

## RM OF SPRINGFIELD PLANNING MEETING

June 25, 2020 6:00 p.m.

WITHOUT PREJUDICE (E&OE)

THERE ARE SOME INTERESTING THINGS IN THIS MEETING BUT BEFORE YOU START READING, I FELT I SHOULD "UPDATE" YOU ON THE MORE THAN HALF A MILLION DOLLAR (\$\$\$) COMMERCIAL COMBO RESCUE APPARATUS THAT IS NOT YET DELIVERED BUT WAS AUTHORIZED TO BE PURCHASED FROM A COMPANY IN FLORIDA, U.S.A. IN NOVEMBER 2018, SHORTLY AFTER MAYOR FELL AND HER COUNCIL WERE ELECTED. I AM ATTACHING AN UPDATE SINCE COUNCIL AND ITS LEADER ARE NOT BEING FORTHCOMING ON THIS FILE. [I HOPE YOU READ IT.](#)

I PRINTED OFF MY COPY OF THIS AGENDA SUNDAY, JUNE 21st. THE TIME OF THE MEETING WAS PRINTED AS 5:00 P.M. I WAS AT THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING EARLY AND TRIED THE DOOR AT 10 TO 5. IT WAS STILL LOCKED. ANOTHER PERSON HAD TRIED IT BEFORE ME AND LEFT. I contacted a Councillor, not mine, who told me it was at 6:00 p.m. WHEN I RETURNED LATER, I PICKED UP A COPY OF THE PRINTED AGENDA ON THE COUNTER AND IT STILL SAID 5:00 P.M. I ASKED THE RECEPTIONIST AND WAS TOLD IT HAD CHANGED AND WAS POSTED ON THE WEB SITE. WHEN I ASKED ERIKA WOOD WHY THE AGENDA STILL READ 5:00, I WAS ADVISED THE COPIES WERE PRINTED ON MONDAY. REGARDLESS, ONCE THE AGENDA IS POSTED ON THE WEB SITE, I FEEL IT SHOULD NOT BE CHANGED OR IF IT IS, THE TIME ON THE ACTUAL AGENDA SHOULD BE CHANGED. The change must have occurred since Monday when they were printed as the correction was not made on the printed agenda.

### 5. PUBLIC HEARINGS - VARIANCES

**5.1 - 1 Penner Road - Site Area - Bouchard (4189-19-7492) - Dan Doucet** - The proposal is to permit the approximate site area and the approximate site width within the proposed units as follows: Unit 1 - a site area of 5,676 sq. ft. and a site width of 88.2 ft.; Unit 2 - a site area of 1,609 sq. ft. and a site width of 25.0 ft.; Unit 3 - a site area of 2,609 sq. ft. and a site width of 25.0 ft.; Unit 4 - same as 2 & 3; Unit 5 - same as 2 & 3; Unit 6 - a site area of 1,992 sq. ft. and a site width of 30.95 ft.; Unit 7 - a site area of 2,008 sq. ft. and a site width of 31.2 ft. **Colleen Draper** - Whereas a Public Hearing has been conducted under The Planning Act to consider an application filed by 7346728 Manitoba Ltd c/o Marcién Bouchard on Lot 1 Plan 65510 WLTO in Lot 44 RCMP with SW 1/4 21-10-4 EPM for a variation of the Springfield Zoning By-law No. 08-01; And Whereas Council is satisfied that the requirements of Part 6 "Variances: has been met; Be It Resolved That Variation Order No. 20-13 be granted subject to the following condition: 1. This Order shall come into force and take effect on the date of registration of a final approval on the matter of subdivision application number 4189-19-7492. **Councillor Williams** - I have a question for our Development Officer. I believe this is the first commercial condominium. Are we addressing site regulations for commercial condominiums in our new Zoning By-Law? **Doucet** responded that yes they would be and he is currently reviewing the Zoning By-law. **CARRIED 6-0** **NOTE: Some questions I believe Council should have had are as follows: Is this lot serviced? If not, is each business going to have their own holding tanks and wells? Access seems to be, from the material provided, via Green Acres Lane which intersects with Penner Road. The individually owned business will be accessed by a common yard/road. Who is going to be responsible for servicing this area? Will there be some type of agreement between the various owners? I feel that as it is private property, it should be the responsibility of the owners to maintain and service the front access just as other taxpayers maintain their own driveways. On May 7, 2019 Council passed a resolution as follows: 10.11 Condo Services Resolution No: 19-212 Moved by: Peter Williams Seconded by: Howard Bredin BE IT RESOLVED that Council of the RM of Springfield agree to take on the following maintenance functions for Bare Land Condo Corporations: 1. Watermain Flushing and valve exercising 2. Sewermain Flushing 3. Hydrant Testing 4. Street Sweeping 5. Excess Snow Removal 6. Maintenance and Replacement of Lighting 7. Street Light Hydro Costs 8. Sign Replacement. I have sent an e-mail to Council asking for a written reply as to whether the services under this resolution will be applied to this and other commercial condo corporations. I will publish their reply in subsequent notes.**



**5.3 Var 20-17 57110 Millbrook Road - Front Yard Setback - Chatt/Evolve Green** --This has to do with the placement of solar panels. The company originally contracted to do the job poured concrete foundation pads for the solar panels but although they had applied for a variance (zoning variance 19-39) and a permit, they did not follow the conditions of the variation order and placed the pads closer to the public roadway than specified. As the job was never finished, Evolve Green has been contracted to complete the installation. **This was observed by our building inspectors after it was completed.** This variation order is to bring it into compliance. **CARRIED 6-0** **NOTE: The late inspection of construction projects in the municipality seems to be more the norm than the exception. Perhaps a requirement of providing the permit should be that the Planning Department is notified when construction is to commence to allow for more timely inspections?**

**5.4 Var 20-19 64106 Monominto Road - Front Yard Setback - Moniak - Evolve Green** - Same situation as 20-17 and same companies involved but in this case the original company did not even apply for a variance and a building permit. **CARRIED 6-0**

ON THE NEXT VARIANCE, THERE WAS ALL SORTS OF FEEDBACK VIA ZOOM SO MAYOR FELL ASKED THE PROPONENT TO CALL HER ON HER CELL PHONE, HE COMPLIED AND THE REMAINDER OF THE CONVERSATION IS ON SPEAKER. I do not see why the meeting must be conducted on Zoom as society is gradually reverting to some semblance of normal while maintaining some measure of social distancing. At Planning Meetings, usually the only people that attend are myself, one other interested resident, and those appearing for the individual applications, and the latter group leave after their hearing.

**5.6 Var 20-21 67040 Deacon Rd - Side Yard Setback - Fones/Cochrane-Fones - Dan Doucet** - The proposal is to permit a sub side yard setback of 28 ft instead of the required 50 ft for the construction of a farm related accessory building being a barn in a rural residential zoning district. They would like to upgrade and replace their existing non conforming accessory building in the exact same location as the existing structure.

**CARRIED 6-0** **NOTE: No one on Council asked any questions about this application but I can think of some: Were the adjacent property owners notified of the new construction? What constitutes "farm related" as from the picture the building is located to the rear of a very large home and it is zoned Rural Residential? The existing building appears to be a barn with corrals. Are horses being kept there and is it within the manure units relative to the size of the property? In the letter of intent, it states that the new building will maintain the functionality of our current purpose for the land but will also be built with versatility for any future use by the present or future owners.**

**6.4 CU 20-15 and Var 20-23 - 36059 PTH 15 - Temporary Additional Dwelling - Fulton/Arthurson** - To permit a temporary additional dwelling on the land providing temporary accommodation for Mr. Ralph and Ms. Ila Arthurson with the Rural Residential Zoning District. They would like to construct an approximate 1100 sq. ft. dwelling for her parents in their retirement and to provide care for her parents for medical reasons.

**Heather Erickson, Anola** - They're talking about constructing an 1100 sq. ft. dwelling and constructing is not the same as temporary. Construct implies a permanent dwelling and frankly that's just a way of getting around subdivision. There is no information contained in the package as to the type of structure, is it going to be on footings, and how temporary can it be if it's an actual construction as opposed to something that is mobile? I am wondering if the applicant can suggest how this 1100 sq. ft. dwelling is going to be temporary. **Dan Doucet** said some temporary dwellings have been stick frame constructions built on site, some RTMs, some have crawl spaces under them. **Heather Erickson** - Is the Planning Department going to ensure the dwelling is constructed to enable it to be moved in future. **Mayor Fell** - Dan, they are not requesting a basement? **Dan Doucet** - That has not yet been discussed. **Heather Erickson** - I would be in opposition if it is not going to be a mobile structure. **Councillor Ralke** - What type of structure is your intention to build for your ailing parents? **Mr. Arthurson** - We don't know because we don't know what we're allowed. We know it's got to be temporary. It didn't say it had to have wheels as a mobile home as this lady is implying and like you said an RTM could be built on site. I'm a contractor and I can save about \$50 grand by building it myself. Our plan was to put it on piles or beams so it could be transported when it's time to leave but without having this part there was no sense in asking any other questions to what we're allowed and not allowed ...now I know we're not allowed a basement. **Councillor Ralke** - So your intention currently right now clearly you're not going to put a basement in. **Mr. Arthurson** - No. No basement. My elderly in-laws are sick so we want to take care of them so putting a basement in doesn't make sense. **Councillor Ralke** - The only other comment I wanted to make is that it will be stated within these conditions it will come to be void in by 2025 so at that point you will just come to apply again and then we would assess the situation again. As long as you know that. **Heather Erickson** - And one of the conditions could be it's on piles, could that be a condition? **Mayor Fell** - Uh, I'm going to, I don't, usually we don't put building conditions on there but I think, I would speak and say we could leave that up to the Development Officer when he talks to the proponent if Council is alright with that. **CARRIED 6-0**

**CU20-12 - 449 Main St. Unit 203 (Second Floor) - Commercial School (Oakbank Plaza Mall)- Baert & Fey - (Reconvene from Planning Meeting June 4th)** - The proposal is to permit a commercial school business providing opportunities for classes and instruction in performing arts such as dance, theatre, visual, literary and music. The hours of operation will range from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. Sunday to Saturday. There will be 1 to 7 employees and approximately 200 students throughout the course of the year, the maximum within one time slot would be 10 to 25. **In the agenda package were 3 lengthy letters in opposition and SPACE had 4 SIGNATURES on their letter asking for support.** The letters of objection contained the following concerns: Congestion at entrance due to parent drop offs; increase use of elevator which can be heard in some of the existing businesses; SPACE students talking in hallways where noise issues already exist; use and abuse of washroom facilities; running up and down stairs; loud sound and impact noises caused by SPACE activities during dance or musical theatre classes; requirement of building code to provide Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating which is not being provided by Planning; lack of soundproofing in the building; one tenant on Main Floor had drywall from ceiling fall into shop due to children running in hallway upstairs; business below depends on quiet, calm, non disruptive environment; parking congestion in lot already congested without the additional traffic; clients with mobility issues not able to find parking close to entrance; businesses providing therapy require quiet one on one atmosphere. **AT THIS JUNCTURE ONE GENTLEMAN IN THE AUDIENCE MENTIONED HOW HARD IT WAS TO HEAR WHAT WAS BEING SAID AT THE COUNCIL TABLE.** **Tayler Fey** - Wished to clarify on business hours and said it is not 7 to 11 on a daily basis. The average season goes from September to May and normally from about 3:30 to 9:30 p.m. in the evening. They do offer daytime programs throughout the week for younger kids or adults that are not at school or work. On weekends they have Saturday mornings and their average Sunday is about 6 to 9 p.m. of operation. Their letter of intent was a generalization as sometimes they do have classes starting at 7 a.m. Their average hours are not as comprehensive as the letter of intent would suggest. **IN FAVOUR: Jason (sounds like Beddick), the broker for the mall in Oakbank** - Not much to say. He has been working hard to put this lease together and he personally has been working hard to make Oakbank a better place and he really thinks having the school in the mall for those kids is a good thing. **Wendy Bobby** - I have been involved with SPACE since its inception in 1992. It is a program that has grown over the years and it's wonderful to see the steps that have been taken forward. I am currently recently a Board member. Just want to say it has brought a lot

of good to the youth and everybody of all ages in the community over the years and I really support the move. **IN OPPOSITION: Darryl Speer, Oakbank** - I am the neighbour, the longest property running in line with this property, and I consider the businesses in this Mall to be important to Oakbank and also find that the, a number of people have worked very hard to be where they are today, so when a new business is proposed then I have to say I am disappointed at the last hearing to find out the day of that a number of these businesses had no idea as to what new business was coming in above them and how they would be negatively impacted. This to me is, particularly the issue with the amount of noise transmission that happens in this building and just walking in the hallways, it transmits noise to the units that are to either side or directly below and with the proposal that's here now to have dance, music and theatre and so on and so forth, it implies a high level of activity. Up to 200 students is what they're indicating up to 25 at a time and with 7 staff, up to 7 staff um this adds up to a lot of traffic into the building, uh into the halls, and into the entryway. So I would like to ask that there be as I mentioned last time uh a consideration for the concerns of all the noise interference, that this be dealt with before this application proceeds and that there be a formal assessment by an accredited sound expert to determine what the issues are with sound that could possibly come from this particular business as it impacts those in the adjoining businesses and that the necessary corrections be made before this business proceeds. And further that any approval be conditional on a review within a year's time with the businesses that are there such that if there is anything that affects their viability, it can be addressed. **Mayor Fell** - Thank you. Is there anyone in the gallery to speak in opposition to the application? **Councillor Wilson** - Yes, thank you, Madame Mayor, um question for the proponent being that, I guess there was some queries from Council as to uh what the response of the proponent would be to uh putting in soundproofing to uh make a uh something like that for the people, I mean, on the main floor and I am just wondering if we could get an answer to that tonight. **Unidentified male voice** - Certainly our builder can answer that. **Larry Wiebe Custom Home Building** - The proposal would be "the gold standard" for noise abatement would be blown in dense packed cellulose in the floor below is actually better than mineral wool insulation and then if that wouldn't be sufficient, the absolute gold standard is for an inch and a half of concrete over top of the existing floor which is not feasible in this case um because of the floor load in there so there is a product that I've researched, it's um Suprema is the manufacturer. It's a 3/8th thick um I'm going to say it's like a cement board product um which they claim is the equivalent of 1 1/2 inches of concrete on top. So that's probably about the best I can do as far as trying to mitigate the noise um transmission from the floors. Um the walls would have mineral wool insulation in them. **Mayor Fell** - Thank you. **Unidentified male voice** - We'd also include the stairwells, elevator surround. **Another Unidentified male voice** Unit 203 doesn't affect the elevator itself. Yep. There is a stairwell I will say on the west side um of the building that is right at the back of the Subway. It's quite secluded there. **Councillor Wilson** - I was just thinking if there's going to be a significant amount of noise due to increased use of the stairwells and elevators that may uh be a factor here. **Another Unidentified male voice** - Ya, I can't speak for the building owner, of course, and what he would be prepared to do for that term of the SPACE. **Councillor Ralke** - Yes I think it would be unfortunate for the owner. I suppose I want to ask because there have been some I'll say in opposition letters, how will you propose to assist these already current tenants with any additional walls and drywall and like the other comments that have been made um to assist and mitigate the issues that they may have? **Another Unidentified male voice** - Sorry Larry, again the space is 18.6 or 18.5 feet deep 6 inches at the back of the building ...all of the units are actually 50 ft. units. We're talking about 37% of an 18 unit total. The building is constructed um with ..there's two layers 5/8 drywall on top of the joists and then there is an 18 inch white space and suspended ceiling. I don't think there'd be any... I can't see any issues with falling drywall unless it had been compromised in some other way. **Councillor Ralke** - And that was a concern from tenants who are currently concerned and feel they would like their concerns mitigated as well if there were additional concerns. I think that's all I want to hear right now. **Another Unidentified male voice** - I did renovate the space below for Donna Bella's earlier this year and um we put in rock solid drywall and you could actually hear the music from the tanning studio before we mitigated those walls. You could hear that in that space. **Councillor Bredin** - Ya, it's just good to have clarified the.....(can't catch what he says) ...I'm double talking. That's the same as normal. Anyway I appreciate hearing it this time clarifying it seems to mitigate most of the problems with other businesses or at least lessen the time that they're open....you seem to be different times from what I understand. So that's helpful, I think to understand that. **Councillor Fuhl** - I'd just like to state it's in the best interests of the owner to work with all tenants because again if there's no tenants there, they have no revenue coming in. So I think it's the best interests again the tenant works or the owner works with all tenants in this situation. **Councillor Williams** - Yes, I have a question for the Development Officer after. The question I had for the Development Officer is, how far do we go in assessing the issues that are not our responsibility? What under the Planning Act gives us the authority to um enable a builder to improve his property like with soundproofing? **Dan Doucet** - As long as it is in accordance with the Building Code and the Office of the Fire Commissioner, the last few days I spoke to the supervisor about this. There are no code requirements for sound suppression in a commercial building. That is up to the tenants and the owner of the property to come up with those ...actually the sound absorption rate.... **Councillor Williams** - So the conditions that you have on this application are adequate. **Dan Doucet** - We have the safety of the building for egress going into the inspectors office of the Fire Commission and also of the Fire Chief to review the structure. **CARRIED 6-0 NOTE: The value of SPACE and its programs are not in question. What is in question here is the fact that this is a Conditional Use, not a permitted use. Therefore it is the responsibility of Council contrary to what Councillor Williams might feel are not issues to be considered by Council, to ensure that the best interests of the majority of tenants in a mall, who have so eloquently expressed their concerns about the proposal, are taken seriously. True, the building manager ultimately is responsible for ensuring the vacant spaces are leased to appropriate and compatible businesses wherever possible and to effect whatever modifications are necessary to appease other tenants that have issues with the proposal. But by approving this Conditional Use, Council is in effect complicit in the end result as they have the authority to either approve the Conditional Use or not approve the Conditional Use or to impose conditions on the approval. Just my opinion. If the other tenants are sufficiently upset about the decision, they could well decide to band together and bring a class action suit against Council for approving the application and against the owner or management company for arranging the lease to a tenant that is not compatible with the existing businesses. My**

**personal opinion is that SPACE may overload the lot, creating inconvenience for current patrons, and they may well take their business elsewhere. It can be very, very busy in that mall parking lot.**

**6.1 Proposal to Subdivide 4189-7380- 57018 Symington Rd. - 1 new lot - Anderson - Dan Doucet** - This is not a public hearing for the subdivision as there are no new roads being created. The intent of the subdivision is to create one new residential lot, both each 1/2 acre. One new lot is proposed for residential purposes. The current zoning is Hamlet (HA) Zoning District and in the Development Plan the designation is General Development Area. The proposed subdivision involves approximately 1 acre of land under CT3023205, part of Lot 79 Plan 433 in Roman Catholic Mission Property, within the Hamlet of Navin. One new lot is being proposed for residential purposes. There is an existing dwelling, accessory structures, an existing well and septic field on the property. Both lots have driveway access on to Symington Road. The proposal falls into the, falls under 8.2 of the policies of the Development Plan. Um within the package provided Winnipeg Land Titles Office requires a 2 lot plan of subdivision. Manitoba Conservation indicate that the existing septic field will need to be decommissioned and method of disposal would be limited to holding tank only. Manitoba Conservation has no concerns but reminds the applicant the water control works and any licensing required. Any time you do a drainage ditch greater than 1 ft. depth the Province requires a license. Bell MTS has no easement requirements as have none for Manitoba Hydro and Centra Gas. Our Engineering Department commented Proposed Lot 1 is a treed residential lot with existing structures on site. Proposed Lot 2 is treed with one existing structure on site. He recommends approval with 6 conditions.

**Councillor Wilson** - Yes, thank you Madame Mayor. Um first of all I do not agree that this proposed subdivision should proceed without a public hearing given that it has such a significant uh potential to be a precedent in our Development Plan um and I will explain why. As our Development Officer rightfully points out, uh we should consider this under section 8.2 of our General Development policies. 8.2.2 reads: Residential lots in this area should generally be 2 acres in size in un-serviced areas. This is an un-serviced area. We are not planning in all of the discussions I've had over the last two administrations in extending services to this area uh soon, later and perhaps not ever. So we are um on the line here. Um in that same section 8.2.2 Residential lots may be less than 2 acres in size if they are serviced. I've already gone through my ... growth shall 8.2.10 growth shall be directed in a manner that piped water, wastewater collection, public transportation and other municipal services can be extended cost effectively. Um I would suggest to Council that there is NO WAY that any services to this area would be cost effective. So in short I don't believe we are doing either prospective lot owners or the neighbouring community or Council itself any favours by setting a precedent for new lot subdivisions smaller than that required to be self sustaining as advised by the Province, that being 2 acres and I would suggest to Council that we deny this application.

**Mayor Fell** - Thank you. Is there any other comments from Council?

**Councillor Williams** - Um isn't there in fact no precedents for this type of subdivision in this area? Have we allowed subdivisions down to half acres?

**Dan Doucet** - There have been subdivisions allowed um previously by the City of Winnipeg when they had jurisdiction. I can't recall any subdivisions since I've been here but there are 14 lots right now on Symington Road that are 1/2 an acre in size and there needs to be Community Planning should Council approve this application community planning will not adhere to this rule.

**Mayor Fell** - Thank you. Is there any further discussion from Council?

**Councillor Ralke** - So I get the Development Officer so if um there were to be a house or something built in that location, what are the water, sewer requirements on that road.

**Dan Doucet** - They would have to decommission their septic field and each of the current dwellings will have to be on a holding tank.

**Councillor Ralke** - Ok, thanks.

**Dan Doucet** - That is why the councillor is against this proposal. I'd like to just speak on the subdivision. I was incorrect. There was one subdivision that did go before Council. It was Casablanca uh not too long ago. That was just immediately prior to our signing.

**Mayor Fell** - And that was approved?

**Dan Doucet** - That was approved. It was a larger holding. They have to see the big size of those lots.

**Councillor Williams** - This was just under the train line, the CN.

**Dan Doucet** - Yes. It was a 3 lot subdivision.

**Mayor Fell** - Is there any other comments from Council?

**Councillor Fuhl** - I have a question for the Development Officer. Out of those 14 lots that are there, 1/2 acre lots, how many are on septic tanks. Can we get that information too.

**Dan Doucet** - I do not know.

**Mayor Fell** - Is there any other comments from Council?

**Councillor Ralke** - Again to the Development Officer. So it is currently zoned that this subdivision will be allowed.

**Dan Doucet** - It is currently in the Development Plan as a Hamlet area. Uh the hamlet regulations say it shall generally be 2 acres in size and the lots serviced.

**Councillor Ralke** - I see.

**Dan Doucet** - And if Council, Council has the ability to allow for a smaller lots and the Development Plan does say for smaller lots to be serviced. Council can consider this subdivision smaller but they'd be limited to a holding tank as per the regulation. It would have to still come back before Council for a Zoning Variance (**Ralke can be heard in background saying, "ya, ya"**) because the lots are substandard.

**Councillor Ralke** - Ok, thank you.

**Mayor Fell** - Is there any other questions from Council? I have a question for Councillor Fuhl because this is his ward. Um is there other lots that size in that area, Councillor Fuhl, do you know?

**Councillor Fuhl** - Say that again.

**Mayor Fell** - Are there other lots similar in size other than what Dan mentioned in that area?

**Councillor Fuhl** - Well, in that, just in that street there is all the 14 lots of half acre. I believe they're all on Symington Road.

**Voice I don't recognize** - Ya, there are tons of small ones, less than that. They're supposed to be 250 ft. wide over there as well.

**Mayor Fell** - Ok is there any other comments or questions from Council?

**Councillor Williams** - I'm uh I, I understand what Councillor Wilson is saying and I don't want to set a precedent but um I'm wondering if we can gather a bit more information about the lots in this area and how they, how they deal with their septic systems. Are there any in there with holding tanks now? I know you don't have that information.

**Dan Doucet** - I could contact Conservation and see what they have in their records.

**Mayor Fell** - Can I ask....

**Councillor Williams** - I would like a bit more information.

**Mayor Fell** - Can I ask you, Councillor Williams, uh whatever they have for a septic system, now the government will come in and tell them what to have for the septic system so what, I'm just trying to understand the line of questioning, why it would matter what those other lots already have because whatever they have to put in, the government will tell them.

**Councillor Williams** - Well, I mean, if they do go down to half lots, we've approved half acre lots. We approved that, then they would have to put in a holding tank. And I'm just wondering what the likes of the others, how they're handling it now. I mean, we wouldn't want to get people into trouble by pointing out to the province that there are people with half acres lots and septic fields.

**Dan Doucet** - So they may have them pre-existing to the current regulations. I am aware of, previous

Development agreements uh on the opposite side of the street there are some lots that are larger when that subdivision got approved in history, there was an engineer in the septic system where there's two sets of systems and the lots are long and narrow so they would switch off one year on one field and the opposite end next year to the other field. That was before my time. But those were long and skinny lots. **Mayor Fell** - Would the rest of Council like to defer? I don't particularly, I don't understand what the point of deferring with all due respect to Council. I'm not sure what that information, how it would impact this decision. Either way, simply because the government will tell these lots how to manage their waste. **Councillor Fuhl** - Well, I would like to say to the Mayor that um there's 14 lots there but that's not, that's not, again it's changed and also it is what it is. That is in having septic tanks. **NOTE: I think what Councillor Fuhl is saying is that just because mistakes have been made in the past, you should not be repeating those mistakes by using them as a precedent. The newly signed Development Plan established new standards and criteria and that is what we should now be following for present and future decision making.** **Mayor Fell** - So ok would you like to defer or would you like to go forward with the vote, Councillor Fuhl. **Councillor Fuhl** - Go forward. **Councillor Wilson** - Madame Mayor, Madame Mayor, uh I believe that if you're in a um a losing situation uh you don't double down with the kind of risk this produces. I would point out to Council that in other areas of the Province close to us, St. Clements for example, um ah St. Andrews um there have been subdivisions on 1 1/2, 1.7 acre lots with a well and field and the well, and that is in heavy heavy Manitoba clay, uh these uh fields failed and polluted the wells and they had to go to piped water systems. Um it simply does not make sense to say well just because there are some smaller lots here already, we should just carry on with....**NOTE: A good example of this is in the town of Anola. The lots on the north side of #15 tend to be larger lots whereas the ones along the south side are quite small. People on the south side had wells and septic fields on small lots, some even cut off the well pipe to facilitate mowing the lawn, and the town ended up with a mandated boil water advisory because these properties contaminated their own wells. As a result, the entire town of Anola was required to go on a municipal water system at great expense to the land owners, even those who had absolutely no problems with their existing systems.** **Mayor Fell interrupts** - Councillor Wilson, are you for deferral (and Wilson is still trying to finish his sentence) .. **Councillor Wilson** - I would say that if, if... **Mayor Fell interrupts yet again** - Asking about deferral...I was asked for deferral by another Councillor so that's why I'm looking for that answer from you right now. I'm still going to ask for comments after. **Councillor Wilson** - If the um deferral would enable us to have some second thought here and uh deliberate and consider this a little further as to the risk that we would be presenting, just to this one lot, but there's people here with one plus acre lots that would want to do the same thing, I'm sure and I think a deferral would be valuable and I would uh I would be in favour of it. (Mayor Fell polls Council) **Councillor Ralke** - No. **Mayor Fell** - So based on that we will go forward with the vote. Is there any other comments from Council? Ok. **Colleen Draper** - *Whereas the owners Bill and Shauna Anderson have submitted an application to subdivide the existing parcel to create one new lot for residential purposes, be it resolved that application for subdivision no. 4189-17-7380 be approved subject to the conditions as read out by the Development Officer.* **Mayor Fell** - Thank you. Is there any further discussion from Council? All those in favour? Opposed? **CARRIED 4-2** **NOTE: Councillor Wilson provided Council with very good reasons why this subdivision should not be approved and his advice and the stipulations in the Development Plan were completely ignored. In my opinion, the most important consideration is that after years of deliberating and discussing the Development Plan with David Jopling, a professional Planner, and arriving at a well thought out Development Plan which is directing the update of the Zoning Plan and should take the RM at least 5 years into the future insofar as planning, we have varied all sorts of zoning and allowed ill advised alterations and exceptions to it and it was just signed prior to the advent of this new Council, a year and a half ago. Council is not doing their due diligence as far as I am concerned. Councillor Ralke bases her decision on the adage "two wrongs make a right". If it has been done before, right or wrong, in accordance with the Development Plan or not, go for it. Councillor Fuhl, in whose ward this subdivision is occurring, opts for the vote instead of deferring it to get additional information about the impact of small lots on water and waste. He votes against it but he should have insisted more research should be conducted into the advisability of even considering this subdivision. Mayor Fell steps in and quashes any dissenting voice by interrupting Councillor Wilson's dissertation. Councillor Bredin says nothing. Councillor Williams at least suggested deferring the vote until further information could be obtained. He should have, because as a founding member of the Springfield Accountability Group (SAG) and someone who taught me everything I know about the workings of municipal governments, and a professional engineer, he definitely knows better. As far as I am concerned, the money being wasted on the ill advised actions of this Council could be better spent improving our lagoon or repairing and dust controlling the miles of roads in this municipality. All but one on Council completely ignores 8.2.2 of their own Development Plan. It seems clear to me that Mayor Fell is NOT a team player as her decision ultimately rules the day.**

Mayor Fell asked for a mover and seconder to close the meeting and declared the meeting ADJOURNED.