Agenda – Appeal Committee – January 28, 2026

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Item No. 4 Appeal – Variance – 4820 Roblin Boulevard
(Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood Ward)
File DAV 217621A/2025D [c/r DASZ 45/2025 & DCU 217664A/2025D]

Appeals were received against the decision of the Assiniboia Community Committee to approve a Variance on "the land" as follows:

1. For the maintenance of an accessory open parking area on Proposed Lot 2 to permit:

   A. an east side yard of 1.5 feet (0.45 metres) instead of 4 feet (1.21 metres)

   B. 102 parking spaces instead of 116 spaces

subject to the following conditions:

1. That the Variance Order shall come into force and effect upon the coming into force and effect of the zoning by-law for the subject land under File DASZ 45/2025.

2. That, if any Variance granted by this order is not established within two (2) years of the date hereof, this order, in respect of that Variance shall terminate.

DECISION MAKING HISTORY:

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

On January 14, 2026, the Appeal Committee adjourned the public hearing to its meeting on January 28, 2026 at 9:30 a.m. in the Council Building at 510 Main Street.

COUNCIL DECISION:

On December 18, 2025, Council concurred in the recommendation of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated December 4, 2025, and approved the subdivision and rezoning of the subject land under File DASZ 45/2025, to an “RMF-M” Residential Multi-Family-Medium District and “R1-L” Residential Single-Family-Large District.

Agenda – Appeal Committee – January 28, 2026

File:	DAV 217621A/2025D
Appellant(s):	Francisco Roman Castillo Amanda Rismani Bradley Smith Alison Sommerfield Melissa Tennant Jessie Thiessen Tyler Thiessen
Applicant:	McGowan Russell Group Inc. (Jackie Wilkie)
Premises Affected:	4820 Roblin Boulevard
Legal Description:	PCL A, C PLAN 48002 48 ST C, hereinafter called "the land"
Property Zoned:	"R1-L" (Residential Single-Family-Large District) Proposed "RMF- M" (Residential Multi-Family-Medium District) and "R1-L" (Residential Single-Family-Large District)
Nature of the Application:	To vary the Proposed "RMF- M" and "R1-L" Development and Design Standards of the Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 200/2006 as follows: For Proposed Lot 2: 2. For the maintenance of an accessory open parking area to permit: A. an east side yard of 1.5 feet (0.45 metres) instead of 4 feet (1.21 metres); B. 102 parking spaces instead of 116 spaces.
Exhibits Filed:	1. Order DAV 217621/2025D dated November 25, 2025 2. Notice of Appeal filed by Bradley Smith, received December 2, 2025 3. Notice of Appeal filed by Tyler Thiessen, received December 4, 2025 4. Notice of Appeal filed by Amanda Rismani, received December 8, 2025 5. Notice of Appeal filed by Francisco Roman Castillo, received December 9, 2025

Exhibits Filed (continued):

6. Notice of Appeal filed by Jessie Thiessen, received December 11, 2025
7. Notice of Appeal filed by Alison Sommerfield, received December 11, 2025
8. Notice of Appeal filed by Melissa Tennant, received December 12, 2025
9. Notification of Public Hearing dated December 29, 2025
10. Manitoba Status of Titles 3273050/1, 2816470/1
11. Letter of authorization dated April 17, 2024, from 6032281 Manitoba Association Inc., Warren Denis Thompson, Janis Eleanor Pregnall, Kathryn Alene Anderson, Gordon Gibson and Doreen Sheila Barton, as trustees of the Charleswood Congregation of the United Church of Canada to McGowan Russel Group
12. Confirmation from the Zoning and Permits Administrator that the subject property may be posted in substitution for newspaper advertising
13. Traffic Study dated April 4, 2025
14. Plans, Sheets 1 to 8 inclusive, for File DAV 217621/2025D dated September 2, 2025
15. Report from the Urban Planning Division dated November 10, 2025
16. Communication dated January 2, 2026 from Eunice Samuels in support of the appeal
17. Communication dated January 3, 2026 from Bradley Smith in support of the appeal
18. Communication dated January 4, 2026 from Amanda Rismani in support of the appeal
19. Communication dated January 5, 2026 from Sheri-Lynn McNamara in support of the appeal
20. Inspection Report
21. Communication dated January 9, 2026, from Keith Merkel in opposition to the appeal
22. Communication dated January 9, 2026, from Susan Russell in opposition to the appeal
23. Communication dated January 9, 2026, from Michael Wilson in opposition to the appeal
24. Communication dated January 9, 2026, from Rebecca Scott in support of the appeal
25. Communication dated January 9, 2026, from Warren Thompson in opposition to the appeal
26. Communication dated January 9, 2026, from Eric Jensen in opposition to the appeal

Exhibits Filed (continued):

27. Communication dated January 9, 2026, from Margaret Gibson in opposition to the appeal
28. Communication dated January 9, 2026, from Darcia Albrechtsen in opposition to the appeal
29. Communication dated January 10, 2026, from Kelly Thompson in opposition to the appeal
30. Communication dated January 10, 2026, from Kevin Nichols in support of the appeal
31. Communication dated January 10, 2026, from Joan Cormie in support of the appeal
32. Communication dated January 10th, 2026, from Heather MacKenzie in support of the appeal
33. Communication dated January 10, 2026, from Wanda Stranc in support of the appeal
34. Communication dated January 10, 2026, from Nicholas and Penny Masniuk in support of the appeal
35. Communication dated January 10, 2026, from Jim Cannons in support of the appeal
36. Communication dated January 10, 2026, from Don Trueman in support of the appeal
37. Communication dated January 10, 2026, from Deanna Trueman in support of the appeal
38. Communication dated January 10, 2026, from Colin Nichols and Candace Ellis in support of the appeal
39. Communication dated January 11, 2026, from Robyn Musgrove in support of the appeal
40. Communication dated January 11, 2026, from Andrew Musgrove in support of the appeal
41. Communication dated January 11, 2026, from Robert Kato in support of the appeal
42. Communication dated January 11, 2026, from Toby Elson in support of the appeal
43. Communication dated January 11, 2026, from Janet Goddard in opposition to the appeal
44. Communication dated January 11, 2026, from Jane Murray in opposition to the appeal
45. Communication dated January 11, 2026, from Marianna Legat in support of the appeal
46. Communication dated January 11, 2026, from Lorrie Martindale in opposition to the appeal
47. Communication dated January 11, 2026, from Monika Franz-Lien in opposition to the appeal

Exhibits Filed (continued):

48. Communication dated January 11, 2026, from William Trimble in opposition to the appeal
49. Communication dated January 11, 2026, from Grant Buchanan in opposition to the appeal
50. Communication dated January 11, 2026, from Gary Fee in support of the appeal
51. Communication dated January 11, 2026, from Danial Lukinuk in support of the appeal
52. Communication dated January 11, 2026, from Ashley Koss in support of the appeal
53. Communication dated January 11, 2026, from Andrew Passalis in support of the appeal
54. Communication dated January 12, 2026, from Leonie Stranc in support of the appeal
55. Communication dated January 12, 2026, from Tom Evans in support of the appeal
56. Communication dated January 12, 2026, from Jackie Wilkie in opposition to the appeal
57. Communication dated January 12, 2026, from Steini Hibbert in support of the appeal
58. Communication dated January 12, 2026, from Gail Hibbert in support of the appeal
59. Communication dated January 12, 2026, from Janice and Larry Hamilton in opposition to the appeal
60. Communication dated January 12, 2026, from John Oldham in opposition to the appeal
61. Communication dated January 12, 2026, from Greg Docker in support of the appeal
62. Communication dated January 12, 2026, from Ross Taylor in support of the appeal
63. Communication dated January 12, 2026, from Anne Burns in opposition to the appeal
64. Communication dated January 12, 2026, from Lynne Couture in support of the appeal
65. Communication dated January 12, 2026, from Gordon Gibson in opposition to the appeal
66. Communication dated January 12, 2026, from Virginia Cail in opposition to the appeal
67. Communication dated January 12, 2026, from Barbara Cannons in support of the appeal
68. Communication dated January 13, 2026, from Bruce Macdonald in opposition to the appeal

Exhibits Filed (continued):

69. Communication dated January 13, 2026, from Shauna Link in support of the appeal
70. Communication dated January 13, 2026, from Melissa Tennant in support of the appeal
71. Communication dated January 13, 2026, from Doreen Barton in opposition to the appeal
72. Communication dated January 13, 2026, from Robert Barton in opposition to the appeal
73. Communication dated January 13, 2026, from William Grassick in support of the appeal
74. Communication dated January 13, 2026, from Lesley Cavanagh in support of the appeal
75. Communication dated January 13, 2026, from Robert Campbell in opposition to the appeal
76. Notice of Adjournment dated January 15, 2026
77. Communication dated January 20, 2026, from Leonie Stranc in support of the appeal
78. Communication dated January 19, 2026, from Wanda Stranc in support of the appeal

The Winnipeg Public Service to advise that all statutory requirements with respect to these appeals have been complied with.

Moved by Councillor

That the report of the Winnipeg Public Service be taken as read.

Moved by Councillor

That the receipt of public representations be concluded.

Moved by Councillor

That in accordance with Subsection 247(3) of The City of Winnipeg Charter, the Variance,

(a) ☐ is consistent ☐ is not consistent
with Plan Winnipeg, and any applicable secondary plan;

(b) ☐ does not create ☐ does create
a substantial adverse effect on the amenities, use, safety and convenience of the adjoining property and adjacent area, including an area separated from the property by a street or waterway;

(c) ☐ is ☐ is not
the minimum modification of a zoning by-law required to relieve the injurious effect of the zoning by-law on the applicant's property; and

(d) ☐ is ☐ is not
compatible with the area in which the property to be affected is situated.

Supporting Reasons:

Moved by Councillor

That the appeal(s) be allowed / denied and the decision of the Assiniboia Community Committee be / not be concurred in.

Moved by Councillor

That Variance Order DAV 217621/2025D be confirmed / cancelled

Moved by Councillor

That the public hearing with respect to these appeals be concluded.

Exhibit "15" referred to in File DAV 217621A/2025D

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Title: DAV 25-217621/D – 4820 Roblin Boulevard

Issue: For consideration at the public hearing of a Variance associated with the creation of two (2) separate lots

Critical Path: Assiniboia Community Committee

AUTHORIZATION

Author	Department Head	CFO	CAO
R. Galston, MCP	n/a	n/a	

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Urban Planning and Design Division recommends **approval** of the application to vary the "R1-L" development and design standards of Winnipeg Zoning By-law 200/2006 as follows:

1. For the maintenance of an accessory open parking area on Proposed Lot 2 to permit:
    A. an east side yard of 1.5 feet (0.45 metres) instead of 4 feet (1.21 metres);
    B. 102 parking spaces instead of 116 spaces.

Subject to the following condition(s):

1. That the Variance Order shall come into force and effect upon the coming into force and effect of the zoning by-law for the subject land under File DASZ 45/2025.
2. That, if any Variance granted by this order is not established within two (2) years of the date hereof, this order, in respect of that Variance shall terminate.

REASON FOR THE REPORT

- The applicant is proposing to subdivided the subject property and requires Variances to the standards of the *Winnipeg Zoning By-Law*.
- This report provides information regarding the subject application's compliance with *The City of Winnipeg Charter*, section 249.

FILE/APPLICANT DETAILS

FILE:	**DAV 25-217621/D**
RELATED FILES:	DASZ 45/2025, DCU 25-217664/D
COMMUNITY:	Assiniboia Committee
NEIGHBOURHOOD #:	2.614 (Eric Coy)
SUBJECT:	To vary the "proposed RMF-M" and "R1-L" development and design standards of Winnipeg Zoning By-law 200/2006 as follows: a) For the maintenance of an accessory open parking area on Proposed Lot 2 to permit: a) an east side yard of 1.5 feet (0.45 metres) instead of 4 feet (1.21 metres); b) 102 parking spaces instead of 116 spaces.
LOCATION:	4820 Roblin Boulevard
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	PCL A & C PLAN 48002 WLTO IN RL 48 PARISH OF ST CHARLES
APPLICANT:	Jackie Wilkie (McGowan Russell Group, Inc.) 825 St. Joseph Street Winnipeg, MB R2H 3A8
OWNER:	Trustees of Charleswood United Church 4820 Roblin Boulevard (C/O Chairman of Trustees) Winnipeg, MB R3R 0G6

HISTORY

N/A

DISCUSSION

CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL

Pursuant to Section 247(3) of *The City of Winnipeg Charter*, an application for a Variance with respect to a property may be approved if the Variance:

(a) is consistent with *Plan Winnipeg* and any applicable secondary plan;

(b) does not create a substantial adverse effect on the amenities, use, safety and convenience of the adjoining property and adjacent area, including an area separated from the property by a street or waterway;

(c) is the minimum modification of a zoning-by-law required to relieve the injurious effect of the zoning by-law on the applicant's property; and

(d) is compatible with the area in which the property to be affected is situated.

SITE DESCRIPTION

- The subject site is located on the south side of Roblin Boulevard, at the corner of Roblin and Dieppe Road. It is in the Eric Coy Neighbourhood of the Charleswood – Tuxedo – Westwood Ward.
- The subject site encompasses three (3) separate properties which have a combined size of approximately 4.71 acres (205,272 square feet). These properties are:
    - 4820 Roblin Boulevard, which contains Charleswood United Church, a place of worship that has been at this location since 1960. An associated hall was constructed in 2008. A parking area with 102 parking stalls is currently located to the rear of the building.
    - 4814 Roblin Boulevard, which contains a one-storey single-family dwelling constructed in 1928.
    - 4724 Roblin Boulevard, which contains a two-storey single-family dwelling constructed in 1962.
- The subject site is located within the Established Neighbourhoods – Recent Communities policy area of the *Complete Communities Direction Strategy 2.0*.
- The subject site is currently zoned “R1-L” Residential Single-Family (Large).



Figure 1: Aerial photo of subject site and surrounding area *(flown 2024)*

SURROUNDING LAND USE AND ZONING (See Figure 2)

North: Roblin Boulevard, then single-family residential uses zoned “R1-L” Residential Single-Family (Large).

South: Single-family residential uses zoned “R1-L” Residential Single-Family (Large).

East: Single-family residential uses zoned “R1-L” Residential Single-Family (Large).

West: Single-family residential uses zoned “R1-L” Residential Single-Family (Large), and Dieppe Road then commercial uses zoned “C2” Commercial Corridor.



Figure 2: Zoning of the site and surrounding area.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- The applicant proposes to create two (2) separate lots, Lot 1 and Lot 2. Lot 1 will contain a new multi-family residential development, while Lot 2 will contain the existing place of worship building. Greater information on the proposal for each lot is as follows:

Proposed Lot 1

- Proposed Lot 1 is to be approximately 114,998 square feet (2.64 acres) in size.
- The applicant proposes to rezone proposed Lot 1 to the “RMF-M” Residential Multi-Family (Medium) district in order to allow a multi-family building.
- The proposed multi-family building will be six (6) storeys tall, with a height of 69.5 feet to the top of the roof parapet.
- 132 dwelling units are proposed.
- A total of 200 accessory parking stalls are to be provided, which is a ratio of 1.51 parking stalls per dwelling unit. This ratio slightly exceeds the minimum number of parking stalls required by the Winnipeg Zoning By-law (198 parking stalls).
- The proposed parking includes:
    - 136 surface stalls;
    - 64 underground stalls;
    - 20 visitor parking stalls
- A total of 100 bicycle parking spaces are provided, including 40 secure indoor spaces. This exceeds the Zoning By-law requirements for bicycle parking, which is 27 spaces.

- Access to proposed Lot 1 is to be taken from a bi-directional private approach from Roblin Boulevard.

Proposed Lot 2

- Proposed Lot 2 is to be approximately 90,169 square feet (2.07 acres) in size.
- On proposed Lot 2, the applicant proposes to maintain the existing place of worship building and use. No building expansion or alterations to the place of worship building are proposed as part of this application.
- A total of 102 accessory parking stalls are proposed to be located on Lot 2.
- The existing bi-directional private approach from Dieppe Road will be maintained. No new private approaches to Lot 2 are proposed.
- No shared vehicle access between proposed Lot 1 and 2 is proposed.

Associated Subdivision and Rezoning (DASZ) and Conditional Use (DCU) Applications

- The proposed development is the subject of an associated Subdivision and Rezoning (DASZ) application concerning the creation of two (2) lots and the rezoning of Lot 1 to allow multi-family residential uses. Please refer to the Administrative Report under file no. DASZ 45/2025 for more information on the Subdivision and Rezoning of the subject site.
- The proposed development is also the subject of an associated Conditional Use (DCU) application concerning the maintenance of a place of worship use on an "R1" lot. Please refer to the Administrative Report under file no. DCU 25-217664/D for more information on this Conditional Use.

ANALYSIS AND ISSUES

OURWINNIPEG 2045

- *OurWinnipeg 2045* is the City's long-range development plan. Per *OurWinnipeg 2045*, the subject site is identified as an Established Neighbourhood – Recent Community. The policy for this area states:

  6.16 Established Neighbourhoods
  - *Designate Established Neighbourhoods within the Urban Structure, representing lands that will accommodate additional growth in a context-sensitive manner, while promoting the efficient use of land, cost-effective municipal servicing, enhanced housing choice and affordability, and conservation of green infrastructure and heritage resources and districts, as defined in* Complete Communities.

COMPLETE COMMUNITIES DIRECTION STRATEGY 2.0

- The *Complete Communities Direction Strategy 2.0* supports *OurWinnipeg 2045*, and has statutory authority as a secondary plan. The strategy guides land use and development in Winnipeg.
- As noted above, the subject property is classified as an Established Neighbourhoods – Recent Communities policy area under *Complete Communities 2.0*. Key policies include:

  Goal 1

1.0 Encourage compatible residential development within Established Neighbourhoods to build more Complete Communities and align with the City's residential intensification target.

Policies

1.1 Encourage residential development that positively contributes to neighbourhood character while expanding housing options for residents in a manner that is sensitive and complementary to existing development.

1.2 Increase the population within Established Neighbourhoods to contribute to the physical renewal and revitalization of older neighbourhoods.

1.5 Support up to mid-rise residential development in Established Neighbourhoods that is compatible with neighbourhood context.

1.6 In the absence of a secondary plan guiding the local development of an Established Neighbourhood, intensification should be guided by a number of factors to ensure compatible development, including:

- *a. Applicable City-endorsed policies or guidelines;*
- *b. Existing zoning of the property and adjacent properties;*
- *c. Characteristics of the immediately surrounding built form including building mass, height, lot coverage, setbacks, and layout;*
- *d. Surrounding uses and their characteristics including residential density and the intensity of commercial and other non-residential uses;*
- *e. Characteristics of the lot, including whether it is a corner lot, a larger lot than is typical for the neighbourhood, or the shape of the lot;*
- *f. The supporting street network (ex. local, collector, or arterial streets) and the street network's ability to support proposed development;*
- *g. The supporting transit, pedestrian and active transportation network; and*
- *h. The supporting water, wastewater, and land drainage infrastructure and capacity to accommodate a proposed development or ability to make the required upgrades necessary to accommodate a proposed development.*

1.14Mid-rise residential uses will generally be accommodated on arterial roads where compatible with adjacent land uses and where they can be conveniently served with transit and local commercial amenities, and in consideration of the factors listed in Policy section 1.6.

Goal 2

2.0 Design new development in Established Neighbourhoods to a high standard of urban design and construction to ensure new development adds value to public and private urban spaces to create a sense of place and civic pride.

Policies

2.3 Encourage, where contextually suitable, the location of multi-family buildings at or near the front and corner side property lines to create a pedestrian orientation that is respectful of the area context. Use setbacks to provide landscaping, front courtyards for individual units or other amenities that support the pedestrian environment, building design and relationship to the street.

2.4 Encourage the use of high-quality, energy efficient, and durable exterior building façade materials.

2.5 Encourage a variety of architectural styles.

2.6 Encourage building design to include a range of architectural features that create visual interest and positively contribute to the visual aesthetics of the street and neighbourhood.

2.9 Buildings with multi-unit residential uses should be designed to support pedestrian activity and reinforce the public realm through thoughtful use of architectural features which may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- *a. Window placement that supports passive surveillance;*
- *b. Unit entrances with direct access to the street;*
- *c. Front porches;*
- *d. Balconies;*
- *e. Awnings;*
- *f. Lighting; and*
- *g. Height of primary entrances*

2.10 Discourage building designs that orient the back of the building to the street.

2.11 Multi-family residential or mixed-use buildings that front public streets and contain internal parking areas should provide a main entrance facing the public street.

2.12 New development should respect and complement the existing character of the built form of surrounding properties.

2.14 Avoid buildings that create long blank walls facing public streets.

2.15 Encourage the use of architectural features to articulate building walls in order to mitigate the impact of new building mass.

2.21 Site design should take cues from the character of the neighbourhood or street and should mitigate the potential for land use conflict with adjacent properties that have different scales, densities and uses. Parking location (motor vehicle and bicycle), vehicular access, servicing elements, building placement and landscaping treatment will be important design elements to ensure context-sensitive design.

2.22 Create or reinforce compact, pedestrian-oriented urban development patterns by ensuring the siting, form and scale of new development has a strong relationship to the street, public spaces and amenities in a way that is consistent with neighbourhood context.

Goal 3

3.0 Ensure all communities provide a diversity of housing options and meet resident life-cycle housing needs. More specifically, policies that relate to the subject proposal are as follows:

Policies

3.1 Encourage a variety of housing types and tenures within Established Neighbourhoods to meet life-cycle housing needs and affordability ranges.

Goal 5

5.0 Ensure Established Neighbourhoods accommodate a variety of public and institutional uses to meet a broad range of community needs.

General policies

5.1 Support public and institutional uses where residential neighbourhoods are not well served by these amenities or are areas of higher need. These uses may include day cares, places of worship, elementary schools, libraries, community centres, public parks, and recreation facilities.

5.2 The expansion or creation of larger scale or regional public and institutional uses will generally be directed towards arterial roads or at locations where they can be community focal points. Larger scale institutional uses should generally be located adjacent to complementary uses in order to mitigate the potential for land use conflicts.

CITY OF WINNIPEG ZONING BY-LAW 200/2006

- Per the dimensional and design standards of the Winnipeg Zoning By-law, accessory parking areas in the "R1" zoning districts must have minimum side yard setbacks of four (4) feet. The applicant proposes an east side yard setback of 1.5 feet. As such, a Variance is required.
- Per the parking requirements of the Winnipeg Zoning By-law, a total of 116 parking stalls are required for the existing place of worship use. The applicant proposes to provide a total of 102 parking stalls for the place of worship use. As such, a Variance for fewer parking stalls is required.

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCES

Side Yard Setback

- The Urban Planning and Design Division recommends approval of this Variance because the reduced side yard setback is on the east lot line, adjacent to the proposed multi-family development (Lot 1).
- It would be difficult to meet the side yard setback requirements on the place of worship lot (Lot 2) without either:
    - Modifying the associated subdivision, thereby reducing space on proposed landscaping for parking stalls, drive aisles, or landscaping; or,
    - Reducing the number of parking stalls or landscaped setbacks on the west side yard.
- Plans submitted show a solid wood fence approximately six (6) feet in height will be constructed along the shared lot line between proposed Lot 1 and Lot 2 in the area of this reduced setback.

Number of Parking Stalls

- This reduction is 14 fewer parking stalls than what is required under the Winnipeg Zoning By-law and represents a decrease of 12 percent from this requirement.
- The Urban Planning and Design Division recommends approval of this Variance because the proposed 102 parking stalls for the place of worship use (Lot 2) is the same

number of stalls this place of worship has had since 2008. Given that the place of worship and associated hall have been serviced by 102 parking stalls for the past 17 years, it is expected that 102 stalls will continue to adequately serve the place of worship and associated hall.

REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

In the context of Section 247(3), the Urban Planning and Design Division recommends **approval** of the application for the following reasons:

(a) is consistent with *Plan Winnipeg* and any applicable secondary plan;

In that, *the Variances will enable the applicant to build a new multi-family development and maintain an existing institutional use in a manner consistent with* Complete Communities Direction Strategy 2.0.

(b) does not create a substantial adverse effect on the amenities, use, safety and convenience of the adjoining property and adjacent area, including an area separated from the property by a street or waterway;

In that, *the reduced side yard has an impact on the two proposed Lot 1 and 2 only, and the proposed number of parking stalls is the same as what has been on the site since 2008.*

(c) is the minimum modification of a zoning-by-law required to relieve the injurious effect of the zoning by-law on the applicant's property; and

In that, *the Variances will enable the applicant to develop the site in a manner consistent with* Complete Communities Direction Strategy 2.0

(d) is compatible with the area in which the property to be affected is situated.

In that, *the reduced side yard has an impact on the two proposed Lot 1 and 2 only, and the proposed number of parking stalls is the same as what has been on the site since 2008.*

CONSULTATION

In preparing this report there was internal consultation with: N/A

OURWINNIPEG 2045 POLICY ALIGNMENT

6.16 Established Neighbourhoods

"*Designate Established Neighbourhoods within the Urban Structure, representing lands that will accommodate additional growth in a context-sensitive manner, while promoting the efficient use of land, cost-effective municipal servicing, enhanced housing choice and affordability, and conservation of green infrastructure and heritage resources and districts, as defined in* Complete Communities."

WINNIPEG CLIMATE ACTION PLAN ALIGNMENT

Strategic Opportunity #4: Facilitate Compact, Complete Development and Increase Density

- **Key Direction 4.1:** *Increase strategic infill development that provides access to and capitalizes on existing and planned corridors with frequent transit service*

WINNIPEG POVERTY REDUCTION STRATEGY ALIGNMENT

Consideration was given to whether this report connects to any of the specific Goals and Objectives in the *PRS* and it was determined the *PRS* is not applicable to this specific report.

SUBMITTED BY

Department:	Planning, Property and Development
Division:	Urban Planning and Design
Prepared by:	Robert Galston, MCP
Date:	Wednesday, November 10, 2025
File No.	DAV 25-217621/D

Exhibit “14” referred to in File DAV 217621A/2025D





4820 AND 4816 ROBLIN BOULEVARD
L1.1 - UPDATED CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN ENLARGED

AUGUST, 2025
SCALE 1:250

DEVELOPMENT EXAMINATION BRANCH
THIS PLAN IS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL
IN CONNECTION WITH DAV 03-217621/D
SHEET 2 OF 8
APPLICANT (SGD.)
DEV. EXAM.
DATE SEP 02 2025



DEVELOPMENT EXAMINATION BRANCH
THIS PLAN IS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL
IN CONNECTION WITH DAV28-217621D
SHEET # 3 OF 8
APPLICANT (SGD.)
DEV. EXAM.
DATE SEP 02 2025

1 LEVEL 00 - BASEMENT PARKING PLAN
NTS

N

PRELIMINARY DRAWING ONLY
NOT TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION
(BEFORE YOU BUILD DRAWING IS FINAL)

BLDG architecture office inc.
604 Osborne Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada, R3L 2B9
T: 1 204 417 6884
E: info@bldgoffice.com

PROJECT
ROBLIN APARTMENTS
WINNIPEG MB
DRAWN KS REVD KS PROJECT NO. 2024_49
DATE 05 JUN 2025 DRAWING NO.
SCALE AS NOTED A00



DEVELOPMENT EXAMINATION BRANCH
THIS PLAN IS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL
IN CONNECTION WITH DW25-217621D
SHEET # 4 OF 8
APPLICANT (SGD.)
DEV. EXAM.
DATE RCD 0 2 2025

1 LEVEL 01 - MAIN FLOOR PLAN
1/8"

PRELIMINARY DRAWING ONLY
NOT TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION
(ALWAYS REFER DRAWING AS FINAL)

BLDG architecture office inc.
694 Osborne Street Winnipeg, Manitoba Canada, R3L 2B9
T. 1 204 417 6804
E. info@bldgoffice.com

PROJECT ROBLIN APARTMENTS
WINNIPEG MB
DRAWN KS REVD KS PROJECT NO. 2024_49
DATE 05 JUN 2025 DRAWING NO. A01
SCALE AS NOTED



DEVELOPMENT EXAMINATION BRANCH
THIS PLAN IS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL IN CONNECTION WITH DAV05-217621/D
SHEET # 5 OF 8
APPLICANT (SGD.)
DEV. EXAM.
DATE SEP 0 2 2025

1 LEVEL 02-06 PLAN
NTS

PRELIMINARY DRAWING ONLY
NOT TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION
(REMOVE WHEN DRAWING IS FINAL)

BLDG architecture office inc.
604 Osborne Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada, R3L 2B9
T: 1 204 417 6804
E: info@bldgoffice.com

PROJECT
ROBLIN APARTMENTS
TRANSFER NO.
DRAWN KS REVD KS PROJECT NO. 2024_49
DATE 05 JUN 2025 DRAWING NO.
SCALE AS NOTED A02



1 EAST ELEV
AS NOTED

2 WEST ELEV
AS NOTED

N

DEVELOPMENT EXAMINATION BRANCH
THIS PLAN IS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL
IN CONNECTION WITH DAV 25-217621D
SHEET # 6 OF 8
APPLICANT (SGD.)
DEV. EXAM.
DATE SEP 02 2025

PRELIMINARY DRAWING ONLY
NOT TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION
(REMOVE WHEN DRAWING IS FINAL)

BLDG architecture office inc.
694 Osborne Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada, R3L 2B9
T: 1 204 417 0884
E: info@bldgoffice.com

PROJECT ROBLIN APARTMENTS
DRAWN KS REVD KS PROJECT NO. 2024_49
DATE 05 JUN 2025 DRAWING NO. E01
SCALE AS NOTED



1 SOUTH ELEV
AS NOTED



1 NORTH ELEV
AS NOTED

DEVELOPMENT EXAMINATION BRANCH
THIS PLAN IS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL
IN CONNECTION WITH D4U25-217621ID
SHEET # 7 OF 8
APPLICANT (SGD.)
DEV. EXAM.
DATE SEP 02 2025

PRELIMINARY DRAWING ONLY
NOT TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION
(REMOVE WHEN DRAWING IS FINAL)

BLDG
architecture office inc.
684 Osborne Street
Winnipeg, Manitoba
Canada, R3L 2B9
T: 1 204 417 6804
E: info@bldgoffice.com

PROJECT: ROBLIN APARTMENTS
DRAWN: KS REVD: KS
DATE: 05 JUN 2025
SCALE: AS NOTED
PROJECT NO.: 2024_49
DRAWING NO.: E02


1 CONCRETE SIDEWALK
L1.0 N.T.S.
2 THICKENED CONCRETE EDGE
L1.0 N.T.S.
3 CONCRETE SIDEWALK RAMPS
L1.0 N.T.S.
4 BICYCLE RACK ON CONCRETE SIDEWALK
L1.0 N.T.S.
PLAYMOBIL
5 1800mm (6') HT WOOD SCREEN FENCE
L1.0 N.T.S.
6 GARBAGE ENCLOSURE
L1.0 N.T.S.
DEVELOPMENT EXAMINATION BRANCH
THIS PLAN IS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL
IN CONNECTION WITH DMV25-217421 / D
SHEET # 8 OF 8
APPLICANT (SGD.)
DEV. EXAM.
DATE SEP 0 2 2025
4820 AND 4816 ROBLIN BOULEVARD
L3.0 - DETAILS
JULY, 2025
SCALE 1:25

Exhibit “8” referred to in File DAV 217621A/2025D

From:
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2025 2:41 PM
To: CLK-Appeals <clk-appeals@winnipeg.ca>
Cc:
Subject: Appeal: DAV 217621/2025D and concerns

Appeal
Attn: City Clerk, City of Winnipeg
Care of: Appeal Committee
Susan A. Thompson Building
Main Floor, 510 Main St.
Winnipeg, MB R3B 1B9
CC to . L Cowan, Mayor Gillingham, Councillor Duncan, Premier Kinew, MLA Kathleen Wood, MP Doug Eyolfson

Appeal: DAV 217621/2025D
File: DASZ 45/2025
To Whom It May Concern,
I am writing to formally appeal the proposed parking lot development on the east side of the property. I wish to express my concerns regarding the use of the lot and the implications of the development as permitted. I respectfully ask for consideration of the following grounds:

---

1. Under Section (b)

The decision states that the development *“does not create a substantial adverse effect”* on neighbouring amenities, safety, use, or convenience.
With respect, I disagree. The information presented at the hearing clearly highlighted several significant impacts:

- **A serious safety hazard** posed by the proposed boulevard cut-through on Roblin;
- **Traffic volumes that exceed the safe capacity** of the current road infrastructure;
- **Potential reduction in property values** for adjacent homes.
- **A lack of other infrastructure in the area.**

These concerns are substantial and, from my perspective, were not adequately weighed in the decision.

---

2. Under Section (d)

The development was deemed “compatible” with the surrounding neighbourhood.

However, the proposed scale and function are **not consistent** with the established character and capacity of the area. Even nearby businesses along Roblin operate with multiple access points and significantly lower vehicle volumes. The proposed development does not align with the existing neighbourhood pattern.

Although I understand that the zoning change itself is not eligible for appeal, I would like to express my frustration and experience with this process.

Concerns Regarding the Hearing Process

This was my first experience participating in a public hearing, and I entered the process with the belief that our community's input would meaningfully influence the outcome. Only today did I learn that the hearing decision itself is not appealable, which adds to the confusion and frustration felt by many residents.

Several issues with the process deserve mention:

- **Inadequate communication and advertising.** An initial post more than a year ago mentioned an open house by councillor Duncan, but no further updates—including the hearing date or instructions for submitting comments—were shared publicly by Councillor Duncan on social media.
- **Confusion upon arrival.** Security staff provided conflicting directions, of which room to go to.
- **Agenda order and delays.** Despite a clearly anticipated large turnout, the matter was listed third on the agenda.
    - Many attendees—both in support and opposition—waited over eight hours. For many, the time of arrival to departure was 10 hours.
    - Facilities were limited, no canteen was available, and people incurred significant parking costs (I personally paid $50 due to repeated extensions).
    - Seniors, families, and residents who took time off work waited for hours; some were forced to leave before speaking due to medical needs, medical appointments, childcare responsibilities, or parking time limits to name just a few.
    - As a constituent I would have liked to have heard all of the presentations both for and against it.

Despite these challenges, **community presentations were thoughtful, well-researched, and deeply sincere**, addressing:

- Traffic and public safety concerns, including input from a paramedic;
- Environmental impacts and local wildlife;
- Generational ties to affected properties;
- Comparisons to other developments, demonstrating clear incompatibilities.

Given the volume and seriousness of the concerns presented, it was surprising and disheartening that the zoning bylaw was approved without any caveats or conditions to mitigate the risks raised.

Throughout the hearing, the emphasis appeared to be focused primarily on density—particularly in comments from Councillor Lukes—without addressing the barriers already faced by communities.

Broader Infrastructure and Public Safety Concerns

I understand the need for responsible growth and development. However, many residents struggle to reconcile the pursuit of increased density with the current strain on essential services. Our hospitals, schools, emergency services, and infrastructure are already operating at or beyond capacity.

As a recent victim of a home robbery, I experienced firsthand the limitations facing our police services. Our district—covering 43% of the city—had only seven patrol cars available. It is difficult for residents to understand how population increases can continue without proportional investment in public safety and basic services.

Before approving further intensification, a **comprehensive review of area infrastructure**—including roads, emergency response capacity, schools, and healthcare—should be conducted to ensure that neighbourhoods remain safe, functional, and resilient.

Closing

I do not expect unanimous agreement on this matter. However, I do believe constituents deserve a **fair, respectful, and transparent process** where residents' concerns are genuinely considered and acknowledged.

Thank you for taking the time to review this appeal. I submit it with respect and with sincere hope that the issues identified will receive thoughtful consideration.

Melissa Tennant

Exhibit “7” referred to in File DAV 217621A/2025D

Charleswood Development Appeal
4820 Roblin Boulevard

To whom it may concern,

I am in opposition of the development. I am a resident of 38 years in Charleswood, 32 years of which on Dieppe.

- We built a **new** sign for Charleswood “The Suburbia", showcasing this neighbourhood's iconic view. With this development, the look would be extinguished.
- The Green Space- which is the site of this development, takes away the joy of nature to all residents, wildlife, and Dieppe students. This space is also used for academic lessons.
- The safety concerns are being overlooked. It is a very busy area and is known for many accidents (i.e. the intersections of Roblin/Dieppe and Grant/Roblin).
- I understand the need for more space to live but as Bill Clement always said that this area needs to be kept for Green Space. He made it clear no development was possible.
- As a resident of , the reasons for the catch basins and drainage is a major problem as it will be in my personal yard.
- What is the fence they are planning to build along my 250 ft on the north side of my house?
- The lightning at the church parking lot is already an issue. With the added lights this will impact both the Buckingham and Dieppe residents.

In conclusion, I understand the reasoning of the building for seniors but the size and structure need to be modified. The safety for the elementary students needs to be prioritized, the traffic influence needs to be addressed in more ways, and surrounding nature needs to be preserved as much as possible. The space **should be used** but for a proper universally enjoyed space. The proposed condominium plans are great but not for this location.

Sincerely,
Alison Sommerfield

Exhibit “6” referred to in File DAV 217621A/2025D

ROBLIN DEVELOPMENT — VARIANCE ORDER APPEAL (Variance Use Order No. DAV 217621/2025D)

To whom it may concern,

I am submitting my formal appeal regarding the proposed 6-storey, 132-unit development at 4820 Roblin Boulevard. My

name is Jessie Thiessen, and I live at . I have been part of Charleswood for most of my life.
My family moved here in 2000, I grew up on Elmvale Crescent, went to Oak Park, and graduated in 2002. In 2015, my husband and I were fortunate enough to purchase a home in the “ditchville” area. Since then, we’ve started a family and have tried to instill in our children the same respect for nature and sense of place that I grew up with.

For us, Charleswood has always been something unique. It is one of the only places in Winnipeg where you can live in the city but still feel like you live in the country. We have trees, space, wildlife, and nature literally outside our doors. That feeling is not decorative—it is the foundation of why people stay here for decades.

While this project will directly affect my household—and has already caused many sleepless nights and a great deal of anxiety—my concerns are not just about my own backyard. They are about the long-term wellbeing, identity, and livability of our neighbourhood as a whole.

As noted in the Variance Order, I have already submitted written opposition. By my count, 76 residents are opposed and 46 are in favour—62.3% in opposition. That is not a minor split; it is a clear sign that many of your constituents believe this neighbourhood is unique and deserves to be treated with care, not simply folded into a broad density strategy because land happens to be available.

Below, I address the supporting points outlined in the Variance Order:

1. No notes.

2. This point contradicts itself. Yes, people stay here for generations—and they do so because of the mature trees, open spaces, and quiet, country-like character. These are not incidental features; they are the heart of Charleswood’s identity. A building of this scale erodes exactly what residents have worked to preserve.

I also ask you to consider the lived reality for older adults. I don’t know many seniors over 70 who dream of living on the 6th floor of a new apartment building. Many of them want gentle, familiar, easily accessible environments that feel grounded and human-scaled.
3. Context and fit matter deeply in community planning. A 6-storey structure on such a small parcel simply does not align with the surrounding environment. The Oakdale developments, often used as comparables, sit along a major roadway with much better access and greater distance from neighbouring homes. That context is completely different. Treating this site as equivalent ignores both the physical realities and the lived experience of the immediate neighbours.

4. I agree with the acknowledgement that the proposed 6-storey development is not in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhood and community. The 62.3% opposition is evidence of that misalignment.

5. Precedent is one of my biggest worries. Approving this development does not happen in isolation. It inevitably raises questions: Will there be a similar proposal in the green space at the end of Dieppe, closer to the Harte Trail? Will more quietly loved pockets of nature be targeted next? We have already seen a pattern with Oakdale, and the City has identified more areas of Charleswood for densification, including land south of the Harte Trail.

Approving this project sends a clear message about what can and will be approved going forward. Once that door is open, it is difficult—if not impossible—to close. At some point, we have to decide where we draw the line and what we are willing to protect, so that our children and grandchildren can have the same closeness to nature that many of us were lucky enough to grow up with.

6. The argument about serving older adults is understandable in intent, but it does not fit this proposal. This is not a seniors' complex, and it is not structured to support aging residents in a meaningful way. Seniors in our community tend to gravitate to smaller, quieter, low-rise buildings with access to natural trails and green space. A thoughtful design truly intended for older adults would reflect these needs: fewer storeys, more direct access to nature, and a layout focused on comfort and accessibility.

There are many ways to create more inclusive, dignified senior living spaces. Placing them in a 6-storey high-rise squeezed between a church and a busy road does not reflect that vision. And to the point of "aging in place": many seniors—whether from this area or another—simply do not have that option. It is important not to use that language to justify a building that is not, in fact, a seniors complex.

7. The church's position also needs to be seen clearly. Their decision to sell land is primarily financial, which is understandable given declining congregations. I do not begrudge them that reality. But it should not be framed as a purely community-driven act. Their motivations, while legitimate on their own terms, are not the same as the long-term interests of the neighbourhood. This dynamic has existed for years; it is not new. What has changed is that they have now found a proposal that appears to meet their needs—but it does so at a significant cost to the surrounding community.

8. Scale, fit, and community impact are at the heart of this appeal. A 6-storey building here will take away privacy from long-time residents who have built their lives around this landscape and its character. I am not opposed to development; I am opposed to development that overwhelms its surroundings and disregards long-standing residents' concerns.

A well-designed three-storey building might be something the community could learn to live with. It would not be ideal, but it could be a compromise between growth and preservation. A six-storey structure is far beyond that. Traffic impacts are real and ongoing, and neighbours have been consistent in voicing these concerns across multiple proposals over many years.

9. I respectfully disagree with the idea that the community has been “heard” in any meaningful way. You have listened, but the majority who are fighting for their community feel ignored.

If there is truly strong support for this development among seniors—despite it not being a seniors complex—where is the overwhelming written support to reflect that? How is it that two 3-storey proposals were turned down in the past for not fitting the community and the area, yet a 6-storey proposal, twice the size, is now being considered acceptable?
From where we stand, it is very hard to understand this shift without feeling that the realities of this proposal—and the people it affects—are being overlooked.

My appeal may not change every mind, but I hope it at least makes you pause and sit with what is truly at stake. This is not just about a building; it is about trust, place, and the kind of city we are choosing to build.

We are families, long-term residents, seniors, newcomers, and community members who love this neighbourhood and are trying to protect what makes it special. This appeal is grounded in care for our area—its character, its people, and its future.

Development can enhance a community. It can also overshadow it. This particular project, at this scale, will cast long- term shadows—literal and figurative—on the lives of many current residents who trusted that their neighbourhood would be respected, not transformed beyond recognition.

I am asking you, as someone who holds decision-making power, to truly see us, to hear us, and to consider whether this is the legacy you want to leave in Charleswood. The consequences of this decision will extend far beyond a single address, and they deserve careful, community-centred consideration.

Respectfully,

Jessie Thiessen

Exhibit “5” referred to in File DAV 217621A/2025D

From: Roman Castillo
Sent: Tuesday, December 9, 2025 7:37 PM
To: CLK-Appeals <clk-appeals@winnipeg.ca>
Subject: Conditional Use Order No. DCU 217664/2025D

Francisco Roman Castillo

In reference to:
Conditional Use Order No. DCU 217664/2025D

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this appeal against the decision to re-zone the land at 4820 Roblin Boulevard based on significant concerns related to public safety, environmental impact, and adverse economic effects on the community in the present and future. I urge the City to reconsider the decision based on the following adverse impacts of the proposed development:

1) Increased Traffic
The increased traffic will lead to vehicular accidents by the school, church, and housing. Injuries and death are likely to occur in a zone already populated by children and families, a risk that will also be inherited by new residents of the proposed development. A smaller lot will not be enough to fix this problem. Pollution caused by vehicular exhaust will also be a persistent issue.

2) Increased Noise
The noise from the construction, as well as the noise produced by people and vehicles once construction is finished, will disrupt the environment. This will upset school lessons, home peace for new and existing residents, and church events.

3) Decreased Property Value
The increase in traffic, noise, and the visual non-conformance of the proposed structure will be perceived negatively by the market. This creates a financial burden on old and new homeowners, as well as renters of the proposed building, and erodes the long-term tax base the city relies on.

The proposed re-zoning poses several risks to public safety and quality of life that outweigh the perceived benefit, risks which will negatively impact all parties involved. I request that the City of Winnipeg overturn the current decision and maintain the original zoning classification.

Sincerely,

Francisco Roman Castillo

Exhibit “4” referred to in File DAV 217621A/2025D

From: Amanda Rismani
Sent: Monday, December 8, 2025 2:01 PM
To: CLK-Appeals <clk-appeals@winnipeg.ca>
Subject: Re: Variance Use Order No. DAV 217621/2025D

Subject: Appeal Opposing Proposed Multi-Unit Apartment Development in Low-Density Residential Area

To Whom It May Concern,

I am submitting this appeal regarding the proposed construction of a multi-unit apartment building within our low-density residential neighborhood. While I understand the importance of accommodating growth, this particular development raises significant concerns related to safety, infrastructure capacity, and environmental impact.

1. Incompatibility With Established Land Use

The proposed apartment building represents a major departure from the existing low-density residential zoning that defines this community. The surrounding homes, infrastructure, and neighborhood layout were not designed to support a high-density building of this scale. Approving this project would set a precedent that is inconsistent with the area’s established planning principles.

2. Proximity to Elementary School – Heightened Safety Risks

The proposed development is located next to an elementary school, where pedestrian traffic is concentrated during morning drop-off and afternoon pick-up. Increasing residential density without first examining traffic impacts poses a serious risk to children who walk, bike, or are driven to school each day. The safety concerns are significant and deserve careful evaluation before any decision is made.

3. High-Volume Four-Lane Traffic Corridor Without a Traffic Study

The street adjacent to the development is a high-volume four-lane road, yet no traffic survey or impact analysis has been conducted. This is a critical omission. A comprehensive traffic study is necessary to understand expected increases in vehicle volume, potential congestion, turning safety, and impacts on both pedestrian crossings and nearby school traffic patterns. Proceeding without this information would be premature and could lead to preventable safety and infrastructure failures.

4. Emergency Response Concerns – Fire and Paramedic Station Less Than a Block Away

The project site is located less than a block from a fire and paramedic station. Increased congestion on a busy four-lane corridor could hinder emergency vehicles entering and exiting the station. Delays in emergency response times—even minor ones—can have severe or even life-threatening consequences. Any development of this magnitude must be evaluated for its potential impact on emergency services.

5. Environmental Loss Due to Forest Removal

The proposed construction would require the complete removal of an established forested area that currently provides valuable environmental benefits, including wildlife habitat, stormwater absorption, and a natural buffer against noise and air pollution. The loss of this green space would permanently affect the neighborhood’s ecological health and overall livability.

6. Community Impact and Precedent
Approving this project, which would be the highest-density residential building in the area, risks placing significant strain on local infrastructure. It would also set a long-term precedent for further high-density development in a neighborhood not designed to support it, raising concerns about overcrowding, traffic saturation, and diminishing quality of life.
Request for Action
For these reasons, I respectfully request that the proposed development be paused or denied until the following steps are completed:

1. A full traffic impact study that specifically evaluates peak-hour congestion, school-area safety, and emergency-response routing,

2. An environmental impact assessment addressing forest loss and stormwater effects,

3. A review of whether the proposed density aligns with current zoning and infrastructure capacity, and

4. A meaningful community consultation process that incorporates resident feedback.

The residents of this community are not opposed to progress. We simply believe that development must be conducted responsibly, transparently, and with full consideration for the people, environment, and safety of the area.
Thank you for your attention and careful consideration.
Sincerely,
Amanda Rismani

Exhibit “3” referred to in File DAV 217621A/2025D

From: Tyler Thiessen
Sent: Thursday, December 4, 2025 10:26 AM
To: CLK-Appeals <clk-appeals@winnipeg.ca>
Subject: OPPOSITION APPEAL: Variance Use Order No. DAV 217621/2025D

Hi there,

I have submitted my appeal via letter mail, however in case the post is slow or unable to deliver, I have submitted it below as well:
ROBLIN DEVELOPMENT — VARIANCE ORDER APPEAL (Variance Use Order No. DAV 217621/2025D)

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to formally appeal the proposed 6-storey, 132-unit development at 4820 Roblin Boulevard.

My name is Tyler Thiessen. I reside at and will be directly impacted by this project, but my objections extend to the long-term character and development trajectory of the neighbourhood.

I have already submitted written opposition, as noted in the Variance Order. By my count, 76 residents are opposed and 46 are in favour — **62.3% against**. This majority should matter.

Below are my points of appeal, responding directly to the supporting arguments outlined in the Variance Order:

1. No notes.

2. This point contradicts itself. Residents stay for decades because the neighbourhood has a mature, country-like character — not despite it. The proposed building ignores this reality entirely. The very qualities that keep people here are the ones this project removes.

3. If context matters, this proposal fails outright. A 6-storey mass on such a small parcel is incompatible with its surroundings. The Oakdale developments are repeatedly referenced as precedent, yet they are situated along a major roadway with far better access and setback. This site is not comparable in any meaningful way.

4. No notes.

5. Precedent is unavoidable. Claims that this development will not set precedent are unconvincing at best. Oakdale already did. The City's stated intention to increase density in Charleswood — including future development south of the Harte Trail — proves this proposal is part of a broader pattern. More green spaces will be targeted if this is approved.

6. The "housing for older adults" argument is irrelevant and misaligned with the design. This is not a seniors complex. Older adults gravitate toward quiet, low-rise buildings like Vasalund, which are set back and integrated with natural surroundings. If the goal were to serve seniors, the building would be lower, wider, and oriented toward walkable greenspace. The claim does not withstand scrutiny.

7. The justification from the church is disingenuous. Religious participation has declined for decades, and the church's motivation here is financial survival. Selling land to a developer is a pragmatic choice, not an altruistic one. Suggesting otherwise is misleading.

8. Scale and fit are the core issues. I am not opposed to development; I am opposed to **this** development as proposed. A 3-storey building with a different layout could be compatible. A 6-storey structure is not. Traffic impacts are unavoidable, and resident concerns have been consistently ignored — not only for this proposal, but for previous ones.

9. No notes.

This appeal is not anti-development. It is a call for responsible development that respects context, precedent, neighbourhood character, and the clear majority opposition of existing residents.

Sincerely,

Tyler Thiessen

Exhibit “2” referred to in File DAV 217621A/2025D

From: Brad Smith
Sent: Tuesday, December 2, 2025 7:57 PM
To: CLK-Appeals <clk-appeals@winnipeg.ca>
Subject: Notice of Appeal of Variance Use Order No. DAV 217621/2025D

I request an appeal of the decision to allow the development of 4820 Roblin Boulevard for the following reasons:

1. The committee stated that the development is not in line with the established neighbourhood's existing buildings, yet disregarded this fact. This is not consistent with the City of Winnipeg's Complete Communities Direction Strategy, as it does not meet section 1.0 in that it is not context-sensitive or compatible with the existing buildings, being a six-storey apartment block surrounded by single-family dwellings. The addition of 132 units with over 200 residents in a block of roughly 28 homes and 60 residents could not be more inconsistent:
   - Two
   - One comparable property quoted in the proposal is 5610 Roblin, which is also an extremely inappropriate building for its location and should be an example of what should not be allowed to be repeated. It is out of place in size and aesthetics and is a universally disliked building in the community. The building has one third of the units that this proposal contains, yet still demonstrates the issues that will be faced by the neighbourhood;
   - Another comparable site is 5429 Roblin, which is not actually located on Roblin. The site has a long driveway for access with a traffic light. The building is smaller than 4820 Roblin, on a larger property, was built on a large empty field, and is surrounded by intermediately-sized buildings that blend it into the neighbourhood. The building has less than half of the units of this proposal and is not comparable;
   - The other property of an equivalent size quoted in the vicinity of this site is 347 Oakdale, which is located on a side street off the main arterial road and backed onto Moray, which is a more appropriate location for a building of this size. 4820 Roblin is not comparable to 347 Oakdale;
2. The city policy on development has not been consistently implemented, as a development at 4506 Grant Avenue, two blocks from 4820 Roblin, was restricted to single-storey buildings due to the incompatibility of larger structures with surrounding buildings. Meanwhile, approval has been granted to build a 70 foot, six-storey building completely isolated from any comparably sized building at this site among a neighbourhood of largely single storey houses;
3. The population density of the proposed site is not compared to the density of the surrounding neighbourhood, which would further demonstrate the inappropriate increase in density. The density quoted is of a built-up urban area in the vicinity of downtown, which is inconsistent with the area;
4. While the site is on an arterial road, it is not serviced by adequate transit or commercial services and no study has been done to determine the impact of doubling the neighbourhoods residents;
5. The traffic at the corner of Dieppe and Roblin was mentioned as being a concern by the committee, but no plan was stated to address this concern and allow for the addition of approximately 200 cars at the intersection. The effect of this traffic on pedestrian safety around

the school on Dieppe Road and the school on Grant Avenue have not been taken into account, and the bottleneck of traffic at Roblin and Grant has not been considered. There is a high volume of traffic on Roblin already due to the limited routes from Charleswood to the East side of the city, and this proposal would increase the bottleneck unnecessarily by having access to the site directly onto Roblin. This would not only impact the immediate neighbours and residents of the new site, but all residents of Charleswood located West of the intersection. Residents of the new site would be required to make a u-turn at Dieppe road to enter the site when approaching from the East, and make a u-turn at the corner of Roblin and Grant when travelling West. Both intersections are exceedingly dangerous to perform a u-turn, due to the odd angles of these intersections. Adding a gap in the median to allow traffic in and out of the site within a few feet of the intersection at Dieppe and Roblin would be unsafe and would disrupt traffic further. Allowing traffic to the site to enter and exit through the Church parking lot would be dangerous for the school and daycare pedestrian traffic, and would cause significant traffic backups during peak traffic times due to the traffic already present due to the school on Dieppe Road. Each scenario would have major drawbacks that cannot be resolved, and it is an irresponsible decision to allow approximately 200 cars access to the site;

6. The Communities Direction Strategy specifies increasing density in walkable communities with adequate public transportation. The site already does not have adequate transit service for the volume of residents, and is not a "walkable community" on the busy arterial road of Roblin, where all businesses are located. The transit service in the area was identified by the Committee as inadequate. The changes to the city's transit system have negatively affected the service in the area already, and have limited the options for residents. This further exacerbates the traffic issues, as most residents will be required to own a car;

7. The committee stated that families remain in the area in their homes for decades due to its character, sense of space, and close-knit feeling of generations living next to each other in family homes. That there is demand for small apartments surrounded by parking lots that do not benefit from the features of the area, with constantly shifting neighbours in rental units is counterintuitive. The appeal of the area is the rural feel and forest that will be clear-cut to build the apartment. Small townhouses or a smaller apartment building like 4313 Grant Ave, located three blocks from the site, would be a better fit for the area that would preserve the features and be in line with what the area contains and makes it desirable;

8. The proposal is quoted as being community-driven, yet ignores the community in which it is being built in every conceivable way. There is no buy-in from the neighbourhood residents, and nearly all affected residents living adjacent to the site have voiced opposition to the project. The project was originally proposed as a ten-storey building, which is only slightly more outrageous than a six-storey building. The church's financial interests have been considered, while current residents legitimate concerns on privacy, security, noise, light pollution, and disruption have been disregarded; and

9. The environmental impact has not been adequately considered, with the loss of 2 acres of precious forested area within the city. The decision to remove an established forest in an era of environmental awareness is out of touch and irresponsible. The proposal claims to "protect hundreds of trees and improve drainage", which is counterintuitive of the project and false, and will destroy a forest ecosystem that absorbs vast amounts of water that does not need to be processed by the city sewer system. Further, the aging infrastructure of Charleswood has not been assessed for the addition of hundreds of new residents. There is a real long-term and

permanent cost associated with the environmental loss that must be shared by the community, which will not be covered by the developers.
I am not against the development of the site, and would welcome an actual community-driven project that serves our needs and highlights what makes the area great. I personally recommend scaling down the project to a two-storey building or series of townhouses, which would be aligned with the community's needs and fit in with the established neighbourhood. The Committee stated that they would not dismiss the concerns of residents, and then immediately did so. A project of this scale will have an immediate and permanent negative effect on many Charleswood residents, and is only in the interest of the investors and church management, while being framed as in the interest of future tenants. The future aging and elderly tenants of this site will suffer from poor access, amenities, and services, with little chance of improvement due to the location of the site. This decision is not based on the effect it will have on the existing community and is not well designed for current or future residents, and requires additional consideration.

Thank you,

Bradley Smith

Exhibit "1" referred to in File DAV 217621A/2025D

Winnipeg

THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
VARIANCE ORDER
ASSINIBOIA COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

DAV 217621/2025D [c/r DASZ 45/2025 & DCU 217664/2025D]

Before:	Assiniboia Community Committee Councillor Duncan, Chairperson Councillor Dobson Councillor Lukes
Hearing:	November 20, 2025 Council Building, 510 Main Street
Applicant:	McGowan Russell Group Inc. (Jackie Wilkie)
Premises Affected:	4820 Roblin Boulevard
Legal Description:	PCL A, C PLAN 48002 48 ST C, hereinafter called "the land"
Property Zoned:	"R1-L" (Residential Single-Family-Large District) Proposed "RMF- M" (Residential Multi-Family-Medium District) and "R1-L" (Residential Single-Family-Large District)
Nature of Application:	To vary the Proposed "RMF- M" and "R1-L" Development and Design Standards of the Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 200/2006 as follows:

For Proposed Lot 2:

2. For the maintenance of an accessory open parking area to permit:

   A. an east side yard of 1.5 feet (0.45 metres) instead of 4 feet (1.21 metres);

B. 102 parking spaces instead of 116 spaces.

It is the opinion of the Assiniboia Community Committee that subject to the conditions listed below, if any, this Variance meets the statutory criteria as outlined in Subsection 247(3) of the City of Winnipeg Charter in that it:

(a) [✓] is consistent [ ] is not consistent
with Plan Winnipeg, and any applicable secondary plan;

(b) [✓] does not create [ ] does create
a substantial adverse effect on the amenities, use, safety and convenience of the adjoining property and adjacent area, including an area separated from the property by a street or waterway;

(c) [✓] is [ ] is not
the minimum modification of a zoning by-law required to relieve the injurious effect of the zoning by-law on the applicant's property; and

(d) [✓] is [ ] is not
compatible with the area in which the property to be affected is situated.

Supporting Reasons:

1. First off thank you to my colleagues for sitting here today and also asking some relevant questions and being a part of this decision. As City Councillor for Charleswood and someone who has lived here my entire life in this community, I want to speak to this proposal for the Charleswood United Site at 4820 Roblin Boulevard.

2. Charleswood is a neighbourhood with strong identity, people stay here for decades because they value its character, its sense of space, and it's close-knit feeling that comes from generations of families living side by side.

3. When we consider the new developments in areas like this, context matters, fit matters, and residents expect that change will be carefully evaluated against the long-standing character of our neighbourhoods.

4. There are reasons someone might not support this application, it's not a single-family housing development, it's not low-density form of multi-family housing. In a mature, predominantly low-density area those concerns are legitimate.

5. People worry about precedent, about changing the established pattern of development, and about the impact on nearby homes, and the overall rhythm of our streets. As a life-long resident myself, I understand those feelings, they come from a deep connection to the place where I, and my family call home.

6. At the same time, we're also facing a very real and pressing challenge in Charleswood, a lack appropriate housing for older adults. Time and time again I hear from long time residents who, frankly, either want to stay in the community or come back to the community that they built, that their family and friends, and that their church, their routines are all in, but they simply can't find the right type of housing.

7. And this is where the Charleswood United Church proposal becomes meaningful. The church had been a stabilizing community-focused institution for generations. Their intention with this project is consistent with the mission, service, inclusion and supporting people through every stage of life.

8. The design aims to provide housing that meeting a growing community need while being as respectful as possible to the surrounding context. I understand the concerns, and I don't dismiss them. Fit matters, scale matters, and we must consider how these decisions shape long-term character of our neighbourhoods. But I also believe in preserving what makes Charleswood special and providing opportunities for the people who built our community.

9. After listing to the residents, reviewing the application and reflecting on housing needs our area, particularly for the older adults, I believe that this proposal finds the responsibility as a community-minded balance. It addresses real need while respecting as much as possible, the character and value of Charleswood as defined. For those reasons I'll be supporting the application at 4820 Roblin Boulevard.

ORDER:

The Assiniboia Community Committee orders that the provisions of the Proposed "RMF- M" and "R1-L" Development and Design Standards of the Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 200/2006 are varied on "the land" as follows:

1. For the maintenance of an accessory open parking area on Proposed Lot 2 to permit:

    A. an east side yard of 1.5 feet (0.45 metres)

    B. 102 parking spaces

Subject to the following conditions, which the Assiniboia Community Committee considers necessary to ensure compliance with criteria (a) to (d) in Subsection 247(3) of the City of Winnipeg Charter, namely:

1. That the Variance Order shall come into force and effect upon the coming into force and effect of the zoning by-law for the subject land under File DASZ 45/2025.

2. That, if any Variance granted by this order is not established within two (2) years of the date hereof, this order, in respect of that Variance shall terminate.

THIS ORDER IS SUBJECT TO ALL BUILDING, HEALTH OR OTHER REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO THE LAND HEREIN REFERRED TO.

DATE OF ORDER: November 25, 2025

CERTIFIED BY:



L. Cowan
Senior Committee Clerk

HOW TO APPEAL

If you object to this Order, you are entitled to file a notice of appeal. Your notice of appeal must:

(a) be in writing;

(b) contain your name, mailing address, and phone number;

(c) be addressed as set out below;

(d) be received at that office not later than 4:30 p.m. on December 12, 2025;

[IF RECEIVED LATE YOUR APPEAL CANNOT BE HEARD]

(e) refer to Variance Use Order No. DAV 217621/2025D; and

(f) provide the reason(s) for the appeal

The City Clerk may not schedule an appeal hearing until your notice of appeal meets the above requirements.

Address:	City Clerk, City of Winnipeg c/o Appeal Committee Susan A. Thompson Building Main Floor, 510 Main Street Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3B 1B9
Fax:	204-947-3452
Email:	CLK-Appeals@winnipeg.ca

THE FOLLOWING PERSONS MADE REPRESENTATIONS AND ARE ENTITLED TO APPEAL:

In Support:

Jas Kalar
Susan Russell
Jackie Wilkie
Darcia Albrechtsen
Doreen Barton
David Barton
Janet Belluk
TJ Belluk
Grant Buchanan
Anne Elizabeth Burns
Virginia Cail
Robert Campbell
Jackie Drever
Monika Franz-Lien
Margaret Gibson
Gordon Gibson
Janet Goddard
Michael Golden
Kenneth Grower
Larry Hamilton
Janice Hamilton
Eliana Handford
Carolyn Hsu
Nancy Jeffrey
Eric Jensen
Deanna Jones
Carina Kirk
Sandy Kluka
Bruce Macdonald
Pat Macdonald
Lorrie Martindale
Val McGuire
Keith Merkel
Sherry Mooney
Jane Murray
John Wesley Oldham
Karen Pomade
Dana Poulton
Allan Richardson
Lily Richardson
Ken Thomas
Warren Denis Thompson
Kelly Thompson
William Carl Trimble
Michael Wilson
Natalia Zyrianova

In Opposition:

Matthew Andrushak
Vanda Araujo
Brett Atkinson
Lisa Bednar
Erin Dack
Charlotte Dykes
Candace Ellis
Thomas Evans
Michael Flynn
Thomas Fred
Betty Anne Fred
Darlene Goodman
William Grassick
Marie-Alice Grassick
J. Harvey
Steini Hibbert
Gail Hibbert
Alex Hollyoake
Dianne Lynne Kennedy
Tasadduq Khan
Kayla Klanreungsang
Ashley Koss
Lorna J Kostiuk
Thomas Kramer
Darlene Boettcher
Shannon Campbell
Barb Cannons
Jim Cannons
Marianna Legat
Shauna Link
Wayne Lucas
Ian Lucas
Norma Lucas
Danial Lukinuk
Christine Marak
Dylan Marsh
Nicholas W. Masniuk
Joel Masniuk
Justin McCann-Suchower
Sheri Mcnamara
Kim Miller
Lauren Murray
Robyn Musgrove
Colin Nichols
Kevin Nichols
Blake Nichols
Stefan Pacin
Andrew Passalis
Cindy Castillo
Lesley Cavanagh
Joan Cormie
Lynne Couture
Gladys Paola Rico Garcia
Clay Ridd
Amanda Rismani
Francisco Roman Castillo
Eunice Samuels
Rebecca Scott
Bradley Smith
Alison Sommerfield
Jennifer Stebner
Christopher Stranc
Barb Swan
Ross Taylor
Melissa Tennant
Jessie Thiessen
Tyler Thiessen
Don Trueman
Deanna Trueman
Laura Lyne Turner
Nicole Young
Cathryn Zambrzycka

Liubov Zorina Charlene Zubriski

For Information:

Nil

For the City:

R. Galston, Urban Planner, Planning, Property and Development Department
K. Kowalyk, Land Development Engineer, Planning, Property and Development Department