS PART OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF PERMIT PROCESS DEPOSIT OR BOND BEING REQUIRED FOR THE VALUE OF THE LANDSCAPING OUTLINED IN THE SUBMITTED PLANS TO BE HELD FOR TWO YEARS TO ENSURE PLANTING AND SURVIVAL OF THE LANDSCAPE. I DON'T THINK THAT WOULD MATERIALLY IMPACT WHAT IS CONSIDERED TODAY AND COULD FULFIL THE NEED. I GUESS IS JUST ONE CLARIFICATION FOR WHAT THE COUNCILLOR MENTIONED REGARDING DEVELOPERS BEING REQUIRED TO PLANT TREES IN THE PLANTING STRIP ALONG THE BOULEVARD. THAT PREPLIES TO LARGER GREEN FIELD DEVELOPMENTS AND NOT TO THE TWO, THREE AND FOUR-DWELLING UNITS THAT ARE BEFORE US TODAY. HOWEVER, THAT BEING SAID, THE CITY OF WINNIPEG'S COMMUNITY PLANTING BYLAWS IS ONE OF THE BEST ON THE CONTINENT THAT INDIVIDUALS TO PLANT WHAT THEY LIKE WITHIN THE PLANTING STRIP OF ONE OF THEIR HOMES PROVIDED THAT'S ONE METRE AWAY FROM THE CURB OR THE SIDEWALK AND NOT PLANTING ANYTHING THAT'S POISONOUS OR EDIBLE BECAUSE OF THE WAY WE TREAT OUR STREETS THAT WOULD MAKE THOSE LANDS NOT GREAT FOR COMMUNITY GARDENING, AS WELL AS IF IT'S EDIBLE. ANYONE IN FRONT OF THEIR HOME TODAY COULD GO PLANT TREES IF THEY COMPLY WITH THAT EXISTING ADOPTED POLICY.

MADAM SPEAKER: THERE'S OTHER THE THANK YOU. COUNCILLOR WYATT, MAYOR GILLINGHAM, FOLLOWED BY COUNCILLOR ROLLINS.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: I'LL PASS.

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR ROLLINS.

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: MADAM SPEAKER, I'M GOING TO ASK YOU TO CONTEMPLATE AS THE IMPLEMENTATION SCIENCES. THERE ARE THOSE THAT HAVE ARGUED THAT

SINCE MALLS AND CORRIDORS AND PERHAPS THIS HEARING WILL REPRESENT -- MAY RISK REPRESENTING AN OVERREGULATION WHERE MALLS AND CORRIDORS, NOW THIS, NOW THESE POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS BOG DOWN THE VERY DEPARTMENT THAT IS BRINGING FORWARD PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT. AND IF THE RULES ARE CLEAR AND CONCISE, THEN GREAT. HOWEVER, THE REALITY IS PND CONTINUOUSLY FALLS SHORT THROUGH NO FAULT OF THEIR OWN AND NO EFFORTS IN BUDGET WITH RESPECT TO PERMITTING, AND THE ANALYSIS TIME THAT IT TAKES EVEN FOR A NEW POLICY THAT WE'VE DONE THIS TERM. SO I'M GOING TO ASK YOU TO COMMENT ON YOUR STAFFING MODEL AND THE RESOURCES TO OVERSEE THESE CHANGES BECAUSE I ANTICIPATE THE COMMUNITY SAYING THAT'S GREAT. BUT IN REALITY, THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS ARE COSTING US TIME. TIME THAT IS A REFLECTION OF THE RESOURCES WITHIN PPND. THAT ARE NOT THERE COMMENT ON THAT, PLEASE?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. HAZEL.
THANK YOU, MADAM CHAIR FOR THE QUESTION. WHILE THE CITY OF WINNIPEG PLANNING PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT IS ONE OF THE LOWEST STAFF BID CITY IN CANADA TODAY AND WE WOULD GREATLY BENEFIT FROM HAVING ADDITIONAL STAFF, PARTICULARLY, WE FEEL THIS WOULD REDUCE STAFF TURNOVER AND, YOU KNOW, BURNOUT ISSUES. HOWEVER, I'M VERY PROUD TO SAY THAT IF YOU GO TO WINNIPEG.CA/BUILDING-DEVELOPMENT /BUILDINGDASHRENOVATION, WE SHOULD HAVE A SHORTER URL FOR THIS. SLASH PERMITTING SLASH TIMES. I HAVE REQUESTED THAT BUT AT THE MOMENT, THAT'S WHERE IT IS WHERE YOU CAN ALSO FIND BY JUST GOING TO PP GOING DOWN TO BUILDING AND RENOVATING PERMITTING PROCESSING TIMES. YOU CAN ALSO FIND IT THAT WAY PERHAPS MORE EASILY. AND THEN IF YOU LOOK AT THE TIME FRAMES RIGHT NOW, WE ABSOLUTELY ARE EXCEEDING OUR NUMBER OF DAYS AT THE MOMENT. SO WE ARE MEETING OUR TIMELINES ON AVERAGE STATISTICALLY SPEAKING NOW. HOWEVER, THAT BEING SAID, I THINK THAT THE INCREASE IN THAT STAFFING CERTAINLY WOULD CONTINUE TO INCREASE OUR ABILITY TO TURN THINGS AROUND QUICKLY. SO WE LOOK FORWARD TO A TIME THAT WE ARE ABLE TO DO THAT. CERTAINLY, COUNCIL APPROVED IN THE FOUR-YEAR BUDGET, 38 ADDITIONAL -- WELL, 38 ADDITIONAL FULL-TIMES. FULL-TIME BUDGETED POSITIONS. THOSE ARE CURRENTLY TEMPORARY BUDGETED POSITIONS. MANY OF THOSE PEOPLE HAVE BEEN WITH THE DEPARTMENT FOR EIGHT YEARS. SO THEY ARE NOT ALL THAT TEMPORARY, BUT THEY ARE NOT BUDGETED, SO THERE'S LESS CERTAINTY ASSOCIATED WITH THEM. ON ONE HAND, YOU MIGHT ARGUE THINGS LIKE MALLS AND CORRIDORS CERTAINLY TOOK THE STAFF MORE TIME TO INITIALLY PREPARE. HOWEVER, TO ADMINISTRATIVELY APPROVE AND CIRCULATE AND REVIEW A DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL ACTUALLY TAKES LESS TIME BECAUSE WE'RE NOT GOING AND PREPARING THAT DOCUMENT FOR THE R.S. WE'RE NOT GOING TO COMMUNITY COMMITTEE. WE'RE NOT POTENTIALLY GOING TO MUNICIPAL BOARD ON THOSE AS OF RIGHT DEVELOPMENTS WHERE THEY ARE NOT REQUESTED -- SO ACTUAL THE THROUGHPUT ON THOSE APPROVALS HAVE BEEN SIGNIFICANTLY FASTER. ALL OF THE LEADERSHIP TEAM THAT YOU SEE AROUND THE TABLE THIS MORNING HAVE BEEN INVOLVED IN THOSE MALLS AND CORRIDORS APPROVAL PROCESSES SO FAR.

AND WE'RE GREATLY ENCOURAGED THAT THAT AS OF RIGHT DEVELOPMENT IS DOING WHAT IT WAS INTENDED TO DO.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS. NEXT QUESTION. COUNCILLOR ROLLINS?

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: JUST TO FOLLOW UP ON THAT. YOU SIT ON COMMITTEES AND MR. MEECH CERTAINLY DOES, TOO, WITH THE PROVINCE AND EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS, COMMENTING ON THE LENGTH OF TIME OF THE PERMITTING PROCESS. RECOGNIZING THAT IT ISN'T ONLY PPND, BUT IT INCLUDES OTHER DEPARTMENTS TO LATE WITH. PLEASE COMMENT ON WHAT YOU HEARING AT THOSE TABLES. ARE THEY CONSISTENT WITH WHAT YOU JUST SAID WITH RESPECT TO THE PERMITTING PROCESS? IS NOT FRUSTRATED AND THE LENGTH OF TIME IS JUST FINE. WHAT MORE DIFFERENT WOULD YOU ADD IN REFLECTING FROM THOSE EXTERNAL COMMITTEES, INCLUDING WITH THE PROVINCE?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. HAZEL?

SURE. THE LAND DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY GROUP AND THE INDUSTRY ADVISORY GROUP HAVE BOTH GIVEN US VERY POSITIVE FEEDBACK ON OUR PROCESSING TIME FRAMES. CERTAINLY, THERE'S ALWAYS THE, YOU KNOW, THE INDIVIDUAL PROJECT THAT RUNS INTO DIFFICULTIES OR DOES NOT PROVIDE A COMPLETE APPLICATION. AND WE WORK WITH THE APPLICANTS TO ENSURE THAT THAT CHANGE IS MOVING FORWARD. THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS AND INFILL ZONING CHANGES THAT INCREASE BY RIGHT ENTITLEMENTS CERTAINLY ARE REDUCING THE VOLUME OF DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS, SO THAT INCLUDES SUBDIVISION, REZONING, VARIANCE, AND CONDITIONAL USES. AND ALL THOSE ARE VERY TIME CONSUMING, BOTH FOR STAFF AND FOR THE ELECTED OFFICIALS. AND DEVELOPMENT PERMITS, WHICH IS A MECHANISM FOR IMPLEMENTING THE BYLAW AMENDMENTS ARE FASTER TO REVIEW AND APPROVE THAN THE DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATIONS THAT ARE TYPICALLY REQUIRED UNDER THE STATUS QUO WHERE THE EXISTING ZONING DOESN'T MATCH UP WITH THE GENERAL MARKET DEMAND. AND PEOPLE HAVE TO DO THOSE MORE COMPLICATED DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS TO ASK FOR SPECIAL PERMISSION TO BUILD WHAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO. SO EVEN WITH MORE DETAILED ZONING REGULATIONS, AT THE PERMIT LEVEL, WE DO ANTICIPATE THAT TODAY'S AMENDMENT WOULD CERTAINLY ENABLE FASTER APPROVALS. WHAT IT DOES REQUIRE OF US IS A TEAM, AND YOU MIGHT HAVE NOTICED ON WINNIPEG.CA/MALLSANDCORRIDORS, THAT THE USER'S GUIDE FOR THAT MALLS AND CORRIDORS AMENDMENT THAT YOU PASSED IN NOVEMBER, AND IT WAS EFFECTIVE IN THE END OF JANUARY, AND IT'S ACTUALLY GROWING BECAUSE WE ARE ADDING TO IT. BUT THE CHECKLIST ITSELF ISN'T, ISN'T QUITE THAT LONG. BUT THE CHECKLIST REQUIRES AN APPLAYY GO THROUGH AND SAY, YES, NO, OR NOT APPLICABLE, PRETTY MUCH TO EVERY SINGLE SENTENCE IN THE ZONING BYLAW. SO THEY ARE -- THEY ARE BASICALLY, SELF-ASSESSING THEIR APPLICATION WITH THE VERY SAME EXACT CHECKLIST THAT THEN THE ZONING DEVELOPMENT OFFICER IS ALSO REVIEWING THEM ON. SO THIS IS THE FIRST TIME THAT WE HAVE HAD AN INTERNAL CHECKLIST AND AN EXTERNAL CHECKLIST THAT ARE EXACTLY THE SAME.

SO PEOPLE KNOW RIGHT UP FRONT WHAT IS THE THING I'M BEING SCORED ON. SO THAT PROCESS IS HELPING PEOPLE UNDERSTAND OH, THIS IS ACTUALLY WHAT'S REQUIRED OF ME. AND THAT IS UNBURDENING STAFF BECAUSE OF GETTING APPLICATIONS THAT ARE COMPLIANT WITH CITY COUNCIL-APPROVED REGULATIONS.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. FINAL QUESTION.

MADAM SPEAKER, GOING TOEDABILITY.

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: TIME DOES -- TIME, INCLUDING TIME WHERE I'VE BEEN REALLY CONCERNED ABOUT LOSING HALF DOLLARS WITH RESPECT TO APPEALS. I'VE BEEN REALLY CONCERNED ABOUT, YOU KNOW, ELONGATED APPROVALS AND DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCESSES WHICH, YOU KNOW, GOES TO EXACTLY WHAT WE'RE DOING TODAY, AND AS OF RIGHT CONSTRUCTION. BUT TO QUANTIFY A DATA POINT THAT I AM VERY CONCERNED ABOUT, A TWO-PART QUESTION. THE AVERAGE LENGTH OF THE BUILDING PERMIT PROCESS AND IT'S AN IMPORTANT ONE. BECAUSE ELONGATED APPROVALS CREATE A LOT OF RISKS. WHETHER YOU'RE NOT FOR PROFIT OR YOU'RE FOR PROFIT. SO IF YOU CAN COMMENT ON THAT, PLEASE. THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. HAZEL?
YOU KNOW WHAT.

MADAM SPEAKER: MR. MAYOR, DO YOU MOVE YOU WORK PAST 12 NOON. 123450 CERTAINLY.

MADAM SPEAKER: ALL IN FAVOUR? CONTRARY? CARRIED. YOUR RESPONSE?

SURE. SO LOOKING AT THAT SAME WEBSITE THAT I WAS TALKING ABOUT EARLIER, WHICH WAS THE PERMIT PROCESSING TIME, THE BUILDING PERMIT PROCESSING TIME FOR THE REPORT DATED MAY 19 THAT TARGET WAS MET 90.8% OF THE TIME. SO AS YOU MIGHT ALSO REMEMBER, THAT THOSE STANDARDS ARE TEN TIMES FASTER THAN THEY WERE A YEAR AND A HALF AGO. SO I'M PRETTY PROUD OF THE TEAM FOR CONTINUING TO MEET THOSE TIMES. ANOTHER INITIATIVE THAT WE'VE DONE A SOFT LAUNCH ON SO FAR, AND HAS BEEN VERY WELL RECEIVED BY THE COMMUNITY IS THAT WE HAVE ACCEPTED THE INTAKE OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION. AT THE SAME TIME AS A DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PROVIDE THAT AT LEAST THE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT IS ISSUED. IT DOESN'T HAVE TO BE APPROVED YET. THIS DOES ALLOW CONCURRENT REVIEW. THERE IS A LITTLE BIT OF RISK TO APPLICANT THAT IF THEY ARE GIVING, APPLYING FOR SOMETHING THAT IS SIGNIFICANTLY OUTSIDE OF THE ZONING REQUIREMENTS THAT THEY MAY HAVE TO SUBMIT A REREVIEW IF THEIR BUILDING PERMIT APPRECIABLY CHANGES FROM WHEN THEY FIRST THE BUT THIS IS ALSO A VAST TIMESAVING MEASURE THAT HAS BEEN REALLY WELL RECEIVED AND IS EFFECTIVE, AND IS ALLOWING SEVERAL HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND GRANT RECIPIENTS TO STAY ON TARGET TIME-WISE. PLACES LIKE PORTAGE PLACE THAT

THAT CONCURRENT REVIEW IS VERY BENEFICIAL.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. WITH THAT, WE'RE GOING TO TAKE A BREAK UNTIL 1:30. I HAVE COUNCILLOR LUKES, COUNCILLOR MAYES, COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW ON THE SPEAKER'S LIST. ANYONE ELSE? COUNCILLOR WYATT. OK. RECONVENE AT 1:30. YOU'RE ON THE BALL. THANK YOU.

**** THIS TEXT FILE WAS TAKEN FROM THE BROADCAST CLOSED CAPTIONS PRODUCED IN REALTIME AND MAY CONTAIN SLIGHT INACCURACIES. THE FOLLOWING TEXT MAY NOT BE PUBLISHED, BROADCAST OR OTHERWISE DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT THE PRIOR WRITTEN AUTHORITY OF THE CAPTIONING GROUP INC.
(1-800-717-9707)
****

MADAM SPEAKER: AFTER QUESTIONS FROM PUBLIC SERVICE, WE WILL HAVE REBUTTAL, THEN A BREAK BEFORE DELIBERATING ON AMENDMENTS. HOPEFULLY TODAY. IF NOT, TOMORROW.

MADAM SPEAKER: GOOD AFTERNOON. I WOULD LIKE TO RECONVENE OUR SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING JUNE 4, 2025. WE ARE ON QUESTIONS OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE AT THIS TIME. NEXT SPEAKER IS COUNCILLOR LUKES.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: I JUST WANT TO RECAP JUST SO THAT WE ARE CLEAR ABOUT I BELIEVE IT WAS COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW THAT SPOKE ABOUT TREES OR COUNCILLOR SANTOS. IN A LOT OF THE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS THAT I DO, WE WORK ON PUTTING THIS LINE IN. THERE AFTER MAINTAIN TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE DIRECTOR. RIGHT FROM MY PLANNER. IT IS WORDS THAT IS ADDED TO PLAN APPROVALS TO ASSURE SOMETHING IS MAINTAINED OVER LONG-TERM. I AM TRYING TO GET DEFINITION OF LONG-TERM. WHAT ARE REWRITING SPECIFICALLY INTO THESE LANDSCAPE PLANS THAT I HAVE SEEN A LOT OF DEVELOPMENT, A LOT OF TREES GO IN. THEY LOOK BEAUTIFUL FOR THE FIRST YEAR. MAYBE THE SECOND YEAR. THEN THEY ARE TOAST. JUST REITERATE, PLEASE, WHAT THE -- HOW TO ENSURE VEGETATION CONTINUES.

MADAM SPEAKER:: HAZEL ON THE PLANS AND MAINTENANCE OF THEM.
I WILL START. PROBABLY SEVERAL WILL JUMP IN.

YES, COUNCILLOR, THAT STATEMENT IS OFTEN PUT IN ZONING AGREEMENTS UNDER PLAN APPROVAL. TO MAINTAIN TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE DIRECTOR SO WHEN PLANTS DIANE THINGS THAT ARE LOCATED ON THE PLANT LIST DIE AFTER THE FIRST YEAR. THEY HAVE TO GO BACK IN AND REPLACE THEM IN PERPETUITY. FOR THE ZONING AGREEMENT. IN THE ZONING BY-LAW I'M NOT SURE. HAZEL AND ROBERT.

MADAM SPEAKER:: ROBERT.
THROUGH THE SPEAKER. TECHNICALLY IT IS A REQUIREMENT OF ZONING BY-LAW AT THE SAME TIME. THEY WOULD HAVE TO MEET THAT REQUIREMENT AND MAINTAIN IT. YOU COULD ADD THAT LANGUAGE PERHAPS THAT AS JAMES MENTIONED. IT IS A REQUIREMENT OF THE PROPOSED BY-LAW TO HAVE THE LANDSCAPING IN.
I WOULD LIKE IT WRITTEN IN THERE. I DISCOVERED THIS. I WASN'T AWARE OF IT. IT ISN'T ALWAYS WRITTEN INTO EVERYONE. THEY TELL ME THEY TRY TO WRITE IT INTO EVERYONE. IT MIGHT GET MISSED. WE SHOULD WRITE IT INTO EVERYONE BECAUSE NOW THAT I KNOW THAT AND HOPEFULLY EVERYONE KNOWS THAT. IF YOU HAVE TREES THAT DIED IN TWO YEARS, MY UNDERSTANDING IS YOU CAN GO BACK AND GET THEM REPLACED.

MADAM SPEAKER:: HAZEL.
LIKE ROBERT SAID, BECAUSE THIS IS NOW WHAT YOU ARE REFERRING TO IS DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WHEN SOMEONE IS DOING LARGE RE-ZONING. NOW BECAUSE THIS IS BY RIGHT ZONING AND WRITTEN INTO THE

ZONING BY-LAW, IT REQUIRES COMPLIANCE WITH THEIR PERMIT INCLUDING LANDSCAPING FOR IN PERPETUITY. IF YOU ADOPT THIS LANGUAGE TODAY. SO IF A TREE DIES, THEN THE ENFORCEMENT PROCESS WOULD BE THE SAME PROCESS TODAY. YOU KNOW, ANY PERSON DRIVING BY CAN WRITE UP THE REPORT ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE WHERE YOU CAN REPORT ANYTHING THAT IS NOT IN KEEPING WITH THE ADOPTED ZONING BY-LAW. WE DO ENFORCEMENT AND THAT PROCESS ROLLS. AS YOU KNOW, WE HAVE RECENTLY BEEFED UP ENFORCEMENT TO MAKE IT MORE STREAMLINED. THAT SECTION 6 UNDER ZONING BY-LAW UNDER GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

MADAM SPEAKER:: NEXT QUESTION, COUNCILLOR LUKES. COUNCILLOR MAYES AND COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: QUESTIONS ABOUT DRAINAGE EARLIER. NEEDING BIGGER PROPERTIES FOR STORAGE OF WATER. IS THERE ANY ABILITY TO UNDERSTAND AT THIS STAGE SEWER CAPACITY OUTSIDE THE CSO DISTRICT. WE TALKED ABOUT THAT. I KNOW COUNCILLOR WYATT I DON'T THINK IS IN CONFLICT. HE ACTED AS LOBBYIST FOR WOULD BE APARTMENT BUILDING OWNER AT 711 MOORE AVENUE IN MY WARD. WE HAD LONG BACK AND NORTH AT APPEALS AND COMMUNITY COMMITTEE. IT WAS DECIDED AT APPEALS COMMUNITY. SIX UNITS WERE APPROPRIATE. WATER AND WASTE SAID THREE. NOT ROOM ENOUGH FOR MORE IN THE PIPE. DOWN THE STREET WATER AND WASTE

APPROVES TWO NO GLENWOOD STYLE BUILDING, TWO INFILL HOMES EACH WITH SECONDARY SUITE. THAT DOESN'T BREAK THE SEWER BY-LAW. HOW CAN THEY GET FOUR AND I ONLY GET THREE. STILL NOTHING BUILT THERE. RUSS IS BACK HERE THREE YEARS. THIS IS ABOUT EIGHT YEARS IN THE RUNNING. NOT RUSS' FAULT. HE IF A GOOD JOB. OTHERWISE THIS IS A BIT OF A FOOL'S GAME, ISN'T IT? WE ARE FIGHTING OVER THESE PROPERTIES TO DO FINE LIMITS, AND YET ONE STREET MAY

HAVE NO CAPACITY, SOUTH SIDE DOES. YOU WOULD KNOW THAT IF YOU WENT THROUGH THE COMMUNITY COMMITTEE HEARINGS WHERE THAT EVIDENCE AND WE ARE OBVIOUSLY HAVING ALL OF THAT THINK OF THE PAST. THIS IS IT FOR ABOUT 150,000 PROPERTIES. IS THERE SOME WAY OF KNOWING AT THE FRONT END WHAT THE SEWER CAPACITY IS, NOT SO MUCH CSO DISTRICTS, BUT IN THE OTHER PARTS OF THE CITY?

MADAM SPEAKER:: RESPONSE.

MADAM CHAIR THROUGH YOU TO COUNCILLOR MAYES. AS YOU ALL KNOW AS FORMER CHAIR OF WATER AND WASTE. WE DON'T RESERVE CAPACITY FOR ANY DEVELOPMENT, AND WE DON'T PUBLISH THAT CAPACITY JUST BECAUSE ANY DEVELOPMENT TODAY WILL CHANGE THE AVAILABILITY CAPACITY FOR TOMORROW. BUT FOR THREE AND FOUR UNIT DEVELOPMENTS AT THE TIME, I DON'T KNOW IF YOU REMEMBER THE FLOWCHART FROM MONDAY'S PRESENTATION OF HOW THE PROCESS IS APPROVED. ONCE THEY HAVE THE OPTIONAL PRE-APPLICATION THEY COULD

CHOOSE TO MAKE THAT REQUEST TO WATER AND WASTE AT THAT POINT IN TIME IF THEY DO THAT PRE-APPLICATION THAT IS THE RIGHT MOMENT TO ASK. IS THERE WATER AND SEWER CAPACITY FOR THIS PARTICULAR PROPERTY. OTHERWISE IF THEY DON'T CHOOSE TO HAVE THAT OPTIONAL PRE-APPLICATION CONVERSATION WITH US. THEN THAT WOULD HAPPEN ONCE WE ACCEPT THEIR APPLICATION IT IS DEEMED COMPLETE. THEN WE CIRCULATE IT TO THE OTHER CITY DEPARTMENTS. THEN AT THAT TIME THEY WOULD FIND OUT IF THERE IS CAPACITY OR IF THERE IS NOT CAPACITY WHAT THEY WOULD NEED TO INVEST PERSONALLY IN ORDER TO CREATE CAPACITY IF THAT IS A POSSIBILITY.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: TWO QUESTIONS ARISE OUT OF THAT. A, YOU ARE SAYING OPTIONAL. I THOUGHT WE ELIMINATED PRE-AP. IS THERE AN OPTIONAL PRE-AP? IT IS NO LONGER PRE-APPLICATION YOU SUBMIT. IT IS A CONVERSATION IN ADVANCE OF THE APPLICATION TO SAY, HEY, WHAT ARE THESE CAPACITIES? BECAUSE NOW THIS BY RIGHT DEVELOPMENT HAS MUCH MORE REGULATIONS THAN THE UNDERLYING PREVIOUS ZONING DID JUST FOR R-1 AND R-2. THERE ARE NOW FORM BASED DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS PEOPLE NEED TO COMPLY WITH. THEY OFTEN HAVE QUESTIONS FOR US ABOUT THAT. SAME IS TRUE FOR MALLS AND CORRIDORS BEFORE THEY ARE READY TO SUBMIT FULL APPLICATION. THEY FREQUENTLY HAVE CONVERSATION WITH US, GIVE US SKETCH PLANS, THIS IS WHAT WE

ARE THINKING ABOUT. DO YOU SEE RED FLAGS? WE NO LONGER HAVE THE PRE-AP. THE FORMAL PROCESS WAS DELETED PREVIOUSLY. THERE IS THIS INFORMAL PROCESS WHERE WE OFFER INSIGHTS.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THESE LIMITS CAN ARISE EVEN IF THE PROJECT AS SMALL AS THREE OR FOUR UNITS. PEOPLE WERE TOLD YOU CAN ONLY HAVE THREE UNITS IN YOUR APARTMENT BUILDING. THIS IS THE LIVE ISSUE AND WILL REMAIN LIVE IN THE

THREE AND FOUR UNIT BUILDINGS.
YES. AS HAZEL MENTIONED, IT WOULD BE THROUGH BUILDING PERMIT REVIEW STAGE. THAT IS WHEN THESE WOULD BE PICKED UP.

MADAM SPEAKER:: ANYTHING FURTHER? COUNCILOR ORLIKOW.
THANK YOU VERY MUCH. SOME COUNCILLORS MAY BE AWARE I DID PUT A MOTION, TWEAKS, I WOULD CALL THEM. I WAS TALKS TO THE DIRECTOR RIGHT NOW TO GO THROUGH THEM FOR ME. WE HAVE HAD QUICK CONVERSATIONS. SOME ARE VERY PROBLEMATIC. SOME NOT TOO BAD. DEBATE WHEN IT COMES. SOME I TOTALLY AGREED WITH. SHE IS GOING THROUGH THEM RIGHT NOW. WE APPRECIATE THAT EXTRA HELP. I AM NOT FINDING IT TOO UPSETTING. ARBORIST REPORT. I KNOW THAT THEY DO THAT TO KEEP A TREE. MY CONCERN IF I WANT AN ARBORIST REPORT IN THIS ONE IS SIMPLY AND I SEE IN THE PAST WHERE THEY PUT THE TREES OR SAY I WANT TO KEEP THAT TREE.

ANYBODY WHO KNOWS ANYTHING ABOUT TREES AND TYPE OF TREE WHERE THE PROPERTY IS GOING TO DO. IT IS GOING TO DIE. ROOT SYSTEMS GO STRAIGHT DOWN. OTHERS SPREAD OUT. ARBORIST. THEY SAY THEY WANT TO KEEP THE TREE BUT THEY CAN'T. THAT TREE WILL NOT MAKE IT IF THEY BUILD THAT CLOSE TO IT. THAT IS THE NUANCE IN THE REPORT WHEN THEY LOOK AT THE PLANTS. I HAD IT BEFORE AND THEY CHANGED IT IN THE AMENDMENTS COMING. ISSUANCE OF OCCUPANCY PERMIT. I APPRECIATE THOSE COMMENTS THERE. THAT WAS GOOD. THE OTHER ONE I WANTED TO ASK THE QUESTION AND THERE WILL BE MORE. THAT IS FYI TO COUNCIL. I HOPE WE HAVE A FEW MINUTES AS WE GET THROUGH THIS PROCESS TO HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY ADMINISTRATION COULD REVIEW SOME OF THE MOTIONS. I WANT TO DO WHAT IS RIGHT. WE ARE NOT ALWAYS GOING TO AGREE. ADMINISTRATION ARE SMART. THEY UNDERSTAND MUCH MORE OF THE NUANCES THAN I DO. LANDSCAPING. WE ARE STILL DEBATING. DIRECTOR POINTED OUT THERE ARE GOOD ROCK FORMATIONS PEOPLE PUT IN FRONT YARDS. I AM GETTING WHERE THEY ARE USUALLY RENTAL PROPERTY AND IT IS JUST GRAVEL, NOT SIDEWALKS OR DRIVEWAYS. THERE ARE SOME NICE BLACK -- NOT SURE WHAT THEY CALL THEM. THAT MAY BE TWEAKED AS WELL. I IN THE BEAUMONT NEIGHBORHOOD THE GUY RENTING IT IS NEVER COMING BACK. THEY PUT GRAVEL OUT FRONT.

I FIND THAT JUST GROSS. DESIGN IS IN THE EYE OF THE BEHOLDER. I WOULD RATHER SEE GRASS. A LITTLE TWEAK THERE AS WELL. THE OTHER ONE I WANT TO ASK IS THERE IS A LITTLE TALK ABOUT CONDITIONAL USES TODAY. I KNOW WE HAVE A BATTLE TO THE DIRECTOR OR CLERKS TO CONFIRM OR NOT THAT WE HAD THE GROSVENOR PROPERTY WHERE THEY WEIGHED IN ON THE VARIANCE. THE BOARD IS NOT TO WEIGH IN ON THE VARIANCE. NOT SURE WE GOT ANY UPDATE ON THAT. MY UNDERSTANDING IS IT IS RE-ZONINGS ONLY. NODS OF YES ON THAT. THAT WAS THE QUESTION OVER TO THE CLERK'S ANSWER THERE. THAT'S IT. IF PEOPLE HAVE CONCERNS OR QUESTIONS, AGAIN, DIRECTOR BROUGHT UP WE WILL HAVE DISAGREEMENT ON THAT REGARDING FRONT PORCHES BEING 12 OR 6 FEET. COUNCILLORS BROUGHT IT UP. WE WANT THEM CLOSE. I DON'T. I DON'T MIND SCREENING. I DON'T WANT BIG BUILDING BLOCK THERE. AS DIRECTOR MENTIONED

AT WINTER CITY IT IS NICE TO HAVE THREE SEASON STUFF. THAT IS FINE. AS I TRY TO MAKE THESE WHERE I BELIEVE. AGAIN, ALSO AREAS WHERE WE ARE GOING TO HAVE DIFFERENCES OF OPINION. THAT IS THE DEMOCRACY PART. I WILL ADDRESS QUESTIONS. IF I CAN'T ADDRESS THEM THE DIRECTOR OR MR. BEACH WILL TRY THEIR BEST. I WAS INTERESTED TODAY ABOUT THE

TIMELINES. I WOULD LIKE TO FOLLOW UP ON THAT THAT COUNCILLOR ROLLINS WAS TALKING ABOUT. WE HAVE DEVELOPERS SAYING WE DON'T DO ANYTHING. HORRIFIC. THEY PUT 780 DAYS ON THE APPLICATIONS. I WANT TO CLARIFY TIMELINES BASED UPON THE INFORMATION I HEARD AND I WANT TO CLARIFY. TIMELINES NOW ARE 99% MEETING THE TIMELINES IS WHAT I HEARD.

90.

98-POINT SOMETHING.
FOR A BUILDING PERMIT. DEVELOPMENT PERMIT. BUILDING PERMITS 90.8 FOR REPORT DATED MAY 19. DEVELOPMENT PERMITS -- I WILL GET BACK WITH YOU. MY WEBSITE IS NOT WORKING.
THANK YOU VERY MUCH. THOSE ARE ALL MY QUESTIONS RIGHT NOW. I APPRECIATE AND WILL ECHO FORMER COUNCILLOR SCHREYER. WE APPRECIATE THE CONVERSATIONS TODAY. IS A BIG BY-LAW CHANGE. I APPRECIATE WHAT WE ARE HEARING TODAY.

MADAM SPEAKER:: COUNCILLOR WYATT FOLLOWED BY COUNCILLOR ALLARD.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: I'M NOT SURE IF ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL ARE AWARE THAT AND I WANT TO BRING ATTENTION TO PUBLIC SERVICE MAYBE THEY ARE NOT AWARE OF IT. AS MEMBER OF THE WINNIPEG HOUSING BOARD OF DIRECTORS WE RECEIVED INFORMATION YESTERDAY RELATING DIRECTLY TO WHAT WE ARE DOING TODAY. THE HF FUNDING. FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PREVIOUSLY SAME GOVERNMENT TECHNICALLY THOUGH DIFFERENT PRIME MINISTER

MADE COMMITMENT TO REBRANDING OF CO-INVESTMENT FUND. NOVEMBER LAST YEAR TO NATIONAL HOUSING FUND. FUNDING TO NOT-FOR-PROFIT GROUPS. THAT MAKES THE PROJECTS DO-ABLE. TO SEE IF YOU ARE AWARE OF THIS OR NOT. FOR EXAMPLE, WINNIPEG HOUSING AND REHABILITATION CORPORATION PROJECT NORTHEAST WINNIPEG HAS RECEIVED COMMITMENT OF $25 MILLION THROUGH NATIONAL HOUSING FUNDS, 11 OF WHICH WAS CASH. 14 OF WHICH WAS LOW INTEREST LOAN FOR 50 YEARS THROUGH CMHC HOUSING FUND. THAT FUNDING BASICALLY MADE IT POSSIBLE FOR THEM TO ACCESS $5 MILLION OF HAF. IN OTHER WORDS THE PROJECT IS ABLE TO PROCEED AND ABLE TO USE THE HAF MONEY. YESTERDAY THEY INFORMED NOT FOR PROFIT GROUPS THE FUND RUN OUT OF MONEY. THEY DON'T KNOW HOW OR IF IT WILL BE REPLENISHED. WHAT I UNDERSTAND AND I HEARD THIS INFORMALLY FROM PUBLIC SERVICE. NOT ONLY PROJECTS IN NORTHEAST WINNIPEG BUT ACROSS THE CITY. I BROUGHT IT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE MAYOR AND THE CONTACTS I HAVE IN PREMIER'S OFFICE. THIS IS SENDING THE WRONG MESSAGE AS WE DEAL WITH THIS TODAY IN GOOD FAITH

WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. ONE HAND IS DOING ONE THING AND ANOTHER HAND IN OTTAWA IS DOING SOMETHING VERY DIFFERENT. MAYBE MISCOMMUNICATION. MAYBE THEY HAVEN'T COMMUNICATED IN TERMS OF RELOADING PROGRAMME. REBRANDING OF THE NEW HOUSING

PROGRAMME. I DON'T KNOW. WHAT I DO KNOW NOW IS THAT THE FUNDING HAS BEEN COMMUNICATED. I RECEIVED THAT IN WRITING FROM STAFF WHO I TRUST AND HAD ARE CONNECTED TO THIS PROCESS. VERY CONCERNING WE ARE HERE NOW. FUNDING WE ARE ACCESSING BECAUSE OF THE CHANGES CAN POSSIBLY NOT BE USED FOR THE VERY PROJECT. PRIVATE SECTOR GUYS WILL BE ABLE TO PROCEED, I'M GUESSING, BECAUSE THEIR PROJECTS TEND NOT TO BE DEEPLY SUBSIDIZED AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND PERMANENT. THEY HAVE SUNSET CLAUSES AFTER SUCH AND SUCH TIME. THE WHOLE IDEA WAS THAT WE WANTED TO CREATE AS MANY, IN MY VIEW, DEEPLY FUNDED WHERE WE SEE THE NEED TODAY. RENT GEARED TO INCOME NO MORE THAN A THIRD OF YOUR INCOME PAID FOR HOUSING. QUALITY DIGNIFIED HOUSING FOR PEOPLE WHO CAN'T AFFORD THAT TODAY. THAT IS THE VERY HOUSING THAT IS GETTING CHOPPED OUT FROM UNDERNEATH US.

MADAM SPEAKER:: YOUR QUESTION.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: I MAKE A MOTION NO BY-LAWS BE READ UNTIL WE RECEIVE IN WRITING CONFIRMATION FROM FEDERAL MINISTER OF HOUSING OR OR PRIME MINISTER OR BOTH THAT THE COMMITMENTS ARE HONORED. I DON'T THINK THAT IS UNREASONABLE REQUEST. WE CAME THROUGH THE FEDERAL ELECTION. CAMPAIGNED ON THIS OPENLY.

MADAM SPEAKER:: THANK YOU. THAT IS A POLITICAL STATEMENT THAT YOU ARE GOING TO BRING. I DON'T KNOW IF THERE IS A RESPONSE.

I CAN MOVE TO THE MAYOR.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: APPRECIATE THAT. FRANKLY, I DO APPRECIATE HE BROUGHT THIS TO MY ATTENTION. I DON'T KNOW, A, IF THAT IS NEW INFORMATION. B, IF NOT, IT IS NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE MATTER BEFORE US. THE TEXT AMENDMENT WE ARE GOING TO VOTE ON IN A LITTLE BIT. IF YOU ARE GIVING BROAD LATITUDE I WILL RESPOND TO SAY I APPRECIATE COUNCIL BRINGING THAT TO MY ATTENTION. I CAN ASSURE YOU STAFF IS FOLLOWING UP. WE NEED TO DEAL WITH THE MATTER BEFORE US HERE TODAY. THE TEXT AMENDMENT RELATED TO WINNIPEG ZONING BY-LAW AND ANYTHING THAT THE COUNCILLOR BROUGHT UP WILL BE DEALT WITH CERTAINLY SEPARATELY. I WOULDN'T WANT TO PREJUDICE WHAT IS BEFORE US HERE WITH ANOTHER MATTER.

MADAM SPEAKER:: THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR. NEW INFORMATION WE ARE HEARING IN TERMS OF IT BEING HEARD IS IN ORDER. WE HAVEN'T GONE TO REBUTTAL YET. WHEN REBUTTAL STARTS, THERE IS NO NEW INFORMATION AT THAT TIME. ANY

OTHER SPEAKERS? COUNCILLOR EADIE AND THEN COUNCILLOR SANTOS.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: MADAM SPEAKER, I RISE, I WILL PREFACE AND ASK A DIRECT QUESTION. PUBLIC SERVICE SITTING HERE ARE REPRESENTING PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT. MADAM SPEAKER, RECENTLY AS APRIL 11 AND COUNCIL VOTED ON IT IN THE END. WATER AND WASTE IS MOVING TO A RAPID RESPONSE PROCESS IN ORDER FOR QUESTIONS OF WATER CAPABILITY AND/OR WASTE WATER

DEALINGS. NOW, TECHNICALLY YOU CAN BUY A PROPERTY BUT YOU CAN MAKE A CONDITION ON A CONDITION. IF SOMEBODY PURCHASES A PROPERTY AND THEY PUT A CONDITION WE GOT TO GO DETERMINE IF WE ARE ABLE IF THERE IS CAPACITY OR WHATEVER JUST TO CONFIRM BEFORE THE DEAL GOES THROUGH. NOW IT USUALLY HAPPENS ON COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES. HOWEVER, IT CAN BE DONE, ANYTHING CAN BE DONE IN AN OFFER TO PURCHASE. I SHOULDN'T SAY ANYTHING. ESSENTIALLY, IF YOU HAVE AN INTEREST IN A PROPERTY AND YOU WANT TO FIND OUT WHAT SEWER CAPACITY THERE IS AVAILABLE, THIS RAPID RESPONSE THROUGH THE BUDGET AND SO ON ESTABLISHED DEDICATED WORKERS TO WORK ON THIS, ANSWER A PHONE CALL AND DEAL WITH THE PROBLEMS I HEARD COUNCILLORS AND I HEARD OTHER PEOPLE DELEGATIONS SPEAK TO. MY REAL QUESTION IS LET'S NOT ESTIMATE OR YOU CAN'T PROVIDE WHAT SHOULD HAPPEN WE ARE HIRING EXTRA PEOPLE WHO WILL HAVE EXPERTISE TO DETERMINE AND GIVE AN ANSWER TO POTENTIAL DEVELOPER THE SEWAGE CAPACITY. I WANT TO KNOW WE ARE GOING TO PASS ZONING RULES AND STUFF AND TALKING ABOUT FOUR UNITS AND ABOUT THIS CAPACITY ISSUE AND ALL OF THESE EFFORTS. STILL A LOT OF WORK ON OTHER REPORTS. I WANT TO KNOW HOW IS PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT GOING TO MAKE IT MORE EFFICIENT FOR PEOPLE TO GET THE FULL NUMBER, E-MAIL ADDRESS THEY ARE GOING TO SEND TO GET ACTUAL INFORMATION FROM WATER AND WASTE WHO KNOW THAT WE HAVE THESE CAPACITY PROBLEMS AROUND THE CITY?

WHAT ARE WE PROPOSING TO DO TO FACILITATE CHANGES TO ZONING BY-LAW?

MADAM SPEAKER:: RESPONSE.
THANK YOU, THROUGH THE CHAIR. RIGHT NOW IN URBAN PLANNING DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION GROUP WHEN WE GET ANY INQUIRIES ABOUT INFILL, WE IMMEDIATELY GIVE THE INCHOIRER THE POTENTIAL DEVELOPER E-MAIL THAT WATER AND WASTE SET UP WITH US TO E-MAIL DIRECTLY TO WATER AND WASTE AND ASK THE QUESTION ABOUT SERVICING. CONCERNS ABOUT SERVICING, ISSUES ABOUT COMBINED SEWER, HOW MANY UNITS? WE HAVE A PROCESS IN PLACE RIGHT NOW. IF YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT ADDITIONAL MONEY AND STAFF THAT IS GOING THROUGH WATER AND WASTE, WE COULD PROBABLY CONTINUE TO WORK WITH THEM AS WE MEET REGULARLY ON ENHANCING SOME OF THAT COMMUNICATION WITH LARGER PROJECTS WHEN WE DID HAVE PRE-APPLICATION PROCESS WE GOT A LOT OF DETAILED INFORMATION FROM ALL BRANCH BACK TO PROPOSED DEVELOPERS. NOW IT IS A LITTLE LESS FORMAL. STILL WE FIND IT QUITE RAPID. WE GET IT DONE QUICKLY FROM OUR END. THERE COULD BE WAYS TO ENHANCE IT.

MADAM SPEAKER:: NEXT IS COUNCILLOR SANTOS.

COUNCILOR SANTOS: WE KNOW THAT SOME OF THE REQUIREMENTS THAT IS BUILT INTO THIS ZONING COMES FROM THE INFILL GUIDELINES, CORRECT? I AM GOING TO PLAY DEVIL'S ADVOCATE WITH RESPECT TO THE DESIGNS. MATERIALS AND DESIGNS. IS IT TRUE TO SAY THE INFILL

GUIDELINES ARE MORE STRICT WHEN IT COMES TO DESIGN AND ARCHITECTURAL VERSUS WHAT THE ZONING BY-LAW IS REQUIRING? AND MY SECOND QUESTION. WHAT CONSULTATIONS HAVE BEEN DONE WITH THE ARCHITECTURAL AND LANDSCAPE PROFESSIONALS OUT THERE?

MADAM SPEAKER:: RESPONSE?
ZONING EXCEPT IN HISTORIC DISTRICT DOES NOT HAVE JURISDICTION OVER ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS AND ELEMENTS. BECAUSE INFILL GUIDELINES ARE JUST GUIDELINES NOT REGULATIONS THEY HAVE MORE FLEXIBILITY TO OPINE. A NUMBER OF ARCHITECTURAL GROUPS WERE IN THE INITIAL ROUNDTABLES THAT INCLUDED HOUSING ADVOCATES. I DON'T HAVE THAT LIST OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD WHO ALL THEY WERE. WE HAD CONVERSATIONS WITH OVER A THOUSAND PEOPLE ON THIS TOPIC OVER THE LAST SEVERAL MONTHS. THAT INFORMATION IS NOT READILY AVAILABLE.

MY SECOND QUESTION. HOW WOULD ANY LANDSCAPER ARCHITECTURE FIRM ARE GOING TO WANT TO DO MORE CREATIVITY. CHANGE A LITTLE BIT OF THE DESIGN ELEMENTS THAT YOU HAD STIPULATED IN THE ZONING? IS THERE ANY FLEXIBILITY TO WHAT IS REQUIRED IN THE ZONING? YOU KNOW A LOT OF ARCHITECTURE, MORE CREATIVITY, DON'T NECESSARILY WANT TO FOLLOW WHAT IS HERE. IS THERE THAT OPPORTUNITY FOR THEM TO GO OUT OF THAT SCOPE? IT FEELS LIKE THIS IS VERY BLACK AND WHITE.
ZONING IS TYPICALLY BLACK AND WHITE. MOST OF WHAT THIS IS REGULATING HERE ARE BULK STANDARDS.

HOW THE BUILDING SITS ON THE LAND. FRONT, REAR SETBACKS, PARKING LOCATIONS, NUMBERS OF TREES AND SHRUBS FOR THE FRONT OF THE BUILDING THAT FACES FRONT STREET GLASS BETWEEN THREE AND EIGHT FEET ABOVE THE FLOOR. ONLY ON THE SIDE OF THE FAÇADE IF CORNER LOT THAT FACES SIDE STREET MINIMUM APRIL OF GLASS ON THAT FAÇADE. ALSO A MAXIMUM WALL WIDTH FOR PRIMARY AND SECONDARY MASKING BECAUSE OF PERSISTENT CONCERN WHY NEIGHBORS DON'T LIKE INFILL ARE LONG FRANK WALLS THAT END UP HAPPENING MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF LOT SURFACE ALONG WITH MINIMUM AMOUNT OF PERMEABLE SURFACE TO GET SPONGY. IT IS VERY BLACK AND WHITE HOW THE BUILDING CAN IT IS ON THE LAND AND HOW THE BUILDING MUST ADDRESS THE STREET. FROM OUR PERSPECTIVE WHILE DESIGNERS AND DEVELOPERS MAY ASK FOR VARIANCES BEFORE YOU TODAY SHOULD YOU CHOOSE TO PASS THEM. ALSO, YOU WILL HAVE THE NORMAL VARIANCE PROCESS THAT IS LAID OUT IN THE DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES REGULATIONS. THOSE WILL NOT CHANGE. THOSE

VARIANCE PROCEDURES VARY BASED ON WHAT IT IS THE PERSON IS ASKING TO CHANGE. THOSE VARIANCES GENERALLY ARE POSTED. IF THERE ARE NEIGHBOR COMPLAINTS, IT GOES THROUGH APPEAL PROCESS.

MADAM SPEAKER:: NO OTHER QUESTIONS WE ARE GOING TO MOVE TO COUNCILLOR WYATT.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: THIS IS AN EXAMPLE THAT I KNOW OTHER JURISDICTIONS IN MOTOR AMERICA HAVE DONE WHERE -- NORTH AMERICA HAVE DONE AS RIGHT OR EVEN

ENCOURAGING INFILL TO TRY TO MAKE AS EFFICIENT AS POSSIBLE. THEY HAVE INSTITUTED PROGRAMMES WHEREBY WORKING WITH THE INDUSTRY THEY HAVE COME UP WITH A PACKAGE, IF YOU LIKE, OF ELEVATIONS, BUILDING DESIGNS, EVEN INCLUDING LANDSCAPING. BASED ON CERTAIN SIZE OF LOTS. A PACKAGE OF THINGS IF YOU GO TO THE CITY OFFICES THERE YOU CAN SEE A FOURPLEX BASED ON LOT THIS SIZE AND 20 DIFFERENT TYPES SCENARIOS TO USE FOR IT. PRESTAMPED, PREAPPROVED. NOT REINVENTING THE WHEEL EVERY TIME IT COMES THROUGH THE DOOR. THE PUBLIC SEES THAT. PREDICTABILITY AND WE KNOW WE WILL NOT SEE BUILDINGS THAT LOOK LIKE NOT TO THE STANDARD WE EXPECTED THEM TO PASS AND TRY TO STRIVE FOR, I KNOW. IS THAT SOMETHING PREPARED OR CONSIDERED AT THIS POINT?
I ENJOY THIS QUESTION. THIS IS ABSOLUTELY BEST PRACTICES ACROSS REALLY WORLDWIDE OF PEOPLE DOING EITHER PREAPPROVED OR PREREVIEWED PLANS. ONE PERSISTENT BE COMPLAINT FROM THE COMMUNITY DURING THE PUBLIC OPEN HOUSES IN PERSON AND VIRTUAL. MANY PEOPLE SAID, HEY, I WOULDN'T MIND IF THESE ILLUSTRATIONS WERE BUILT IN MY NEIGHBORHOOD. I AM CONCERNED IT WILL BE MATERIALLY DIFFERENT THAN THESE GOODY SIGNS. CERTAINLY THAT IS SOMETHING AT COUNCIL'S DIRECTION AND PROVIDED BUDGET EXISTED TO DO SO WE COULD EASILY -- EASILY DO THE PREAPPROVED PLANS APPROVED BY BUILDING PERMIT TEAM TO ENSURE FULLY COMPLIANT WITH THE MANITOBA BUILDING CODE AND WOULD

FIT ON LOTS FROM X TO Y WIDE FOR THIS SERIES OF PLANS OR WIDE AS THAT FOR THAT SERIES OF PLANS. THE WAY OUR DEPARTMENT WOULD PREFER TO DO THAT IS THE APPLICANT WOULD NEED TO PROVIDE THEIR OWN FOUNDATION PLAN BASED ON WHATEVER THE LOT CONDITIONS ARE. JUST THE FOUNDATION PLAN WOULD NEED AN ENGINEER'S STAMP OR ARCHITECT'S STAMP. REST OF IT WOULD CERTAINLY ACCELERATE DEVELOPMENT OF INFILL IN KEEPING WITH VERY GOODY SIGN.

SOMETHING THAT WOULD REQUIRE FUNDING THAT DID NOT EXIST FOR US TO DO THAT IS THAT CORRECT WHAT I HEARD?
YES, THAT'S CORRECT. IF WE UTILIZED ILLUSTRATIONS AND DRAFT FLOOR PLANS WE PREPARED AS PART OF UNDERSTANDING THE PARAMETERS FOR THIS ZONING PACKAGE BEFORE YOU TODAY, ALL OF THOSE ILLUSTRATIONS YOU HAVE SEEN ALREADY IF WE UTILIZED THOSE IT WOULD BE OF A SUM WHAT MODERATE BUDGET.

MADAM SPEAKER:: RESPONSE HERE.
AS WE CONTINUE PLANNING FOR THREE AND FOUR YEARS OF THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND THIS WAS CONCEPTUALIZED IN THE APPLICATION. FOLLOWING OUTCOME OF TODAY'S VOTE SOMETHING TO LOOK AT IN FUTURE YEARS FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: THE OTHER PART IS TWO IS TWO. ANY THOUGHT GIVEN IN TERMS OF GIVING COUNCIL UPDATED QUARTERLY REPORTS OR BIANNUAL REPORTS IN TERMS OF TRACKING THE TRENDS? NEIGHBORHOODS GETTING GREATER DEMAND, APPLICANTS PULLING PERMITS, WHAT YOU ARE SEEING. FORECASTING WHAT COULD BE SEEN IN THE FUTURE BASED ON TRENDS

NOW? ANY SHOT IN TERMS OF THAT?

MADAM SPEAKER:: RESPONSE.
WE REPORT MONTHLY TO E.P.C. ON NUMBER OF BUILDING PER METED. THEY ARE MAPPED MONTHLY.
YOU REPORT WHERE?
E.P.C.
WHY NOT P AND D?
GOOD QUESTION. IT WAS OUT OF FUNDING. E.P.C. AT THAT LEVEL. IT COULD COME TO P AND D QUARTERLY. IT IS NOT WARD OR AREA. I THINK THAT WOULD BE A SIMPLE ANALYSIS TO ADD ON THAT REPORTING.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: WE GET CALLS FROM CONSTITUENTS ALL OF THE TIME. WHAT IS GOING ON ON SUCH AND SUFFICIENT STREET? THIS IS AUTHORITY. IN THE PAST WE WOULD HAVE INPUT INTO THE PLAN APPROVAL. WE KNOW WHAT IS HAPPENING. IS IT MUCH TO ASK REALLY THE ADMINISTRATION FOUGHT FOR PROVIDING TO COMMITTEE FOR APPROVAL MORE AS INFORMATION. BY THE WAY, IN THE LAST 30-DAYS THIS IS A PROJECT THAT IS PULLING PERMITS. THIS IS THE ELEVATIONS PRE-APPROVED OR NOW APPROVED. FYI SO WE DON'T LOOK LIKE DEAR IN HEADLIGHTS WHEN WE GET CALL FROM CONSTITUENT AND DON'T KNOW WHAT IS GOING ON. IS THAT TOO MUCH TO ASK? THAT IS MY QUESTION.
I WILL REFER THAT TO HAZEL.
THIS IS AS OF RIGHT ZONING. THE MOMENT WE START CIRCULATING PLANS AND ELEVATIONS AS MUCH AS FOLKS DON'T WANT TO MEDAL IN AS OF RIGHT ZONING CALLS MAY START TO OCCUR. IT GENERALLY WE DON'T HAVE

STAFFING CAPACITY TO DO THAT OUTREACH AND BE ABLE TO HIT OUR TIMES. WHAT I COULD ADD IN RESPONSE TO AREA PLANNERS WORK CLOSELY WITH AREA COUNCILLORS. WITH BIGGER PROJECTS WE GIVE HEADS UP WHAT IS COMING FORWARD. IT IS RE-ZONING SUBDIVISION TYPICALLY. IF THESE ARE PASSED AS OF RIGHT THEY WON'T COME THROUGH THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT. IT WILL BE STRAIGHT THROUGH ZONING DEVELOPMENT PERMIT BUILDING. WE COULD INFORMALLY I CAN GO BACK TO AREA PLANNERS AND TALK TO THEM ABOUT THIS

IDEA. I THINK IT WOULD BE MORE INFORMAL PROCESS IF THEY GET INQUIRIES, HEARING ABOUT PROJECTS IT IS REASONABLE TO REACH OUT TO AREA COUNCILLOR AT LEAST WITH MAYBE E-MAIL OR HEADS UP. IF WE GET WIND OF THESE. THEY DON'T HAVE TO DEAL WITH PLANNING DEPARTMENT.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: THANK YOU FOR RESPONSES. NO WAY AM I SAYING YOU ARE DOING THIS FOR APPROVAL FROM US. MORE INFORMATION. TO BE FRANK, CITY WHEN ECONOMY IS MOVING STRUGGLES TO DEAL WITH EXISTING PERMITTING. I BELIEVE THIS IS GOING TO DEMAND THAT COUNCIL FIND FUNDING TO DO, NUMBER ONE, PROCESS THESE PERMITS THROUGH THE APPROPRIATE DIVISION AS MR. BEACH WAS REFERRING TO. THAT IS SOMETHING WE HAVE TO ADDRESS COMING UP HERE. SECOND IS ENFORCEMENT. WE TALKED ABOUT TREES, LANDSCAPING, ELEVATIONS. USE LESS IF NOT ENFORCEMENT. NOW IT IS BASED ON COMPLAINTS.

IF NOBODY COMPLAINS AND YOU DON'T KNOW AND THEY ARE NOT ENFORCED. I CAN GUARANTEE BUILDERS DO NOT GO OUT AND DO WHAT THEY ARE TO DO WITH PLAN APPROVALS. ZERO ENFORCEMENT BY THE CITY. THAT MAKES THE SYSTEM A BIT OF A FARCE. YOU NEED MORE RESOURCES GOING FORWARD IS WHAT I AM SAYING AS WHAT COUNCILLOR ROLLINS WAS SAYING, TOO.

MADAM SPEAKER:: RESPONSE.
WE AGREE THAT WE COULD UTILIZE MORE RESOURCES TO DELIVER ON OUR COLLECTIVE LOCAL VISION AND FASTER MORE EFFICIENT WAY. I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT COUNCILOR ORLIKOW, ONE OF HIS SPECIFIC MOTIONS IS ABOUT REQUIRING DEPOSIT OR BOND TO BE REQUIRED FOR THE VALUE OF LANDSCAPING TO BE HELD FOR TWO YEARS TO ENSURE PLANTING AND SURVIVAL OF LANDSCAPING. THAT WOULD CERTAINLY HELP WITH ENFORCEMENT IF SOMEBODY IS WAITING TO CASH BACK IN THEIR BOND.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: ANOTHER QUESTION.

MADAM SPEAKER:: COUNCILLOR DUNCAN.

COUNCILLOR DUNCAN: WE ARE NOT DISCUSSING MOTIONS AT THIS POINT IN TIME.

MADAM SPEAKER:: YOU ASKED YOUR QUESTION? DID YOU FINISH THAT QUESTION?

COUNCILLOR WYATT: ARE YOU AWARE ABOUT 10 YEARS AGO SOMEBODY ON THIS COUNCIL MOVED A MOTION THAT DIDN'T GO ANYWHERE THAT WAS SIMILAR TO WHAT WE HAVE DONE WITH ENGINEERING, ENGINEERS TO REVERSE ONUS WITH THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS TO REVERSE ONUS ON THEM TO BE HELD ENFORCEMENT WISE ON PLAN

APPROVALS. ARCHITECTS WELCOMED THAT. CITY OF WINNIPEG DID NOT IMPLEMENT THAT INITIATIVE. ARE YOU AWARE OF THAT? THAT WAS OVER 10 YEARS AGO.
YES, WE ARE AWARE OF THAT THAT WAS DURING 2006 ZONING REWRITE. ONE OF

THE SUGGESTIONS REGARDING PLAN APPROVAL AND LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE STAFF. NEVER WENT FORWARD.

MADAM SPEAKER:: COUNCILLOR GILROY.

COUNCILLOR GILROY: WE HAVE SEEN LARGE INCREASE IN LANDFILL GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. I WONDER WHAT OTHER CITIES HAVE DONE. THAT WAS DUE TO CONSTRUCTION AND HOUSING CONSTRUCTION. HAS OTHER CITIES DONE ANYTHING TO IMPLEMENT ANY TYPE OF ANYTHING IN THEIR AS OF RIGHT AGREEMENTS TO ENSURE WE ARE DEALING WITH THE FACT WE ARE SEEING MORE CONSTRUCTION IN HOW TO DEAL WITH THE CONTRACTORS AND USING MORE REASONABLE MATERIALS AND STUFF LIKE THAT? ANYTHING YOU KNOW THAT OTHER CITIES HAVE DONE TO COMBAT THAT?

MADAM SPEAKER:: RESPONSE.
PERHAPS HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND AND THEIR RESEARCH.
NOTHING COMES TO MIND. WE COULD LOOK INTO THAT.

MADAM SPEAKER:: ANYTHING FURTHER? WE ARE GOING TO GO TO REBUTTAL.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: I HAVE A QUESTION.

MADAM SPEAKER:: WE ARE GOING TO TAKE A BREAK. MAYOR GILLINGHAM.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: HOW SOON CAN WE GO TO REBUTTAL?

MADAM SPEAKER:: DO YOU HAVE A FEW? WE NEED TO GO TO A HEALTH BREAK. 10 MINUTES. 10 MINUTE HEALTH BREAK.

CAN WE COME BACK AT 2:40 P.M. PLEASE OR SOONER. THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER:: GOOD AFTERNOON. I AM RECONVENING OUR SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING AFTER A SHORT RECESS. STILL AT QUESTIONS FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE. NEXT SPEAKER, COUNCILLOR WYATT.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: I WANT TO QUICKLY ASK A QUESTION PERTAINING TO THE ASSESSMENT ELEPHANT IN THE ROOM ON THIS ONE. IT IS TALKED ABOUT BUT I DON'T KNOW IF THE ADMINISTRATION IS AWARE WE ARE GETTING CALLS. WE HAD 5.9% PARTY TAX INCREASE WE ALSO SEE SHIFT IN TAX PIE BEING SPLIT DIFFERENTLY. EMPLOYMENT LANDING FALLING OFF. RESIDENTIAL PICKING UP THE REST OF THE PIE, THAT IS DRIVING TAX BILLS AND CONCERN THAT I KNOW A LOT OF FOLKS ARGUE THIS IS PUSHING ME OUT OF MY HOUSE. WE DO HAVE RESPONSE TO THAT WITH WHAT IS HAPPENING NOW. HOWEVER, THIS SCENARIO ARGUABLY DEPENDING ON WHAT HAPPENS IN TERMS OF LAND ACQUISITION OR TRANSFER AND NEW ASSESSED VALUES ESTABLISHED THROUGH THAT PROCESS. INDEED SOMEBODY LIVING ON SINGLE FAMILY HOME ON LOT THAT COULD ACCOMMODATE

A FOURPLEX OR RMF S. OUR ASSESSORS ARE INSTRUCTED TO FOLLOW ASSESSED VALUES IN NEIGHBORHOOD AND HIGHEST AND BEST USE. THE CHALLENGE WE ARE FACING WOULD BE ONE THAT HAS TO REQUIRE ASSISTANCE FROM PROVINCE, REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE APPROPRIATE ACT OR ACTS TO BASICALLY BENCHMARK OR GRANDFATHER VALUES BASED ON THE EXISTING USE OF THE PROPERTY AT

THIS TIME VERSUS WHAT VALUES ARE DRIVEN UP ON POTENTIAL USE. THIS IS A CONCERN THAT I THINK IS REAL. WHAT ARE YOUR THOUGHTS ON THAT?

MADAM SPEAKER:: RESPONSE, PLEASE.
GOOD QUESTIONS. OUR ASSESSMENT STRUCTURE IS ON SUPPOSED TO BE ON AS BUILT CONDITION NOT ON HIGHEST AND BEST USE. CERTAINLY MY TIME IN SERVICE ON THE MANITOBA MUNICIPAL BOARD ARGUING OVER ASSESSED VALUES OF LAND THAT IS ABSOLUTELY HOW THE MANITOBA MUNICIPAL BOARD ADJUDICATES DISAGREEMENTS OVER THAT. COUNCIL RAISES A GOOD POINT. WHILE CONSTRUCTION OF MATURE COMMUNITIES FROM 2019-2022 WHICH WE MENTIONED EARLIER IN THIS PROCESS A FEW MONTHS AGO BUT FOLKS MIGHT HAVE FORGOTTEN. WHEN REPLACING SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED DWELLINGS. ASSESSED VALUE ON INFILL ITSELF INCREASED 217% FOR NEW TRIPLEXES, 269 FOR NEW FOURPLEXES. HOWEVER GOING BACK TO A WINNIPEG REALTOR'S ASSESSMENT, THIS IS SIMILAR TO ASSESSMENT AND TAXATION DATA IN EDMONTON. THE ONES I JUST READ WHICH SHOWS OVER THE LAST 10 YEARS MULTI-UNIT LOW OR MID-RISE APARTMENTS HAVE NOT LOWERED PROPERTY VALUES ON THEIR SIGNIFICANT INFILL LOTS. THIS IS IN ALIGNMENT WITH STUDY FROM WINNIPEG REALTORS MEMBERS WHO WERE ALSO MEMBERS OF APPRAISAL INSTITUTE OF CANADA ASSOCIATION PRESENTED TO STCPD IN 2019. PREVIOUS YEAR THOSE MEMBERS CONDUCTED 33,000 THIRD-PARTY APPRAISALS VALUE OVER $29 BILLION.

THEY HAVE EXPERIENCE IN THE REGION. FOR THEIR STUDY FOR INFILL HOUSING AND REPORT CALLING STUDY OF AREA VALUE IMPACTS RELATED TO INFILL PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT, THEY FOUND THAT MOST PROPERTIES SURROUNDING INFILL HOUSING SHOWED A MARKET VALUE INCREASE IN 2 TO 4% PER YEAR WHICH IS FAIRLY CONSISTENT WITH OVERALL WHAT THE OVERALL MARKET SAW DURING THAT SAME TIMEFRAME.

MADAM SPEAKER:: NEXT QUESTION.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: I CAN SAY THAT IN WINNIPEG YESTERDAY I TOOK A DRIVE THROUGH PART OF MY WARD HAS THE HISTORICAL ST. BONIFACE. I WAS AMAZED HOW MANY EMPTY BUILDINGS ARE THERE. WE ARE BEING SUCCESSFULLY COMPETED AGAINST BY MUNICIPALITIES AROUND US FOR EMPLOYMENT OR ZONING OR EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT. ON THAT NOTE, WOULD IT BE -- IT WOULDN'T PREVENT BUT EMOTION SEE DATING TO THE EVICT THAT WINNIPEG COUNCIL REQUESTS APPROPRIATE DEPARTMENT MINISTER TO CONSIDER.

MADAM SPEAKER:: COUNCIL WYATT YOU HAVE A OPPORTUNITY.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: ONE OTHER THOUGHT. NOW WE ARE DOING BLANKET RE-ZONING. ALLOWING UP TO FOURPLEX. WE KNOW RMF S COULD IN THEORY COME FORWARD BASED ON WHAT WE HAVE DONE NOW AND APPLY FOR A CONDITIONAL USE TO GO HIGHER. IS THAT FAIR TO SAY OR NO?

MADAM SPEAKER:: RESPONSE, ROBERT.
THROUGH THE CHAIR, IF IT WAS ZONED R-2 YOU WOULD BE ABLE TO. YOU CAN APPLY FOR MULTI-FAMILY CONSIDERABLE USE. YES, YOU CAN GO BEYOND 4 IN R-2.

R-1 CAPPED AT FOUR.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: R-2 BEYOND FOURPLEX WHAT WE ARE DOING HERE TODAY. RMF S IS INCLUDED FOR SOME CHANGES. IT PERMITS BEYOND THAT. ONCE IT GOES BEYOND FOURPLEXES IT WOULD FOLLOW NORMAL ZONING RULES.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: NOT CU SCENARIO?
NO, BECAUSE IT IS PERMITTED.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: ISSUE IS R-2 ZONING. IN LIGHT OF ALL OF THIS WE ARE DOING ACROSS THE INDUSTRY AND DEMANDS DEPARTMENT IS GOING THROUGH IN TERMS OF TRYING TO ISSUE PERMITS TO IMPLEMENT THIS ADD MINISTRATIVELY MAYBE THAT A TWO YEAR MORATORIUM BE PLACED ON CUS ON R-2 TO SEE THE EFFECT IN THE CITY SO WE DON'T SEE THE HORSE RUN AWAY ON US ALL OF A SUDDEN? THAT WOULD MAKE ME VERY, VERY NERVOUS. FOR INSTANCE, MANY OF OUR HISTORIC BUILDINGS THAT AREN'T USED CURRENTLY FOR RESIDENTIAL ARE IN R-2 ZONING CATEGORIES IF THEY ARE CHURCH, MOSQUES, TEMPLES, PLACES OF WORSHIP, THAT SORT OF THING. A LOT OF THOSE BUILDINGS ARE GOING DARK NOW. THEY ARE POTENTIALLY GOOD CANDIDATES FOR ADAPTIVE REUSE TO SIX OR EIGHT UNITS. THAT WOULD REMOVE THAT POSSIBILITY FOR THEM AND REQUIRE LEMMING TO SIT DARK FOR A TWO YEAR MORATORIUM COULD CAUSE CATASTROPHIC FAILURE IF THEY ARE EMPTY.

COUNCILLOR WYATT.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: AS THE SYSTEM IS NOW WITH R-1. THEY ARE GOING TO BUILD A

FOURPLEX RMF S IS THAT CORRECT?

CORRECT.
IN THAT SCENARIO WHICH IS REALLY WHAT WE ARE CONTEMPLATING BY THIS AS OF RIGHT WE WOULD COLLECT LAND DEDICATION RESERVE DOLLARS AT THAT POINT BASED ON WHAT YOU ARE PROPOSING? CORRECT.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: THE LAND DOLLARS WILL BE GONE.

IF THERE IS NO RE-ZONING ATTACHED TO IT.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: IF WE DON'T INCLUDE THAT AT THIS TIME BECAUSE IT IS AS OF RIGHT, CORRECT? I KNOW THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DOESN'T WANT NEW FEES. WE ALREADY HAVE THIS IN PLACE, CORRECT?
THROUGH RE-ZONING CORRECT.

MADAM SPEAKER:: HAZEL. THAT HAPPENED ZERO TIMES IN 2019 SOMEONE TRYING TO GO FROM R-1 TO RMF S WITH FOURPLEX THAT HAPPENED TWO TIMES IN 2020. HAPPENED PRECISELY TWO TIMES IN 2021. IT IS A VERY RARE OCCURRENCE. AS FAR AS THE LVR MONEY WE COLLECTED.IN LIGHT OF RARE OCCURRENCE.THAT WOULD CIRCUMVENT?

COUNCILLOR WYATT: THEY HAVE TO HONOR IT AS THEY HONORED IT IN THE PAST. NO APPEALING OF THE FEE THEY PAY THE BE.

MADAM SPEAKER:: I IO LIKE TO GO TO REBUTTAL. NO NEW INFORMATION AT THIS TIME.THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER AND THANK YOU FOR THE CLERKS. I WOULD DEFER TO YOU ON THE ASPECT OF NEW INFORMATION. WE WANT TO PROVIDE CLARIFICATIONS AND CONTEXT. I WOULD SAY DEVON AND I WERE BRILLIANT SIX HOURS AGO.

MADAM SPEAKER:: FIVE MINUTES ON THE CLOCK. THANK YOU.
I AM MOVING ALONG. WE ARE BRILLIANT SIX HOURS AGO. YOU HAVE COVERED MANY OF THE THINGS. IN THE DISCUSSION WITH PUBLIC SERVICE A LOT IS ADDRESSED. WE WOULD ACKNOWLEDGE THE VOICES HEARD. AS APPLICANT ESPECIALLY WE WANT TO ACKNOWLEDGE PEOPLE THAT SPENT TIME TO COME DOWN HERE. THERE ARE PROS AND CONS. SOME SAID WE DIDN'T DO ENOUGH. SOME SAID YOU DID OKAY BUT TREES AND CANOPIES AND COMBINED SEWERS.
I WENT TO THE MAP TO SEE IF MY HOUSE WAS WITHIN 800 METERS OF FREQUENT OR RAPID TRANSIT. WHAT WOULD I FEEL LIKE WITH A FOURPLEX BUILT BESIDE ME? WE WORKED WITH THAT WITH THE COMMUNITY. INTERESTS THINGS HAVE COME FORWARD. WINNIPEG IS A SERIES OF BUILDING BLOCK. IN OLDER AREAS 25 AND 50 FEET WORK. IN MANY AREAS 60-FOOT IS IN PLACE. DIFFERENT SUBDIVISIONS THAT HAPPENED. UNIQUE PATTERN OF LAND DEVELOPMENT BASED ON LEGAL SYSTEM IN PLACE. I WILL TURN OVER TO DEVON TO TOUCH ON WHAT WE HEARD ABTOOK AWAY FROM YESTERDAY. I FEEL YOU MAY HAVE QUESTIONS FOR PLEA. AS I STEPPED AWAY WE HAD CONVERSATIONS AND TOUCHED IN OPENING PRESENTATION. WHAT IS IN THE REPORT IS WHAT WAS ENDORSED BY THE SPIRIT OF INTENT.

MOTIONS WILL COME FORWARD. ALL GOOD. CMHC PERSPECTIVE I WILL USE THEIR LANGUAGE. THEY CANNOT MATERIALLY WEAKEN APPROVED PROPOSAL IN PLACE. BY MATERIALLY WEAKENED WHAT DOES THAT MEAN? I AM NOT SURE I WILL BE AGE TO DEFINE UNTIL THE MOTIONS COME FORWARD. RELY ON PUBLIC SERVICE FOR THAT ASPECT OF INTERPRETATION. I WILL STATE FOR YOU AND. THE OTHER DAY WAS RIVER LOT EXEMPTIONS WHICH CAME IN. CMHC EVIDENCE GIVEN THE OTHER DAY WAS THEY HADN'T YET CONSIDERED THE RIVER LOT EXEMPTIONS. THANK YOU

THAT WAS LANGUAGE MATERIALLY WEAKENED. NO HARD DEFINITION ON IT. THAT WAS THE INTENT. WE WILL COME BACK TO LOT WIDTH NUMBERS IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS. THAT WILL BE IMPORTANT IN YOUR DELIBERATIONS. THEY ARE USED LANGUAGE WITH US THAT WE PUSHED THEM TO WHAT THEY WOULD FEEL AS MOST LIBERAL APPROACH IN CANADA RELATED TO MUNICIPALITIES AND FRONT PAGE WITH FOUR-BY-FOURS. THEY ARE FRUSTRATED OTHERS ARE USING WINNIPEG. THEY WOULD LIKE TO FOLLOW. THAT IS THE CONTEXT. I WILL LET DEVON SPEAK TO WHAT WE HEARD AND ACKNOWLEDGE THE PRESENTATIONS MADE.

MADAM SPEAKER:: DEVON CLARK.
THANK YOU. PART OF THE APPLICANT TEAM AND I WILL PROVIDE BRIEF OVERVIEW WHAT WE HEARD FROM DELEGATES OVER THE LAST TWO DAYS. MANY DELEGATES IN SUPPORT HOME OWNERSHIP IS TOO FAR OUT OF REACH AND COST OF RENTING WASN'T

MUCH BETTER. PARKING MINIMUMS SHOULD BE REMOVED AND MAXIMUMS IMPOSED. THE CONSIDERATIONS FOR REDUCTIONS SHOULD BE GIVEN TO PROPERTIES MOST CLOSELY TO TRANSIT CORRIDORS. WE HEARD FROM THOSE CONCERNED ABOUT SUSTAINABILITY FROM THE FUTURE FROM ENVIRONMENTAL CLICK AND SOCIAL PERSPECTIVE AND FROM PEOPLE WHO WANT TO LIVE IN VIBRANT DENSE NEIGHBORHOODS TO SUPPORT LOCAL AMENITIES AND TRANSIT. WE HEARD ABOUT SUPPORTING ACCESSIBLE HOUSING AND ONE UNIT IN FOURPLEX TO BE LOCATED ON GROUND FLOOR. COMMENTS ABOUT ALLOWING MORE UNITS IN SOME AREAS OF THE CITY MORE ECONOMICALLY DISTRESSED WHERE PARKING REQUIREMENTS COULD BE REDUCED TO .15 STALLS PER UNIT. DELEGATES IN SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION KEEP BE IT CLEAN AND SAFE IS DESIRABLE. CERTIFICATION PROCESSOR MEMBERSHIP IN MANITOBA HOMEBUILDERS ASSOCIATION WOULD BE BENEFICIAL TO HELP ELEVATE CONSTRUCTION SITE PRACTICES. A NUMBER OF CONCERNS OVER PROTECTION OF WATERWAYS. PARTICULARLY WITH REGARD TO REAR YARD SETBACKS. WE HEARD CONCERNS OVER LOSS OF TREES ON PRIVATE PROPERTY. WE HEARD CONCERNS ENSURING ADEQUATE GREEN SPACE IN EACH NEIGHBORHOOD.

MADAM SPEAKER:: COUNCILLOR DUNCAN MOVES FIVE MINUTES. THAT IS CARRIED. WE HER CONCERNS COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW AND DISCHARGE TO RIVERS. RESIDENTS LOSING OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE INPUT ON DEVELOPMENTS BEING

PROPOSED NEAR THEM. OVERALL, THIS ISSUE IS COMPLEX AND MULTI-LAYERED TO BRING HIGH LEVEL ISSUE PROVIDING MORE HOUSING TO SPECIFIC DETAILS INTO THE SITE AND BUILDING DESIGN PRACTICES.

MADAM SPEAKER:: THANK YOU, DEVON.
IN ESSENCE WHEN WE WENT THROUGH THIS. WE HAD A NUMBER OF ITEMS WE WERE LOOKING TO ADDRESS. I BELIEVE THE PUBLIC SERVICE ADDRESSED THE MAJORITY OF THEM. I WILL PAUSE THERE. THERE ARE QUESTIONS I CAN WALK THROUGH WITH YOU. ITEMS ADDRESSED THAT WE HAD FLAGGED WAS COMMUNITY

ENGAGEMENT, LAND VALUES ADDRESSED BY DIRECTOR, LAND DEVELOPMENT RESERVE ADDRESSED. DEVELOPMENT PACING HAD COME UP. WE DID SEE MUNICIPALITIES IN CANADA GREATER RIGHTS FOR EASE OF DEVELOPMENT. PACING WAS AN ISSUE SEVERAL YEARS AGO WITH INFILL GUIDELINES. CHALLENGING TO IMPLEMENT. NEW FORM OF REGULATION TO ITS POINT SLOWS DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION. I WOULD PERHAPS TOUCH ON SOME OF THE LOT WIDTHS. I WILL GIVE YOU GROSS NUMBERS. WE WILL GET INTO THOSE IN A FEW MOMENTS. PUBLIC SERVICE HAS DETAILED INFORMATION. FOR CITY OF WINNIPEG IN ROUND FIGURES BECAUSE THAT IS WHAT I UNDERSTAND. CITY OF WINNIPEG HAS ABOUT 200,000 LOTS. FRONTAGE AND WIDTHS WILL COME INTO DISPLAY. 50-FOOT WIDE THERE ARE 100,000 THAT HIT THE THRESHOLD. HALF OF THEM MEET THE 50-FOOT

WHITE THRESHOLD. LESS THAN 40,000 MEET THE 60-FOOT WIDE THRESHOLD. INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS IF THAT MOVED. 61, 62, 70 CAME UP IN THE QUESTIONS WHEN WE TABLED THE AMENDMENTS. IF IT WENT TO 65 FEET THAT IS 20,000 UNITS HIT THE 65-FOOT TARFET. THE QUESTION WILL COME WHO HAS THE FRONT DRIVE AND THOSE ASPECTS.

MADAM SPEAKER:: QUESTION WAS POSED EARLIER. INFORMATION IS BEING RECEIVED NOW. MR. CLERK, WOULD YOU SUGGEST THAT IS NEW INFORMATION? NO. THE QUESTION WAS POSED EARLIER. THERE WILL BE A BREAK WHEN WE PUT FORWARD AMENDMENTS. QUESTION WAS POSED EARLIER AND INFORMATION IS PROVIDED NOW.
THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER. IN ESSENCE, FOR CASCADING IN LOT WIDTHS WE GO FROM 200 TO 100 TO 40,000. THOSE THAT HIT 50 FEET, 60, 65.

MADAM SPEAKER:: TO CLARIFY. WAS THE QUESTION POSED TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE OR APPLICANT? THE PUBLIC SERVICE SHOULD HAVE ANSWERED IN THEIR TIME. I WILL DEFER FUTURE DETAIL ON THAT TO PUBLIC SERVICE. THE HORSE LEFT THE BARN.

CAN WE START AT THE TOP ON CASCADE. I AM HAVING TROUBLE HEARING.

MADAM SPEAKER:: CLERK IS CONNECTING WITH ME AS WELL. JUST A MOMENT.
I WILL STEP ASIDE ON FIGURES. THAT WILL BE FOR PUBLIC SERVICE.

MADAM SPEAKER:: CONVERSATION IS IN ORDER. QUESTIONS OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE

CAN BE WHEN WE PRESENT AMENDMENTS. THE COMMENTS ARE IN ORDER. HE CAN COMMENT TO WHAT HE HEARS FROM PUBLIC SERVICE AND PUBLIC AND ALSO OURSELVES. IT WOULD BE GOOD TO PRESENT THIS INFORMATION EARLIER SINCE IT WAS POSTED TO PUBLIC SERVICE. LET'S CARRY ON. THANK YOU. WE WILL COME BACK. I WILL MOVE ON AT THIS POINT TO OTHER ITEMS THAT HAVE COME UP. THE SETBACK WAS COVERED. WE WOULD ADDRESS THAT HAS NOT BEEN IN CONCLUDED IN THE AMENDMENT IN FRONT OF YOU IS BECAUSE THERE IS A GREEN PLAN AND TREE BUYOUT POTENTIALLY FOR THE FUTURE. WE ARE UPDATING

ZONING BY-LAW. THOSE WOULD BE ADDRESSED IN 2026 INITIATED REVIEW TO LOOK AT OVERALL ZONING BY-LAW. WATER WAYS. WE TURNED ON THAT ALREADY. THERE WAS DISCUSSION RELATED TO EXPANSION OF THAT SCONE AND BASED ON DIFFERENCES FROM WHAT IS IN THE CURRENT PROTECTED AREA AND PROPERTIES AFFECTED, IF IT WAS EXPANDED IT WOULD IN THE RANGE ADD ALMOST DOUBLE THE NUMBER OF PROPERTIES THAT WOULD BE TOUCHED UPON. THAT WOULD GO FOR RIVERS AND CREEKS FROM 29 TO 5500 UNITS. THAT WAS FOR CLARIFICATION. AS I SAID I WASN'T PROVIDING REBUTTAL. I WOULD STOP THERE, MADAM CHAIR.

MADAM SPEAKER:: QUESTIONS, COUNCILLOR MAYES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THANK YOU FOR THE PRESENTATION. NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ARISING FROM THOSE NUMBERS. THANK YOU FOR PRESENTING THEM. ON THE RIVER LOT EXCEPTED LOTS.

AS WE HEARD IN EVIDENCE THAT WAS BROUGHT IN CMHC HADN'T SIGNED OFF ON THAT. COMMENDABLE RECOMMENDATION FROM STAFF TO EXCEPT THE NUMBER THERE.IT IS NUMBER 29-50. IF WE DID SOMETHING ELSE IT WOULD GO UP.

2900 UNITS WOULD FALL INTO THAT CATEGORY FOR THE AMENDMENT. HIGHER INCOME. PEOPLE WITH RIVER LOTS ARE HIGHER INCOME IN MY WARD. WE WOULDN'T HAVE BREAKDOWN? WE HAVE NOT CROSS-REFERENCED THAT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: 2950 COMING OFF THE TOP FOR THREE OR FOUR PLEX ELIGIBLE IS PUT FORWARD BY THE STAFF. THAT WILL BE PART OF THIS DISCUSSION SHOULD THAT BE ADOPTED HERE THAT IS A CHANGE FROM WHAT WE HAD SEEN.THAT IS THE CHANGE, YES.ON THE LOT SIZE THAT SEEMED POSSIBLE. BACK LANES OR NOT BACK LANES $200,000 GRAND TOTAL. R-1, R-2, RMS. I MAY HAVE EXTRA M IN THERE. 100,000 UP TO 50 FEET, BACK LANES, GAVEL BACK LANES, NO BACK LANES? THAT IS THE GROSS NUMBER. THE NUMBER FOR UNCONSTRAINTED LOTS WOULD BE 83,000.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: UNCONSTRAIN TED.GRAVEL. CHIP SEAL DITCHES, THAT BUNDLE OF OTHER CONDITIONS THAT HAVE BEEN APPLIED. REMOVED. THAT WOULD BE ABOUT 83.5000 AVAILABLE.WHERE WE COULD DO DEPENDING ON LOT WIDTH. DUPLEXES, TRIPLEX FOURPLEX.

NEXT YOU HAD 50 AND 60.

40,000.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: BETWEEN 50 AND 60 ANOTHER 40,000 UNCONSTRAINED? TAKE OUT THE GRAVEL BACK LANES, ETC. 32.5000 FALL INTO THAT CATEGORY OF LOT WIDTH.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: WE DON'T HAVE SEPARATION OUT OF THIS MANY WITHOUT

BACK LANES.THE DEPARTMENT MIGHT BEEP AGE TO PROVIDE THAT. I WILL GIVE THEM A FEW MINUTES TO DRILL DOWN THAT NUMBER.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: WE ARE JUST GETTING IT. IT WAS MENTIONED TO ME YESTERDAY. WE ARE JUST HAVING THIS MADE PUBLIC NOW. WE HAVEN'T HAD TIME TO REVIEW IT OR WE DON'T HAVE IT IN WRITING OR ADDRESSES. WE DON'T HAVE WARD BY WARD BREAKDOWN. THE NEXT CASCADE BETWEEN 60 AND 65 WOULD BE ANOTHER 20,000ISH? UNRESTRICTED OVER 15,000 FALL INTO THAT FRONT YARD DIMENSION. HAD.I HAVE SAVED DISCUSSION PAPERS AND SAT FOR MONTHS. I HAVE BEEN THIS DISCUSSION OUTLINED SINCE NOVEMBER. THANK YOU. 20,000 LOTS BETWEEN 60 TO 65 FEET IN LOT WIDTH IN CITY OF WINNIPEG. ROUGHLY CAN YOU GIVE THAT TO ME. HOW MANY? SOME NUMBER FELL AWAY THERE.TO BE CONSISTENT IF WE TALK ABOUT LOTS THEN DRILL DOWN. BETWEEN 60 TO 65-FOOT WIDE THERE IS 19,000.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: HOW MANIBLY I DON'T UNDERSTAND 65?
THAT IS 65 AND UP.

REVERSE ENGINEERING. 65 FEET WIDE AND UP THERE ARE 19693 AVAILABLE SOME ARE CONSTRAINED.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: BEFORE THAT I AM 20,000 SHORT. 100,000 UP TO 50.UNDER 50. BETWEEN 50 AND 6 TO ANOTHER 40. ANOTHER 20,000 BETWEEN 60 AND 65.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: DOESN'T THAT ADD UP TO 180? YES, BUT SOME HAVE OTHER RESTRICTIONS, TOO. I WILL DO THE MATH AS I STAND HERE LOOKING AT THE SHEET. AROUND 180.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: 200,000 LOTS WE FIND 180,000. THE 20,000 BETWEEN 60 AND 65, CAN YOU GIVE THE CONSTRAINTED NUMBER AGAIN? CONSTRAINED? UNCONSTRAINED?

COUNCILLOR MAYES: EITHER WAY.

CONSTRAINED SITES BETWEEN 60 TO 65 IS 4200.
THAT FALLS AWAY IF WE DON'T TOUCH LOT WIDTH THAT IS GONE. IS RIVER LOCKS. YES, IT WOULD. COMBINED WITH CHIP STEAL AND SUBSTANDARD BACK LANES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: GRAVEL ROADS OUT? I AM GOING TO GRAVEL ROADS, YES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: SOME WOULD BE CORNER ADDING BACK IN THE CONSTRAINED ON CORNER LOTS? THEY WOULD BE BACK IN OR DO WE KNOW? I WOULD ASK DEPARTMENT TO SPEAK TO THAT. SOME THAT HAVE BACK LANES HAVE FRONT DRIVES IN CERTAIN AREAS.I PRESUME WE DIDN'T TAKE OUT GLENN VIEW AND MIC COLALL 60S WITH GRAVEL LANE WITH FRONT

DRIVEWAY?

SH YES.
DID YOU CATCH THAT. WHAT IS THE STREET CONDITION THERE? SOME HAVE DITCHES. I WANT TO BE SURE IT IS THE SAME STREETS.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: NICHOLE, 60 FEET WIDE LOTS WITH GRAVEL LANES. FRONT DRIVEWAYS. WE ARE ASSUMING VICTORIA CRESCENT NO CITY SEWER, THEREFORE DID WE CATCH THAT IN THE CONTRACT LISTING. I WAS TO BE CAREFUL. I WOULD REFER TO MIKE FROM THE DEPARTMENT FOR SPECIFICS.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: NOW IT IS THE APPLICANT.APPLICANT MAY NOT HAVE THAT FEEDBACK.THERE ARE A NUMBER OF CONSTRAINED PROPERTIES AND PROPERTIES THAT MIGHT YET BE TAKEN OUT AS WELL BECAUSE OF OTHER FACTORS. THAT DOES BIGGER NUMBER THAN I EXPECTED. THAT INCLUDES PROPERTIES WITH BACK LANES, RIGHT? IN SOME CASES, YES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: PAVED BACK LANE. I HAVE MY 60-FOOT WIDE PROPERTY ON STERLING AVENUE. I HAVE A PAVED BACK LANE. THAT IS IN THERE. ANY MOVE TO CHANGE THE LOT WIDTHS FOR PROPERTIES WITHOUT LANES. THAT IS TOO HIGH. YOU HAVE BACK LANE NUMBERS IN THERE. COUNCILLOR CUNCAN HAS THEM AS WELL. THERE IS A FRONT DRIVE AND COMBINATION OF THE TWO.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: IF I HAVE

60-FOOT LOT AND PAVED BACK LANE, I AM NOT CONSTRAINED.
YOU WOULD SEE THIS IN THE AMENDMENT.
TO BE BLUNT I AM TALKING ABOUT MOVING FROM 60 TO 65. IT IS UNDER 6,000 BECAUSE SOME OF THEM HAVE BIG LANES, CORRECT?

CORRECT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: WE ARE TRYING TO EXEMPT THOUSANDS OF RARE ABIDING LOTS. THING TO AT THE RISK OF MY OWN NEW INFORMATION. THAT IS AS PUBLIC AS ANYTHING ELSE. CMHC. WE KNOW HOW MANY LOTS THAT EXCEPTS OUT. IF YOU ARE ON CHIP SEAL AND/OR HAVE A DITCH AND I SUSPECT A LOT OF OVERLAP YOU ARE EXEMPT FROM THE THREE AND FOURPLEX DISCUSSION YOU ARE ELIGIBLE FOR DUPLEX?
IF I UNDERSTAND YOUR QUESTION CORRECTLY, YES. THE PART WHERE YOU STARTED WAS CMHC.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: EXEMPTIONS HOW MANY. I ASSUME CMHC SIGNED OFF ON 194-KILOMETER WORTH OF ROAD OUT. HOW MANY LOTS?
I WOULD REFER TO THE DEPARTMENT TO RESPOND TO NUMBER OF LOTS RELATED TO CHIP SEAL. GETTING TO CHIP SEAL SPECIFICALLY?

MADAM SPEAKER:: DITCHES AS WELL YOU SAID.

YES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: GRAVEL ROADS IS NONISSUE DUE TO THE AG EXPENSES. QUICK GLANCE IN THE RANGE OF 20,000 LOTS.

20,000 LOTS WOULD BE ON THE CHIP SEAL OR DITCHES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: 86-KILOMETE

R WORTH OF GRAVEL LANES. MY WARD WITH LARGEST SHARE IS THAT IN WITH THAT NUMBER OR SEPARATE.
I CAN BREAK THAT OUT FOR YOU. AROUND 14,000 LOTS GIVE OR TAKE.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: 200,000 LOTS IN THE CITY. EXCEPTING OUT 20,000 ON CHIP SEAL OR DITCHES.

CORRECT. 15 SUBSTANDARD IN SOME WAY, SHAPE OR FORM. CMHC EXEMPTING ON TECHNICAL REASONS THEY ARE COMFORTABLE. RIVERBANK ZONES NOT SO MUCH HABITAT. GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES THEY HAVE TO BE EXEMPTED ON. GRAVEL BACK LANES THEY WERE MORE OPEN TO THAT ADJUSTMENT. I WILL PARAPHRASE THEIR LANGUAGE. FOR AESTHETIC REASONS TO THEIR STATEMENT WE HAVE DESIGN BOOKS THAT SHOW HOW FOURPLEXES FIT 35 TO 40-FOOT WIDE LOTS. WE FEEL WINNIPEG IS PUSHING THE BOUNDARIES OF COMFORT FOR CMHC. THAT IS NOT A BAD THING. THAT PERSPECTIVE.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: WE HAD IN EVIDENCE AND I DON'T KNOW IF YOU CAN SPEAK TO THIS AT ALL. HALIFAX SOME NEIGHBORHOODS THERE IS A 70 FEET OF LOT WIDTH FOR FOURPLEX. CMHC SIGNED OFF ON THAT.
THERE WERE CIRCUMSTANCES WITH THE DEEP DIVE AS TO WHY. WE ASKED THAT QUESTION, TOO, OF CMHC.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THE CHART STAFF PRESENTED TO US ONLY FOURPLEXES YOU HAVE TO HAVE A BACK LANE. LIKE INFILL WITH NO PROVISION IF YOU WANT FOURPLEX YOU CAN'T DO THE FRONT DRIVEWAY. WE HAD THAT IN GUIDELINES.

CMHC SIGNED OFF. THEY SAID NO. YOU CAN ONLY DO THIS ON LANES.
I WOULD DEFER TO THE OTHER SIDE I AM NOT AS FAMILIAR. I WILL ACCEPT THAT AS A FACT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: MADAM SPEAKER I NEED TO LOOK AT MY NOTES. PERHAPS SOMEBODY ELSE CAN JUMP IN.

MADAM SPEAKER:: COUNCILLOR EADIE.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: WE ARE IN THIS CONVERSATION ABOUT LOT WIDTH. WHAT WAS THE NUMBER 25-FOOT FRONT LOTS IN THE CITY OF WINNIPEG?
I WOULD DEFER TO PUBLIC SERVICE. I DON'T HAVE THAT NUMBER IN FRONT OF ME.

WE WORKED OFF THE UP TO 100 FOOD FRONTAGE. IF I COULD ASK ROB OR MIKE THEY WOULD BE BEST SOURCE. I DON'T KNOW IF YOU WANT TO BRING MIKE IN OR NOT.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: I DID ASK ABOUT 33-FOOT FRONT, TALKED ABOUT 50. 100,000 INCLUDES 25. FRANKLY, I HIGHLY DOUBT THERE IS MANY EXACTLY 35 FEET FRONT. DO YOU KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT THAT?
THE STANDARD BUILDING BLOCK HOW WINNIPEG IS BUILT OUT IS 25 AND 50. THE OTHER IS 30 AND 60.

33S.

SOME ARE.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: A LOT OF 3.
THERE IS A RANGE. THAT IS WHY WE WEREN'T AS SPECIFIC TO THE CATEGORY. HOW MANY UNDER 50 FEET IN FRONTAGE, ETC.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: WHEN WE TALK ABOUT BUILDING TRIPLEX AND THREE PLEXUS WAS REFERENCE TO

CMHC, WHATEVER.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: IF YOU HAVE 10% LESS THAN 35. YOU COULD BUILD THREE. IS IT NOT TRUE THERE IS POSSIBILITY CONDITIONAL USE. CMHC DID THEY CONSIDER THE CONDITIONAL USE PROGRAMME AS WELL?
THEY ARE AWARE OF THAT. THIS IS BY RIGHT VERSUS CONDITIONAL USE. RESTRICTIONS BOTH ARE THE DIRECTION FOR BOTH FOR THE CHIP FUNDING AND THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUNDING IS FOURPLEX BY RIGHT. WHAT WE HAVE DONE IS SHAPED IT TO MEET CERTAIN CONDITIONS IN LOCATIONS WHAT BY RIGHT WOULD LOOK LIKE BASED ON LOT FRONTAGE MORE OF A WINNIPEG CONTEXT.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: REALITY WE HAVE CONDITIONAL USE PROCESS IF DEVELOPER WANTS TO SPEND MONEY, RIGHT?

CORRECT THAT HAS ITS OWN PROCESS TO BE FOLLOWED. IF YOU LOOK FOR GREATER DENSITY BY RIGHT THERE IS SEPARATE PROCESS FOR THAT.

MADAM SPEAKER:: THANK YOU. COUNCILLOR MAYES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: I HAVE A COUPLE QUESTIONS. MAYBE WE CAN GET DONE BEFORE MIDNIGHT. WE CAN'T KNOW HOW MANY MORE LOTS ARE GOING TO BE EXCLUDED DUE TO SEWER CONSTRAINTS? WE CAN'T KNOW THAT?

CORRECT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: BETWEEN DECEMBER PRESENTATION WE GOT AND THE JANUARY PRESENTATION WE GOT, STAFF SAID WE LISTENED. THREE PLEXUS IF YOU DON'T HAVE BACK LANE 45 FEET WE ARE GOING TO 60. WE WOULDN'T HAVE A NUMBER OF

LOTS THAT AFFECTED, I AM ASSUMING?
I DON'T HAVE THAT IN FRONT OF ME. WHATEVER NUMBER I GIVE YOU THAT I BELIEVE MAY BE WRONG BUT THAT IS A QUESTION FOR MIKE. MIKE IS EXCEPTIONAL IN THE MAPPING AND THE NUMBERS.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THAT WASSENT FOURPLEX THAT WAS THREE PLEX WITHOUT BACK LANE ISSUE. THANK YOU TO THE DIRECTOR AND MR. VEATCH FOR LISTENING TO CONCERNS FROM COUNCILLORS THERE. THIRD QUESTION. COUNCIL IN NOVEMBER OF 2023, YOU HAVE GOT TO ALLOW FOUR STORIES FOR THE FOURPLEXES WITHIN 800 METERS OF TRANSIT. COUNCIL SAYS HEIGHT NOT GREATER THAN 48 FEET. THROUGH THIS PROCESS WE MOVED THAT DOWN TO 39 FEET. C MHMHC SIGNED OFF ON THAT.

SHAPING OF THE HEIGHT CONTINUED TO MEET INTENT OF THE AGREEMENT AND THE PROGRAMME.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THERE IS NO WAY TO KNOW HOW MANY, I GUESS THAT AFFECTED DO WE HAVE COUNT HOW MANY LOTS IN THE 800-METER SHED? THAT WOULD TAKE ME A MOMENT TO DIG OUT OF MY FILE, COUNCILLOR.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: I WOULD BE VERY SURPRISED IF YOU HAD THE NUMBER. I AM ASSUMING WE DON'T KNOW HOW MANY LOTS THAT AFFECTED? THE IDEA WE ARE GOING FROM 48 TO 39 WITHIN THE 800 METERS? THAT NUMBER WE DON'T HAVE. THAT IS IN THE EFFECT NET VALUE SAME. TO THE DEPARTMENT'S CREDIT AND THE PEOPLE THEY WORKED WITH. THEY WERE SHAPING THE BOX FOR LACK OF BETTER TERM. BY BRINGING IT DOWN, THEY STRETCHED OUT TO BALANCE OFF WITH PERCENTAGE OF LOT COVERAGE. I THINK YOU HEARD EARLIER TODAY ABOUT THE TRYING TO REDUCE GIANT BLANK WALL THE EXISTING RESIDENCE. SHAPING OF DIMENSIONS THEY WERE ABLE TO ACHIEVE AND DEMONSTRATED THROUGH DESIGN CRITERIA AT DESIGN WORKSHOP HOW THAT CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED. THE WORDS FOUR STORIES ARE STILL IN THERE. IT CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED WITHIN THE 38-FOOT HEIGHT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: 39. FINAL QUESTION, MADAM SPEAKER. WHAT PEOPLE DON'T LIKE THEY DON'T LIKE 35-FOOT TALL 50-FOOT DEEP STUCCO WALL. IS IT POSSIBLE TO GIVE US -- IT PROBABLY ISN'T BECAUSE IT IS LOT COVERAGE. YOU CAN'T TELL MEAL. WE KNOW HOW TALL THE WALL COULD BE. DO WE KNOW HOW DEEP THE WALL COULD BE? YOU HAVE THE NUMEROUS BACKYARD SETBACKS. THERE IS A NUMBER OF IMAGES WITHIN THE PUBLIC INFORMATION PACKAGE. I WOULD HAVE TO GO TO THAT. IT IS BROKEN UP. THE DEPARTMENT HAD HIGHLIGHTED THROUGH THAT PROCESS THESE DORMERS, WINDOW GLAZING, THOSE KINDS OF THINGS.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THE NUMBER YOU GAVE BETWEEN 60 TO 65 IS BOTH WITH PAVED LANES AND WITH FRONT DRIVE? I WILL SAY YES AS I CHECK MYSELF.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER:: FURTHER QUESTIONS? SEEING NONE. THANK YOU.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

MADAM SPEAKER:: BACK TO QUESTIONS OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE. WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR COUNCILLORS TO PUT MOTIONS TOGETHER. WE WANT TO DO THAT. PROBABLY BE A GOOD IDEA TO RECESS NOW. RECONVENE IN A FEW HOURS OR RECONVENE TOMORROW. WE WILL HAVE MAYBE ONE HOUR FOR COUNCIL. I WILL TAKE A QUICK RECESS FOR FIVE MINUTES. STAY ON THE FLOOR. THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER:: GOOD AFTERNOON. WE ARE GOING TO BE TAKING A RECESS. SO COUNCIL CAN PUT TOGETHER AMENDMENTS THEY MAY HAVE. IT IS 3:45 P.M. WE WILL RECONVENE IN AN HOUR OR HOUR AND 15 MINUTES. THAT WILL BE BY 5:00 P.M. THANK YOU.
[CAPTIONER SWITCH]

MADAM SPEAKER: GOOD AFTERNOON. I WOULD LIKE TO RECONVENE THE SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING OF JUNE 4, 2025, AFTER A SHORT RECESS.COUNCILLORS PUT TOGETHER AMENDING MOTIONS THAT HAVE BEEN CIRCULATED.MR. MAJOR.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: FIRST OF ALL, I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE WE GO PAST 6 O'CLOCK.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU,
MR. MAYOR. ALL IN FAVOUR? CONTRARY. THAT'S CARRIED. A NUMBER OF MOTIONS HAVE BEEN CIRCULATED. THE FORMAT AS YOU KNOW IT WE'LL INTRODUCE EACH AMENDING MOTION AND HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO DEBATE AND WEIGH IN.MR. MAYOR.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: I WOULD LIKE TO -- I HAVEN'T DONE THIS IN A FEW YEARS. MOVE THE REPORT OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE BE TAKEN AS READ.

MADAM SPEAKER: ALL IN FAVOUR IN CONTRARY? CARRIED.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE THE RECEIPT OF THE PUBLIC REPRESENTATION BE INCLUDED.

MADAM SPEAKER: ALL IN FAVOUR. CONTRARY? CARRIED.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: I WOULD LIKE TO MOVE THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE BE CONCURRED IN.

MADAM SPEAKER: AS AMENDED? WELL, NOT AS AMENDED. THIS IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO HEAR TODAY MENDING MOTION. WE'LL PAUSE THERE.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE FIRST AMENDING MOTION.MADAM CLERK, WE'LL HAVE THE RESOLVES READ INTO THE RECORD. FIRST AMENDING MOTION IS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MAYES.

CLERK: THEREFORE BE RESOLVED THE BY-LAW AMENDED TO THE FOLLOWING.SECTION 52-C AND 53-C AND 11-1 BE 60 FEET AND REPLACED WITH 65 FEET.

THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR MAYES. YOUR OPPORTUNITY TO INTRODUCE YOUR MOTION.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: WELL, HERE WE ARE AFTER ABOUT 18 MONTHS OF -- SINCE WE FIRST VOTED. WE ARE ON THE FORE PLEX HEARING. MY THANKS TO THE STAFF AND THE PUBLIC FOR WEIGHING IN. IMPORTANT TO SET CONTEXT. I WANT TO THANK MY ASSISTANT, JEFF, WHO HAS DONE A LOT OF RESEARCH ON THIS.MY SON, WELLS, WHO IS THE ALONE PERSON LEFT IN THE GALLERY. OUT LAST NIGHT DRIVING AROUND CHECKING OUT CERTAIN BUILTEDINGS AS WE DEBATED AND DEALT WITH THE NUMBERS. IT'S A GREAT SCENE AT THE THE START OF BACK TO THE FUTURE WHERE MICHAEL J. FOX CHARACTER WRITES OUT INSTRUCTIONS FOR HIS FATHER BECAUSE THEY ARE ABOUT THE SAME AGE. ONE LINE, HE'S SUPPOSED TO SAY TO THIS GIRL I'M YOURS DESTINY AND HE SAYS I'M YOUR DENSITY. I FEEL THAT WAY TODAY. THIS IS A BIG VOTE TODAY.CERTAINLY WILL BE MOVING FORWARD ON A NUMBER OF IMPORTANT ITEMS ABOUT DENSITY. A COUPLE OF THINGS ABOUT BACKGROUND, HOW WE GOT HERE. VOTE BY COUNCIL IN NOVEMBER OF 2023 TO PROCEED WITH THE ACCELERATOR FUND.COUNCIL WAS GIVEN THE RIGHT TO COME BACK AND DETERMINE CERTAIN PARAMETERS. THAT'S COUNCIL DECISION ON THINGS LIKE LOT WIDTH SPECIFICATIONS. I'LL COME BACK WITH THAT AS I CLOSE. FIRST THE VOTE IN MAY.MALLS AND CORRIDORS IN OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER AND AT LAST THE FOURPLEXES. THE NUMBERS ARE IMPORTANT TO REMEMBER HERE.CERTAINLY WE'VE MET THE TARGET FOR THE MISSING MIDDLE. WE SET A TARGET OF OVER 1,000 UNITS. WE DISCUSSED THIS MANY TIMES. THE LATEST REPORT HAD US ABOUT 30% OVER THE TARGET AND 15 MONTHS OR SO IN A THREE YEAR THING. WE'VE MET THE TARGET. EVEN THE F.A.Q. PAGE THAT STARTED THIS PROCESS SAID MISSING MIDDLE IS ONLY 5%. REMEMBER THAT. THAT IS NOT THE KEY PART TO THIS WHOLE PLAN. THE KEY PART WAS PROBABLY WHAT WE DID WITH MALLS AND CORRIDORS. THAT WAS SOMETHING THE MAYOR RAN ON. I DON'T THINK ANY OF US RAN ON FOURPLEXES. IT WASN'T IN OUR ORIGINAL APPLICATION FROM JULY OF 2023, WHICH I VOTED FOR. THE REVENUE, THERE ARE A LOT OF NUMBERS TOSSED AROUND. PROS AND CONS

BUT THANKS FOR CONFIRMING ESTIMATE ANGLE REVENUE INCREASE OF ALL THE UNITS GET BUILT IS 168,000 AND OUR TAX REVENUE IS IN THE NATURE OF 700 MILLION. THIS ISN'T CRUCIAL TO FUTURE BUDGETARY DEBATES OR SHORT-TERM BUDGET DEBATES. IT IS, HOWEVER, A FEDERAL CONDITION. IF YOU LOOK AT THE F.A.Q. PAGE IT'S LISTED AS A FEDERAL REQUIREMENT. HERE WE ARE TRYING TO SORT OUT THE DETAILS AFTER ALL THE MONTHS OF WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO? WE HAVE TO DO SOMETHING SO WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO? THE DETAILS MATTER. THIS MOTION IS ABOUT ONE SUCH DETAIL, WHICH IS AN ATTEMPT TO CHANGE THE MINIMUM LOT WIDTH REQUIREMENT. IF YOU HAVE A FRONT DRIVEWAY. NOTHING TO DO WITH GRAVEL LANES, I'M PLEASED TO SAY. NOTHING TO DO WITH PAVED LANES. THIS IS ONLY DEALING WITH A FAIRLY NARROW STRAND OF PROPERTIES. THE STRAND OF PROPERTIES THAT'S BETWEEN 60 FEET WIDE AND 65 FEET WIDE AND A FRONT DRIVEWAY. NONE OF THIS PERTAINS TO THE PROPERTY THAT HAS A BACK LANE, THE AMENDMENT. WE'RE CLEAR IF YOU HAVE A PAVED BACK LANE YOU CAN DO A FOUR PLEX ON 50 FEET WIDE. THAT'S NOT CHANGING. LET ME RESTATE THAT. THAT'S NOT CHANGING. I VOTED FOR THAT. THAT'S SPREAD ACROSS THE CITY, AS A WHOLE. THAT'S A FAIRLY MAJOR MOVE TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF FOURPLEXES. IF YOU HAVE A PAVED LANE, 50 FEET WIDE. THIS IS WHAT IF YOU HAVE A LOT WITH A FRONT DRIVEWAY. THAT'S WHAT WE'RE DEBATING HERE. ALL THE CONVERSATIONS I'VE HAD TO TERRY TO BEN CARR, THEY SAY, ULTIMATELY THIS IS YOUR DECISION. YOU'RE THE COUNCIL AND THEY ARE AN ELECTED BODY. ULTIMATELY THIS IS THE DECISION OF THIS ELECTED BODY AND THE ELECTED FEDERAL BODY. THEY'VE BEEN CLEAR IT'S OUR DECISION. WHAT HAVE WE DONE? YOU MIGHT SAY AREN'T YOU -- SO HAVE WE DONE OR VARIOUS PROVISIONS. WE STARTED OUT AT 48 FOOT LIMIT. NOW WE'RE AT 39. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WAS FINE WITH THAT. WE STARTED OUT WITH 45 FEET IN OUR NOVEMBER DOCUMENT FOR A THREE PLEX, IF YOU HAD A FRONT DRIVE. THE STAFF SAID, NO, 60 FEET FOR THAT. NO VETO FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OR CMHC SO 15 FOOT MORE WIDTH WAS ALLOWED. I THINK THAT'S A GOOD PRECEDENT TO SAY, LOOK, WE DID THAT AND THERE WAS NO VETO FROM CMHC. THE 15 FOOT INCREASE, WHERE WOULD I GET THAT FROM? IT'S PRETTY STRAIGHTFORWARD. WE TALKED ABOUT IT EARLIER. IT'S OUT OF WHAT WE ALREADY APPROVED AS PART OF A HALF PROCESS. INFILL GUIDELINES SAID IF YOU HAVE 25 FOOT, YOU CAN BUILD ON A 25 FOOT PROPERTY IF YOU HAVE A BACK LANE. IF YOU DON'T HAVE A BACK LANE YOU NEED 15 MORE FEET. YOU NEED 40 FEET.15 MORE FEET OF WIDTH IF YOU DON'T HAVE THE BACK LANE. THOSE ARE THE INFILL GUIDELINES. WE VOTED, I VOTED FOR IT IN MAY OF 2024, FIRST PART OF A HALF PROCESS. WE SAID IF YOU HAVE A SINGLE FAMILY HOME ON A BACK LANE 25 FEET. IF YOU DON'T HAVE A BACK LANE 40 FEET. WE VOTED FOR IT. WENT THROUGH. NO VETO FROM CMHC THERE. WE HAVE A PRECEDENT HERE. IN FACT, IF YOU WANT PERCENTAGES, GOING FROM 25 TO 40, THAT'S A 60% INCREASE. THAT'S A LOT BIGGER THAN GOING FROM 50 TO 65. BEAR THAT IN MIND. WE HAVE A PRECEDENT HERE UNDER THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR WHERE WE INCREASED THE LOT WIDTH REQUIREMENTS BY 15 FEET IF YOU DON'T HAVE A BACK LANE. THAT'S MY RATIONAL. AND YOU MIGHT SAY, WELL YOU'RE EXEMPTING OUT SOME PROPERTIES HERE. WELL, YES. THAT DIALOGUE I HAD, CLEARLY WE'VE ALREADY EXEMPTED OUT 20,000 PROPERTIES WHERE THERE ARE

DITCHES OR SHIP SEAL. NO VETO FROM CMHC. WE'VE EXEMPTED OUT THOUSANDS OF PROPERTIES THAT HAVE GRAVEL LANES. NO VETO FROM CMHC. WE'VE ALSO -- WE EXEMPTED PROPERTIES THAT DON'T HAVE CITY WATER AND SEWER. NO VETO FROM CMHC.MR. KIERNAN MADE CLEAR THERE'S WELL OVER 100,000 PROPERTIES ELIGIBLE FOR THREEPLEXES AND FOURPLEXES, AS LONG AS THEY MET THE LOT WIDTH REQUIREMENT, THE DISCUSSION OVERCONSTRAINED AND UNCONSTRAINED.STILL ABLE TO DO THE THREEPLEXES AND FOURPLEXES IF THEY HAVE ENOUGH WIDTH. WHAT ARE WE REALLY TALKING ABOUT HERE? I WOULD ALSO POINT OUT THE -- WHAT YOU HEARD PUT IN EVIDENCE BY MR. KENNER ON THE FIRST DAY. WE MADE THIS CHANGE ON THE RIVER LOTS.CMHC HASN'T SIGNED OFF YET BUT WE'VE MADE THIS CHANGE. I THINK HE MENTIONED 2900 LOTS WOULD BE EXEMPTED. THE STAFF ARE PREPARED TO GO FORWARD WITH THAT WITHOUT PRESENTING IT. WE DON'T HAVE CMHC SIGN OFF. I'M REALLY NOT THAT WORRIED THAT CMHC WILL BE TOO CONCERNED ABOUT A CHANGE OF 8%, FIVE FEET, ON A 60-FOOT BASE. YOU'RE INCREASING ONE MEASURE FOR A SET OF HOMES. WE ARE ALREADY GOING FORWARD -- WE'RE ALREADY GAMBLING TO AN EXTENT THE RIVER LOTS WILL BE OKAY. I'M CERTAINLY SAYING BASED ON OUR HISTORY HERE, THIS SHOULDN'T BE DIFFICULT. IT SHOULDN'T BE CONTROVERSIAL. WE HAD A NUMBER OF EXEMPTIONS ALREADY. WE HAD A NUMBER OF AMENDMENTS MADE ON MALLS AND CORRIDORS.COUNCILLOR LUKES MOVED THE BIRD.COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW MOVED FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING. DID CMHC VETO ANYTHING? NO. AWAY WE WENT. I THINK WE'RE IN GOOD STANDING IF WE GO FORWARD. IT'S A FIVE-FOOT INCREASE ON A 60-FOOT BASE. IT'S NOT THAT BIG A DEAL, FRANKLY. IT DOES MATTER IN SOME WARDS. IT CERTAINLY IS IMPORTANT. I SAY SOME WARDS BECAUSE I'VE TALKED TO COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW WHO SAID I DON'T THINK I HAVE ANY 60-FOOT LOTS.COUNCILLOR SANTOS SAID I DON'T THINK I HAVE ANYBODY SERVICED UP FOR FRONT DRIVEWAYS. THIS WILL HAVE DIFFERING IMPACTS IN DIFFERENT WARDS BUT IT'S NOT MEANT TO EXEMPT MY ENTIRE WARD. I CAN GIVE YOU STREET AFTER STREET. YES. GREENDALE AVENUE THERE'S 58 PROPERTIES OVER 60-FEET WIDE BUT WE'RE EXEMPTING SIX OF THEM HERE. YOU'LL STILL HAVE MORE THAN 50 PROPERTIES ON GREENDALE WHERE YOU CAN PUT UP A THREE PLEX OR FOUR PLEX. IN FACT, A FOUR PLEX.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU,
COUNCILLOR MAYES.
MORE?

COUNCILLOR MAYES: YES. WELL, I'LL HAVE A CLOSE, AS WELL. I WANTED TO THANK COUNCILLOR
SANTOS FOR A QUESTION SHE HAD FOR ME, WHICH WAS, WELL, IF YOU DO THAT AREN'T YOU MOVING FORWARD THEN WITH THE BIGGER BUILDINGS WILL SURVIVE BECAUSE IT'S ON A BIGGER LOT. THAT'S TRUE BUT THE BIGGER BUILDINGS WOULD BE THERE ANYWAY ON THE 65-FOOT LOT. WHAT THIS WOULD DO IS ON SOME OF THE SMALLER LOTS, THE 60 FOOT, YOU WOULD NO LONGER QUALIFY. YOU WOULD, HOWEVER, NOT BE EXEMPT THERE EVERYTHING. YOU COULD STILL HAVE A DUPLEX. YOU CAN STILL HAVE A HOME WITH A SECONDARY SUITE. YOU CAN STILL INTENSIFY. IT'S NOT TRYING TO EXEMPT ANY PROPERTY FROM

THE SCOPE OF THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR. YOU CAN STILL DO A DUPLEX. YOU CAN STILL INTENSIFY. FINAL POINTS THEN I WILL HAVE SOME DISCUSSION ON MY CLOSE, I THINK. THE INFILL GUIDELINES, AND I WON'T READ IT OUT UNLESS PEOPLE WANT ME TO. I WON'T READ OUT THE PROVISION THAT SAID -- IT'S ON PAGE 18 OF THE INFO GUIDELINES. IF YOU DO A FOUR PLEX YOU HAVE TO HAVE A BACK LANE, WHY? THERE WAS A LOT OF TIME.COUNCILLOR ALLARD HAS BEEN GOOD TALKING ABOUT THIS. WE SHOULD BE ENCOURAGING PEOPLE TO DO THIS WHERE THERE ARE BACK LANES. IT'S MUCH MORE PEDESTRIAN FRIENDLY. FEWER CONFLICTS WITH PEDESTRIANS. LESS IMPACT ON BOULEVARD TREES. LESS IMPACT ON STREET PARKING IF YOU SERVICE IT ALL OFF THE LANE. WE'RE TOLD, UNLIKE SURREY, B.C., YOU CAN'T DO IT WHERE THERE ARE BACK LANES. YOU HAVE TO HAVE SOME THAT ARE FRONT DRIVEWAY SERVICED. OKAY. I THINK IT'S CONSISTENT WITH INFO GUIDELINES. WE DID SAY IN 2023, WE SHOULD BE FOLLOWING THE SPIRIT OF THE INFILL GUIDELINES. I FEEL I'M DOING THAT BY SAYING ENCOURAGE MORE WHERE THERE ARE BACK LANES RATHER THAN WHERE THERE ARE NOT BACK LANES. ONE MORE THING ON THE NUMBERS TALKED ABOUT THEN I CAN COME BACK TO THAT LATER. THE MAYOR SAID WHAT'S THE IMPACT OF WHAT YOU'RE DOING? I PUT THIS OUT ON A DISCUSSION PAPER IN OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER. WE GOT THE NUMBERS YESTERDAY IN PART FROM THE STAFF, WHO PRESENTED IT IN GOOD FAITH AND, AGAIN, TODAY. ALL WE CAN COME DOWN TO IS WHAT KIERNAN SAID. WE THINK THERE ARE ABOUT 20,000 PROPERTIES BETWEEN 60 AND 65 FEET. WE THINK 4200 ARE ALREADY OUT. THEY ARE ON RIVER LOTS. THEY ARE ON CHIP SEAL, ET
CETERA, ET CETERA. THE REMAINDER WE DON'T KNOW IF THEY ARE BACK LANE LOADED OR FRONT LANE LOADED. WE DON'T. HOW MANY LOTS IS THIS GOING TO EXEMPT? I DON'T THINK WE CAN SAY EXACTLY. IF I HAD TO PLACE A BET, MAYBE 6000 OUT OF THE 200,000 IN THE CITY. YOU WOULD STILL BE ABLE TO DO A DUPLEX. YOU WOULD STILL BE ABLE TO DO A HOME WITH A SECONDARY SUITE. IT'S MEANT TO REFLECT, A, A CONSISTENCY WITH WHAT WE'VE DONE ON OTHER LOTS WHERE THERE AREN'T BACK LANES AND THE REALITY THAT WE SHOULD ENCOURAGE THIS WHERE PEOPLE HAVE BACK LANES, AS WE DID IN THE INFILL GUIDELINES. I WISH I HAD AN EXACT NUMBER. I DON'T. I KNOW IT'S LESS THAN 16,000 THAT'S FOR SURE.MR. KIERNAN SAID IT'S A MIX OF BACK LANES AND NON BACK LANES. I CAN'T GIVE AN EXACT NUMBER. IN MY WARD WE DID A MANUAL COUNT AND IT WAS ABOUT 500. I WILL COME BACK WITH A CLOSE AND THANK -- COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS TALKED TO ME.
COUNCILLOR ALLARD TALKED ABOUT TRYING TO ENCOURAGE THIS.COUNCILLOR SANTOS HEARD ME OUT AND HAD GOOD QUESTIONS, I THOUGHT. I APPRECIATE THAT FROM HER. I WILL HAVE MORE ON CLOSE BUT THAT'S IT FOR NOW. THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU, COUNCILLOR MAYES.MR. MAYOR.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER. I WON'T BE SUPPORTING THIS MOTION NUMBER ONE. I DO WANT TO TAKE THE OPPORTUNITY TO JUST EXPRESS APPRECIATION FOR WHAT COUNCILLOR MAYES HIGHLIGHTED. TO WHAT

MR. KIERNAN WAS TALKING ABOUT. IT GOES BACK TO THE ORIGINAL DEBATE FOR A YEAR ON THIS MATTER. FOR A WHILE THERE WAS A SENSE THE CITY IS TAKING WHAT THE FEDS SAY AND THEY ARE JUST NOT PUSHING BACK AT ALL.MY GOODNESS WE'VE PUSHED BACK TO THE POINT, AS JOHN SAID, OTHER JURISDICTIONS SAY WE WANT WHAT WINNIPEG WANTS AND CMHC SAID NOT ENOUGH BUT THAT'S THE IMPRESSION I GET. WE HAVE BEEN NEGOTIATED WITH, WHETHER IT'S MALLS AND CORRIDOR, BUILDING HEIGHTS, CHIP SEAL. WE HAVE BEEN PUSHING BACK. FOR THE RESIDENTS, FOR MEMBERS OF COUNCIL HERE WHO THINK WE'VE HAD THIS RAMMED DOWN OUR THROAT. YES, FOR SURE THERE'S SOME THINGS THE FEDS HAVE PUT CONDITIONS ON BUT WE HAVE PUSHED BACK. WE HAVE NEGOTIATED. WE'VE MADE DEALS AS IT WERE. WE'VE TESTED CMHC TO SAY WE NEED A CHANGE HERE, A CHANGE THERE, WE'VE MADE AMENDMENTS. I WANT TO COMMEND STAFF FOR HOURS AND HOURS OF DIALOGUE WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, WITH CMHC TO MAKE A MORE MADE IN WINNIPEG APPROACH TO SOME OF WHAT WE'VE ALREADY ADOPTED AND THEN WHAT IS BEFORE US, AS WELL. A PRIMARY REASON THOUGH FOR NOT SUPPORTING MOTION NUMBER ONE IS EVEN IF WE USE -- WE'LL USE THE COUNCILLOR'S NUMBER, PERHAPS 6,000 PROPERTIES. IF THOSE PROPERTIES CAN NO LONGER HAVE FOURPLEXES AT 60 FEET AND BEYOND, BUT THEY CAN HAVE DUPLEXES AND TRIPLEXES, AT A MINIMUM THAT'S 6,000 UNITS TAKEN OFF THE TABLE. THE AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD OF WINNIPEG, I THINK ACCORDING TO THE LAST LOOK I SAW WAS 2.5 PEOPLE PER HOUSEHOLD. THAT MEANS WE REMOVED THE POSSIBILITY, THE POTENTIAL OF THOSE SITES ACCOMMODATING 15,000 WINNIPEGGERS. IF WE ELIMINATE THE POSSIBILITY OF DOING A FOUR PLEX ON THOSE SITES. ARE ALL FRONT LOTS GOING TO BECOME FOURPLEXES. NO. THAT'S UNLIKELY. BUT AS FAR AS THE POTENTIAL OF WHAT COULD BE POSSIBLY WE HAVE TO SAY IF WE'RE GOING TO USE 6,000 UNITS ARE TAKEN OFF THE TABLE THEN THAT BECOMES, YOU KNOW, HOUSING FOR AT A MINIMUM 6,000 MORE LIKELY 12,000 POTENTIALLY 15,000 PEOPLE IF WE USE THOSE NUMBERS. THAT BECOMES PART OF WHAT JOHN KIERNAN SAID. I DON'T REMEMBER THE EXACT QUOTE BUT HIS RESPONSE WHEN THEY ASKED CMHC ABOUT THIS IDEA OF MOVING THE LOT SIZE FROM 60 FOOT TO SOMETHING LIKE 65. THIS IDEA OF THEY WON'T SUPPORT IT IF THERE'S A MATERIAL DIFFERENCE OR SOMETHING ALONG THAT LINE. FORGIVE ME, I DON'T HAVE THE QUOTE RIGHT. TO ME REMOVING THE POTENTIAL OF 6000 PLUS LOTS FROM DEVELOPMENT IS MATERIAL. I DON'T THINK WE SHOULD RISK IT. I BEAR MANY MIND THIS. WE HAVE MADE CHANGES. WE'VE MADE AMENDMENTS AND NEGOTIATED WITH CMHC. WHEN I LOOK AT ALL OF THESE MOTIONS. THE 19 OF THEM -- NO, 21 NOW. THANK YOU WE'RE NOT STAYING ALL NIGHT TO DEAL WITH THIS. I APPRECIATE THAT. WHEN I LOOK AT SOME OF THEM, SOME MAY BE OUT OF LINE FOR THE CONTEXT OF WITH A WE'RE DOING. BUT THERE'S TWO PRIMARY LENSES TO WHICH I'M GOING THE SEE EACH ONE OF THOSE. ONE, DOES THIS JEOPARDIZE THE $450 MILLION OF FUNDING THAT WE ARE ACCESSING FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RIGHT NOW THROUGH VARIOUS FUNDS? TWO, DOES IT TAKE A NUMBER OF UNITS OFF OF -- OUT OF PLAY? MEANING LESS HOUSING POTENTIAL IN THE CITY OF WINNIPEG. LESS FOR RENTAL. LESS FOR PURCHASE. I THINK THAT'S ANOTHER POINT THAT I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE. THERE'S SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT PROTECTING MAYBE NEW HOME BUYERS OR THOSE THAT WANT TO BUY HOMES. WE NEED BOTH. WE NEED NEW HOMES PEOPLE CAN

BUY. BUT OUR VACANCY RATE AS THE END OF LAST YEAR WAS 1.7%. WE NEED RENTAL UNITS. S THE NOT ONE OR THE OTHER, WE NEED BOTH. WHAT WE'RE DOING TODAY IS TRY TO GET TO A PLACE WHERE WE ADOPT THESE AMENDMENT, THESE CHANGES TO THE WINNIPEG ZONING BY-LAW TO MAKE IT EASIER AND FASTER FOR HOUSING TO GET BUILT. WHETHER IT'S RENTAL HOUSING OR HOUSING PURCHASED. WE NEED BOTH SO IT'S NO THE ONE OR THE OTHER. I WILL NOT SUPPORT MOTION NUMBER ONE FOR THOSE REASONS. THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR. WE'RE GOING TO RECIRCULATE THIS MOTION RIGHT NOW. THERE IS A SMALL TYPO IN THE LAST SENTENCE WHERE IT SAYS, 53-C. IT SHOULD SAY 53B. MOTION ONE. IF YOU CAN RECIRCULATE IT, PLEASE. ANY OTHER SPEAKERS ON THIS ITEM?COUNCILLOR ROLLINS.

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER.MADAM SPEAKER, IS IT TIME TO SPEAK TO THE MOTION OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE AND OTHER MOTIONS? CAN I DO THAT? I'LL JUST START.

MADAM SPEAKER: YOU CAN BUT I THINK IT'S TIME TO SPEAK TO THIS PARTICULAR MOTION AND THE MAIN ITEM, I GUESS, YOU CAN LEAVE IN. THE OTHER MOTIONS HAVE NOT BE INTRODUCED JUST YET.

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: THEN I'M GOING TO, WITH FEAR OF BEING CRITICIZED, I'M GOING TO SPEAK IN SUPPORT OF THE GOVERNMENTS NATIONAL HOUSING. THE ONE THAT WE PUT IN. AND THEN I'M GOING TO SPEAK TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE RECOMMENDATIONS BEFORE US THAT ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE MOTION TO PRESERVE AND PROTECT THE FEDERAL TRANSFERS INTO THE CITY OF WINNIPEG. I WANT TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE EXTRAORDINARY WORK OF THE PUBLIC SERVANTS, FIRST AND FOREMOST, MADAM SPEAKER, AND PARTICULARLY, THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND TEAM. I WANT TO SAY AS DIRECT AS I CAN WITHOUT BREACHING PROTOCOL, THAT, MADAM SPEAKER, YOUR DILIGENCE, YOUR PRECISION, AND DEEP ENGAGEMENT WITH COMMUNITY PRIORITIES DESERVE TO BE COMMENDED. I WANT TO THANK THE PUBLIC SERVICE AND THE HYBRID APPLICATION TEAM FROM THE CITY OF WINNIPEG WHO ARE NO LONGER IN THE ROOM BUT HOPEFULLY ARE STILL LISTENING. I WANT TO THANK EVERYONE WHO CAME TO ZONING HEARINGS, THE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENTS OR TOOK TIME TO WRITE COUNCIL. YOUR TESTIMONY, YOUR CONCERN FOR YOUR COMMUNITY ARE PART OF WHAT SHAPE IMPORTANT DECISIONS. I ESPECIALLY WANT TO THANK THE URBAN DISCORD PAGE AND THOSE WHO ROUTINELY SHOW UP TO SAY YES IN WINNIPEG AND ADVOCATE FOR BETTER CLIMATE, EQUITY AND HOUSING OUTCOMES. I WANT TO MEET WITH ALL OF THEM, MADAM SPEAKER, FOLLOWING THIS HEARING AND DOING A POSTMORTEM. AS SOMEONE WHO SERVED AS CHAIR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT I CAN SAY POLICY HAS A PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL PRIORITY FOR ME. WHAT WE'VE DONE THIS TERM IS THE MOST INTENSIVE POLICY OVERHAUL OF WINNIPEG ZONING FRAME WORK IN A GENERATION. I AM VERY PROUD TO STAND BEFORE YOU, YOU KNOW, AND WAS PROUD TO STAND WITH COUNCIL TO FORWARD A SERIES OF MOTIONS AND AMENDMENTS. IT HAS BEEN A THOUGHTFUL

MULTIYEAR JOURNEY FOR US THAT I HOPE WILL TAKE US THROUGH ALL THE WAY TO THE 2027 REWRITES. THERE HAVE BEEN MANY PHASES OF DIALOGUE. THE ATTEMPT, I THINK, WAS TO BUILD MORE PERMISSIONS, LESS RED TAPE, AND LESS EXPENSE FOR ALL OF THOSE RUNNING TO SUPPORT THE HOUSING CRISIS TO INCREASE SUPPLY AND BUILD UP THIS CITY NOT OUT. I WANT TO BE CLEAR, MADAM SPEAKER. THIS PACKAGE ISN'T MY FAVOURITE INSTALMENT OF ALL OF THAT. IT ISN'T BECAUSE OF THE THREAD OF ELIMINATING THE SINGLE-FAMILY HOME NEIGHBOURHOOD. IT IS THAT THIS INSTALMENT DOESN'T IN OF ITS GENERATE A MASSIVE AMOUNT OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING. AS OF RIGHT GRANTS, PROPERTY OWNERS TO USE AND DEVELOP WITHOUT NEEDING APPROVAL FROM THE CITY COUNCIL OR PUBLIC HEARING OR RETURN TO CITY CENTRE COMMITTEES OR COMMUNITY COMMITTEES. ALLOWING DUPLEXES, TRIPLEXES AND FOURPLEXES AS OF RIGHT IS NOT ABOUT DISRUPTING NEIGHBOURHOODS BUT IT IS ABOUT EVOLVING WITH THEM. IT'S ABOUT ENSURING HOUSING IS AVAILABLE FOR WIDE SPECTRUM OF RESIDENT, YOUNG WORKER, FAMILIES STARTING OUT, AND YES, OUR GROWING POPULATION OF SENIORS WHO WANT TO AGE IN PLACE NEAR COMMUNITIES THEY HELP TO BUILD. I KNOW WHAT GENTLE SMALL SCALE INFILL LOOKS LIKE, MADAM SPEAKER, AND HOW IT CAN WORK REALLY WELL. BUT IT'S THE CONVERSATION AROUND FOURPLEXES ESPECIALLY IN MATURE NEIGHBOURHOODS THAT SPEAK TO GENERATIONAL CHANGE WE'RE FACING, I THINK. WE SAW THIS GENERATIONAL DIVIDE PLAY OUT IN THIS HEARING. WE SEE IT IN OUR OFFICES. ONE GENERATION MOST CRITICAL OF DENSITY UNTIL THEY NEED IT. UNTIL THEY ARE LOOKING TO DOWNSIZE WITHOUT LEAVING THEIR NEIGHBOURHOOD. UNTIL THEY ARE ADULT CHILDREN FACE A DIVORCE AND WANT TO KEEP THEIR OWN CHILDREN IN THE SAME SCHOOL. AND UNTIL A PARENT PASSES AWAY AND MULTIGENERATIONAL LIVING BECOMES A REALITY THAT THEY WANT AND NEED.MADAM SPEAKER, MY OWN PERSONAL EXPERIENCE REFLECTS THE NEED FOR THIS MOVE. WHEN MY PARENTS DIVORCED IT WAS A BEAUTIFUL DUPLEX WITH A BASEMENT SUITE THAT MY MOTHER AND I MOVED INTO. THE TOP FLOOR OF THAT DUPLEX. WE OCCUPIED THAT SECOND FLOOR. A YOUNG MARRIED COUPLE WITH A NEWBORN, EVENTUALLY A NEWBORN, LIVED ON THE MAIN FLOOR AND A FREQUENT TRAVELLER, A JTF2 SPECIAL LIVED IN THE BASEMENT SUITE. IT WORKED WELL.SIDE BY SIDE IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD WE LIVED IN OTTAWA AMONGST SINGLE HOME RESIDENTS AND OTHER DUPLEXES AND TRIPLEXES. THESE SCENARIOS ARE NOT THREE LET CALL. THEY ARE LIVED EXPERIENCES FROM FAMILIES ACROSS FROM THE CHURCHILL HIGH SCHOOL IN EARL GREY, IN OZ BORN VILLAGE. THEY ARE WHAT WE, AS COUNCILLORS HERE AT THE GROUND LEVEL, PROBABLY EVERY DAY OPPOSITE PEOPLE WHO NEED US TO BUILD DIFFERENT AND MORE HOUSING FOR THEM. THEY ARE WHY A MORE FLEXIBLE ZONING FRAMEWORK ACROSS THE CITY WHEN IT SUPPORTS GENTLE DENSITY IS CRITICAL. IN SOME RESPECT TODAY, MADAM SPEAKER, I BELIEVE I AM SACRIFICING WHAT WORKS IN MY OWN NEIGHBOURHOOD P.D.O.S AND DENSITY FOR THE GREATER GOOD. WHAT GUIDE MID WORK AS CHAIR OF PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT AND WITHIN MY WARD WAS EVIDENCE THAT SHOWED ME THAT CITY BY-LAW REPRESENTED BARRIERS AND RED TAPE. AND THE EVIDENCE, WHICH HAS BEEN PROVEN OUT IN STUDIES FROM TERMS BEFORE EVEN I GOT HERE, WAS THAT ALMOST HALF, 45% OF INFILL APPLICATIONS, UNDERWENT VARIANCE APPLICATIONS. OVER 90% OF THE TIME THESE WERE

APPROVED BY COMMUNITY COMMITTEES.MOST OF THE VARIANCES WERE ABOUT PARKING AND INCREASING DENSITY. THAT IS WHAT I A SOUGHT TO CHANGE, MADAM SPEAKER. THAT IS THE OPPORTUNITY OF AS-OF-RIGHT. TO UNDERSTAND WHAT OTHERS HAVE BEEN DOING IS TO UNDERSTAND A BIT OF WHY I WAS EXCITED THAT THIS WOULD HOLD PROMISE.SO OTTAWA, FOR INSTANCE, OPPOSITE FOURS, ARE AT THE 39 FOOT MARKET. WINDSOR, THE SAME. HALIFAX, 35 FOOT IN TERMS OF LOT FEET.SASKATOON 50 FEET IN TERMS OF LOT WIDTH.SO IS BRAMPTON AND VANCOUVER AT A 32.1 FOOT. TO GIVE RELATIVE EXAMPLES OF CITY CENTRE THAT WE'VE APPROVED LAST TERM, I WOULD LIKE TO REVIEW, IF YOU WANT TO FOLLOW ALONG.797 DORCHESTER, FOUR UNITS ON A 50-FOOT LOT.717 JESSE IS FOUR UNITS. THAT'S ON A 50-FOOT WIDE LOT.107 KUSHON IS FOUR UNITS ON A 33-FOOT WIDE LOT.160FURBY, FOUR UNITS 33-FOOT WIDE LOT.18 RATHGARD, FOUR UNITS. I ARGUE THAT'S PROBABLY A 50 FOOTER. AND IF NOT LESS, 25 KUSHON.40 FOOT LOT. THAT'S A FIVEPLEX.MADAM SPEAKER, AS OF RIGHT FOR ME WHEN I LOOK AT 60 FEET AND I LOOK AT 65 FEET, I ARRIVE IN A MOMENT SLIGHTLY APPOINTED AS IN OSBORN VILLAGE, DOWNTOWN COUNCILLOR AND THE COUNCILLOR FOR THE FORK AREA THAT ARGUABLY HAS APPROVED HALF OF ALL OF THE FOURPLEXES THAT WE APPROVED AT ALL IN THE CITY OF WINNIPEG. I WANT TO POINT OUT THAT I GOT EXCITED WHEN MR. MCGERRY CAME.MOST EXAMPLES HAVE THE STORAGE ON THE 35 FOOT, 45 FOOT LOT. I ARRIVE WITH A PUBLIC SERVICE RECOMMENDATION ON A 60 FOOT LOT. AMENDING MOTION ON A 65. I TELL YOU IT PROBABLY DOESN'T MATTER MUCH. BUT WHAT I DO THINK MATTERS IS FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MONEY IS CRITICAL. IT DOES NOT HELP US WHEN HEADLINES. THAT'S FOR SURE. WE KNOW THAT, WHY? EVERY MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT WOULD BE OUT IN FRONT OF THIS AND WE KNOW THAT ISN'T THE CASE. IT WILL THOUGH DIRECTLY FUND INFRASTRUCTURE TRANSIT AND IT'S ABSOLUTELY, THIS MONEY IS ABSOLUTELY HELPED HOUSE PEOPLE. WE KNOW ALL OF THOSE THINGS ARE TRUE. WE HAVE TO MAKE SPACE FOR PEOPLE YOUNG AND OLD WHO WANT TO LIVE IN WALKABLE CONNECTED COMMUNITY. ACCORDING TO A RESEARCH POLL, 60% OF WINNIPEGGERS SUPPORT THIS DIRECTION. THIS RESEARCH POLL, I THINK, IS REALLY CRITICAL BECAUSE IT WAS ON DUPLEXES AND TRIPLEXES AND FOURPLEXES. IT IS A SCIENTIFIC POLL BECAUSE THE GOOD PEOPLE AT PROBE DID IT. IT SHOWS THAT 60% OF WINNIPEGGERS SUPPORT THIS DIRECTION AND MANY OF THEM ARE YOUNGER. THESE ARE THE PEOPLE WE NEED TO RETAIN. THE PEOPLE LIKE MY KIDS, THAT

MIGHT AFTER THEY ARE SOJOURNED IN BRITISH COLUMBIA AND ONTARIO COME BACK FROM SCHOOL AND COME BACK TO THE CITY AND NEED SOME PLACE TO LIVE. I'M REASSURED, MADAM SPEAKER, BY THIS POINT AND BY THE COLLEAGUES THAT PUT SO MUCH THOUGHT INTO THIS HEARING. THIS MOTION ISN'T THE END OF THE CONVERSATION. IT IS THE CONTINUATION OF IT WITH EACH OTHER AND WITH OUR FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL PARTNERS. I JUST URGE ALL OF US TO IN SOME WAY SUPPORT THAT NATIONAL HOUSING STRATEGY AND THE MONEY THAT IS TIED TO US DOING THIS THAT PRIME MINISTER TOLD US AT FEDERATION, INDEED ALL MUNICIPALITY, THAT HE DIDN'T HAVE TIME TO CHANGE BUT THAT HE WAS GOING TO ADD MORE FUNDING TO IT. I URGE ALL OF US TO SUPPORT IT IN ANY WHICH WAY WE CAN AND TO, AS A COMMITTEE OF A WHOLE,

THAT I'M STILL SO PROUD WE'RE DOING FOR EACH AND EVERY ITERATION, EVEN THOUGH IT'S DIFFICULT AND WE'RE UNACCUSTOMED TO IT. BUT TO REMEMBER WHAT'S AT STAKE. FOR EACH OF US THAT MIGHT BE DIFFERENT. ADS BOWMAN USED TO SAY I AM PUTTING A BIT OF WATER IN MY WINE TODAY, TOO. I A ILLUSTRATED THAT HERE, I HOPE, TODAY. WHAT I BELIEVE IS AT STAKE IS A CITY THAT WORKS FOR EVERYONE AND NOT JUST EVERYONE WHO HAS A HOME IN IT BUT EVERYONE WHO WE NEED TO PLAN THAT WILL HAVE A HOME IN THE FUTURE. THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU.COUNCILLOR SANTOS FOLLOWED BY COUNCILLOR WYATT.

COUNCILLOR SANTOS: ACTUALLY, I HAD QUESTIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION. WITH RESPECT TO MOTION NUMBER ONE. I APPRECIATE THE COMMENTS IMMEDIATE BY THE MAYOR AND COUNCILLOR MAYES. I WANTED TO UNDERSTAND AND HELP ME UNDERSTAND WHY DID WE CHOOSE
60 FEET?

COULD YOU GIVE ME SOME BRIEF CONTEXT OF WHY WE CHOSE 60 FEET? IS IT TO OPEN THE WINDOW FOR MORE UNITS TO BE BUILT?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE, PLEASE.

THE CONTEXT IS THAT THE PARAMETERS WE'RE GIVEN IN MOTION FROM NOVEMBER OF 2023 WAS TO USE THE INFILL GUIDELINES TO SUPPORT THE RECOMMENDATIONS, BASICALLY. IN NOT SO MANY WORDS. BUT THE INFILL GUIDELINES NEVER HAD ANYTHING FOR FRONT APPROACH, PARTICULARLY FOR THREES AND FOURS. IT'S MAINLY SPEAKING TO INSTANCES WITH LANES.
SO WITH THAT WE HAD 50 FEET WAS THE PARAMETER FOR A FOUR-UNIT DEVELOPMENT. GIVEN THAT WE WERE ADDING A DRIVEWAY WITH A MAXIMUM WIDTH OF TEN FEET, WE THOUGHT IT APPROPRIATE TO GO TO 60. FOR A FRONT DRIVE INSTANCE.

COUNCILLOR SANTOS: WOULD YOU SAY THAT 65 FEET IS ACCEPTABLE FOR A FRONT DRIVEWAY OR WOULD YOU STILL WANT TO STICK TO 60?

WE WOULD WANT TO STICK TO 60.

COUNCILLOR SANTOS: THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: ANY FURTHER
SPEAKERS? THERE'S A REQUEST FOR THE DINNER BREAK RIGHT NOW. OKAY. THERE'S ALSO A REQUEST FOR HEALTH BREAK. WE NEED TO HONOUR THAT.
MR. MAYOR, WE'LL COME BACK IN 30 MINUTES.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: JUST WONDERING HOW MANY SPEAKERS LEFT?

MADAM SPEAKER: THERE ARE THREE
SPEAKERS FOR THIS ITEM. HALF AN HOUR, PLEASE. THERE IS A MEAL NEAR IN THE WEST BOARDROOM, THANK YOU.
[CAPTIONER SWITCH]

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNTDOWN PLEASE.

GOING LIVE IN THREE, 2, 1.
[GAVEL]

MADAM SPEAKER: GOOD EVENING. I'D LIKE TO RECONVENE OUR SPECIAL COUPLE MEETING OF JUNE 4TH, 2025. WE'RE DELIBERATING ON AMENDING MOTIONS THAT ARE BEFORE COUNCIL. MOTION 1, NEXT SPEAKER. COUNCILLOR ALLARD.

COUNCILLOR ALLARD: THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER, AND I'LL ATTEMPT TO BE BRIEF. I WANT -- YES -- YES. THE MORE COMMENTS I DO GET FROM THE GALLERY THOUGH -- [LAUGHTER] AND IN ALL SERIOUSNESS, I WANT TO THANK COUNCILLOR MAYES FOR THIS MOTION AND THIS REFLECTS THE CONVERSATIONS THAT COUNCILLOR MAYES AND I HAD WITH THE PUBLIC SERVICE EARLIER. I DO THINK THAT UNLIKE THE HENSON REPORT THAT LOOKED AT EVERY SINGLE UNIT OF RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY AND TRIED TO APPLY A FORMULA THAT APPLIED TO THE ENTIRE CITY THAT WAS EQUAL TO, YOU KNOW, BASICALLY SAYING THAT EVERY UNIT IS THE SAME -- I DON'T THINK IS THE CORRECT APPROACH. AND I DON'T THINK THAT APPROACH WHERE -- WELL, I MEAN, THIS ONE IS I THINK -- IT'S UTILITARIAN IN THAT THERE'S A DEADLINE AND THERE'S ONE THING AND WE NEED TO DO SOMETHING AND THIS IS THE PACKAGE THAT THE PUBLIC SERVICE IS PROPOSING. THIS IS THE PACKAGE THAT HAS BEEN PROPOSED TO THE CMHC. I DO THINK THAT THERE IS ROOM TO NEGOTIATE WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. I DO THINK THAT, UM, WHEN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FIRST PUBLISHED THEIR LETTER, I THINK THAT WE'VE GONE BACK AND FORTH FROM WHAT THOSE REQUIREMENTS WERE. AND SO I GUESS THAT WOULD BE MY THOUGHTS ON THAT. I THINK THAT IF WE DO PASS A BY-LAW, UM, THAT ALLOWS FOR -- FOUR UNITS WITH THE CONDITIONS, WHICH I THINK IS WHAT COUNCILLOR MAYES IS DOING HERE, IS SETTING SOME OF THE CONDITIONS, UM -- I DID DO SOME ANALYTICS FOR ST. AUGUST WARD AND MOST PROPERTIES EXCLUDED WOULD BE IN THE COMMUNITIES OF SOUTH DALE AND WINDSOR PARK MOSTLY. NOT THAT MUCH IN ISLAND LAKE, I GUESS THAT THE FRONTAGES THERE AREN'T AS BIG. BUT, UM, PRIMARILY AND PERHAPS IT'S -- PERHAPS IT'S HAVING GROWN UP ON THE CENTRAL ST. BONIFACE WHERE THERE'S BACK LANES AND SIDEWALKS, UM, I -- I THINK THAT'S A BETTER PLACE FOR DENSEIFF. AND I THINK THAT IF YOU DRIVE AROUND THE CITY, I THINK THAT MORE AND MORE AS DENSITY INCREASES, UM, FARTHER OUT FROM THE CORE OF THE CITY, THE MORE THAT WE'RE GOING TO SEE THINGS LIKE LEVELS OF SERVICE DECREASE FOR CARS. MANY OF THE STREETS THAT THESE RESIDENTS ARE BUILT ON DON'T HAVE SIDEWALKS. A LOT OF THEM WERE BUILT WITH THE IDEA THAT KIDS SHOULD PLAY IN TRAFFIC LIKE LITERALLY -- I HEARD THAT FROM THE DEVELOPERS THAT THE COMMUNITIES ARE BUILT IN ORDER FOR KIDS TO BE ON THE STREET. AND I

THINK THAT SOME OF THESE -- SOME OF THESE STREETS ARE QUITE BUSY ALREADY, EVEN IF THEY ARE BAYS. SO I THINK THAT LIKE IN ST. BONIFACE WARD, THE OLD -- THE NORTH ST. BONIFACE SECONDARY PLAN IS THE TYPE OF MODEL THAT -- THAT I WAS -- THAT I CHAMPIONED. AND THAT IS A BIG DENSITY INCREASES IN RESIDENTIAL AREA WHERE THE RESIDENTS WERE ENGAGED OVER MANY YEARS. AND WE CREATED A HIGH DENSITY AREA AND A MIDDLE DENSITY AREA AND A SINGLE FAMILY AREA. SO TO SUPPORT COUNCILLOR MAYES' MOTION, NOT ALL RESIDENTIAL UNITS ARE CREATED EQUAL. I THINK THAT WE SHOULD FOCUS ON THE DOWNTOWN. THIS IS NOT GOING TO HELP THE DOWNTOWN. I DON'T THINK THAT THIS IS GOING TO HELP SUBURBAN NEIGHBORHOODS IN TERMS OF LEVELS OF SERVICE FOR VEHICLES. AND I THINK THAT IN TERMS OF THINGS LIKE TRANSIT, YES, WE HAVE A MASTER PLAN AND, YES, SOME OF THESE COMMUNITIES DON'T HAVE THE SAME LEVELS OF SERVICE THAT YOU HAVE IN MATURE NEIGHBORHOODS. SO I THINK THIS IS A LITTLE TWEAK. I THINK THAT I DON'T HAVE THE NUMBER IN FRONT OF ME, BUT I THINK THAT IT WOULD TAKE -- OH, I DO HAVE THE NUMBER IN FRONT OF ME BASED ON THE ASSESSMENT ROLLS AND THERE WOULD BE ABOUT 400 PROPERTIES TAKEN OUT AND I DON'T HAVE THE CITY-WIDE NUMBERS THOUGH I COULD PROVIDE THEM IF I HAD MORE TIME TO ANALYZE. AND SO I -- I SUPPORT -- I LIKE THE -- THIS CITY-WIDE AS A RIGHT FOURPLEX AND I THINK THAT IT'S GOOD AND I THINK THERE'S CRITERIA WHERE THAT SHOULD AND SHOULDN'T BE. AND IN THIS CASE I WANTED TO SHOW MY SUPPORT FOR COUNCILLOR MAYES WHO DID A LOT OF WORK ON THIS. I DO THINK THAT THE FEDS AREN'T GOING TO -- ARE GOING TO TURN US AWAY, BECAUSE OF FIVE FOOT FRONTAGE ON STREETS WITH -- STREETS WITH NO SIDEWALKS. IN SUBURBAN NEIGHBORHOODS. I DO THINK THAT THEY'D TURN US DOWN IF WE DON'T GET A BY-LAW THROUGH THAT ALLOWS FOR MULTIFAMILY AND THE SINGLE FAMILY POLICY AREA WITH THE RIGHT CRITERIA. AND COUNCILLOR MAYES MENTIONED THAT THERE'S ALREADY BEEN A NUMBER OF EXCEPTIONS, LIKE RIVERBANK, LIKE PROPERTIES NEAR RAIL, AND I THINK THAT ALL OF THOSE EXCEPTIONS ARE MATERIAL. AND THIS WOULD BE -- THIS WOULD BE ONE MORE AND I THINK THAT ONE THAT IN THE COMMUNITIES THAT COUNCILLOR MAYES REPRESENTS -- I KNOW THAT IN MY COMMUNITY ST. AUGUST WARD DID EMBRACE DENSITY. WE BUILD SIX-STOREY BUILDINGS AND RIGHT ALONGSIDE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCES AND NOT ON MAJOR ARTERIALS BUT IN AREAS THAT WE AS A COMMUNITY DECIDED THAT WOULD BE THE HIGH DENSITY POLICY AREAS. SO I -- I THINK THAT THERE'S -- I THINK THAT WE CAN BE MORE -- WE CAN DO THINGS MORE SPECIFICALLY AND I DON'T BLAME ANYONE FOR WHERE WE'RE AT THE THIS POINT, BECAUSE EVERYTHING IS DONE ON A TIMELINE. I THINK THAT THIS OMNIBUS IS GOOD AND THIS IS JUST A VERY SMALL TWEAK, SO I'LL BE VOTING TO SUPPORT COUNCILLOR MAYES' MOTION AND I LOOK FORWARD TO DEBATING THE OTHERS.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. NEXT SPEAKER, COUNCILLOR EADIE.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER, I'LL TRY TO BE BRIEF. I HAVE A GENERAL COMMENT THAT I -- WELL, I'LL SAVE IT FOR ANOTHER DISCUSSION. BUT I HEAR ABOUT, YOU KNOW, IN-FILL AND THERE WILL BE INCREASED PROPERTY TAXES, MADAM SPEAKER, WHICH GIVES EVERYBODY THE ASSUMPTION THAT THERE'S INCREASED DOLLARS TO RENOVATE A COMMUNITY CENTER THAT NEEDS IT

BECAUSE THERE'S GOING TO BE A LOT MORE PEOPLE LIVING IN A NEIGHBORHOOD, FOR EXAMPLE. BUT THAT MONEY, MADAM SPEAKER, IT'S NOT GOING TO BE MADE AVAILABLE BECAUSE WHAT HAPPENS IS THAT THE ESTIMATE OF NEW ASSESSMENT ENDS UP GETTING FOLDED IN BEFORE YOU CALCULATE THE MILL RATE. AND SO, THEREFORE, ALL IT'S DOING IS HELPING YOU TO STEM OFF COUNCILLOR SCHREYER'S CONSTRUCTION INFLATION AND I WON'T SPEAK ABOUT THAT. BUT IN REGARDS SPECIFICALLY, I WANTED TO JUST MENTION THAT BECAUSE A LOT OF PEOPLE WHO PRESENTED HAVE THESE ASSUMPTIONS, BUT THEY DON'T LOOK AT HOW THE MILL RATE IS CALCULATED. SO, THEREFORE, THEY HAVE THIS CONCEPT OF HOW THINGS MAY OR MAY NOT WORK WITH THE CITY. AND BUILDING AND GROWING. IN TERMS OF THE 65-FOOT -- INSTEAD OF 60-FOOT FRONT. NOW, I'M HEARING A NUMBER THAT SAYS, WELL, I THINK THAT IT WAS 20,000 PROPERTIES. 6,000 OF WHICH MIGHT BE EXCLUDED AND HOW MANY UNITS THAT IS. SO THAT'S THE NEGATIVE SIDE, MADAM SPEAKER. THE POSITIVE SIDE IS THAT THERE'S STILL WHATEVER -- WHATEVER NUMBER -- I CAN'T REMEMBER THE EXACT NUMBERS. BUT THERE'S STILL -- THERE'S STILL A WHOLE BUNCH OF PROPERTIES THAT QUALIFY AS COUNCILLOR MAYES HAS POINTED OUT. AND THEY'LL BE BUILDING NEW UNITS THAT NEVER EXISTED AS WELL. AND I AM SUPPORTING THIS. BECAUSE I AM NOT SEEING IT -- I'M SEEING IT FROM THE OTHER SIDE. AND, UM, THERE'S ISSUES OF THE DRIVEWAY AND IT WAS ACCURATELY DEPICTED OF WHAT HAS BEEN DONE REGARDS OTHER ZONING CHANGES BY COUNCILLOR MAYES. AND SO I DON'T KNOW WHAT THE CALCULATION IS A POSITIVE, BUT I'M GOING TO JUST LEAVE YOU WITH THIS THOUGHT. WHEN WE PRESENT THESE NUMBERS AND YOU SAY, OH, THESE UNITS -- NO. THE ISSUE REALLY IS THE DEVELOPERS WHO WANT TO DO THIS ARE GOING TO HAVE TO BUY THE PROPERTY, MADAM SPEAKER. THE PROPERTIES, OKAY, IF THERE'S A FAMILY ALREADY IN A 60-FOOT PROPERTY, AND IT'S STILL YOUNG, WELL, NOTHING IS GOING TO HAPPEN THAT I WILL KNOW FOR QUITE A LONG TIME. I HEARD A LOT OF COUNCILLOR TALKING ABOUT GENERATIONAL PASSING DOWN OF HOMES, MADAM SPEAKER. SO WE ALL NEED TO REMEMBER THIS. WHAT WE'RE CHANGING HERE IS A LONGER TERM TO MEET HOUSING ISSUES IN THE CITY. PLACES TO LIVE. SO I -- YOU KNOW, THE OTHER THING IS THAT PEOPLE KEEP TALKING ABOUT, WELL, YOU HAVE A RIGHT TO FOUR. REMEMBER THAT THERE'S A CONDITIONAL USE. MR. LÓPEZ HAS A PROPERTY -- 50-BY-150. IT DOESN'T -- YOU KNOW, AS A RIGHT HE CAN BUILD FOUR, BUT IT'S GOING TO GET A CONDITIONAL USE AND BUILD NINE. AND THE SAME COULD BE SAID FOR A LOT, 50-BY-100 AND THAT'S 5,000 SQUARE FEET AND YOU DO THE CALCULATION AND YOU GET WHAT YOU GET, RIGHT? BUT -- SO, ANYWAY, IN PARTICULAR TO THIS ONE, I'M VOTING FOR IT BECAUSE ANYTHING THAT HAPPENS WITH THOSE KIND OF PROPERTIES, ESPECIALLY THE WIDER ONES I -- I HAVE A 60-FOOT LOT THOUGH I HAVE A BACK LANE SO IT'S NOT A BIG DEAL. BUT NOBODY IS MOVING OUT OF THAT HOUSE ANYTIME SOON, OKAY?

SO THERE'S NOT -- THE EFFECTS OF THIS ZONING CHANGE THAT WE'RE DOING -- IT'S MORE OF A LONGER TERM. YEAH, THERE MIGHT BE SOME DEVELOPERS READY TO GO ON SOME LOTS. BUT, ANYWAY -- SO JUST SPECIFICALLY ON THIS ONE, I AM NOT UNDERSTANDING REALLY A PROBLEM. AND REMEMBER THAT THERE WILL BE VARIANCES AND THERE'S A REALLY GOOD MOTION COMING UP. THERE WILL BE

APPLICATIONS FOR VARIANCES, BECAUSE NOT EVERY PROPERTY IS EXACTLY 35 FRONT FOOT. RATHER, THEY'RE 33, OR THEY'RE 30. WHATEVER THEY ARE. THEY'RE CLOSE. 10% LIMITATION, RIGHT? SO IT WILL BE VARIANCE REQUESTS. 10% TO 60 FEET IS 6.5 FEET, IS IT NOT? OR 6 FEET? SO 6 FEET, WHICH IS MORE THAN THE EXTRA FIVE FEET THAT IS BEING ADDED. SO, YOU KNOW -- ANYWAY, I'LL BE SUPPORTING IT.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. NEXT SPEAKER COUNCILLOR LUKES.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: CAN I DO A QUESTION OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE?

MADAM SPEAKER: YES.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: CAN YOU HAVE A MORE ACCURATE NOTE, AND BY CHANGING IT TO 65-FEET, APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY UNITS WOULD BE ELIMINATED? LOTS, LOTS, SORRY. THANK YOU.

MADAM CHAIR THROUGH YOU TO COUNCILLOR LUKES. THIS IS A REDUCTION TO 16,899 UNCONSTRAINED LOTS FROM THE REMAINING CONDITIONS IN THE DRAFT ZONING AMENDMENT. WHILE THE SPONSOR OF THIS MOTION POINTED OUT THAT THIS MOTION WOULD STILL ALLOW SMALLER UNITS, THE
FEDERAL -- [INTERJECTIONS]

A POINT OF ORDER ON FACTUAL STATEMENT. IT WAS SAID THAT INCLUDED DRIVEWAY AND BACK LANE SERVICE LOTS SO IT ISN'T AFFECTING --

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU FOR THE POINT. ARE THESE NUMBERS SIMILAR TO WHAT JOHN KIERNAN PRESENTED?

THEY HAVE BEEN REFINED THROUGH THE -- I DON'T THINK THAT MR. KIERNAN WAS LOOKING AT ALL OF THE DATA IN FRONT OF HIM.
MIKE HILL IS STILL ON THE PHONE ON ZOOM IF WE WOULD LIKE TO BRING HIM IN.

MADAM SPEAKER: THE MOTIONS HAVE BEEN CIRCULATED BASED ON WHAT THE COUNCIL HEARD EARLIER. YEAH.

OKAY.

MADAM SPEAKER: BUT WE CAN LET YOU -- PARDON? WE DO WANT TO HEAR --

MR. KIERNAN SAID THAT HE'D DEFER TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE AT THIS POINT BECAUSE HE WASN'T SURE OF HIS NUMBERS.

MADAM SPEAKER: JUST A SECOND. COUNCILLOR WYATT, COUNCILLOR WYATT, NO. [INTERJECTIONS]

MADAM SPEAKER: START AGAIN. YES. YOU HAVE FURTHER INFORMATION ON THE QUESTION THAT WAS ASKED? GO AHEAD.

THAT'S RIGHT. WHEN MR. KIERNAN WAS ANSWERING THAT QUESTION EARLIER TODAY, HE SAID THAT HE WOULD LIKE TO DEFER IT TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE BECAUSE HE WAS NOT SURE OF HIS ANSWER. SO BECAUSE IT IS 16,899 UNCONSTRAINED LOTS, WE DO FEEL LIKE THIS IS A MATERIAL CHANGE THAT LIKELY WOULD IMPAIR THE FEDERAL FUNDING.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU.

[INDISCERNIBLE] LIKE A SIGNIFICANT CHANGE?

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR MAYES, YOU WILL HAVE YOUR OPPORTUNITY IN JUST A MOMENT. COUNCILLOR LUKES.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: OKAY. AND JUST RECAP FOR ME PLEASE ON THE INFO GUIDELINES FOR, UM, FOURPLEXES ON -- WHAT IS THE DRIVEWAY WIDTH? YOU SAID THAT IT WAS 10 ON A 50?

SORRY. IT'S -- THE DRIVEWAY WIDTH FOR A FRONT LOADED FOURPLEX -- SO A DRIVEWAY COMING IN FROM THE FRONT -- IS A MINIMUM WIDTH OF 60-FEET IN THE CURRENT PROPOSAL BEFORE YOU FROM THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

MADAM SPEAKER: OKAY. THANK YOU. COUNCILLOR BROWATY, IT'S THE SAME LINE OF QUESTIONING, DO YOU MIND IF WE FINISH THIS. COUNCILLOR MAYES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: I DO HAVE A CLOSE SO I CAN WAIT -- MR. KIERNAN INDICATED A NUMBER OF LESS 4200 AND THE BALANCE -- SOME HAVE BACK LANES AND SOME DON'T. THAT'S ABOUT ALL WE CAN SAY. COUNCILLOR ALLARD'S NUMBERS, 40, THE NUMBER IN MY WARD WAS 500. AND IT MIGHT BE 6,000, THAT SEEMS PROBABLY A LITTLE HIGH. BUT 50 MORE, IT MIGHT BE BUT IT'S CERTAINLY NOT 16,000. AND MR. KIERNAN INDICATED THAT NUMBER INCLUDED THE PROPERTIES WITH BACK LANES. SO WE DON'T KNOW EXACTLY HOW MANY LOTS ARE AFFECTED BECAUSE THE MOTION SPEAKS ONLY TO PROPERTIES THAT HAVE FRONT DRIVEWAYS. SO I GUESS THAT IS A QUESTION.

MADAM SPEAKER: ANY FURTHER COMMENT FROM THE PUBLIC SERVICE?

NO. MY QUESTION IS ALSO I HAVE THREE STAFF THAT ARE ON ZOOM, BUT IF YOU'RE NOT GOING TO BRING ANY OF THEM IN, I WOULD LIKE THE ABILITY TO RELEASE THEM FOR THE DAY.

MADAM SPEAKER: WE CAN CERTAINLY BRING THEM IN IF WE CALL ON THEM.

WELL, I WAS JUST CALLING ON MR. HILL TO ANSWER THIS QUESTION, SHOULD YOU WANT HIM TO. BUT IF YOU DON'T WANT -- I HAVE MIKE HILL, AND DYLAN, AND HARRIS AND EVAN ALAN ON THE ZOOM MEETING WITH US AT THE MOMENT. AND I'D

BE DELIGHTED TO LET THEM GO IF THEY AREN'T GOING TO BE CALLED IN.

MADAM SPEAKER: NO ONE HAS ASKED THAT WE DIDN'T WANT TO HEAR FROM THEM. IF YOU WOULD LIKE THEM TO SPEAK WE'D LIKE TO HEAR FROM THEM.
COUNCILLOR ROLLINS.

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: IF WE'RE GOING TO CONTINUE THE HEARING TONIGHT AND THE PUBLIC SERVICE IN QUESTION ARE GOING TO BE NEEDED, AND THEY NEED TO STAY.

MADAM SPEAKER: NO ONE IS RELEASING THEM.

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: OKAY.

MADAM SPEAKER: NO ONE SAID THAT. OKAY.
COUNCILLOR -- MR. MAYOR RELATED TO THIS.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: YES, COUNCILLOR LUKE'S QUESTION PIQUED MY INTEREST. IF THERE'S SOMEONE IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE WITH CONFIDENCE THAT CAN CAN GIVE US AN ACCURATE NUMBER OF THE NUMBER OF 60-FOOT LOTS AND BY GOING TO 65 WOULD BE AFFECTED -- IN MY COMMENTS IT IS USING COUNCILLOR MAYES' NUMBER WHICH I THINK IS WOEFULLY LOW OF 6,000. IF THERE'S AN ACCURATE NUMBER, WE WOULD LIKE THAT NUMBER, PLEASE. I WOULD LIKE IT.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. HAZEL, IS SOMEONE READY TO ANSWER THAT?

YES, MIKE HILL IS READY TO JOIN US AND HE'S JOINING NOW.

TO CLARIFY, STARTING IN ZONED R1R2 OR RMFS, THERE'S 38,900 LOTS. WHEN YOU TAKE AWAY LOTS RELATED TO RESTRICTIONS ON RIVER ABUTTING AND THE STANDARD ROADWAY OR UNPAVED BACK LANES, YOU ARE LEFT WITH THE FIGURE OF 32,370. SO THAT'S THE FIGURE THAT WE HAVE BEEN DESCRIBING AS UNCONSTRAINED. 65-FEET WIDE, WE HAVE 19,693 TOTAL LOTS, AGAIN, ZONED R1 OR R2 OR RMFS AND I TAKE AWAY RESTRICTIONS YOU HAVE 15,466. SO THAT'S A DIFFERENCE OF 16,900. SO ROUND UP TO 17,000. THERE'S A COMMENT MADE ABOUT NUMBER OF LOTS WITH FRONT DRIVES, AND THAT'S A PRETTY SIMILAR NUMBER. YOU HAVE -- SORRY AT 60-FEET WIDE LOTS 31,200 LOTS. AGAIN, NO BACK LANES, FRONT DRIVES. AND THEN 65-FEET, THAT'S 15,667. SO THAT LEAVES YOU WITH A DIFFERENCE OF PRETTY SIMILAR -- I'M JUST ADDING THIS RIGHT NOW -- 15,500.

MADAM SPEAKER: OKAY. THANK YOU.

POINT OF ORDER.

MADAM SPEAKER: YES.

WE ARE DISCUSSING MOTION NUMBER ONE, ARE WE NOT?

MADAM SPEAKER: YES, WE ARE.

NOW MOTION NUMBER ONE IS VERY SPECIFIC. IT SAYS BE AMENDED BY DELETING 60-FEET AND REPLACING IT WITH CLAUSE 65. CAN YOU GIVE US A SIMPLE CALCULATION, MR. HILL, LIKE YOU THROW NUMBERS OUT AND NUMBERS ARE HARD TO CONTEMPLATE. WHAT IS THE PERCENTAGE IN TERMS OF THE OVERALL EFFECT --

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR WYATT, I WILL CALL YOU ON.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: OKAY, OKAY.

MADAM SPEAKER: ANYTHING ELSE ON THIS?

I HAD MY SUGGESTION OUT SINCE NOVEMBER SO WE HAD A PRESENTATION ON THE NUMBERS FOR FIRST TIME EARLIER TODAY AND THE NUMBERS NOW DRAMATICALLY INCREASED -- DRAMATICALLY HAVE INCREASED FROM WHAT MR. KIERNAN SAID WHICH WAS ABOUT 16,000 AND WE DON'T KNOW HOW MANY UPFRONT DRIVEWAYS OR NOT. SO NOW YOU'RE SAYING, MIKE, IT'S 31,000, AND THEY HAVE FRONT DRIVEWAYS THAT ARE 60-FEET OR MORE?

YES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: LET ME ASK YOU ANOTHER QUESTION, ACTUALLY. SO THE NUMBERS THAT I SAW THE OTHER DAY SAID THAT IF YOU GO TO 65-FEET WIDE, IT'S 19,693. WHAT IF YOU GO TO 66 FEET?

66 FEET, INSTEAD OF 65 FEET IS ALMOST A NEGLIGIBLE DIFFERENCE AND WE FOUND TWO LOTS CITY-WIDE THAT ARE 65-FEET AND NOT 66. SO IT DOESN'T MAKE A DIFFERENCE.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THIS IS INTERESTING BECAUSE MY SON DROVE LAST NIGHT AND WE FOUND, WITH THE CITY'S OWN DATA, 25 SUCH LOTS IN ST. VITAL.
65 TO 66-FEET FRONT LOADED. MAY I -- MADAM CLERK, WOULD YOU LIKE PLEA TO GO THROUGH THEM. 25 DARWIN AND 14 DARWIN AND 132 ADIN AND 22 FAULKNER. SO ON AND ON I COULD GO. IN MY WARD ALONE WITH MY SON DRIVING AROUND AND VERIFYING THEM BECAUSE ONE HAD A SIDE THING -- THERE'S 26 PROPERTIES BETWEEN 65-FEET AND 66-FEET. THAT'S YOUR DATA. THAT'S YOUR DATA THAT YOU GAVE ME. THAT IS YOUR DATA, SAYING THAT 65 TO 66-FEET AND WE VERIFIED IT ON THE CITY ASSESSMENT AND YOU'RE SAYING THAT WE ONLY FOUND TWO CITY-WIDE. SO I'M GOING TO SAY THAT MAYBE THE DATA THAT IS BEING HURLED AT US NOW AT THE LAST MINUTE -- WHICH COULD BE DEFINED AS NEW INFORMATION -- BUT, REGARDLESS, IT -- I APPRECIATE THE FEROCITY WHICH THIS PUBLIC SERVICE DISLIKES THIS MOTION -- I DO. BUT THERE'S AT SOME POINT WHERE ONE BEGINS TO

GET A LITTLE TESTY AND SAY, NO, THERE ARE MORE THAN TWO. DO YOU WANT TO GO THROUGH THEM, I HAVE 26 EXAMPLES OF LOTS BETWEEN 65 AND 66-FEET IN MY WARD ALONE THAT ARE FRONT LOADED. I'VE GOT TWO ON STERLING AVENUE ALONE. NOT TO MENTION ALL OF THESE OTHER ONES THAT I'VE JUST GIVEN YOU. NOT GRAVEL. SO, NO, I THINK THAT YOUR DATA IS FLAWED AND THAT'S WHAT I'M GOING TO SAY.
SO I APPRECIATE THE LAST-MINUTE CAMPAIGN. I HONESTLY DO. BUT THE NUMBERS AREN'T RIGHT. THE NUMBERS AREN'T RIGHT. LET'S JUST DEBATE THIS ON WHAT MR. KIERNAN SAID, I GUESS.

MADAM SPEAKER: OKAY. THANK YOU. ON THIS TOPIC, COUNCILLOR EADIE -- WELL, IS IT A DIFFERENT TOPIC OR THE SAME LINE OF QUESTIONING?

COUNCILLOR EADIE: A MOTION ON THE PUBLIC SERVANT TO PROVIDE -- [INDISCERNIBLE]

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR EADIE.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: MADAM SPEAKER, I WOULD LIKE TO PUT THE QUESTION IN REGARDS TO FRONT DRIVES -- A LOT OF FRONT DRIVES EXIST ALONG OUR RIVERS. AND CREEKS. AND SO THE QUESTION IS THAT WE HEARD A NUMBER OF HOW MANY PROPERTIES, REGARDING 50 FEET OR WE'LL GO 15. BUT HOW MANY OF THESE FRONT DRIVE PROPERTIES IN THE CITY ARE RELATED TO WHAT WE -- WHAT THE PUBLIC SERVICE HAS PUT IN THE ZONING TO -- YOU KNOW, TO PROTECT RIVERWAYS? DO YOU KNOW HOW MANY PROPERTIES THAT IS WITH FRONT DRIVES? I KNOW THAT -- I KNOW ALONG SCOTIA, MOST OF THE RIVER SITE PROPERTIES, THEY'RE PRETTY WIDE WITH FRONT DRIVEWAYS.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. MR. PELL, CAN YOU ANSWER THAT?

THAT IS LOTS THAT ARE RIVER ABUTTING THAT HAVE DRIVEWAYS. UNFORTUNATELY, I DON'T HAVE THAT FIGURE. WHEN YOU'RE WORKING WITH THE CITY-WIDE DATASETS IT BECOMES A LITTLE UNWIELDY AND HARD TO WORK WITH, SO, UNFORTUNATELY, I DON'T HAVE THAT FIGURE.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: , I HAVE A FOLLOW-UP QUESTION, MADAM SPEAKER, AND I APPRECIATE WHAT HE'S SAYING AND THAT'S WHY I ASKED THE QUESTION. LOOKING AT CITY-WIDE, SO IN MANY CASES, WHAT THE NUMBER OF PROPERTIES -- LIKE THE CALCULATION AND THE NUMBER OF PROPERTIES THIS WOULD AFFECT WITH THE ADDING OF THE 15 FEET TO 65 WITH THE FRONT DRIVEWAY, SO THERE'S NO WAY OF ACTUALLY GIVING US ACCURATE FACTUAL DATA. IS THAT CORRECT?

MADAM SPEAKER: HAZEL BORIS TO RESPOND.

I THINK THAT IT IS IMPORTANT TO SAY THAT RIVER ABUTTING LOTS WERE ALREADY SUBTRACTED OFF OF ALL OF THE DATA THAT MR. PILL JUST SHARED.
SO THE RIVER ABUTTING LOTS AND THE CHIPPED SEAL ROADS AND DITCHES AND

THE SUB-STANDARD BACK LANE, ALL OF THOSE WERE SUBTRACTED OUT BEFORE HE STARTED TALKING ABOUT THOSE NUMBERS. AND THE NUMBERS THAT HE WAS JUST SHARING IS WHAT HE'S CALLING UNCONSTRAINED LOTS.
SO LOTS THAT WE HAVEN'T ALREADY CONSTRAINED FROM THE DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY. BECAUSE OF ALL OF THESE OTHER THINGS WHICH ARE IN THAT NOVEMBER 23RD, 2023 MOTION.

MADAM SPEAKER: OKAY, THANK YOU. MOVING ON, MAYOR GILLINGHAM.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: THANK YOU. JUST FOR CLARITY ON THIS, THERE'S CURRENTLY A NUMBER OF LOTS THAT ARE ELIGIBLE FOR FOURPLEX CONSTRUCTION AT 60 FEET WITH NO BACK LANE. IF THAT NUMBER WAS MOVED TO 65-FEET WITH NO BACK LANE, HOW MANY LOTS WOULD, THEREFORE, BE INELIGIBLE FOR FOURPLEX CONSTRUCTION? BY GOING FROM 60 TO 65 FEET IN LOT WIDTH?

MADAM SPEAKER: MR. PELL, WILL YOU ANSWER THAT?

APPROXIMATELY 15,500, ACCORDING TO OUR DATA.

MADAM SPEAKER: OKAY. THANK YOU.

AND THEY ARE 60 TO 65 FEET WIDE AND HAVE A FRONT LANE.

MADAM SPEAKER: QUESTION?

COUNCILLOR EADIE: I WILL HAVE MORE QUESTIONS BUT WE'RE SHOWING TWO LOTS CITY-WIDE BETWEEN 65 AND 66.

MADAM SPEAKER: I NEED TO GO BACK TO COUNCILLOR BROWATY.

COUNCILLOR JEFF BROWATY: THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER.
MY WHOLE CONCERN WITH THIS WHOLE EXERCISE IS THE FACT THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS TELLING US WITH SUCH A PRESCRIPTIVE TOP-DOWN APPROACH, THIS IS THE PROGRAM THAT YOU HAVE TO DO TO GET ANY OF THIS MONEY. WINNIPEG IS NOT TORONTO. WINNIPEG IS NOT REGINA AND WINNIPEG IS NOT MISSAGA OR ANY OTHER CITIES IN CANADA AND IT'S EXCEPTIONALLY PRESCRIPTIVE. HOWEVER, AS WE FOUND OUT THAT DIFFERENT CITIES ARE DOING DIFFERENT THINGS AND WE'RE MAKING A WHOLE BUNCH OF EXCEPTIONS HERE. WE ARE
[CAPTIONER SWITCH]
BUT WE DON'T KNOW IF THEY'RE GOING TO ACCEPT THIS. HOW FRUSTRATING IS THAT? WE'RE NEGOTIATING WITH THE WIZARD OF OZ HIDDEN BEHIND A SCREEN IN SOME FARAWAY PLACE. I'M REALLY CONCERNED WITH HOW OTTAWA IS DEALING WITH THIS, AND YOU KNOW WHAT, I'M GOING TO VOTE FOR THIS. I AGREE, WE NEED DENSITY, WE NEED TARGETS AND IF THERE'S GOING TO BE STRINGS ATTACHED, IT'S RELATED TO NUMBERS. WE CAN DO IT ALONG MAJOR ROADS, WE

CAN DO IT WHERE IT'S PERMITTED. IF YOU LOOK AT MY VOTING RECORD OVER THE LAST COUPLE OF YEARS, I'VE LOST FRIENDS BECAUSE I'VE VOTED FOR DEVELOPMENT. VERY ODD THAT I'VE NOT SUPPORTED THE PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT AND DIFFERENT TYPES OF PROJECTS THROUGHOUT THE CITY AND IN NORTH KILDONAN, AS WELL. I'M GOING TO SUPPORT THIS. I KNOW MY COLLEAGUE COUNCILLOR MAYES HAS SPENT A LOT MORE TIME DELVING INTO THIS, AND IF THIS IS THE FINAL HUMP THAT GETS HIM OVER THIS, THAT'S HUGE. I'M ON BOARD. THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU, COUNCILLOR BROWATY. NEXT IS COUNCILLOR WYATT.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: THANK YOU. I JUST WANT TO KIND OF BRING EVERYBODY BACK TO HOW THIS ALL STARTED. THIS WAS ALL SUPPOSED TO BE ABOUT AFFORDABLE HOUSING. THERE WAS A BILL PASSED IN 2019 THAT ASKED ABOUT STRATEGY WHERE THE DECLARATION WAS MADE, HOUSING IS A RIGHT. DIGNIFIED HOUSING IS A RIGHT FOR EVERY CANADIAN, BUT WHAT DID THEY DO? NOTHING. THEY SAT ON THEIR HANDS UNTIL EVERYBODY STARTED TALKING ABOUT IT. AND THEN, THEY CAME UP WITH A PLAN AND A PROGRAMME WHICH FRANKLY WE KNOW FROM OUR OWN EXPERIENCE AS A MUNICIPALITY OVER THE PAST 20, 25 YEARS THAT WILL DO ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO HELP HOUSING. DID THE POLICE STABILIZE? DID LAND PRICES ACTUALLY GO DOWN? WE SUPPLIED MORE, WE THOUGHT THAT THE MARKET ACTUALLY HAD? NOT ONE BIT. IT WENT THE EXACT OPPOSITE WAY, AND THERE IS GROWING DISENCHANTMENT WITH NOT JUST THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BUT EVERY GOVERNMENT. I'LL GET INTO THAT. WE NEED -- I BELIEVE IN A MIXED ECONOMY, AND I WAS INSPIRED BY JASON'S FATHER WHO TRIED TO TAKE THIS ISSUE ON IN THE 1970S, AND I'LL GET ONTO THAT, TOO, WHEN I SPEAK TO THE MOTIONS, WHAT THEY TRIED TO DO THEN TO BRING DOWN PRICES AND OUT-OF-CONTROL PRICES FOR SERVICE LAND AND HOUSING DEVELOPMENT. THE BIGGEST THING THAT CONCERNS ME HERE TODAY WAS THAT IF THIS WAS TRULY BROUGHT FORWARD AND IT'S ALL ABOUT AFFORDABLE HOUSING, WHY DID WE JUST SIMPLY BLINK? I HEARD ALL OF THESE NICE THINGS, WE'RE GOING TO TAKE STEPS, WE'RE GOING TO MAKE A CALL TO THE FEDERAL MINISTER. YESTERDAY, WE GOT NEWS THAT THE FEDERAL HOUSING FUNDS, THE ONE ENTITY THAT IS MAKING POSSIBLE TO BUILD DEEP AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS IN THIS CITY JUST GOT THE RUG PULLED OUT FROM UNDERNEATH OF IT BY THIS NEW GOVERNMENT. NOW -- AND IT WAS ANNOUNCED THAT -- BY THE WAY, I'VE GOT TO
SAY THAT I'M HAVING TROUBLE
SPEAKING BECAUSE OF THE AIR FROM THE SMOKE THE LAST FEW DAYS.

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR, DO YOU WANT TO TALK TO THE MOTION? THERE'S LOTS OF TIME TO TALK TO THE MAIN ITEM.

COUNCILLOR WYATT: I JUST WANT TO SAY THIS -- I JUST WANT TO SAY THIS. LET'S GET BACK TO THE ISSUE IN A WE SHOULD BE TALKING ABOUT, WHICH I THOUGHT WAS AFFORDABLE HOUSING. IT WOULD BE NICE IF WE CAN PUT ALL THIS ON HOLD UNTIL THE FINANCE MINISTER REFINANCED THE FEDERAL HOUSING FUND NOW

AND THEN WE'LL TALK ABOUT YOUR DEMANDS ON US TO REZONE THE ENTIRE DAMN CITY. ANY WAY, THAT'S ALL.

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR LUKES, FOLLOWED BY COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: I AGREE WITH COUNCILLOR BROWATY. WHETHER IT'S 6,000, 10,000,
16,000, I THINK 6,000 AND ABOVE IS A MATERIAL DIFFERENCE, AND I DON'T THINK I WOULDN'T ACCEPT THAT CHANGE IF I WAS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LOOKING FOR MORE HOUSING SO I WON'T BE SUPPORTING THIS MOTION.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU.
COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW FOLLOWED BY
COUNCILLOR ROLLINS.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: I'M GOING TO GET RIGHT INTO THE ISSUE THAT -- WELL, I'M NOT SURE THAT EVERYBODY IS THINKING ABOUT IT. THIS WHOLE PROPOSAL I THINK IS A PRETTY HARSH, ESPECIALLY FOR MY NEIGHBORHOOD LAST TIME I DID THIS. I GOT DEFEATED QUITE HANDILY LAST TIME I WAS THERE, AND I WAS DEFEATED UNDER THE SAME GUISE IF WE DON'T DO THIS, WE'RE GOING TO LOSE ALL THE FUNDING, AND WE'RE BACK HERE NOW.SOMETIMES WE SAY YES, OH, YOU CAN'T TOUCH ANYTHING, COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW, BECAUSE WE'RE GOING TO LOSE THE FUNDING, AND NOW WE'RE SITTING HERE SPECULATING ON WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL OR WILL NOT DO, AND I WILL SAY MY VOTE, IF THERE WAS NO MONEY ON THE TABLE, I WOULDN'T BE VOTING FOR MOST OF THIS. I WOULDN'T BE, SO MY QUESTION IS WE'RE GOING TO HAVE A NUMBER OF MOTIONS TODAY, AND THE ADMINISTRATION AND SOME OF US WILL SPECULATE THAT THE FEDS ARE NOT GOING TO LIKE THIS ONE, AND WE'RE JEOPARDIZING THE FUNDING, BUT THE QUESTION IS HOW DO WE KNOW IF WE ARE OR NOT? WILL THERE BE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AFTER WE DO THIS MOTION TO WEIGH-IN AND SAY HEY, WE ACTUALLY ARE GOING TO GIVE YOU A DEFINITIVE IF YOU DO THIS AND PASS THIS IN SECOND AND THIRD READING, YOU ARE GOING TO LOSE YOUR FUNDING. YOU KNOW, THAT WOULD BE VERY NICE TO KNOW THAT. NONE OF US ARE SPECULATING AT THE TABLE.SOME OF US ARE PRO-INFILL, SOME OF US ARE PROCOMMUNITY, NIMBY, YIMBY, WHATEVER YOU WANT. AS THE MAYOR POINTED OUT, WE'RE NOT A RICH CITY. WE NEED THIS MONEY, AND IT IS BLACKMAIL, BUT IT IS WHAT IT IS, AND WE ACCEPTED THE BLACKMAIL WHEN WE SAID YES TO THE FOUR [INDISCERNIBLE]. WHATEVER YOU WANT IT TO BE, THEY'RE HANGING A VERY HARD CARROT OVER OUR HEAD OR STICK. WHEN THIS IS ALL THROUGH, AND WHEN THE BY-LAW IS ACTUALLY APPROVED OR NOT WITH THE AMENDING MOTIONS WILL THERE BE BEFORE THE SECOND READING THE ACTUAL FEDERAL GOVERNMENT COMES BY AND SAYS YES, WE'RE ACTUALLY OKAY WITH ALL OF THIS OR NO, WE'RE GOING TO PULL YOUR FUNDING? WILL THERE BE AN ACTUAL TIME FOR THAT?

MADAM SPEAKER: OKAY. IS THAT A QUESTION FOR PUBLIC

SERVICE?

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: YES.

MADAM SPEAKER: OKAY.
CASEY?

WE HAD A CALL THIS MORNING. I'LL JUST REITERATE THE LANGUAGE THEY DID USE FOR COUNCIL'S
CONSIDERATION. ANY CHANGES THAT HAVE A
MEANINGFUL MATERIAL WEAKENING OF THE PROPOSAL THAT THEY APPROVED IN FEBRUARY WHICH IS WHAT WAS
SHARED WITH THE PUBLIC THROUGH OPEN HOUSES AND THROUGH COUNCIL IN MARCH AT THE EARLIEST WOULD BE PROBLEMATIC TO GO FURTHER, AND THEY WERE SPECIFIC ON LOT WIDTHS. WE PUSHED THEM FOR WEEKS ON 60 FEET, WE PUSHED THEM VERY HARD WITH A LOT OF SCIENTIFIC BACKING AND GOING BACK TO COUNCIL'S DIRECTION FROM THE NOVEMBER MOTION THAT WE ARE MOVING FROM THE INFILL GUIDELINES AS A BASIS. ANYTHING FURTHER I THINK IS PUSHING THE BOUNDARIES, AND THEY WERE QUITE CLEAR, AND I WILL JUST ADD AFTER YOU GO THROUGH AMENDMENTS AND VOTE, WHETHER IT'S TONIGHT OR TOMORROW, WE COULD TRY TO GO BACK TO CMHC. THEY HAVE NOT SAID HOW QUICKLY THEY COULD REVIEW THINGS. THEY HAVE SAID, DEPENDING HOW QUICKLY IT WOULD BE ON THE FINAL VOTE AND OUR ANNUAL OUTCOME AT THE END OF THE YEAR IS OUR ASSESSMENT AND THEY COULD PROVIDE AN OUTCOME POTENTIALLY.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: SO AS A FOLLOW-UP, THEN, I'M HEARING YOU SAY THAT NO MATTER WHAT WE'RE GOING TO HAVE TO GUESS IF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT LIKES THIS OR NOT.SURE, THEY SAY IT'S PROBLEMATIC. I'M NOT SURE WHAT "PROBLEMATIC"

MEANS BECAUSE I'M VERY TROUBLED BY THEIR MANDATE BUT I MAY HAVE TO VOTE FOR IT. I KNOW LAST TIME IN THE 44 WE GOT A VERY STRONG LETTER FROM THE MINISTER, VERY STRONG LETTER, SAYING YOU MUST DO THIS,SO YOU'RE SAYING WE COULDN'T GET THAT AGAIN? I'M SURE THAT CMHC AND THE MINISTER ARE WATCHING THIS RIGHT NOW, LUCKY HIM AND HER, THEY'RE ALL HAVING A GOOD TIME WATCHING THIS.SO WE DO A FIRST READING, AND THEN THEY WOULDN'T BE ABLE TO COME BACK AND GIVE US A DEFINITIVE READING -- DIDN'T THEY RAISE THIS IN WINDSOR WITH THE FORCE AND THEY LOST ALL OF THEIR FUNDING? BUT THIS IS NOT A NUANCE AND IT'S NOT THE SAME THING.

MADAM SPEAKER: QUESTION, COUNCILLOR.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: SO THERE IS NO OPPORTUNITY THAT WE'RE GOING TO GET AN ANSWER BEFORE THIS THIRD READING?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. LACEY?

THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER. I DON'T THINK WE'RE GOING TO GET A DEFINITIVE ANSWER. I THINK THE INFORMATION THAT WASSHARED THIS INFORMATION WILL PROBABLY BE REITERATED WHEN WE GO BACK. THAT'S WHAT THEY SAID. THEY HAVE NOT SAID YES OR EVEN NO.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: THAT'S EVEN WORSE.

ARE WE SPEAKING TO THE CLAUSE? MOTION ONE?

MADAM SPEAKER: YES. NEXT, WE HAVE COUNCILLOR ROLLINS FIRST ON THE SPEAKER'S LIST.COUNCILLOR ROLLINS?

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: THROUGH YOU, MADAM SPEAKER, THE HOUSING CONTRIBUTE PLAN DETAILS IN PART THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND AND THE REQUIREMENTS FOR REPORTING. IN IT, THERE ARE TARGETS, AND IN IT, WE HAVE TO PASS THIS. TAKEN TOGETHER WITH WHAT PRIME MINISTER CARN CARN HAD TOLD S.C.M. THAT IN TERMS OF TONE I TEND TO AGREE THAT GIVEN, YOU KNOW, THAT IF YOU SHINE A LIGHT ON POLICY ACROSS THE COUNTRY THE -- THE SHEER AMOUNT -- NUMBER OF 60 FEET VERSUS 65 FEET IS JUST A BIT OF AN ABERRATION TO THE POLICY THAT HAS BEEN ADOPTED ACROSS THE COUNTRY.SO IF 60 TO 65 MATTERS, THEN
SURELY THE PUBLIC SERVICE PERHAPS THEN SAW TO LOOK AT THE LOTS THAT WOULD BE IN SCOPE IF 35 FEET WAS THE RULE OR IF 50 FEET WAS THE RULE. I THINK IF WE WERE AT A 55-FOOT SORT OF VARIANCE BETWEEN, YOU KNOW, WHAT OTHERS HAVE ADOPTED, THAT WOULD BE A MATERIAL DIFFERENCE, BUT -- BUT BETWEEN 60 AND 65, I'M NOT SURE I'M IN THE SAME VICINITY AS OTHER FOLKS BECAUSE I DON'T SEE MUCH OF A DIFFERENCE, SO I DON'T KNOW IF THEY DID THAT NUMBER, 35 TO, LIKE, LIKE, A 35-FOOT LOT.SO, YOU KNOW, I GUESS A QUESTION, AND THEN, AND THEN IS THE REVERSE TRUE?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. HAZEL BORIS TO RESPOND?

SURE, MADAM CHAIR. WE HAD DONE THAT ANALYSIS INITIALLY WHEN WE WERE MAKING THE CASE TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT THAT IN WINNIPEG, YOU KNOW, COUNCIL'S SUPPORT WOULD PROBABLY BE A LITTLE BIT LARGER THAN 35. I THINK IT'S ALSO -- I'M SORRY.

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: I WASN'T CLEAR ON THAT STATEMENT. LIZZY SAID IN HER STATEMENT THAT THEY PRESENTED SCIENTIFIC DATA, SO WHAT WAS THE COUNCIL CONNECTION ON THE 35 FEET? I'M UNCLEAR ON WHAT MS. BORIS MEANT?

MADAM SPEAKER: HAZEL?

WE DID PROVIDE A WIDE VARIETY OF SCIENTIFIC SUPPORTS. I DON'T HAVE THAT ANALYSIS RIGHT IN FRONT OF ME BUT I DO HAVE THE NUMBER THAT'S DIRECTLY TO

THE COUNCILLOR'S QUESTION WHICH THE TOTAL NUMBER OF LOTS IN WINNIPEG THAT ARE 35 FEET WIDE OR LARGER IS 151,629. I ALSO THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO SAY THAT WHEN THE COUNCILLOR WAS LOOKING AT THE -- AND CITING THE LOT WIDTHS BASED ON TAX ASSESSMENT DATA, THAT THAT IS MEASURED JUST AT THE FRONTLINE -- PROPERTY LINE, AND SO THAT'S FOR TAX ASSESSMENT PURPOSES, AND SO THE FRONTAGE TAX IS BASED ON THAT. BUT IF THE PROPERTY IS EITHER A CURVILINEAR PROPERTY, AND WE HAVE MANY OF THOSE NEAR THE RIVERS AND THE CREEKS, THOSE ARE ASSESSED AT THE PROPERTY OR 50 FEET BACK IN THE PROPERTY, SO YOU CAN'T JUST LOOK AT THE TAX ASSESSMENT FRONTAGE DATA TO GET THE LOT WIDTH. THIS IS WHY WE FIRST COULDN'T ANSWER COUNCILLOR MAYES' QUESTIONS REGARDING WHAT THE LOTS WERE. EVEN THOUGH WE'RE MOVING TOWARD THAT NOW WE ONLY HAVE AN OLDER LESS FUNCTIONAL TOOL OF GEOMEDIA, SO WE ACTUALLY HAD TO CONTRACT WITH A CONSULTANT WHO USES ESRI TO MAKE THOSE MORE COMPLICATED CALCULATIONS, AND THAT'S WHY THIS DATA WAS SOMETHING MORE COMPLICATED, BUT THE ANSWER IS 151,629.

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR ALLARD?

COUNCILLOR ALLARD: NO, I'LL --

MADAM SPEAKER: OKAY.COUNCILLOR WYATT?

COUNCILLOR WYATT: OKAY. COUNCILLOR MAYES' MOTION AND ANYTHING ELSE IS VERY UNINTRUSIVE IN TERMS OF THE OVERALL THAT WE ARE SUPPLYING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RIGHT NOW THAT THEY HAVE REQUESTED, AND I JUST DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY, YOU KNOW, KIND OF DEBATING HOW MANY ANGELS COULD SIT ON THE HEAD OF A PIN KIND OF THING. THEY ARE -- THEY ARE GETTING MASS SWATHS OF LAND IN OUR CITY REZONED SO THAT THE VERY DEVELOPMENT INDUSTRY THAT THE LAST 25 YEARS BASICALLY IN THIS COUNTRY THAT HAS FUNDED OUR ELECTIONS AND THE FEDERAL ELECTIONS AND EVERY OTHER ELECTION, GO CHECK YOUR LIST [INDISCERNIBLE] ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING WHO DONATES TO OUR CAMPAIGN, LET'S BE HONEST HERE, THE FACT IS WE'RE MAKING TONNES OF LAND AVAILABLE FOR THE PROVIDE SECTOR DEVELOPERS. THE ONE THING THAT WE COULD HAVE GONE AFFORDABILITY, DEEP SEATED AFFORDABILITY WAS TO TIE IN THE A.H.F. MONEY THROUGH PROJECTS THAT WOULD BE FUNDED THROUGH THE NATIONAL HOUSING FUND. I SOUND LIKE A BROKEN RECORD.MAYBE I AM. THAT, BY THE WAY, WAS TAKEN AWAY YESTERDAY. PROJECTS THAT HAVE $5 MILLION, WHATEVER AMOUNT FROM A.H.F. THAT WERE TIED IN THAT PROGRAMME, ARE NO MORE. THEY CAN'T USE THAT MONEY FROM A.H.F. IF THEY DON'T HAVE THAT OTHER FUNDING.SO THE QUESTION HAS TO BE WELL, HOLD ON, THE FEDERAL MINISTER CAME HERE, AND WE NEGOTIATED IN GOOD FAITH, BUT YET IT'S KIND OF IRONIC, EH, HOW AFTER YOUR F.C.M. CONVENTION WHERE THE PRIME MINISTER WAS THERE, I BELIEVE, AND SPOKE TO ALL OF YOU, HOW ALL OF A SUDDEN IT WAS THE MONDAY RIGHT AFTER THE F.C.M. CONVENTION THAT SOME OFFICIAL FROM THE A.F.C. LET IT OUT THAT WE'VE TAKEN THE MONEY OUT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING FUND.

MADAM SPEAKER: OKAY.COUNCILLOR, WE'VE --

COUNCILLOR WYATT: ALL THE RESOLUTIONS THAT WE'RE BRINGING HERE, I'VE READ THEM ALL, AND IT'S NOT DOING ANYTHING WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS TRYING TO ACHIEVE, WHICH IS TO GET MORE MONEY TO THEIR POLITICAL FUNDERS BECAUSE IT'S REALLY NOT AFFORDABILITY. IF IT WAS --

MADAM SPEAKER: YOU'VE PUT YOUR COMMENTS ON THE RECORD, COUNCILLOR WYATT. WE'RE MOVING ON, AND COUNCILLOR MAYES IS CLOSING ON AMENDING MOTION ONE.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THANK YOU.COUPLE OF THINGS --

MADAM SPEAKER: OR NOT CLOSING BUT YOU INDICATED YOU WANTED TO SPEAK.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THANK YOU. FOR ALL OF YOU WHO HAVE WEIGHED IN, THANK YOU. IT'S BEEN A TONNE OF WORK. I WISH I'D BEEN GIVEN SOME OF THOSE NUMBERS AT SOME POINT IN THE WORK AND I COULD HAVE POINTED OUT HOW FLAWED THEY WERE. I'VE MANLY GONE THROUGH EVERY PROPERTY -- MANUALLY GONE THROUGH EVERY PROPERTY IN THE WARD THAT WERE OVER 35, AND THE NUMBERS ARE FRANKLY INCOMPREHENSIVE. I WILL WANT TO SIT DOWN WITH MIKE PILL, WHO I LIKE, AND WE'LL TRY AND SORT OUT THAT MYSTERY, AT LEAST. THAT'S THE MAP THAT WAS TABLED A FEW DAYS AGO. THERE ARE A LOT OF PLACES IN THECITY THAT HAVE PAVED LANES. NONE OF WHAT WE'RE DOING AFFECTS ALL OF THAT RED AREA. THAT'S STILL 50 FEET, OKAY? NONE OF THIS AFFECTED THE GRAVEL LANED AREAS, NONE OF THIS AFFECTS AREAS WITH CHIP SEAL. I TEND TO LIKE ALLARD'S SUBMIT OF 1800 LOTS CITYWIDE BUT PILL AND I WILL SIT DOWN AND HAVE A COFFEE AND TALK ABOUT IT ONE OF THESE DAYS. I DO KNOW THIS, WHICH IS WHEN YOU SAY, WELL, YOU'RE COSTING THE CITY 6,000 UNITS, WELL, IF YOU ACTUALLY LOOK IN THE HALF ANNUAL REPORT THAT THE CITY PREPARED WHICH I GOT THROUGH F.O.I., HERE IT IS, ESTIMATED NUMBER OF UNITS, MISSING MIDDLE, ESTIMATED NUMBER OF UNITS THE ISSUE WILL INCENTIVIZE IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS, 6,613. WE'RE WANTING TO INCENTIVIZE 6,000 UNITS OVER THE NEXT TEN YEARS. THAT'S WHAT I'LL SAY ABOUT THE NUMBERS -- YOU DID SAY IT WAS 6,000 UNITS -- I'LL WITHDRAW THAT, THEN. I WILL SAY THAT THE ESTIMATED NUMBER OF UNITS IS 6513 OVER THE NEXT TEN YEARS.SO TWO WORDS WITH WHICH I WANT TO END. ONE IS -- THEY'RE VERY DIFFERENT. ONE IS BOGEYMAN WHICH WAS USED YESTERDAY BY COUNCILLOR LUKES. DON'T WORRY ABOUT IT, ALL THIS FEAR ABOUT THE FOURPLEXES, IT'S A BOGEYMAN. OH, GREAT. THEN IT SHOULDN'T BE ANY WORRY ABOUT SHAVING DOWN THE NUMBER OF UNITS.85 DOWN TO 65 FEET, ONLY FOR HOMES THAT DON'T HAVE BACK LANES.SO MAYBE THAT'S NOT THE BOGEYMAN.MAYBE THE BOGEYMAN IS YOU'RE JEOPARDIZING THE 5500 LOTS. THAT SEEMS TO HAVE GONE THROUGH SAFELY.COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW MADE AN AMENDMENT. THAT SEEMS TO HAVE GONE THROUGH SAFELY. FINALLY, WE OURSELVES VOTED IN LAST YEAR TO GO UNDER THE HALF PROGRAMME FROM 25 FEET TO 40 FEET DIFFERENCE IF YOU HAVE A LANE, IF YOU DON'T HAVE A LANE FOR

SINGLE-FAMILY. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S ALREADY ACCEPTED THAT DIFFERENCE FOR SOME PROPERTY UNDER THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR, SO I'M NOT REALLY SURE THIS IS THE BIG GAMBLE. WE HEARD HOW HAVING THIS HEARING IN JUNE WAS GOING TO BE ALL TOO RISKY. WE'RE FINE. WE'LL GET THIS THING DONE BY JUNE 12. FRANKLY, IF THIS PASSES, I'LL PROBABLY SUPPORT THE OVERALL PACKAGE. THE FIRST WORD WAS "BOGEYMAN." THE SECOND AND THE MORE IMPORTANT WORD WAS "DISCRETION."COUNCILLOR ROLLINS, TO HER CREDIT, TOUCHED ON THIS, TO HAVE THE ACT AND THE MOTION PASSED LAST YEAR BOTH TALKED ABOUT COUNCIL HAVING DISCRETION, SO THE MOTION FROM LAST NOVEMBER TALKED ABOUT, WELL, IT'S ACTUALLY THE PRECEDING NOVEMBER. IT SAYS FOR LOT SPECIFICATIONS, COUNCIL WILL DETERMINE, COUNCIL. IT IS OUR RIGHT TO DETERMINE WHAT THE CORRECT INVESTIGATIONS ARE. I WOULD SUGGEST MOVING FROM 60 TO 65 FEET IS NOT A MATERIAL CHANGE. WE HEARD HOW THIS IS A MATERIAL CHANGE. WE'VE JUST EXEMPTED ALMOST 3,000 RIVER LOTS AND NOBODY BLINKED AN EYE. NOBODY SAID OH, THAT'S A MATERIAL CHANGE. NOBODY SAID OH, THAT'S -- THE STAFF AREN'T CREATING ANY SORT OF RISK HERE BY EXEMPTING 3,000 RIVER LOTS, SO WE HAVE THE DISCRETION. AND FINALLY, TO END, WHAT DOES THE HALF AGREEMENT SAY? WHAT DOES THE HALF AGREEMENT SAY? NOTHING IN THIS AGREEMENT WILL FETTER THE DECISION OR THE AGREEMENTS BY THE ELECTED COUNCIL. MADAM SPEAKER, I WOULD SUBMIT THIS HAS BEEN A LONG 18 MONTHS. IT'S NOT A RISKY CHANGE, IT'S A RESPONSIBLE CHANGE. IT REFLECTS SOME RESPECT FOR OUR EXISTING NEIGHBORHOODS, AND WE HAVE THE POWER TO MAKE THE DECISION.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. I'M GOING TO CALL THE VOTE ON AMENDING MOTION ONE. OKAY. CALLING THE QUESTION ON AMENDING MOTION ONE. ALL IN FAVOUR? OKAY. ALL IN FAVOUR, PLEASE RISE.

CLERK: COUNCILLORS ALLARD, BROWATY, CHAMBERS, DOBSON, EADIE, GILROY, MAYES, ORLIKOW, ROLLINS, WYATT, MADAM SPEAKER, COUNCILLOR SHARMA.

MADAM SPEAKER: OKAY. THOSE OPPOSED, PLEASE RISE.

CLERK: HIS WORSHIP MAYOR GILLINGHAM. COUNCILLORS LUKES, SANTOS.

CLERK: YEAS ONE, NAYS FOUR.

MADAM SPEAKER: OKAY. THE AMENDING MOTION PASSES. I'D LIKE TO TAKE A TWO-MINUTE RECESS.
STAY IN THE CHAMBER, PLEASE.
STAY IN THE CHAMBER, PLEASE.

MADAM SPEAKER: I'M GOING TO ASK EVERYBODY TO TAKE THE PACKET THAT THE CLERK HAS PRINTED OFF, TAKE IT TO YOUR OFFICE, PLEASE, AND THEY'LL ALSO BE E-MAILED TO US BUT DO KEEP YOUR PRINTED OUT COPIES. I'M GOING TO COME BACK ON THE LIVE STREAM AND WE'LL ADJOURN. COUNCILLOR EADIE? [INDISCERNIBLE].

MADAM SPEAKER: I CAN'T HEAR YOU.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: YEAH, OKAY.SO THERE'S NOTHING TOMORROW THATSAYS WE CAN'T BREAK FOR A LONGER LUNCH AND THINGS LIKE THAT?

MADAM SPEAKER: OKAY. WHY WOULD WE DO THAT?

COUNCILLOR EADIE: THE MAYOR HAS AN EVENT THAT I'M ATTENDING.

MADAM SPEAKER: OKAY. I HAD CHECKED IT WITH THE OFFICE AND A TYPICAL LUNCH IS FINE. I CHECKED IT WITH DESTINY AND THERE IS AN IMPORTANT ARTS EVENT OVER LUNCH. I DO WANT TO SAY WHEN WE DO HAVE A RECESS, TO BE RESPECTFUL OF THE RECESS AND COME BACK ON TIME. OTHERWISE, WE MAY START THE MEETING AND YOU'LL BE SURPRISED THAT YOU'LL BE OUT. LET'S COME BACK ON TIME WHEN WE HAVE OUR SHORT BREAKS, OKAY? LET'S BE RESPECTFUL OF ONE ANOTHER BECAUSE WE DO HAVE OTHER COMMITMENTS ON FRIDAY. IT WOULD BE NICE TO FINISH TOMORROW. OKAY. I'M GOING TO BRING IT BACK ON THE LIVE STREAM. I'LL CALL TO THE MAYOR TO CALL FOR ADJOURNMENT. BRINGING THE MEETING BACK TO ORDER AFTER A SHORT RECESS. THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR.

THE HON. SCOTT GILLINGHAM: THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER. I'D LIKE TO MOVE ADJOURNMENT OF THE MEETING UNTIL TOMORROW, JUNE 5, AT 9:30 TOMORROW MORNING.

MADAM SPEAKER: ALL IN FAVOUR? CONTRARY? CARRIED .MADAM CLERK, ROLL CALL, PLEASE.

CLERK: MADAM SPEAKER, COUNCILLOR SHARMA, MAYOR GILLINGHAM.

COUNCILLORS ALLARD, BROWATY, CHAMBERS, DOBSON, EADIE, GILROY, LUKES, MAYES, ORLIKOW, ROLLINS,
SANTOS, AND WYATT.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. MOTION CARRIED.
MEETING ADJOURNED.