

RM of Springfield November 25, 2021 6 p.m.
PLANNING MEETING

WITHOUT PREJUDICE (E&OE)

CANWHITE SANDS UPDATE - The meeting held Wednesday, December 1, 2021 at the Anola Community Club (and thanks to all those who attended and took the time to listen to the 3 presenters), was well attended and generated a great deal of interest and concern. Apparently the link on the handout is not correct. The correct link is <https://saveourwaterspringfield.com/signup/> Two other meetings are being held, December 7th, today at 7 p.m. at Cooks Creek Community Centre and December 9th 7 p.m. at Dugald Community Centre. These have been arranged and are being funded by concerned citizens of Springfield.

Length of Meeting: 2 hours 32 minutes 19 seconds

Mayor Fell - For the record, Councillor Williams is away today. He will not be attending. Going to skip down to the Public Hearing portion of the agenda, No. 5 which is 5.1 to 5.4. Can be held anytime when we have a break or at the end of the meeting. She moved on to Public Hearings. **NOTE: No sign of distress or explanation of this Councillor's lengthy absence even through the Williams family, which has just suffered a loss as published in the Winnipeg Free Press obituaries Saturday November 27th. issue and notice attached, are very close to the Mayor's family. I watched the meeting and Mayor Fell and Councillor Ralke were kibitzing and laughing before the meeting started. I would think the Mayor would want to advise the public of possible exposure to COVID 19, including her own potential exposure, which could affect the remainder of Council, other municipal elected representatives, those in the gallery, and staff of the RM of Springfield.** There was quite a delay while Dan Doucet endeavoured to sign into the meeting with the help of someone. Mayor Fell said they were having technical issues or as Doucet stated "the head set was dead". He stated he would not be reading the in-depth report as they were posted on the Web Site.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

6.1 - Proposal to Subdivide 4189-21-7603 - Dugald - 95 New Lots - Ventura Land Company Inc. - Dan Doucet - **NOTE: There was a lengthy delay due to technical issues while Mr. Doucet endeavored to dial into the meeting as "his head set was dead".** We have subdivision application 4189-21-7603. The applicant and owner is Ventura Land Company. The intent is to subdivide the existing 31.8 acres of land to create 95 residential single and two family lots within NW 1/4 of 34-10-5 in the community of Dugald, Blocks 11, 12, 13, 14 & 15, Plan 62061 NW 1/4 34-10-5. Current zoning is AG Agricultural. Development Plan designation is residential. Continuation of Wheatland Park, phases 5 and 6 of the overall planned area, south of Wheatland Drive and east of PTH 206. The drainage plan 60534 is located on the south boundary limits of this property. Application proposed to extend Harvest Moon Road, Sunset Drive, Morning Glory Way to provide access to the newly created lots. There are 2 public reserves along the northern portion of holding. Lots will be serviced by municipal sewer and water. Community & Regional Planning recommendation: ...However as presented the proposed subdivision is currently zoned AG and would have to be re-zoned RS & RT zones to accommodate the future land use. Province had 6 conditions. Doucet listed 12 conditions which include: "the storm water retention system shall be a naturalized design...**NOTE: Yet another artificial water feature to attract Marsh Bulrush and other what are considered weeds, perhaps muskrats as was experienced by one homeowner in Oakbank, mosquito breeding areas, and debate over who is responsible for maintaining these artificial "lakes".** ...a loop connection to the municipal water line from the existing fire hydrant on Holland Drive on the east side of the Dugald Community Club to the existing water line to the north limits of the Phase 4 of Wheatland Drive Plan 62061 so there's a little stub uh along Holland Drive that there is no water line, this is for the looping just to have that interconnection...to supply and install a traffic control devices and street name signage, provide fire protection, off site financial contributions for the extension of Holland Street which is to the east of Dugald Community Club to the north limits of the Phase 4, Plan 62061, landscaping and active transportation paths, driveway access location..., construction access to the development and any other public works deemed necessary by Council.....incorporated in Development Agreement. Any utilities that require relocation or modification shall be responsibility of the developer. **NOTE: My question, was any consideration given to whether or not we have the waste and water capability for this additional development.** 10% of the property development is provided to the RM of Springfield in land or cash or a combination thereof to satisfy the needs for recreational opportunities, open space and buffer zones. **NOTE: This is a reasonably new condition...probably to raise funds for the proposed Recreation Centre in Oakbank or even the new Health & Wellness facility in Dugald. It used to be collected for the School Division.** The developer shall provide a landscaping, boulevard, tree planting plan with a minimum of 4 different species of deciduous trees suitable to the local climate planted in alternating format .. variance orders to ensure compliance with Zoning By-law ...etc. He recommended approval of the subdivision subject to the conditions outlined in Option 4. **Tim Comack, Ventura** - We have a quick presentation if we could have the floor that led us through...I think what has been presented is acceptable to us. We have all the confidence in the world after...close to 15 years of working with this Municipality ...and **successfully negotiate any of the items that we're contemplating this evening.** **NOTE: What? If Council approves this resolution, they are approving it as read into the record and NO CHANGES SHOULD BE NEGOTIATED SUBSEQUENTLY that would change the intent and content of the conditions. That would be the opposite of TRANSPARENCY, ONE OF THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF THIS COUNCIL according to their Strategic Plan.** **Mr. Comack then projected a pre-prepared presentation on the screen in the Council chamber, the entirety of which can be heard on the audio file posted on the RM Web Site. THE SELL.** "mix of options..small amount of duplexes peppered into each corner SW and SE of subdivision...the average lot size of 60 ft., the park and lake lots are 11,600 sq. ft., the average standard lots ...measuring about 46 to 58 ft. in width are 8,565 sq. ft. in site size. It is important to note that your average 2 family requirement is about 5,000...we're sitting in the, you know, well above that 5000 requirement and your other standards of 7,000 and we're sitting in the 11,000 on average. Um again as I had mentioned earlier, uh because of the fact that we've collaborated, nothing that we're doing here today should come as a surprise. We're putting forward what we believe has been multiple years of conversation, multiple years of discussion, and the hope here is to continue into Phase 5 & 6 once we've built out the majority of Phases 3 & 4. I'll show you a concept plan, this concept plan should be familiar to most people and all I've done is, I've juxtaposed our application for subdivision on top of that just to show you that it's exactly what we've said we'd be doing. Um in that vein here um these 95 new units will be brought on line within the next

number of years at a pace requisite with the build out of Phase 3 & 4. We ask that Council give us due consideration as we've been at these discussions, negotiations about this overall site, the 68 some odd acres since about 2007 from my records and we're patient, we understood the Development Plan had to be brought forward in order to designate this land as it's been designated and now we're looking to put forward for Council's consideration is development and entitlement of this parcel according to those designations. As always we're welcome to any input and always willing to listen. I think that over the years we've proven that we want to be a positive member of the community and from a development perspective, we want to be the group that works with this Council and this Administration in a positive mind set towards a win - win objective. With anything else to be asked or for any questions to be answered, I'd be happy to take them at this time. Thank you. **FOR INFORMATION: Bob Askew** - We want Dugald to grow and I notice that one of the items that was in Mr. Doucet's presentation was construction access to the development. We've been complaining is the right word about traffic down Wheatland Drive for the last year and it seems to me that this is going to continue for several more years. Is there going to be serious consideration about using that access a bit further south where Reimer still is using it to get at their dirt supply? That would be one question. The second was fire protection um I see and I know that Ventura is putting in fire hydrants but they're not active as far as I know. Um I'm really concerned about that in the bigger picture and I know that they've upgraded that Water Plant in there by ..over in the corner of 206 and 15 ..um and that was really ..we did kind of think the traffic concerns we have Wheatland. Personally I don't have any kids but I'm nervous about traffic coming in on Holland with the school and the Rec Centre and the playground there. Those are kind of concerns that we've been raising around here with **Mr. Williams I totally understands his absence tonight it's very unfortunate what's happened** um but hopefully these things are still being considered just like in a broader picture. Development's great but there's certain little things that are very annoying to us that have been here since 2013. That's all, thank you. **Mayor Fell** - Dan, did you want to address those 2 questions about the fire hydrants? Do you know that information. **Dan Doucet** - No I don't ..I believe the Fire Hydrants are pressurized Uh but from our Sewer and Water Department there is water flowing through the development and with the commercial access we will try to discuss with the Department of Highways to utilize the southern access for this development. I don't know if Mr. Comack has had the opportunity to speak with Highways yet or if he has some knowledge on uh on that access proposal. **Mayor Fell** - Tim did you have a chance to speak with MI regarding that access. **Tim Comack** - Well first of all Bob thank you for your questions and yes we have had conversations about that. In fact we're long overdue for having shut it down and closed it and removed it and circumvented the removal of it this year at a demand by MI. So there is a concern that that might be a pretty steadfast request especially now that we have dealt with the soil that's there. I can work on that. I've got very good contacts at MI but with that said, I also have a secondary concern is we have a requirement to build a berm on the far west side of this property and then fence across that north-south and that's a requirement of MI as well and so that's another contract we've signed with them associated with a few things but pejoratively being the on highway improvements that we've made. And I just want to speak ...I can't speak to the fire hydrants ..that's an RM matter. We install them. We hope they're pressurized. I believe they are. I think Dan's right. Insofar as the Wheatland Drive use, I deal with this everywhere and everybody in Phase 1 doesn't want traffic from Phase 2 but yet signs often our agreement understanding that there's an overall concept plan for Phase 1 through 10 sometimes um and so it's not much I can do but I can express to you that Wheatland Drive was designed as a collector road. So it's oversized, it's intended for this use and it has on highway improvements with those specific lanes added for safety for both ingress and egress to the subdivision. We go above and beyond as best we can to deal with any issues presented on safety matters. We take safety seriously. We're a CORE certified business. In that vein, we don't just answer to Safe Work Manitoba. We answer to a broader body that's much more stringent. Insofar as how we can mitigate and manage those concerns, Venutura's ears are always open. We'll do whatever we can to work with the RM to alleviate whatever pressures and concerns associated with our work but with that said, we have to all collectively understand that we're in the midst of development on a multi-phase subdivision and sometimes being in Phase 1 and 2 means that you have construction traffic in passing through 3, 4, 5 and 6. That said, because we'll be doing Phase 5 to the south of what would be Cloverdale on the far west, we can move traffic into Wheatland and then down south um into the actual new phases at that time and that should alleviate the east-west traffic that they're dealing with now while we do Phase 3 & 4 so I see a lot of very easy solutions to these concerns and we are very motivated to alleviate residents' concerns. We don't want to be on the receiving end of any of that negativity or um bad experience. I think it's something that we've expressed with Dan that we'll always work with you on. **Bob Askew** - I appreciate what's being said and I understand but unfortunately we are..you know, the people that sell lots and the homes don't mention any of that stuff when you're buying. Um and we've lived here for 8 years before anything was done so you know, **it came as a bit of a shock with no information coming to us** and I think that's because of the requirement that you only have to notify residents within 300 ft. of a change, is that an RM law or a Federal law ...or **Mayor Fell (interrupting)** - That's set out by the Provincial Planning Act. **Bob Askew** - Can the RM not override that and let us know what's going on? **Mayor Fell** - Um in certain circumstances we do um but they're very few and far between. We want to keep a standard across the RM. **NOTE: My personal opinion is that in each case notification should be tailored to the application, the density of the population, the geography of the locale, etc. That would be an easy matter for Planning and only require a little more clerical work and postage cost.** Um so We like to follow what the Province sets out. **Bob Askew** - Like, Tim, I know you made improvements to the highway with some things that are like a passing lane on the outside or whatever and a merge lane but why are there...I don't know if you the answer there's solid lines and my understanding of the traffic laws is that if there's a solid line, you're not supposed to move into that lane um so people, the odd time when I'm turning east on to Wheatland Drive, the odd time someone will come around me but most of the time they just kind of honk at me and give me crap for you know not going faster. Um I don't know if there's an answer to it. I'm just wanting to mention like it's not working in my mind and it's not your fault, it's just that it doesn't work. So that was just a comment I want to let you know. **Tim Cormack** - We'll work with you to get something to work. My email is easy Tim@VenturaDevelopments.ca. I'm happy to meet with everybody and coordinate and communicate more broadly if that's what... **Mayor Fell interrupted.** **Bob Askew** - I got you. I know where you are. I know your white Audi that comes to town. **Mayor Fell (interrupting)** - Is there anyone else in the gallery, on line or in persons that's here for information....**As there were none and no one to speak in favour or opposed, she closed the Public Hearing and the resolution was read and voted on. CARRIED 4-0**

Mayor Fell then moved on to Planning Matters from Public Hearings on the agenda.

5.1 Proposal to Subdivide 4189-21-7609 - 27081 Dugald Rd 60N - 1 New Lot - Wayne Johnston Automotive Repairs Ltd. - Dan Doucet - Application for a 2 lot split for their existing CH Highway Commercial zoned land. Proposed Lot 1 would be 2.3 acres Proposed Lot 2 would be 3.9 acres, on the north side of PTH 15 on eastern limits of Dugald. Referred to 8 conditions. Resolution read out. **CARRIED 4-0**

Mayor Fell then returned to Public Hearings. **NOTE: As she gave forewarning that they would be re-ordering the Agenda, why is it not published in the order in which it is intended to be followed in the first place. This would give people planning to attend or observe the meeting some idea of the timing of when the items are being presented. The re-ordering may have been done to accommodate one developer with no consideration of observers or other presenters.**

6.2 Proposal to Subdivide 4189-21-7611 Penner Rd - 45 New Lots - R & M Penner Holdings Ltd - Dan Doucet - Applicant and owner intends to subdivide the existing 82.9 acres of land to create the following: 41 Commercial Lots and 4 Rural Residential Lots. Current zoning is AG and required zoning is RR - those are the lots off Murdock Road and CH are the ones off of PTH#1. Land is held under 2 separate titles. Owner intends to develop with public roads and public reserve. The Public Reserve will be utilized for land drainage. The existing commercial building proposed Lot 2 is Penner Trailers. The lots will be serviced with holding tanks, septic fields, and private wells. Provincial comments: Community & Regional Planning listed 6 recommended conditions. He then read out 12 conditions of approval. Rezoning of all lots required and possible variances and requirement of Hydrogeological Report of Groundwater Resource potential for employment area by professional engineer. REU equivalent calculation will be applied at the time of the building permit application to calculate new equivalent REU equivalent value on the said property. Wants to ensure there's enough water for this development. REU Equivalent will be applied at the time of the building permit application to calculate the new equivalent REU value on the said property. What that means is that if someone uses a higher volume of sewer and water, at the permit state we will look at the calculations and see if the REUs have to be increased on Capital Levies. There is a Letter of Objection from Elizabeth & Michael Robb to the subdivision and one letter of concern from Jeremy Ruban. **Allison Driedger of Blue Stem Consulting, professional Planner** - Gave a **presentation** on behalf of the proposal. Feels Council **would consider revising this condition** to include a **financial contribution of \$22,500 for fire protection water supply for the commercial development** for well and equipment. If not done within 10 years, condition would no longer apply. Contacted Jason from Friesen Drillers and he estimated it's between \$4,500. to \$6,000. for a well and also looked into price of submersible well pump and RM about cost for the other services required and that the RM would have 2 systems half a mile apart because there is a similar system at the water development subdivision???. **NOTE: Jason from Friesen Drillers does all the studies for the RM.** **FOR INFORMATION: Cathy ..Ruban 20141 Niakwa Road** - Hasn't lived there long enough to have been part of the Development Plan discussions. Wasn't notified as not within 300 ft. or meters as the case may be. **Discouraged to see another piece of our prairie sacrificed for commerce.** Wants to see it done with effectively with minimal negative impact on land and current residents of area. **Mayor Fell (in answer to type of businesses)** - So there's a whole list... **Cathy ..Ruban** - What specific types But I was wondering if we know primarily the developers are bringing in because... **Mayor Fell (interrupting)** - I would hesitate to ask them to comment on that at this time. The only thing you can really go off of is if one is allowed and if one is allowed, there is a list of conditional businesses that can apply and those again have to come before Council for approval. 2. What does it mean on Page 7 of the internal review doc under recommendations by Community Regional Planning "the proposed lots will be accessed by an internal road system and a future road connection has been identified". What future road connection is that referencing? **Mayor Fell** - Dan, did you want to answer that? **Dan Doucet** - Turned his screen "on the notice that went out we have the internal road system . There is an internal connection going north-south to possible future commercial designation so this is the only internal road that's the future connection if you can see that right of way because the land adjacent to the highway is currently commercial because if we put ..if we put lots there any future developments cannot interconnect. ...It could remain not developed...the right of way...for a period of time. We're just planning for the future." **Cathy ..Ruban** - So how long does the Development Plan that was put in place ...I mean how long does that get revisited I was wondering. **Mayor Fell** - We revisit it every 5 years and actually the one we just passed was 19 years in the making. ... It's not completely overhauled every 5 years, it's just revisited every 5 years to see if there's any revisions that have to be made. **Cathy ..Ruban** - So that future road...under 9.2.5 of Commercial Policies um "if a new development abutting residential areas may be required to provide protective buffering or screening to reduce the impacts of noise, unsightly storage and lighting. In addition parking and loading on side adjoining the residential areas may be prohibited" um and I do know that um there has been a buffer set up between the commercial and rural residential lots that are being built or proposed to be built but I'm noticing that the buffer for the new residences but not the current rural residences so I'm just wondering um like what is the plan for having a buffer to those who are already existing there on rural residential lots? **Dan Doucet** - The current rural residential on the west side? **Cathy ..Ruban** - On the north. **Dan Doucet** - On the north side, that is not rural residential. That's designated Agricultural that land but we put into the development agreement some fencing requirements or some landscaping buffering that we're going to be looking at in the Development Agreement. **Cathy ..Ruban** - I meant the properties though. Like the properties that are abutting it. **Dan Doucet** - There is 3 or 4 properties to the north. Those are all agricultural...**then several people started commenting all at once.** **Mayor Fell** - Excuse me, no I'm sorry you can't uh you can't jump in like that...sorry I apologize. Dan, if you could answer ..all your questions do have to be, excuse me m'am...so ok your questions have to be directed to the Chair. They can't be directed right to Dan. Dan, if you could answer that. **Dan Doucet** - There is one dwelling in the north to Lot number 5 I believe..lot number 9 in the triangle pie shaped corner lot..that's the only dwelling that is immediately abutting which is right here. That's the only...there's a dwelling right here. The rest, all the dwelling are off Murdock or uh Navin um Niakwa..thank you. **Cathy ..Ruban** - Like you're talking about the houses but is this not still their properties. It's their property...it's designated Agricultural but if you read the policy it talks about Rural Residential. This is not Rural Residential, this is Agricultural. But we will try and incorporate a buffer with the Development Agreement for either a landscaping feature or fencing. **Cathy ..Ruban** - So I am just wondering ...so on Page 3, 9.2.3 under Commercial Policies, um letter (d) factors such as noise and other potential nuisances shall be mitigated and so my question is, how are potential nuisances accounted for if we don't even know all of the businesses that will be in our front yards so noise, unsightliness, possibly smells depending on what goes in there. I'm just wondering typically cause this is new for me, how are such things mitigated that may decrease our quality of life and certainly our property values. **Mayor Fell** - In regards to noise, we do have a Noise By-law that will deal with any...so you just call in and make a complaint and an investigation is launched regarding that. Um when it's a permitted use, if there's an issue you contact the RM. If it's a Conditional Use um when we put through a resolution there are certain clauses we can put in um for light and for noise and that type of thing so again it depends on what the applicant is putting in for there...which business they want to open up. **Cathy ..Ruban** - This is a major concern for me because our property ..while it doesn't abut it looks straight out on to it so I am quite concerned about lighting you know shining all night into my yard from 41 businesses so um I am just wanting to raise that as a concern and ask them questions about that and then for point "e" under that same one ...site design shall consider aesthetic factors particularly with regard to exterior processing or storage..ok so what does "consideration" actually require of the applicant in this case should this get passed through? **Dan Doucet** - You're looking at clause #e under Design, site design considerations, um we're not going to be putting site considerations for the rural residential

which you'll be facing. There'll be either within the public reserve area with retention is at the back, likely be a fence at that location and then we'll look at the design criteria of some of those individual lots. We're going to asking for landscaping plans for the commercial lots as well and we're asking the developer to hard surface the road to prevent any dust off the road...that's all part of the development agreement strategy.

Cathy ..Ruban - And then page 9, Community and Regional Planning under point 10 says "the Developer shall provide a permanent solid fence as specified within the Development Agreement along the rear property limits". Is that talking the northern border of this development? **Dan Doucet** - Sorry, which reference were you looking at. **Cathy ..Ruban** - Page 9 under Community and Regional Planning recommendations, I think it was. Under Point 10. **Mayor Fell** - So those are under the recommendations ...Planning just takes that into consideration when creating the Development Agreement with the proponent. **Cathy ..Ruban** - Right and I'm wondering where that permanent solid fence is going to be erected. **Mayor Fell** - So again it's not that it has to be done, it's something that they're going to consider so they haven't created that document yet so until they do that Planning will make a recommendation of where it goes. Right now there's nothing solidly in place that there will be a fence there, that's just a recommendation from Beausejour Planning. **Cathy ..Ruban** - To the point when those are created, what is such a solid fence made of? **Mayor Fell** - Generally it's timber but sometimes there is um like the metal fencing with the lattice that goes through it as well. **Cathy ..Ruban** - And I was just wondering, like how tall are those typically...like what am I going to be looking at is my concern? **Mayor Fell** - Is it 8 ft. is the by-law. **Dan Doucet** - Typical fencing is 6 ft. high for these continuous fences, mostly made of treated timber. They can go, I believe, as tall as 8 ft. **Cathy ..Ruban** - And just for my knowledge, is this for sound mediation and blocking of light? Typically is that what those fences are for? **Dan Doucet** - For light, no. More aesthetics (privacy?) yup, um within our Zoning By-law it does indicate that commercial development, industrial development, must use low glow uh low shine lights (Good!) within the development so that's in our Zoning By-law and we'll incorporate that in our development agreement. **Cathy ..Ruban** - And again are you...when it's talking about that as a recommendation, I know that you don't know for sure yet but how do I advocate for my community to have a fence put up around or some sort of a barrier at the northern ..**Mayor Fell (interrupting)** - You're advocating right now (laughing) ... **Cathy ..Ruban** - I hear you. I don't even like the thought of looking out at a big long fence but I rather prefer that than 41 buildings. OK Page 7 Point 10 says "engineering study to determine the threat of groundwater pollution may be required at the time of the development agreement. I'm just checking because that's my childrens' drinking water that could possibly be polluted so I'm just wondering if it is in fact going to be required or **Mayor Fell** - Again we can't answer right now whether it'll be required or not but Dan can answer in regards to the development agreement. **Dan Doucet** - I had placed that as one of our conditions, uh, the uh ...for Council was in the resolution which is Condition #4 and asking for a hydro-geotechnical report. (oh, that's it)...that's the one... **Mayor Fell** - So it's in the resolution, then it's a requirement for the development. **Dan Doucet** - We just want to make sure the groundwater's protected and that there's enough groundwater in the area. **Cathy ..Ruban** - Ok...so uh I do see that um the Public Works Department indicate that tree planting and landscaping are requirements within the ROW, which I don't know what that is...and public reserve will apply at the time of the development agreement um landscaping, fencing and tree planting requirements are also mentioned. The developer shall provide a landscaping, boulevard, tree planting plan so this is what I'm putting forward um putting up a solid fence will help with the aesthetic damage of this commercial development for those of us who um love living in the middle of the farm land that we moved out here for and it does do something to separate our rural lives from the city and structure but I would like to request that Council considers requiring the developer to plant it and maintain the trees along that north side which would provide continuity with the existing tree lines because those properties um particularly the one that you had pointed out as having the residents right on that corner there has a tree line of beautiful trees and a beautiful farm field right beside it and just would prefer to look forward to watching trees grow than seeing the buildings there. ...it would also be in keeping with the expectations set out for the developer according to the policy document indicating requirements for protecting or having existing tree stands mitigating noise and other potential nuisances, providing protective buffering and screening being appropriately landscaped in consideration of the current uses. ..Thank you..

NOTE: I would like to commend Ms. Ruban on her comprehensive review of this proposal to subdivide and speaking up for her neighbourhood. BUT I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO COMMENT THAT THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN IS ONLY A YEAR OR SO OLD, THE ZONING BY-LAW TO CORRESPOND TO IT IS NOT YET FINALIZED, but this Council is approving an inordinate number of changes to the zoning and thus usage of municipal lands. I would have thought considering the age of the document, very little change SHOULD BE REQUIRED FOR THE NEXT 5 YEARS until another review of the document is conducted.

Cole Mackie, 57082 Murdock Road - It's the most direct property and I think Cathy has said everything well. The biggest thing is it's got to be ..Dan, you've got to provide some better uh information regarding that fence. It's got to be a little bit more engineered a little better than what you're just saying...8 ft. high, timber. I'd recommend that you guys actually put a 50 ft. buffer from our property on the north side there from where you're going to start uh the development. You know, that's kind of where we're at. We're going to see a lot more continuity in that plan on the north side there to protect our livelihoods and what we do cause obviously that's going to be a lot of commercial applications right in our back door. So you should also speak with my Mother. She's here being a res and I'll pass her off to you as well. Thank you. **?Mrs. Mackie (did not identify herself)** - I am also a medical foster mom. I have 4 complex care children which means they require 24 hour nursing care and an environment that's conducive to quiet, to good air quality because I have 3 little boys with tracheotomies and one on a ventilator so this is a huge issue for me. Huge. We moved out here a year ago because my children are indigenous and one Inuit, to provide them with an environment that improves their quality of life, not just their health but everything. It gives them a holistic life. That will not happen cause now I will look from my front, off my front kitchen deck, on to your businesses. And noise is huge. I have an autistic child who noise is her enemy and for you who know anything about Autism, chaos, activity, all those things are life changing for them. I have a little boy in a wheelchair who spends excessive amounts of time cause that's all he has is to go for walks down our driveway and on to Murdock Road. That will be taken away from him because it will be a safety issue. He is in a wheelchair. How am I going to make sure that the nurses caring for him are not going to have issues with traffic, all those kinds of things, like you're right beside my property. It totally has taken away what I worked very, very hard to bring these children. Like air quality, like all those things that I bring these little children that spent...I have children that have spent 2 to 4 years of their life in the hospital. I bring them out here to bring them peace and that's all being taken away from them. It is. **Mayor Fell** - Thank you. Is there anyone else in the gallery or on line... **NOTE: Listen to the audio file. The Mayor is complete unaffected by this emotional presentation.**

IN OPPOSITION: Cathy Rubin, 20141 Niakwa Road - I am not happy about that future road being put in there...I am going to speak in opposition of it due to that future road being put up to make it easier or conducive for the agriculture preserve that's out my front door to be made into commercial land or industrial land. **IN FAVOUR: Ernie Waldner** - I'm in the area...live somewhat in the area and also have a business in the area...and I could maybe bring some peace of mind to some of the opposition. So...the RM of Springfield unlike some others do a very good job on keeping things clean and proper and to protect residential from commercial and whatever and some of the things so I think ..there's a confidence that I have they're doing pretty good but also

in terms of pollution they're talking about, it's ...this is a primarily dominated by farm community in that area which is a lot more pollution and odors and etc. which some people concerned, were concerned of, a lot more that the majority of the commercials, industries that are made up in that area cause so a concern is more in the agriculture than it actually is in commercial if you look at this. There's some regulations that they have quite a bit and so I just wanted to maybe balance that out a little bit. I wouldn't be too terribly concerned and I am certainly in favour of that development. I do think that Springfield needs in those areas a few more developments in those areas, regulated development, so I'm 100% in favour of that development. **NOTE: I must agree that the modern agricultural industry with its chemical soil additives and aerial spraying probably present more of a hazard than a business in a building that sells "gismos" or "equipment" etc. if you disregard the fact that every one of those potential businesses are going to be a draw down on water reservoirs and will be generating waste. Further no one has mentioned that there are other lands in the Development Plan that were set aside for commercial/industrial development while this particular parcel WAS NOT. Further this gentleman has a business in the area and possibly land that would increase in value if it were zoned commercial/industrial rather than agricultural while those currently living there on land zoned rural residential could potentially see their property values significantly decrease.** **IN OPPOSITION: Michael Robb, 57057 Murdock Road** - My wife and I own a parcel of rural residential lot that is immediately opposite the subject lot on Murdock Road so I wrote a letter which was posted this evening and I hope that everyone's had a chance to read.... **Mayor Fell (interrupting)** - We reviewed it. ... **Michael Robb** - my letter of opposition...thank you very much, Mrs. Chairperson. I would like to add to the letter. In some of the things that I've learned tonight and just ...you know we've owned this parcel of land for some time and we do appreciate the importance of uh staying current and keeping abreast of what's going on in the RM and in particular attending Council meetings but I'm taken very much by surprise tonight. Some of the information that was presented by the proponent, the consultant that's brought in on behalf of the land owner for developing this parcel of land. I actually didn't know that there was ..I actually didn't know that in 2018 the RM undertook ..undertook this revision of the Development Plan, I guess it is **Mayor Fell (interrupting)** - It actually wasn't a revision, it was...like it hadn't been looked at or redone since 2001 so it was actually a previous Council that started it and we held 15 open houses and it was almost 3 years in the making. **Michael Robb** - So I apologize, I must live...you know I actually don't think I live under a rock...but I am kind of surprised ...in what's presented tonight is the consultant that works on behalf of the landowner was present...and successful and able to change the designation of this land ...and I didn't even know that ..it was taking place ...the change of the property directly across the street from me...was taking place...absolutely understand the importance of staying abreast with what's taking place ...I kind of wish....just in the same way I got notice of this hearing..that there was some kind of duty to inform owners...within a certain proximity...I never received a letter from the RM about any change in designation to the land across the street. ...Map No. 1 ..if the employment lands are coloured red and the rural residential lots are coloured orange...difficult to find a place where these 2 colours come together...difficult to find where the RM is going to allow the creation of new Rural Residential lots that are immediately adjacent to employment lands. ...only Transport Road or Springfield Road and Wenzel ...where rural residential lots are basically adjacent to employment lands...the depth of lot considering it is to be changed to Highway Commercial ..not consistent with other properties...other commercial lots existing on Deacons corner...not of the same scale. This is not a small undertaking. The size and scope of what is being proposed here....very significant undertaking. ...highway commercial.... nice on highway side but not on rear side. Already had an issue with a neighbour wanting to expand. Having 40 more of these businesses is concerning...kind of businesses being operated in Phase 1 now I would suggest ...probably operate on a conditional basis...and lean towards industrial uses....operate like general contractor...equipment that needs to run in winter months....make a lot of noise. Not familiar with many other places in the city ...where we have commercial or maybe near industrial activities next to a cemetery. Can only imagine someone being laid to rest while noise of businesses is going on. **Rene Fiola 58008 Murdock Road** - Took me by surprise...haven't received anything in regards to ...these projects that were in the works ...for example the other site that this gentleman brought up earlier on Murdock Road with the construction outfit. We hear through the grapevine...neighbours knocking on the door...don't receive anything from you guys ...I missed most of this meeting...but would like to oppose this project just because the lack of information that was proposed at the time to the neighbouring properties. **Councillor Fuhl** - My question to the proponents is would you look at doing something on the north side there for that resident that lives direct to those lots and also for the resident that's on Niakwa Road? **Unidentified Speaker** - I may address that. My name is Marcel Jodoin, Counsel for the owner and the applicant. I just want to clarify one matter...you had indicated that we are prepared to ...to pay \$22,500. for that water supply and system..the intention of course is that we would ...that number has been discussed...Mr. Doucet and I had a number of conversations with respect to that and we just wanted to have a particular number set so that the developer has some sense of what this may cost ...we costed it out and said basically we ...are prepared to pay for that cost... With respect to the house on the north, Mr. Doucet and I have had some discussions with respect to that ...and there was an initial discussion with respect to fencing, should we have fencing go at a particular area there and at the end of the day, Mr. Doucet and I both concluded that the best way of dealing with this is in fact by having that issue dealt with appropriately in the Development Agreement once this is approvedyes we can build a fence but the practical problem with the fence is that it looks great for 5 years and then 10 years from now it doesn't look so good so our suggestion would bediscussions we had with that homeowner ..we would provide some trees to be planted on that property along the driveway so that there would be this natural vegetation ..along that boundary....long term we thought that would be a much better solution... Something we hope to deal with in the development agreement..hopefully to the satisfaction of the homeowner..to the north. **Mayor Fell** - We'll discuss it further when we talk about the resolution. Closed the Public Hearing. *Whereas R&M Holdings Limited has submitted an application to subdivide an existing approximate 82.9 acres of land to create the following: 41 commercial lots and 4 rural residential lots, be it resolved that application for subdivision number 4189-21-7611 be approved subject to the conditions as read out by the Development Officer.* **Mayor Fell** - I wanted to clarify with Councillor Fuhl, do you want to put in there specifically to put a tree line and a shrub line along the north side of the property? **Councillor Fuhl** - I do. Mayor Fell then asked that it be added in "and wherever else the Development Officer considers it appropriate for the development" of significant size. **Councillor Ralke** - Ya I just wanted to ask the Development Officer if you'll have um uh the added conversation with the proponent or the citizen in the concern with the roadway...is there an alternate location, is there something else that would work better when you talk about that road that is being placed, is that for the future, is that part of the development. **Dan Doucet** - That interior road to the north, that little stub road, that's a future connection point. It doesn't have to be developed at this point in time. **(Ralke is trying to talk while he is talking.)** Within the development agreement we can leave it as a right of way that is undeveloped **(Perfect)** to there is no physical road at that location. There may be some drainage swales along there to accommodate drainage...um **Mayor Fell** - You'll take that into consideration with your development agreement... **(Fantastic)** **Dan Doucet** - I'd just like to add one more point. ROW represents Right of Way. **Councillor Fuhl** - I would also like that the Development Officer take into consideration again for the home on the north side to look at what would be reasonable other..on top of the trees because we're talking about

the fencing, with the wood fence, not lasting a long time ...we'd look at something there on top of the trees just because of the concern with the residents with the children there. **NOTE: ?On top of the trees..... I am assuming he means in addition to the trees.** Dan Doucet - I think I'll be in consultation with that land owner (Mayor Fell talking while he is speaking "development agreement") during the development agreements and you know if there's berming required or some other separation measures. Colleen Draper, at the request of the Mayor, read out the additional clause... *a tree and shrub line to be planted along the north side of the development and approved by Public Works.*

CARRIED 4-0

They then took a 5 minutes break, returned and did the following items which don't require my comments and were dealt with without much if any commentary: 6.3, 6.4, 6.6, and 6.8.

6.5 Variance 21-69 (0 side yard setback of pool change room on Rochelle Bay in Oakbank) garnered some discussion but the most affected current neighbour was not in disagreement with the placement of the accessory building (change room re pool) so there was an adjustment to the conditions. Some neighbour did complain but it was not the one most affected. Much discussion occurred after hearing closed. Mayor has no problem with leaving it there as long as they put eavestroughs, downspouts, roof rake etc. and get agreement from most affected neighbour. Councillor Ralke brought up potential future sale of property and implications at that time so it was agreed that this variance should be brought to the attention of future buyers and if survey done, and building observed to be encroaching, should be a requirement to move. *Condition No. 1 place eavestroughs on the rear of the accessory building with downspouts towards the water retention area along with a rook rake to prevent snow landing on the neighbouring property. No. 2 If a surveyor building permit is provided then the building is to be observed as encroaching and the accessory building must be relocated at that time.* **CARRIED 4-0** It was a very poorly handled item, much disorganized commentary but not worthy of my transcription and comments.

6.7 Conditional Use 21-45 67110 Poplar Rd. 31E - Home Industry - Dunkley - There were 2 letters of objection from neighbours so it was only approved for 2 years, until 2022. They will have to re-apply then. **CARRIED 4-0**

6.9 Conditional Use 21-46 - 63136A Briercliffe Road 34E - Renewal of Temporary Additional Dwelling Habing - For some reason this was shown as Habing 1 and Habing 2, all under the same Conditional Use, but there was only one Conditional Use. **CARRIED 4-0**

5.2 Re-Zoning By-law 21-27 - AG to CH & RR - Blk 8 & 29 Plan 433 - R & M Penner Holdings Ltd - 1st Reading - *Be it resolved that First Reading be given to By-law No. 21-27 being a by-law of the RM of Springfield to re-zone all those lands under CT #2897614/1 described as Blocks 8 and 29 Plan 433 in Lot 44 RCMP from AG Agricultural General Zoning District to CH Commercial Highway Zoning District and RR Rural Residential Zoning District.* **CARRIED 4-0**

5.3 Re-Zoning By-law 21-28 - AG to RS & RT - Block 11 to 15 Plan 62061 - Ventura Land Company Inc. - 1st Reading - *Be it resolved that First Reading be given to By-law 21-28 being a by-law of the RM of Springfield to re-zone all those lands under CT #292033/1 described as Block 11 Title No. 3088451/1 as Block 12, Title No. 292939/1 of Blocks 13 Title No. 2929041/1 as Block 14 and Title No. 2929042/1 as Block 15 Plan 62061 in part of the NW 1/4 of 34-10=5 from AG Agricultural General Zoning District to RS Residential Single Family Zoning District and RT Residential Two Family Zoning District.* **CARRIED 4-0**

5.4 Oakbank South Secondary Plan Amendment By-law 21-29 - PR206 & Cedar Lake Road 62N - Kothari Group/Wilkinson - 1st Reading - *Be it resolved that First Reading be given to By-law No. 21-29 being a by-law of the RM of Springfield to amend the Oakbank South Secondary Plan By-Law No. 21-20 to include text amendment of Section 4.2.5.2 Access Management to state the following: Proposed connections to Cedar Lake Road are zoned on the land use and transportation policy map. These accesses are considered temporary albeit longer term in nature and will be removed at such time as the SW 1/4 16-11-5 develops and a connection is made to Vernon Road or future Cedar Lake corridors built, whichever occurs first. Map amendment Section 7 Land Use and Transportation Policy Map to show PR206 access approximately 400 meters north of Cedar Lake Road and a collector road connection and additional temporary access for Cedar Lake Road and collector road connection.* **CARRIED 4-0**

MEETING ADJOURNED