Minutes – East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee – September 3, 2026

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Item No. 4 Variance – 513 Pandora Avenue West
(Transcona Ward)
File DAV 133682/2026D [c/r DAZ 211/2026 and DCU 133692/2026]

COMMUNITY COMMITTEE DECISION:

The East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee concurred in the recommendation of the Winnipeg Public Service, as amended, and approved a Variance on "the land" for the construction of a multi-family dwelling to permit as follows:

1. Insufficient building foundation landscaping;

2. Insufficient buffering of a parking or loading area located within 20 feet (6.1 metres) of a side or rear lot line adjacent to a residential district.

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.

2. That the Variance Order shall come into force and effect upon the coming into force and effect of the zoning by-law for the subject land under File DAZ 211/2026.

DECISION MAKING HISTORY:

The Winnipeg Public Service advised that all statutory requirements with respect to this application have been complied with.

The Chairperson called Councillor Durand-Wood to the Chair in order to move the following motions:

Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
That the report of the Winnipeg Public Service be taken as read.

Carried

Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
That the receipt of public representations be concluded.

Carried

Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
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.

DECISION MAKING HISTORY (continued):

Supporting Reasons:

1. I'm happy to hear that the applicant is supportive of upgrading landscaping, upgrading the parking lot to ensure there is proper buffering for residents so they're not looking into a parking lot or have lights shining in, that there will be a proper fence, solid fence, so that lights will not be shining in, that there will now be a four-foot buffer minimum, possibly more he indicated.

2. I'm of the opinion that sometimes the 20-foot-wide access drive in to the stalls is too big, so bring it down today to 22 feet. It's more appropriate for vehicles sometimes these days.

3. I'm happy to see the bicycle parking on the site, happy to see that it's not a higher density than eight units, happy to see still that with the reduction of one parking stall that there's still eight parking stalls. Knowing full well that it is on Pandora Avenue West, but there is parking on Pandora Avenue West.

4. I want to point out. Just recently this road was upgraded, I believe the sidewalk was repaired with the renewal of the road there so, because I saw the sidewalk was in poor shape in front of the building and they tied that in. I'm hoping they did that, I'll have a look today.

5. Those are the things I wish to point out in support.

6. This is a former large lot that was 46 feet in width, approximately, 66 feet in width, that is able to accommodate this density. We have done similar densities on similar size lots on Regent Avenue and on Pandora.

DECISION MAKING HISTORY (continued):

7. I would encourage the applicant to hire an architect just to bring a higher standard with regards to the elevations and I would encourage the public service at the time of Plan Approval to definitely consider that, because I really believe the elevations are somewhat lacking. We've now approved developments on Pandora Avenue West on this block and just beyond. That truly have raised the standard in terms of higher quality of elevations. Back in the day, when we first had the first development by Michael Mark, across from the New Flyer Industries on the old Jim Johnson Sports Site on the corner of Moroz and Pandora Avenue West, northeast corner of Moroz and Pandora Avenue West. That was the standard then, but the standard has changed. The quality of construction has changed quite a bit too, costs have gone up but so have the rents. So, I really like to see a higher standard when it comes to elevations than what we have here today. We're not approving that here today, that's coming back with Plan Approval, and I just want to make sure the Plan Approval does come this Community Committee in the future, that that's also amended in this report, because sometimes it doesn't.

8. I've received the petition from the residents. They are expressing concern about the storm sewer water capacity that is subject to the Water and Waste Department. I understand high rates of runoff and issues, there are issues on every lane, sadly.

9. Insufficient buffering between the proposed parking area and adjacent residential properties. I think we tired to address that with the buffering now against the parking that didn't exist before and the residents to the west, properties to the west. The building height and impact on privacy, we've now glazed the windows on the western side to ensure that there is no peering into yards, homes, at homeowners. And these windows must be glazed, and permanently glazed in nature. With greater landscaping recommended and a higher standard with regards to the elevations that's been recommended at time of the community committee's Plan Approval, when that happens.

10. I believe we've addressed many of the concerns expressed in the petition here.

Carried

DECISION MAKING HISTORY (continued):

Moved by Councillor Wyatt,

That the recommendation of the Winnipeg Public Service be concurred in with the following amendment:

- Permit Item 1 as applied for, namely:

  "1. Insufficient building foundation landscaping"

and the Variance be approved.

Carried

Moved by Councillor Wyatt,

That the public hearing with respect to this application be concluded.

Carried

Councillor Wyatt resumed the Chair.

Winnipeg

THE CITY OF WINNIPEG
VARIANCE ORDER
EAST KILDONAN-TRANSCONA COMMUNITY COMMITTEE

DAV 133682/2026D [c/r DAZ 211/2026 and DCU 133692/2026]

Before:	East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee Councillor Wyatt, Chairperson Councillor Browaty Councillor Durand-Wood
Hearing:	September 3, 2026 Council Building, 510 Main Street
Applicant:	John Scott Wintrup Planning & Development (John Wintrup)
Premises Affected:	513 Pandora Avenue West
Legal Description:	LOT 6/7 BLOCK 132 PLAN 1840 NW 5 11 4E, hereinafter called "the land"
Property Zoned:	"R1-M Mature Communities PDO-1 Mature Communities PDO-1" (Residential Single-Family – Medium Mature Communities Planned Development Overlay – 1 (District) Mature Communities Planned Development Overlay – 1 (District)) Proposed "R2 Mature Communities PDO-1" (Residential Two-Family Mature Communities Planned Development Overlay – 1 (District))
Nature of Application:	To vary the proposed "R2 Mature Communities PDO-1" development and design standards of Winnipeg Zoning By-law 200/2006 for the construction of a multi-family dwelling to permit as follows: 1. Insufficient building foundation landscaping;

2. Insufficient buffering of a parking or loading area located within 20 feet (6.1 metres) of a side or rear lot line adjacent to a residential district

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

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

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

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

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

Supporting Reasons:

1. I'm happy to hear that the applicant is supportive of upgrading landscaping, upgrading the parking lot to ensure there is proper buffering for residents so they're not looking into a parking lot or have lights shining in, that there will be a proper fence, solid fence, so that lights will not be shining in, that there will now be a four-foot buffer minimum, possibly more he indicated.

2. I'm of the opinion that sometimes the 20-foot-wide access drive in to the stalls is too big, so bring it down today to 22 feet. It's more appropriate for vehicles sometimes these days.

3. I'm happy to see the bicycle parking on the site, happy to see that it's not a higher density than eight units, happy to see still that with the reduction of one parking stall that there's still eight parking stalls. Knowing full well that it is on Pandora Avenue West, but there is parking on Pandora Avenue West.

4. I want to point out. Just recently this road was upgraded, I believe the sidewalk was repaired with the renewal of the road there so, because I saw the sidewalk was in poor shape in front of the building and they tied that in. I'm hoping they did that, I'll have a look today.

5. Those are the things I wish to point out in support.

6. This is a former large lot that was 46 feet in width, approximately, 66 feet in width, that is able to accommodate this density. We have done similar densities on similar size lots on Regent Avenue and on Pandora.

7. I would encourage the applicant to hire an architect just to bring a higher standard with regards to the elevations and I would encourage the public service at the time of Plan Approval to definitely consider that, because I really believe the elevations are somewhat lacking. We've now approved developments on Pandora Avenue West on this block and just beyond. That truly have raised the standard in terms of higher quality of elevations. Back in the day, when we first had the first development by Michael Mark, across from the New Flyer Industries on the old Jim Johnson Sports Site on the corner of Moroz and Pandora Avenue West, northeast corner of Moroz and Pandora Avenue West. That was the standard then, but the standard has changed. The quality of construction has changed quite a bit too, costs have gone up but so have the rents. So, I really like to see a higher standard when it comes to elevations than what we have here today. We're not approving that here today, that's coming back with Plan Approval, and I just want to make sure the Plan Approval does come this Community Committee in the future, that that's also amended in this report, because sometimes it doesn't.

8. I've received the petition from the residents. They are expressing concern about the storm sewer water capacity that is subject to the Water and Waste Department. I understand high rates of runoff and issues, there are issues on every lane, sadly.

9. Insufficient buffering between the proposed parking area and adjacent residential properties. I think we tired to address that with the buffering now against the parking that didn't exist before and the residents to the west, properties to the west. The building height and impact on privacy, we've now glazed the windows on the western side to ensure that there is no peering into yards, homes, at homeowners. And these windows must be glazed, and permanently glazed in nature. With greater landscaping recommended and a higher standard with regards to the elevations that's been recommended at time of the community committee's Plan Approval, when that happens.

10. I believe we've addressed many of the concerns expressed in the petition here.

ORDER:

The East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee orders that the provisions of the Proposed "R2 Mature Communities PDO-1" development and design standards of the Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 200/2006 are varied on "the land" for the construction of a multi-family dwelling to permit as follows:

1. Insufficient building foundation landscaping;

2. Insufficient buffering of a parking or loading area located within 20 feet (6.1 metres) of a side or rear lot line adjacent to a residential district.

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

1. That 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.

2. That the Variance Order shall come into force and effect upon the coming into force and effect of the zoning by-law for the subject land under File DAZ 211/2026. ,

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

DATE OF ORDER: September 4, 2026

CERTIFIED BY:



B. Harris
Committee Clerk

HOW TO APPEAL

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

(a) be in writing;

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

(c) be addressed as set out below;

(d) be received at that office not later than 4:30 p.m. on September 24, 2026;

[IF RECEIVED LATE YOUR APPEAL CANNOT BE HEARD]

(e) refer to Variance Use Order No. DAV 133682/2026D; and

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

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

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

THE FOLLOWING PERSONS MADE REPRESENTATIONS AND ARE ENTITLED TO APPEAL:

In Support:

John Wintrup

In Opposition:

Roselle Abelle
Jamie Albent
B Almero
R Almero
Venus Aniasco
Jackie Becker
Jeff Becker
Vero Berube
Shannon Bittner
Adam Burton
Leila Caoagas
Stephani Chu
Adrian Deforry
J Dekker
Paul Desautels
Mel Dueck
Jaron Dueck
Brandon Dueck
Chantel Dumas
Janett Eberhard
Dave Edwards
Peggy Emmond
E.H. Evans
Leesa Fast
Robert Fields
Courtney Fields
Crystal Fletcher
Jaydon Froese
Roy Geuvreau
Breanne Gibson
Sergio Gresbrecht
Orville Heinrichs
Steven Heldebrecht
Harleight Hoogerdijk
Svitlana Ivaniv
D James
Karen Jashyn
Alma Jennings
Vera Johnson
Isaac Kaatz
Kristine Kaschyshyn
Jon Kaschyshyn
Justin King
Pete Koetler
Trina Kostuck
Keelan Krishka
Marianna Krzyszton
Darren Kush
Darren Kush
Taisa Lamoureux
Matt Lamoureux
Yna Felicia Luis
Kate Mackenzie
Bonnie Marchant
Don McPhail
Cayla McRorie
K Megarry
Sabrina Meneses
Sabrina Meneses
Ezra Micklefield
Larry Moser
Joshua Moser
Maria Nguyen
Khamkone P
Tammy Padobe
C Palehitski
Lori Parenteau
Nick Pollock
C. Rathgele
R Reitman
Justin Sadowy
Declan Say
Vanessa Say
S Schroeder
Glenda Schroeder
Angus Schuerfeld
Andrew Shuerfeld
Derrick Slater
Adeline Sunga
Mercy Thiessen
K Vander Vegte

Aiden Veenendaal
Garth Walker
Cammy Walker
C Welechenko
Chad Wiese
Jeremy Wilde

For Information:

Nil

For the City:

C. Ho, Planner, Planning, Property and Development Department

EXHIBITS FILED FOR DAV 133682/2026D

1. Application dated March 27, 2026
2. Notification of Public Hearing dated August 12, 2026
3. Manitoba Status of Title 3395627/1
4. Letter of authorization dated September 16, 2025 from 10010672 MB Inc. (Joel Scott) to John S Wintrup
5. Confirmation from the Zoning and Permits Administrator that the subject property may be posted in substitution for newspaper advertising
6. Plans, Sheets 1 to 7 inclusive, for File DAV 133682/2026D dated March 30, 2026
7. Report from the Urban Planning Division dated August 26, 2026
8. Inspection Report
9. Communication dated September 3, 2026, from John Wintrup in support of the application
10. Communication dated September 1, 2026, from Trina Kostuck in opposition to the application
11. Communication dated August 31, 2026, from Darren Kush in opposition to the application
12. Petition in opposition to the application purporting to contain 88 signatures, submitted by Trina Kostuck

Exhibit "7" referred to in File DAV 133682/2026D

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Title: DAV 26-133682/D – 513 Pandora Avenue West

Issue: For consideration of a Variance for a multi-family dwelling (8 units).

Critical Path: East Kildonan-Transcona Community Committee

AUTHORIZATION

Author	Department Head	CFO	CAO
Gillian Kolody, MCP	n/a	n/a	

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONDITIONS

The Urban Planning and Design Division recommends **approval, in part,** of the application to vary the proposed "R2 Mature Communities PDO-1" development and design standards of Winnipeg Zoning By-law 200/2006 for the construction of a multi-family dwelling to permit as follows:

~~1. Insufficient building foundation landscaping;~~

2. Insufficient buffering of a parking or loading area located within 20 feet (6.1 metres) of a side or rear lot line adjacent to a residential district.

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.
2. That the Variance Order shall come into force and effect upon the coming into force and effect of the zoning by-law for the subject land under File DAZ 211/2026.

REASON FOR THE REPORT

- The applicant is proposing to build an 8-unit multi-family dwelling and requires two Variances for landscaping and buffering requirements of the *Winnipeg Zoning By-Law*.
- This report provides information regarding the subject application's compliance with *The City of Winnipeg Charter*, section 249.

FILE/APPLICANT DETAILS

FILE:	**DAV 26-133682/D**
RELATED FILES:	DAZ 211/2026, DCU 26-133692/D
COMMUNITY:	East Kildonan - Transcona Committee
NEIGHBOURHOOD #:	4.402 - (MELROSE)
SUBJECT:	To vary the proposed "R2 Mature Communities PDO-1" development and design standards of Winnipeg Zoning By-law 200/2006 for the construction of a multi-family dwelling to permit as follows: 1) Insufficient building foundation landscaping; 2) Insufficient buffering of a parking or loading area located within 20 feet (6.1 metres) of a side or rear lot line adjacent to a residential district.
LOCATION:	513 Pandora Ave W
LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	LOT 6/7 BLOCK 132 PLAN 1840 NW 5 11 4E
APPLICANT:	John Wintrup (John Scott Wintrup Planning & Development) 139 Roslyn Rd Unit 301 Winnipeg, MB R3L 0G7
OWNER:	10010672 MANITOBA INC. 380 Foxdale Ave Winnipeg, MB R2G 1A4

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 the north side of Pandora Avenue West, between Bismarck Street and Hoka Street, in the Melrose neighbourhood of the Transcona ward.

- The site is 7,917 square feet (735.5 square meters) in area and is currently occupied by a one-storey single-family residence constructed in 1947.
- There is a detached garage located at the rear of the property.
- The subject site has vehicular access via concrete rear and side public lanes and additionally has frontage along Pandora Avenue West.
- Under the *Complete Communities Direction Strategy 2.0*, the site is within the Established Neighbourhood – Mature Communities policy area.
- The property is currently zoned "R1-M Mature Communities PDO-1" Residential Single-Family (Medium) District.



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

SURROUNDING LAND USE AND ZONING (See Figure 2)

North: A concrete rear public lane, then residential single-family uses zoned as "R1-M Mature Communities PDO-1" Residential Single-Family (Medium).

South: The Pandora Pathway active transportation path, then Pandora Avenue West, then 500 Pandora Avenue West, a manufacturing use zoned as “M2” Manufacturing (General).

East: A concrete side public lane, then 505-509 Pandora Avenue West, a commercial use zoned as “C2 Mature Communities PDO-1” Commercial (Community).

West: 515 Pandora Avenue West, a residential single-family use zoned as “R1-M Mature Communities PDO-1” Residential Single-Family (Medium).




Figure 2: Zoning of the site and surrounding area.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- The applicant is proposing to construct an 8-unit multi-family residential dwelling that is two (2) storeys in height.
- The proposed dwelling features four three-bedroom units that occupy the basement and main floors, and four two-bedroom units that occupy the upper floor.
- The building dimensions are approximately 57 feet (17.37 metres) wide by 54 feet (16.46 metres) deep by 29.56 feet (9.01 metres) high.
- Of the nine (9) parking stalls at the rear of the proposed dwelling, one (1) is accessible and one (1) is a dedicated visitor stall. There are six (6) bicycle parking stalls at the front of the proposed dwelling.

- Vehicular access to the property is proposed to remain via the concrete rear public lane.
- The site plan shows street edge plantings totaling three (3) trees and ten (10) shrubs. No building foundation landscaping is provided.
- The façade of the building features Hardie siding, wood looking metal plank, acrylic stucco and traditional stucco as the primary cladding materials.
- The proposed development requires that the subject property be rezoned from "R1-M Mature Communities PDO-1" Residential Single-Family (Medium) District to "R2 Mature Communities PDO-1" Residential Two-Family District (see planner's report for DAZ 211-2026).
- The proposed development requires Conditional Use approval for the establishment of a Multi-Family Dwelling (8 units) use (see planner's report for DCU 26-133692/D).

COLLABORATIVE PLANNING AND CONSULTATION

With the Urban Planning and Design Division

- The applicant engaged with the Division to discuss the application prior to making a formal submission.

With the Public

- The applicant did not submit any letters or signatures of support in their formal submission.

ANALYSIS AND ISSUES

COMPLETE COMMUNITIES DIRECTION STRATEGY 2.0

- The *Complete Communities Direction Strategy 2.0* (*CCDS 2.0*) is one of four direction strategies supporting *OurWinnipeg 2045*, the city's long-range development plan, and has statutory authority as a secondary plan. The strategy guides land use and development in Winnipeg. *CCDS 2.0* provides policy guidance when assessing proposals that are seeking entitlements or changes to the *Winnipeg Zoning By-Law*.
- The subject property is located in the "Established Neighbourhood – Mature Communities" policy area as identified in *CCDS 2.0*.
- The key goals and policies guiding the development of Established Neighbourhoods include:

  Goal 1 *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.*

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

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

1.8 *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 2 *Design new development in Established Neighbourhoods to a high standard of urban design and construction to ensure new development adds value to public and private urban spaces to create a sense of place and civic pride.*

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

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

2.5. *Encourage a variety of architectural styles.*

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

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

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

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

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

2.16 *For properties with public lane access, vehicular access should be taken from the public lane in order to:*

- ***a.*** *Reduce potential conflict between pedestrians using sidewalks and motor vehicles crossing the public right of-way to access private property;*
- ***b.*** *Preserve green space and protect existing trees that can be impacted by the establishment of front approaches and corresponding private driveways; and*
- ***c.*** *Prevent fragmentation of the public boulevard in order to better accommodate on-street motor vehicle parking and public snow clearing.*

2.17 *Locate commercial, mixed-use, or multiple family residential parking underground or behind buildings in order to create a more pedestrian-oriented built form. Active uses should be located at grade when these buildings face public streets.*

Goal 3 *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.*

SMALL-SCALE AND LOW-RISE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES FOR MATURE COMMUNITIES

The subject site is located in the “Established Neighbourhoods – Mature Communities” policy area of *CCDS 2.0 and* is subject to the *Small-Scale and Low-Rise Residential Development Guidelines for Mature Communities* (*Infill Guidelines*), which guide infill development in mature communities. The *Infill Guidelines* were adopted by Council on June 24, 2021.

The *Infill Guidelines* include two major components. The first is a "Preferred Location Criteria" that establishes the lot characteristics enabling specific building typologies. At times, "Secondary Considerations" may be used to enable a building typology beyond what the Preferred Location Criteria would allow if it can be demonstrated that there are unique characteristics to a lot that should enable a different building typology. The second includes building and site design policies that regulate the physical characteristics of any proposed building. Both components work together to create opportunities for residential intensification in mature communities that mitigate adverse effects on existing residents.

Preferred Location Criteria

The subject site **does not meet the Preferred Location Criteria** for this building typology in Area 1 because under Scenario 1, the property does not abut an arterial street and under Scenario 2, either the side or rear yard does not abut a commercial, multi-unit residential or non-residential use.

However, Secondary Considerations were used to enable support for a low-rise multi-family residential building as:

- Although not directly abutting a commercial use, the subject property is adjacent to a commercial use, separated by a side public lane.

- The site is generally walkable, bikeable and has high-frequency Public Transit with 400 metres.

- There are local and regional amenities and services along Regent Avenue West, which is just north of the subject property.

Site Design and Building Design

- The proposed development ***does not*** meet all the applicable "Site Design" and "Building Design" guidelines, including:

<u>Landscaping</u>

- As per the Landscaping provisions in the *Infill Guidelines*, a minimum of 20% of the lot area should be reserved for soft landscaping. The proposed development has 18% of the lot area dedicated to soft landscaping, therefore not complying with the *Infill Guidelines*.

<u>Utilities, Servicing and Mechanical (AC, utility meters and furnace output)</u>

- As per the Utilities provisions in the *Infill Guidelines*, HVAC units and other ventilation equipment should be located in the building, on the roof, or at the rear of the property. The proposed development has AC units on the side of the building, therefore not complying with the *Infill Guidelines*.

In order for the proposed development to comply with the *Infill Guidelines*, Plan Approval will be recommended as a condition of approval for the associated file (DAZ 211/2026).

CITY OF WINNIPEG ZONING BY-LAW 200/2006

Reasons for Variances

Building Foundation Landscaping

- The *Winnipeg Zoning By-law* requires building foundation landscaping for all principal buildings outside of the Urban Infill Areas (section 190.5). The applicant is not proposing any building foundation landscaping; therefore, a Variance is required to proceed.

Parking Area Buffering

- The *Winnipeg Zoning By-law* requires a landscaped buffer when a parking area is within 20 feet of a rear lot line adjacent to a residential zoning district (section 190.8). The applicant is proposing a parking area abutting and accessed from the rear public lane. Therefore, a Variance is required to proceed.

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCES

Building Foundation Landscaping

- In review of the site plan for the proposed multi-family dwelling, it appears the applicant could meet the building foundation landscaping requirement. Additionally, *CCDS 2.0* encourages a high standard of urban design for new development in Mature Communities. For these reasons, the Urban Planning and Design Division does not support this Variance.

Parking Area Buffering

- A buffered parking area would create no greater privacy to the residential lots than what already exists with the rear lane adjacent to the rear lot lines. For this reason, the Urban Planning and Design Division supports this Variance.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

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

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

In that, *the proposal aligns with Complete Communities Direction Strategy 2.0, provided that Variance 1 is rejected.*

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

In that, *the proposed Variances are relatively common and are unlikely to pose an adverse effect on the surrounding area, provided that Variance 1 is rejected.*

(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 proposed Variances are required in order to develop the site, suggesting that the Winnipeg Zoning By-Law poses an injurious effect on the applicant's property, provided that Variance 1 is rejected.*

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

In that, *it is a supportable use at this location, and aligns well with the existing development, provided that Variance 1 is rejected.*

CONSULTATION

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

OURWINNIPEG 2045 POLICY ALIGNMENT

Goal: City Building

Objectives

1. 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.

6.6 Intensification Target

Achieve the intensification target by making development in intensification target areas easier and more desirable and predictable, as directed in *Complete Communities*.

6.16 Established Neighbourhoods

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

WINNIPEG CLIMATE ACTION PLAN ALIGNMENT

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

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

Key Direction 4.2: Ensure new areas of growth are designed according to the principles of Complete Communities.


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:	Gillian Kolody, MCP
Date:	August 26, 2026
File No.	DAV 26-133682/D


Exhibit “6” referred to in File DAV 133682/2026D





MAIN FLOOR PLAN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"


ZONING AND PERMIT BRANCH
THIS PLAN IS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL IN
CONNECTION WITH: DAV26-133682/D
SHEET # 2 OF 7
DATE: March 30, 2026



UPPER FLOOR PLAN

SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0"

ZONING AND PERMIT BRANCH
THIS PLAN IS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL IN
CONNECTION WITH: DAV26-133682/D
SHEET # 3 OF 7
DATE: March 30, 2026



BASEMENT FLOOR PLAN

SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0"

ZONING AND PERMIT BRANCH

THIS PLAN IS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL IN

CONNECTION WITH: DAV26-133682/D

SHEET # 4 OF 7

DATE: March 30, 2026

ZONING AND PERMIT BRANCH
THIS PLAN IS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL IN
CONNECTION WITH: DAV26-133682/D
SHEET # 5 OF 7
DATE: March 30, 2026



SOUTH ELEVATION
SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0"



EAST ELEVATION
SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0"

ZONING AND PERMIT BRANCH

THIS PLAN IS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL IN CONNECTION WITH: DAV26-133682/D


SHEET # 6 OF 7

DATE: March 30, 2026



NORTH ELEVATION


SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0"




WEST ELEVATION

SCALE 1/8" = 1'-0"

Garbage Enclosure Details





ZONING AND PERMIT BRANCH
THIS PLAN IS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL IN
CONNECTION WITH: DAV26-133682/D
SHEET # 7 OF 7
DATE: March 30, 2026

8' long gate
Swings Open

