COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

Wednesday, January 21, 2026 (Un-audited)

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.

MADAM SPEAKER: GOOD MORNING. MR. CLERK, DO WE HAVE A QUORUM?

CLERK: YES, WE HAVE A QUORUM.

MADAM SPEAKER: I CALL THIS SPECIAL MEETING OF CITY COUNCIL FOR JANUARY 21, 2026, TO ORDER. AND ACKNOWLEDGE WE ARE ON TREATY ONE TERRITORY.. HOME AND TRADITIONAL LANDS OF THE PEOPLES AND IN THE NATIONAL HOMELAND OF THE RED RIVER MATEA. OUR DRINKING WATER IS -- ROLL CALL, MADAM CLERK.

CLERK: COUNCILLOR SHARMA, HIS WORSHIP MAYOR GILLINGHAM, COUNCILLOR ALLARD, COUNCILLOR BROWATY, COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS, COUNCILLOR DUNCAN, COUNCILLOR EADIE, COUNCILLOR LUKES, COUNCILLOR MAYES, COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW, COUNCILLOR ROLLINS, COUNCILLOR SCHREYER, COUNCILLOR WOOD.

MADAM SPEAKER: READ THE TWO INTO THE RECORD.

BY COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW AND SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR GILLINGHAM THAT GILROY AND SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR DURAND-WOOD THAT COUNCILLOR WYATT BE GRANTED LEAVE OF ABSENCE DUE TO PERSONAL MATTER.

MADAM SPEAKER: FAVOUR, CONTRARY, CARRIED. THE NOTICE FOR TODAY'S SPECIAL MEETING.

CLERK: SCHEDULE AB SPECIAL MEETING OF COUNCIL CALLED FOR WEDNESDAY JANUARY 21, 2026, AT 9:30 A.M. IN COUNCIL CHAMBER TO CONSIDERING THE FOLLOW MATTER. PUBLIC HEARING TEXT AMENDMENT TO SCHEDULE AB PDO 1 MALLS AND CORRIDORS OF THE WINNIPEG ZONING BY-LAW 200/2006. PURSUANT TO REQUIREMENTS OF THE CITY CHARTER NO OTHER SUBJECT MATTER OTHER THAN OUTLINED SHALL BE CONSIDERED AT THE MEETING.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. MY PLEASURE TO INTRODUCE TO TODAY'S PAGES. JOIN ME IN WELCOMING JOCUM FROM MAPLE SCHOOL AND ZANDER WHO RESIDES IN THE ELMWOOD WARD. THANK YOU FOR JOINING COUNCIL TODAY. AS OUTLINED IN THE NOTICE READ BY THE CLERK, ON DECEMBER 18, 2025, COUNCIL DID NOT HEAR ANY REPRESENTATION ON THIS ITEM AND ADJOURNED THE PUBLIC HEARING TO TODAY'S SPECIAL MEETING. BEFORE WE BEGIN I WOULD LIKE TO REMIND COUNCIL IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS FOR ANY OF THE REPRESENTATIVES OR THE PUBLIC SERVICE,

PLEASE RAISE YOUR HAND AND I WILL PUT YOU ON THE SPEAKER LIST. I WILL CALL ON YOUR WHEN IT IS YOUR OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK. THERE ARE NO RESTRICTIONS ON THE TIME OR FREQUENCY OF QUESTIONS AND YOU MAY REMAIN SEATED WHEN YOU SPEAK THROUGHOUT THE HEARING.

ARE WE ABLE TO COME AND GO? COUNCILLOR SANTOS ARRIVED AFTER CALLING THE MEETING TO ORDER AND TOOK ROLL CALL. I'M ASSUMING WE'RE FREE --

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU COUNCILLOR MAYES FOR THE QUESTION. COUNCILLOR SANTOS IS PERMITTED TO STAY IN THE HEARING BECAUSE WE HAVEN'T OPENED UP THE HEARING YET. BUT FROM THIS MOMENT FORWARD, ONCE WE OPEN UP THE HEARING THERE IS NO COMING AND GOING AND WE WILL TAKE BREAKS AS NECESSARY. I DID CHECK THAT WITH THE CLERK JUST BEFORE STARTING THE MEETING BEFORE 10:00. CORRECT, MR. CLERK, IT'S PERMITTED?

CLERK: CORRECT, THE PUBLIC HEARING HASN'T STARTED YET, MADAM SPEAKER.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. AMENDMENTS TO THE ITEM NEED TO BE SUBMITTED IN WRITING AND DISTRIBUTED TO COUNCIL TO ENSURE EVERYONE IS CLEAR ON WHAT IS BEING PROPOSED. NO SECONDARIES ARE REQUIRES FOR ANY AMENDMENTS. I WOULD LIKE TO REMIND ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL YOU MUST BE PRESENT AS WE JUST DISCUSSED FOR THE DURATION OF THE HEARING. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS BEFORE WE BEGIN? I'LL TURN IT OVER TO OUR CITY CLERK TO INTRODUCE THE ITEM. MR. CLERK IS THE FEED SHOWING THE MEETING, CORRECT? NOT JUST THE PRESENTATION. THANK YOU.

CLERK: IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF WINNIPEG CHARTER AND DEVELOPMENT PROCEDURES, BY LAW, THE HEARING BODY WILL HEAR FROM PUBLIC SERVICE WITH SUMMARY OF THE APPLICATION. WE WILL HEAR FROM THE APPLICANT FOLLOWED BY ANYONE REGISTERED IN SUPPORT OF THE APPLICATION. NEXT THOSE REGISTERED IN OPPOSITION ARE HEARD FOLLOWED BY THOSE REGISTERED FOR INFORMATION. AN APPLICANT MAY RETURN TO SPEAK AS REBUTTAL BUT NO NEW INFORMATION IS PERMITTED. WHEN YOUR NAME IS CALLED IT'S YOUR OPPORTUNITY SPEAK.

THAT'S NOT THE PROCEDURE WE FOLLOWED. WE DID TAKE IN ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AFTER THE REBUTTAL.

MADAM SPEAKER: MR. CLERK, IF YOU CAN CLARIFY.

FROM ONE SIDE ONLY THOUGH.

MADAM SPEAKER: YES.

CLERK: NOTE WHEN YOUR NAME IS CALLED IT IS YOUR OPPORTUNITY SPEAK HOWEVER YOU'RE NOT OBLIGATED TO DO SO. FOR MORE IN DEPTH OVERVIEW OF THE HEARING PROCESS AND OTHER INFORMATION PERTAINING TO WHAT HAPPENS BEFORE, DURING AND AFTER PUBLIC HEARING, CONSULT THE CITY CLERKS DEPARTMENT WEBSITE. NOTE THAT ALL PUBLIC HEARINGS ARE RECORDED AND WILL BE PART OF THE PUBLIC RECORD. SHOULD YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS AFTER THE HEARING CONCLUDED CONTACT THE CITY CLERKS DEPARTMENT. ITEM ONE, TEXT AMENDMENT TO SCHEDULE AB-PDO-ONE, MALLS AND CORRIDORS OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG ZONING BYLAW 200/2006 UNDER FILE

DAZ 225/2025. NOTE ALL SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED HAVE BEEN DISTRIBUTED TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE HEARING BODY.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU, MR. CLERK. WE WILL BEGIN THE HEARING. THE PRESENTATION IS FROM THE PUBLIC SERVICE. THEY'LL PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF THE APPLICATION. WE'RE JOINED BY A FEW MEMBERS TODAY FROM THE PLANNING PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT. HAZEL BORYS, DIRECTOR, PLANNING, PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT. JAMES VEITCH, MANAGER, URBAN PLANNING AND DESIGN. MICHAEL ROBINSON, PRINCIPLE PLANNER AND LISSIE RAPPAPORT, MANAGER OF THE HOUSING ACCELERATED FUND.

CAN YOU CLARIFY WHO IS THE APPLICANT AND WHO ARE THE ADMINISTRATION?

MADAM SPEAKER: THE PUBLIC SERVICE ARE THOSE THAT WERE JUST INTRODUCED AND MR. CLARK WILL BE ACTING AS THE APPLICANT. MR. DEVIN CLARK IF YOU CAN RECOGNIZE YOURSELF, PLEASE. IS THAT CLEAR, COUNCILLOR. MR. DEVIN CLARK IS THE APPLICANT.

DEVIN CLARK IS THE APPLICANT. OKAY. DEVIN CLARK IS THE APPLICANT FOR THE CITY?

MADAM SPEAKER: THAT'S RIGHT.

ON THEIR BEHALF.

MADAM SPEAKER: IT'S A RIGHT. SIMILAR TO LAST HEARING.

I WAS CONFUSED. TOO. THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND.

MADAM SPEAKER: LISSIE IS HERE IN CASE THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS. WITH THE PUBLIC SERVICE. THERE ISN'T ENOUGH CHAIRS ON THIS SIDE OF THE CHAMBER.

THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: MR. VEITCH TO YOU TO OPEN UP THE PRESENTATION. THIS IS FROM THE PUBLIC SERVICE SO IT'S A SUMMARY OF THE REPORT ESSENTIALLY.

THANK YOU, MADAM CHAIR. MR. MAYOR, COUNCILLORS, GOOD MORNING. THIS IS THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS AMENDMENTS PUBLIC HEARING. THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY IS INTENDED TO ENABLE AS OF RIGHT DEVELOPMENT ALONG URBAN AND REGIONAL MIXED USE CORRIDORS AND MALLS SITE TO SUPPORT HOUSING AND MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT. THE USE OF THE PDO IS OPTIONAL. MEANING DEVELOPERS CAN CHOOSE TO USE THE PDO, USE EXISTING ZONING RULES OR APPLY FOR REZONING AND SUBDIVISION TO SUPPORT GREATER DEVELOPMENT ENTITLEMENTS. THE PDO WAS APPROVED BY COUNCIL NOVEMBER 21, 2024, AND CAME IN TO FORCE AND EFFECT JANUARY 31, 2025. SINCE IT'S ADOPTION THE CITY HAS NOT RECEIVED ANY AS OF RIGHT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS FOR CORRIDOR OR MALL SITES UNDER THE PDO ONE APPLICATION SOUGHT VARIANCES WHICH WERE APPROVED AFTER AN APPEAL HEARING. WHILE OTHERS CONSIDERED USING THE PDO BUT ULTIMATELY PROCEEDED THROUGH THE STANDARD SUBDIVISION AND REZONING PROCESS. DISCUSSIONS WITH POTENTIAL APPLICANTS AND CONSULTATION WITH THE

URBAN DESIGN INSTITUTE OF MANITOBA, THE PUBLIC SERVICE IDENTIFIED SEVERAL RECURRING ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN LIMITING THE VIABILITY OF THE AS OF RIGHT DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE PDO TO IMPROVE THE UPTAKE OF THE PDO FACILITATING RAPID RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND TO REDUCE THE NEED FOR VARIANCES. THE PUBLIC SERVICE IS BRINGING FORWARD THREE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ADDRESS THE COMMON DEVELOPMENT BARRIERS WE HAVE HEARD. THESE AMENDMENTS INCLUDE NUMBER ONE, REMOVING THE 14-FOOT MINIMUM GROUND FLOOR HEIGHT REQUIRED FOR NONRESIDENTIAL USES. NUMBER TWO, REMOVING BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOW DESIGN PROVISIONS. NUMBER THREE, REVISING BUILDING HEIGHT REGULATIONS TO THE 45-DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN. WE WANT TO EMPHASIZE THESE EDITS ARE ENTERED AND AN INTERIM FIX TO ALLOW DEVELOPS TO OPT IN TO PDO WHILE THE PUBLIC SERVICE CONDUCTS A MORE ROBUST, PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT INCLUDING DETAILED CROSS JURISDICTIONAL REVIEW AS PART OF THE TWO-YEAR COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW REWRITE. WITH WITH RESPECT TO THE REMOVAL OF THE BIRD-FRIENDLY CLAUSE WE WANT TO PROVIDE FURTHER CONTEXT. DESIGNERS AND DEVELOPERS TOLD US SOURCING MATERIALS TO MEET THE CLAUSE WAS CHALLENGING AND ADDED SIGNIFICANT COST TO PROJECTS. IN ONE CASE, AN APPLICATION REQUESTED VARIANCES AND APPROVAL WAS GRANTED WITH A CONDITION REQUIRING A BIRD-FRIENDLY APPLIQUE TO BE APPLIED TO THE WINDOWS, INSTALLED AND MAINTAINED TO THE DIRECTOR'S SATISFACTION. TO AVOID REPEATED VARIANCE REQUESTS AND PROVIDE GREATER FLEXIBILITY, THE PUBLIC SERVICE RECOMMENDS REMOVING THE CLAUSE FOR NOW. THIS CHANGE SUPPORTS HOUSING DEVELOPMENT BY RIGHT UNDER THE PDO UNTIL THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW REVIEW IS COMPLETED. IN 2021, COUNCIL DIRECTED THE PUBLIC SERVICE TO CONSIDER THE C.S.A. BIRD-FRIENDLY REGULATIONS AS PART OF THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY-LAW REVIEW AND CONSULT WITH OTHER PROFESSIONALS, ACADEMICS AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS. WE BELIEVE THIS CITY-WIDE REVIEW, THIS DIRECTION FROM COUNCIL IS THE BEST WAY TO THOROUGHLY STUDY AND IMPLEMENT BIRD-FRIENDLY STANDARDS. WE RECOGNIZE MANY PEOPLE SHARED CONCERNS ABOUT REMOVING THE CLAUSE AND WE APPRECIATE THE TIME TAKEN TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK. IF COUNCIL PREFERS TO AMEND THE CLAUSE INSTEAD OF REMOVING IT, WE'RE COMFORTABLE WITH THIS APPROACH. WE BELIEVE THAT ENGAGING STAKE HOLDERS THROUGH THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BYLAW REVIEW IS THE BEST LONG-TERM APPROACH. HOWEVER, SINCE THAT REVIEW WON'T BE COMPLETE UNTIL LATER 2027, THERE MAY BE AN OPPORTUNITY TO ADJUST THE CLAUSE FOR NOW. THIS WOULD ALLOW FLEXIBILITY FOR BIRD-FRIENDLY COMPLIANCE WHILE ENABLING MORE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AT MALL AND CORRIDOR SITES WITHOUT REQUIRING VARIANCES. THAT CONCLUDES THE INTRODUCTION FROM THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. QUESTIONS. COUNCILLOR ROLLINS.

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: THANK YOU. THE FIRST QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE BIRD-FRIENDLY DESIGN. WHY WHEN COUNCIL ASKED YOU TO DO THE RESEARCH ON BIRD FRIENDLY BACK AT THE START OF THE ORIGINAL MOTION, AND NOW YOU'RE SUGGESTING THE LONGER MORE COMPREHENSIVE ONE IS THE PATH. WHY WHEN COUNCIL DIRECTED IT THEN -- WHY -- HOW WOULD YOU PROVIDE US WITH ASSURANCE THAT YOU'RE GOING TO DO IT NOW? I CAN REPEAT THE QUESTION BUT, YOU KNOW, WE HAD DIRECTED IT. WE HAD VOTED ON IT. BUT WE HAD DIRECTED IT BASED ON A CANADIAN STANDARD. NOW WE'RE HEARING FROM THE ADMINISTRATION THAT THEY ARE NOW GOING TO DO IT AGAIN, ESSENTIALLY. HOW IS COUNCIL SUPPOSED TO BE ASSURED ON THAT? AND THEN THE NEXT QUESTION IS THEY ARE PROPOSING A JURISDICTIONAL SCAN OF MALLS AND CORRIDORS. ISN'T IT PART OF EVERY PACKAGE COUNCILS GET THAT THE ADMINISTRATION LOOKS OUT AND ACROSS CANADA, IF NOT NORTH AMERICA, AND OTHER LARGE CITIES, MADAM SPEAKER, TO PROVIDE US WITH THE BEST POSSIBLE

POLICY ADVICE? WHY WASN'T IT DONE BEFORE AND HOW CAN THIS COUNCIL BE ASSURED IT'S GOING TO BE DONE THIS TIME?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE, PLEASE.

MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. THANK YOU, COUNCILLOR. THAT COUNCIL DIRECTION I WAS REFERRING TO FOR REVIEW OF THE BIRD-FRIENDLY GUIDELINES WAS FROM 2021. AS PART OF THAT MOTION COUNCIL SAID REVIEW THE C.S.A. BIRD-FRIENDLY REGULATIONS AS PART OF THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BYLAW REWRITE. SO THAT'S WHY WE'RE DOING IT NOW. THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BYLAW REWRITE IS BEING INITIATED NOW. WE HAVE CONSULTANTS NOW THAT HAVE BEEN HIRED TO DO THIS AND THIS IS A TWO-YEAR PROCESS. THAT'S WHY IT WASN'T DOING BEFORE. THE BIRD-FRIENDLY GUIDELINES THAT ENDED UP IN THE PDO, THOSE WERE BROUGHT FORWARD AS A MOTION AT THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE FLOOR OF COUNCIL WHEN WE WERE HEARING THE MALL AND CORRIDOR PDO WE DIDN'T HAVE A LOT OF TIME TO RESEARCH THAT. THAT WAS PRETTY MUCH ON THE FLOOR OF COUNCIL AT A LATE HOUR AT NIGHT I HOPE THAT ANSWERS YOUR QUESTION.

MADAM SPEAKER: NEXT QUESTION. COUNCILLOR ROLLINS.

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: MY QUESTION WASN'T ANSWERED. DO I NEED TO REPOSE IT AGAIN?

MADAM SPEAKER: RESTATE THE QUESTION, PLEASE.

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: THE SECOND PART PERTAINS TO JURISDICTIONAL SCANS. AGAIN, WE ARE A YEAR OUT FROM GO TIME ON -- 2027 IS REALLY THE COMPREHENSIVE REWRITE TIMELINES. AGAIN, HOW CAN COUNCIL BE ASSURED THAT A JURISDICTIONAL SCAN IS PART OF THE NEXT PACKAGE WHEN APPARENTLY IT WASN'T PART OF THIS PACKAGE?

MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. THE CROSS JURISDICTIONAL SCAN, COUNCILLOR, IS REFERRING TO THE BIRD-FRIENDLY GUIDELINES AND WHAT OTHER CITIES DO. YOU MENTIONED MALLS AND CORRIDORS UNDER THE CROSS JURISDICTIONAL SCAN. WHEN WE BROUGHT FORWARD THE MALLS AND CORRIDOR PDO THAT WAS BASED ON A LOT OF RESEARCH ACROSS CITIES EVEN IN CITIES IN THE UNITED STATES WITH OUR CONSULTANTS DPZ CODESIGN. THE CROSS JURISDICTIONAL SCAN I'M REFERRING TO HERE IS RELATED TO THE CANADA STANDARDS ASSOCIATED WITH BIRD-FRIENDLY GUIDELINES. WHICH SEVERAL OTHER CITIES HAVE IN PLACE, LIKE TORONTO, AND THAT'S WHAT I'M REFERRING TO HERE. NOT THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS RESEARCH.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. COUNCILLOR LUKES -- COUNCILLOR MAYES GO AHEAD.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: I WILL HAVE MORE THAN TWO QUESTIONS. THANK YOU FOR THE PRESENTATION. FIRSTLY, THE HOW WE GOT HERE. I AM PLEASED WE'RE MEETING IN COUNCIL, AS A WHOLE. THEREFORE, WE MUST BE PROCEEDING IN RELATION TO THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND. THIS IS THE PROCESS WE SET UP IN LATE 2023. MY FIRST QUESTION IS I DID NOT HEAR ANY EVIDENCE THAT WE HAD ANY CALLS OR TEXTS OR E-MAILS OR VISITS FROM THE FEDERAL AUTHORITIES TELLING US THAT IF WE DIDN'T MAKE THESE AMENDMENTS WE WOULD LOSE SOME, PERHAPS ALL, OF OUR HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUNDING. CAN THE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION CONFIRMED WE HAVE NOT RECEIVED ANY

COMMUNICATION TO DATE AND WE'RE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE HEARING AND LET THIS EVIDENCE IN ON THE FOUR PLEX. HAVE WE RECEIVED ANY COMMUNICATIONS TODAY FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT INDICATING ANY FUNDING RIDES ON THE PROCEEDINGS HERE TODAY.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. RESPONSE.

THROUGH YOU, MADAM SPEAKER. NO. WE HAVE NOT HEARD ANY COMMUNICATION FROM CMHC REGARDING THESE AMENDMENTS.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: SHOULD WE HEAR ANY FOLLOWING CLOSE OF EVIDENCE BEING TENDERED TODAY? ARE WE ANTICIPATING THAT? ARE WE SCHEDULED PHONE CALLS AFTER THE EVIDENCE IS ALL IN OR ARE WE -- SEEMINGLY MY PRESENCE ALONE SEEMS TO TENDER PHONE CALLS FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO WHICH COUNCILLORS ARE NOT ALLOWED TO PARTICIPATE. ARE WE ANTICIPATING ANY OUTREACH CALLS OR TEXTS FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT THREATENING FUNDING FROM THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND SHOULD WE NOT PROCEED PER THE WISHES OF THE ADMINISTRATION TODAY?

MADAM SPEAKER: THE RESPONSE.

THROUGH YOU, MADAM SPEAKER, TO COUNCILLOR. NO. I DO NOT ANTICIPATE ANY PHONE CALLS. CMHC IS AWARE THE HEARING IS OCCURRING TODAY. THEY WERE AWARE IT WAS SCHEDULED A FEW WEEKS AGO WHEN IT WAS POSTPONED. I HAVE NOT HEARD ANY INDICATION THAT THEY WILL BE REACHING OUT WITH PARTICULAR QUESTIONS.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: YOU CAN DIRECT THIS AS YOU SEE FIT. WHEN WE APPROVED THE MALLS AND CORRIDOR, WHICH I VOTED FOR, THERE WAS NO SUNSET CLAUSE. THERE WAS NO REVIEW CLAUSE. THERE WAS NO MANDATE. THERE WAS NO DIRECTION TO RETURN BACK HERE IN ANY FRAME OF TIME TO REVISIT AMENDMENTS INTRODUCED BY COUNCILLORS OR OTHER ISSUES. IS THAT CORRECT?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. RESPONSE.

NO. THAT'S NOT CORRECT. WHEN WE DID MALLS AND CORRIDORS AND TWOS, THREES AND FOURS THERE WAS DIRECTION FROM COUNCIL AS PART OF THE ORIGINAL MOTION IN NOVEMBER 23, 2023. PART OF THAT ORIGINAL MOTION DIRECTED THE PUBLIC SERVICE TO HOLD PUBLIC HEARINGS WITH ALL OF COUNCIL FOR ANY OF THE CHANGES RELATED TO THESE. I COULD REFER TO THE CLERKS FOR PROBABLY BETTER LEGAL LANGUAGE THAN I USED.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THE QUESTIONS WAS PERHAPS NOT WELL PHRASED. WE DID HAVE A PUBLIC HEARING IN THIS BODY ON MALLS AND CORRIDORS. WE PASSED SIX AMENDMENTS, I THINK, DEFEATING ONLY THE ONE TABLED BY COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS. THERE WAS NOTHING PASSED AT THAT POINT SAYING AND WE WANT YOU TO COME BACK IN A YEAR OR 18 MONTHS OR TWO YEARS TELLING US WHERE THINGS HAVE GONE BADLY. WHERE THINGS HAVE GONE WRONG. THERE WAS NO PROVISION THAT REQUIRED US TO COME BACK HERE ON A SUBSEQUENT HEARING.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE.

MADAM CHAIR. I DEFER TO THE CLERKS TO -- IF THAT'S ALLOWED.

CLERK: WE WOULD HAVE TO GO BACK AND LOOK AT THE ORIGINAL DECISION, MADAM SPEAKER.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: CARLOS HAS BEEN HERE LONGER THAN I HAVE. I'LL AWAIT HIS GUIDANCE.

CLERK: OUR DIRECTOR CAN SPEAK TO THAT, AS WELL.

MADAM SPEAKER: MADAM DIRECTOR.

THROUGH YOU TO THE COUNCILLOR. THE VERY NATURE OF ZONING IS THAT WE WANT IT TO BE RESPONSIVE TO TODAY'S MARKET CONDITIONS AND CERTAINLY FOR MOTIONS THAT WE DIDN'T HAVE THE AMENDMENT OF TIME TO RESEARCH THE ABILITY TO SOURCE MATERIALS TO BE ABLE TO SATISFY THOSE MOTIONS, BOTH IN A TIMELY MANNER AND NOT COST PROHIBITIVE MANNER. THE NATURE OF ZONING IS TO BRING IT BACK IF THERE ARE PARTS OF IT THAT AREN'T WORKING. NO ZONING IS EVER REALLY SET IN STONE. IT CHANGES OVER TIME TO TRY TO SATISFY THE WILL OF THE COUNCIL, IN THIS CASE IS DELIVERY OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND ADDITIONAL HOUSING THAT'S MARKET RATE, AS WELL.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. COUNCILLOR MAYES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: NOT SURE IT'S THE WILL OF COUNCIL TO HAVE THIS HEARING WHEN THERE WAS NO DIRECTION TO SCHEDULE THIS HEARING. PUBLIC SERVICE HAS TAKEN A COURSE THEY ARE ALLOWED TO TAKE AND MOVE FORWARD WITH THIS REZONING. THE EVIDENCE THAT THE PDO -- WHY ARE WE HERE AND THE EVIDENCE SEEMS TO BE WE'RE NOT GETTING ENOUGH HOUSING STARTS. I GUESS I'LL LET YOU DIRECT THIS AS YOU SEE FIT, MADAM SPEAKER. DIDN'T WE GET AN ANNOUNCEMENT SUNDAY WITH SOMETHING THAT HOUSING STARTS 12% IN 2025 OVER 2024. CAN SOMEONE IN THE ADMINISTRATION CONFIRM THAT IN FACT IF WE'RE CONCERNED ABOUT LACK OF HOUSING STARTS THAT DOES SEEM TO RUN COUNTER TO THE CELEBRATION OF THE 12% INCREASE IN HOUSING STARTS IN 2025 OVER 2024.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE.

MADAM CHAIR, IT'S NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO HOUSING STARTS. THIS AMENDMENT IS RELATED TO THE UPTAKE IN MALLS AND CORRIDORS PDO IT'S BEEN APPROVED FOR OVER A YEAR. WE'VE HAD ONE APPLICATION THAT NEEDED VARIANCES AND NO OTHER APPLICATIONS FOR THE ENTIRE MALLS AND CORRIDORS PDO THAT'S WHAT THIS IS ABOUT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THAT LEADS TO ME QUESTION THEN WHICH IS IF THE EVIDENCE OF THE PROBLEM WOULD BE A LACK OF HOUSING STARTS, SURELY, THE FACT THAT WE HAVE AN ALMOST RECORD, NOT QUITE RECORD NUMBER OF HOUSING STARTS, WOULD SEGMENT PERHAPS NOT USING THE PDO BUT SURELY THE POINT OF THE PDO IS TO HAVE HOUSING STARTS. THE POINT OF HAVING A PDO IS NOT SIMPLY TO HAVE A PDO AM I MISSING SOMETHING HERE? WE SEEM TO BE CONGRATULATING OURSELVES ON A NEAR RECORD NUMBER OF HOUSING STARTS YET HERE WE ARE SAYING WE'RE NOT LIBERAL ENOUGH WITH THE RULES AND WE NEED TO ALLOW MORE FOR HOUSING STARTS.

MADAM SPEAKER, IF I MAY. FOR THE THREE YEARS AND INCLUDING THIS, I WAS THE CHAIR OF PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT. IT WAS POLITICAL DIRECTION OF COUNCIL AND AS CHAIR RESPONSIBLE FOR TRYING TO MOVE THIS THROUGH COUNCIL AND MAKE SURE THAT COUNCIL -- COUNCIL'S DIRECTION AROUND MALLS AND CORRIDORS WERE BEING USEFUL TO THE HOUSING STARTS, MADAM SPEAKER, I DID -- THIS WAS A CONCERTED EFFORT ON THE COMMITTEE TO KNOW THAT IT WASN'T WORKING AND TO GET QUICKLY BACK. THE QUESTION THEN THAT DIRECTOR HAZEL ANSWERED, I.E., IT'S NATURE WANTING TO COME BACK TO MAKE SURE THAT IT WAS DELIVERING FOR WINNIPEG.

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR ROLLINS, THANK YOU. WE'LL COME BACK TO YOU IF YOU WANT TO ELABORATE. I'LL CONTINUE WITH COUNCILLOR MAYES. WE HAVE A FEW SPEAKERS BEFORE YOU. THANK YOU. COUNCILLOR MAYES ANY OTHER QUESTIONS?

COUNCILLOR MAYES: YES. THANK YOU. WE'RE IN THE PROCESS TO ASK QUESTIONS. NO LIMIT ON THE AMENDMENTS AND NO LIMIT ON QUESTIONS.

MADAM SPEAKER: LOTS OF OPPORTUNITIES TODAY FOR SURE.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: SHAME COUNCILLOR WYATT ISN'T JOINING US. THE NUMBER PRESENTED, IN FACT, YESTERDAY AT E.P.C. FOR MULTIFAMILY UNITS UNDER THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR, I HAVE A QUESTION ABOUT THAT. YOU CAN DIRECT THAT AS YOU SEE FIT, MADAM SPEAKER. THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR NUMBERS ARE BEING MUCH CELEBRATED FOR BEING SUCCESSFULLY AT OR AHEAD OF TARGET. SEEMS TO CONTRADICT OR JUXTAPOSE WHAT WE'RE HEARING TODAY. MULTIFAMILY UNITS IN THE CITY DURING THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR PHASE ARE CURRENTLY AT 147% OF THE THREE-YEAR GOAL. WE'RE ABOUT TWO YEARS IN. WE'RE ALREADY ALMOST HALFWAY MORE THAN MULTIFAMILY THAN WE WERE TARGETING UNDER HOUSING ACCELERATOR. CAN SOMEONE CONFIRM THAT SINCE THAT WAS PRESENTED YESTERDAY.

MADAM SPEAKER: THE RESPONSE. LISSIE.

THANK YOU. YESTERDAY WE REPORTED THE BUILDING PERMITS RELEASED IN THE TIMEFRAME OF THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND AGREEMENT AS OF JANUARY 24, 2026. I CAN CONFIRM THAT MULTIFAMILY OTHER IS AT 147% AND THE OTHER REFERS TO MULTIFAMILY HOUSING THAT'S NOT WITHIN PROXIMITY OF TRANSIT. FREQUENT TRANSIT. SO MULTIFAMILY WITHIN PROXIMITY OF FREQUENT TRANSIT IS AT 63%. IT'S LOWER THAN THE REST OF OUR HOUSING UNITS AND WHERE WE THOUGHT WE MIGHT BE AT THIS TIME AND HOW THAT RELATES TO THE HEARING TODAY. THE CORRIDORS ARE WHERE OUR FREQUENT TRANSIT RUNS SO WE ARE A LITTLE BIT LOWER THAN WHERE WE THOUGHT WE WOULD BE.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: WE SHOULD BE AT 67% TWO YEARS INTO A THREE YEAR DEAL. WE'RE AT 63%.

MADAM SPEAKER, WE ARE AT 75% OVERALL. WE WOULD HOPE WE WOULD BE CLOSE TO THAT IF NOT ABOVE THAT FOR TRANSIT UNITS BUT WE ARE BELOW IT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: I'LL TAKE THAT AS A YES. TWO YEARS INTO A THREE YEAR THING WE SHOULD BE AT 67% WE'RE AT 63 AND 140% OF THE THREE YEAR TARGET ALREADY ON OTHER MULTIFAMILY. I'M

TRYING TO GET A SENSE OF THE DEPTH OF THE CRISIS WE'RE CALLED TO DEAL WITH SOMETHING WE JUST PASSED A YEAR AGO AS A COUNCIL.

I DON'T THINK ANYONE SAID CRISIS. I DON'T THINK ANYONE FRAMED THIS AS A CRISIS.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR. COUNCILLOR MAYES WE CAN COME BACK TO YOU. THAT'S YOUR FINAL QUESTION FOR NOW. THERE ARE A FEW OTHERS. YOU'VE HAD NINE MINUTES ALMOST NOW. CAN I COME BACK TO YOU?

COUNCILLOR MAYES: AS LONG AS YOU COME BACK TO ME.

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR LUKES.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: THANK YOU. I WANT TO CLARIFY. IF WE WERE TO ELIMINATE THE BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOW DESIGN PROVISIONS, WHAT WOULD BE ENACTED TOMORROW OR AFTER THE THREE READINGS? WHAT IS IN PLACE RELATED TO BIRD FRIENDLY? LIKE IF WE WERE TO ELIMINATE THAT IT DEFAULTS BACK TO THE ORIGINAL, CORRECT?

WE DON'T HAVE ANY REGULATIONS IN THE ZONING BYLAW WITH RESPECT TO BIRD FRIENDLY. SO RIGHT NOW MALLS AND CORRIDORS IS THE ONLY PART OF OUR ZONING BYLAW THAT HAS BIRD-FRIENDLY REQUIREMENTS. IF IT WAS REMOVED IT WOULD THEN BE THE SAME AS THE REST OF THE CITY.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: WOULD IT NOT GO BACK TO WHAT WE PASSED IN MALLS AND CORRIDORS THAT WE'VE GOT EXISTING IN THE BYLAW?

THE RECOMMENDATION THE PUBLIC SERVICE IS PUTTING FORWARD THAT WE REMOVE IT FOR NOW AND THEN THAT WE INCLUDE IT IN THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BYLAW REVIEW AND LOOK AT SOMETHING CITY WIDE.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: JUST WAIT HERE. I'M NOT CLEAR ON THIS THEN. YOU'RE SAYING THERE'S NOTHING IN THE BYLAW NOW? AM I NOT UNDERSTANDING.

THERE'S NOTHING IN THE ZONING BYLAW CURRENTLY EXCEPT WITHIN THE PDO

COUNCILLOR LUKES: EXCEPT WITHIN THE PDO, EXACTLY. THAT'S THE QUESTION. IF WE ELIMINATE IT FROM THE PDO TODAY. IF WE JUST TAKE OUT ELIMINATING BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOW DESIGN PROVISIONS. IF WE TAKE THAT OUT OF THE PDO TODAY WHAT'S ENACTED AFTER THE THIRD READING? WHAT IS IN PLACE?

THERE WOULD BE NO BIRD-FRIENDLY REGULATIONS THEN FOR ANYWHERE IN THE CITY.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: OKAY. I'M NOT UNDERSTANDING THIS CORRECTLY.

THROUGH MADAM CHAIR. COUNCILLOR, THE REST OF THE PDO WOULD STILL BE IN PLACE. AND WE'RE TRYING TO ENCOURAGE HOUSING ACROSS THE CITY AND IT'S GREAT NEWS WHAT WE'VE HEARD FROM

HALF AND WHAT WE'VE PERMITTED ACROSS THE CITY. WE'RE REFERRING TO THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS. THERE'S BEEN ZERO NEW HOUSING STARTS ALONG THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: OKAY.

BY RIGHT.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: SO THERE'S BEEN 0. HOW MANY HAVE OCCURRED THE OTHER PROCESS? ALONG MALLS AND CORRIDORS? IF YOU KNOW THERE'S NONE AS OF RIGHT, HOW MANY HAVE OCCURRED OTHERWISE? ARE YOU SAYING NONE EITHER?

MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. OVER THE LAST FIVE YEARS, THERE HAVE BEEN 2101 HOUSING STARTS WITHIN THE STUDY AREA OF THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS AND FOR CLARIFICATION, THE STUDY AREA OF THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS IS 2520 ACRES. THAT'S TEN SQUARE KILOMETRES VERSUS THE CITY AS A WHOLE, IS 5285 SQUARE KILOMETRES. THE CITY AS A WHOLE IS 518 TIMES BIGGER THAN MALLS AND CORRIDORS AND AT PRESENT TIME THERE'S NO BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOW REQUIREMENT.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: INDEPENDENT OF THE BIRD-FRIENDLY REQUIREMENT, WHEN WE DID AS OF RIGHT FOR MALLS AND CORRIDORS, WHEN THAT WAS PASSED. HOW MANY APPLICATIONS HAVE COME FORWARD SINCE THAT POINT IN TIME THAT HAVE NOT USED THE AS OF RIGHT THAT HAVE JUST FOLLOWED THE REGULAR PROCESS? YOU SAY THERE'S NONE THAT HAVE COME FORWARD AS OF RIGHT SINCE WE ENACTED THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS. HOW MANY HAVE COME FORWARD IN THE SAME WINDOW? I'M THINKING MAYBE THE TIMING THINGS AREN'T HAPPENING RIGHT NOW ON MALLS AND CORRIDORS. HOW MANY HAVE COME FORWARD

THROUGH YOU TO THE COUNCILLOR. WE DON'T HAVE AN EXACT NUMBER BUT WE HAVE HAD APPLICATIONS WHERE WE'VE HAD DISCUSSIONS WITH DEVELOPERS ABOUT THE PDO AND THEY'VE CHOSEN TO GO THROUGH THE REGULAR REZONING PROCESS BECAUSE THEY FOUND THE PDO TO BE TOO DIFFICULT TO MEET.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: YOU DON'T HAVE A NUMBER ON THOSE?

IT'S A HANDFUL. I COULDN'T GIVE YOU AN EXACT NUMBER.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: I'LL COME BACK.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. MR. MAYOR FOLLOWED BY COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: JUST A GENERAL QUESTION. PUBLIC POLICY, CITY POLICY COUNCIL SETS IN WORKING WITH THE PUBLIC AND THE PUBLIC SERVICES IS NOT A MATTER OF SET IT AND FORGET IT. I THINK IT'S ONE OF THE LINES OF QUESTION IS WHY ARE WE BACK HERE? WHO ASKED US TO COME BACK HERE? I FOUND A SURPRISING LINE OF QUESTION. MY QUESTION TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE IS DO THEY BELIEVE IT'S THEIR PREROGATIVE AND, IN FACT, RESPONSIBILITY TO WORK WITH THE PUBLIC IN THIS CASE DEVELOPERS AND COUNCIL TO IDENTIFY PROBLEMS AND BRING FORWARD SOLUTIONS TO COUNCIL? WE WOULD EXPECT, I THINK, WHETHER IT'S ON SNOW CLEARING, TRANSIT, AND IN THIS CASE IN DEVELOPMENT. DOES THE PUBLIC SERVICE SEE REALLY US BEING HERE AS THEIR ROLE TO

IDENTIFY PROBLEMS AND TO WORK WITH BRINGING FORWARD SOLUTIONS WITH US?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU, MR. MAYOR. THE RESPONSE.

YES. WE DEFINITELY SEE THAT AS OUR RESPONSIBILITY, PARTICULARLY BECAUSE BY RIGHT DEVELOPMENT GETS ADMINISTRATIVELY APPROVED VERSUS DEVELOPMENT THAT REQUIRES A REZONING WOULD GO AS COUNCIL WELL KNOWS BUT THROUGH COMMUNITY COMMITTEE, THROUGH S.P.C., THEN FOR APPROVALS VERSUS -- AND POTENTIALLY TO MUNICIPAL BOARDS. THIS WOULD SHORTEN THOSE APPROVAL TIMES. WHEN WE'RE TALKING ABOUT AFFORDABILITY, THE LONGER THE DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL PROCESS IS THE MORE EXPENSIVE THAT PROCESS ALSO IS FOR THE END USER.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. MR. MAYOR.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: I APPRECIATE THE QUESTION AND HOPE THAT ALL THE PUBLIC SERVICE, NO MATTER THE DEPARTMENT, WOULD BE IDENTIFYING PROBLEMS AND BRINGING FORWARD PROPOSED SOLUTIONS FOR COUNCIL TO CONSIDER AND NOT JUST WAIT ON COUNCIL TO CALL FOR THOSE SOLUTIONS. THE SECOND QUESTION I WOULD HAVE IS REGARDS TO HOUSING AND HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS. WE HAVE CELEBRATED THE NUMBER OF HOUSING STARTS THAT WE'RE -- WE SAW IN 2025, AS WE SHOULD CELEBRATE. IT'S REFLECTIVE OF THE WORK WE'VE DONE AS COUNCIL, YOU'VE DONE AS PUBLIC SERVICE AND OTHER PARTNERS IN THE COMMUNITY HAVE ENGAGED. TO SEE US HAVE A PUBLIC -- HAVE NUMBERS THAT REALLY DOUBLE WHAT THE NATIONAL AVERAGE IS. SO THE QUESTION I WOULD HAVE FOR PUBLIC SERVICE IS THAT A TIME WHEN WE ARE HITTING SOME TARGET AND ALMOST HITTING OTHER TARGETS, IS IT YOUR VIEW WE SHOULD SLOW DOWN OR CONTINUE TO REMOVE BARRIERS TO CONTINUE THE MOMENTUM ESPECIALLY WHEN WE HAVE A POLICY, A PDO, WE ADOPTED JANUARY 31ST LAST YEAR. WE'VE SEEN NO UPTAKE ON THAT PDO SO DO YOU THINK IT'S A TIME TO SLOW DOWN OR SHOULD WE KEEP THE MOMENTUM GOING?

MADAM SPEAKER: RESPONSE.

MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. THE WHOLE ACCELERATOR FUND HAD MULTIPLE TIERS OF INITIATIVES THAT IS INTENDING TO HAVE A SERIES OF OUTCOMES. THIS IS PART OF INITIATIVE ONE, WHICH IS ALL OF THE REZONING INITIATIVES AND THEN -- AND PART OF INITIATIVE 1 AND 2. THERE ARE OTHER INITIATIVES THAT ARE ABOUT THE GRANT PROGRAMS. SO WHILE THAT 5,000 NEW HOUSING STARTS WE ENJOYED IN 2025 HAD A LOT TO DO WITH GRANT PROGRAMS IN PLACE, THESE ZONING CHANGES ARE TO CREATE LONG-TERM SYSTEMIC SUPPORT IN OUR MARKET PLACE IN ORDER TO ENCOURAGE HOUSING VIABILITY LONG TERM. YES. WHEN WE IDENTIFY ISSUES OR PROBLEMS WITH ANY OF OUR TOOLS THAT WE CURRENTLY HAVE ADOPTED, OUR JOB IS TO RECOMMEND TWEAKS TO THOSE SO THEY WORK BETTER.

MR. MAYOR, IT'S NOT A TIME TO SLOW DOWN. IT'S A TIME TO KEEP MOVING FORWARD AND TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THIS MOMENTUM. WE'VE SEEN AND HEARD MALLS AND CORRIDORS PDO IS JUST NOT WORKING FOR THESE KEY REASONS. THAT'S WHY WE'RE BRINGING THIS FORWARD. KEEP GOING WITH THIS MOMENTUM AND ENCOURAGE MORE BUILDING PERMITS.

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

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: . KEEP GOING FAST. DEMOCRACY IS COMPLETELY OVERRIDDEN. I'LL GET INTO THAT A LITTLE BIT. I'M NOT AS KEEN AS THIS GUNS BLAZING, LET'S KEEP MOVING. I'LL PUT THAT ON THE RECORD. I THINK IT'S HAVING SOME IMPACTS ESPECIALLY WITH THE POPULATION SLOWING DOWN. ONE TIME WE SAID, OKAY. WE SEE A PROBLEM. LET'S GO FORWARD AND GET IT FIXED. THAT'S WHAT WE TOLD AND THAT'S WHAT WE'VE BEEN TOLD TODAY IS WHAT WE'RE GOING TO BE DOING. HOWEVER, WHEN WE TALK ABOUT IT BEFORE, COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW, WE MUST WAIT TO HAVE A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW HAPPENS, COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW. THAT'S WHEN WE'LL LOOK AT THIS, COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW. COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW. LET IT SETTLE AND THEN DO THE BUNDLING WHEN WE HEAR THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW. WE'LL WAIT FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW ON SOME AREAS PROBABLY RELATED TO INDIVIDUAL RIGHT AND DEMOCRACY. WE'RE NOW GOING TO CHANGE. SOME AREAS WE WAIT FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW AND SOME WE'RE NOT. THAT'S WHAT'S HAPPENING TODAY. CAN YOU EXPLAIN THAT.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU FOR THE QUESTION. THE RESPONSE.

MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. COUNCILLOR, WE ARE RECOMMENDING THESE C.S.A. BIRD-FRIENDLY REGULATIONS BE PART OF THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW. WE DID NOT BRING FORWARD MALLS AND CORRIDORS WITH BIRD-FRIENDLY REGULATIONS. WE WERE DIRECTED BY COUNCIL IN 2021 TO REVIEW THESE BIRD-FRIENDLY REGULATIONS AS PART OF THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW. THAT'S WHAT WE'RE SAYING IN TERMS OF COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BYLAW REVIEW.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: YOU'RE SAYING TO ME TODAY. EVEN THOUGH COUNCIL SAID WE WANT TO PUT IT IN HERE SINCE THERE'S AN AMENDMENT WE MAY NOT AGREE TO. WE WANT TO PULL IT OUT AND PUT IT IN THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW EVEN THOUGH COUNCIL PUT IT IN AS AN AMENDMENT. THAT'S WHAT THE GENERAL GIST IS? CORRECT?

MADAM SPEAKER: RESPONSE.

MADAM CHAIR, IT WAS AN AMENDMENT AT THE 11TH HOUR AT THAT COUNCIL MEETING, AS YOU REMEMBER. WE DID NOT HAVE TIME TO RESEARCH IT. HOWEVER, THERE WAS COUNCIL DIRECTION TO PUT THAT AMENDMENT INTO THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS PDO WE ARE SEEING NOW IT'S NOT WORKING. SO WE'RE RECOMMENDING TO GO THROUGH THE FULL ZONING BYLAW REWRITE AND HAVE THAT AS PART OF THE WHOLE PROCESS AND THAT'S WHAT WAS DIRECTED IN 2021. THAT AMENDMENT CAME FROM THE FLOOR OF COUNCIL AT THE 11TH HOUR. IT WASN'T SOMETHING WE RECOMMENDED, AT THAT TIME.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: SOMETIMES COUNCIL DECIDES IT WANTS TO DO SOMETHING ADMINISTRATION DOESN'T. AGAIN, THAT'S OUR RIGHT AND STRENGTH AS COUNCIL. WE GET TO DO THAT. YOU DON'T SEE A PROBLEM HERE SO WE'RE GOING TO GO BACK ON THAT. COUNCIL'S WILL, I GUESS. ANOTHER QUESTION IS THE APPLICANT TODAY IS THE CITY OF WINNIPEG. HAVE YOU -- YOU SPOKE WITH DEVELOPERS HAVING PROBLEMS WITH THIS ISSUE. YOU DIDN'T SPEAK TO ANYBODY IN THE PUBLIC, I DON'T THINK, BUT OKAY. ARE ANY OF THE DEVELOPERS HERE TODAY TO SUPPORT THIS REMOVAL? HAVE THEY SHOWN UP OR ON THE LIST? I DIDN'T SEE ANYTHING YESTERDAY ON THE LIST.

MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. COUNCILLOR, I'M NOT AWARE OF WHO MAY HAVE REGISTERED

FROM THE DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY. I KNOW WE'VE RECEIVED E-MAILS AND POSITIVE FEEDBACK FROM SEVERAL MEMBERS OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY INCLUDING LANNY MCI NN CIRCUMSTANCES.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: WE DON'T HAVE THAT AS PART OF THE PUBLIC RECORD. THE QUESTION IS ARE THEY HERE TO SAY WE SUPPORT THE REMOVAL OF THIS? THAT'S ALL I WANT TO KNOW.

MADAM SPEAKER: THERE ARE SOME DELEGATIONS TO COME FORWARD LATER.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: LAST QUESTION. IF YOU'RE SAYING THAT WE'RE NOT GETTING ENOUGH PICK UPS IN MALLS AND CORRIDORS. IT'S A PROBLEM. WE HAVE TO FIX THIS BEFORE THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW HAPPENS. I'M HEARING A LOT OF THINGS I'M NOT TOO UNHAPPY ABOUT. FOURPLEXES AREN'T WORKING. THE DEVELOPERS CALLED ME AND SAID WE WANT TO DO SIXPLEXES. FOURPLEXES IS ECONOMICALLY NOT VIABLE. WE'RE NOT GOING TO DO THEM UNTIL YOU LET US DO SIXPLEXES. NOW IT'S SETTING A PRECEDENT TO SAY YOU'RE GOING TO HEAR FROM DEVELOPERS PROBABLY THE SAME THING. WHY WON'T YOU COME BACK NEXT MONTH AND SAY WE WANT TO AMEND THE FOURS AND MAKE IT SIXES? PRECEDENT IS SET HERE TODAY. I DON'T KNOW WHO CALLED OR DIDN'T CALL. CAN YOU ALLEVIATE SOME OF MY CONCERNS THIS ISN'T SETTING A PRECEDENT FORWARD DEVELOPERS ARE GOING TO BE ABLE TO TALK TO THE ADMINISTRATION BY THEMSELVES BEHIND CLOSED DOORS AND SAY, HEY. WE WANT TO CHANGE STUFF. THEN THE ADMINISTRATION IS GOING TO ACT ON BEHALF OF THE DEVELOPER AND COME FORWARD TO SAY, OKAY. FOURPLEXES, WELL, WE DON'T LIKE THOSE. WE WANT TO DO SIXPLEXES. HOW CAN YOU ASSURE ME THAT'S NOT GOING TO BE HAPPENING?

MADAM CHAIR THROUGH YOU TO THE COUNCILLOR. TODAY'S HEARING IS REGARDING MALLS AND CORRIDORS PDO WE HAVEN'T HAD A LOT OF FOURPLEXES TO DATE AND WE'LL CONTINUE WORKING WITH THE DEVELOPMENT INDUSTRY AND AS WE GO THROUGH THE FULL ZONING BYLAW REWRITE, THERE MAYBE BE CHANGES. MADAM DIRECTOR.

MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. FOR SOMETHING LIKE SIXPLEXES, WE WOULD NEVER RECOMMEND THAT CITY WIDE. THAT'S NOT BEST PRACTISE. YOU'RE NOT SEEING ANY CITY ON THIS CONTINENT DOING THAT BECAUSE OF INFRASTRUCTURE CONSTRAINTS, STREET CONSTRAINTS, NEIGHBOURHOOD AMENITY CONSTRAINTS.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: TORONTO GOT FUNDING REDUCED BECAUSE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND DEMANDED SIXPLEXES CITY WIDE. THEY SAID NO AND THAT ENDED UP CHANGING. YOU MAY SAY IT'S SOMETHING WE WOULDN'T APPROVE BUT OBVIOUSLY OTHER CITIES OR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAVE DECIDED SIXPLEXES CITY WIDE IS SOMETHING THAT THEY AGREE WITH. DOING SO IN TORONTO SAID NO SELECT NEIGHBOURHOODS. THEY LOST I THINK $10 MILLION FROM THEIR FUNDING. I HEAR YOU SAYING THAT BUT YOU MAY NOT SAY THAT BUT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS SAYING THAT. MAYBE THERE'S A DIFFERENT OPINION SIXPLEXES ARE A GOOD THING BY SOME PLANNERS.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS. COUNCILLOR DUNCAN.

COUNCILLOR DUNCAN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MADAM SPEAKER AND I APPRECIATE YOU ALLOWING US TO SIT TO POSE OUR QUESTIONS TODAY. IT'S MUCH APPRECIATED. FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE

THROUGH YOU, MADAM SPEAKER. WE'LL START OFF EASY. I HATE TO REHASH OLD WOUNDS. WHAT WAS THE INTENTION OF HAVING MULTIFAMILY BUILT ON CORRIDOR AND AT MALL SITES? WHAT'S THE INTENTION OF THAT?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE.

MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. THE INTENTION IS MULTIFOLD. ONE IS WE HAVE COUNCIL ADOPTED POLICY THAT ENCOURAGES COMPLETE COMMUNITIES FOR BETTER USE OF OUR INFRASTRUCTURE. SO COMPLETE COMMUNITIES TEND TO, IF YOU ADD THEM TO EXISTING PARKING LOTS FOR MALLS FOR BABY BOX FOR STRIP MALLS FOR BIG BOX, THAT'S USING THAT UNDERUTILIZED PARKING LOT BUT IT'S ALSO COMPLETING A SINGLE-USE COMMUNITY WITH WHAT'S MISSING. COMPLETING IT WITH MISSING USES AND IN THIS CASE PREDOMINANTLY RESIDENTIAL BUT ALSO SMALL-SCALE AMENITIES LIKE RESTAURANTS AND SHOPS. SO THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS PDO INTENDED AS PART OF THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND PACKAGE OF POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS, IT INTENDED TO GROW THE TAX BASE IN A WAY THAT COULD UTILIZE THE UNDERUTILIZED RESOURCES AND RETURN BACK TO THE CITY MORE PROPERTY TAX PER ACRE BECAUSE OF THE FACT THAT MUCH OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE IS ALREADY IN PLACE. SOMETIMES THAT'S NOT TRUE. SOMETIMES YOU NEED TO UP SIZE SOME OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE, AS WELL.

COUNCILLOR DUNCAN: THROUGH YOU, MADAM SPEAKER. I WOULD ASSUME THERE'S ALSO A DENSITY WANT HERE TO HAVE DENSITY ON OUR CORRIDORS. HAVE THEM -- A NEW IDEA FOR WINNIPEG TO HAVE DENSITY, RESIDENTIAL DENSITY, AT OUR MALL SITES, TRUE?

VERY MUCH TRUE, MADAM CHAIR THROUGH YOU TO THE COUNCILLOR. FOR INSTANCE, IF YOU LOOK AT OUR EXISTING UNDERLYING ZONING THAT'S PREDOMINANTLY USED ON MALLS AND CORRIDORS NOW. BUT FOR THAT 2500 ACRE STUDY AREA THAT IS MALLS AND CORRIDORS, THE EXISTING UNDERLYING ZONING WOULD SUPPORT UP TO 47,000 DWELLING UNITS. BUT THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS WOULD SUPPORT 180,000 DWELLING UNITS. THAT'S PUTTING THE NEW DENSITY ON OUR WIDEST FASTEST STREETS. THE NEW DENSITY IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO OUR MOST FREQUENT TRANSIT SERVICES.

COUNCILLOR DUNCAN: SO THROUGH YOU, MADAM SPEAKER, SHOULD WE NOT ALLOW ANY AMENDMENTS TO THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS PDO? I WOULD ASSUME THAT MULTIFAMILY WOULD BE TARGETED WITHIN NEIGHBOURHOODS, ESTABLISHED NEIGHBOURHOODS. TRUE OR FALSE?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. RESPONSE.

MADAM CHAIR I'LL START AND SOME OTHER PUBLIC SERVICE MIGHT WANT TO JOIN IN. THAT WOULD BE TRUE. THAT WOULD BE OUR ESTIMATION. THEY WOULD CONTINUE TO BUILD IN NEIGHBOURHOODS OR THEY WOULD CONTINUE TO USE THE UNDERLYING ZONE AND GO THROUGH THE PUBLIC HEARING PROCESS, GO THROUGH VARIANCES. GO THROUGH A MUCH LONGER PROCESS TO GET DEVELOPMENT.

COUNCILLOR DUNCAN: I KNOW THERE ARE SOME, THROUGH YOU MADAM SPEAKER, THAT ARE OPPOSED TO MULTIFAMILY IN RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS. ON OCCASION I AM ONE OF THEM. WHAT IS SOME OF THE BIGGEST PUSHBACK WE HEAR FROM WINNIPEGGERS WHEN THERE IS A MULTIFAMILY BUILDING BUILT IN AN ESTABLISHED NEIGHBOURHOOD SURROUNDED BY SINGLE-FAMILY

HOMES?

MADAM CHAIR, TYPICALLY IT'S TRAFFIC, PARKING, HEIGHT, MASSING. THOSE ARE SORT OF THE KEY PUSH BACKS WE GET. ON MALLS AND CORRIDORS YOU AVOID A LOT OF THOSE CONCERNS BECAUSE YOU'RE ON OUR FASTEST AND WIDEST STREETS. YOU'RE WITHIN THE LARGE PARKING AREA OF RETAIL MALLS. YOU HAVE HEIGHT AROUND YOU THAT'S ALREADY AT A HIGHER SCALE THAN SOME OF THE NEIGHBOURHOODS. THOSE ARE SOME OF THE KEY CONSIDERATIONS.

COUNCILLOR DUNCAN: IF I MAY, MADAM SPEAKER, HOW OFTEN DOES THE DEPARTMENT COME FORWARD TO COUNCILLORS, INFORMALLY ON SUGGESTIONS ON MOTIONS.

SUGGESTIONS ON MOTIONS?

COUNCILLOR DUNCAN: TO IMPROVE THE PROCESSES, POLICY, BETTERMENT OF OUR CITY. HOW OFTEN?

MADAM CHAIR THROUGH YOU. WHENEVER A COUNCILLOR APPROACHES US WITH A MOTION TO, YOU KNOW, SAY WOULD THIS WORK WITH WITHIN OUR ADOPTED POLICIES, WE ALWAYS PROVIDE SUPPORT AND INFORMATION REGARDING THAT.

MADAM CHAIR IT'S RARE THAT WE COME TO COUNCILLORS WITH MOTIONS. IT'S TYPICALLY THE OTHER WAY AROUND. IN THIS CASE, THIS ISN'T A MOTION. THIS IS A RECOMMENDED AMENDMENT AND WE'RE COMING FORWARD BECAUSE WE SEE A PROBLEM WITH WHAT COUNCIL ADOPTED.

COUNCILLOR DUNCAN: FINAL QUESTION ON THIS ROUND FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE, MADAM SPEAKER. HAVE YOU RECEIVED FEEDBACK ON THESE PARTICULAR AMENDMENTS FROM COUNCILLORS AND WHAT HAVE YOU DONE WITH THAT FEEDBACK, IF YOU HAVE?

MADAM SPEAKER: THE RESPONSE. MICHAEL, THE RESPONSE.

THROUGH YOU TO THE COUNCILLOR. WE DID RECEIVE FEEDBACK ON THE BIRD-FRIENDLY RECOMMENDATION TO ELIMINATE THE BIRD-FRIENDLY REQUIREMENTS. THERE WAS TREPIDATION OR CONCERN ABOUT THAT THAT IT MIGHT BE GOING TOO FAR. WE DID SUGGEST THAT THERE COULD BE A COMPROMISE WHERE INSTEAD OF REMOVING IT COMPLETELY A CHANGE TO THE BYLAW WOULD SAY AN ALTERNATIVE COULD BE APPROVED TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE DIRECTOR. IT WOULD BE LESS PRESCRIPTIVE AND ALLOW MORE FLEXIBILITY.

COUNCILLOR DUNCAN: THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU, COUNCILLOR DUNCAN. NEXT COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS FOLLOWED BY COUNCILLOR SANTOS.

COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER. PART OF THE QUESTION I HAVE HAS BEEN ANSWERED IN TERMS OF THE LINE OF QUESTIONING BY COUNCILLOR DUNCAN. AT THE BEGINNING OF THE HEARING YOU HAD MENTIONED MR. VEITCH THAT THE PUBLIC SERVICE WOULD ACCEPT AMENDMENTS TO THE BIRD FRIENDLY. YOU JUST REITERATED THAT. HAS ANYONE FROM THE PUBLIC

SERVICE DONE ANY ENVIRONMENTAL SCANS TO SEE WHAT OTHER CITIES ARE DOING IN TERMS OF OPTIONS TO THE BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOWS AND WOULD BE IN A POSITION TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCILLORS WITH RESPECT TO KEEPING THIS IN. AGAIN, FROM THOSE NATURE PERSPECTIVE, THOSE THAT ARE SEEKING TO PROTECT BIRDS, YOU KNOW, THE DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY CAN WORK WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT YOU PROVIDE BASED ON ENVIRONMENTAL SCANS OF OTHER CITIES AS OPPOSED TO JUST RIPPING IT RIGHT OUT.

MADAM SPEAKER TO THE COUNCILLOR. DEVIN CLARK, OUR SENIOR PLANNING WILL BE PRESENTING ON BEHALF OF THE PUBLIC SERVICE IN A MOMENT. HE DID DO A QUICK CROSS JURISDICTIONAL SCAN AND HE DOES HAVE SOME SUGGESTIONS. I THINK HE'LL BE ABLE TO ELABORATE FURTHER ON THAT WHEN HE COMES UP.

COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS: SECONDLY, SECOND QUESTION. WINNIPEG IS HOME TO QUITE A FEW WINDOW MANUFACTURERS, THE INDUSTRY HERE IN MANITOBA, EXPANSION OF A COUPLE OF DIFFERENT BUSINESSES DEALING WITH WINDOWS. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION WITH THOSE BUSINESSES IN TERMS OF HOW PROHIBITIVE THIS PROCESS MIGHT BE?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE.

MADAM CHAIR THROUGH YOU TO THE COUNCILLOR. YES, WE DID HAVE SOME INFORMAL CONVERSATIONS WITH A NUMBER OF WINDOW PROVIDERS. IT'S VERY HARD TO GIVE SPECIFIC DOLLAR FOR DOLLAR COMPARISONS BECAUSE WINDOWS THESE DAYS ARE SPECIFIED WITH ALL SORTS OF DIFFERENT MODIFICATIONS LIKE DEPENDING ON UV OR REFLECTION. BUT IF YOU JUST TAKE A SIMPLE GLASS THAT MAY RUN $25 A SQUARE FOOT AND THEN YOU PUT THE BIRD-FRIENDLY REQUIREMENTS ON IT. ON AVERAGE IT DOUBLES. THEN YOU NEED TO BUILD THE FRAME AND INSTALL IT. IT'S NOT DOUBLING THE PRICE OF THE WINDOWS BUT IT'S DOUBLING THE PRICE OF THE GLASS ON AVERAGE. BUT FOR A SIMPLE GLASS. HOWEVER, ADDITIONALLY TO THE PRICE THERE ARE ALSO AVAILABILITY CONSTRAINTS. IN CANADA RIGHT NOW THERE'S PREDOMINANTLY THE LARGEST AND MOST DEPENDABLE PROVIDER IS IN B.C. THE REST OF THE BIRD-FRIENDLY GLASS THAT WILL HOLD UP TO OUR CLIMATE IS PREDOMINANTLY SOURCED FROM THE U.S. UNLESS YOU WANT TO ADD LARGE ARTWORK SORT OF DECALS THAT MAKE IT NOT ABLE TO SEE INSIDE THE BUILDING, WHICH WOULD BE A PROBLEM IN A COMPLETE COMMUNITY WALKABLE ENVIRONMENT. YOU WANT TO HAVE THAT ABILITY TO HAVE EYES ON THE STREET AND HAVE THAT SENSE OF COMMUNITY IN PLACE. SO JUST MAKING THE WINDOWS INPENETRABLE TO SIGHT IS A CHALLENGE WHICH IS WHY THE CANADIAN STANDARDS ASSOCIATION RECOMMENDS THE BIRD-FRIENDLY DOTS THAT YOU CAN STILL SEE INTO THE BUILDING.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS, NEXT QUESTION.

COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS: LAST QUESTION. MORE OF A COMMENT. I WILL WAIT FOR DEVIN CLARK'S PRESENTATION IN TERMS OF OPTIONS FOR THE BIRD FRIENDLY. THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. NEXT COUNCILLOR SANTOS FOLLOWED BY COUNCILLOR EADIE. COUNCILLOR EADIE.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: MADAM SPEAKER. THERE WAS AN ANSWER ABOUT RECEIVING COMMUNICATIONS AND I JUST HEARD THAT THEY INVESTIGATED -- SPOKE TO SOME WINDOW COMPANIES, MADAM

SPEAKER. IS THERE -- DEVELOPMENT IN COMMUNICATING HAS ANY APPLICANTS SAID WE'RE NOT GOING TO DO THIS BECAUSE WE HAVE TO DO BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOWS?

THROUGH YOU TO THE SPEAKER. WE DID HAVE ONE WHO APPLIED FOR A VARIANCE AND THEY WERE SUCCESSFUL IN GETTING THE VARIANCE. THEY INDICATED MEETING THE BYLAW WOULD HAVE COST PROHIBITIVE FOR THE PROJECT. THEY APPLIED FOR A VARIANCE. WE'VE HAD OTHERS WHO HAVE NOT GONE THROUGH THE PDO BECAUSE THEY SAID IT WAS TOO DIFFICULT. IN SOME CASES IT COULD HAVE BEEN A COMBINATION OF FACTORS. IT COULD HAVE BEEN THE BIRD FRIENDLY OR IT COULD HAVE BEEN THE HEIGHT OR IT COULD HAVE BEEN THE FIRST FLOOR. THERE'S MULTIPLE ISSUES WITH IT.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: MADAM SPEAKER, SO THE VARIANCE, JUST TO BE CLEAR, WAS THE VARIANCE REQUEST TO GET RID OF BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOWS?

MADAM SPEAKER TO THE COUNCILLOR. YES. IT WAS A VARIANCE APPLICATION. IT WAS FOR A PROJECT ON PORTAGE AVENUE AND THE DEVELOPER INDICATED THAT THE COST OF SOURCING THE BIRD FRIENDLY WOULD HAVE MADE THE PROJECT -- IT WOULD HAVE BEEN COST PROHIBITIVE AND MADE THE PROJECT NOT FEASIBLE SO THEY APPLIED FOR A VARIANCE TO WAIVE THE BIRD-FRIENDLY REQUIREMENTS.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: MADAM SPEAKER, I'M REALLY CURIOUS. THE THING IS ALL THESE WINDOW PRODUCING COMPANIES ARE PRIVATE SECTOR CORPORATIONS ALWAYS LOOKING FOR MARKETS TO EXPAND THEIR REVENUE AND SALES. IS THERE ANY KIND OF STUDY THAT YOU CAN PROVIDE US THAT SAID IF MORE CITIES HAD THIS BIRD FRIENDLY IN THEIR ZONING BYLAW -- SO MARKET CAPABILITY. YOU SAID SOME ARE CAPABLE BUT IS THERE AN ACTUAL REAL STUDY THAT WOULD INDICATE WHETHER OR NOT HAVING THIS IN PLACE, I THINK IT IS IN SOME OTHER CITIES. I'M NOT SURE. SEEMS TO ME COMPANIES WILL MOVE TO FILL THE MARKET AND THEY'LL BE COMPETITIVE. IS THERE ANY KIND OF STUDY THAT YOU'RE BRINGING FORTH IN THIS APPLICATION TO REMOVE THE OR IS THERE ANYTHING IN THIS APPLICATION TO SUPPORT HOW THE PRIVATE SECTOR MIGHT RESPOND IF THERE WAS MORE OF THESE RULES IN PLACE?

THROUGH YOU SPEAKER TO THE COUNCILLOR. DEVIN CLARK WILL TALK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT THE CROSS JURISDICTIONAL ANALYSIS AND WHAT HE FOUND. I BELIEVE PRESENT DAY SOME JURISDICTIONS IN ONTARIO ARE THE ONLY OTHER JURISDICTIONS IN CANADA THAT HAVE REQUIREMENTS FOR BIRD-FRIENDLY GLASS ON THEIR BUILDINGS. I AGREE WITH THE PREMISE OF WHAT YOU'RE SAYING. IF MORE MUNICIPALITIES HAD THESE REGULATIONS POSSIBLY THE COST OF SUPPLIES WOULD GO DOWN. WE'RE DEALING WITH A SITUATION AS IT IS TODAY.

MADAM SPEAKER: NEXT QUESTION.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: ONE THING JUST FOR CLARIFICATION. I'M NOT SURE AT WHAT LEVEL THE BIRD ARE ON HERE FLYING. I DO GET A BIRD FLYING INTO MY COUNCIL BUILDING OFFICE WINDOW LOWER DOWN. IT HAPPENS. MAYBE ONCE EVERY COUPLE OF MONTHS. WHAT FLOOR LEVELS DO YOU NEED TO PROVIDE THIS BIRD-FRIENDLY GLASS? IS IT A COUPLE OF STOREYS OR IS IT LIKE HALF THE BUILDING?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE, PLEASE.

THROUGH THE CHAIR TO THE COUNCILLOR. IT'S 52 FEET FROM THE GROUND UP TO THE FIRST 52 FEET OF THE BUILDING THAT WOULD REQUIRE THE BIRD-FRIENDLY GLASS IN THE BYLAW, CURRENTLY.

COUNCILLOR EADIE: MADAM SPEAKER, SO 52 FEET. THAT'S SIX STOREY, I THINK.

THROUGH THE CHAIR TO THE SPEAKER. IT WOULD BE APPROXIMATELY 4 TO 5 STOREYS DEPENDING UPON THE FLOOR TO CEILING HEIGHT. NO MORE THAN FIVE STOREYS.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS, COUNCILLOR MAYES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THANK YOU. COUPLE OF QUESTIONS ON PROCESS AND A COUPLE OF QUESTIONS ON EVIDENCE. IN TERMS OF PROCESS, THE MAYOR QUESTION USED A PHRASE WORKING WITH THE PUBLIC, CONSULTING WITH STAKEHOLDERS. I UNDERSTAND THE EVIDENCE WE'VE BEEN PRESENTED THERE WERE TWO MEETINGS WITH DEVELOPERS OR DEVELOPER GROUPS. THERE WAS NO PUBLIC TOWN HALLS. THERE WAS NO VIRTUAL PUBLIC TOWN HALL. NOTHING WITH THE PUBLIC ON THESE AMENDMENTS. CAN WE GET THAT CONFIRMED?

MADAM SPEAKER: THE RESPONSE.

THANK YOU, THROUGH THE CHAIR TO THE COUNCILLOR. THERE WAS NO CONSULTATION. THESE WERE THREE EDITS BROUGHT FORWARD AT A RAPID PACE TO ENCOURAGE THE DEVELOPMENT AND UPTAKE ON THESE COUNCIL PRIORITY AREAS. THESE EDITS WERE REVIEWED AND CONTEMPLATED WITH THE IN HOUSE RESOURCES AND AS YOU MENTIONED, WE DID CONNECT WITH THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE A FEW TIMES INFORMALLY. THERE'S NO BUDGET ASSOCIATED WITH THIS WORK, WITH THIS CHANGE. NOR WAS -- IT WASN'T AVAILABLE FOR CONSULTATION. WE SEE THE EDITS AS A QUICK FIX JUST TO ENCOURAGE THE MULTIFAMILY APPLICATION ON MALLS AND CORRIDORS. AS PART OF THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BY LAWS, THE R.F.P., HAS BEEN ISSUED AND AWARDED. AS PART OF THAT WORK IT'S A TWO YEAR PROCESS. IT'S KICKING OFF RIGHT NOW. THAT WILL INCLUDE THOROUGH REVIEW, CROSS JURISDICTIONAL ANALYSIS, SIGNIFICANT PUBLIC CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THE ANSWER WAS NO. THERE'S BEEN NO CONSULTATION ON THIS PROVISION WITH THE STAKEHOLDER ORS WITH THE PUBLIC. I HAVE NOT SEEN IN 14 YEARS MORE THAN 700 PEOPLE FILE IN OPPOSITION TO SOMETHING. IT MIGHT BE 600. MAYBE HIGH 600S. THE CLERKS CAN MAYBE CLARIFY THAT. SORRY. 700. OVER 700 PEOPLE FILING IN OPPOSITION. IN TERMS OF -- I'M STILL TRYING TO GET THE PROCESS REALLY. THERE HASN'T BEEN PUBLIC CONSULTATION. WE'VE HAD 700 PEOPLE CONTACT THE COUNCILLORS AND THE MAYOR, PRESUMABLY, WITH OBJECTIONS TO THIS PROPOSAL. ARE YOU AWARE OF ANY -- THE FEEDBACK ON THIS SEEMS TO DWARF OTHER ZONING CHANGES PROPOSED UNDER THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR. IS THAT ACCURATE?

YES. I WOULD SAY THAT'S ACCURATE.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: IN TERMS OF PROCESS THERE'S A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ABOUT TARGETS IN THE PLURAL. SO I'VE GOT TO ASK. MISSING MIDDLE HAS BEEN THE GREAT SUCCESS STOREY UNDER THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR ONE COULD ARGUE. 209% OF THE THREE YEAR TARGET WE'RE PASSED THE TWO YEAR MARK. WE'RE DOUBLE WHAT WE SET OUT TO ACCOMPLISH IN TWOS, THREES, AND FOURS.

BASED ON THE RUNWAY SUCCESS OF MISSING MIDDLE ARE WE ANTICIPATING ANY CITY OF WINNIPEG STAFF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO WHAT WAS PASS BID COUNCIL AROUND THAT PARTICULAR AREA GIVEN THAT WE SEEM TO BE LITERALLY MORE THAN DOUBLE WHAT WE WERE TARGETING TODAY?

MADAM CHAIR TO THE COUNCILLOR. NO. WE DON'T ANTICIPATE BRINGING FORWARD ANY CHANGES TO THE ADOPTED TWOS, THREES AND FOURS MISSING MIDDLE INFILL WORK. THIS IS SPECIFICALLY IDENTIFYING THE PDO FOR MALLS AND CORRIDORS WHERE WE'VE HAD 0 UPTAKE. THAT'S WHY WE'RE BRINGING THIS FORWARD.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THE UNDERACHIEVING COUSIN UNDER THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR IS THE ABSENT SINGLE, WHICH IS AT 36% OF WHAT WE WERE TARGETING FOR SINGLE FAMILY HOMES. ONE YEAR IN WE SHOULD BE AT 67%. TWO YEARS WE SHOULD BE AT 67% AND WE'RE AT 36%. WITHER WELL BEHIND ON SINGLE FAMILY. ANY PROPOSED CHANGES COMING TO PROMOTE ENHANCE, ACCELERATE THAT PARTICULAR AREA? THE ABSENT SINGLE?

MADAM CHAIR, NO SPECIFIC CHANGES AT THIS POINT TO SINGLES. HOWEVER, WITH THE FULL ZONING BYLAW REWRITE THAT WILL BE SOMETHING WE LOOK AT CLOSELY.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THE ABSENT SINGLE.

I WOULD JUST SAY SINGLE FAMILY.

MADAM SPEAKER, I'LL ADD REMINDER AS TO WHY WE'RE BEHIND ON OUR SINGLE DETACHED TARGETS AND WHY WE'RE AHEAD ON MISSING MIDDLE. AS WE PREPARED THE APPLICATION IT WAS OUR UNDERSTANDING SINGLE DETACHED HOMES WITH A SECOND CARE SUITE WOULD BE CONSIDERED SINGLE DETACHED HOME. AFTER BEING APPROVED THEY ARE CONSIDERED MISSING MIDDLE. I DON'T KNOW THE NUMBER BECAUSE WE DON'T TRACK SINGLE DETACHED WITH A SECONDARY SUITE ON ITS OWN TO UNDERSTAND THE CONTEXT. IT IS LOWER BECAUSE THE SINGLE DETACHED HOMES ARE SHOWING UP IN THE MISSING MIDDLE NUMBERS.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: I WAS HOPING YOU WOULD SAY THAT BECAUSE THAT GOES TO DISCUSSION ABOUT THE RESERVE. YOU CAN'T SAY THIS COUNTS AS A TWO FOR PURPOSES UNDER COUNT UNDER HALF BUT DOESN'T COUNT AS TWO FOR PURPOSE OF INFILL. NO MISSING MIDDLE. NO. IT WAS ONLY DUPLEXES FOR THIS COUNT AND OVER HERE IT DOESN'T. YOU CAN'T DO BOTH. IT'S YOU'RE IN OR OUT. WE'LL COME BACK TO THE RESERVE AT SOME OTHER POINT. THANK YOU. I'M HOPING TO HAVE THAT EVIDENCE. CAN YOU GIVE US ANY OTHER ADDRESSES, NAMES OF DEVELOPERS SITES. WE'RE TOLD THIS BIRD FRIENDLY --

WE'VE HAD ONE APPLICATION UNDER ONE PDO THIS IS NOT SOMETHING AFFECTING THE ENTIRE CITY. WE'VE MADE A COMMITMENT TO REVIEW BIRD-FRIENDLY STANDARDS FOR THE ENTIRE CITY AS PART OF THE ZONING BYLAW.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THERE IS A PROTECTION IN PLACE IN SOME PARTS OF THE CITY. THERE ISN'T A PROTECTION IF PLACE IN LARGE PARTS SQUARE MILES TO HAVE REST OF THE CITY. THE PROPOSAL IS TO REMOVE THE PROTECTION IN PLACE FOR ONE PART WHERE THE PROTECTION EXISTS. IT DOES NOT EXIST ACROSS THE WHOLE CITY. THAT'S FAIR. THE PROPOSAL IS IT'S TO TAKE OUT THE PROTECTION IN

PLACE FOR THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS?

MADAM CHAIR, THAT'S CORRECT. IT EXISTS IN THE PDO ONLY. IT DOESN'T EXIST IN THE REST OF THE CITY BYLAW.

FOR CLARITY, IT EXISTS IN 10.2 SQUARE KILOMETRES TODAY, WHICH IS THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS PDO IT DOES NOT EXIST IN THE REMAINDER OF THE 5285 SQUARE KILOMETRES THAT IS ALL OF WINNIPEG.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: WHAT WE ARE LOOKING AT TODAY IS A REVISED REPORT, WHICH WAS REVISED AT SOME POINT AFTER SEVERAL HUNDRED OBJECTIONS CAME IN. I CAN'T GIVE YOU THE EXACT COUNT. WE OFTEN ASK THE APPLICANT ARE YOU OKAY WITH THE REPORT. WHAT ARE THE REVISIONS IN THIS REPORT COMPARED TO THE ORIGINAL REPORT. IT SAYS REVISED REPORT.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE PLEASE. WE'LL PUT THE INFORMATION ON THE PUBLIC RECORD, PLEASE.

THROUGH YOU CHAIR TO THE COUNCILLOR. WE DIDN'T MAKE ANY REVISIONS TO THE -- WHAT PUT FORWARD IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT. WE JUST INDICATED WE WOULD BE OPEN TO AN AMENDMENT TO THE PDO TO ALLOW FOR MORE FLEXIBILITY AND MAKE IT LESS DESCRIPTIVE. IF A COUNCILLOR WANTED TO BRING A MOTION FORWARD LIKE THAT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: WHEN ONE LOOKS AT PAGE 37, ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT DASH REVISED. YOU'RE SAYING THERE ARE NO REVISIONS. I THINK IT'S A FAIR QUESTION. WE WERE TOLD. WE GOT AN E-MAIL FROM THE CLERKS, IN FACT, SAYING HERE'S THE REVISED REPORT.

MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU TO THE COUNCILLOR. YEAH. CORRECT. THERE WAS A MINOR REVISION TO THE SUN AND SHADOW LANGUAGE IN THE ACTUAL BYLAW. BUT THAT WAS IT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: WITH YOU YOU WALK ME THROUGH THAT.

THROUGH YOU CHAIR TO THE COUNCILLOR. DEVIN CLARK HAS MORE OF THOSE DETAILS. IF WE COULD PAUSE THAT QUESTION FOR THE PRESENTATION I THINK HE MAY BE ABLE TO ANSWER THAT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THE APPLICANT IS GOING TO ANSWER THE QUESTION I'M POSING TO THE ADMINISTRATION ABOUT THE ADMINISTRATION REPORT, CORRECT?

CORRECT.

MADAM SPEAKER: SHOULD BE ABLE TO PROVIDE THAT DETAIL. MAYBE WE CAN GO TO ANOTHER QUESTION AND COME BACK AND THAT CAN BE ANSWERED.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: I MAY HAVE MORE MADAM CLERK.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THERE'S A REQUEST FOR A BREAK. TEN MINUTES. THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: GOOD MORNING. I WOULD LIKE TO RECONVENE OUR SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 21, 2026, AFTER A SHORT RECESS. WE'RE STILL ON THE POINT OF QUESTIONS TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE. COUNCILLOR LUKES.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: SHUT MY COMPUTER DOWN OR DOING AN UPGRADE. I'M TRYING TO REMEMBER MY QUESTIONS. BACK IN 2018 WAS WHEN I MADE THE FIRST MOTION TO GET BIRD-FRIENDLY TREATMENTS ON WINDOWS. IN 2018. I WAS GUIDED TO ASK FOR A GUIDE. I WORKED ON THAT AND THEN THAT'S WHEN ANOTHER COUNCILLOR, WE WORKED TO GET IT ACTUALLY IN PLACE. WE HAVE A GUIDE. I WOULD THINK THE PUBLIC SERVICE DID RESEARCH ON THE GUIDE ACROSS JURISDICTIONAL RESEARCH TO CREATE AND DEVELOP THIS GUIDE. MY INTENT AT SOME POINT HERE IS TO MAKE A MOTION TO FOLLOW THE STANDARDS SET OUT IN THE, I DON'T HAVE IT IN FRONT OF ME, THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF -- I LOST WHATEVER IT IS. IT'S A NATIONAL CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF BIRD STANDARDS. THAT'S MY INTENT IS TO MAKE A MOTION TO THAT AFFECT. MY QUESTION THEN IS IF THAT PASSES THEN THAT WOULD BE ENACTED AFTER THE THIRD READING. I GUESS. IS THAT CORRECT?

YES, MADAM CHAIR. THROUGH YOU. YES. THAT WOULD BE PART OF WHAT COUNCIL WOULD ADOPT IF IT PASSED. IT'S THE C.S.A. BIRD-FRIENDLY REGULATIONS.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: I WAS GOING TO QUOTE THE ONE ON BIRD WINDOWS BUT THAT'S THE ONE. THAT'S GOING TO BE MY INTENT TO GET TO THAT POINT AFTER ALL THESE QUESTIONS. IT'S A NATIONAL STANDARD. IT'S BEEN STUDIED. WE'VE LOOKED AT IT. ONE OF THE DEVELOPERS THAT I WORKED WITH THAT DID THE SOUTH END TWIN TOWERS, AS I CALL THEM THE TWO TOWERS, I WORKED WITH THEM DURING THE APPROVAL PROCESS. THEY DID INCORPORATE THAT INTO THEIR WINDOWS THAT ARE THERE. I'M CONCERNED AND I'LL TELL COLLEAGUES AND PUT IT ON THE RECORD. I'M CONCERNED THAT WE STUDY THIS, WE REACH OUT. I'VE HEARD A LOT OF FEEDBACK. I WANT TO THANK THE BIRD COMMUNITY FOR SENDING ME THE FEEDBACK THEY HAVE. I'VE HEARD A LOT OF FEEDBACK. WE'RE HEARING FEEDBACKS FROM PRESENTERS LATER AND MAYBE WHY THEY WANTED OUT. I PERSONALLY DON'T WANT TO KEEP STUDYING THIS AND STUDYING THIS AND WORKING IT IN. FOR MALLS AND CORRIDORS, YES, I UNDERSTAND. I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE AND AMENDMENT TO GET IT INTO THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS. AFTERWARDS MAKE ANOTHER MOTION TO DO IT TO ANY OTHER BUILDING WHERE THE NATIONAL STANDARD IS 16 METRES HIGH AND PUT IT IN ALL ACROSS THE CITY. WE'RE NOT HERE TO DO THAT TODAY BUT, AGAIN, I STARTED THIS IN 2018. I GREW UP IN THE INTERLAKE. I GREW UP IN WHAT IS CALLED THE BOG AND NOW OUR FARM IS MARSH. I APPRECIATE ALL THE EDUCATION THE BIRD COMMUNITY HAS DONE ON THIS. I JUST WANT TO MOVE ON THIS. THAT'S WHY MY MOTION, I SAW THAT OPPORTUNITY AT THE PDO OF THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS. I SAW THAT OPPORTUNITY ON THE FLY. PUT THAT MOTION IN, THAT REQUIREMENT IN. I GATHER IT NEEDS REFINEMENT AND THAT'S SORT OF JUST TO PUT IT ON THE RECORD. WE'LL HEAR FROM APPLICANT ON RECOMMENDATIONS MAYBE. THAT'S WHERE I WANT TO END UP. I WANT IT IN. I WANT IT IN. WE ARE BUILDING RAPIDLY FAST. RAPIDLY. ANYWAY. I JUST WANTED TO PUT THAT ON THE RECORD FOR THAT QUESTION.

MADAM SPEAKER: THE RESPONSE, PLEASE.

WHAT MADAM CHAIR. THE REGULATIONS IN THE P.D.O. NOW ARE FROM THE C.S.A. STANDARD. THEY ARE DIRECT AND PRESCRIPTIVE. I THINK IF YOU SAY IN A MOTION WE WOULD RECOMMEND THE LANGUAGE BE MORE OPEN, IT CAN REFER TO THE C.S.A. AND TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE DIRECTOR.

THE C.S.A. DOES HAVE A MENU OF OPTIONS FOR BIRD-FRIENDLY PROTECTION BUT PUBLIC SERVICE WOULD RECOMMEND THE LANGUAGE ISN'T AS RESTRICTIVE AS WHAT'S IN THE P.D.O NOW BECAUSE THEN WE'LL BE AT THE SAME PLACE.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: I WAS. I DID IT ON THE FLY. I'VE BEEN FRUSTRATED IN TRYING TO GET THIS IN SOMEWHERE SINCE 2018 ALONG WITH OTHER COUNCILLORS THAT MAYBE I DO NEED TO REFINE IT. WE NEED TO REFINE IT. THERE WAS AND I DON'T HAVE IT IN FRONT OF ME BECAUSE MY COMPUTER CLOSED. THERE WAS A STATEMENT THAT CAUSED ME GREAT CONCERN IN THIS PUBLIC CONSULTATION ASPECT RELATED TO AFFORDABILITY. AFFORDABILITY. WE WANT TO MAKE IT AFFORDABLE BUT I DON'T WANT TO BE A REASON WE DON'T DO IT. THAT'S WHY THIS PUBLIC CONSULTATION DOES KIND OF CONCERN ME. I MIGHT COME BACK ONCE MY COMPUTER IS ON AGAIN TO MAKE THAT STATEMENT CLEAR SO PEOPLE UNDERSTAND IT. I DON'T SEE ANY REASON WHY WE CAN'T PROCEED AND GET SOMETHING IN PLACE TODAY. AFTER THE THIRD READING.

MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. AS WE MENTIONED, AS PART OF THE OVERALL COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BYLAW REVIEW, WE WILL BE LOOKING AT BIRD-FRIENDLY GUIDELINES AS PER THE C.S.A., AS PER OTHER CITIES ACROSS THE ENTIRE CITY.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: RIGHT NOW -- I THINK I'VE DONE A PRETTY GOOD JOB TO SUPPORT DENSITY, TO SUPPORT DENSITY THROUGH HIGHER BUILDINGS ABOVE 4 AND 5 STOREYS ON A MAJOR CORRIDOR AND THERE'S OTHER PARCELS OF LAND THAT THERE'S A GREAT OPPORTUNITY ON. YOU KNOW, IF WE FOLLOW THE RULING OF THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION WHERE WE DON'T DO THE WHOLE BUILDING BUT WE DO UP TO THE TREE LEVEL, WHICH IS RECOMMENDED, I WOULD REALLY LIKE TO SEE THAT WORKED IN AND PUT IN THERE TODAY.

IN TERMS OF LANGUAGE MAYBE, PERHAPS, IT WOULD BE IN GENERAL CONFORMANCE TO THE C.S.A. BIRD-FRIENDLY STANDARD. TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE DIRECTOR. IF SOMETHING IN GENERAL ALIGNMENT OR GENERAL CONFORMANCE GIVES DEVELOPERS A BIT OF FLEXIBILITY TO SAY I'M GOING TO DO THIS AND THIS IS HOW IT'S IN CONFORMANCE.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: AS LONG AS IT CONFORMS TO THE BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOWS AT 16 METRES. YEAH.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. FURTHER QUESTIONS COUNCILLOR LUKES? MR. MAYOR AND THEN COUNCILLOR MAYES.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: I LOOK FORWARD TO HEARING MR. CLARK.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. COUNCILLOR MAYES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: TWO THINGS, AT THIS TIME, AT LEAST. I ASSUME WE'LL BE HEARING ABOUT THE REVISIONS OF THE REPORT FROM DEVIN OR FROM, PERHAPS I'M WRONG. MR. VEITCH WOULD YOU LIKE TO CLARIFY THE BUSINESS ABOUT THE REVISED REPORT.

YES. MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. IT'S IN THE AMENDING BYLAW THAT'S ATTACHED AS APPENDIX A. UNDER SECTION 39 ON PAGE TWO OF FOUR IS WHERE WE TALK ABOUT A SUN AND SHADOW STUDY.

THIS IS IN RELATION TO CHANGING THE REGULATIONS OF THE 45-DEGREE PLAIN THAT AFFECTS THE HEIGHTS OF THE BUILDING. WE PUT IN THIS PIECE ABOUT A SUN AND SHADOW STUDY, WHICH WOULD BE ANOTHER WAY TO HELP REVIEW AND, YOU KNOW, STUDY THE IMPACT OF A TALLER BUILDING. THIS SUN AND SHADOW STUDY IS REQUIRED. WE GET THESE QUITE OFTEN WITH DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS WHEN WE REQUEST THEM. IF YOU LOOK AT SECTION 39 SUN AND SHADOW STUDY, I'LL TELL YOU WHAT THE AMENDMENTS WERE. NUMBER ONE, STUDIES WILL CONSIST OF THE FOLLOWING PARTS. NO CHANGES TO SENTENCE ONE, SENTENCE TWO. SENTENCE THREE, IT USED TO SAY, ILLUSTRATIONS SHOWING THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS IMPACT WITHIN THE EXISTING CONTEXT AND MASSING PER THE SUBJECT PROPERTIES PROPOSED NEW ZONING. WE CROSSED OUT NEW ZONING IN THE EDIT AND WE PUT IN BUILDING HEIGHT ABOVE THE AS OF RIGHT BUILDING HEIGHT. THAT CLARIFY THAT IS THESE PROJECTS AREN'T A NEW ZONING. THEY ARE AS OF RIGHT PROJECTS SO WE'RE TIEING NUMBER THREE, THE ILLUSTRATIONS TO THE BUILDING HEIGHT. NUMBER FOUR, ILLUSTRATIONS SHOWING --

COUNCILLOR MAYES: COME BACK.

NUMBER FOUR ILLUSTRATIONS SHOWING DIRECTION STAYS THE SAME. NUMBER FIVE, A LETTER SUMMARIZING IMPACTS. WE CROSSED THIS OUT COMPLETELY. A LETTER SUMMARIZING IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND ANY MEASURES THAT WILL BE TAKEN TO MITIGATE THESE IMPACTS. WE TOOK THAT RIGHT OUT BECAUSE THE WHOLE SHADOW STUDY BASICALLY ADDRESSES SUMMARIZING THE IMPACTS. WE WILL ALSO GET THAT WITHIN THE LETTER OF INTENT. THAT WAS TAKEN OUT FOR CLARITY. THEN THE ONLY OTHER AMENDMENT TO THIS SHADOW STUDY PIECE IS UNDER 39.2 STARTING OFF WITH A SUN AND SHADOW STUDY MUST SHOW. FURTHER DOWN IN THE SECOND SENTENCE IT SAID, THE DETERMINATION FOR CONSECUTIVE HOURS BEGINS AT THE MOMENT ANY SHADOW, IT USED TO SAY TOUCHES ANY PORTION OF, WE CHANGED THAT TO CROSSES THE LOT LINE OF THE SURROUNDING RESIDENTIAL USE. TYPICALLY, WHEN YOU'RE WRITING BY LAWS YOU OFTEN SEE THAT THERE CAN BE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE LANGUAGE AND THESE TWEAKS WE FELT WERE AN IMPROVEMENT AND TO THE SUN AND SHADOW STUDY REGULATION WE'RE PROPOSING.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: CAN YOU CLARIFY WHAT ROMAN NUMERAL THREE -- THE ILLUSTRATION IS SHOWING THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS IMPACT WITHIN THE EXISTING CONTEXT AND MASSING PER THE SUBJECT PROPERTIES PROPOSED BUILDING HEIGHT ABOVE THE AS OF RIGHT BUILDING HEIGHT. WHAT DOES THAT -- YOU HAVE AN AS OF RIGHT BUILDING HEIGHT. HERE YOU'RE GOING IN EXCESS OF THE AS OF RIGHT BUILDING HEIGHT?

MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. THE AS OF RIGHT BUILDING HEIGHT WE'RE PROPOSING IS 75 FEET. THEN FOR ANY BUILDING THAT WANTED TO GO ABOVE 75 FEET, THEY WOULD HAVE TO SUBMIT THIS SHADOW STUDY AND THEY WOULD HAVE TO SHOW THAT ANY SHADOWS ARE NOT CROSSING A PROPERTY LINE OF AN R1, R2 OR ARM NOWS PROPERTY AND IF THEY WERE NOT ABLE TO DO THAT THEY WOULD NOT GET ANYMORE THAN 75 FEET. IF THEY WERE TO SHOW THERE WAS NO NEGATIVE IMPACT THEY COULD GET MORE THAN 75 FEET.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: HOW IS THAT NOT A VARIANCE?

CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. IT WOULDN'T BE A VARIANCE BECAUSE THE BYLAW WOULD ALLOW MORE THAN 75 FEET SUBJECT TO THE SHADOW STUDY AND ALSO THERE'S ONE OTHER LAYER TO ALL THIS. THE

HEIGHT IS DEPENDANT UPON THE RIGHT OF WAY WIDTH. SO THERE'S DIFFERENT HEIGHTS BASED ON HOW WIDE THE CORRIDOR IS. THE NARROWEST CORRIDOR WOULD BE 75 FEET AND AS THE CORRIDOR WIDTH GOES UP THE POTENTIAL HEIGHT WOULD GO UP. PROVIDED THE SHADOW STUDY SHOWS IT DOESN'T HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON ADJACENT RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.

MADAM SPEAKER: MADAM DIRECTOR.

TO ADD TO WHAT MR. ROBINSON JUST SAID. IT'S IMPORTANT TO KNOW THE UNDERLYING ZONING, THE EXISTING ZONING THAT WAS THERE BEFORE MALLS AND CORRIDORS P.D.O OCCURRED, OFTEN HAD A MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF 75 FEET. SO THE MALLS -- IF SOMEONE WANTED TO USE THAT EXISTING ZONING THEY WOULDN'T BE REQUIRED TO DO ALL OF THE OTHER UPGRADES THAT THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS REQUIRES, SPECIFICALLY, AROUND UPGRADED FRONTAGES THAT ARE ALSO MORE FRIENDLY TO THE NEIGHBOURS. SORRY, 70 FEET MAXIMUM.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. NEXT QUESTION, IF ANY.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THE AMENDMENT THAT YOU YOURSELVES HAVE DISCUSSED ABOUT LEAVING IT TO THE DISCRETION OF THE DIRECTOR. I WANT TO GET CLARITY ON THAT. IN ST. VITAL THE COUNCILLOR PUT IN A PROVISION OF A STREET WARD AVENUE AND THE TIMING WAS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS. I'M NOW INFORMED THE DIRECTOR HAS WRITTEN A LETTER TO THE DEVELOPER SAYING YOU DON'T NEED TO DO THIS. IT WAS NEVER GOING TO BE AT THE COST OF THE DEVELOPER IT WAS GOING TO BE THE COST OF THE CITY. WE REIMBURSE. I LOST, ACCORDING TO LEGAL, ALL LEVERAGE BECAUSE AT THE DISCRETION OF THE DIRECTOR WILL DETERMINE THE TIMING AND THE DIRECTOR SAYS NEVER. I GUESS YOU CAN ARGUE THAT'S A TYPE OF TIMING. I'M A LITTLE CONCERNED THAT NONE OF US REALLY GIVE -- NONE OF US, YOU KNOW, THE FINE DETAIL OF THE GLAZING MATERIALS AND ALL THAT WE WOULD PROBABLY LIKE TO LEAVE TO THE DIRECTOR. IS THERE SOME REASSURANCE THERE WILL BE SOME LEVEL OF BIRD PROTECTION. THE WAY OTHER DEPARTMENTS ARE INTERPRETING THESE IS I'M USING MY DISCRETION TO REQUIRE NOTHING AT ALL. I'M GOING TO WAIVE IT. NOTHING AT ALL. WE'LL LEAVE IT TO ELECTED IF I RECALLS TO SORT THAT OUT. I THINK YOU CAN SEE, NOTHING PERSONAL, BASED ON INTERACTIONS WITH OTHER DEPARTMENTS I'M CONCERNED LEAVING SOMETHING TO THE DISCRETION OF THE THE DIRECTOR. IS THERE STILL SOME FLOOR STANDARD THAT WOULD APPLY?

YES, MADAM CHAIR THROUGH YOU. CERTAINLY. THE PROPOSED WORDING WOULD BE THAT IT COMPLIES WITH THE C.S.A. BIRD-FRIENDLY DESIGN STANDARDS OR AN ALTERNATIVE THAT MEETS THOSE SAME INTENTS TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE DIRECTOR SO WE DON'T GET LOCKED INTO SOME SORT OF ETCHED GLASS THAT IS ONLY FABRICATED IN ANOTHER COUNTRY THAT WE HAVE TARIFF IMPACTS AND TIMING IMPACTS AND THAT SORT OF THING. ALSO IMPORTANTLY, THIS WOULD ONLY BE FOR A 2, 2 AND A HALF YEAR TIMEFRAME. WHENEVER BETWEEN NOW AND WHEN COUNCIL HEARING THE FULL ZONING BYLAW REWRITE THAT WOULD HAVE MORE SPECIFIC STANDARDS AND THEN ONCE AGAIN, NOT JUST BE APPLYING TO THE 2520 ACRES OF MALLS AND CORRIDORS BUT FOR THE 1.3 MILLION ACRES OF THE CITY, AS A WHOLE.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THANK YOU. THAT'S VERY REASSURING. NOT TO BELABOUR THE POINT. THE BUILDING WHERE THERE WAS A VARIANCE GRANTED ON PORTAGE THERE WASN'T 0 BIRD MEASURES AT ALL. IT WAS THE GLAZING. YOU HAD A TERM, GLAZING OR --

CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. THERE WAS AN APPLIQUE REQUIRED AS A CONDITION OF APPROVAL.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: SO IN THAT SAME SPIRIT, PERHAPS, I DON'T WANT TO PUT WORDS IN ANYONES MOUTH. THE IDEA IS DISCRETION NIL. IT'S MEET THE C.S.A. STANDARD OR ROUGH EQUIVALENCIES AS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR?

WITH THE C.S.A. REGULATIONS TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE DIRECTOR.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS. COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS.

COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER. ONE QUICK QUESTION. THERE WAS A LETTER THAT WAS SENT BY THE PARK CONSERVANCY. DID YOU RECEIVE SAID LETTER WITH RESPECT TO REASONS WHY BIRD STRIPE WINDOWS ARE NECESSARY?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE, PLEASE.

I DO NOT RECALL, MADAM CHAIR THROUGH YOU TO THE COUNCILLOR, RECEIVING THAT LETTER. I DID HAVE AN EXTENSIVE CONVERSATION WITH THAT INDIVIDUAL, WHICH WAS VERY HELPFUL. I'LL GO BACK AND SEE IF I MISSED AN E-MAIL FROM THEM. COULD YOU SAY HIS NAME AGAIN.

I'VE ASKED FOR A COPY OF SAID LETTER, AS WELL. PARK CONSERVANCY.

MADAM SPEAKER: ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? COUNCILLOR DURAND-WOOD.

COUNCILLOR DURAND-WOOD: THANK YOU. I GUESS WHAT I'M HEARING IS WE NEED MORE TIME TO FIGURE OUT HOW TO MAKE THIS WORK. WHAT DO YOU THINK, YOU KNOW, SORT OF IN YOUR EXPERTISE. WHAT DO YOU THINK FACTORS ARE GOING TO CHANGE BETWEEN NOW AND THE TIME WHEN THIS IS EVENTUALLY INCORPORATED INTO THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BYLAW? WHAT FACTORS DO YOU THINK WILL BE DIFFERENT THAN WE ARE DEALING WITH RIGHT NOW?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE, PLEASE.

THROUGH YOU TO THE CHAIR. TO THE COUNCILLOR, THE DIRECTOR CAN ADD, AS WELL. THE FACTORS ARE THE CONSIDERABLE CONSULTATION WE'RE GOING TO UNDERTAKE WITH STAKEHOLDERS. THE REVIEW WE'RE GOING TO LOOK AT WITH OTHER CITIES ACROSS JURISDICTIONAL ANALYSIS. THE ACTUAL FACTORS OF BIRDS AND THEIR MIGRATION ROUTES AND THE HEIGHTS THEY FLY AT. NONE OF THOSE THINGS ARE GOING TO CHANGE, OBVIOUSLY. THE CHANGE IS ALL THE RESEARCH WE'RE GOING TO BE ABLE TO DO AND BRING FORWARD A MORE -- JUST A MORE REASONABLE RECOMMENDATION ON THE BIRD-FRIENDLY GUIDELINES THAT DEVELOPERS AND THE PUBLIC AND MOST PEOPLE WOULD FIND ACCEPTABLE.

COUNCILLOR DURAND-WOOD: MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. THERE WILL BE JUST -- THERE WILL BE WELL OVER 100 MEETINGS ALMOST 200 ACTUALLY, OF CONSULTATION WITHIN THE NEXT TWO YEARS

ON THIS TOPIC BOTH INTERNAL TO THE CITY, WITH CITY COUNCILLORS, WITH THE DIFFERENT DEPARTMENTS IN THE CITY, AS WELL AS, WITH THE COMMUNITY AS A WHOLE AND WITHIN THE DESIGN TEAMS. SO THAT IS BUDGETED TIME TO CONSIDER ALL OF THE FULL GAMETE OF THE ZONING BYLAW. YOU MIGHT HAVE NOTICED IF YOU HAD A CHANCE TO REVIEW THE R.F.P. FOR THAT INITIATIVE, WHICH WENT THROUGH MERCK, AS USUAL. IT DOES REQUIRE THAT EXTENSIVE COMMUNITY CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT. THAT IS A FUNDED INITIATIVE. TODAY'S EDITS ARE NOT A FUNDED INITIATIVE SO WE DON'T HAVE THAT ABILITY TO ENGAGE IN THAT WAY.

MADAM SPEAKER: ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? COUNCILLOR LUKES.

COUNCILLOR LUKES: I JUST WANT TO UNDERSTAND THIS. WE COULD MAKE AN AMENDMENT TODAY. IT COULD GO IN PLACE LIKE THE ONE WE'RE SPEAKING ABOUT UP TO THE 16 METRES. THAT COULD GO IN PLACE. IT COULD BE IN PLACE FOR TWO YEARS ON THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS. THEN YOU CAN GO ABOUT DOING ALL YOUR STUDYING AND WHATEVER YOU'RE GOING TO DO. YOUR FUNDED STUDYING. THEN YOU CAN DO THAT. THEN IF SOMETHING IS DRAMATICALLY DIFFERENT TO COUNCILLOR DURAND-WOOD'S POINT OR QUESTION. THEN YOU CAN COME BACK -- WELL WE COULD COME BACK AND DO ANOTHER SESSION LIKE THIS. IS THAT CORRECT?

MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU. WE DO NOT INTEND TO COME BACK AND DO ANOTHER SESSION LIKE THIS, AT THIS TIME. THE NEXT TWO YEARS WILL BE COMPLETELY FULL OF FULL ATTENTION ON THE FULL ZONING BYLAW REWRITE. HOWEVER, AT THE END OF THAT TIME, THAT IS WHEN WE WOULD BE BRINGING BACK TO COUNCIL A FULL HOLISTIC ZONING BYLAW REPLACEMENT THAT WILL DO MULTIPLE THINGS. ONE, IMPLEMENT OUR WINNIPEG COUNCIL ADOPTED POLICIES THAT WILL IMPLEMENT COMPLETE COMMUNITIES 2.0, COUNCIL ADOPTED POLICIES. PERHAPS BY THEN COUNCIL WILL HAVE ALSO CONSIDERED BRING IT FORWARD FOR CONSIDERATION, ANYHOW, THE GREEN SPACE MASTER PLAN AND BIODIVERSITY BYLAW THAT SPEAKS VERY CAREFULLY ON OUR BIODIVERSITY --

COUNCILLOR LUKES: WOULD IT OVERRIDE THIS?

WE ANTICIPATE THE IN FILL SCHEDULE TO HAVE VERY FEW CHANGES BUT HOW THIS WOULD POTENTIALLY BE ONE OF THOSE CHANGES AS YOU THINK ABOUT, OKAY, HOW ARE THE CHANGES YOU MAY MAKE TODAY. WHAT WERE IMPACTS OVER THE TWO YEAR TIMEFRAME. WHAT WAS BUILD DURING THAT TIMEFRAME AND WHAT YOU MIGHT WANT TO CONSIDER FOR CHANGES ONCE IT COMES FORWARD.

AT THE END OF THE TWO YEARS YOU'VE DONE THIS CONSULTATION ON EVERYTHING BUT ON SPECIFICALLY THE BIRD ASPECT OF IT. SAY TODAY WE MAKE AN AMENDMENT AND THAT'S IN PLACE TWO YEARS. YOU SEE WHAT HAPPENS. THEN YOU DO THE BIG CONSULTATION AND WHATEVER YOU FIND IN THE BIG CONSULTATION THAT MIGHT NEED -- LIKE HOW DOES IT GET -- HOW DO MALLS AND CORRIDOR PDO GET CHANGED?

MADAM CHAIR THROUGH YOU. WE'LL BRING FORWARD THE FULL ZONING BYLAW REPLACEMENT THAT INCORPORATES THE MALL AND CORRIDOR PDO AND INCORPORATES THE INFILL HOUSING SCHEDULE AC. THE R.F.P. SAYS THE CONSULTANT IS NOT ALLOWED TO CHANGE THEM DRASTICALLY BECAUSE WE SPENT TWO WEEKS ALMOST IN PUBLIC HEARINGS TO GET THEM WHERE THEY ARE NOW. IF THERE ARE PARTS THAT AREN'T WORKING AS COUNCIL INTENDED WHEN WE DO THE FULL BYLAW

REPLACEMENT --

COUNCILLOR LUKES: SURE. WE COULD DO THE AMENDMENT, LIVE WITH THAT TWO YEARS AND IF THERE ARE OTHER MODIFICATIONS OR CHANGES. IF YOU'VE LEARNED OTHER THINGS THEN WHEN YOU BRING IT FORWARD TO COUNCIL AND I CAN'T FATHOM HOW THAT'S GOING TO GO. BUT IT GETS APPROVED I WOULD BE APPLICABLE BECAUSE MALLS AND CORRIDORS PDO WAS IN IT. OKAY.

MADAM SPEAKER: OKAY. SEEING NO FURTHER QUESTIONS. MR. CLERK, NEXT WE WOULD HEAR FROM THE APPLICANT, I BELIEVE. I THINK IT MAKES SENSE TO TAKE A RECESS NOW AND RECONVENE, PERHAPS. OR HEAR THE PRESENTATION. THEY HAVE FIVE MINUTES. WE CAN EXTEND AND COME BACK PERHAPS AFTER LUNCH AND HEAR MORE IF WE NEED TO. WANT TO GET STARTED ON IT THEN? VERY GOOD. THANK YOU. MR. CLERK.

CLERK: WE ARE GOING TO HAVE THE APPLICANT PRESENT. DEVIN CLARK.

WITH RESPECT TO THE FIVE MINUTES, I WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST AN ADDITIONAL FIVE, IF I MAY.

MADAM SPEAKER: LET'S HEAR THE PRESENTATION AND WE'LL GET INTO ANY EXTENSIONS.

I APPRECIATE IT. THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING MR. MAYOR, COUNCIL, MADAM SPEAKER. THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT OUR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS PDO MY NAME IS DEVIN CLARK SENIOR PLANNER AT THE PLANNING PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT. MY COLLEAGUES HAVE COVERED A NUMBER OF THINGS IN THE INTRODUCTION IN THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS SO IN THE INTEREST OF TIME AND MY PRESENTATION I WILL FOCUS ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. I'LL ASK YOU TO SPEAK A LITTLE LOUDER.

DEVON CLARK: PARDON ME. THANK YOU. BEFORE I GET INTO THE AMENDMENTS AND JUST AS A REFRESHER, I HAVE A MAP ON THE SCREEN SHOWING WHERE THE PDO APPLIES. IT'S TO URBAN AND REGIONAL MIXED USE CORRIDORS THROUGHOUT THE CITY SUCH AS PEMBINA HIGHWAY AND PORTAGE AVENUE AND CENTRES SUCH AS ST. VITAL CENTRE. A PROPOSED AMENDMENT NUMBER ONE TO THE GROUND FLOOR HEIGHT FOR NONRESIDENTIAL USES. THE P.D.O. CURRENTLY REQUIRES A 14-FOOT GROUND FLOOR HEIGHT FOR NONRESIDENTIAL USES. THE INTENT OF THIS CLAUSE WAS TO CREATE A PROMINENT GROUND FLOOR THAT CAN SUPPORT A VARIETY OF COMMERCIAL USES SUCH AS OFFICE, RESTAURANTS AND RETAIL SPACES. SINCE THE PDO CAME INTO AFFECT, WE HAVE HAD INQUIRIES ABOUT LOWERING THE GROUND FLOOR HEIGHT TO HELP REDUCE OVERALL BUILDING HEIGHT IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH THE 45-DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN OR BECAUSE SOME COMMERCIAL USES DON'T NEED 14 FEET. WE ALSO HEARD DEVELOPERS SAY A FIXED HEIGHT CAN AFFECT MARKET VIABILITY OF COMMERCIAL SPACE. AS SUCH THE PUBLIC SERVICE RECOMMENDED THIS CLAUSE BE REMOVED TO RESTORE FLEXIBILITY FOR DETERMINING APPROPRIATE HEIGHTS OF COMMERCIAL SPACE ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS. FURTHER REMOVING THIS RULE MAY ALSO HELP REDUCE OVERALL BUILDING HEIGHTS. THE SECOND AMENDMENT IS FOR THE REMOVAL OF THE BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOWS PROVISION. THE CURRENT PDO RULES INCLUDE BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOW REQUIREMENTS AS INDICATED ON THE NEXT SLIDE. DEVELOPERS HAVE TOLD US THESE RULES CAN BE HARD TO MEET BECAUSE MATERIALS CAN BE DIFFICULT TO SOURCE AND CAN ADD SIGNIFICANT COST AND/OR DELAYS

TO PROJECTS. TO ENCOURAGE MORE PROJECTS TO USE THE PDO AND SPEED UP HOUSING APPROVALS WE BELIEVE FLEXIBILITY IN THIS PROVISION IS NEEDED. THE PUBLIC SERVICE HAS LOOKED AT OTHER JURISDICTIONS IN CANADA THAT REGULATE BIRD-FRIENDLY DESIGN. CITIES SUCH AS VANCOUVER AND CALGARY HAVE VOLUNTARY GUIDELINES IN PLACE. OTHER JURISDICTIONS MANDATE BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOWS. THESE WERE FOUND TO BE PRIMARILY IN ONTARIO. TORONTO IS CONSIDERED A LEADER ON THE FRONT AND USES STRATEGIES SUCH AS VISUAL MARKERS, BUILDING INTEGRATED STRUCTURES AND USE OF NONREFLECTIVE GLASS. THE PUBLIC SERVICE RECOGNIZES THE IMPORTANCE OF BALANCING ENVIRONMENTAL OBJECTIVES WITH HOUSING OBJECTIVES. PER THE 21 COUNCIL MOTION WHICH HAS BEEN DISCUSSED THE PUBLIC SERVICE WILL REVIEW THE BIRD-FRIENDLY MEASURES AS PART OF THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BYLAW REVIEW WHICH IS GETTING UNDERWAY NOW. THIS WILL ALLOW FOR BROADER STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT INCLUDING ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANIZATION, DEVELOPERS AND THE PUBLIC. IT WILL PROVIDE AN OPPORTUNITY TO EVALUATE BEST PRACTISES AND CONSIDER A RANGE OF IMPLEMENTATION OPTIONS AND ENSURE BIRD-FRIENDLY STRATEGIES ARE ALIGNED WITH CITY WIDE OBJECTIVES INCLUDING HOUSING NEED, GROWTH GROWTH MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY. THE PUBLIC SERVICE IS AWARE THERE ARE CONCERNS WITH LOSING THIS PROVISION OUTRIGHT UNTIL SUCH TIME THE NEW ZONING BYLAW COMES INTO AFFECT. AS PREVIOUSLY MENTIONED, THE PUBLIC SERVICE IS -- WOULD BE SUPPORTIVE OF A REVISION TO THE PDO ALLOWING FOR A MORE FLEXIBLE APPROACH UNTIL THE NEW ZONING BYLAW IS IN AFFECT. THE THIRD AMENDMENT IS TO MODIFY THE 45-DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN RULES. THE 45 DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN IS A MEASUREMENT TOOL REGULATING BUILDING HEIGHT AND SETBACKS AND INTENDED TO ADDRESS COMPATIBILITY WITH LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL AREAS. WE'VE HEARD CONCERNS THIS IMPACTS DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL BY RIGHT ALONG CORRIDORS MAKING PROJECTS LESS FEASIBILITY AND DISCOURAGING USE OF THE PDO TO ADDRESS THESE CONCERNS WE RECOMMEND FOUR CHANGES TO THE 45 DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN RULE. PERMITTING BUILDINGS UP TO 75 FEET BY RIGHT WITHIN THE PDO FOR PORTIONS ABOVE 75 FEET, THE 45 DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN RULE WOULD APPLY. OR AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO USING THE 45 DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN ADDITIONAL BUILDING HEIGHT COULD BE ALLOWED IF A SUN AND SHADOW STUDY CONFIRMED --

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR ROLLINS MOVES EXTENSION. ALL IN FAVOUR IN CONTRARY. CARRIED.

ADDITIONAL HEIGHT COULD BE ALLOW ABOVE THE 75 FEET WITH A SUN AND SHADOW STUDY WITH THE IMPACT THEY ARE AT AN ACCEPTABLE RANGE. LASTLY TRAINING CHANGES TO THE DEFINITION TO HAVE 45 DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN TO ENSURE IT APPLIES APPROPRIATELY TO DEVELOPMENT SITES ALONG THE CORRIDOR ACCOUNTING FOR A VARIETY OF CONTEXT. TO BE CLEAR, THE 45 DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN IS NOT THE ONLY RULE THAT REGULATES BUILDING HEIGHTS UNDER THE PDO BUILDING HEIGHTS ARE REGULATED BY THE CORRIDOR RIGHT OF WAY WIDTH WHICH DETERMINES MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT. WE HEARD THE 45 DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN WAS OFTEN AT ODDS WITH BUILDING HEIGHTS ALLOWED UNDER THE RIGHT OF WAY WIDTH. OFTEN THE PLAIN ENDED UP CROSSING THE BACKSIDE OF THE UPPER STOREYS RESULTING IN EITHER THE NEED TO DO A STEP BACK, BRING THE BUILDING HEIGHT DOWN, OR EXPLORE THE POSSIBILITY OF A VARIANCE. ALL OF WHICH AFFECTS DOS AND TIMELINE FOR PROJECTS. THIS IMAGE DEMONSTRATES HOW THE 45 DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN APPLIES UNDER CURRENT RULES USING A 75-FOOT TALL BUILDING AS AN EXAMPLE. SIX STOREY REQUIRE 70-75 FEET IN HEIGHT AND FEASIBILITY OF SIX STOREY MAY BE AFFECTED WHEN STEP BACKS ARE REQUIRED. WE HEARD THE PREFERRED DESIGN FOR A SIX-STOREY BUILDING WOULD TYPICALLY FOLLOW THE SCENARIO SHOWN ON THE SCREEN, WHICH DOES NOT INCORPORATE STEP BACKS. FOR CONTEXT THIS EXAMPLE IS ON A 100 FOOT DEEP LOT SHOWING A 75-FOOT TALL BUILDING

AND THE 45 DEGREE PLAIN IS INTERSECTING THAT UPPER REAR PORTION ON THE UPPER STOREYS. THIS IMAGE DEMONSTRATES WHAT THE PUBLIC SERVICE IS RECOMMENDING. WE PROPOSE 75 FEET BE ALLOWED IN ALL CIRCUMSTANCES AND THAT FOR ANY PORTION OF THE BUILDING ABOVE 75 FEET IT SHALL COMPLY WITH THE 45 DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN RULE. THIS ADDS SOME LEVEL OF ASSURANCE THAT REGARDLESS OF THE DEPTH OF THE LOT THE DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS WOULD CONSISTENTLY ENABLE A SIX STOREY BUILDING. THE INTENT OF THESE CHANGES IS TO GIVE THE PDO AN ADVANTAGE OVER EXISTING ENTITLEMENTS FOR PROPERTIES LOCATED WITHIN THE PDO THE MAJORITY OF WHICH ARE ZONED C2. THE PROPOSED CHANGE SEEKS TO INCREASE THE HEIGHT FROM 70 FEET, WHICH IS ALREADY ALLOWED UNDER THE C2 ZONING DISTRICT, AND INCREASE IT TO 75 FEET. AND THEN FROM THERE ADDITIONAL HEIGHT WOULD BE ENTITLED UNDER THE 45 DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN DIVISION OR SUN AND SHADOW STUDY PROVISION BUT ALWAYS WOULD BE CAPPED AT THE ROAD RIGHT OF WAY HEIGHT ALLOWANCES I PREVIOUSLY MENTIONED. FOR ADDITIONAL FLEXIBILITY THE PUBLIC SERVICE IS RECOMMENDING A SUN AND SHADOW STUDY MAY BE SUBMITTED WHEN A PROPOSAL IS TALLER THAN 75 FEET. THE SUN AND SHADOW STUDY WOULD NEED TO CONFIRM A MINIMUM OF FIVE CONSECUTIVE HOURS OF SUNLIGHT WILL REMAIN CAST ON NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES DURING THE REQUIRED TEST DATES AND TIMES AS SHOWN ON THIS SLIDE.

MADAM SPEAKER: TO PAUSE. COUNCILLOR DUNCAN MOVES WE MOVE PASSED 12 NOON. ALL IN FAVOUR. CONTRARY. CARRIED.

LASTLY THE PUBLIC SERVICE HEARD THE DEFINITION WAS NOT FLEXIBLE ENOUGH TO ACCOUNT FOR ATYPICAL SCENARIOS SUCH AS SHOWN ON THIS SLIDE. SO THE DEFINITION CHANGE IS TO ENSURE THE 45 DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN CAN BE MEASURED FROM BOTH SIDE AND REAR YARDS OF ABUTTING OR ADD JAY SENT PROPERTIES. CLARIFIES IT ONLY APPLIES BEING MEASURED TO THE REAR YARD OF THE DEVELOPING PROPERTY AND NOT THE SIDE YARDS. AS DEMONSTRATED IN THIS IMAGE, AT PRESENT THE RULE WOULD USE THE REAR YARD OF THE GREEN PROPERTY TO DETERMINE WHERE THE 45 DEGREE ANGULAR MEASUREMENT IS TO BE DRAWN. IF THAT IS THE CASE IT WOULD BE DRAWN INTO THE SIDE YARD OF THE BLUE DEVELOPING PROPERTY. WITH THAT IT WOULD DRASTICALLY IMPACT THE DEVELOP ABILITY OF THAT SITE. THAT CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION. THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. QUESTIONS FOR THE APPLICANT? COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: THANK YOU. I'M GOING TO LEAVE THE BIRDS FOR OTHER PEOPLE AT THIS MOMENT. THE 45 DEGREE PLAIN WE DON'T WANT TO MAKE IT BAD FOR DEVELOPERS TO DO SET BACKS BECAUSE THEY CAN'T DEVELOP MUCH MORE AT A COSTLY SQUARE FOOTAGE. IS THAT WHAT YOU'RE SAYING?

THAT'S WHAT WE WERE HEARING.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: HAVE YOU TALKED TO ANY RESIDENTS -- SO RESIDENT A HAD PROTECTION WITH THE SUN STUDY THAT IT HAD SETBACKS. I DID ONE ON CORDON. BEAUTIFUL. SET BACK. NEIGHBOURS DIDN'T LIKE IT BUT IT HELPS THE NEIGHBOURS TO GET MORE SUN. NOW YOU'RE SAYING YOU DON'T HAVE TO DO A SET BACK?

TO DO THE STEP BACK?

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: SORRY, STEP BACK.

WELL POTENTIALLY, YES.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: POTENTIALLY WITH NO STEP BACK WOULD THAT PUT -- IT WILL. CAST MORE SHADOWS ONTO THE PROPERTIES SAY ACROSS THE STREET? NOT ALL SOME OF THESE 75 FOOTERS ARE GOING TO BE CLOSE TO RESIDENTIAL STREETS ON THE BACKSIDE. I HAVE A COUPLE IN MY NEIGHBOURHOOD. YOU TELLING ME TODAY WE WANT MORE SHADOWING ONTO THOSE NEIGHBOURS?

NO. WE'RE PROPOSING THAT -- WELL, WE ENABLE BUILDINGS TO BE 75 FEET BY RIGHT. THAT ANYTHING ABOVE THAT WOULD REQUIRE EITHER TO COMPLY WITH STEP BACKS OR SUBMIT A SUN AND SHADOW STUDY THAT CONFIRMS THE ADDITIONAL HEIGHT AND IMPACTS CAUSED FROM THE HEIGHT WOULD NOT CREATE LESS TAN FIVE HOURS OF AVAILABLE SUNLIGHT ON THE SURROUNDING PROPERTIES.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: PRESENTLY WE HAVE THE STEP BACK PROVISION OF THE 45. NOW WE'RE GOING TO SAY WE'RE MOVING THE STEP BACK. WE'RE ALLOWING STRAIGHT WALL OF DOOM RIGHT UP TO THE NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY WITHOUT ANY KIND OF STEP BACK. YOU'RE SAYING THAT WON'T AFFECT THE SHADOWING FOR THOSE NEIGHBOURS ACROSS THE STREET? STILL THE SAME KIND OF SHADOWS -- I DON'T KNOW HOW THAT WORKS.

I SUPPOSE UNDER A C2 EXAMPLE WHERE THE ENTITLEMENTS ARE 70 FEET, WE'RE SUGGESTING THAT THE DEVIATION IS FIVE FEET. THOSE IMPACTS WOULD BE POTENTIALLY NEGLIGIBLE IN TERMS OF DIFFERENCE OF WHAT IS ALLOWED UNDER C2 AND WHAT WOULD BE ALLOWED UNDER THIS PROPOSED CHANGE. CERTAINLY, THE AFFECTS OF THE MASSING, IF IT EXTENDS FURTHER BACK THAN WHAT IT CURRENTLY WOULD BE REQUIRED, IT'S POSSIBLE THAT SHADOW IMPACTS COULD INCREASE IN THAT SCENARIO.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: WE'RE GOING TO SHADOW PEOPLE MORE, OKAY. THAT'S BAD. WHAT DO YOU CONSIDER ACCEPTABLE? I THINK YOU MENTIONED THAT YOU CONGRATULATIONS YOU GET FIVE HOURS OF LIGHT A DAY. IS THAT ACCEPTABLE? IS THAT WHAT WE'RE SAYING TO THE PUBLIC?

BETWEEN THE TEST TIME HOURS OF 9:00 A.M. AND 6:00 P.M. THAT IS THE STANDARD WE'VE BEEN APPLYING IN NUMBER OF INSTANCES WITH SUBDIVISION REZONING APPLICATIONS OVER THE YEARS. WE USE THAT AS A TOOL TO HELP US UNDERSTAND WHAT THE IMPACTS ARE BASED ON THE MASSING.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: NOW IS THAT -- I'M GOING TO PICK THE SUMMER BECAUSE THE SUN IS HIGH. WOULD THAT BE SEASONAL STUDIES?

IT'S AT THE EQUINOX. IN MARCH 21 AND SEPTEMBER 21ST, THOSE ARE THE TEST DATES.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: IF THE SHADOW STUDY SHOWS IT'S PROVIDING FIVE HOURS OR LESS FOR A NEIGHBOUR WHO IS NOW -- CONGRATULATIONS YOU GET FIRE HOUR, MAYBE. WOULD THAT REQUIRE THE SETBACK THEN OR WOULD THAT BE UP TO THE DISCRETION OF THE DEVELOPMENT INSIDE IF THEY NEED TO STEP BACK OUT?

UNDER A SCENARIO WHERE YOU'RE EXCEEDING THE 75 FEET IN A SUN AND SHADOW STUDY IS REQUIRED, IF IT DEMONSTRATED YOU WERE NOT ABLE TO MEET THAT FIVE HOURS OF CONSECUTIVE SUNLIGHT -- AM I MISUNDERSTANDING?

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: STICK WITH 75 FEET. THIS NEW THING AS OF RIGHT 75 FEET. I'M FINDING OUT THAT IT COULD BE 90 FEET IF STREETS WERE WIDE ENOUGH. I THOUGHT AS OF RIGHT 75 FEET. NOW I'M HEARING WE KIND OF DID BUT KIND OF DIDN'T. PRESENTLY WHAT WE HAVE IS 75 FEET. WHAT STEP BACKSEAT IF THE SHADOW AT 45 PLAIN. YOU WANT TO GET RID OF 45 PLAIN FOR 75 FOOT OR LOWER AND THAT WILL CREATE SHADOWING FOR NEIGHBOURHOOD AND HOPEFULLY IT WON'T -- THEY MAYBE GET FIVE HOURS A DAY OF SUN. BEFORE WITH THE STEP BACK, THEY GOT MORE LIGHT. CORRECT?

UNDER 75 FOOT SCENARIO OR BELOW.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: I'M NOT TALKING ABOUT GOING HIGHER.

AT PRESENT MEETING THE 45 DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN, TYPICALLY YOU REQUIRE, IF YOU BUILT EXACTLY TO THAT STANDARD -- I CAN'T FLIP TO IT BUT IF YOU CAN FLIP TO THE IMAGE THAT SHOWS WHERE THE STEP BACK IS. YOUR BUILDING WOULD HAVE BEEN ALLOWED TO PUSH AS FAR BACK AS THE 12 FEET CURRENTLY APPROVED. THEN FROM THERE, YES, YOU NEED TO DO THE STEP BACK IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE THE ADDITIONAL HEIGHT. SHADOWS WOULD HAVE BEEN ALLOWED OR BEEN CAST UNDER THAT TYPE OF SCENARIO. I SUPPOSE THE ADDITIONAL SHADOWS CREATED ARE WITHIN THAT GAP WHERE THE STEP BACK PREVIOUSLY WOULD HAVE BEEN REQUIRED.

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW A FEW MORE QUESTIONS.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: ONE MORE TO BE VERY CLEAR. WHAT THESE CHANGES DO FOR THE 75 FOOT OR LOWER, IT REMOVES THE REQUIREMENT FOR A STEP BACK.

CORRECT.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: WE'RE GOING TO INCREASE THE MASSING AND SHADOWING FOR NEIGHBOURS BEHIND THEM.

CORRECT.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU FOR QUESTIONS. WE DO NEED TO RECESS. THERE'S A TECHNICAL ISSUES WITH THE CAMERAS. WE NEED TO REBOOT THE SYSTEM. I WOULD LIKE TO PROPOSE COME BACK IN ONE HOUR. THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: WE'RE GOING TO BEGIN MOMENTARILY. COUNCILLOR DOBSON INFORMED ME THE OTHER DAY TO THE CLERK HE HAD TO DEPART. SO I DON'T THINK HE'LL BE BACK. OK. COUNCILLOR ROLLINS. THE COUNTDOWN, PLEASE. THAT'S RIGHT.

MADAM SPEAKER: GOOD AFTERNOON. I'D LIKE TO RECONVENE OUR SPECIAL THING OF JANUARY 21st, 2026. WE ARE NOW ASKING QUESTIONS OF THE APPLICANT. NEXT SPEAKER IS COUNCILLOR MAYES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THANK YOU. THANKS FOR THE PRESENTATION. WE ALWAYS ASK APPLICANTS IF THEY HAVE ANY OBJECTIONS TO THE CITY OF WINNIPEG REPORT. IT SEEMS ONLY FAIR TO ASK YOU THAT, Mr. CLERK.

CLERK: NO OBJECTIONS.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THAT WOULD BE INTERESTING. CAN YOU CLARIFY FOR ME THIS INTERPLAY OF THE HEIGHT REQUIREMENT BEING THE HEIGHT ALLOWANCE BEING INCREASED SOMEWHAT, DUE TO THE 45 ANGULAR PLANE CHANGES. BUT THIS CONFUSING, IT ALSO IS THE RIGHT OF WAY. SO PERHAPS AN EXAMPLE OR ANY AM YOU CAN PROVIDE.

SURE, ABSOLUTELY. MICHAEL, IF YOU COULD PUT THE SLIDE THAT TALKS ABOUT THE ROAD REQUIREMENTS. SLIDE 13. OK.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: IS THERE A PARTICULAR SECTION IN THE BYLAW?

THIS IS UNDER SECTION 31 BUILDING HEIGHTS UNDER AB-39 OF THE ZONING BYLAW. SO YEAH. THIS SECTION OUTLINES WHAT THE BUILDING HEIGHTS ARE ALLOWED TO BE, BASED ON IF THE PROPERTY IS FRONTING ON A CORRIDOR IN A CERTAIN WIDTH. SO FOR EXAMPLE, THE RIGHT OF WAY WIDTH FROM THE PROPERTY LINE TO THE PROPERTY LINE ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE STREET WHERE IT'S 80 FEET. THE BUILDING MAY BE 75 FEET. WHERE THE ROAD RIGHT OF WAY IS BETWEEN 100 FEET, THE BUILDING CAN BE AS TALL AS 105 FEET AND SO ON. WHEN THE RIGHT OF WAY IS MORE THAN 100 FEET, THE BUILDING MAY NOT EXCEED 150 FEET. AND THERE'S SOME OTHER PROVISION. OR 200 FEET WHERE THE BUILDING OR A PORTION THEREOF IS LOCATED MORE THAN 75 FEET FROM THE LOT LINE. SO THESE PROVISIONS ARE IN PLACE ALREADY OF THE PDO. BUILDING HEIGHTS CAN GO UP AS TALL AS DEPENDING ON WHAT THE CORRIDOR WIDTH IS. AND THE FINAL PROVISION, WHICH IS CURRENTLY IN PLACE WITH RESPECT TO THAT 45 ANGULAR PLAIN. SO YEAH. IT SAYS THIS, BUT 45 ANGULAR PLANE COMES IN AND SAYS OTHERWISE, YOU'RE CAPTIVE THAT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THE SETBACK. LET'S USE THE MIDDLE ONE THERE. IF YOU'RE, YOU CAN GO BETWEEN 80 AND 100 FEET STREET RIGHT OF WAY, YOU CAN GO UP 105.

CORRECT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: HOW DOES THE ANGULAR PLANE. YOU WOULD HAVE TO DO A SETBACK?

THAT'S RIGHT. IS EACH OF THE PROPERTIES ALONG THESE CORRIDORS HAVE VARYING SCENARIOS. SO ONE EXAMPLE, YOU MIGHT HAVE A PROPERTY THAT'S 100 FEET DEEP WHERE IMMEDIATELY, A BUS, ANOTHER PROPERTY, OR YOU MIGHT HAVE A SCENARIO WHERE THERE'S 100-FOOT LOT THAT ABUTTS A LANE. BUT THROUGHOUT THE CORRIDOR, THERE ARE ALL SORTS OF VARYING CONTEXT THAT WOULD CHANGE THE ALLOWABLE HEIGHTS, IN THAT 45 ANGLE PLANE. BECAUSE OF THE INCONSISTENCIES THROUGHOUT THE CORRIDOR, WE'RE SUGGESTING THAT IF WE ALLOW AT LEAST THE MINIMUM OF A CERTAIN HEIGHT, AND SOMETHING THAT'S COMPARABLE TO WHAT THE C-2 ZONING DISTRICT ALREADY DOES, THEN AT LEAST THAT SETS AT LEAST A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING ACROSS THE BOARD OF WHAT HEIGHTS AT MINIMUM, COULD BE PERMITTED HERE.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: SO RIGHT NOW, THE HEIGHT LIMITS, IF YOU DIDN'T PROCEED UNDER THE PDO. YOU WENT UNDER THE OLD SYSTEM HARD AND FAST, ABSOLUTE CAP IS 75, IT WILL VARY DEPENDING ON THE UNDERLYING ZONING AND THE DETAILS YOU JUST MENTIONED. YOUR DIFFERENCE.

THAT'S RIGHT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: OK. SO THIS COULD AFFECT BUILDINGS IN ANY OF THESE CATEGORIES. IT'S ERRONEOUS TO SAY IT'S ONLY GOING TO AFFECT THIS LITTLE SLICE WHERE THE STREET IS 75 FEET WIDE. DEPENDING ON WHERE THE BUILDING IS LOCATED ON THE LINE.

EXACTLY. DEPENDING ON THE PROPERTY ABIDING THE CORRIDOR, THE DEPTH YEAH. THERE'S A NUMBER OF THE TOTAL HEIGHT THAT COULD BE ALLOWED.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: IN HONOUR OF OUR FORMER CHIEF OF STAFF WHO DID A WHOLE DIAGRAM, WHO EXPLAINED THE CONCEPT. THE ENGINEER IS COMING THROUGH. IF ANYTHING, WITHOUT CHANGING IT'S 45 BASED ON FOR SOME REASON, 6 FEET, AN ELEVATION OF 6 FEET, AND THEN YOU'RE DOING THE -- WE'RE NOT CHANGING THAT.

NO, THAT REMAINS THE SAME. SO IT STARTED A HEIGHT OF 12 FEET ON AT THE LINE, OR THE PROPERTY LINE ADJACENT TO THE BACK LANE.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: OK. SO IT'S 12 FEET UP. SO IT'S MORE BUILDING HEIGHT. BUT WE'RE NOT CHANGING THAT.

THAT'S RIGHT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: AND IT'S MEASURED, THAT LAST POINT. I THOUGHT I HAD IT. SO THE LINE FROM WHERE YOU'RE MEASURING IS, IS THAT THE NEIGHBOUR'S PROPERTY? OR IS THAT YOUR PROPERTY WHERE IT HITS THE BACK LANE?

IT'S THE NEIGHBOUR'S PROPERTY. IF IT'S R-1 OR R-2. IN THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT'S WHERE THE 45 ANGULAR PLANE APPLIES. IT IS MEASURED, IF THE CORRIDOR PROPERTY SHARING A PROPERTY LINE WITH THAT R-1, R-2 LOT, THAT'S WHERE YOU BEGIN THE MEASUREMENT FROM. BUT IF THERE'S A PUBLIC LANE, THEN YOU GO ACROSS THAT PUBLIC LANE AND START THE MEASUREMENT FROM THAT R-1 OR R-2 MFS LOT AT 12 GRADE.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: I MAY HAVE SOMETHING MORE, BUT I'LL TAKE A BREAK.

THE ANSWER TO MY QUESTION.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW?

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I HEARD YOU REPLY TO COUNCILLOR MAYES, WHICH CONFUSED ME A LITTLE BIT MORE, A LITTLE BIT. SO WE'RE GOING TO TALK ABOUT A PROPERTY THAT HAS RMF RESIDENCE BEHIND IT, A LANE OF HOMES BEHIND IT. NOT GETTING HEARING. WHEN WE'RE

ASKING FOR TODAY IS TO REMOVE THE 12-FOOT. YEAH, 12 FEET. SORRY, 12 FEET. THAT'S WHERE THE LINE STARTS IN YOUR DIAGRAM HERE, CORRECT?

NO. WE'RE NOT PROPOSING TO REMOVE HOW THE 45-DEGREE ANGULAR PLANE IS MEASURED. WE'RE JUST CHANGING AT WHEN IT APPLIES. AT THIS EXAMPLE, THE BUILDING BEING SHOWN IS 75 FEET IN HEIGHT. AND IN A SCENARIO WHERE THEY COULD, IN FACT, DO THE SETBACK AND GO TALLER, THEY WOULD BE ALLOWED UNDER WHERE THAT 45 ANGLE LINE CONTINUES TO PROJECT ABOVE THE 75 FEET. THAT WOULD BE THEIR NEW BUILDING AREA. ALLOWABLE BUILDING AREA.

SO THAT GREY AREA IS STILL NOT.

THE GREY IN THIS IMAGE SHOWS WHAT WOULD BE ALLOWED IF THE CHANGE WAS APPROVED TODAY TO ALLOW 75 FEET.

YOU GO BACK TO THE OTHER PICTURE THEN.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: SO WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THAT PICTURE AND THE HEIGHT ON TOP? WHAT'S THE DIFFERENCE HERE, VERSUS WHAT THE PICTURE HAS.

THE DIFFERENCE WOULD BE THAT THE GREY AREA IS DEMONSTRATING THE POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL MASSING THAT WOULD BE PERMITTED.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: SO THE SETBACK WOULD NOT BE REQUIRED LIKE IN THE ORIGINAL PICTURE.

CORRECT.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: SO THE SETBACK IS NOT REQUIRED IN THE NEW PROPOSAL. EXTRA BUILDABLE SPACE BY NOT HAVING THIS STEPBACK.

CORRECT. BASED ON THAT 75-FEET HIGH EXAMPLE.

Councillor THANK YOU. OK. THAT CLARIFIES. OK, THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS?

COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER. THROUGH YOU TO DEVON. WHAT OPTIONS WERE YOU PROVIDED WITH, WITH RESPECT TO BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOWS IF THAT AMENDMENT WAS TO BE TAKEN OUT OF CONSIDERATION HERE?

SO WE NEED TO GO BACK A LITTLE BIT. ON THE WORK THAT WE CONDUCTED, CERTAINLY, NOT IN-DEPTH AND COMPREHENSIVE. WE LOOKED AT OTHER JURISDICTIONS ACROSS CANADA THAT EITHER HAD SOME REFERENCE TO BIRD-FRIENDLY REGULATIONS, OR MANDATED REQUIREMENTS WITHIN THE ZONING BYLAW TO HAVE BIRD-FRIENDLY REGULATION. WHAT WE FOUND WAS MUNICIPALITIES IN ONTARIO, PARTICULARLY. WE'RE THE ONLY ONES THAT WE COULD COME ACROSS THAT HAD ZONING IN THEIR BYLAWS, STATING THAT A CERTAIN REQUIREMENT, SUCH AS VISUAL MARKERS OR INTEGRATED STRUCTURES, OR THE USE OF NONREFLECTIVE GLASS SHALL OR MUST BE USED ON

PROJECTS WITHIN A CITY. FURTHER TO, THAT THE PARTICULAR REQUIREMENTS FOR THE VISUAL MARKERS ONLY BEING ALLOWED WHEN THE PROPERTY WAS LOCATED NEAR A PARK. SO WITHIN THE ZONING BYLAW RULES, A PERMIT IS REQUIRED. BUT THEY OFFER FLEXIBILITY BASED ON CONTEXT OR DESIRED REQUIREMENTS OF ANY PARTICULAR PROJECT.

COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS: WHAT WE HEARD THIS MORNING WAS VANCOUVER AND CALGARY. SO VANCOUVER AND CALGARY, WHEN WE LOOKED AT THEM, THOSE REQUIREMENTS ARE VOLUNTARY. TO WHAT DEGREE? I'M NOT ENTIRELY SURE. WE DON'T KNOW IF IT'S SIMPLY ENCOURAGED AND PEOPLE ARE WILLING AND WANTING TO DO THIS, OR IF IT'S INCENTIVIZED. I DON'T HAVE A CLEAR ANSWER ON THAT. WHAT I DO KNOW IS THAT THEY DON'T EXPLICITLY REQUIRE AS A PART OF ALL DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS THROUGH THEIR ZONING BYLAW. THOSE CITIES ARE IDENTIFIED AS BEING BIRD-FRIENDLY CITIES UNDER THE -- LET'S SEE WHAT THE NATURE CANADA -- SO NATURE CANADA SAYS 36 MUNICIPALITIES ACROSS CANADA TO BE DESIGNATED AS BIRD FRIENDLY. UNDER THAT DESIGNATION, THESE MUNICIPALITIES HAVE TO DEMONSTRATE HOW THEY ARE ADDRESSING BIRD-FRIENDLYED ENVIRONMENTS. SO WINDOWS ARE ONE OF THE CRITERIA, BUT IT'S ALSO MANAGING CATS. THE USE OF PESTICIDES AND ADDRESSING LIGHT POLLUTION. SO THERE'S A NUMBER OF OTHER FACTORS OUTSIDE JUST WINDOWS THAT ARE ENCOURAGED TO SUPPORT MORE BIRD-FRIENDLY CITIES.

COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS: IS WINNIPEG CONSIDERED ONE OF THE 36 MUNICIPALITIES?

NO, NOT AT THIS TIME.

COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS: WHAT IS THE CRITERIA USED TO ESTABLISH THEM?

I'M NOT ENTIRELY SURE. I THINK YOU HAVE TO ACKNOWLEDGE YOU WERE INTENDING TO BE AND PROPOSED SOMETHING TO SAY WE WISH TO BE IDENTIFIED AS A BIRD-FRIENDLY CITY. FROM THERE, THEY WOULD LOOK AT CRITERIA TO HELP DETERMINE WHAT YOU NEED TO DO TO ACHIEVE THAT.

COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? COUNCILLOR MAYES?

COUNCILLOR MAYES: JUST SO I'M CLEAR ON THE 45. LOOKING AT THE BYLAW HERE, SO IT'S NOT LIKE THE 45 ANGULAR REQUIREMENT IS ELIMINATED BY THIS SUGGESTED REFORMS HERE. IT'S RATHER -- THERE'S STILL A NUMBER OF REFERENCES TO BUILDINGS OVER 75 FEET. SUCH SETBACK IS REQUIRED BY A 45 ANGULAR ANALYSIS WHERE APPLICABLE. SO IT'S STILL IN PLAY, BUT IT IS -- IT KICKS IN AT A HEIGHT ABOVE 75 FEET?

CORRECT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: SORRY. GO AHEAD. YOU'RE THE APPLICANT TECHNICALLY. SO IT'S UNCLEAR. THERE'S TALK OF AN AMENDMENT THAT WOULD -- I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE YOU HAVE THE SAME UNDERSTANDING THAT I HAVE. SO THE AMENDMENT WOULD BE THE SAME PROVISIONS WE HAVE. BUT IN ADDITION, THE DIRECTOR COULD AT THE DIRECTOR'S DISCRETION COULD APPROVE A BUILDING WITH -- JAMES GOT THE WORDING. ROUGHLY COMPARABLE, BUT THE PROVISIONS THAT ARE ROUGHLY COMPARABLE TO THE STANDARDS.

YES. I UNDERSTAND THAT RECOMMENDATION. I WOULD AGREE WITH IT, IF THAT'S THE RULE OF COUNCIL. CERTAINLY, IT'S AN OPPORTUNITY TO COVER THAT GAP BETWEEN TODAY AND THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BYLAW UPON THE COMPLETION. AND ULTIMATELY, OFFERS THE FLEXIBILITY THAT NEEDS TO BE EMBEDDED. IF YOU'RE GOING TO CREATE ZONING BYLAW RULES OFTEN, AND YOU WANT AS OF RATE DEVELOPMENT, YOU CERTAINLY NEEDS FLEXIBILITY WITHIN THAT AS WELL IN ORDER TO ACCOUNT FOR VARIOUS CONTEXT IN CIRCUMSTANCES. SO YEAH, I'M COMFORTABLE WITH THAT APPROACH IF THAT'S THE DIRECTION IF COUNCIL WISHES TO VOTE.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: IS THERE ANY HEIGHT BELOW WHICH THE BIRD PROTECTIONS MAY NOT BE REQUIRED?

BUILDING HEIGHT? IT APPLIES TO THE FIRST 16 METRES ABOVE GRADE. SO NO.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: SO IN THEORY, IT'S PART OF THE ZONING BYLAW. THIS COULD BE EXTENDED TO, DARE I SAY, FOUR-PLEXES OR OTHER LOWER RISE STRUCTURES. THIS ISN'T WE NEED TO DO THIS FOR HIGH-RISES. IT'S ALMOST A REVERSE. WE NEED TO DO THIS UP TO SIX STORIES OR THE TREE LINE.

I THINK IN MY UNDERSTANDING OF THE RESEARCH, YES, THAT'S WHAT IS RECOMMEND THE HIS. I UNDERSTAND IT'S STILL ABOVE THOSE HEIGHTS. THERE ARE BIRD STRIKES. IT DOESN'T TOTALLY ELIMINATE THE POTENTIAL FOR BIRD STRIKES. IT'S ENCOURAGED BECAUSE AT THE TREE CANOPY LEVEL THAT'S WHERE BIRDS ARE TRYING TO FLY TO AND LAND ON. THAT'S WHERE THE MISTAKE IS THE TREE IS NOT A TREE. IT'S A WINDOW, AND THAT'S WHERE THEY COLLIDE. IT'S SOMETHING THAT COULD BE LOOKED AT FOR TALLER BUILDINGS AS WELL. I KNOW THERE'S CRITERIA WITH THE NUMBER OF DIFFERENT THE TORONTO REGULATIONS LOOK AT TALLER BUILDINGS AS WELL. FOR THIS PURPOSE, YEAH, IT WOULD APPLY TO THE HEIGHTS OF THIS REGULATION. SO AS TALL AS 200 FEET.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: SO THE DE FACTO IMPLICATIONS OF THE AMENDMENT WOULD BE PROVISION WOULD STAY IN PLACE. SOME ARE MORE FLEXIBLE. TO THE DISCRETION OF THE DIRECTOR UP UNTIL SUCH TIME THIS ISSUE CAN BE EXTENDED CITY-WIDE OR ELIMINATED ALTOGETHER.

CORRECT. I THINK THROUGH THAT PROCESS, WE'LL HAVE A BETTER OPPORTUNITY TO ENGAGE WITH DEVELOPERS, WITH ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTISTS, AND PEOPLE WHO HAVE A REALLY GOOD UNDERSTANDING OF THIS TO REALLY FIND WHERE THAT BALANCE IS AND WHAT THE BEST APPROACH NEEDS TO BE.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? AT THIS TIME, Mr. CLERK. NEXT WE'LL HEAR FROM?

CLERK: NEXT WE HAVE INDIVIDUALS THAT ARE REGISTERED TO SPEAK TO THE APPLICATION. FIRST REGISTERED IN SUPPORT IS LIONEL McINNIS FROM THE MANITOBA HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION.

MADAM SPEAKER: HELLO. GOOD AFTERNOON. YOU ARE MUTED. IF YOU CAN JUST UNMUTE.

HOW'S THAT?

MADAM SPEAKER: VERY GOOD. THANK YOU.

OK, THANK YOU. GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS LIONEL McINNIS. I'M THE PRESIDENT AND C.E.O. OF MANITOBA HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION, AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE OF MANITOBA. MY APOLOGIES FOR NOT BEING ABLE TO JOIN YOU IN PERSON, BUT I I'M SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF THE COLLECTIVE MEMBERS IN ACCORDANCE TO THE CITY MALLS AND CORRIDORS PDO. I'D LIKE TO BEGIN BY THANKING THE CITY ADMINISTRATION, SPECIFICALLY JAMES BEECH AND HIS TEAM FOR THEIR OUTREACH, AND THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS IN NOVEMBER OF LAST YEAR. IT WAS STATED BY THE CITY'S ADMINISTRATION THIS MORNING THAT TO DATE, THE CITY HAS NOT RECEIVED ANY AS OF RIGHT APPLICATIONS SINCE THE ZONING CHANGES IN THE PDO WERE IMPLEMENT SHORT OF THE CITY'S EXPECTATIONS. WE COMMEND THE ADMINISTRATION FOR TALKING TO POTENTIAL APPLICANTS FOR OUR FEEDBACK OVER THAT TIME, IDENTIFYING THAT THERE WERE BARRIERS THAT CAN BE ADDRESSED BY AMENDING THE PDO, AND ASKING OUR COMMUNITY TO VERIFY WITH THE ADMINISTRATION HAD EXPERIENCED AND HEARD OVER THESE PAST YEARS, SO THEY CAN PROVIDE YOU AS COUNCIL TO PROVIDE THE BEST INFORMATION TO MAKE A DECISION ON THIS MATTER. PRIOR TO THE ORIGINALLY SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARING IN DECEMBER, WE SHARED WITH ALL MEMBERS OF COUNCIL THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE RATIONALE BEHIND THESE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE THREE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN PROVIDED TO THE ADMINISTRATION DURING THEIR OUTREACH. AND WHILE I RECOMMEND A RECOMMENDATION WERE NOT FULLY REFLECTED IN THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS THAT WERE BROUGHT FORWARD BY THE ADMINISTRATION, WE DO SUPPORT THE AMENDMENTS, AS THESE CHANGES WILL HELP ADDRESS BARRIERS TO INCREASING RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITHINS AND BORDERS PDO. WE SUPPORT ELIMINATING THE MINIMUM GROUND FLOOR HEIGHT REQUIREMENT WITHIN THE PDO. OUR MEMBERS INDICATED THAT FROM THEIR PERSPECTIVE, THERE'S NO PLANNING BENEFIT TO MANDATING SPECIFIC HEIGHT FOR COMMERCIAL UNITS. A DEVELOPER SHOULD SET THE BASE HEIGHT ON THE INTENDED USE OF THAT SPACE. WE ALSO RECOMMENDED ELIMINATING THE PLANE REQUIREMENT. THIS RULE IS AT ODDS WITH ANOTHER RULE THAT REGULATES BUILDING HEIGHT BASED ON THE WIDTH OF THE RIGHT OF WAY. WHEN THE CITY SAYS WE WOULD LIKE TALLER RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS ON A WIDER RIGHT OF WAY, IT IMMEDIATELY CONTRADICTS THAT BY PLACING AN ANGULAR PLANE LIMITATION ON THAT SAME BUILDING. THIS CONTRADICTION WAS IDENTIFIED BY Mr. CLARK DURING HIS PRESENTATION, AND OUR UNDERSTANDING IS THAT THERE'S NO SUCH REQUIREMENT FOR, SAY, A COMMERCIAL BUILDING LIKE AN OFFICE BUILDING THE SAME LOCATION. ON THAT BASIS, OUR RECOMMENDATION REMAINS THAT THIS REQUIREMENT SHOULD BE DELETED. IT UNDERMINES THE CITY'S MAIN OBJECTIVE, WHICH IS TO GAIN DENSITY BY A HEIGHT ON OUR MAJOR ROADWAYS. IF THE CITY TRULY WANTS DEVELOPMENT DENSITY ON CORRIDORS, JUST LIMIT THE HEIGHT RIGHT OF WAY BY WIDTH AND ACCEPT THE INCREASED DENSITY DOES COME WITH INCREASED SHADOW. BUT SHOULD THERE BE A WILLINGNESS BY COUNCIL TO CONTINUE PLACING THIS REQUIREMENT ON RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS WITHIN THE PDO, THE AMENDMENT AS PROPOSED ON THIS REQUIREMENT, WHILE STILL BEING A BARRIER, SHOULD AT LEAST PROVIDE A MORE WORKABLE SOLUTION, AND WOULD BE AN IMPROVEMENT TO THE EXISTING WORDING. OUR MEMBERS HAVE CLEARLY SKATED THAT THESE FIRST TWO REQUIREMENTS ARE BY FAR MORE IMPACTFUL AND PUNITIVE THAN THE THIRD REQUIREMENT ADDRESSED IN THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS, YET PUBLIC AND THIS COUNCIL'S FOCUS SEEMS TO BE PRIMED-FRIENDLY WINDOW REQUIREMENT. OUR RECOMMENDATION REMAINS THAT THIS REQUIREMENT AS CURRENTLY WRITTEN

BE ELIMINATED, BUT FOLLOWING COUNCIL'S DECISION TO RESCHEDULE THE DECEMBER PUBLIC HEARING. WE HAVE SHARED WITH THE ADMINISTRATION PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE WORDING TO THE BIRD-FRIENDLY REQUIREMENT THAT IN OUR VIEW, WOULD PROVIDE A FLEXIBLE, REASONABLE, AND WORKABLE SOLUTION TO THIS REQUIREMENT THAT ACTUALLY HELPS ACHIEVE THE CITY'S OBJECTIVE OF BIRD PROTECTION. WE HOPE THAT YOU'LL CONSIDER OUR FEEDBACK. WE APPRECIATE HAVING THE OPPORTUNITY TO PROVIDE IT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK TO THIS ITEM TODAY, AND I'M HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE AS BEST AS I CAN. THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. QUESTIONS FOR THE DELEGATION? COUNCILLOR MAYES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: SO THE FIRST TWO YOU MADE THE HEIGHT REQUIREMENT AND THE ANGULAR PLANE YOU FEEL ARE MORE OF A TO YOUR DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY THAN THE BIRD PROVISION? YOU SAID THE FIRST TWO. THESE THINGS ARE ORDERED DIFFERENTLY IN DIFFERENT PARTS OF THIS. I WANT TO MAKE SURE. THE BIGGER CONCERNS ARE THE HEIGHT AND THE ANGULAR PLANE. IS THAT FAIR?

MADAM CHAIR, YES. THE PRIORITY ITEMS IN TERMS OF CONCERNS FROM OUR MEMBERS ARE THOSE TWO. THEY HAVE THE LARGER IMPACT IN TERMS OF THE PRO FORMA PROJECT BEING IMPACTED. HAVING SAID THAT, AS WORDED, THE BIRD-FRIENDLY REQUIREMENT IS VERY PRESCRIPTIVE, AS THE DIRECTOR INDICATED IN HER COMMENTS THIS MORNING. THE COSTING OF THE SOURCING DOES HAVE A PRETTY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT IN TERMS OF COST ESCALATION. AND WHEN RESTRICTIONS LIKE THE 45-DEGREE ANGLE PLANE AND THE FLOOR OR THE GRADE FLOOR HEIGHT REQUIREMENT, THEN THE IMPACT ON THE PROJECT BE ABLE TO MOVE FORWARD, CAN BE COMPROMISED.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. NEXT QUESTION, COUNCILLOR MAYES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: ARE THERE ANY SPECIFIC PROJECTS WHERE THIS RESULTED IN A NO-GO AND NOT PROCEEDING WHERE YOU CAN LIST FOR US? ON THE BIRD PROVISION. NOT ON THE OTHER PROVISION.

MADAM CHAIR, THAT'S LIKELY A QUESTION BETTER ASKED OF THE ADMINISTRATION, AS WE'RE NOT PRIVY TO DISCUSSIONS ON POTENTIAL PROJECTS AND APPLICATIONS THAT HAPPEN BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPERS AND THE CITY OF WINNIPEG.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. NEXT, Mr. MAYOR.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: MADAM SPEAKER. I WANT TO THANK Mr. McINNIS FOR HIS PRESENTATION. HE REFERENCED THE DISCUSSION WITH PUBLIC SERVICE RELATED TO SOME SORT OF COMPROMISED AMENDMENT WORDING RELATED TO THE BIRD-FRIENDLY PROVISION. CAN HE JUST RESTATE AND REMIND US WHAT YOUR PROPOSAL IS?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE?

THANK YOU, MADAM CHAIR. OUR RECOMMENDATION WAS TO SIMPLIFY THE WORDING TO STATE A BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOW TREATMENT MUST BE APPLIED TO GLAZING SYSTEMS UP TO 16 METRES ABOVE GRADE, OR TO THE TOP OF THE MATURE TREE CANOPY, WHICHEVER IS HIGHER TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE DIRECTOR.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: NEXT QUESTION. ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? SEEING NONE, THANK YOU FOR YOUR PRESENTATION TODAY.

THANK YOU.

CLERK: WE HAVES REGISTERED TO SPEAK IN SUPPORT OF THE APPLICATION -- WE HAVE NO ONE ELSE. IS THERE ANYONE WHO WISHES TO SPEAK IN SUPPORT?

ON A POINT OF CLARIFICATION. I'M GLAD WE HAVE SOMEONE TO SUPPORT. THE RULES ARE CHANGING HERE SO MUCH. IT'S WEIRD ALREADY. I'M JUST GOING TO ASK. I LOOK AT LIST I WAS GIVEN YESTERDAY. THERE WAS NO ONE IN SUPPORT OF ANY OF THIS YESTERDAY. NOW I'M FINDING OUT THERE IS SOMEONE IN SUPPORT. HOW DID THAT ALL WORK OUT?

MADAM SPEAKER: WE'LL ASK THE CLERK IN A MOMENT. TYPICALLY, WHEN WE'RE AT COMMUNITY UP UNTIL THE HEARING STARTS, YOU CAN REGISTER EITHER WAY. YEAH. Mr. CLERK?

CLERK: JUST TO CLARIFY, THAT WERE THE SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED UP UNTIL THAT POINT. MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC HAVE THE ABILITY TO REGISTER, INCLUDING AT THE PUBLIC HEARING AND THE SUBMISSIONS UP TO AND INCLUDING AT THE PUBLIC.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU FOR THE QUESTION.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: SAME THING. WE'RE HEARING ABOUT AMENDMENTS. BUT I DON'T HAVE ANYTHING IN FRONT OF ME. SO I'M NOT SURE HOW WE'RE ALLOWING AMENDMENTS COME IN BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT IN FRONT OF ME.

MADAM SPEAKER: AMENDMENTS FROM YOUR COLLEAGUES?

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: FROM ANYONE.

MADAM SPEAKER: THIS IS A HEARING. THERE WILL BE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR DISCUSSION AND HEARING FOR AMENDMENTS. WE'LL TAKE A RECESS, AND THOSE AMENDMENTS WILL BE DISCUSSED.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: SO THERE WILL BE NO AMENDMENTS PROVIDED FROM THE ADMINISTRATION. WHAT I HAVE NOW IS REPORTED IN FRONT OF ME.

MADAM SPEAKER: THAT'S RIGHT. THE ELECTED OFFICIALS WILL BE DELIBERATING ON ANY AMENDMENTS. THANK YOU. Mr. CLERK? NEXT SPEAKER.

CLERK: THE NEXT SPEAKER WE HAVE REGISTERED. WE'RE GOING ON TO THE LIST OF INDIVIDUALS THAT HAVE REGISTERED IN OPPOSITION. FIRST PERSON ON THE LIST IS ALISON CONRAD, WHO IS APPEARING IN PERSON. AFTER ALISON, WE DO HAVE JARVIS.

THANK YOU. GOOD AFTERNOON. PRESENTATION. OK.

MADAM SPEAKER: FOLLOWING JARVIS BROWNING, WE'LL HEAR FROM JACOB HERD ALSO IN PERSON. WE'LL GO TO THREE OTHER DELEGATIONS, VIA ZOOM. OF COURSE, AFTER WE HEAR FROM THOSE IN OPPOSITION, IT WILL BE THOSE THAT ARE REGISTERED FOR INFORMATION. AND THEN A REBUTTAL BACK FROM THE APPLICANT.

TRANSCONA SECONDARY PLAN BACK IN 2024. WE'RE ONLY DEALING HERE WITH THE BYLAW, THE ZONING BYLAW, RIGHT? WE'RE NOT DOING A COMPLETE COMMUNITY TRANSCONA THING. THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: THAT'S CORRECT. DO YOU NEED A FEW MINUTES, JOSH?

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. YOU HAVE THE FLOOR.

GOOD AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS ALISON CONRAD. I'M HERE DISSENTING. YOU CAN FIND OUT MORE IN THE ANNEX OF THE PRESENTATION PROVIDED, BUT ESSENTIALLY, OUR GOAL IS TO MAKE WINNIPEG A CERTIFIED BIRD-FRIENDLY CITY. WE LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH CITY COUNCIL THIS YEAR. YOU00 SUBMISSIONS WHERE MANY INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS HAVE PROVIDED GREAT SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON HOW BEST TO MOVE FORWARD WITHOUT DELETING BIRD REQUIREMENTS AND STILL PRIORITIZING HOUSING. I'M HERE TO PRESENT A POLICY PERSPECTIVE AND HIGHLIGHT THE OPPORTUNITY COUNCIL HAS TO SHOW LEADERSHIP IN TWO AREAS OF IMPORTANCE, HOUSING AND BIODIVERSITY. THIS IS THE RIGHT TIME, ESPECIALLY WITHIN UPCOMING ELECTION. SO THE FIRST AREA OF IMPORTANCE IS HOUSING. AS WE ALL KNOW THROUGH AVENUES INCLUDESING THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND, WHICH IS MOST RELEVANT HERE -- INCLUDING. THE SECOND IS BIODIVERSITY WHICH IS REPRESENTED BY A VARIETY OF POLICIES AND ACTIONS. THE GREEN SPACE PLAN AND BIODIVERSITY POLICY INCLUDES CONTAINING CORRIDORS NATURAL SPACES THAT SUPPORT THE MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE, PLANTS AND ANIMALS, WHICH IS VERY RELEVANT HERE CONSIDERING THE MALLS, CORRIDORS AND PS ALONG NATURAL CORRIDORS, IN THINKS RIVERS. WINNIPEG ALSO SIGNED THE MONTREAL PROTOCOL, WHICH INCLUDES REDUCING THREATS TO BIODIVERSITY, AND EFFECTIVELY MANAGING INTERACTIONS OF VULNERABLE SPECIES WITH HUMANS. AGAIN, VERY RELEVANT HERE, CONCERNING THE EXISTING THREAT HUMANS CREATED CLOSE TO BIRDS. AS YOU KNOW, LIVABLE SAFE, HAPPY HEALTHY CITY IS FOUND MANY OF WHICH TOUCH ON THESE IMPORTANT AREAS. HOUSING AND DIVERSITY IS NOT AT ODDS WITH ONE ANOTHER. BIODIVERSITY DOES NOT EXIST OUT THERE OUTSIDE THE CITY. IT IS HERE EVERY DAY IN THE FORM OF MANY LIVING THINGS. IN THIS CASE, BIRDS. CITY COUNCIL IS FOR HOUSING AND BIODIVERSITY AND CAN BE DONE AND ACTUALLY MAKE EACH OTHER BETTER. THE OVERLAP IS WHERE WE SUCCEED. LIVABILITY IS NOT JUST ABOUT HOUSING. IT'S ABOUT BEING IN A CITY FULL OF VIBRANT LIGHT, GREEN SPACES AND SO MUCH MORE INSTEAD OF CONCRETE BUILDINGS AND DEAD BIRDS ON THE SIDEWALK. THERE WERE MANY ORGANIZATIONS ACROSS THE CITY AND PROVINCE. MANY OF THOSE SENT IN LETTERS AND SUBMISSIONS TODAY. SO WHAT SHOULD YOU CONSIDER WHEN IT COMES TO THIS PDO? SO THIS TABLE WILL ILLUSTRATE SOME OF THE THINGS DEVELOPERS AND ADMINISTRATIONS ARE SAYING, AND WHAT COUNCIL SHOULD CONSIDER BASED ON EXPERTISE ACROSS WINNIPEG. FIRSTLY, DEVELOPERS ARE SAYING THAT IT'S TOO EXPENSIVE AND DIFFICULT TO SOURCE BIRD-FRIENDLY MATERIALS, ACCORDING TO THE REQUIREMENTS. BUT ORGANIZATIONS ACROSS WINNIPEG HAVE IMPLEMENTED BIRD-FRIENDLY DESIGN. IN A COST-EFFECTIVE MANNER AND SOURCED FROM CANADIAN COMPANIES. THERE ARE MANY VARIABLES AND DESIGN

DECISIONS, FRIENDLY DESIGN IS ONE COST VARIABLE. OFTEN, IT CAN BE A FRACTION OF CONSTRUCTION COSTS AND EXPECTED PROFITS, WHICH CAN BE SIGNIFICANT IN THIS CASE. AND COSTS CAN BE OFFSET BY ADJUSTING OTHER VARIABLES. SECONDLY, DEVELOPERS SAYS SINCE THEREABOUTS UPCOMING BYLAW REVIEW WHERE BIRD-FRIENDLY MEASURES WILL BE LOOKED AT, INSTEAD OF APPLYING IT IN THE SPECIFIC CONTEXT, WE SHOULD WAIT. COUNCIL SHOULD CONSIDER IF WE CAN'T APPLY BIRD-FRIENDLY MEASURES TO THE SMALLER SCOPE, HOW DO WE EXPECT TO INCLUDE THIS CITY-WIDE? HOW MANY BIRDS WILL DIE WHILE WE WAIT? AND LASTLY, THE PDO RUNS ALONG THE RIVERS. THESE ARE IMPORTANT FLYWAYS AND MIGRATORY PASS FOR BIRDS, MAKING THIS EVEN MORE IMPORTANT. SO FINALLY, WHAT CAN WE DO NEXT? COUNCILLOR LUKES AND ALL OF YOU BEGAN A CONVERSATION AROUND BIRD-FRIENDLY DESIGN AND CREATED A FOUNDATION,S TAKE. IT'S A GREAT PLACE TO START AND BUILD MOMENTUM. WE DON'T WANT YOU TO WAVER. ORGANIZATIONS ACROSS THE CITY ARE READY TO PROVIDE EDUCATION AND SUPPORT TO THE CITY AND DEVELOPERS TO REDUCE THOSE BARRIERS, SHOW YOU THIS ISN'T TOO EXPENSIVE, AND IT'S NOT TOO DIFFICULT. THIS IS POSSIBLE. WE CAN HAVE HOUSING, AND WE CAN SUPPORT BIODIVERSITY. WHAT IS DECIDED HERE TODAY WILL SET A PRECEDENT FOR HOW WE PRIORITIZE THE LIVABILITY AND HEALTH OF OUR RIVER CITY AND PRECIOUS WILDLIFE. PLEASE HELP US BUILD A BETTER WINNIPEG FOR EVERYONE, AND THAT INCLUDES THE BIRDS. THANK YOU FOR YOUR LEADERSHIP AND SUPPORT ON THIS.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. ANY QUESTIONS FOR ALISON CONRAD? COUNCILLOR LUKES?

COUNCILLOR LUKES: IT'S MORE OF A DID YOU KNOW? DID YOU KNOW THAT YOU HAVE EDUCATED ALL OF US VERY WELL, THE BIRD COMMUNITY HAVE EDUCATE VERY WELL, SO YOU PROBABLY WON'T GET ANY QUESTIONS.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU FOR YOUR PRESENTATION.

CLERK: NEXT DELEGATION WE HAVE REGISTERED IS JARVIS BROWNLEE, WHO UNFORTUNATELY HAD TO LEAVE, BUT DIDN'T MAKE A SUBMISSION WHICH HAS BEEN PLACED IN THE COUNCILLOR'S FOLDER WITH THE OTHER SUBMISSIONS THAT WERE SENT. NEXT DELEGATION IS JACOB HURD, WHO IS ALSO ATTENDING IN PERSON. JACOB HURD? MAD ACSPEAKER, I DON'T SEE JACOB IN THE GALLERY. SO THE NEXT PERSON REGISTERED IS DAVE GREEN, WHO IS PRESENTING HIS.

MADAM SPEAKER: DAVE GREEN, GOOD AFTERNOON.

DAVE GREEN: GOOD AFTERNOON. I'M JUST BRINGING UP MY PRESENTATION RIGHT NOW. I'M DAVE GREEN OF I'M THE CO-CHAIR OF OURS WINNIPEG. AS YOU KNOW, WE'RE A CITY-WIDE FOCUSING ON GREEN SPACES, RIVER CORRIDORS AND FOREST CANOPY. WE URGE THE CITY TO DEVELOP PLANNING DOCUMENTS TO PRESERVE AND HAS NATURAL AMENITIES OF WINNIPEG. BIODIVERSITY OBVIOUSLY INCLUDES BIRDS AS AN IMPORTANT PART OF NATURAL AND WE HOPE THAT ALL CITIZENS, THAT IS THE PUBLIC INCLUDING BUSINESSES DO WHAT THEY CAN TO UPDATE ACKNOWLEDGE LIVING UPDATE AND ENVIRONMENT. WE OPPOSE CHANGING AMENDMENT TO THE WALLS AND CORRIDORS ZONING BYLAW TO REMOVE BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOWS THAT WERE ONLY ADOPTED LAST YEAR. WE THOUGHT IT WAS A GREAT POSITIVE STEP FORWARD IN DECEMBER 12 OF 2024 WHEN WINNIPEG COUNCIL ENACTED THE BYLAW TO INCLUDE BIRD-FRIENDLY TREATMENT FOR THE WALLS AND CORRIDORS. IN LESS THAN A PLANS TO STEP BACKWARDS BY WANTING TO ROLL BACK THESE WINDOW TREATMENT REQUIREMENTS TO NEW BUILDINGS. TO US, THERE'S LITTLE INDICATION TO INCLUDE APPETITE ON THIS ISSUE WITH THE

COMPREHENSIVE BYLAW REVIEWING OCCURRING IN 2026-2027. NEW BUILDINGS WILL BE AROUND FOR A LONG TIME, AND THIS ONLY PROLONGS THE DESTINATION AS BUILDING NUMBERS INCREASE WITH CITY GROWTH. WHAT ARE THE CHANCES OF BUILDING WINDOWS IN THE FUTURE? HIGHLY UNLIKELY. IN SEPTEMBER OF 2021, THE CITY ADOPTED THE CANADIAN STANDARD ASSOCIATION OF BIRD-FRIENDLY DESIGN, AND INCLUDED INFORMATION ON THE CITY WEBSITE TO PROVIDE WAYS TO HELP KEEP BIRDS SAFE, INCLUDING POLICY BUILDING DESIGN AND THINGS YOU CAN DO AT HOME AND WORK. IT WAS MOST DISAPPOINTING THIS FALL IN 2025, WE COULD NO LONGER FIND THIS INFORMATION IN THE CITY WEBSITE. REQUIREIES TO THE CITY REPORTED BACK IN THE INFORMATION WE MOVED BECAUSE IT WAS OUT OF DATE. LOOKING AT THE CITY OF WINNIPEG, NOW ON A WEB BROWSER FROM NOVEMBER OF 2025 UP UNTIL THISS JANUARY 15th, 2026, ONLY DIRECTING PEOPLE WHICH TREES ARE IMPORTANT FOR BIRDS. BUT IT HAS NOTHING ABOUT BIRDS IN THERE. MY PRESENTATION A WEEK AGO. FIRST, IT WENT TO THIS. THE ENVIRONMENT PAGE. NOW IT GOES TO THE BIRD FRIENDLY LIGHTS-OUT ONLY POLICY. THIS IS AN EXAMPLE OF WHAT THE PAGE USED TO BE LIKE. I JUST UNDERLINED WHAT I THINK ARE KEY POINTS. WINNIPEG PROVIDES AN IMPORTANT HABITAT FOR MIGRATORY BIRDS. PRESERVING BIRD POPULATIONS CONTRIBUTED TO ENVIRONMENT SUSTAINABILITY AND REDUCED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS. THE CITY OF WINNIPEG IS COMMITTED TO BEING BIRD FRIENDLY. WE HAVE THE LIGHTSOUT WINNIPEG PART OF IT WHERE COUNCIL APPROVED THAT IN 2022. THE POLICY ENCOURAGED ALL WINNIPEG RESIDENTS TO TURN OFF DIM LIGHTS AT NIGHT AND DRAW BLINDS AT THE OFFICE OR HOME. AND BIRD-FRIENDLY DESIGN STANDARDS FOR NEW BUILDINGS BY THE CSA GROUP WHERED BE SOREY CONSIDERED BY BUSINESS RESIDENTS, DESIGNERS AND BUILDERS BEFORE BUILDING ANY PROJECTS. AND HAD SOME GOOD INFORMATION ON WHAT RESIDENTS CAN DO TO TURN OFF LIGHTS AT NIGHT IN THEIR HOME. TREATMENT OF SCREEN, WHATEVER. MAKE YOUR YARD MORE BIRD FRIENDLY. JUST THE TAIL END OF THAT INFORMATION. IN 2021, CALGARY, ALONG WITH VANCOUVER, TORONTO AND LONDON BECAME THE FIRST BIRD-FRIENDLY CITIES. CALGARY WAS CERTIFIED IN 2023, UPGRADE FROM ENTRY TO INTERMEDIATE LEVEL. IN 2025, THAT INTERMEDIATE LEVEL WAS RENEWED FOR A SECOND TIME. CALGARY SUPPOSEDLY BECAME THE CANADIAN CITY WITH THREE CERTIFICATIONS. WHAT ARE THE RISKS OF THE OUTSIDE LAWS? THERE ARE FEDERAL LAWS THAT HELP PROTECT BIRDS. HOW CRITICAL ARE BIRDS -- I DON'T KNOW. THERE IS A MIGRATORY BIRD REGULATION, ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION ACT IN THE PROVINCE. PROHIBIT BUILDING OWNERS GLASS WHETHER INTENTION THE INCUMBENT UPON DUE DILIGENCE TO PREVENT FURTHER BIRD DEATHS. IN CANADA WHEN COLLISIONS KILL ANYWHERE FROM 16 TO 42 MILLION BIRDS A YEAR. THE UNITED STATES, WHICH HAS MANY MORE BUILDINGS.

MADAM SPEAKER: DAVE?

DAVE GREEN: IN CONCLUSION, I JUST HAVE ONE MORE.

MADAM SPEAKER: IF WE NEED MORE TIME, WE CAN DO THAT. YOU'RE SPEAKING VERY FAST. JUST BE COMFORTABLE.

DAVE GREEN: THIS IS MY LAST LINE.

MADAM SPEAKER: OK. THANK YOU. GO AHEAD. THAT WAS YOUR LAST LINE?

DAVE GREEN: THIS IS MY LAST LINE. SO I JUST SAY, LET'S STOP KICKING THE CAN DOWN THE ROAD, AND KEEP PUTTING THE ONUS ON FUTURE GENERATIONS WE KNOW OCCUR TODAY. WE NEED TO

REINSTATE FORMER COMBINED BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOW TREATMENT AND INFORMATION RESOURCES TO THE WINNIPEG WEBSITE. THESE INFORMATION GIVE MORE INFORMATION TO RESIDENTS ON WHAT CAN BE DONE, THAN JUST THE RECENT LINK TO THE ONLY POLICY. THE LATTER INFORMATION, THE FORMER INFORMATION WITH MORE LIGHTSOUT TECHNICAL POLICY DOCUMENT THAT PEOPLE GET DIRECTED TO. PERIODICALLY RAISING THIS ISSUE IN THE PUBLIC FORUM WOULD HELP KEEP IT ON PEOPLE'S MINDS. THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: ANY QUESTIONS FOR OUR PRESENTER? COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS?

COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS: THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER. THANK YOU FOR YOUR PRESENTATION, Mr. GREEN. EARLIER, IT WAS MENTIONED BY THE CITY OF WINNIPEG STAFF THAT THERE ARE 36 MUNICIPALITIES ACROSS THE NATION THAT ARE CONSIDERED BIRD FRIENDLY MUNICIPALITIES. I'M ASKING YOU IF THERE'S ANY INTEREST FOR THE CITY OF WINNIPEG TO BECOME A BIRD-FRIENDLY CITY. WHAT ARE THE MEASURES THAT WOULD HAVE TO BE UNDERTAKEN TO MOVE US TOWARD THAT?

THE CITY I THINK WOULD HAVE TO APPLY FOR IT. I THINK DEVON WAS MENTIONING SOMETHING ABOUT THAT WHEN HE WAS ASKED. I'M NOT A BIRD-FRIENDLY OR BIRD EXPERT. AUTUMN GEORGE I THINK IS -- I SEE HER NAME. SHE'S MORE OF THE BIRD-FRIENDLY EXPERT THAN I AM. SO I'M NOT REALLY SURE EXACTLY THE PROCESS BECAUSE IT'S NOT MY EXPERTISE. IN WHAT HAS TO BE DONE TO BECOME BIRD FRIENDLY. I HAVE LOOKED AT WHAT OTHER CITIES HAVE DONE, AND IT HAS BEEN SAID, TOO, THAT I THINK DEVON HAD MENTIONED IT, THAT IT COULD BE THINGS LIKE IF YOU HAVE BYLAWS THAT SAY CATS HAVE TO BE KEPT INSIDE BECAUSE THEY ARE ALSO A CAUSE OF BIRD DEATHS. SO I THINK WE HAVE A BYLAW ON THAT WHERE CATS ARE NOT SUPPOSEDLY ALLOWED TO BE WANDERING FREE. THERE ARE OTHER ASPECTS, TOO. CALGARY -- I THINK IT WAS MENTIONED THEY DON'T EXACTLY HAVE REQUIREMENTS TO HAVE WINDOW TREATMENTS OR TREATMENTS ON YOUR WINDOWS FOR PREVENTING BIRD STRIKES. BUT THERE'S OTHER THINGS THEY HAVE DONE. HABITAT INCREASES IN HABITAT AND ALL THOSE KIND OF THINGS. SO I GUESS I'M NOT AN EXPERT. SO OTHER EXPERTS, OTHER BIRD PEOPLE WOULD BE BETTER ADEPT AT ANSWERING THAT QUESTION.

COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS: HAVE YOU -- THERE'S A LETTER THAT WAS SENT TO THE CITY BY Dr. STEPHEN PETERSON, WHO IS THE DIRECTOR OF CONSERVATION AND RESEARCH AT ASSINIBOINE PARK CONSERVANCY. IT'S INCLUDED IN THE SUBMISSION TO THE CITY OF WINNIPEG. HAVE YOU HAD A CHANCE TO REVIEW THAT SAME LETTER?

NO BECAUSE WHEN I LOOKED AT THE -- WHEN I'M LOOKING AT THE EVEN FOR PUBLIC HEARING, AND I CAN'T SEE ANYWHERE, WHERE ANY OF THE SUBMISSIONS THAT WERE ON THE INTERNET. SO I'M NOT SURE IF THEY ARE THERE. SOMEHOW I'M MISSING RELATIVE SUBMISSIONS ARE SHOWN. WHEN I LOOK AT THIS I DON'T SEE HEM ANYWHERE.

WHERE ARE THEY SPECIFICALLY?

THOSE SUBMISSIONS ARE PROVIDED TO THE HEARING BODY AND THE PUBLIC RECORD.

THANK YOU.

HELLO, EVERYONE. I'M JUST GOING TO SHARE MY SCREEN. I HAVE A PRESENTATION. I'M ANOTHER CO-

FOUNDER OF BIRD-FRIENDLY WINNIPEG. SO SOME OF THE QUESTIONS ABOUT BIRD-FRIENDLY CITIES AND THE REQUIREMENTS. I WOULD LOVE TO TAKE A LITTLE BIT OF OVER FIVE MINUTES, IF YOU WOULD INDULGE ME AND WE COULD TALK ABOUT SOME OF THIS CRITERIA. I WANT TO BACK UP A LITTLE BIT AND TALK ABOUT THE PROBLEM ITSELF. WE WERE TALKING ABOUT BIRD-FRIENDLY GUIDE LINES AS THOUGH IT MIGHT BE OUT OF THE GOODNESS OF OUR HEARTS. WHY ARE WE DOING THIS? WHAT IS THE PROBLEM ACTUALLY? WHAT IS THE COST OF NOT HAVING THESE TYPES OF PROVISIONS? EVEN ON A SMALLER SCALE, ON A LARGER SCALE. WHY WOULD WE WANT TO DO THIS IN THE FIRST PLACE? I RECENTLY MOVED HOME TO WINNIPEG FROM SCHOOL. ONE OF THES I MISSED THE MOST IS WINNIPEGERS TAKE PRIDE IN BEING KIND TO OUR NEIGHBOURS. THIS IS AT THE HEART OF THE CITY. IT INCLUDES TAKING CARE OF OUR NEIGHBOURS, WHO ARE MORE THAN HUMAN. WE FEED THEM. WE PUT UP BIRDHOUSES FOR THEM, AND WE CERTAINLY DON'T WANT THEM TO BE HURT OR KILLED. EVERY YEAR WE HEARD COUNCILLORS MENTION THE THUMP AGAINST THEIR CHAMBER WINDOWS. THIS HAPPENS MORE THAN WE THINK. WE'RE PROBABLY ONLY WITNESSING 10% OF THE COLLISIONS THAT ARE HAPPENING. THIS IS BECAUSE BIRDS ARE COLLIDING WITH WINDOWS THEY CAN'T SEE OR IT'S REFLECTING HABITAT BACK TO THEM, IF IT'S A PARTICULARLY MIRRORED SURFACE. THIS IS KILLING 16 TO 42 MILLION BIRDS ANNUALLY IN CANADA ALONE. WHAT DO THESE NUMBERS EVEN MEAN? EACH BIRD IN THIS PHOTO WAS KILLED THE SAME WAY. IT FLEW INTO GLASS, AND THIS IS IN TORONTO. THIS THE TIP OF THE ICEBERG OF BIRDS THAT DIE EVERY SINGLE YEAR. 16 MILLION. I WAS HAVING A HARD TIME WRAPPING MY HEAD AROUND IT. IT'S ABOUT THE ENTIRE HUMAN POPULATION OF TWO NEW YORK CITIES, AND 42 MILLION IS ABOUT THE ENTIRE HUMAN POPULATION OF CANADA. THIS IS A HUGE RANGE. OBVIOUSLY, IT'S DIFFICULT TO ESTIMATE THE EXACT NUMBER OF BIRDS THAT DIE EVERY YEAR BECAUSE YOU DON'T ALWAYS DETECT EVERY SINGLE BIRD. SOMETIMES THEY ARE STUNNED. THEY ARE PICKED UP BY A PREDATOR. ONE OF THESE ROAMING CATS. WHO KNOWS. IT COULD BE A HUNGRY RACOON, TOO. SOMETIMES THEY ARE INJURED OR CONCUSSED, AND THEY FLY AWAY AND LATER DIE OF THEIR INJURIES. BUT WHAT WE KNOW FOR SURE IS THAT THIS IS A PROBLEM OF MAGNITUDE. IT'S HAVING A MEASURABLE EFFECT ON POPULATIONS OF BIRDS. THIS IS A GRAPH FROM BIRDS CANADA, ONE OF THE OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL NGOs THAT DOES RESEARCH WITH BIRDS AND THE BIRDS. THIS IS THE POPULATION CHANGED SINCE 1970. THEY ESTIMATE THAT OVERALL, WE LOST ABOUT 3 BILLION BIRDS IN JUST CANADA. THESE INCLUDE THINGS LIKE GRASSLAND BIRDS, THE BIRDS THAT MAKE UP THE HEART AND SOUL OF OUR PRAIRIE PROVINCE. THESE ARE THE AERIAL -- INSECTIVORES THAT EAT MOSQUITOES. THE BEETLES ARE THE ONES CONTRIBUTING TO DUTCH ELM DISEASE. ACTUAL SIGNIFICANT PESTS AND THREATS TO OUR URBAN FOREST. IT CAN BE SO DAUNTING TO CONSIDER ALL OF THESE NEGATIVE FACTS. WE ARE STAFFED WITH PROBLEMS. WE HAVE A HOUSING CRISIS. WE HAVE A CLIMATE CRISIS. WE HAVE A COST OF LIVING CRISIS. WHAT ARE WE SUPPOSED TO DO? HOW ARE WE SUPPOSED TO PRIORITIZE? I THINK IT CAN BE EASY TO SAY THESE ARE JUST BIRDS IT'S BAD AND SAD, BUT ULTIMATELY, WHO CARES? BUT THESE PROBLEMS ADD UP, AND THEY ARE ALL CONNECTED. AND IT TAKES A PSYCHOLOGICAL TOLL ON WINNIPEGERS TO HEAR THESE PROBLEMS AGAIN AND AGAIN, AND TO KNOW THERE IS NOTHING TO DO TO SOLVE THEM. THE GREAT NEWS IS THIS PROBLEM HAS A SOLUTION. IT HAS A VERY EASY SOLUTION. ADDING THESE THAT ARE ALREADY SPECIFIED IN THE CURRENT PDO, THE SPECIFICATIONS ARE QUITE RIGID ON PURPOSE BECAUSE THESE ARE THE SCIENTIFICALLY DRIVEN MEASUREMENTS THAT REDUCE COLLISIONS, SO THESE MINIMUM DISTANCES. ANYWHERE ELSE, ANY FLEXIBILITY WOULD PERHAPS MAKE THEM MEANINGLESS AND INEFFECTIVE. BUT WHEN THEY ARE EFFECTIVE, THESE EVIDENCE-SUPPORTED MEASUREMENTS, THEY REDUCE COLLISIONS BY 59%. YOU MAY WHY NOT THE OTHER 5%? TO PUT THAT INTO PERSPECTIVE, I WOULD SAY SEAT BELTS HAVE A 45 TO 60% EFFICACY RATE OF REDUCING FATALITIES IN COLLISIONS. WE ALSO COLLECTIVELY AGREE THAT SEAT BELTS ARE EFFECTIVE AND USEFUL AND THEY ARE USEFUL AND WE

REQUIRE THEM BY LAW. YOU CAN IMAGINE THE AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY WHEN SEAT BELTS WERE FIRST REQUIRED, THERE MAY BE DIFFICULTY SOURCING THE MATERIAL. MAYBE THEY WOULD BE EXPENSIVE. YOU KNOW, MAYBE IT WOULD BE CHALLENGING. IN FACT, HENRY FORD, JR. SAID THAT THESE NEW SAFETY REQUIREMENTS WERE UNREASONABLE, ARBITRARY AND TECHNICALLY UNUSABLE. HE THOUGHT THEY MIGHT CLOSE DOWN. IN FACT, FORD WENT ON TO BE A LEADER IN SAFETY RATINGS AND EVEN BOASTED ABOUT THIS. SO SEAT BELTS.

MADAM SPEAKER: SHELL JUST PAUSE FOR A MOMENT. HOW MUCH MORE TIME DID YOU NEED?

ONE MINUTE.

MADAM SPEAKER: ALL IN FAVOUR? CONTRARY. CARRIED.

THANK YOU. SO UNLIKE WHAT IS BEING SORT OF FRAMED AS A BARRIER TO DEVELOPMENT, WE ACTUALLY KNOW -- WE GET TO DECIDE WHAT KIND OF A WINNIPEG WE ARE DEVELOPING. AND THIS MARKET AND THESE DEVELOPERS ARE CATERING TO A MARKET. WITH SUFFICIENT DEMAND, THESE BARRIERS TURN INTO STRENGTHS. SO WHEN WE DEVELOP IN A CITY THAT IS LIKE ALISON HAD MENTIONED, BOTH PROVIDING WAREHOUSING AND CREATING BIODIVERSITY, WE KNOW THIS IS A BETTER, STRONGER AND MORE RESILIENT WINNIPEG. WINNIPEGERS HAVE SPOKEN. THEY WANT YOU TO KEEP THESE BIRD-FRIENDLY GUIDELINES. THIS IS UNPRECEDENTED PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT THE YOU TO HELP US DEVELOP A WINNIPEG WE CAN BE PROUD OF. SO PLEASE KEEP THE BIRD-FRIENDLY REQUIREMENTS IN THE MALLS, CORRIDORS, AND PDO BYLAW. FOR MORE INFORMATION, YOU CAN FOLLOW US ON INSTAGRAM OR VISIT OUR WEBSITE.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. ANY QUESTIONS? COUNCILLOR MAYES?

COUNCILLOR MAYES: CAN YOU PLEASE STAY ACTIVE ON BEING INVOLVED IN THIS DEBATE, AS WE GO FORWARD IN THE PUBLIC ZONING REVIEW? THAT WAS ONE OF THE MORE PROFESSIONAL BOTH IN CONTENT AND IN TERMS OF PRESENTATION I THINK I'VE SEEN IN A LONG TIME. HOPEFULLY, YOU CAN STAY ACTIVE IN THIS DEBATE AS WE GO FORWARD IN THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BYLAW REVIEW.

THANK YOU. I'M NOT GOING ANYWHERE.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. SEEING NO FURTHER QUESTIONS, THANK YOU FOR PRESENTING TODAY.

CLERK: NEXT IS AUTUMN GEORGE.

MADAM SPEAKER: GOOD AFTERNOON.

HI, EVERYONE. THANK YOU FOR TODAY. CAN YOU HEAR ME ALL RIGHT?

MADAM SPEAKER: YES, WE CAN.

AWESOME. I DON'T THINK I'LL NEED MORE THAN FIVE MINUTES TODAY. BUT THANK YOU ALL SO MUCH FOR LETTING ME HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH YOU TODAY. I'M CALLING IN FROM

OTTAWA, AND MY NAME IS AUTUMN JORDAN, THE BIRD-FRIENDLY CITY ORGANIZER AT BIRD CANADA. I'LL BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS IN THE PROGRAMME AS WELL. WE'RE ONE OF OUR COUNTRY'S OLDEST NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHARITIES IF YOU HAVEN'T HEARD OF US BEFORE. I'M HERE TO RESPECTFULLY URGE COUNCIL TO MAINTAIN FRIENDLY REQUIREMENTS AND REJECT THE PROPOSED BYLAW AMENDMENT THAT WOULD REMOVE THE STANDARDS FROM DOWNTOWN CORRIDORS AND DEVELOPMENTS. AS OTHERS BEFORE ME HAVE STATED, THE IMPACT OF CLIMATE AND HABITAT LOSS HAVE IRREVERSIBLE CONSEQUENCES FOR BOTH HUMANS AND WILDLIFE. ACROSS NORTH AMERICA, WE HAVE LOSS THREE BILLION BIRDS SINCE THE 1970s, AS SHELBY AS MENTIONED, THE CANADIAN STATS, SPECIFICALLY. FATAL COLLISIONS WITH GLASS AND REFLECTIVE SURFACES IS THE SECOND LEADING CAUSE OF BIRD POPULATION DECLINES IN THE COUNTRY. BY SOURCING AFFORDABLE, EFFECTIVE CANADIAN-MADE PRODUCTS SUCH AS FEATHER FRIENDLY MARKERS, BEFORE AND AFTER CONSTRUCTION IS, A SIMPLE AND EASY WAY WE CAN ALL DO OUR PART TO HELP MAKE OUR COMMUNITIES BE GOOD FOR BIRDS. NO ONE WANTS TO GO SHOPPING AND BE GREETED WITH A DEAD BIRD ON THEIR DOORSTEP. WITH WINNIPEG HAVING SUCH DIVERSITY OF SYSTEMS AND BIWAYS, IT'S CRUCIAL THAT NEW BUILDINGS INCLUDE BIRD-SAFE DESIGN TO ALLOW BIRDS SAFELY TRAVEL TO AND FROM THEIR SUMMER WINTER HOMES. BEYOND COST CONSIDERATIONS, IT'S IMPORTANT TO RECOGNIZE THE BROADER PUBLIC INTEREST AND NATURE OPPORTUNITIES, GENERALLY. BIRDS PROVIDE A ESSENTIAL ECOLOGICAL CONTRIBUTE TO BIODIVERSITY. THEIR PRESENCE ENHANCES THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR RESIDENTS, AND CONTRIBUTES TO WINNIPEG'S NATURAL HERITAGE. I RESPECTFULLY REQUEST THAT COUNCIL MAINTAIN THE EXISTING BIRD BYLAW AND MAINTAIN ALL THE POLICIES THAT PROTECT THE MILLIONS OF BIRDS THAT LIVE IN, MIGRATE THROUGH, AND DEPEND UPON WINNIPEG AND MANITOBA EACH YEAR. DELETING BIRD-SAFE DESIGN IN WINNIPEG'S BYLAW AND FUTURE POLICY IS A STEP BACKWARDS FOR WINNIPEG'S ENVIRONMENTAL GOALS AND NATURAL SPACES. THANKS AGAIN FOR YOUR TIME, ATTENTION.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. ANY QUESTIONS TODAY? SEEING NONE. THANK YOU, AUTUMN, FOR YOUR PRESENTATION.

CLERK: NEXT DELEGATION ATTENDING IN PERSON IS LUKE KELLER. ALSO IN OPPOSITION TO THE ITEM.

MADAM SPEAKER: IN PERSON?

CLERK: MADAM SPEAKER, I DON'T SEE LEE FELLER COMING DOWN. IF YOU GO ON TO THE NEXT DELEGATION.

MADAM SPEAKER: YES.

CLERK: NEXT IS TRACY.

JUST WAITING FOR SOME WATER. MY THROW THE GETS DRY -- THROAT GETS DRY. THANK YOU AND WELCOME.

GOOD AFTERNOON, COUNCILLORS. MY NAME IS TRACY FERNWAGON. I KNOW SOME OF YOU BACK FROM WHEN I WORKED AT -- I'M PLEASED TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO THIS ISSUE. I'M USING MY PHONE FOR NOTES. I'M GOING TO BE JUMPING AROUND BECAUSE THERE'S A LOT THAT'S ALREADY BEEN SAID, SO IT MIGHT SEEM A LITTLE BIT DISJOINTED. FORGIVE ME FOR THAT. SO I JUST WANT TO

START BY SAYING I'M NOT A DEVELOPMENT EXPERT. I'M NOT A CONSERVATIONIST, HORTICULTURIST. YOU HEARD FROM THOSE EXPERTS ALREADY, SO I WON'T GO OVER THOSE DETAILS. I BRING MORE OF THE ANIMAL RIGHTS PERSPECTIVE. I'M JUST THE ONE WHO CARES ABOUT ANIMALS AND ECOSYSTEMS, AND THE PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE OF HUMANS AND WILDLIFE. SO SKIPPING OVER THAT. SO I'M AMONG THE OVER 600 PEOPLE WHO HAVE REGISTERED THEIR OPPOSITION TO THIS PROPOSAL, WHICH I UNDERSTAND IS QUITE UNPRECEDENTED. SO ONE WORD THAT'S BEEN THROWN AROUND TODAY IS "BARRIER." I DON'T KNOW IF I'M THE ONLY ONE THAT DEFINES THAT. IT'S AN INTERESTING CHOICE OF WORD. WE'RE TALKING ABOUT BIRDS FLYING INTO WINDOWS, WHICH ARE ESSENTIALLY AN INVISIBLE BARRIER, RIGHT? SO ESSENTIALLY, THE CITY IS PROPOSING TO REMOVE BARRIERS TO DEVELOPMENT BY REESTABLISHING A PHYSICAL BARRIER THAT KILLS 60 TO 80 MILLION BIRDS A YEAR. SO I'M HOPING THAT I'M NOT THE ONLY ONE THAT THAT GAVE PAUSE TO. SO THERE'S BEEN THREE MAIN REASONS WHY THE CITY HAS SENT THE BIRD REQUIREMENTS OR BARRIER. THE FIRST ONE, WHICH I DON'T THINK HAS GOTTEN ENOUGH ATTENTION IS THE SOURCING AND SUPPLY CHAIN ISSUES. WE WEREN'T REALLY GIVEN DETAILS ON IT, OTHER THAN WE MIGHT HAVE TO LOOK TO THE STATES TO GET THESE MATERIALS. BUT ONE OF THE STUDIES THAT WAS CITED IN A CBC ARTICLE MENTIONED OR USED A PROVIDER CALLED FEATHER FRIENDLY. IT'S A CANADIAN COMPANY BASED IN ONTARIO. AND THEY SELL DECALS AND OTHER SORTS OF WINDOW TREATMENTS. THEY DO BOTH RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL. AND ONE OF THEIR DESIGNS FITS THE SPECIFICATIONS OF ONE OF THE PDO EXACTLY. AND I'M SURE THEY ARE JUST ONE OF MANYS, SO I'M JUST NOT REALLY SURE WHAT THESE SOURCING ISSUES HAVE BEEN. I'M JUST NOT REALLY CONVINCED BY THAT. THE OTHER ISSUE -- ANOTHER ISSUE IS COST. AND I HAVE NO DOUBT THAT DEVELOPERS DON'T WANT TO PAY AN EXTRA COST ON TOP OF THE COST OF THE PROJECT. BUT AGAIN, I THINK AS FOLKS HAVE POINTED OUT, THERE'S EXPERTS THAT HAVE DONE RESEARCH ON THIS AND SHOWN THAT IT ACTUALLY IS NOT MUCH MORE THAN 1 OR 2% ON TOP OF WINDOW CONSTRUCTION COSTS. SO WHY ARE WE DEVIATING SO MUCH FROM THAT? IS THERE NO WAY TO CUT COSTS IN OTHER AREAS, AS WAS ALSO MENTIONED. THE THIRD BARRIER, OR I GUESS THE THIRD REASON WHY THE REQUIREMENTS ARE SEEN AS A BARRIER. IT'S BEEN SAID THEY DON'T HAVE THE INTENDED EFFECT. THEY ARE NOT INTENDED GOAL REDUCING COLLISIONS. I'M NOT SURE IF THAT'S REFERRING TO THE LESS THAN ONE YEAR THAT THEY HAVE BEEN IN PLACE IN THIS PDO. PROBABLY NOT BECAUSE AS WE'VE HEARD, THERE'S REALLY BEEN NO PROJECTS THAT HAVE BEEN DONE. BUT I JUST DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY YOU HAVE STUDIES THAT SHOW THAT DECALS REDUCE COLLISION RISK BY 95%. AND YET OURS ARE, ACCORDING TO THE DEVELOPERS, THEY ARE NOT EFFECTIVE. SO I DON'T REALLY UNDERSTAND THAT. EARLIER, I WAS ENCOURAGED TO HEAR THAT THE PUBLIC SERVICE IS WILLING TO CONSIDER AMENDING THE PROVISION, RATHER THAN JUST DELETING IT OUTRIGHT. I WAS SWAYED BY AN EARLIERS SAYING THAT THE PROVISION IS STRICTLY WORDED FOR A REASON, THAT YOU HAVE KIND OF HAVE TO BE. I HAVE TWO MORE MINUTES.

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR ROLLINS MOVES TWO-MINUTE EXTENSION. ALL IN FAVOUR? CONTRARY? CARRIED.

SO ANYWAYS, I WAS ENCOURAGED THAT THE CITY WAS WILLING TO, RATHER THAN DELETE IT OUTRIGHT, ADD SOME MORE FLEXIBLE WORDING. I'VE BEEN INCLINED TO REFER TO Ms. BOND, WHO SAID THEY ARE STRICT FOR A REASON. NOW THAT SAID, WHEN I WAS SORT OF LOOKING INTO THIS ISSUE IN PREPARATION FOR THIS, I CAME ACROSS SOMETHING IN THE ZONING BYLAW WITH REFERENCE TO PDO AREA TWO, WHICH AS FAR AS I UNDERSTAND, IS THE PARKER LANDS. I HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO FIND IT SINCE. I'M WONDERING IF I IMAGINED IT. IT OUTSERIES OF BIRD-FRIENDLY PROVISIONS. IT SAYS DEVELOPERS MUST CHOOSE ONE OF THERE'S LIKE A DOZEN THERE. SO THAT'S

VERY FLEXIBLE LANGUAGE. SO IT WILL INCLUDE NOT JUST THINGS LIKE DECALS, BUT UV-RESISTANT TREATMENTS OF WINDOWS AND OTHER SORTS OF THINGS. SO I'M IN THE SURE WHY THAT CAN'T BE THROWN INTO THIS PDO. SO IT SORT OF ALLUDED TO MY CONCERN WITH DELETING THIS AND WAITING TO DO COMPREHENSIVE CITY-WIDE REVIEW IS IN THOSE TWO YEARS, YOU'RE ALLOWING A WINDOW -- PARDON THE PUN -- FOR DEVELOPERS TO SWEEP IN AND GET A BUNCH OF PROJECTS UP AND GOING BEFORE THEY HAVE TO PUT IN BIRD-FRIENDLY REQUIREMENTS. A COUPLE OF YEARS. THESE BUILDINGS WILL BE UP FOR DECADES. AS HAS BEEN POINTING OUT THAT'S POTENTIALLY HUNDREDS OF BIRD DEATHS OVER THE LIFE. THOUSANDS EVEN OF THAT BUILDING. SO IT'S ALREADY BEEN POINTED OUT THAT THIS IS IN CONTRAVENTION OF THE SPIRIT OF OUR WINNIPEG, PARTICULARLY, THE OBJECTIVES AROUND ENVIRONMENTAL RESILIENCE. ONE MORE MINUTE.

MADAM SPEAKER: TRACY, IF YOU COULD JUST WRAP UP. WE'RE READY FOR QUESTIONS. 20 SECONDS, PLEASE. THANKS.

OK. SO LASTLY, I JUST WANT TO POINT OUT THIS DECISION DOESN'T EXIST IN A VACUUM. IT'S PART OF A LARGER CONTEXT OF DECISIONS AROUND ANIMALS IN THE CITY THAT I WORRY MAKE US LOOK LIKE NOT A VERY ANIMAL-FRIENDLY CITY. SO TO THAT POINT, I JUST WANT TO QUICKLY READ A LETTER TO THE EDITOR THAT APPEARED IN DECEMBER BY SOMEONE THIS ISSUE. WINNIPEG CITY COUNCIL IS NOW CONSIDERING SCRAPPING ITS BIRD-FRIENDLY BYLAW BECAUSE DEVELOPERS SAY IT EATS INTO THEIR PROFITS. THIS IS ONLY THE LATEST IN A STRING OF MOVES BY THE CITY THAT SIDE STEPS ANIMAL WELFARE. EARLIER THIS YEAR, THE CITY HAD TO BE RESTRAINED BY THE PROVINCE FROM GASSING GROUND SQUIRRELS IN PUBLIC PARKS. COUNCIL REJECTED A BYLAW THAT WOULD CURB THE SALE OF EXOTIC PETS. WHO IS STEERING ANIMAL WELFARE POLICY AT CITY HALL? CRUELLA DEVILLE. THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS FOR THE DELEGATION? COUNCILLOR MAYES?

COUNCILLOR MAYES: GOOD TO SEE YOU AGAIN. THANKS FOR COMING BACK TO CITY HALL AND CARING. JUST THE POINT YOU'RE MAKING ABOUT THE PARK LANDS, I THINK THE PDO. CAN YOU AMPLIFY THAT? THERE WERE SOME PROVISIONS?

I THINK IT WAS SCHEDULE 8-A. I WAS TRYING TO FIND IT WHEN I WAS UP THERE. I THINK THIS PLACE IS LIKE A BUNKER THE LOADING. SCHEDULE 8-A. THEY KEPT REFERRING TO PDO AREA TWO, WHICH I UNDERSTAND ARE THE PARKER LANDS. IT WOULD MAKE SENSE TO ME WITHIN THE PARKER LANDS WHY IT WOULD BE A MORE EXTENSIVE PROVISION. BUT IT'S CONFUSING THAT IT HAS NOT BEEN MENTIONED AT ALL TODAY. I'M WONDERING IF I'M IMAGINING THE WHOLE THING, TO BE HONEST.

MADAM SPEAKER: SEEING NO FURTHER QUESTIONS. THANK YOU FOR YOUR PRESENTATION, TRACY.

THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: MOVING ON. Mr. CLERK.

CLERK: OUR NEXT DELEGATION IS MICHELLE KEATING ALSO ATTENDING REMOTELY.

MADAM SPEAKER: WELCOME, MICHELLE. WOULD YOU LIKE TO PUT YOUR CAMERA ON?

IT IS ON. I DON'T THE NOT FEEDING. MY AUDIO AND VIDEO ARE BOTH TURNED ON.

MADAM SPEAKER: WE CAN'T SEE YOU, WE CERTAINLY CAN HEAR YOU THOUGH.

OK. WE'LL HAVE IT MAKE DUE WITH THAT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR HAVING THIS VERY IMPORTANT HEARING TODAY. I'M JUST GOING TO HAVE TO PULL UP MY SUBMISSION HERE. AND I WANTED TO DRAW ATTENTION TO THE FACT THAT I DID PUT TOGETHER AN ARTICLE ABOUT THIS FOR THE COMMUNITY REVIEW EAST THAT CAME OUT TODAY OR THIS WEEK. YOU CAN'T HEAR ANY MORE ABOUT MY THOUGHTS THERE. I'LL JUST TOUCH ON A FEW THINGS HERE. WINDOW STRIKES ARE HIGHLY PREVENTABLE. WE CAN ADOPT STANDARDS TO DESIGN BUILDINGS AND RETROFIT EXISTING BUILDINGS. BUT HUGE COSTS STAND IN THE WAY OF VOLUNTARY ADOPTION OF NEW STANDARDS. TO BE EFFECTIVE ON A LARGE SCALE AND EVEN A SMALL SCALE, THEY MUST BE PART OF THE ZONING BYLAWS. SO IT WAS NICE TO SEE THEM IN THIS PDO. AND I THINK IT'S A TERRIBLE MOVE TO REMOVE THEM FROM THE PDO. PEOPLE, IF YOU ARE INTERESTED IN BEING CERTIFIED AS A BIRD-FRIENDLY CITY, I THINK THE REMOVAL OF THIS ONE SMALL BYLAW AFFECTING A VERY SMALL PORTION OF THE CITY AND REMOVING IT FROM THAT WOULD BE CERTAINLY A STRIKE AGAINST IT, IF I WAS EVALUATING WINNIPEG'S POTENTIAL TO BE A BIRD-FRIENDLY CITY. ALL THE PROMISES IN THE WORLD ABOUT HAVING MORE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS, SO THAT IT COULD BE THEORETICALLY APPLIED CITY-WIDE TO ALL TYPES OF BUILDINGS. I'LL BELIEVE IT WHEN I SEE IT. I'VE BEEN ADVOCATING FOR BIRD-FRIENDLY DESIGN SINCE 2001 WHEN I WAS A PART OF THE {GR} THEN TO 2004 WHEN I WAS PART OF THE CITY'S CIVIC ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE. THERE HAS BEEN NOTHING BUT DELAYS IN GETTING THIS TO THE POINT WHERE IT'S ACTUALLY IN A BYLAW. IT IS A RIGHT THING TO DO. 600 PLUS OR 700 PLUS PEOPLE TOLD YOU THAT. IT'S ALSO THE LEGAL THING TO DO. CANADIAN LAW PROHIBITS BUILDING OWNERS FROM KILLING MIGRATORY BIRDS, EVEN THROUGH UNINTENTIONAL COLLISIONS WITH GLASS. THE STANDARDS THAT WERE ADOPTED BY THE CITY AND THIS PDO, ARE CONSISTENT WITH FEDERAL LAW, AND THAT WILL PROTECT BUILDERS FROM RISK OF LIABILITY. THERE WERE VERY BAD REASONS TO REMOVE THE STANDARDS LAST MONTH. ONE WAS THE SUGGESTION THEY DON'T WORK, WHICH IS ENTIRELY FALSE. THERE'S A RIGOROUS TESTING OF BIRD-FRIENDLY GLASS, DECALS AND SO ON. THEY ARE ASSIGNED A THREAT FACTOR WITH PRODUCTS THAT HAVE LESS THAN 30. THEY REDUCE WINDOW STRIKES BY AT%. SO THIS RESEARCH IS OUT THERE. A 2022 STUDY FOUND DECALS REDUCED STRIKES BY 95%. THE COST IS TINY. THE DECALS, APPROXIMATELY $1.40 TO $1.80 CANADIAN PER SQUARE FOOT. SO THAT'S A MINUSCULE PRICE TO SAVE BIRDS' LIVES. NOW GRANTED, THERE IS A COST OF APPLYING THEM. THAT CAN EITHER BE DONE PROFESSIONALLY AND THE COST MIGHT BE HIGHER THAT WAY, OR MAYBE IT'S A THOUGHT TO MOTIVATE SOME OF THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN OPPOSED TO THIS AND COME UP WITH A WAY THAT WE CAN ASSIST WITH THE APPLICATION OF DECALS, AS THESE PROJECTS COME UP. IT IS NOT TOO EXPENSIVE. THAT WAS ANOTHER REASON FOR THIS. FLAT CANADAEST GLASS IF YOU WENT THAT ROUTE AND NOT THE DECALS, IT WOULD INCREASE THE WINDOW CONTRACTS BY 5% AND 1% FOR A HIGH-RISE BUILDING. ANOTHER STUDY, A TOOL DEVELOPED FOR BUILDERS BY A OR {THOLG} CENTRE SAID THAT GLASS SAVES BIRDS AT LESS THAN HALF A PERCENT FOR GLASS FRONTED BUILDINGS THROUGH THE TOTAL PROJECT COSTS. SO THE IDEA THAT THIS IS A BARRIER, I THINK NEEDS TO BE FULLY CONSIDERED. SO I'M HERE TO APPROVE -- OPPOSE THE REMOVAL OF THE BIRD-FRIENDLY STANDARDS. AND NOW I'VE HEARD THE DISCUSSION, ANY AMENDMENTS TO GIVE GREATER FLEXIBILITY AND SATISFACTION TO THE DIRECTOR. THIS HAS TO BE APPLIED. THE WAY IT'S WRITTEN IN THE

CURRENT PDO. IT IS ALREADY FLEXIBLE THE SPECIFY EXPENSIVE GLASS. DECALS ARE SUFFICIENT. IT'S NOT PRESCRIPTIVE IN THAT WAY. THE OTHER WAYS TO PREVENT BIRD STRIKES -- I KNOW FROM EXPERIENCE THAT IT CAN BE MUCH MORE EXPENSIVE THAN THE SIMPLE APPLICATION OF DECALS WITHIN THE 16 METRES REQUIRED. SO SOME OF THE DECALS, IN FACT, ARE EVEN CHEAPER THAN THE FEATHER FRIENDLY ONES, WHICH ARE MADE HERE IN CANADA, AND THEY MAY COST AS LITTLE AS 34 CENTS PER SQUARE FOOT. SO THAT ARGUMENT REALLY DOESN'T HOLD WATER. AND THE WORDING AFTER THE HEARING TO GIVE BUILDERS GREATER FLEXIBILITY WILL NOT ENSURE THE ACCOMMODATIONS.

MADAM SPEAKER: DID YOU NEED MORE TIME IN YOUR PRESENTATION?

YES, PLEASE. TWO MINUTES WOULD BE GOOD.

MADAM SPEAKER: MAYOR MOVING EXTENSION OF TWO MINUTES. ALL IN? CONTRARY? CARRIED. YOU'VE GOT TWO MORE MINUTES.

LET'S SAY, FOR EXAMPLE, A DECISION IS MADE BY THE DIRECTOR IN THIS TIME FRAME. WHAT SORT OF ACCOUNTABILITY IS THERE FOR THAT? WILL THE RATIONALE OF THE DIRECTOR BE MADE PUBLIC? SO THE BIRDING COMMUNITY CAN SEE WHERE THAT DECISION CAME DOWN AND WHY LEADING INTO THIS ROUND OF DISCUSSIONS FOR THE MORE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW. YOU KNOW, I'VE ALWAYS FOUND THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE TO BE A BIT OF A MISNOMER. INSTITUTE IMPLIES RESEARCH. BUT THE SENSE I'M GETTING FROM THIS APPLICATION FROM THE CITY OF THE ADMINISTRATION, THAT IT'S BASED MORE ON WORD OF MOUTH. NOT A LOT OF DATA, NOT CONCRETE EXAMPLES HERE AND NOW. MAYBE TALKING TO PEOPLE IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS. MAYBE IT WAS -- WE DON'T KNOW. PRESENTED WITH FACTS, DATA AND INFORMATION IN ORDER FOR COUNCIL TO MAKE A GOOD DECISION IN THIS REGARD. SO I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE COMBINE FORCES WITH THE OTHER PRESENTERS, WHO WERE HERE. AND ACTUALLY DO GATHER DATA DURING THIS PERIOD OF TIME. DON'T REMOVE IT FROM THE EXISTING BYLAW. BUT COME FORWARD WITH CONCRETE FIGURES. AND THIS CAN FEED INTO THE PROCESS OF GETTING THINGS INTO THE WIDER ZONING BYLAW. WE NEED GOOD SOLID INFORMATION, NOT BASED ON WORD OF MOUTH, NOT BASED ON FEAR, NOT BASED ON SUPPLY CHAIN ISSUES THAT MAY NO LONGER EXIST. IT'S TIME FOR US TO GATHER REAL DATA AND REAL EVIDENCE. I DON'T WANT TO SEE IT LEFT FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BECAUSE EVERYONE SAYS WELL, THAT'S ONLY TWO YEARS. NO. CONSULTATION IS TWO YEARS. IT WILL BE ANOTHER TWO YEARS UNTIL THAT ZONING BYLAW IS IMPLEMENTED. SO THAT'S FOUR YEARS OF BUILDINGS BEING BUILT WITHOUT ANY BIRD DESIGN FEATURES.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. ANY QUESTIONS FOR OUR DELEGATION? THAT'S OUR FINAL DELEGATION IN OPPOSITION. SEEING NONE. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME TODAY.

CLERK: THAT WAS OUR LAST REGISTERED SPEAKER IN OPPOSITION TO THE APPLICATION. IS THERE ANYONE WHOSE NAME HAS NOT BEEN CALLED WHO WISHES TO SPEAK IN OPPOSITION? SEEING NONE. WE'LL MOVE ON IT THOSE REGISTERED FOR INFORMATION. FIRST INDIVIDUAL REGISTERED FOR INFORMATION IS JAMES. I BELIEVE JAMES IS NOT ONLINE. SO WE'LL MOVE ON TO SARAH ANDERSON, WHO IS ATTENDING IN PERSON.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH. IT MEANS THEIR LIVES AND ULTIMATELY, IT AFFECTS OURS. THANK YOU, CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS AND STAFF FOR HAVING US HERE TODAY. YOU HAVE BEEN VERY WELCOMING AND PROFESSIONAL. MY NAME IS SARAH ANDERSON. MY FATHER AND I HAVE JOINED YOU TODAY, REPRESENTING OUR FAMILY OF HAD RUN BUSINESS, AS WELL AS THE INDUSTRY OF WINDOW FILM AND GLASS ENHANCEMENTS AS A WHOLE IN THE CITY OF WINNIPEG. WE ARE HERE SPECIFICALLY RELATING TO THE MATTER OF BIRD-FRIENDLY DESIGN STANDARDS. SO AS WE KNOW, THERE ARE REPORTED ONE BILLION BIRD DEATHS PER YEAR REPORTED IN NORTH AMERICA AS A WHOLE. AND IN RELATION TO COLLISIONS WITH GLASS AND UP TO 42 MILLION OF THOSE DEATHS AFFECT MIGRATORY BIRDS IN THE -- IN CANADA. SO THIS IS A NUMBERS GAME. AS THE SPECIES RESPONSIBLE FOR THE GLASS, WE CAN ALSO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SOLUTION. WE ALSO UNDERSTAND THERE HAS BEEN PUSHBACK TO THE LEGISLATION OF BIRD-FRIENDLY DESIGN STANDARDS IN LIEU OF BEING ABLE TO GET THINGS DONE. WE ALSO UNDERSTAND VERY WELL THAT -- OF THE HOLDUPS IN THE CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS IN THE MATTER, DUE TO THE SUPPLY CHAIN ISSUES AND THE HIGH COST ASSOCIATED WITH IT. MY FATHER AND I ARE HERE TODAY AS A NEUTRAL PARTY. WE UNDERSTAND HOW CHALLENGING THE CONSTRUCTION DEVELOPMENT INDUSTRY IS, AND ESPECIALLY IN THE AREA OF WORKING WITH THE CITY. WE WOULD LIKE TO SIMPLY MAKE IT KNOWN THAT WE ARE HERE. THIS IS A SERVICE THAT WE PROVIDE. THERE ARE OTHER VENDORS IN THE CITY AS WELL, WHO HAVE THE CAPABILITIES, ALTHOUGH WE CAN'T SPEAK TO OUR INDIVIDUAL OPERATIONS. DETAIL TO OUR INDIVIDUAL -- JUST SOME DETAIL TO OUR INDIVIDUAL OPERATION. WE'RE USING THE METHOD OF APPLYING A PATTERN ON THE GLASS, WHICH IS SUPPORTED BY EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE THAT REDUCES BIRD STRIKES BY 95%. WARRANTY FOR THIS PRODUCT IS UP TO FIVE YEARS. IT CAN BE APPLIED TO EXISTING GLASS AND MOST EFFECTIVE ON THE EXTERIOR SURFACE DURING TEMPERATURES ABOVE 10 CELSIUS. THIS METHOD IS SUBSTANTIALLY LESS EXPENSIVE, AND IT IS FAR MORE EFFECTIVE THAN MARKERS APPLIED BETWEEN THE PANES OF GLASS OR INTERIOR SURFACE. AND BEING LESS EXPENSIVE AND FAR LESS SUPPLY CHAIN ISSUES, SUCH AS THE PREFABRICATED GLASS MANUFACTURED OUTSIDE OF CANADA. WITH OUR OWN THE EXPANSION, OUR CAPABILITIES TO TAKE ON MORE OF THESE PROJECTS IS ALSO INCREASING. BUT AS WE WERE DISCUSSING EARLIER, THIS IS AN EMERGING MARKET, AND IT'S VIEWED THE COUNCILLORS HAD MENTIONED, WE ARE ONLY ONE SMALL BUSINESS OF A FEW COMPANIES IN WINNIPEG, WHO WOULD BE ABLE TO FILL THE GAP PRESENTED BY THIS LEGISLATION. AND WE CAN CONFIRM THE INDUSTRY IS IN NEED OF SUPPORT. WE'RE COMMITTED TO INVESTING IN MARKETING FOR THESE PRODUCTS, ESPECIALLY SINCE WE CAN CLEARLY SEE THERE IS A REQUIRED SERVICE THAT MANY ARE HAVING TROUBLE SOURCING. SO WE ARE VERY HAPPY AND OPEN TO YOUR FEEDBACK FROM YOUR COUNCIL TODAY AND ON ANY OTHER SUGGESTIONS OR IMPLEMENTATION FACTORS TO CONTINUE THE DEVELOPMENT OF OUR CITY HERE IN WINNIPEG. THANK YOU, COUNCIL MEMBERS FOR YOUR TIME AND CONSIDERATION TODAY. AND WE'RE OPEN TO QUESTIONS, ESPECIALLY ONES RELATED TO THE CHALLENGES FACED BY LOCAL SERVICES. MADAM SPEAKER.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THANK YOU FOR YOUR PRESENTATION. YOU WAITED A LONG TIME TODAY TO PRESENT. COUNCILLOR MAYES?

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THANK YOU. THAT WAS LEGITIMATE INFORMATION. I COULDN'T QUITE HEAR ONE NUMBER. IT REDUCES THE NUMBER OF STRIKES BY 5%? I COULDN'T QUITE HEAR YOU.

YES. I BELIEVE THE INTERNAL DEMARKATION. SO THE ONES THAT ARE PREFABRICATED IS AN 86% AVERAGE SUCCESS -- 85% AVERAGE SUCCESS, SUCH AS HAVING THE DEMARKATION ON THE EXTERIOR IS 95%. SAME AS WHAT WE WERE SAYING BEFORE.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR EADIE?

COUNCILLOR EADIE: YES, MADAM SPEAKER. SO IN APPLYING THIS, THESE BUILDINGS, DO THEY UTILIZE THE ANNUAL OR BIANNUAL WASHING OF WINDOWS TO PUT THEM ON AFTER THE FIVE-YEAR WARRANTY? I'M SURE YOU HAVE TO REPLACE THEM.

IT WOULD DEFINITELY BE BENEFICIAL TO COORDINATE THAT AT THE SAME TIME, AS WE WOULD NEED TO HAVE ACCESS TO THOSE WINDOWS, SIMILAR TO THE WINDOW WASHERS, YES.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. SEEING NO FURTHER STATEMENTS, I APPRECIATE YOUR PRESENTATION.

CLERK: THAT WAS OUR LAST REGISTERED SPEAKER FOR INFORMATION ON THE APPLICATION. IS THERE ANYONE WHOSE NAME HAS NOT BEEN CALLED WHO WISHES TO SPEAK FOR INFORMATION ON THE APPLICATION. WE HAVE NO FURTHER REGISTERED SPEAKERS.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THAT CONCLUDES OUR DELEGATIONS. ARE THERE QUESTIONS FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE BEFORE WE ASK THE APPLICANT TO RETURN TO SPEAK IN REBUTTAL? NO FURTHER QUESTIONS. COUNCILLOR ROLLINS?

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE. SO I DO RECALL WHAT THE LAST DELEGATION WAS SPEAKING OF WITHIN THE PARKSER LANDS. SO IT LOOKS LIKE SEVERAL ITERATIONS OF COUNCIL HAS DIRECTED OPPOSITE BIRD FRIENDLY. THE MATTER TODAY IN TERMS OF MALLS AND CORRIDORS, I WOULD LIKE TO UNDERLINE THAT IT IS POLICY THAT I'D LIKE TO SEE WORK, AND THAT IS WHAT I FEEL THE IMPETUS OF THIS HEARING SHOULD BE. WHAT IS CONCERNING IS, AGAIN, WITHOUT REPEATING MYSELF, MADAM SPEAKER, IS THAT THERE SEEMS TO BE COUNCIL DIRECTION PRIOR TO 2021, BUT CERTAINLY, AT 2021. CERTAINLY, WITHIN THE CONFINES OF THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS HEARING WHERE WE ADDED THIS. AND AGAIN, I'LL ASK. HOW CAN WE GET ASSURANCE THAT THAT WILL BE ENACTED BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE? WHEN THERE SEEMS TO BE A PATTERN OF DROPPING THIS AS AN ISSUE. AND I'D LIKE TO PROVIDE ALSO THE OPPORTUNITY FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE TO RESPOND BECAUSE IN THE CONTEXT OF THIS REPORT, THEY ARE ABSOLUTELY ASKING US TO SUSPEND IT. BUT GIVEN THE PATTERN, I'D LIKE THEM TO MAKE A BROADER COMMENTARY ON WHY DESPITE, PERHAPS, GENERATIONS OF COUNCILLORS' INTEREST IN THIS, THAT IT CONTINUES TO BE THEIR BEST ADVICE NOT TO PURSUE IT.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THE RESPONSE, PLEASE.

MADAM CHAIR, THROUGH YOU TO THE COUNCILLOR. THANK YOU FOR RAISING THIS VERY IMPORTANT POINT OF CLARIFICATION. IN 2021, COUNCIL DIRECTED THE PUBLIC SERVICE TO CONSIDER BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOWS AS PART OF THE FULL ZONING BYLAW REPLACE THIS MONTH AND WILL BE FULLY ACTIVE OVER THE NEXT TWO YEARS OF WRITING AND DRAFTING. AND THEN THE FOLLOWING YEAR, BE UP FOR ADOPTION EARLY IN THE YEAR FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION. SO WE ARE FOLLOWING COUNCIL DIRECTION TO A TEE WITH RESPECT TO THAT. ALSO, THE PARKER LANDS BIRD-

FRIENDLY DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS, WHICH IS IN SECTION 50 OF THAT ZONING BYLAW. IT DOES STATE THAT PRINCIPAL BUILDINGS WITH FOUR OR MORE STORIES WITH OR WITHOUT MIXED USES WITHIN THE PDO-2 AREA SHOULD CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING GUIDELINES. SO IT IS A SHOULD. IT IS NOT A MUST. AND IT DOES HAVE -- IT DOES HAVE A NUMBER OF EXCELLENT CONSIDERATIONS, BUT GIVES THAT FLEXIBILITY OF A CONSIDERATION REQUIREMENT. I THINK THE OTHER POINT THAT THE COUNCIL RAISES IS VERY IMPORTANT TO TODAY'S DIALOGUE, AND THAT IS TO REMEMBER THAT THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS, PDO STUDY AREA OF 2500 ACRES HAS THREE OPTIONS FOR HOW A LANDOWNER CAN DEVELOP THEIR PIECE OF PROPERTY NOW. OPTION ONE IS THAT UNDERLINING ZONING THAT IS IN EXISTENCE, WHETHER IT'S COMMERCIAL OR OTHERWISE. AND THE SECOND OPTION IS TO ASK TO GO FOR A REZONING. AND THE THIRD OPTION IS THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS PDO. SO WHATEVER COUNCIL CONSIDERS TODAY, IT IS STILL AN OPTIONAL PORTION OF THE SET OF ZONING TOOLS THAT LANDOWNERS IN WINNIPEG HAVE AT THEIR DISPOSAL. ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? NOT AT THIS TIME? OK. WE'LL NOW HAVE THE APPLICANT BACK TO SPEAK IN REBUTTAL TO THE COMMENTS HEARD THROUGHOUT THE HEARING. Mr. DEVON CLARK.

AFTER THE APPLICANT DOES HIS REBUTTAL, IF WE COULD MOVE TO A FIVE-MINUTE BREAK.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. THAT IS THE PLAN.

MR. CLARK: YES, THANK YOU. WE CERTAINLY DO APPRECIATE EVERYONE COMING OUT TO SPEAK ON THIS MATTER. CERTAINLY, PEOPLE WHO HAVE EXPERIENCE IN THE INDUSTRY AND THE SCIENCE TO SUPPORT THESE ISSUES. WHERE TO BEGIN? SO LET'S TALK ABOUT THE COST, I SUPPOSE. WE'VE LOOKED AT THIS. WE'VE HEARD FROM PEOPLE WHO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS AND HEARD IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE OR IN ORDER TO IMPLEMENT THESE STANDARDS THAT IT WOULD INCREASE COSTS QUITE SIGNIFICANTLY. WE'RE CERTAINLY INTERESTED IN LEARNING MORE ABOUT MORE AFFORDABLE COSTS AND APPROACHES THAT WOULD ACHIEVE THAT 95% EFFECTIVENESS. TO DATE, WE HAVEN'T BEEN ENTIRELY CLEAR ON WHAT THOSE ARE THAT WOULD LAST FOR EITHER THE DURATION OF THE BUILDING, OR THE LONG-TERM HERE UNDER COLDER SITUATIONS LIKE -30 WEATHER, OR WITHSTAND WINDOW WASHING. SO ABSOLUTELY, WE WANT TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THISED FIND COST-EFFECTIVE SOLUTION THAT'S WOULD ALLOW -- ABOUT THIS AND FIND COST EFFECTIVE SOLUTIONS THAT WOULD ALLOW THIS TO EXIST. ALSO, TO GET HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AS DESIRED. WHEN WE DO LOOK INTO SOME OF THE OPTIONS ON ALTERNATIVE TO THE WINDOWS, WE DID TALK TO FEATHER FRIENDLY AND GOT A QUOTE, JUST ROUGHLY ABOUT HOW MUCH IT WOULD COST TO DO THE MORE HIGHLY DURABLE PRODUCT. WE LEARNED THAT PRODUCT COULD WITHSTAND THE -30 WEATHER. THAT WAS GREAT. IT HAD A WARRANTY OF 15 YEARS, AND EXPECTED TO LAST 20 OR SO YEARS. THE COST WE RECEIVED WAS $12.75 PER SQUARE FOOT, WHICH INCLUDED THE APPLICATION. SO WHEN LOOK AT THIS ON A MORE BROAD APPLICATION, THE DEVELOPMENTS THAT STORIES OR GREATER, IT IS REQUIRED FOR THE FIRST 16 UP TO 52 FEET IN HEIGHT. AND OBVIOUSLY, MAKING SOME ASSUMPTIONS UNDER A 40% -- GLAZING ON THE BUILDINGS IS 40% ALL THE WAY AROUND. WE DETERMINE THIS COST TO BE ANYWHERE AROUND 125 TO $160,000. SO THE COST THAT WE FOUND WAS STILL RATHER HIGH IN RELATION TO THE MORE MID-RISE TYPE OF DEVELOPMENTS. I UNDERSTAND THE TALLER YOU GO, THE BIGGER DEVELOPMENT, THE COST PERCENTAGE-WISE START TO COME DOWN. ON THESE MID-RISE DEVELOPMENTS, WE STILL DON'T HAVE A CLEAR PICTURE OF HOW THE COSTS CAN BE DOWN. CERTAINLY HOPING TO UNDERSTAND THAT A LITTLE BIT FURTHER.

I'M NOT SURE THERE'S TOO MUCH FOR US TO REBUT AT THIS TIME. WE APPRECIATE THE INPUT FROM

THE PEOPLE WHO HAVE EXPERIENCE IN THE INDUSTRY, AND WE CERTAINLY DO WANT TO CONTINUE THESE CONVERSATIONS AND TAKE THAT INTO CONSIDERATION AS WE GO FORWARD. PERHAPS, I WOULD JUST ADD THAT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE EARTH-FRIENDLY GLAZING IS ONLY EFFECTIVE IF WE GET THE DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE PDO. IF WE DON'T GET DEVELOPMENT THAT FOLLOWS THE PDO, THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BIRD-FRIENDLY GLAZING ALSO DISAPPEAR. SO IT'S IMPORTANT THAT WE FIND THAT BALANCE, THAT WE CAN START INCENTIVIZING DEVELOPMENT UNDER THE PDO ALONGSIDE THAT, ACHIEVE SOME OF THESE BIRD-FRIENDLY REQUIREMENTS.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. QUESTIONS? COUNCILLOR MAYES?

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THANK YOU FOR THOSE COMMENTS ABOUT FINDING A BALANCE. IT'S BEEN A LONG DAY, BUT GLAD WE COULD HEAR FROM THE PUBLIC AND THE PROPONENT. THE PROVISION ABOUT THE 45-DEGREE ANGULAR PLANE. I GET 75-FOOT BIT. THEN THERE WAS A BIT THAT SAID YOU COULD FURTHER -- YOU COULD BREACH THE 45-DEGREE PLANE ABOVE THAT HEIGHT AND ALONG THE PROVISION ABOUT SHADOWS STUDIES. ANY OBJECTION TO HAVING THAT SCENARIO COME BACK TO A PLAN APPROVAL AT COMMUNITY COMMITTEE? BECAUSE THAT'S STARTING TOED THE PDO TO A SORT OF PDO PLUS LEVEL. I GET CONCEPT OF A PDO. THERE'S NO PUBLIC HEARING FOR YOU IF YOU PLAY BY THE RULES, BUT PLAY BY THE RULES. DON'T GO UP ABOVE THE 75 FEET AND STILL BREACH THE 45 . MAYBE THERE'S A CASE TO BE MADE HERE FOR IT, BUT I DO THINK THERE'S A BALANCE WITH THAT. SO THE QUESTION IS, ANY OBJECTION TO A PLANNED APPROVAL PROCESS THAT THE COMMITTEE ON THAT PROVISION?

I SUPPOSE TO THAT, I WOULD SAY THAT THE INTENT OF THE PDO IS TO REALLY SET THE STANDARDS IN THE BYLAW THAT WOULD ENABLE DEVELOPMENT BY RIGHT. AND BY RIGHT, MEANS NOT HAVING TO GO THROUGH ANY SORT OF ADDITIONAL APPROVAL PROCESSES. SO I GET IT. IT'S ADDING ADDITIONAL FLEXIBILITY UNDER SET WOULD APPLY IN A DIFFERENT WAY AND IN VARIOUS DIFFERENT CONTEXTS. BUT AS FAR AS THE PDO GOES, I WOULD CERTAINLY WANT TO TRY AND REMOVE THOSE PIECES WHERE WE HAVE TO STEP IN AND SAY, YOU KNOW, YES, IT'S OK IN THIS CIRCUMSTANCE. OR NO, IT'S NOT OK IN THIS CIRCUMSTANCE. THAT'S WHY WE WROTE IT IN THIS WAY FOR THE BYLAW TO HAVE SOME FAIRLY CONCRETE PARAMETERS THAT YOU KNOW YOU HAVE TO FOLLOW IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE THAT. SO I SUPPOSE THE PREFERRED OPTION IS THAT IT REMAIN IN THE PDO AND NOT HAVE TO GO THROUGH ADDITIONAL APPROVAL PROCESS.

MADAM SPEAKER: SECOND QUESTION.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: I FEEL LIKE THAT ANSWERS, THAT SUPPORTS -- THERE'S A CONCRETE STANDARD HERE. THIS DOES NOT APPLY UP TO 75 FEET. OK. BUT THEN WE'RE STARTING TO GET INTO OR, YOU KNOW, DECIDE IF IT'S SUFFICIENTLY NEGATIVE OR NOT. THAT'S FLIRTING WITH -- AND TO BE FAIR TO THE STAFF, HAVE BEEN VERY VIGILANT NOT GRANTING VARIANCES ON THE FOUR-PLEX AND ON THESE TO THEIR CREDIT. TRULY, THE POINT OF THE PDO, IT'S A VAST ENHANCEMENT OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF RIGHTS ON THE COMMITTEE. AS LONG AS YOU PLAY TO THE RULES, YOU DON'T HAVE A HEARING. BUT THEN YOU HAVE TO HAVE RULES. YOU CAN'T HAVE RULES. IF YOU DON'T LIKE THAT, GO UP EVEN HIGHER. MAYBE WE'LL APPROVE THAT AS WELL. IT WOULD ONLY APPLY IN SCENARIOS WHERE YOU'RE UP ABOVE -- SHOULD REQUEST AN AMENDMENT PASS, THEN THE ONLY INCIDENT WHERE THIS WOULD APPLY, THIS SORT OF FLEXIBILITY WOULD BE ABOVE 75 FEET. OR AM I MISCONSTRUING.

YES, THAT'S CORRECT. IT WOULD ONLY APPLY WHEN IT'S 75 FEET. MUST IT INTERSECTS THAT 45 ANGULAR PLANE. SO THAT'S WHEN THEY WOULD BE ASKING FOR A SHADOW STUDY TO ALLOW FOR ANY ADDITIONAL HEIGHTS. AGAIN, IT WOULD ONLY GO AS TALL AS THE CORRIDOR RIGHT OF WAY WOULD ALLOW. SO THE SKY IS NOT THE LIMIT. IT'S STILL UP TO A SET MAXIMUM.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: OK. I'M SURPRISINGLY DRAFTING AN AMENDMENT. I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE. SO FACTUALLY, THERE'S STILL A TAP BUT I'D LIKE TO HAVE A SET OF RULES. YOU EITHER PLAY BY THE RULES. YOU GET NO PUBLIC HEARING. OR YOU GET SOME SECOND LEVEL. YOU STILL DON'T GET A PUBLIC HEARING. SO FEET, SHOULD BE REVISIONED AS PROPOSED -- UP TO 75 FEET, NO WORRIES ABOUT THE ANGULAR PLANE. YOU'RE STILL CAPPED AT A MAXIMUM BASED ON YOUR STREET WIDTH. IT'S THE IN BETWEENNESS PERHAPS THAT I'M NOT ON THE SAME PAGE AS YOU. THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? COUNCILLOR EADIE?

COUNCILLOR EADIE: YES, MADAM SPEAKER. WITH REFERENCE TO THE LIFETIME OF THE BUILDING, SO THE LIFETIME OF BUILDINGS ARE QUITE LONG WITH MAINTENANCE-TYPE SERVICES. FOR EXAMPLE, 55 NASSAU. MY FATHER HAD TO REDO THE CAULKING BACK IN OH, I CAN'T REMEMBER WHAT YEAR THAT WAS. BUT THERE'S A NUMBER OF VERY TALL APARTMENT BLOCKS, INCLUDING JUST OFF OF -- JUST OFF THE St. JAMES BRIDGE IN St. JAMES. WHICH MY FATHER ALSO HAD TO RECAULK. WINDOWS HAVE TO BE REPLACED, QUITE OFTEN, OVER THE LENGTH OF THE TIME. SO I'M JUST TRYING TO UNDERSTAND. WHEN YOU'RE SAYING THE LIFETIME OF THE BUILDING, YOU'RE MEANING THATALITY CERTAIN POINTS, YOU MIGHT HAVE TO REPLACE A WINDOW, OR REPLACE I DON'T KNOW, THE PRODUCT THAT THAT YOUNG WOMAN WAS TALKING ABOUT. SO WHEN YOU REFER TO LIFETIME OF THE BUILDING, YOU'RE REFERRING TO, WHAT, IT COULD LAST A HUNDRED YEARS.

THANK YOU. YES, CERTAINLY. I GUESS THE LIFETIME OF THE BUILDING DEPENDS ON THE TYPE OF THE BUILD. WE KNOW BUILDINGS CAN LAST SEVERAL HUNDRED YEARS. WE KNOW BUILDINGS CAN LAST MAYBE 60 YEARS. SO IT'S HARD TO SAY UNDER ALL CIRCUMSTANCES WHAT THAT WOULD BE. CERTAINLY, UNDER ANY OF THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES THOUGH. BUILDINGS REQUIRE UPDATES OR CHANGES. IT'S NOT TO SAY THAT IN THE LIFETIME OF A BUILDING, WINDOWS NEED TO BE REPLACED. BUT THAT ALSO DOES HAPPEN. I THINK JUST WITH REFERENCE UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES I REFERENCED. THE LIFETIME OF THE BUILDING. I WAS TALKING ABOUT THAT ADDITIONAL FILM THAT WOULD BE ADDED TO THE EXTERIOR OF THE WINDOWS. SO AGAIN, IT MAY NEED TO BE REPLACED TWO, THREE, FOUR TIMES THROUGHOUT THE LIFETIME OF THE BUILDING. WE DON'T ENTIRELY KNOW THAT FOR SURE IN ALL CIRCUMSTANCES.

MADAM SPEAKER: ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS? SEEING NONE. THANK YOU, Mr. CLARK. THERE ARES I'M HEARING. SO I THINK A RECESS -- THERE ARE AMENDMENTS I'M HEARING. SO I THINK A RECESS WOULD BE IN ORDER TO HAVE A CHANCE TO CRAFTING THOSE AND DISCUSSING WITH THE CLERK. HOW LONG IS NEEDED? ANY SUGGESTIONS ON HOW LONG? HALF AN HOUR WAS MY THOUGHT. HALF AN HOUR? OK. 30 MINUTES. THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: ARE WE READY? LET'S TAKE OUR SEATS. COUNCILLOR DUNCAN, I'LL CALL ON YOU. GOOD AFTERNOON. I'D LIKE TO RECONVENE OUR SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING OF JANUARY 21st, 2026. WE'RE HERE WITH PUBLIC HEARING ON MALLS AND CORRIDORS. COUNCILLOR DUNCAN, OPPORTUNITY TO MOVE MOTIONS NOW OR CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.

COUNCILLOR DUNCAN: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, MADAM SPEAKER. I'D LIKE TO MOVE THE REPORT OF THE WINNIPEG PUBLIC SERVICE BE TAKEN.

MADAM SPEAKER: ALL IN FAVOUR? CONTRARY? CARRIED.

I'D LIKE TO MOVE THE SEAT OF REPRESENTATION BE CONCLUDE.

MADAM SPEAKER: ALL IN FAVOUR? CONTRARY. CARRIED.

COUNCILLOR DUNCAN: I DO BELIEVE THERE ARE A COUPLE OF AMENDMENTS HERE BEING CIRCULATED.

MADAM SPEAKER: ONE OTHER MOTION.

COUNCILLOR DUNCAN: I'D LIKE TO MOVE THE RECOMMENDATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE BE OCCURRED IN PUBLIC AMENDMENTS.

MADAM SPEAKER: PUBLIC REPRESENTATIONS ARE CLOSED.

COUNCILLOR DUNCAN: I DID DO THAT.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. GOOD. WE'RE ON TO THE MOTIONS, AS YOU MENTIONED. OK. WE'RE GOING TO HEAR FROM -- ABOUT THE TWO MOTION THAT'S WERE CIRCULATED. AMENDING MOTION ONE MOVED BY COUNCILLOR LUKES. ON THE BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOW TOPIC. AND THE SECOND MOTION IS MOTION TWO, MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MAYES. IT'S REFERENCING PLAN APPROVAL FOR THIS PROCESS. AND THEN, OF COURSE, ANYONE CAN SPEAK TO EITHER OF THE MOTIONS. AND THEN WE'LL VOTE IN THE ORDER THEY WERE RECEIVED. COUNCILLOR LUKES?

COUNCILLOR LUKES: OK, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I'M GLAD WE REACHED THIS POINT. SO MY MOTION IS BASICALLY ASKING TO FOLLOW THE CANADIAN STANDARDS ASSOCIATION OF BIRD-FRIENDLY GUIDELINES, WHICH ASK THAT BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOW TREATMENT BE APPLIED TO GLAZING SYSTEMS UP TO 16 METRES ABOVE GRADE OR TO THE TOP OF MATURE TREE CANOPY, WHICHEVER IS HIGHER, TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE DIRECTOR. SO WHAT THIS WILL DO, FROM MY UNDERSTANDING, IS THAT WHEN THIS GETS PASSED ON THE THIRD READING, I BELIEVE. THERE ARE THREE READINGS. THAT THIS WILL BE APPLIED RIGHT AWAY. SO THEN I HEAR THE PUBLIC SERVICE WANTING TO DO ALL THIS IN-DEPTH CONSULTATION, SO FINE. THEY CAN GO ABOUT THAT AND DO THAT, AND THEN BRING RECOMMENDATIONS, WHATEVER THEY HEAR BACK FOR THE WHOLE CITY. AND THEN AT THE WHOLE CITY, HOPEFULLY, WE'LL HAVE SOME SUPPORT IN SEEING VERY SIMILAR MOTION IMPLEMENTED, AND MAYBE THERE WILL BE OTHER ASPECTS TO IT. LIKE I MENTIONED, I'VE BEEN SORT OF CHISELLING AWAY AT THIS FOR A WHILE, TRYING TO GET THIS THROUGH. I GREW UP IN A VERY BIRD-FRIENDLY ENVIRONMENT. I HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO BE MENTORED BY AN INTERNATIONAL MANITOBAN INTERNATIONAL GLOBAL AUTHORITY ON IT AND IT REAL YOU OPENED MY EYES THROUGH EXPENSIVE BINOCULARS I BOUGHT TO REALLY UNDERSTANDING A LOT ABOUT BIODIVERSITY IN BIRDS. I'M REALLY PLEASED WITH THIS. I REALLY WANT TO THANK THE BIRD COMMUNITY AGAIN FOR ALL THE ADVOCACY THEY HAVE DONE ON THIS. THAT'S THE MOTION I'M PUTTING FORWARD. I OPEN THE FLOOR TO QUESTIONS.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. SPEAKERS ON THIS MOTION? ANY FURTHER SPEAKERS ON THIS MOTION? WELL, LET'S TAKE A SECOND MOTION AS WELL, AND THEN WE CAN SPEAK TO BOTH, SINCE THERE'S ONLY TWO MOTIONS. COUNCILLOR MAYES?

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THANK YOU. I'M SPEAKING TO ALL OF IT, I PRESUME AND THEN I'LL CLOSE.

MADAM SPEAKER: SURE. INTRODUCE YOUR MOTION.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: MY MOTION IS THE SECOND AMENDMENT. IT'S FRANKLY TECHNOCRATIC. IT SPEAKS TO 38. SO A BIT COMPLICATED. IN TERMS OF THE OVERALL AMENDMENTS BEING PROPOSED BY THE ADMINISTRATION, I CERTAINLY FIND AND SUPPORT THE HEIGHT CHANGE, THANKS COUNCILLOR LUKES FOR BRINGING THE AMENDMENT ON BIRD-FRIENDLY PROVISIONS, BECAUSE THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION WAS JUST BLOW IT ALL OUT. JUST GET RID. SO IT SEEMS LIKE WE FOUND A COMMON GROUND HERE, AND WE COMMUNICATED NO. THE DISCRETION IS NOT GOING TO BE USED TO HAVE NO PROVISIONS AT ALL. IT WILL BE USED TO HAVE SOME FLEXIBILITY, EQUIVALENT BETWEEN THE CSA STANDARDS AND WHAT MIGHT BE PUT IN PLACE. I DO THINK THANKS TO THE BIRD-FRIENDLY COMMUNITY FOR OVER 700ISH AND CERTAINLY PEOPLE SO IT'S A BALANCE. MY AMENDMENT IS ALSO AN ATTEMPTED BALANCE WHICH IS TO SAY, THE ADMINISTRATION IS SEEKING TO INCREASE THE HEIGHT AT WHICH THE 45-DEGREE ANGULAR PLANE WOULD APPLY RIGHT THE RIGHT NOW, THERE'S A LIMIT DEPENDING ON THE DEPTH. THERE ARE A NUMBER OF VARIABLES AT PLAY HERE. IN ESSENCE, AT SOME HEIGHT, YOU HAVE TO START SETTING BACK. WHAT WE'RE NOW SAYING IS THAT HEIGHT IS NOT GOING TO BE UNTIL YOU'RE AT 75 FEET OR MORE. AND SO THE MOTION HERE IS TO SAY LOOK, LET'S HAVE SOME INPUT FROM THE COMMUNITY COMMITTEE, FROM THE AREA OF THE COUNCIL FOR PLAN APPROVAL PROCESS. IF YOU ARE ABOVE 75, AND YOU'RE STILL SEEKING TO NOT HAVE A SETBACK. SO THIS REALLY COULD MATTER IF YOU'RE ON St. MARY'S ROAD, STE. ANNE'S ROAD, SOMEWHERE LIKE THAT. YOU'RE A SINGLE-FAMILY HOME SEPARATED ONLY BY A BACK LANE. YOU'RE RIGHT THERE. YOU WANT SOME SETBACK AT SOME POINT, SO YOU DON'T WANT THE BUILDING SPANNING VERTICALLY ANY MORE THAN IT NEEDS TO. IF YOU CAN VISUALIZE THAT BUILDING WHERE THE ZOO WAS, IF YOU LOOK AT THAT, THERE IS A PRONOUNCED SETBACK THERE. IT REDUCES THE IMPACT OF THE STREET ON THE NEIGHBOURS. IT'S A GOOD IDEA, I THINK, TO HAVE SOME SETBACKS. SO THE LIMIT HERE IS WELL, YEAH, BUT IF YOU'RE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE PARKING LOT OF THE St. PATEL CENTRE AND I CAN PRODUCE A SHADOW CENTRE THAT SHOWS I'M NOT GOING TO AFFECT THE NEIGHBOURS, LET ME GO STRAIGHT UP. LET ME NOT HAVE SETBACKS. I CAN SEE THAT, TOO. IT'S A WAY OF SAYING THE WHOLE POINT AS OF THE REGIME, IS WE'RE GOING TO SET OUT SOME RULES. IF YOU PLAY BY THE RULES, YOU DON'T HAVE TO DO A PUBLIC HEARING. THAT'S LITERALLY WHAT WAS SAID IN THE FAQ THAT WAS PRODUCED ABOUT THE HALF THING, RIGHT? THE CONCEPT OF AS OF RIGHT INS YOU DON'T HAVE PUBLIC HEARINGS. THAT'S LITERALLY IN THE TEXT OF WHAT OUR STAFF PREPARED. SO I GET THE POINT. THE MAYOR'S PLATFORM WAS PRETTY BLUNT SAYING I WANT AS OF RIGHT REGIME, WHERE THESE BUILDINGS CAN GO UP IN MALLS AND CORRIDORS. I SUPPORTED THIS IN THE ORIGINAL FORM. BUT AT SOME POINT, THEN YOU HAVE TO HAVE A SET OF RULES BY WHICH YOU'RE PLAYING. AS I'VE ALREADY SAID TODAY SAYING, LOOK, DON'T COME IN HERE AND SAY I WANT A FIVE-PLEX. THE RULE IS YOU'RE GETTING A FOUR-PLEX. SO YOU'RE NOT GOING TO GIVE YOU A VARIANCE. THERE HASN'T BEEN A THUNDERSTORM OF VARIANCES UNDER THIS, OR EVEN UNDER THE FOUR-PLEX PDO. SO WHY? BECAUSE WE'RE ENCOURAGING PEOPLE TO PLAY BY THE RULES. SO HERE WE ARE. WE HAVE A SET OF RULES. WE'RE GOING TO SLIGHTLY SOFTEN THE RULES TO SAY LOOK, THE ANGULAR PLAYING LIMIT, WE

HAVE TO START SETTING OUR BUILDING BACK. IT DOESN'T APPLY AT A LOWER HEIGHT. IT'S TO 75 FEET OR ABOVE. IT DOES NOT SEEM TO BE TO BE A BIG REACH TO SAY LOOK, THERE MUST BE SOME PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, IF YOU'RE THEN SEEKING TO GO EVEN MORE HEIGHT GOING STRAIGHT UP. WHERE AM I GETING THIS IDEA OF THE PLAN APPROVAL? FROM COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS' MOTION BACK WHEN WE FIRST TALKED ABOUT MALLS AND CORRIDORS. IT WAS THE ONE AMENDMENT THAT DIDN'T GET PASSED IN MY MEMORY. FIVE OF SIX OR SIX OR SEVEN DID GET PASSED. SO CERTAINLY NOT UNCHARACTERISTIC OF US TO AMEND. WE'VE PUT THROUGH A NUMBER OF AMENDMENTS ON THE FOUR-PLEX PDO AS WELL. SO NOTHING UNTOWARD WITH TRYING TO SEEK AMENDMENT HERE. AGAIN, I SUPPORT COUNCILLOR LUKES' AMENDMENT. SO THE IDEA HERE IS NOT TO DELAY THE THING. THE IDEA IS NOT TO CLUTTER IT WITH BUREAUCRACY. THE IDEA IS TO BALANCE, TO SAY WELL, WE HAD A SET OF RULES BACK THERE IN OCTOBER OF 2024, AND WE ARE LOOKING TO REVISE THE RULES. OBVIOUSLY, THE THOUGHT IS THAT IT WOULD GO THROUGH PRETTY QUICKLY. WE HAD TO SCHEDULE THE COUNCIL MEETING. GIVEN IT WAS 4:00. SO LARGELY DUE TO THE BIRD PROVISIONS. BUT THIS PROVISION I THINK WOULD APPLY IN MY WORDS OR COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW'S WORDS, IT'S A CONCERN. I'VE HAD PEOPLE SAY, IT'S GOOD YOU'RE ENCOURAGING ON THE CORRIDORS. WE'RE FINE WITH THAT. THERE HAS TO BE SOME TRADE-OFF HERE AT SOME HEIGHT. YOU SHOULD BRING IN THE AREA COUNCILLOR. YOU SHOULD HAVE A PLAN APPROVAL PROCESS TO SAY YOU KNOW, I DO THINK THERE SHOULD BE A SETBACK HERE AFTER 80 FEET OR 90 FEET. THERE SHOULD BE SOME LIMIT. NOW YOU CAN'T GO 200 FEET STRAIGHT UP BECAUSE THAT WOULD TRIGGER A VARIANCE, RIGHT? IT'S 200 FEET WIDE. SO NO. STAFF ISN'T PROPOSING SOME INFINITE HIDE ALONGS HERE. SO I'M SEEKING SOME SORT OF BALANCE WHERE, FINE. I'LL GIVE YOU THE REQUEST THAT WAS MADE HERE ABOUT THE ANGULAR PLANE. IT DOESN'T KICK IN UNTIL YOU'RE UP ABOUT 75 FEET. BUT IT DOES SEEM A BIT MUCH TO SAY OH, THERE'S ALSO YET ANOTHER PROVISION. YOU CAN EITHER GO ABOUT THAT IF YOU TALK TO THE ADMINISTRATION AND HAVE A SUN-SHADOW STUDY. THAT'S CREATING ANOTHER. THE IDEA THAT MAYES HERE IS CREATE SOMETHING ADDITIONAL BARRIER OR SOME OBSTACLE, WELL, THE PROVISION OF THIS STUDY WOULD ALSO CREATE A BARRIER OR OBSTACLE. BUT THERE'S REASONS FOR IT BECAUSE YOU'RE TRYING TO RESPECT THE PUBLIC INTEREST HERE. SO MY THANKS TO COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS FOR OFFERING THIS BACK SOME MONTHS AGO IN AN ATTEMPT TO SAY, LOOK, IN THIS CIRCUMSTANCE, YOU'RE NOT COMPLETELY PLAYING BY THE RULES. WE'RE NOT GOING TO MAKE YOU DO A WHOLE PUBLIC HEARING, BUT NEED TO GET PLAN APPROVAL. WHAT'S THE WORST THAT CAN HAPPEN? HEY, ABOVE 75 FEET, YOU HAVE TO SET IT BACK A BIT IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH THE 45 ANGLE. THAT'S THE WORST THAT COULD HAPPEN. SO YOU MIGHT LOSE A LITTLE. YOU MIGHT LOSE A LITTLE COLOURED TRIANGLE SPACE. I DON'T THINK THAT'S GOING TO BE FATAL TO TOO MANY DEVELOPMENTS. SO THE PROPOSAL WAS I THINK A BALANCING OF LOOK, LET'S HAVE A PLAN APPROVAL PROCESS. MAYBE THE COUNCILLOR WILL SAY FINE. IT'S THE CENTRE OF THE St. PATEL PARKING LOT. I DON'T CARE. NOBODY CARES. LET'S GO. OR MAYBE THEY WILL SAY AFTER A 14-FOOT GRAVEL BACK LANE OR PAVED BACK LANE OR HOUSES. I DO CARE ABOUT THIS, SO GIVE ME SOME SORT OF SETBACK. THAT'S WHAT I'M TRYING TO ACCOMPLISH HERE. SO AGAIN, SUPPORT THE CHANGE IN THE HEIGHT FOR THE MAIN FLOOR. THANKS TO COUNCILLOR LUKES. I CERTAINLY SUPPORT THAT. AND U HOPE PEOPLE CAN SEE THE BALANCING HERE THAT -- I HOPE PEOPLE HERE THAT WOULD GO INTO SOME SORT OF PLAN APPROVAL. I HAVEN'T BEEN CALLED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT YET AS COUNCILLOR DUNCAN HAS ASKED ME. PRESUMABLY, WE HAVEN'T ANY CONCERNS FROM OUR FEDERAL FRIENDS ON THIS PROVISION. HOPEFULLY, WE CAN AGREE ON BOTH OF THESE AND MOVE FORWARD. THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. ANY FURTHER SPEAKERS? COUNCILLOR ROLLINS?

COUNCILLOR ROLLINS: THANK YOU. SO COUNCILLOR LUKES, CERTAINLY COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW, TOO, AS EVIDENCED BY THE DEVELOPMENT AND I REAL YOU ENVISIONED THE DESIRE, YOU KNOW, FOR KEY CORRIDORS TO IT BEING EASIER TO DEVELOP. WE -- I CERTAINLY MEANT TO SHINE A LIGHT ON POLICY THAT WORKS THIS TERM AS OF RIGHT, WHICH REALLY HAS PROVEN, IN MANY CASES, TO EXPEDITE DEVELOPMENT THAT WE NEED IN WINNIPEG, IN PARTICULAR, HOUSING UNITHE AND I DO, YOU KNOW -- UNITS. AND I DO THINK IT'S REALLY INTENTIONAL, AND I WANT TO THANK THE PUBLIC SERVICE FOR BRINGING MALLS AND CORRIDORS BACK BECAUSE OF CONCERNS THE POLICY WASN'T DOING, AS COUNCIL HAD INTENDED, I.E., WORKING AT ALL. SO I REALLY WANT TO BRING THE APPLICANT FOR BRINGING THIS FORWARD, AND OF COURSE PUBLIC SERVICE AND THE DEPARTMENT. I DO HAVE A CONCERN, DESPITE 2021 VOTES AND THE COUNCIL DIRECTION OPPOSITE MALLS AND CORRIDORS, RELATING TO BIRDS, THAT IT WAS BROUGHT BACK. AND SO I'LL BE SUPPORTING CERTAINLY, COUNCILLOR LUKES' AMENDMENT, AND THE AMENDMENT BY COUNCILLOR MAYES THAT OBLIGATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMITS. I'M CONCERNED THAT I WOULD LIKE TO SEE THAT WOULD LIKE TO HEAR FROM THE PUBLIC SERVICE IF THEY THINK IT WOULD SLOW DOWN THINGS ANY. BUT I DO THINK THAT IT IS A GOOD PROVISION OF INFORMATION, GIVEN WE'RE CONCERNED WITH RESULTS. SO THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. ANY FURTHER SPEAKERS? YES, Mr. MAYOR.

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: THANK YOU, MADAM SPEAKER. I WANT TO THANK THE DELEGATES, OR THOSE WHO SPOKE TODAY THAT ARE ONLINE AND IN PERSON. I WANT TO THANK YOU FOR YOUR PATIENTS TODAY AND THANK THE STAFF FOR THEIR WORK. I'LL BE SUPPORTING THE FIRST MOTION RELATED TO THE BIRD-FRIENDLY WINDOW TREATMENTS. IN LOOKING OVER THE SECOND MOTION, I UNDERSTAND WHERE COUNCIL IS COMING FROM, BUT I WON'T BE SUPPORTING IT FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS. FIRST OF ALL, THE GOAL OF THE PDO IS TO PROVIDE AS OF RIGHT PROVISIONS, RULES FOR DEVELOPERS TO ENCOURAGE THEM, EXCUSE ME, TO DEVELOP ALONG THE MALL SITES AND CORPS WAS, IN FACT, PART OF SORT OF THE -- CORRIDORS, WAS IN FACT, PART OF THE ESSENCE. BUT IT ALSO BECAME AND IS EMBEDDED WITHIN THE COUNCIL'S ADOPTED STRATEGIC PRIORITIES ACTION PLAN, THAT WE ENCOURAGE THIS DEVELOPMENT. WE BROUGHT IN THIS PDO A YEAR AGO. WE'VE REALLY HAD NO UPTAKE ON IT. SO WE'RE HERE TODAY TO MAKE THE CHANGES REQUIRED. ONE OF THE ADVANTAGES, I THINK, OF THE PDO THAT WE THOUGHT WAS THAT IT DOES PROVIDE DEVELOPERS AS OF RIGHT PROVISION. THEY STILL CAN CHOOSE, AS MANY OF THEM ARE, THE MORE TRADITIONAL AND ESTABLISHED ZONING BYLAW. THEY HAVE THAT PROCESS THEY CAN GO THROUGH AS WELL. TRYING TO SET OUT A PATH TO ENCOURAGE AND EXPEDITE MORE DEVELOPMENT BY INSERTING, YOU KNOW, A REQUIREMENT TO COME BACK THE COMMITTEE. IT IS YET WE COME BACK TO THE REGULAR STEPS IN OUR PROCESSES THUS FAR, AND REALLY, THERE'S ANY BUILDING OVER 75 FEET IN MY MIND, MAYBE NO ADVANTAGE IT USING THE PDO. HAVING SAID THAT, WHEN YOU LOOK AT WHAT IS IN SECTIONS 34, 38, EXCUSE ME, AND 39, THERE IS ALREADY PROVISION AND REQUIREMENTS WITHIN THE PDO THAT ANY BUILDING OVER 75 FEET SETBACK IS REQUIRED BY 45 FEET DEGREE ANGULAR ANALYSIS IS REQUIRED. SO THE 45-DEGREE REQUIREMENT IS STILL THERE AND ESTABLISHED AND ESTABLISHED AND SET OUT IN THE PDO FOR BUILDINGS 34, 35-C FOR BUILDINGS OVER 75 FEET. SUCH SETBACK, AS REQUIRED BY 45 DEGREE 45 ANGULAR ANALYSIS. SO SETBACKS, 45 ANGULAR ANALYSIS ARE THERE. SO BUILDINGS MUST NOT EXCEED 75 FEET EXCEPT AND THEN THE TWO PROVISIONS. THE BUILDINGS CONTAINED BELOW 45 ANGULAR PLANE OR A SUN AND SHADOW SETTING SUFFICIENT WITHIN REQUIREMENTS AS STATED IN SECTION 39 SO. I BELIEVE THAT THE PROVISIONS AND THE RULES THAT ARE ALREADY ESTABLISHED THAT WE ADOPTED A YEAR AGO, THAT DEVELOPERS HAVE TO FOLLOW, HAVE TO COMPLY WITH, IN

ORDER TO GET THE BUILDINGS BUILT. RULES FOR UNDER 75 FEET, BUT MORE SPECIFICALLY HERE TODAY, TO THIS AMENDMENT RULES IN PLACE FOR ANYTHING OVER 75 FEET. SO I BELIEVE THAT WE HAVE THOUGHT THAT THROUGH. THERE'S GOOD PROVISIONS AND RULES THAT ARE ALREADYED FOR THAT REASON, I'LL BE SUPPORTING MOTION -- THAT ARE ALREADY ESTABLISHED, AND FOR THAT REASON, I'LL BE SUPPORTING MOTION ONE, BUT NOT TWO.

MADAM SPEAKER: COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW?

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I WAS GOING TO WAIT FOR Mr. MAYOR TO SPEAK. I WAS GOING TO GO ON THIS ANGLE. YOU HAVE TO ALLOW THE PUBLIC TO HAVE NO SAY SO WE CAN BUILD MORE FOR DEVELOPERS. THAT'S WHAT'S HAPPENING IN NUMBER THREE, IN MY OPINION, REGARDLESS OF THE MOTION. WHAT WE'RE DOING IS ALLOWING THE BUILDING TO BE -- THAT'S WHAT WE'RE DOING. REGARDLESS OF THE MOTION. IT ALLOWS THE BUILDING TO BE AMASSED, MUCH MORE BIGGER MAX. SO BEFORE, WE HAD THE FOUR STORIES AND WE HAD THE SETBACK. SO IMAGINE IF YOU'RE LOOKING OUT YOUR WINDOW ACROSS THE BACK LANE TO THE 8-STOREY BUILDING. YOU'VE GOT FIRST FLOOR, AND THEN YOU'VE GOT A STEPBACK. THAT REALLY IMPACTS YOUR QUALITY OF LIFE, THE WAYS WHY I VOTED FOR THIS FROM THE BEGINNING. THE PUBLIC WON'T HAVE ANY SAY IN THIS, BUT THAT'S A NICE DETAIL TO MAKE SURE THE PUBLIC WILL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY, THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE BACK THERE WILL NOT BE OVERSHADOWED BY AN 8-STOREY BUILDING, 12 FEET OF THE PROPERTY LINE STRAIGHT UP. THAT'S WHAT WE'RE DOING. THAT'S A BIG CHANGE. THAT'S A BIG CHANGE. SO COUNCILLOR MAYES IS COMING ACROSS AS YEAH, IT'S A CHANGE. A LITTLE BIT MORE. YOU HAVE TO COME BACK. I DON'T REALLY LIKE THAT COMPROMISE, BUT IT'S BETTER THAN NOTHING. PRESENTLY, WHAT I'M HEARING AND ASKED REPEATEDLY. SO YOU'RE TELLING ME I'M GOING BACK TO THE PUBLIC. VOTING ON IT TODAY. I'M SORRY YOU'RE ON A BACK LANE. I'M SORRY IT'S 12 FEET AWAY. SURE, ANOTHER, FOR MYSELF, IT'S ON GRANTS UP FRONT. NOBODY CARES. BUT THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE ON THE BACKSIDE OF THAT MALL, THEY WILL CARE NOW INSTEAD OF HAVING A FOUR STOREY WITH A SETBACK, WHETHER AIRSPACE AND NOT SO CLAUSTROPHOBIC, NOW IT'S STRAIGHT UP.

COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW: THAT IS A MASSIVE CHANGE TO WHAT WE ORIGINALLY PROPOSED. MASSIVE. I'M SORRY THE DEVELOPERS WANT MORE DENSITY TO MAKE MORE MONEY. THAT'S FINE. THAT'S THEIR JOB. I'M NOT DISPARAGING THEM FOR THAT BUT THERE'S THE PUBLIC LIVING ACROSS THE BACK LANE. DON'T THEY DESERVE NOT TO LOOK AT AN 8-STOREY BUILDING MAYBE 20 FEET AWAY FROM THEM. I BELIEVE THEY DO, ESPECIALLY AS OF RIGHT. I BELIEVE THE MINI MOTION FINDS THAT BALANCE BUT TO SAY WE GET RID OF THIS AND ALLOW DEVELOPERS TO OVER MASS, IN MY OPINION, FOR THE SAKE OF MORE UNITS. I'M NOT PREPARED TO GO THERE. COUNCILLOR LUKES, NO PROBLEM AND THE HIKE OF THE MAIN FLOOR, NO PROBLEM. THE THIRD ONE I'M NOT VOTING FOR IT. I MAY VOTE FOR AMENDING MOTION. I WILL VOTE FOR THE AMENDING MOTION AND I WON'T BE ABLE TO VOTE FOR THIS STEPBACK OR THE CHANGE OF THE 45 PLAIN. I THINK IT'S OFF. I'VE HAD DEVELOPMENTS. IT'S AMAZING WHEN YOU DO A STEPBACK HOW MUCH IT MAKES THE NEIGHBOURS HAPPIER BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT LOOKING AT THE WALL OF DOOM, I CALL IT. I DON'T WANT TO DO THAT IF THERE'S CONCURRENCE FOR COUNCILLOR MAYES' MOTION.

MADAM SPEAKER: ANY FURTHER SPEAKERS? COUNCILLOR ALLARD.

COUNCILLOR ALLARD: THANK YOU. I'LL BE MAKING REMARKS IN FRENCH AND WANTED TO SHARE MY THOUGHTS WITH COUNCIL COLLEAGUES THAT I DO PLAN ON SUPPORTING COUNCILLOR LUKES'

MOTION. I WANT TO THANK COUNCILLOR LUKES FOR THE ORIGINAL AMENDMENT. I DON'T THINK IT'S A BIG -- I DON'T THINK IT'S BIG -- LIKELY A BIG FINANCIAL IMPACT TO HAVE WINDOWS THAT ARE BIRD FRIENDLY AND WITH THAT IN MIND I THINK HAVING THE COMPROMISE MOTION OF GIVING THE DELEGATE AUTHORITY DIRECTOR IS REASONABLE. I THINK WHERE THERE'S A WILL THERE'S A WAY AND JUST BRIEFLY.

MADAM SPEAKER: THANK YOU. ANY FURTHER SPEAKERS? WE CAN GO BACK TO CLOSING. COUNCILLOR MAYES. DO YOU WISH TO SAY ANYTHING MORE?

COUNCILLOR MAYES: SURE.

MADAM SPEAKER: I MEAN -- WELL.

I DON'T THINK SO, MADAM SPEAKER.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: I WAS TOLD I COULD.

MADAM SPEAKER: IF WE DON'T WANT TO CALL THE CLOSE, IF YOU HAVE ANY FURTHER COMMENTS THIS IS THE TIME TO MAKE THEM.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: FAIR POINT. YEAH. I THINK THREE THINGS. THANK YOU TO THE ADMINISTRATION FOR INDICATING THAT THIS IS IN RESPONSE TO A LACK OF UPTAKE ON THE PDO. I THINK MR. VEITCH SAID WE'RE NOT COMING BACK ON THE FOURPLEXES. WE HAVE NO PLANS TO DO THAT. WE'RE NOT COMING BACK ON THAT. WE'LL SEE YOU IN A FEW YEARS ON COMPREHENSIVE ZONING BUT WE'RE NOT DOING THAT. I APPRECIATE THAT. WE'RE WAY AHEAD OF PROJECTIONS ON MISSING MIDDLE STUFF IN TERMS TO HAVE ACCELERATOR. I THINK THAT'S FAIR. THERE'S THE NO ATTEMPT TO COME BACK ON THAT. WE'RE DOING THIS AND WE'LL SEE YOU AGAIN -- THOSE OF US HERE AT THE ZONING COMPREHENSIVE ZONING AMENDMENT. NUMBER TWO, GLAD TO HEAR THE STRATEGIC PLAN MENTIONED AND SOME WEIGHT PUT BEHIND THAT. I CERTAINLY HAVE MEETINGS SCHEDULED WITH MR. HILDEBRAND AND OTHERS TO POINT OUT TWO OF THE THINGS I PUSHED FOR HAVE NO PROGRESS AT ALL ACCORDING CHART. THE GREEN UTILITY AND DOING SOMETHING ABOUT THE GRAVEL LANES. THAT'S IN THE STRATEGIC PLAN AND 39 OF THE ISSUES HAVE HAD NO PROGRESS AT ALL. I FEEL HARD DONE BY THESE IMPORTANT ISSUES IN ST. VITAL AND NOTHING HAPPENED. I'LL CERTAINLY BE CITING THAT WHEN I MEET WITH THE C.A.O. AND MR. HILDEBRAND TO GET MOVEMENT ON THE GRAVEL LANES. TO BUSINESS AT HAND IT'S AN AS OF RIGHT REGIME. THAT MEANS YOU DON'T HAVE GO THROUGH A PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS BECAUSE YOU'RE PLAYING BY THE DEFINED RULES. THE TROUBLE IS THEY ARE SAYING HERE ARE THE RULES. THERE'S THIS OPT IN. YOU GO HIGHER IF YOUR DEAL WITH US, THE STAFF, BUT WE'LL HAVE THE VETO POWER IF WE LIKE YOUR SUN AND SHADOW STUDY. I DON'T THINK THAT'S HOW AN AS OF RIGHT REGIME WORKS. YOU HAVE TO HAVE THE PUBLIC AWARE OF WHAT THE RULES ARE. OTHERWISE WE COULD JUST SAY, WELL, THERE'S NO HEIGHT LIMITS AT ALL. IT'S AS OF RIGHT. IF THE STAFF THINKS IT'S TOO TALL, WELL THEN -- AND IF YO OPPOSE THEM GOD YOU'RE AGAINST HOUSING. WE HAVE HEARD NO TALK ABOUT AFFORDABLE HOUSING. NO TALK TODAY ABOUT HOUSING ACCESSIBLE FOR THE DISABLED COMMUNITY. NONE AT ALL. THIS MIGHT LIMIT A FEW UNITS ABOVE THE 75-FOOT MARK ON A BUILDING PROPOSED IN THE MALLS AND CORRIDORS WHICH ONLY OCCUPY SOME RELATIVELY SMALL AMOUNT OF SQUARE KILOMETRES THE DIRECTOR INDICATED. I DON'T THINK THIS IS THE ACHILLES HEEL THAT WILL KILL ALL DEVELOPMENT ALONG MALLS

AND CORRIDORS IN THE CITY OF WINNIPEG. IT'S AN ATTEMPT TO SAY, LOOK. COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW WAS SAYING, LOOK. THERE HAS TO BE SOME POINT WHERE THERE'S A PUBLIC INTEREST, THERE'S A BALANCE HERE. YOU WANT A SETBACK AT SOME HEIGHT OR IT'S A VERTICAL WALL GOING UP 100 FEET AND YOU'RE SEPARATED BY A 14-FOOT LANE. THAT TO ME IS A PROBLEM. IT'S A PROBLEM AND IT IS NOT A BALANCE. I THINK WE SHOULD HAVE SOME ABILITY TO HAVE A PLAN APPROVAL, AT LEAST, THAT THE LOCAL COUNCILLOR COULD SAY, LOOK, I'M IN FAVOUR OF THIS. OR SAY, LOOK, I HAVE CONCERNS. CAN WE WORK OUT SOME SORT OF SET BACK REQUIREMENT HERE. I WOULD CERTAINLY SAY WE'RE GIVING THE DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY A GOOD DEAL OF WHAT IT IS REQUESTING BY SAYING, OKAY. THE 45-DEGREE LIMIT DOESN'T QUALIFY FOR THE FIRST 75 FEET, FOR SIX STOREYS. I THINK THERE ARE SITUATIONS WHERE IT COULD STILL APPLY HIGHER UP. THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE AS OF RIGHT REGIME IS SUPPOSED TO BE PLAY BY THE RULES AND YOU WON'T HAVE TO GET VARIANCES. NOT PLAY BY THE RULES OR SEEK SOME OTHER INFORMAL MECHANISM TO NOT PLAY BY THE RULES. OR WE HAVE FLEXIBLE RULES SO IT'S FLEXIBLE WHETHER YOU PLAY BY THE RULES. THAT TO ME IS NOT FAIR TO PUBLIC INTEREST. I WILL BE SUPPORTING BOTH AMENDING MOTIONS. MR. CLERK, CLARIFY, ARE WE ABLE TO VOTE SEPARATELY THEN --

MADAM SPEAKER: YES.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: WHEN THE MAIN VOTE COMES AROUND.

NO. TWO AMENDING MOTIONS YOU CAN VOTE SEPARATELY ON AMENDING MOTIONS BUT THERE ARE THREE RECOMMENDATIONS BEFORE COUNCIL. THE FIRST IS THAT COUNCIL GIVE FIRST READING TO A BYLAW TO AMEND THE WINNIPEG ZONING BYLAW IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS REPORT A DRAFT OF WHICH AN ATTACHED BYLAW IS ATTACHED TO THE REPORT. THAT'S APPENDIX A. THE MOTIONS THAT ARE BEFORE COUNCIL RIGHT NOW, THESE AMENDING MOTION, ARE TO AMEND THAT DRAFT BYLAW.

MADAM SPEAKER: ITEM ONE. BUT THE QUESTION WAS CAN WE VOTE ON 1 AND 2 SEPARATELY?

YES. THE RECOMMENDATIONS BEFORE COUNCIL, RECOMMENDATIONS 1, 2, AND 3 YOU CAN VOTE ON SEPARATELY. THE FIRST ONE IS FOR THE ATTACHED BYLAW. IF AMENDING MOTIONS DO PASS THEN IT WOULD BE TO VOTE ON THE BYLAW AS AMENDED. THEN THERE'S A SECOND RECOMMENDATION THAT FOLLOWING FIRST READING AND APPLYING INSTRUCTIONS PLANNING PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT AND CITY SOLICITOR RETURN BYLAW TO COUNCIL AND THE FINAL ONE IS THE PROPER OFFICERS. SO IF YOU'RE ASKING IF YOU CAN VOTE INDEPENDENTLY ON THE THREE ITEMS THAT ARE THE SUBJECT OF THE BYLAW, NO. THEY ARE CONTAINED IN THE BYLAW. YOU CAN VOTE ON THE BYLAW POTENTIALLY AS AMENDED DEPENDING ON WHAT HAPPENS WITH THESE TWO MOTIONS. DOES THAT CLARIFY?

COUNCILLOR MAYES: YEP. THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE MANITOBA MUNICIPAL BOARD. WE'VE HAD 700 OBJECTIONS HERE. THEY DIDN'T ALL APPEAR, CLEARLY, THANKFULLY. WHERE DOES THAT LEAVE US IN REGARD TO A POTENTIAL REFERENCE?

CLERK: DUE TO NUMBER OF PETITIONS AND PEOPLE REGISTERED THIS WOULD QUALIFY FOR APPEAL TO MUNICIPAL COURT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: OKAY. THANK YOU.

CLERK: SHOULD SUFFICIENT OBJECTIONS --

BECAUSE WE'RE BUNDLING ALL THREE TOGETHER THE APPLICATION WOULD BE FOR THE GROUND FLOOR, THE CORRIDOR AND FOR THE BIRDS?

CLERK: THERE'S THREE MATTERS THAT ARE THE SUBJECT OF THE BYLAW. CORRECT ME IF I'M WRONG. REMOVING THE 14-FOOT MINIMUM GROUND FLOOR HEIGHT REQUIREMENT FOR NONRESIDENTIAL USES. ELIMINATING THE BIRD-FRIENDLY DESIGN PROVISION AND BUILDING HEIGHT REGULATIONS TIED TO THE 45-DEGREE ANGULAR PLAIN. THOSE ARE THREE SUBJECT MATTERS PART OF THE BYLAW BUT YOU DO NOT VOTE ON THEM INDIVIDUALLY. THEY ARE CONTAINED IN DRAFT BYLAW.

WILL THE MUNICIPAL BOARD HEAR ALL THREE?

CLERK: IF THIS WERE APPEALED -- YEAH. THE BYLAW WOULD BE REFERRED TO MUNICIPAL COURT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: WE MIGHT NOT BE BOUND BY THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE MUNICIPAL BOARD. THANK YOU. THE VOTE THEN IS ON EACH OF THE AMENDMENTS AND THEN THERE'S A SINGLE VOTE ON THE BYLAW.

CLERK: ON THE ITEM ITSELF. CORRECT.

COUNCILLOR MAYES: THANK YOU.

MADAM SPEAKER: OKAY. SEEING NO FURTHER SPEAKERS. I'LL CALL THE VOTE THEN. COUNCILLOR DUNCAN YOU WISH TO SPEAK.

COUNCILLOR DUNCAN: I HAVE TO ADD SOME SUPPORTING REASONS PRIOR TO.

MADAM SPEAKER: AFTER.

CLERK: THE LAST MOTION WE HAVE ON THE TABLE IS RECOMMENDATION OF THE WINNIPEG PUBLIC SERVICE. TWO MOTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED. WE WOULD BE VOTING ON THE MOTIONS, AT THIS TIME, MADAM SPEAKER IN THE ORDER THAT THEY WOULD BE RECEIVED. FIRST IS MOTION ONE REGARDING THE WORD FRIENDLY STANDARDS.

MADAM SPEAKER: PUT SUPPORTING REASONS ON LATER ON AFTER THE MOTIONS ARE VOTED ON. OKAY. I'LL CALL THE QUESTION ON AMENDING MOTION ONE THAT WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR LUKES. ALL IN FAVOUR? CONTRARY? THAT'S CARRIED. AMENDING MOTION TWO CALL FOR A RECORDED VOTE. THIS WAS MOVED BY COUNCILLOR MAYES AND IT'S REGARDING NEED FOR PLAT APPROVAL. ALL IN FAVOUR PLEASE RISE.

CLERK: COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS, COUNCILLOR DUNCAN, COUNCILLOR DURAND-WOOD. MAYS, COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW, COUNCILLOR ROLLINS, COUNCILLOR SHARMA.

MADAM SPEAKER: OPPOSED PLEASE RISE.

CLERK: HIS WORSHIP MAYOR GILLINGHAM, COUNCILLOR ALLARD, COUNCILLOR BROWATY, COUNCILLOR EADIE, COUNCILLOR LUKES, COUNCILLOR SANTOS.

YEAS SEVEN AND NAYS SIX.

MADAM SPEAKER: AMENDING MOTION TWO PASSES. NOW THE MAIN ITEM AS AMENDED. ALL IF FAVOUR? CONTRARY? CARRIED. COUNCILLOR DUNCAN I'LL LOOK TO YOU FIRST FOR YOUR SUPPORTING REASONS.

COUNCILLOR DUNCAN: I'LL MOVE THE RECOMMENDATION WINNIPEG PUBLIC SERVICE CONCURRED AS AMENDED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS. I WANT TO KNOW THAT THE HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND PROVIDES FEDERAL FUNDING TO CANADIAN MUNICIPALITIES THROUGH HOUSING SUPPLY BUT REQUIRES A COMMITMENT TO SIGNIFICANT CONDITIONS IN ACTION PLAN INCLUDING INCREASING HOUSING GROWTH TARGETS IMPLEMENTING ZONING REFORMS LIKE AS OF RIGHT DEVELOPMENT FOR UP TO FOUR UNIT, AND STREAM LINES APPROVALS WHILE ACHIEVING LONG-TERM SUPPLY GROWTH. MY SUPPORTING REASONS INCLUDING THAT IS THAT THIS PROMOTES DENSIFICATION ALONG OUR CORRIDORS AND MALL SITES WHILE GIVING SOME AUTONOMY TO COMMUNITY COMMITTEE AND ULTIMATELY INCREASING HOUSING UNITS IN WINNIPEG. IT IMPROVES THE LIKELIHOOD TO MEETING HOUSING GROWTH TARGETS. IT PROVIDES WILDLIFE PROTECTIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH BIRD-FRIENDLY DESIGN GUIDELINES AND IT DOES NOT GREATLY DEVIATE FROM PAST COUNCIL DECISIONS ON FEDERAL HOUSING ACCELERATOR FUND GUIDELINES.

MADAM SPEAKER: ANY OTHER? MR. CLERK OTHER SUPPORTING REASONS ARE PERMITTED? I THINK THAT SUMS IT UP. SUMS IT UP. EVERYONE HAS HAD A CHANCE TO SPEAK. WITH THAT I CALL THE QUESTION. ALL IN FAVOUR IN CONTRARY? CARRIED.

I MOVE THE PUBLIC HEARING WITH RESPECT TO THIS APPLICATION BE CONCLUDED.

MADAM SPEAKER: ALL IN FAVOUR? CONTRARY? CARRIED.

NOTE COUNCIL MADE A FINAL DECISION ON THE MATTER AND THE CORRESPONDING BYLAW WILL BE SUBMITTED FOR FIRST READING AT A REGULAR MEETING OF COUNCIL.

MADAM SPEAKER: MR. MAYOR YOU MOVE ADJOURNMENT?

MAYOR GILLINGHAM: I DO.

MADAM SPEAKER: ALL IF FAVOUR? CONTRARY? CARRIED. STAY FOR ROLL CALL. MADAM CLERK.

MADAM SPEAKER, COUNCILLOR ALLARD, COUNCILLOR BROWATY, COUNCILLOR CHAMBERS, COUNCILLOR DUNCAN, COUNCILLOR DURAND-WOOD, COUNCILLOR EADIE, COUNCILLOR GILLINGHAM, COUNCILLOR LUKES, MAYES, COUNCILLOR ORLIKOW, COUNCILLOR ROLLINS, COUNCILLOR SANTOS.

MADAM SPEAKER: MEETING ADJOURNED.