Agenda – Appeal Committee – June 17, 2026

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Item No. 2 Appeal – Variance – Rowntree Avenue
(St. Norbert-Seine River Ward)
File DAV 122903A/2026C [c/r DCU 241747A/2025C]

Appeals were received against the decision of the Director of Planning, Property and Development to approve a Variance on "the land" for the establishment of an accessory parking area to permit as follows:

1. a front yard of 4 feet (1.22 metres) instead of 19 feet (5.79 metres).

subject to the following conditions:

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

DECISION MAKING HISTORY:

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

The Appeal Committee did not hear any representation on the appeal and adjourned the public hearing to its meeting on June 17, 2026, at 9:30 a.m. in the Council Building at 510 Main Street, due to improper notice.

Agenda – Appeal Committee – June 17, 2026

File:	DAV 122903A/2026C
Appellant(s):	Chaimae Bouamira, Bilian Cen, Hiu Fan Cheung, Joanne Choi, Tin Kin Kenneth Chui, Bibek Ranabhat, Mandeep Saini, Kwan Yu Wong, and Stanley Yeung
Applicant:	GS Homes Ltd. (Waqar Younas)
Premises Affected:	Rowntree Avenue
Legal Description:	LOT 53 BLOCK 2 PLAN 60574, hereinafter called "the land"
Property Zoned:	"R2" (Residential Two-Family)
Nature of the Application:	To vary the "R2" Development and Design Standards of Winnipeg Zoning By-Law No. 200/2006 for the establishment of an accessory parking area to permit a front yard of 4 feet (1.22 metres) instead of 19 feet (5.79 metres).
Exhibits Filed:	1. Order DAV 122903/2026C dated April 21, 2026 2. Notice of Appeal filed by Kwan Yu Wong, received April 23, 2026 3. Notice of Appeal filed by Hiu Fan Cheung and Tin Kin Kenneth Chui, received April 24, 2026 4. Notice of Appeal filed by Chaimae Bouamira, received April 24, 2026 5. Notice of Appeal filed by Stanley Yeung and Joanne Choi, received on April 26, 2026 6. Notice of Appeal filed by Bilian Cen, received April 27, 2026 7. Notice of Appeal filed by Mandeep Saini, received May 2, 2026 8. Notice of Appeal filed by Bibek Ranabhat, received May 4, 2026 9. Notification of Public Hearing dated June 15, 2026, and June 21, 2026 10. Manitoba Status of Title 3367833/1 11. Letter of authorization dated September 12, 2025 from 10237251 Manitoba Ltd. (Guriqbal Ghuman) to GS Homes (Satnam Singh, Gobind Vasir, Waqar Younas) 12. Confirmation from the Zoning and Permits Administrator that the subject property may be posted in substitution for newspaper advertising

Exhibits Filed (continued):

13. Plans, Sheets 1 and 2, for File DAV 122903/2026C dated February 27, 2026
14. Report from the Urban Planning Division dated April 10, 2026
15. Notice of Adjournment dated June 4, 2026.
16. Communication from Arshdeep Jassal in opposition to the appeal
17. Communication from Brent Dhillon in opposition to the appeal
18. Communication from Damanpreet Singh in opposition to the appeal
19. Communication from Daniel Olivier in opposition to the appeal
20. Communication from Gautam Khatter in opposition to the appeal
21. Communication from Gobind Vasir in opposition to the appeal
22. Communication from Jeremy Gay in opposition to the appeal
23. Communication from Jujhar Singh in opposition to the appeal
24. Communication from Navneet Kaur in opposition to the appeal
25. Communication from Surinder Pal Grewal in opposition to the appeal
26. Communication from Allison Driedger in opposition to the appeal

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

Moved by Councillor

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

Moved by Councillor

That the receipt of public representations be concluded.

Moved by Councillor

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

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

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

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

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

Supporting Reasons:

Moved by Councillor

That the appeals be allowed / denied and the decision of the Director of Planning, Property and Development be / not be concurred in.

Moved by Councillor

That Variance Order DAV 122903/2026C be confirmed / cancelled

Moved by Councillor

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

Exhibit “14” referred to in File DAV 122903A/2026C

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Title: DAV 26-122903\C – Rowntree Ave

Issue: For consideration of a Variance associated with a reduced front yard to establish an accessory parking area.

Critical Path: Director of Planning, Property, and Development

AUTHORIZATION

Author	Department Head	CFO	CAO
Sawyer Klassen, MCP	n/a	n/a	

DECISION AND CONDITIONS

The Urban Planning and Design Division **approves** the application to vary the "R2" Development and Design Standards of Winnipeg Zoning By-Law No. 200/2006 for the establishment of an accessory parking area to permit a front yard of 4 feet (1.22 metres) instead of 19 feet (5.79 metres).

Subject to the following condition(s):

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

REASON FOR THE REPORT

- The applicant is proposing to build a multi-family building and requires a Variance for the establishment of an accessory parking area to permit a front yard of 4 feet (1.22 metres) instead of 19 feet (5.79 metres).
- This report provides information regarding the subject application’s compliance with *The City of Winnipeg Charter*, section 249.

FILE/APPLICANT DETAILS

FILE:	**DAV 26-122903\C**
RELATED FILES:	DCU 241747/2025C
COMMUNITY:	Assiniboia Committee
NEIGHBOURHOOD #:	2.684 - (BRIDGWATER TRAILS)
SUBJECT:	To vary the "R2" Development and Design Standards of Winnipeg Zoning By-Law No. 200/2006 for the establishment of an accessory parking area to permit a front yard of 4 feet (1.22 metres) instead of 19 feet (5.79 metres).
LOCATION:	Rowntree Ave
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	LOT 53 BLOCK 2 PLAN 60574
APPLICANT:	Waqar Younas (GS Homes Ltd.) 943 Kapelus Dr Unit 5 West St Paul, MB R4A 5A4
OWNER:	THE MANITOBA HOUSING AND RENEWAL CORPORATION 352 Donald St 200 Winnipeg, MB R3B 2H8

HISTORY

N/A

DISCUSSION

CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL

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

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

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

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

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

SITE DESCRIPTION

- The subject property is located on Rowntree Ave, in the Bridgwater Trails neighbourhood of the South Winnipeg - St Norbert ward.
- The subject site is 22,984 square feet (2,135 square metres) in area. The site is currently occupied by vacant land.

- Under the *Complete Communities Direction Strategy 2.0*, the site is within the Recent Community policy area. The property is zoned “R2” Residential Two-Family District.

- The site is within the Waverley West – West Secondary Plan, where it is classified as Lower Density Residential Area.



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

SURROUNDING LAND USE AND ZONING (See Figure 2)

North: Rowntree Avenue, then vacant land zoned “R2” Residential Two-Family.

South: Single-family residential uses zoned “R1-M” Residential Single-Family Medium.

East: Eaglewood Drive, then vacant land zoned “R2” Residential Two-Family.

West: Two-family residential uses zoned “R2” Residential Two-Family.



Figure 2: Zoning of the site and surrounding area.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- The applicant intends to construct a 12-unit multi-family dwelling.
- The proposal includes 19 parking stalls.
- The applicant is proposing a building height of 34 feet (10.36 metres).
- The submitted site plan shows that the proposed access will be on Rowntree Avenue.
- The proposal is for up-down townhouses.

Associated Conditional Use (DCU) Application

- The proposed Variance is also the subject of an associated Conditional Use (DCU) application concerning the establishment of a multifamily building in the “R2” Residential Two-Family zone. Please refer to the Administrative Report under file no. DCU 25-241747 for more information.

ANALYSIS AND ISSUES

ANALYSIS AND ISSUES

COMPLETE COMMUNITIES DIRECTION STRATEGY 2.0

- Goal 1 1.0 Encourage compatible residential development within Established Neighbourhoods to build more Complete Communities and align with the City’s residential intensification target.

- 1.1 Encourage residential development that positively contributes to neighbourhood character while expanding housing options for residents in a manner that is sensitive and complementary to existing development.
- 1.2 Increase the population within Established Neighbourhoods to contribute to the physical renewal and revitalization of older neighbourhoods.
- 1.5 Support up to mid-rise residential development in Established Neighbourhoods that is compatible with neighbourhood context.
- 1.15 Low-rise residential uses will generally be encouraged to locate on arterial roads and collector roads where compatible with adjacent land uses and where they can be conveniently served with transit and local commercial amenities, and in consideration of the factors listed in Policy section 1.6

- Goal 3 3.0 Ensure all communities provide a diversity of housing options and meet resident life-cycle housing needs.
  - 3.1 Encourage a variety of housing types and tenures within Established Neighbourhoods to meet life-cycle housing needs and affordability ranges.
  - 3.2 Encourage a mix of types, tenures and unit sizes within residential developments. Make provisions for unit sizes that can accommodate varying family sizes and multi-generational households.

WAVERLEY WEST – WEST SECONDARY PLAN

- 5.1.1 Composition of Lower Density Residential Area Policy
  - (1) Ground-oriented, single-family uses shall be the predominant land use, allowing for single-family attached and detached housing, townhouses and duplexes.

CITY OF WINNIPEG ZONING BY-LAW 200/2006

The City of Winnipeg Zoning By-law requires a front yard of 19 feet (5.79 metres) for the establishment of an accessory parking area. This proposal has a front yard of 4 feet (1.22 metres), which requires a Variance.

ANALYSIS OF THE VARIANCE

The proposal shows a front yard setback for an accessory property area of 20’3” (6.17 metres), which meets the requirements of the By-law. However, the shape of the lot is not a uniform square or rectangular. Instead the northeast boundary of the lot is curved, which changes the distance between the parking area and the lot boundary. Although the parking area is in a straight line, the distance between it and the boundary gradually shrinks from over 20 feet to just 4 feet as the lot begins to curve. This causes the Variance for 4 feet to only be at a specific point, and roughly 40% of the parking area fronting the front yard meets the By-law minimum requirement.

Where the Variance is required, the property fronts onto a roundabout. This increases the space between it and the property across the street significantly, from approximately 59 feet to approximately 90 feet. This distance prevents the Variance from having a negative impact on the adjacent property. Along the roundabout itself is a sidewalk, and then landscaped space

within the centre of the roundabout. The applicant has proposed landscaped buffering of trees and shrubs along the boundary of the property, sufficiently buffering the parking area.

The parking area is sufficiently screened, distanced from the neighboring property, and the Variance is only required for part of the front yard. For these reasons, the Variance is approved.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

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

REASONS FOR DECISION

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

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

In that it aligns with Complete Communities 2.0 and the Waverley West – West Secondary Plan.

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

In that it will have minimal impact on the neighboring properties.

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

In that the Variance is due to an irregular property line.

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

In that it is a supported use at this location, and aligns well with the existing properties.

CONSULTATION

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

OURWINNIPEG 2045 POLICY ALIGNMENT

- 6.0 City Building
  - Objectives
    - 3 Facilitate development opportunities that complete established communities, and plan new communities as complete and connected from the outset.
  - Policies
    - 6.1 Sustainable Urban Growth

- The City must accommodate physical development that reflects this Plan's goals, and achieves a continuum of complete and connected communities over the lifecycle of the Plan.

WINNIPEG CLIMATE ACTION PLAN ALIGNMENT

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

WINNIPEG POVERTY REDUCTION STRATEGY ALIGNMENT

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

SUBMITTED BY

Department:	Planning, Property and Development
Division:	Urban Planning and Design
Prepared by:	Sawyer Klassen, MCP
Date:	Friday, April 10, 2026
File No.	DAV 26-122903\C

Exhibit “13” referred to in File DAV 122903A/2026C





2025-10-27 12:24:15 PM, ISSUED FOR REVIEW, DWG NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Exhibit “8” referred to in File DAV 122903A/2026C

Hello,

I am writing this email in reference to the dissatisfaction of the project DCU 25-241747C (Townhouse) and the parking lot that has been approved by the city. It is utterly stunning how the city officials approved the project without keeping in mind that spot is just by the narrow roundabout.

On top of that, the street (Rowntree Ave) is already crowded and there is already huge traffic in that street, also a new school is in construction in that street. Does the city not care about the safety of people and future students when the traffic gets over crowded? Aesthetics wise also it does not look to be properly designed. It takes away the beauty of the community.

The spot where they have proposed to put the garbage bin will directly affect the surrounding buildings. It gets smelly and just by the decks of the neighbouring houses. When you open the windows of your bedroom it is just infront and city doesn’t care about the wellbeing and hazards that is created by the dumpster.

I believe the project it self is too big for that small space. I know the builders wouldn’t want to lose money but you have to think about the neighborhood too. I hope city will take proper actions.

Thank You!

Regards,

Bibek Ranabhat

Resident of the neighborhood

Exhibit “7” referred to in File DAV 122903A/2026C

Hello there,

I would like to formally appeal the 3 storey building being approved to built on rowntree ave.

Reasons- Street safety

Neighbourhood character - does not match the character of the neighborhood

Privacy- the 5 house on the back will be critically impacted as the balconies will be over long the back yard and eventually the inside the houses, the builder should plant privacy trees in the back as well.

Thank you

Mandeep Saini

Exhibit “6” referred to in File DAV 122903A/2026C

File Number: DAV26-122903c
Subject: Formal Objection to Parking Lot Design – Safety, Traffic, and Parking Concerns

Dear Appeal decision committee,

I am writing as a resident of the Rowntree Avenue neighborhood in Winnipeg to strongly object to the proposed parking lot design for the 12-unit multi-family development, particularly due to the serious concerns regarding pedestrian safety, the parking lot’s location beside the roundabout, and the already severe parking shortage in our community.

First and most importantly, this neighborhood has a very large number of pedestrians, especially children. Our community is highly family-oriented, with many young families living in side-by-side homes. Every day, children walk to school, ride bicycles, play outside, and families regularly walk with strollers, pets, and elderly family members. This area is not simply a roadway—it is an active residential environment where pedestrian safety must be the highest priority.

Adding a high-density multi-family development with a busy parking lot will significantly increase vehicle movement in an area already heavily used by pedestrians. More vehicles entering and exiting means a much greater risk of accidents involving children, especially during school hours, evenings, and weekends. Children are often less visible and less predictable, which makes increased traffic in this area especially dangerous. A parking lot design that increases vehicle conflict in such a family-heavy neighborhood is simply not appropriate.

Second, the proposed parking lot is located far too close to the neighborhood roundabout, creating major traffic safety risks. A roundabout already requires drivers to carefully watch vehicles inside the circle, pedestrians crossing, cyclists, and vehicles exiting. Placing a parking lot entrance and exit directly beside it creates additional blind spots and serious visibility problems.

Vehicles entering, leaving, waiting, reversing, or temporarily stopping near the parking lot will block sightlines and make it much harder for drivers to react safely. This is especially dangerous with larger vehicles such as SUVs and pickup trucks, which are very common in Winnipeg and create even larger blind spots.

In addition, Winnipeg’s winter conditions make this situation even more dangerous. Our winters are long, icy, and difficult, and vehicles already have a higher risk of sliding or losing control when approaching and exiting roundabouts due to snow, ice, and reduced braking ability. Adding a parking lot directly beside the roundabout will create even more stop-and-go traffic, sudden braking, turning movements, and congestion, all of which greatly increase the chance of winter collisions. A design that may already be risky in summer becomes even more dangerous during several months of winter conditions.

A roundabout is designed to reduce traffic conflict and keep vehicles moving smoothly. A parking lot entrance beside it does the opposite—it creates more stopping, more turning, more waiting, and more congestion. During busy hours, vehicles waiting to enter the parking lot can easily back up into the roundabout, creating dangerous traffic jams, sudden braking, rear-end collision risks, and unsafe pedestrian crossings.

Third, parking on this road is already extremely limited and overcrowded. Rowntree Avenue already has a serious parking shortage, with street parking often completely full. Residents, visitors, delivery vehicles, and service providers regularly struggle to find available spaces. The street is already heavily congested without this development.

Although the proposal states there will be 19 parking stalls for 12 units, the reality is that this is not enough for a multi-family development of this size. Many households have more than one vehicle, and visitors, guests, deliveries, and service vehicles also require parking. Overflow parking will inevitably spill onto surrounding residential streets, making an already difficult situation much worse.

This will create daily inconvenience for existing homeowners, reduce accessibility, increase neighborhood frustration, and may even interfere with emergency vehicle access.

This proposal places too much pressure on a neighborhood that is already functioning at capacity. It ignores the reality of how families live in this area and fails to prioritize the safety and quality of life of current residents.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the City to reject the current parking lot design and reconsider the overall development proposal. Safety for children, proper traffic flow, winter driving conditions, and adequate parking must come before overdevelopment.

Please protect the families, pedestrians, and residents who already call this community home.

Sincerely,

Bilian Cen

Exhibit “5” referred to in File DAV 122903A/2026C

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing as a resident to express my concern regarding the Conditional Use and Variance for the proposed multi-family townhouse approved recently.

This decision raised serious concerns regarding the long term living conditions, safety and capacity of the neighbourhood with the potential increase in population density and overcrowding. Our neighborhood already has a certain capacity in terms of infrastructure, green space, and community resources. A development that significantly increases the number of residents may put additional strain on these existing systems and change the character and livability of the area.

In terms of environmental health, our neighbourhood has already been facing a persistent issue of flies. The ongoing problem indicates underlying challenges in waste management and sanitation. Based on the development floor plan, the garbage area will be sitting in immediate proximity to others’ property which raised significant concerns. If not carefully planned, this could create ongoing hygiene issues such as odors, pests, and general sanitation concerns that would directly affect nearby homes and shared spaces. It is important that waste facilities are thoughtfully placed and properly designed to minimize these impacts to nearby residents.

In addition, traffic and parking are ongoing challenges in our community. The plan seems did not take into consideration of the traffic flow in Rowntree Avenue, reviewing the adequacy of parking for both new and existing residents. There have already been vehicles parking on the streets creating congestion. Additional units will likely bring more vehicles, which could worsen congestion on local streets and make parking even more limited for current residents. It will worsen the congestion, reduce road visibility and increase conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. This will create safety hazards and further strain an already limited roadway system.

Furthermore, with the construction of a new school nearby, traffic volume will undoubtedly increase significantly especially during peak hours. The roundabout connecting Rowntree Avenue is already known to be hazardous during winter months due to ice and snow accumulation, and frequent traffic incidents occurred under these conditions. A sudden increase in population and vehicles will significantly increase these risks and create more dangerous conditions for drivers and pedestrians.

Also, recreational facilities are already insufficient to support the current population. Nearby parks are already exceeding their capacity and there is a clear shortage of safe and adequate play space for children. The addition of 12 households will further limit available resources, leaving children without appropriate recreational spaces and negatively impacting community well-being.

With respect to above concerns, I strongly request for a comprehensive traffic impact assessment conducted before taking any further steps. Without a thorough and transparent evaluation of traffic flow, safety risks and infrastructure capacity, it is irresponsible to proceed with this development.

I understand the importance of accommodating growth in our city, but I hope that these concerns, coming from someone who lives in the area, will be taken seriously. I respectfully ask that the Appeals Committee carefully review this proposal and consider adjustments or conditions that will help protect the health, safety, and quality of life in our neighbourhood.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I would appreciate being kept informed of any decisions or updates related to this development.

Yours faithfully,

Stanley Yeung and Joanne Choi

Exhibit “4” referred to in File DAV 122903A/2026C

To: Appeals Committee
City of Winnipeg
510 Main Street
Winnipeg, MB

Re: Appeal of Conditional Use Approval – File DCU 25-241747C (Rowntree Avenue)

I am writing to formally appeal the approval of the Conditional Use application (File DCU 25-241747C) permitting the establishment of a multi-family dwelling on Rowntree Avenue.

I respectfully request that the Appeals Committee overturn this decision on the basis that the proposal does not meet the required tests under the City of Winnipeg’s planning framework, including the Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 200/2006 and applicable secondary plan policies.

1. Failure to Meet Conditional Use Approval Criteria (Zoning By-law No. 200/2006)

Under the Zoning By-law, a Conditional Use may only be approved if it is:

Consistent with Plan Winnipeg and any applicable secondary plan
Compatible with the surrounding area in terms of scale, intensity, and form
Not detrimental to the health, safety, convenience, or general welfare of persons living or working in the surrounding area

The proposed development fails to meet these criteria:

It introduces a significantly higher density and building form that is not compatible with the existing low-density, side-by-side residential character of Rowntree Avenue.
It creates adverse impacts on neighboring properties, including traffic, parking overflow, privacy loss, and noise.
It undermines the stability and livability of the neighborhood, which is a key consideration in Conditional Use decisions.
2. Inconsistency with Plan Winnipeg and Complete Communities Direction Strategy

The City’s long-term planning documents, including Plan Winnipeg and the Complete Communities Direction Strategy, emphasize:

Context-sensitive infill development
Respect for existing neighborhood character
Gradual and compatible intensification

While these policies support infill and increased density in appropriate areas, they clearly state that intensification must be:

Sensitive to the existing built form
Compatible with surrounding land uses
Designed to minimize negative impacts on adjacent properties

The proposed multi-family development does not represent “gentle density” or context-sensitive infill. Instead, it constitutes a material intensification that is out of scale with the surrounding single-family and side-by-side homes.

3. Lack of Compatibility with Established Neighborhood Character

Rowntree Avenue is characterized by low-density residential development, primarily side-by-side and single-family dwellings. The proposed multi-family building:

Alters the established streetscape and massing
Introduces a building form and occupancy level inconsistent with the area
Creates a visual and functional disruption to the neighborhood fabric

This conflicts with the City’s objective to maintain predictable and stable residential environments.

4. Traffic, Parking, and Safety Impacts (Public Interest Considerations)

The Appeals Committee must consider whether the proposal is detrimental to public safety and convenience. The development raises several concerns:

Increased vehicle traffic on a street designed for low-density residential use
Insufficient on-site parking, leading to spillover onto public streets
Reduced visibility and maneuverability, increasing the risk of accidents
Restricted access for emergency vehicles due to congestion

These impacts are inconsistent with the requirement that Conditional Uses must not negatively affect public safety or convenience.

5. Adverse Impact on Adjacent Properties

The proposal will have direct negative effects on neighboring residents, including:

Loss of privacy due to increased height, windows, and occupancy
Increased noise and activity levels
Potential reduction in property values due to change in neighborhood character
Shadowing and overlook impacts

These effects demonstrate that the development is detrimental to the general welfare of surrounding residents.

6. Precedent and Cumulative Impact

Approval of this application sets a precedent for similar developments within the area. This creates a risk of:

Gradual but significant erosion of low-density zoning intent
Incremental transformation into higher-density housing without comprehensive planning
Increased pressure on infrastructure and services

Such piecemeal intensification is inconsistent with the City's planning principles, which call for coordinated and context-aware growth.

7. Infrastructure Capacity Concerns

Existing infrastructure—including roads, drainage systems, and municipal services—was designed for low-density residential use. The increased demand from a multi-family development may:

Strain existing systems
Reduce service levels
Lead to long-term maintenance and capacity issues

This further supports the conclusion that the proposal is not appropriate for this location.

Conclusion

Based on the above, the approved Conditional Use does not satisfy the statutory and policy requirements set out in:

Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 200/2006
Plan Winnipeg
Complete Communities Direction Strategy

The proposal is incompatible with the surrounding area, detrimental to residents, and inconsistent with sound planning principles.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Appeals Committee overturn the approval of Conditional Use File DCU 25-241747C.

Thank you for your consideration.

Resident on Rowntree Avenue.

Exhibit “3” referred to in File DAV 122903A/2026C

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing as a concerned resident to formally object to the recently approved Conditional Use and Variance for the proposed multi-family townhouse development on Rowntree Avenue.

This decision raises serious concerns regarding the long-term livability, safety, and infrastructure capacity of our neighborhood. The sudden and significant increase in population density resulting from this development will place undue strain on an area that is not designed to support such growth.

In terms of environmental health, our neighborhood has already been facing a persistent issue with flies. This ongoing problem indicates underlying challenges in waste management and sanitation. If this development proceeds, the expected increase in household waste will very likely intensify the situation, potentially leading to more severe infestations and hygiene concerns that will negatively affect nearby residents’ quality of life.

Parking and traffic conditions are also a major concern. According to the proposal, only 19 parking spaces are planned for the development. This is clearly insufficient for a multi-family townhouse project, as it is common for households to own more than one vehicle. With no additional parking capacity provided, residents may resort to parking on the street, which will inevitably lead to increased congestion, reduced road visibility, and conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians. This situation will create safety hazards and further strain an already limited roadway system.

Moreover, there is ongoing construction of a nearby school. Once completed, traffic volume in the area will increase significantly, particularly during peak hours. The roundabout connected to Rowntree Avenue is already known to be hazardous during winter months due to ice and snow accumulation, with frequent traffic incidents occurring under these conditions. A sudden increase in population and vehicle usage will only exacerbate these risks, making the area even more dangerous for both drivers and pedestrians, and significantly impacting the daily lives of existing residents.

In addition, local recreational facilities are already insufficient to support the current population. Nearby parks are frequently at capacity, and there is a clear shortage of safe and adequate play space for children. The addition of approximately 12 more households will further strain these limited resources, leaving children without appropriate recreational areas and negatively impacting community well-being.

Given these concerns, I strongly request that a comprehensive Traffic Impact Assessment be conducted before any further steps are taken. Without a thorough and transparent evaluation of traffic flow, safety risks, and infrastructure capacity, it is irresponsible to proceed with this development.

If the City intends to proceed despite these concerns, it is imperative that meaningful mitigation measures be implemented. These should include, at a minimum, the expansion of nearby recreational facilities, the addition of public open spaces, and significant improvements to traffic infrastructure and safety measures to accommodate the increased demand.

Taken together, these issues demonstrate that the proposed development is incompatible with the current capacity and conditions of the neighborhood. The cumulative impact on sanitation, safety, traffic, and quality of life is severe and should not be overlooked.

I respectfully urge the Appeals Committee to reconsider this approval and to prioritize the health, safety, and well-being of existing residents.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Hiu Fan Cheung, Tin Kin Kenneth Chui

Owners of

Exhibit “2” referred to in File DAV 122903A/2026C

Dear Secretary of the Appeals Committee,

I am writing to formally appeal the City’s decision to approve the variance under File No. DAV 26-122903C for the proposed development on Rowntree Avenue.

As a resident in the area, I have serious concerns regarding the impact this variance will have on traffic safety, congestion, and overall neighbourhood livability.

Specifically:

- Existing High Density: This area already contains side-by-side homes and relatively high residential density. The current infrastructure and road capacity are already under pressure. As side by side house already high population in area.

- Traffic Congestion & Safety: Rowntree Avenue is frequently reduced to a single usable lane due to on-street parking, despite being a busy route connecting to Landover Drive and surrounding streets.

- Waste Collection Impact: During waste collection days, bins placed along the roadside further narrow the street, creating unsafe conditions for both drivers and pedestrians.

- Increased Density Concerns: Reducing the required front yard setback (from 19 feet to 4 feet) to accommodate additional parking will likely increase congestion rather than resolve it.

- Pedestrian Safety: Limited space and reduced visibility increase risks, particularly for children, families, and individuals walking in the neighbourhood.

Given these concerns, I respectfully request that the Appeals Committee reconsider this variance approval and assess whether it aligns with the intent of the Winnipeg Zoning By-law, particularly in maintaining safe and functional residential streets.

I would appreciate being notified of any hearings or further steps in the appeal process.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Kwan Yu Wong

Hi

I would like to Attached photo to support my appeal for
Traffic Congestion & Safety , high density concerns

. Existing Road Conditions (Evidence Attached)
The current condition of Rowntree Avenue already presents significant challenges:

- Vehicles are frequently unable to pass each other due to on-street parking, effectively reducing the road to a single lane.
- During waste collection days, garbage and recycling bins further obstruct the roadway.
- There have been near-miss situations between vehicles due to limited space and reduced visibility.
- The street layout is already difficult and unsafe for pedestrians, including children and families.
-

2. Proximity to Roundabout and Conflict Points
The subject location is close to a roundabout area with pedestrian crossings, driveway access points, and active traffic flow. This creates multiple conflict points between vehicles and pedestrians.

- Additional congestion and parking will increase the risk of accidents in this already complex traffic area.
- Vehicles entering and exiting driveways near the roundabout further reduce visibility and reaction time.

3. Existing High Density
The area already consists of side-by-side homes with relatively high residential density. The current road infrastructure is not designed to accommodate further intensification.

4. Impact of the Approved Variance
The approved reduction of the front yard setback (from 19 feet to 4 feet) to allow additional parking will likely increase congestion and worsen existing safety concerns, rather than alleviate them.

5. Emergency and Public Safety Concerns
Given the narrow effective roadway and added congestion, emergency vehicle access may be compromised.

Thanks again

Regards,
Kwan Yu


oy St, Winnipeg, MB R3Y 0S4
owntree Ave, Winnipeg, MB R3Y 1S4
oogle 街景服務

Exhibit “1” referred to in File DAV 122903A/2026C

Planning, Property and Development Department
Service de l'urbanisme, des biens et de l'aménagement
Unit 31 – 30 Fort Street • 30, rue Fort, unité 31 • Winnipeg • Manitoba R3C 4X7

VARIANCE ORDER

DAV 26-122903/C

APPLICANT:	Waqar Younas GS Homes Ltd. 943 KAPELUS DR UNIT 5 WEST ST PAUL MB R4A 5A4 CAN
PREMISES AFFECTED:	Rowntree Avenue
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	LOT 53 BLOCK 2 PLAN 60574 hereinafter called "the land".
PROPERTY ZONED:	R2
ZONING ATLAS SHEET:	AN20

NATURE OF APPLICATION:

To vary the "R2" Development and Design Standards of Winnipeg Zoning By-Law No. 200/2006 for the establishment of an accessory parking area to permit a front yard of 4 feet (1.22 metres) instead of 19 feet (5.79 metres).

It is the opinion of the Director of Planning, Property and Development Department that subject to conditions listed below, if any, this order meets the statutory criteria of the City of Winnipeg Charter in that it:

(a) is consistent with Plan Winnipeg and any applicable secondary plan;
(b) does not create a substantial adverse effect on the amenities, use, safety and convenience of the adjoining property and adjacent area, including an area separated from the property by a street or waterway;
(c) is the minimum modification of a zoning by-law required to relieve the injurious effect of the zoning by-law on the applicant's property; and
(d) is compatible with the area in which the property to be affected is situated.

C.W. Charter Subsection 247(3)

ORDER:

RE: Rowntree Avenue

The Director of Planning, Property and Development Department hereby orders that the provisions of the "R2" dimensional standards of Zoning By-Law No. 200/2006 and amendments thereto are **VARIED TO PERMIT** on "the land" the establishment of an accessory parking area

having a front yard of 4 feet (1.22 metres), subject to the following condition(s) which the Director of Planning, Property and Development Department considers necessary to ensure compliance with criteria (a) to (d) above, namely:

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

DATE OF ORDER: April 21, 2026

CERTIFIED BY:



for the Director Planning, Property and Development Department

HOW TO APPEAL

You can appeal this order by filing a letter of appeal with the City Clerk. Note that, in filing the appeal, the entirety of the order is subject to review by the designated committee at the appeal hearing. The appeal letter must:

(a) be addressed as set out below,

(b) be received at that office not later than 4:30 p.m. on May 05, 2026
[IF RECEIVED LATE YOUR APPEAL CANNOT BE HEARD.]

(c) refer to Variance Order No. DAV 26-122903/C, give brief reasons and describe whether you appeal the whole order or only part(s) of it.

You can attend the appeal hearing and speak on issues raised in someone else's appeal; but the designated committee can only rule on issues raised in appeals filed. If you are not sure what others have appealed you should file your own appeal.

Address: City Clerk, City of Winnipeg
c/o Appeals Committee
Susan A. Thompson Bldg.
510 Main Street
Winnipeg, MB, R3B 1B9
Fax 947-3452
Email: clk-appeals@winnipeg.ca