

Excerpt of my Notes from September 24, 2020 meeting related to the recent article also attached to these notes. There was as you will read quite a bit of opposition to the proposal.

4189-19-7490 Plessis Road Waterside Development Corp. Also includes Re-Zoning By-law 20-04 (Second and Third Reading) from AG to MB (I was told First Reading was done April 23, 2020.) HISTORICAL INFORMATION: 4.3 Re-zoning By-law 20-04 1st Reading - Pt. Plan 433 WLTO in W 29-10-4E - AG to MB (Waterside Development Corp.) The Development Officer read his report. The Chair closed the evidentiary portion of the meeting. Resolution No: 20-167 BE IT RESOLVED THAT first reading be given to By-law No. 20-04 being a by-law of the Rural Municipality of Springfield to re-zone Lots 120, 121, 132 and 133 Plan 433 WLTO and all those portions of Lots 95, 95, 122 and 131 in Plan 433 WLTO within W 1/2 29-10-4 EPM from "AG" Agricultural General Zoning District to "MB" Industrial Business Zoning District. **Carried (6-0) MY NOTES FROM THAT MEETING: Re-Zoning By-Law 20-04 (First Reading) - Mayor Fell** - Colleen, is that just you or is Dan.... **Dan Doucet** - We have By-law 20-04. This is first reading of a parcel of land uh just off of Plessis Road across from Symington Yards in Springfield. It is within the West 1/2 of 29-10-4. It encompasses lots 120, 121, 132, 133 of Plan 433 and also Lots 95, 96, 122 and 131 also of Plan 433. All lands are to be zoned, re-zoned um from AG Agricultural General District to MB uh General sorry Industrial Business Zoning District. I just want to checkwhat I want to verify is the zoning.....he mumbles on about applicationum this by-law should read MG but on their application it looks like an MB so they want to go MG General Industrial. **NOTE: One would think our Development Officer of in excess of 10 years would by now be completely prepared and also have a complete command of the Zoning By-law, Designations, Planning Act, etc. when he comes to Council specifically for a Planning Meeting. He shouldn't be doing it on his feet during a session of Council. Perhaps if he spent less time on writing Firearm By-laws, which I believe should be the task of the CAO and Administration in conjunction with whatever department for which it has relevancy such as the Springfield Police Service, he would have more time to do his real job even though he in actual fact is not a qualified Planner which is why his title is Development Officer.** The original application was for Industrial. **Mayor Fell** - Thank you for the clarification. **Dan Doucet** - Sorry, on their Letter of Intent they had CH NMP and their Letter of Intent had Industrial Business and Highway Commercial so based on what they have submitted, it is the MB the Light Industrial. Someone asks if they can confirm that. He replies: I can ...we could recess for 5 minutes and I'll make a quick call before we proceed with this by-law. **Mayor Fell** - Take a 5 minute recess. She then called the meeting back to order. I will clarify that the application as written is what we will be discussing which is Light Industrial MB. Are we alright with that? Can I have a mover and a seconder, please? Councillor Fuhl, Councillor Wilson. **Colleen Draper** - *Be it resolved that first reading be given to By-law No. 20-04 being a by-law of the RM of Springfield to re-zone Lots 120, 121, 132 and 133 Plan 433 and all those portions of Lot Nos. 95, 96, 122 and 131 in Plan 433 within the West half of 29-10-4 from AG Agricultural General Zoning District to MB Industrial Business Zoning district.* **Mayor Fell** - Thank you, is there any further discussion from Council? **Councillor Williams** - I have a question for our Development Officer. How do they handle notifications in other municipalities of re-zoning like this one in Winnipeg? And the next one in Tache? **Dan Doucet** - We send it out to those municipalities and throughout that district. **Councillor Williams** - Send what out? **Dan Doucet** - We uh are you talking about the next stage for the public hearing or ...? We would send out notification to the City of Winnipeg Planning Office, we post it on site, put it on our Municipal Web Site, and notifications in the paper. We do not obtain a listing of the surrounding land owners and other jurisdictions. **Councillor Williams** - I understand. So you provide them with a boundary. **Dan Doucet** - We provide who with a boundary. **Councillor Williams** - The neighbouring municipalities? **Dan Doucet** - No. **Councillor Williams** - What do you provide them? **Dan Doucet** - We provide them just with.....**Someone speaks during the answer so could not catch.** And under the Act we go above and beyond also like posting on the site. **Mayor Fell** - Thank you. Is there any other questions from Council? All those in favour? **CARRIED 6-0 Doucet** - The proposal is to subdivide approximately 269 acres of land to create an 82 lot industrial subdivision with public roads and public reserve to accommodate storm water retention and has line easements. Access will be on to Plessis Road. Currently classified AG Lands, will have to be re-zoned to MG Industrial General or MB Industrial Business Zone. Both have minimum site requirements of one acre site area and 75 ft. site width. Residual will remain classified AG. The re-zoning 2nd and 3rd readings follow the subdivision application. Ten conditions including drainage, lighting, fire protection, etc. **NOTE: There is no background reports of various agencies included in the information package of today's meeting.** **TODAY'S HEARING: Bill McGarry, Waterside Development Corp.** - Stated they have a Traffic Impact Study approved by the City of Winnipeg and also had a Land Drainage Study done also approved by the City of Winnipeg. **Brad Cook, Engineer, Dillon Consulting** - Traffic Study was submitted both to City of Winnipeg and to MI (Manitoba Infrastructure) and was approved by both. 203 acre Industrial Park. Will generate 710 trips each in a.m. and p.m. rush hour. Approximately 50% will head north into City of Winnipeg and the other 50% will go south to PTH #1. About 15% will be going into another industrial development area, Camille Sys. There are 3 accesses onto Plessis, north, centre and south. North immediately across from existing approach to Tandec Logistics, centre from CN Intermodal Yard, southern approach will be a new access and there is another industrial development across the street. At northern and centre access, Plessis is already divided with raised median. Propose improving intersection. Recommend developing raised median and southbound left turn lane. All 3 of the approaches can operate under 2 way stop controls so no stop signs along Plessis and no requirement for traffic signals. **FOR APPLICATION: Paul Kammerloch - Legal representative of owners of property immediately to the north - 97 acres Fronts on to St. Boniface Road** - On behalf of owners, supports the application. Because of its location, he thinks it is a positive and appropriate use of the land near to Symington Yard. I think Mr. Doucet could give you the location. It is the 97 acres immediately to the north. It's that sort of wedge shaped piece which fronts on St. Boniface Road and the other boundary of it is the aqueduct. **IN OPPOSITION - Stephen McEndry Smith, 58095 Symington Road - 1/2 mile east of proposed subdivision and development** - Handed out documents to Council. Speaking against subdivision and rezoning. Has 7 things to talk about. **First** of all, we are removing arable land from production. Cited the Municipal Planning Guide wherein it states important to preserve, among others, natural areas and agricultural land. He said in the Development Plan, it is classified as Employment Land for future commercial development but it is still

being cropped every year. There are areas available already zoned for development that are not being cropped e.g. Industrial Park at Symington and Fermor, entire Industrial Area north of Gunn Road, and an area east of Wenzel Street. These are already zoned Industrial and not being farmed and not appropriate for residence. Develop those first. 9.4.12 Zoning By-law - Proponent must show there is significant demand for the development being proposed. Has municipality asked that question and has the proponent demonstrated demand? **Second** - Negative impact on the environment and adjacent uses. 9.1.6 One of the objectives of the Employment Designation is to ensure commercial developments do not negatively impact the environment or adjacent uses. This will require a residual smaller than normal lots allowed within the adjacent Agricultural Preserve area. Farming 40 acre piece not economical. If this land abandoned, it is negative impact on agriculture in the area and not the intent of the agricultural preserve area. In order to develop this parcel, it will be necessary to level about 20 acres of trees which removes about 21 tons of CO2 from the atmosphere every year, therefore negative impact on the environment. Developer is proposing about 40 acres of roadway. The runoff from roads including road salt will end up in ditches and river system. **Third** - He is only person affected 9.1.6 Our home is located on Symington Road about half a mile east of the proposed development and right now have lovely view to the west. This year view is crop of sunflowers and adds to the salability of their home. Development will make home less attractive and more difficult to sell in future. 3 storey buildings allowed and those in the development to the south of them are very visible from half mile away. **Fourth** - Impact on the aquifer. He understands one of the requirements will be a thorough study of the aquifer by a hydrological engineer. Would it not make sense to have that done **before** the subdivision and rezoning. Cart before the horse. **Fifth - Not following best practices.** Planning Act suggests consultation should be done with adjacent land owners before subdivision and rezoning is done. RM Zoning By-law 3.1.10 reflects similar wording. Councillor for Transcona informs him he just became aware of this rezoning through a constituent. Springfield did not contact Councillor for Transcona. Springfield surrounds Transcona on 3 sides and thus activity in the RM can have serious impact for Transcona. Cited as example fire in Industrial Area north a few years ago. Mayor of Winnipeg advised him they were close to having to evacuate parts of Transcona. We are not seen as good neighbours to Transcona. Thinks we should be transparent and considerate of needs and concerns of our neighbours. **Sixth** - Incompatibility with surroundings. By-law 3.1 gives a number of general objectives for the plan which includes "to ensure development proceeds in a manner that is harmonious with surrounding land uses" and 3.1.6 To support the agricultural economy in the RM of Springfield. Further 18-09-11 states that the objectives of the Employment Designation is to promote the growth of commercial and industrial uses within the municipality in harmony with surrounding land uses. Now the area under consideration is surrounded on three sides by land that is zoned agricultural preserve within the municipality and agriculture general in the City of Winnipeg. Changing this zoning to Industrial Business would create an area of industry surrounded on three sides by agricultural land. Wart on area. Reminder that the Springfield Development Plan and By-law 18-08 states the Development Plan will undergo periodic reviews providing the RM an opportunity to adjust the policies as necessary and future policies may need to be amended in order to more accurately reflect new conditions and unanticipated changes to local conditions. This is a living document. Because this area has been designated Employment doesn't mean that you can't un-designate it employment. It can be changed back. It is not too late. I believe it might have been a mistake to designate it that way and hopes it can be corrected. **Brian Walker** - I live at 996 Plessis Road. I have been asked by the South Plessis Road Residents Association to speak on their behalf. In principle we are not opposed to the proposed Industrial Park subject to certain conditions. **First - Vehicular and heavy truck traffic.** The proponent mentions a Traffic Study that was done but not one resident was consulted re issues regarding vehicle and truck traffic. The residents along south Plessis Road have already endured many years of dangerous situations, conditions, noise, shaking homes due both to vehicle and heavy truck traffic daily and dangerous conditions and very real occurrences. Cited several examples of near and actual accidents. Entrances and exits from this Industrial Park are on to Plessis Road. Requesting plan be amended to use Fermor and the TransCanada highway instead of Plessis Road and that the RM of Springfield set up a Town Hall Meeting with local residents and association and other area residents to hear first hand their life threatening and life altering stories and to obtain input on the proposed development. **Architectural design specifications** - They don't want a hodge podge of buildings that become eyesores. They request the RM work with the Developer in establishing architectural guidelines that must be met and providing parameters that must be met in the industrial park. They would also like to understand how the RM will monitor and control the noise and air quality issues that may arise and impact surrounding residential areas and have guidelines built for the Watersides Development Plan that the businesses must adhere to regarding noise and air quality issues. **Water and Sewer** - They understand businesses will draw water from aquifer and use septic tanks for waste disposal. Vast majority of South Transcona residents rely on well water for their homes. Our request is that the RM work closely with the Manitoba Water Services Board in reviewing the environmental impacts of the water and sewer and hold a town hall with the residents of south Transcona to share information and obtain their input. **Conclusion** - Reiterates that in principle residents not opposed and encourage economic development but are opposed to developments which disregard the impacts on the quality of life of established long standing residents. Have proposed viable solutions and think everyone must work together towards mutually agreeable solutions. Personally has long family history in the area. Request delaying decision until matters of concern can be addressed in advance and are willing to cooperate with all stakeholders and consider viable options for a win-win solution. **Lawrence Toet 450 Foch Avenue** - Sad no consultation with residents of South Transcona. Not opposed to development in area but am concerned about negative impacts that could occur if not done correctly. Lack of detail on key issues including whether it is for Industrial General or Industrial Business. Not clear in proposal. Key areas of concern: (1) protection of existing aquifer and glad to see conditions include hydrological groundwater resource report but it is not just availability of the water but protection of the resource as residents depend of wells and concerned about contamination including sewage disposal. What are controls on septic tanks to ensure no overflow. (2) Concerned about restrictions as to intensity of business e.g. mushroom factory - requests both environmental impact assessment and includes but not limited to potential contamination and mitigation requirements both from water usage and water waste perspective. (3) Fire protection - What is the fire protection plan? Who is responsible for fire and chemical protection of the neighbourhood residential community. And what business will be allowed or restricted from locating here to

make sure no unnecessary risk is introduced to area residents. (4) Architectural parameters - Is there a master architectural plan from the developer for the tenants of the area. Are we going to see the same problems as in the Gunn Road Industrial Park where business does not have to adhere to any sort of architectural design and landscape requirement. (5) What will the road surfaces be and what will the surface requirements of the individual lots be? Will there be a plan for individual lot owners as to landscaping? How can we be assured they will not be dragging mud on to the roads the existing residents have to travel. Wants a full site plan with full details of the construction of all public roadways, common area landscaping and design including architectural and landscaping guidelines that must be adhered to by all tenants. He also wants to hear more about the traffic impact on Plessis Road. He was a former MP and worked diligently to get the Plessis underpass built and residents were assured they would be provided a 4 lane road on Plessis from Dugald Road to Fermor Avenue with a service road for residential access. When I look at the width of that roadway now and how much space will be allowed for that roadway, he is very concerned that will never happen. This might be the time for the RM to work alongside the City of Winnipeg to make sure that is done for the protection of the residents on Plessis Road. The Province recently closed a lot of access points including the ones in your RM to the perimeter highway for safety reasons. If there is any concern for safety, it makes no sense to add three more uncontrolled accesses and you talk about a single stop sign and he feels that is pretty much an uncontrolled access to a two lane road with a speed limit of 80 kph. which is already very intensive. Turning from St. Boniface Road on to Plessis is a very scary thing. This is not a wise plan. Need to have a better development of the intersections and I would propose it should only be one intersection, one access road and he hopes the RM looks at that, agree on one, and make sure it is properly lighted. Point 8 of the recommendations is a Traffic Impact Assessment approved by the City and the Province. "Unbelievable to me is that it has been done without any participation from area residents." Implore them to go back to developer and City of Winnipeg "there **has** to be a new assessment" to assess the impact and **must** be residential input before completed. While he recognizes the need for development and realizes someone is always against everything but feels there is real concerns that need addressed before proceeding. Asked developer to engage the residents of south Transcona before proceeding. **Doing the right thing should always be the priority.** **Brian Walker** - Some of the people of the South Transcona Residents Association he represents, some of whom are confrontational, and some of them also protested the Oly West proposal but he tried to moderate their protest and he personally would like to see collaboration on the part of this company with the residents of the South Transcona Residents Association to discuss conditions before it actually goes forward for approval. **Mayor Fell** - Then asked Council for input. When Councillor Fuhl indicated he did, she asked "for Bill or his traffic consultant?". Invited Bill to the mike. **Councillor Fuhl** - "Did you consult through the consulting company and the residents of the area.....and whether you looked at that at all." **Bill McGarry** - We hired Dillon Consulting and they are the professionals. We hired them to do what they normally do. **Councillor Fuhl** - He then addressed the question to Dillon Consulting. (No) "For what reason?" **Brad Cook (Dillon Consulting)** did not come to the mike and therefore one cannot hear what he is saying but I think the gist of it was that he has done many of these and no one came forward on house to house survey and typically they do the study and then it is brought to the public hearing after the fact. **Councillor Wilson** - To Traffic Consultant. The twinning, 4 lane of Plessis is apparently an issue here. How close is the traffic on Plessis, with the potential addition of several hundred lots, at peak periods to a requirement for a 4 lane? **Again could not hear the reply. Think basically he said that it would require acquisition of private property and basically it was "not close"**. Did the issue of speed on Plessis come up and is there any recommendations? **I think he said they had no recommendations but it was within the purview of City and Province to request speed reduction.** He then asked about the sewage system and road surface issues. **Dan Doucet** - Most industrial parks are fully asphalted or gravelled. As for sewer and water, no municipal sewer and water system there unless there is an agreement with the City of Winnipeg to tie into their infrastructure but currently proposal for private wells and holding tanks for which there are regulations. In the Provincial report, everything was submitted to the City of Winnipeg and the comment was "although adjacent to the City of Winnipeg it does not order any residential areas and the City of Winnipeg has not indicated concern with industrial development at this location." **Bill McGarry** - They will be doing architectural designs for that development as they have done in other jurisdictions along the Perimeter and Ferry Road. This is their hope. **Mayor Fell** - Felt lowering speed could be a condition. However you have done the Traffic Study which is one of the conditions of the application approval but felt there might be some value in the developer and consultant holding an information session for residents and that also could be a condition. Asked if they would be comfortable with that. She said they still have to approve the Traffic Study and could wait for feedback at information session before doing that. **Councillor Ralke** - Wanted confirmation from Brad on 710 trips they estimated morning and afternoon rush hour. "Is that just a supposition on your part that 50% would be using opposite location.....?" **Again he was not required to come to the mike so reply cannot be clearly heard but had discussions with the City of Winnipeg.** "Ya.....ya.....ya.....ok.....ok.....ok great ... and I wanted to make note to one of the speakers, I think it was Mr. Walker that we, I hear what you are saying about the concerns of the traffic. I feel for you and your understandings of stories of what happened to you and your families and your neighbours and um I think a reduced speed limit if theall of us can work together to do something like that.....we could work with in the future. But just making acknowledgement to that. Thank you." **Lawrence Toet** - I just feel it is important to clarify to Council that the speed limit thing has been brought up a few times. That only...it is 50 kph up to Camille Sys so the concerns that residents like Mr. Walker have expressed **don't change by moving it to 50 for the stretch south of Camille Sys so that's not a solution for those residents at all. You think you are helping those residents by saying you're going to look at a 50 k speed limit in that area. You are doing nothing, absolutely nothing.** So it's really important you understand that. **Dan Doucet** - I'd like to add that if Waterside Development does have the Open House that they invite the City of Winnipeg officials there because they are the authority having jurisdiction over the roadway, not the municipality. We cannot set the speed limits to that section of road. **Brian Walker** - I would just like to echo what Lawrence had said. These accidents that have occurred including some very serious ones are in the 50 kph zone so changing the speed limit or reducing it is going to do nothing to affect it. I just want to point out there is an exit lane off the Trans Canada. It is close to a kilometer long and parallels the southern part of just south of the development. By

having an exit and an entrance on that stretch may further induce the traffic to use Fermor or the Trans Canada as their entry and exit point. Other solutions are to make a No Left Turn from the Industrial Park on Plessis so they can't turn in from Plessis so in other words the only way they can get into the Industrial Park and similarly when they're exiting it is to make a Left Turn only. They have to exit on to Fermor. **Mayor Fell** - Thinks Open House is good idea and Council has to approve the Traffic Study so having that in between when we approve it and getting input from the residents and I think the developers are more than open to that. We can work together to make sure we mitigate those concerns.

Brian Walker - As long as it is not a lip service process because the fact that this was done without anyone being consulted to date obviously leaves us tainted. **Mayor Fell** - I agree I think you need to talk to Winnipeg officials as well regarding the traffic. **Brian Walker** - "**absolutely we are, believe you me! we are**". **Our concerns are very real and there are kids and families.** **Paul Kammerloch** - The traffic study said 710 trips per day, I would like to know if those trips are strictly for commuting trips and I'd like to note that one of the permissible uses should this area be rezoned, one of the permissible uses is for a trucking company. They can use land zoned Business Industrial and given the proximity to the intermodal facility at CN, I'm thinking it would probably attract trucking companies. **Mayor Fell** corrected him by saying both a.m. and p.m. so 1420 per day during peak hours. **Colleen Draper** - [Council may wish to leave the hearing open pending hearing results of the Open House.](#)

Mayor Fell - [No, I think we are going to move forward with the resolution](#), and then the developer can come back with Dan and Dan can give final approval to the traffic study. **NOTE: This is an example of how Mayor Fell disregards the best advice of her CAO. What is not clear is her motivation and that opens the door to speculation. In my opinion, the other members of Council by now have learned that the best policy in order to avoid unpleasantness is just to go along with what Mayor Fell says.** Council consented. She then closed the Public Hearing.

Mentioned there would be 2 open houses. **Colleen Draper, CAO** - *Whereas Rob Dillon on behalf of Waterside Development Corp., the owner of the property within Section 29-10-4 has submitted an application to subdivide the existing approximate 260 acres of land, BE IT RESOLVED that application for subdivision #418-19-7490 be approved subject to the 10 conditions as read out by the Development Officer and #11 that the applicant arrange a minimum of two Open Houses with area residents.* **Councillor Williams** - Wants Development Officer to clarify that there is one agency that was not contacted in Provincial circulation and you said we can proceed and then perhaps update conditions if we get reasonable comment back from that agency. **Response cannot be heard.** **Mayor Fell** - Thank you for that clarification. **CARRIED 6-0** She then called a 5 minute break before going on to next agenda item and sped out of Council Chamber in pursuit of someone. **Council then did Second and Third Reading of Re-Zoning By-law 20-04 AG to MB. Also Variance 20-08 for the reduced size of residual parcel which was also carried 6-0 in spite of Mr. Smith's objections.**