

RM OF SPRINGFIELD PLANNING MEETING  
Thursday, October 22, 2020 6 p.m. held at Cooks Creek Community Centre

WITHOUT PREJUDICE (E&OE)

At the registration desk they gave attendees a 3 page handout titled The Planning Hierarchy with org. chart type presentations of both the Development Plan and the Zoning By-law Adoption Processes. ?????? I am unsure what purpose they meant to serve by doing this as our current Development Plan received final approval less than 2 years ago and Council has done nothing but make alterations to it since then, even before the Zoning By-law has been updated to mirror any changes to 08-01 as a result of the amended Development Plan. Regardless of the designation of an area, Council has found ways to circumvent the agreed upon long term use of certain tracts of land. As an example, BERGER PEAT purchased land on Oakwood Road west of PTH 207 designated Agricultural and in a rural residential area on Lornehill Road and Oakwood Road W. to the floodway. While the product, peat, is used for horticulture purposes, it is classified as a mineral, falls under Mines & Mineral Resources of the Department of Sustainable Development and the cleaning, processing and packaging of the product are considered an Industrial use. Nonetheless Mayor Fell and her Councillors erroneously passed a resolution declaring peat to be an agricultural product (ostensibly in agreement with the Province of Manitoba which turned out not to be fact) and allowed Berger Peat to proceed to commence construction of their facility without benefit of a conditional use or any other type of public hearing until public protest occurred. They then held an "information only" type meeting hosted by Berger Peat at the Dugald Community Club and while Council was in attendance, they did not assert themselves officially in the meeting. They merely hovered at the rear of the room. Berger Peat is under no particular restrictions insofar as dust, noise, odours, hours of operation, etc. The rights of the long time residents were completely ignored. Similarly on Poplar Road south of PTH 15, without any consideration of the immediate neighbours, our Council and Planning Department allowed PARRISH & HEIMBECKER to build I would guess two gigantic 5 storey grain terminals on land zoned agricultural after stripping and hauling away the good topsoil and replacing it with gravel (I had a giant crack in my windshield and gaping crater to prove it) on land zoned agricultural. While these eye-sores may be used to store chemicals employed in farming, the chemicals themselves are not agricultural products and the purpose of the facility is commercial. Further there are no marker lights as yet atop these edifices which I believe is contrary to the dictates of Transport Canada insofar as aviation requirements. To the south of the terminals, they are constructing what looks to be a some type of commercial building a few stories in height. This has forever changed the lives of the adjacent rural residential constituents whose objections were largely ignored by Council. I think these constructions exceed what was described as a "grain storage facility" on the agenda and should have been more correctly labelled "grain storage terminals". **CORRECT ME IF I AM WRONG BUT IS COUNCIL NOT SUPPOSED TO REPRESENT THE WISHES AND BEST INTERESTS OF THE MAJORITY OF TAXPAYERS IN A MUNICIPALITY, NOT BUSINESS ENTITIES. AND THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IS "COMPLICIT" AS THEY MUST SIGN OFF ON PLANNING MATTERS AND ON ISSUES AFFECTING RESOURCES SUCH AS AQUIFERS.** That affected Wards 1 and 5 but also still under threat is Ward 4 due to a company from Alberta and BC called CANWHITE SANDS that has petitioned Council and Planning to erect a silica sand processing plant in the vicinity of the peaceful hamlet of Vivian before they have even applied for mining permits. While the Council of the RM of Tache has done the right thing by their constituents, achieving a moratorium on even exploratory bore hole digging in their municipality, our Council is affording us no protection whatsoever. Instead we had the support of the provincial Liberal Party, Dr. Jon Gerrard himself attending a meeting and spending 4 hours standing in the parking lot of the Petrocan at the junction of Hwys. 12 and 15 obtaining signatures on a petition to abort the efforts of CanWhite Sands. I won't even go into the 12 acres of aggregate reserve sold to PINERIDGE HOLLOW for a hotel, spa, and merchant village atop another vulnerable aquifer providing potable water to residents of Springfield. **NOTE: I am dismayed at Council's cavalier attitude and behaviour toward their electorate. Mayor Fell always calls a 5 minute break after Council approves a controversial item, then runs out to confront the disheartened constituents and it appears is able to sweet talk them into acquiescence, I have no idea how, outside the hearing of the public. THIS IS UNCONSCIONABLE! Mayor Fell and Councillor Ralke are observed texting each other throughout the course of the meeting and Mayor Fell on the recording is obviously having trouble maintaining a serious composure. I would suggest communication devices other than the microphones each member of Council is wearing for ZOOM should be prohibited from the table in front of each councillor. There should be no private communications going on at the Council table during a meeting, as has been observed between Mayor Fell and Councillor Ralke. In a single Planning meeting there are 4 Development Plan amendment/Rezoning By-laws. GO FIGURE!!! OUR DEVELOPMENT PLAN WHICH WAS IN THE MAKING FOR 10 YEARS OR MORE AND FINALLY APPROVED WITHIN THE LAST 2 YEARS SHOULD NOT REQUIRE THIS AMOUNT OF AMENDMENTS SO SOON AFTER ITS COMPLETION. THE SOUND QUALITY OF THE RECORDING IS TERRIBLE!!!!**

5.1 and 5.1.1 (2nd Reading) Development Plan Amendment By-law 20-15 Agricultural Preserve to Employment NE-11-10-4 EPM Make Space - DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT to re-designate lands from Agricultural Preserve Area to Employment Lands. Lands affected described under Certificate of Title #3023133/1 as follows: All that portion of the northerly 285 feet perp of the easterly 1100 feet perp of the SE 1/4 of Section 11-10-4 EPM which lies to the west of the western limit of Road Plan 7905 WLTO in NE 1/4 11-10-4 EPM. Make Space Storage owns the property to the north of the subject site and operates a Mini-Warehouse and Self Storage business there. Wish to expand business to the south and intend on using the land for the parking and storage of vehicles, trailers and containers. They do not intend on adding permanent structures on this lot at present. Property will require a re-zoning from AG Agricultural General to MG Industrial General to allow for the expansion of the storage building. Manitoba Infrastructure requires consolidation of the various titles to provide legal access onto PR 207 as they will not approve any additional access to PR207. **NOTE: Doucet did not mention that they require written confirmation drainage is not**

an issue and may require a detailed drainage plan prepared by qualified experts or that they had concerns about the impact the additional traffic generated may have on PR207 and may require some traffic projections to determine need for a detailed Traffic Impact Study prepared by a qualified engineer and what, if any, highway improvements may be required. Community Planning recommends consolidation of the 4 titles to ensure that all properties have legal access on to PR207 but has no concerns with approval of this by-law. Will not allow any additional access. Sustainable Development reminds the proponent that some subdivisions/developments may require an engineered drainage plan and all water control works require licensing under the Water Rights Act. Need Minister's approval before proceeding to Third Reading. **Mayor Fell** - (here the recording goes silent for a significant length of time after she asks if the proponent is "on line"). **Dan Doucet** - For Make Space applicant is Adam Nesbitt, Operations Manager, and Danny Friedman is owner and apparently neither were on line. *Be it resolved that Second Reading be given to By-law No. 20-15 being a by-law of the RM of Springfield to re-designate all those lands described under Certificate of Title #3023133/1 (all that portion of the NLY 285 feet perp of the ELY 1100 feet perp of the SE1/4 of section 11-10-4 EPM which lies to the west of the western limit of road plan 7905 WLTO in NE 1/4 11-10-4 EPM) from Agricultural Preserve Area to Employment lands.* **CARRIED 6-0**

**6.1 and 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 (2nd and 3rd Reading) Re-Zoning By-law 20-14 Industrial Extractive to Agricultural Restricted E 8-12-5 EPM - Charkewycz - Dan Doucet** - We have By-law 20-14 to rezone a parcel of land within the SE 1/4 of 8-12-5 being Lots 2 & 3 of Plan 18095. The intent is to re-designate lands from MX Industrial Extractive Zone to AR Agriculture Restricted Zoning District. I would recommend Council grant second and third reading. Miss Valerie Charkewycz has applied to re-zone the subject site being 4.4 acres from Industrial to Agricultural which was AR in a previous Zoning By-law but was inadvertently changed to MX in 2010 when it should have remained AR. **NOTE: Again there is a big silence after he ceases speaking.** **Mayor Fell** - Asks Mrs. Charkewycz if she has anything to add and she responds NO and also no other response received on line or in person. She then closes the public hearing. Second reading and third & final reading read. **CARRIED 6-0**

**7.1 and 7.1.1 (2nd Reading) Development Plan Amendment By-law 20-18 Residential to Employment SW 27-11-5 EPM Didyk - Dan Doucet** - I've had a number of inquiries from the general public on this application. He then refers to the handout given to attendees titled The Planning Hierarchy. (laughing) The application for the planning amendment is the first step and is for one piece of property. Application is reviewed and must be approved by the Minister, Provincial Government as well as the municipality. Council cannot proceed further than 2nd Reading. If both Council and Province approve, then it must go for Re-Zoning which is currently RM Residential Multi-Family to CH Highway Commercial Zoning. That is where the detail as to what you can do with the property comes in and at the re-zoning stage Council can attach conditions such as a Development Agreement. Council could be restrictive at that stage and prohibit such things as gas stations, etc. **NOTE: Perhaps Council and the Planning Department are the ones that need a review of the planning process. The proper process was followed and as a result, a Development Plan was arrived at short 2 years ago. Now before the Zoning By-law has even been updated to reflect any changes to the Development Plan, Council and the Planning Department are varying what was arrived at through the regular process.** Site is just north of the Oaks Condo. Mr. Quinton Didyk appearing on behalf of a numbered company 10006348 Manitoba Limited making application to re-designate site under land title 30609781 SW 1/4 27-11-5 from Residential to Employment area. The owner would like to develop and eventually rezone this property to have a mini warehouse and self storage business with exterior storage of recreational vehicles, boats, and other vehicles. Previous owners found it cost prohibitive to extend municipal services to the location to enable multi-family residential development. He said water services end at the carwash. Putting water and sewer under railway could be an issue and very expensive. Access would have to be moved to the northern limit of the property. Provincial Agriculture Resource Branch are against any future expansion of the employment area northward along PR206. Infrastructure is not supportive of any development that has large volumes of traffic associated with it and would require further traffic information and drainage plan prior to any development of the property. Conservation may require an engineered drainage plan and licensing under the Water Rights Act. Community Planning would recommend entering into a development agreement on this property to restrict it to only those enterprises requiring low volumes of traffic. Only those who object will be notified subsequently and they must then put their objection in writing. **MR. DIDYK WAS ON LINE but had nothing to add. IN OPPOSITION: Cathy Loewen, Oaks North** - Opposes application. **Jill Overall, retired school teacher** - Our family, Derek and myself and our boys have lived in Springfield for 28 years and we've lived in the town of Oakbank on Aspen Drive for the past 21 of those years and we still live there now. I understand that an application has been made to erect a storage facility on Main Street at the north end of town. I'm here to present an objection to the proposed re-zoning of SW 27-11-5E for a number of reasons. Firstly, as a taxpayer of Springfield I'd like to suggest that ventures such as this are best served in the Industrial area. In a Consumer Affairs report advising Canadians on issues that they might find while renting a storage facility it noted fire as a significant potential hazard for renters of units. In our Springfield Industrial area we already support Fire Station #3 which is located in that industrial area. The rationale for establishing that fire station was that the response time to those industries would be improved greatly if we established a fire hall closer to them. So with that same rationale in mind if we limit the number of industries in our residential area it will cut down on response times to residences in the municipality. Secondly this storage facility will have to implement security measures that don't mesh well with residential living and I'm speaking of the condo building right next door that houses 26 units. The facility will have the compound continually lit up for security and with the current height of lighting stands allowed to be up to 30 ft. in height, that puts security lights directly in the windows of all the units on the north side of the condo. The facility will have to erect fencing all around the compound for security. They'll have outdoor parking storage for boats, campers, trailers, whatever toy you have and this is not a good aesthetic nor what we want to greet people at the north entrance to the town of Oakbank. A fenced-in storage facility at the north entrance to our community will not generate Oakbank pride. My third point is that we have a beautification committee that work hard all year to keep Oakbank beautiful. They establish sidewalks and benches in conjunction with the municipality. There's an army of volunteers who drive up and down both sides of Main Street watering those lovely flower baskets all summer. That is pride in our community and that says

great community spirit. I've spoken with the Chair of that Committee who's also signed a petition and they believe that this facility is counter to beautifying Oakbank. And my next point is, it won't just be our Springfield residents using this storage facility. There'll be many others from elsewhere and it's that unknown element that may be coming to visit our town of Oakbank so put it in an Industrial Area where there are no houses and no families. And my last point is possibly the most concerning...you, our elected representatives seem to have overstepped your authority and you've not followed the established process for rezoning applications. That process includes applications to rezone being made followed by a public hearing just like this to see if there are objections and then and only then you vote to see if the application moves on and you're probably going to tell me you haven't voted yet, you haven't taken an official vote but it seems like you've given an unofficial go ahead to this application. I called my Councillor, Howard Bredin, nice conversation and I told him my concerns and he called me right back and he was very honest with his responses to my questions and when I asked my Councillor if the council had given the applicant the impression that he could go ahead, he indicated that you had. He, along with other Council members, were sure that this decision was a popular one and that Council hadn't heard any objections. Well, I'd like to point out that you had not yet asked us. You hadn't asked Springfield residents if they had objections, you jumped the gun because here we are, objecting. Apparently most of you on Council, perhaps all of you, have toured the site and you've given the applicant your blessing. My Councillor explained that one of his reasons for being in favour of this application was that this would solve a parking issue that we had on some streets in Oakbank because driveways were filled with boats and other toys and cars were being left on the street. Well, I believe it is not due to a lack of available storage. I believe my fellow Oakbankians are choosing not to store their recreational toys elsewhere cause there's numerous storage facilities within a 20 minute drive. My Councillor also stated that the Springfield Industrial area was too far away for people to store things there but I'm not sure why a 15 minute drive is too far. It's not like people need to go and visit their boat while it is put up for the winter? He also explained that this particular property had been up for sale for a lengthy period of time and no offers until now so this idea seems like a good solution to everyone. But I kind of chuckled because with an initial list price on 3 acres of a million dollars, it was no surprise to anyone that it didn't sell. And it's not your job to help anyone sell their property. The decision Council makes on this rezoning application will be precedent setting. If you rezone this residential lot to employment commercial highway if then this business doesn't turn out to be viable, can any random commercial business then move in. You've said that you might be able to set parameters. Will it be in writing somewhere once you guys are out and someone else is voted in? Will they remember or is it written somewhere? If you've lost control of the direction of development on that lot on our Main Street at the entrance to town it's going to be really disappointing. I am submitting to you a petition signed by 44 residents of the Springfield Municipality. Included in those signatures are signatures of the residents of Oaks North who have the most to lose. This year their combined tax contributions to the municipality topped \$60,000. Since they were built, they have contributed over a million in taxes. I hope that entitles them to expect their elected representatives will take their concerns seriously and make a decision that protects them. *We the undersigned object to allowing Lot SW27-11-5E to be rezoned to employment for the purpose of erecting a storage facility. We do not believe that this industry is in keeping with the work done to beautify the Main Street of Oakbank and with the ongoing work of residents to create community pride nor is it harmonious with the long existing residences already established in the area.* Obviously this applicant is extremely confident that you will rezone this land to benefit this single business because you've already told him or her that you will. The undersigned hope that you maintain the current zoning of residential for the benefit of all current and future Springfield residents. This business is better suited for an already zoned commercial/industrial district or somewhere other than Main Street. At the very least, you must slow down, put on the brakes, and adhere to the process already set up for you to follow. **I believe you are out of order.** Thank you for listening. **Mayor Fell** - Miss Overall, you mentioned that you couldn't hear Dan very well when he was speaking. So you continually mentioned a rezoning application. This is not a rezoning application. This is a Development Plan amendment. **Ms. Overall** stated the obvious, that this is the first step to rezoning and stipulated that she is opposed to the Development Plan amendment. **NOTE: Does Mayor Fell think that the residents of Springfield are lacking in intelligence. While she is correct that this is a Development Plan amendment, since the current Development Plan was just approved within the last two years, it is OBVIOUS TO ALL BUT THOSE OF LESS THAN AVERAGE INTELLIGENCE THAT THERE WOULD BE NO PURPOSE IN AMENDING THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN with respect to this property UNLESS THERE WAS A NEED TO DO SO and it is equally obvious that the need to do so MUST BE TO FACILITATE THE GOAL OF THE PURCHASER TO CONVERT THIS RESIDENTIAL LOT INTO A STORAGE BUSINESS WHICH OF COURSE DOES NOT COMPLY WITH THE CURRENT DESIGNATION OF THE PROPERTY, RURAL RESIDENTIAL. I found Mayor Fell's response to Ms. Overall to be somewhat CONDESCENDING and compliment Ms. Overall on her constraint and measured response. If this were affecting my future life style, I am not sure I would have been quite so polite.** **Owner of Unit 301 overlooking the site** - I live at the southwest corner of Oaks North which overlooks the property in question. She has a petition with 33 more signatures, in addition to the one already mentioned. Owners of condos in Oaks North bought into this property because of the proximity to agricultural land. They would not have invested in their condos if they knew it was going to be located next to a commercial property. Values based on quiet country environment. Some condos have just recently sold and she can imagine the surprise the new owners will feel when they find out what is proposed for next door. Mentioned fenced, rodents, toxic and flammable substances such as fireworks being stored next door and possibly maintenance work on site, strangers coming and going to the property, devaluation of condos. Spoke to Conditional Use agreement. Owners did not follow advice to meet with the owners of the condos but they were able to meet with all members of Council. Some owners did not receive written notification, only heard by word of mouth, and Council did not ensure that they did. Seems the process being rushed. Fears loss of value of their properties which could be affected by Council's arbitrary decisions. Council's duty is to protect existing residents from encroachment by non suitable neighbors. "Employment" designation is misleading and any suggestion a storage facility would generate any amount of employment opportunities is unrealistic and would lead to a designation of Highway Commercial. We are suspicious, we don't know this neighbour and we don't feel safe. There would be traffic in and out, lights, and no trees or berm would mask potential downsides, loss of feeling of safety. Traffic is a serious concern as strange

vehicles could be coming and going at all hours. There are other properties available in the RM for commercial enterprises. I have the right to expect protection from Council. What is the "other side of the story" that is not being told. Feels there is a serious lack of transparency issue here. At very least, decision should be tabled pending further thought. Unelected Planning Department has overstepped its bounds in her opinion. If approved, our property values will spiral down and our properties should accordingly be assessed at a much lower value. Asked Council to vote against. **Darryl Speer** - Has relative living there and supports stated objections. Development Plan recently accepted allows properties suitable for Employment lands. Thinks the Ag Resource Branch expressed opposition to future development north of CPR tracks and think this should apply this application as well. **Mr. Didyk** in answer to **Councillor Fuhl's** question, said he did not follow Council's suggestion to speak to residents of condo due to COVID 19 restrictions. Didyk believes it would not have changed any of the sentiments expressed. Would be willing to speak with the residents. **Councillor Fuhl** said contrary to what has been said, his mind is not yet made up. **Councillor Wilson** asked that decision be deferred until proponent meet with Condo residents and discuss concerns. **Councillor Ralke** as usual tended to echo the Mayor's statements that this is not a rezoning and feels that if Mr. Didyk showed the residents what the site will look like in future, that would give residents some relief. **Mr. Didyk** said too early in stage to provide complete draft of what property will look like if this proceeds but objections he has heard are based on **assumptions** of what the property could potentially look like and he would like a few moments to relay some information that would quell some of the concerns. He didn't anticipate objections and submitted as part of the application some example of facilities of this nature and they are routinely placed next to residential dwellings (e.g. St. Anne's Self Storage and Steinbach Self Storage Facility) and commonplace throughout the province. He would expect some restriction being placed on lighting and would not necessarily be a 24/7 accessible facility. The storage structures are only 10 to 12 ft. high and motion activated lighting set at 6 to 7 ft. Have had a professional engineer on site regarding potential need for drainage structure, vegetation, etc. Planning berm 54 to 60 feet wide and 6 to 7 ft. high and topped with vegetation for a natural barrier. Says there are only 8 windows of condo facing north, two of which are common areas, but they have discussed vegetation barriers. This is just a process and this is just the first stage in this process. **Ralke** and **Fell** both re-iterated this is not a rezoning application, merely a development plan amendment. **Councillor Ralke** said she "knows many people that drive past that property every day and they have never even noticed there is an empty lot there because of the trees" and **Mr. Didyk** said they might have to remove only 10 trees on the northerly boundary of the property to provide for drainage if approved. **Councillor Williams** felt the residents should talk to staff and Council so they could understand "the process" and that might alleviate some of their objections. **Mayor Fell (delay because he phone rang)** emphasized Council could attach all sorts of conditions including meeting with affected residents, which conditions are VERY EXTENSIVE AND THEY COULD ACTUALLY RESTRICT THE TYPE OF BUSINESS LOCATING THERE. Said they could not start construction until conditions fulfilled. She went on and on "defensively" to justify this amendment. Apparently some of the condo residents received a letter and some did not. **ONE OF THE SPEAKERS TRIED TO REITERATE (not on recording) AND THAT IS WHEN MAYOR FELL TRIED TO "PUT THE BLAME ON CANADA POST"**. **Doucet** mentioned that the conditions are included on the title and if property sold, the conditions continue to be valid. He also mentioned 2 letters of support received, one from Darilyn Magnusson and one from the Springfield Chamber of Commerce and asked if he could be provided with a copy of the petitions mentioned at this hearing. **Mayor Fell** read the support letters mentioned, one from Mr. Trush, one from the Springfield Chamber of Commerce, and then one from Darilyn Magnusson of Coldwell Banker. **Scott Chabluk, Oakbank** - As I have been listening, any time anything has been brought up in favour I've been hearing the verbal equivalent of "eyeroll" coming from the gallery. I find that to be a little bit unprofessional. I also think it is very, very dangerous to make decisions based on assumptions and misinformation. Mr. Didyk is a very good friend of mine personally and for people to question his integrity based on assumptions and misinformation. Communication is a two way street. I have been on site clearing brush off property, it is no secret I am involved in this process, and Didyk is in the medical profession and understands the danger of COVID 19 and his reluctance to meet with the residents of Oaks North. It is not 3 acres and it did not sell for a million. **Councillor Ralke** tried to suggest, although she has trouble saying it clearly, that because it is currently multi family, low rental and substandard housing that attracted an unsavoury type of resident could be built there and that could be more of a problem and a negative. **Dan Doucet** - Backed her up by saying Residential can include various types of multi family housing types such as condos, apartments, row housing, etc. but he could only control the zoning, not who lived there. **Heather Erickson, Anola** - Why couldn't Mr. Didyk put a facility like this on 207 where there is virtually no residential development and commercial/industrial properties already exist and they are appropriately designated and zoned. **Darryl Speer** - Who visited the property from Council? **Mayor Fell** said all of Council met, one was late, and the CAO and Planning also attended the property with Mr. Didyk. **Mayor Fell** interrupted Mr. Speer when he asked the question again and she was somewhat rude, in my opinion and again brought up the fact that **lack of understanding of the process is the problem**, it is a multi step process, and the residents of Oaks North would NOT understand and when **Mr. Speer** tried to continue, **Mayor Fell** interrupted him several times, said **she could do that because she was the Chair**, and **threatened that he would be asked to leave** if he did not lower his voice. **Darryl Speer** - The reason given **why Mr. Didyk could not meet** with the residents of Oaks North was COVID, however **COVID was still an issue when the members of Council met with Mr. Didyk**. Tonight Mr. Didyk **should have been here in person** to present his case. **Mayor Fell** - He would not meet with the residents of Oaks North until after the application was in and the regulations for COVID were in place during that time but thank you for the question. **Councillor Bredin** - I would agree with our conversation that I had with Miss Overland....(corrected) Overall except I would disagree to say that I did not know how all the Councillors would vote tonight so I don't want to put .....(one of the speakers is clarifying something but it cannot be heard) ...but I just wanted to make that clear that my fellow councillors knew that I did ...I spoke and I still believe that this is a good idea for the community. I've heard for years that people are looking for this so I just want to just make that clear. I understand some of the concerns but I think some of the concerns are overconcerns that aren't really going to happen as our developer has tried to explain so I think we can still work through this process to see if it goes through smoothly so anyway....and I ...just wanted to make sure my councillors knew I wasn't throwing them under the bus either so....**Mayor Fell** interrupts to get

him off the hook. **NOTE: At this juncture I would like to STATE THE OBVIOUS. Unless there was a specific need to amend the Development Plan with regard to this piece of property, this would NOT EVEN BE ON THE AGENDA. Obviously there is a specific need and that is already known by Council before this hearing. The need is that this must be done before the property can be considered for re-zoning which is the next step to enable the specific requirement for the Development Plan amendment. AM I JUST SMARTER THAN THE AVERAGE BEAR? In other words, it seems obvious to me that Council has already decided on the use of this property and it is misleading of them to even suggest otherwise. The residents of Oaks North have little ability to thwart either the amendment, the rezoning, or the establishment of the storage business next door to them, thus in my opinion, and I did take a real estate course many years ago so I do have some knowledge of what determines property values, devaluing their homes. Councillor Bredin lives on the periphery of Oakbank, if I am not mistaken, and owns land that he could sell adjacent to his home for storage of trailers, RVs, etc. etc. Why is he selling it to residential developers? Is it because he does not want a commercial enterprise next door to his home? Does it have something to do with the price at which he can sell? What is the reason?** Mayor Fell - Steps in and asks her Council whether they feel it should be deferred as per Councillor Wilson's suggestion. She said that if she, Planning, the representatives of Oaks North, Ms. Overall, and Mr. Didyk and added, anybody that's here (ya right, the other members of the gallery would probably not be notified) further discussed the concerns and arrived at a compromise, it could put everyone's mind at ease. **NOTE: Deferral seems to be Mayor Fell's method of putting off issues until the decision that she feels is appropriate can be negotiated.** Decision was made by Council to DEFER and meantime a meeting with residents, Ms. Overall, Development Officer, her and developer Didyk to better inform could be held. DEFERRED. Doucet said it could be two months due to notification requirements etc. **NOTE: Councillors Wilson, Williams, and Fuhl were in favour of deferral, Ralke felt it could go ahead because it's a Development Plan decision, Bredin said he would go along with what the others decided.**

**8.1 Re-zoning By-law 20-10 Development Reserve to Rural Residential SE 3-10-4 EPM Gaudette (2nd and 3rd Reading) and Var 20-43 3301 Dawson Road Site Width for Proposed Lots 1 & 2 Subdivision File 4189-19-7471 Gaudette - SECOND READING AND VARIANCE.** Dan Doucet said the intent is an application to rezone the land from DR Development Reserve Zoning District to RR Rural Residential Zoning District. I recommend Council grant second and third reading. Affecting Lot 2 of Plan 37115 within the Southeast 1/4 of 3-10-4 EPM. Mr. Gaudette acting on behalf of 6341731 Manitoba Limited that owns the property has applied to rezone approximately 33.73 acres of land, requirement of the subdivision application 4189-19-7471. - creation of 6 residential lots 5 to 6 acres in size. Property currently designated Rural Residential under Development Plan. Comments from Manitoba Infrastructure, Water Management Planning & Standards Branch advised that the land covered is within the Red River Flood area and subject to Section 17 of the Water Resources Administration Act and the designated Flood Area Regulations. All structures must meet minimum elevations for flood protection measures. **NOTE: My question - why would anyone knowingly want to build a home in a known flood plain?** They received one letter of objection from THE RM OF TACHE. Ross Mitchell, firm of Scythe and Blackburn Consulting - Cory and I have been at this for 3 years. We first came before you for 2 acre subdivision plan was rejected, so now going for 5 acres lots, 3 fronting on Prairie Grove Road and 3 on Dawson Road. He gave a copy of their plan to one of the audience opposed, Mr. Bertrand, parsing the design. Doesn't require land drainage plan but provided one sealed by a professional engineer because of opposition. Your advocate engineer, Hartley Katz, has approved it. Have gone above and beyond the regulations. Have gone to Conservation for permits to construct control structures. Houses will be perched at flood protection level to prevent issues in future years. Elevation will need to be verified by Provincial Planning before permits to construct will be issued. Water flows in south westerly direction and they will collect water in a swale that runs on the west side of his property. We have another swale that runs east west. It is running to the southwest corner of this property and restricting it through a culvert underneath Prairie Grove Road to your municipal drain on the south side of Prairie Grove Road which flows to the west and connects with a Provincial drain that eventually outfalls into the floodway through the Grande Prairie dike. We have to comply with the Drainage Regulations. We have to confine the runoff to this site which we're doing by constructing this dike. Again all the water flows in a southwesterly direction. It's going to collect in this drain. It's not going to go on the farmer's field to the west and we're controlling it so we're not contributing any more water to the Prairie Grove ditch than is already going there. We have to balance the pre and post drainage flow, that is a requirement under the regulations. Again this drainage plan has been prepared by a qualified engineer, it has been stamped, sealed, circulated through Dan to your advocate engineer, Hartley Katz who has been your advocate engineer for years. He has approved this plan. It still has to go through the provincial parties but we've been in contact with all of them and none of them have a problem. Angela Howes, Water Management Planning Technologist, she is the Water Resources Officer that distributes these documents, Evan Graham, Acting Senior Flood Protection Planning Officer, Water Management Planning and Standards Hydrologic Forecasting Water Management, Manitoba Infrastructure, Mark Lee, Manager, Surface Water Management Section, Water Science and Watershed Management Branch, Manitoba Agriculture Resource Development, Wendy Lewyk who is the Water Resource Officer for this district, I've even spoken with Robert Belton again, he's moved on from his position. He's now acting Supervisor of Emergency Measures Organization and Recovery Assessment, I've talked to all these people and distributed all supporting paperwork and they're all confident in the design, the brief and the Land Drainage Management Plan for this area. HiRoss will not be required to review the Land Drainage Plan. If the people in Prairie Grove have drainage problems, they are not going to be exacerbated by this. If Dawson Road is acting as the dike, then whatever drainage problems are happening on the southwest side of Dawson Road that is so unfortunate but this is not going to exacerbate that problem but it does give people an opportunity to come out and complain about land drainage. We have 2 years to comply with the conditions of the subdivision approval but we are already presenting this plan and had their approval. They are doing the drainage plan for Berger and a subdivision in Anola and one in Springfield Industrial that we don't even know about yet. **Jim Bertrand, Prairie Grove Road** - I've lived immediately across the road from this development for 13 years, the last 5 of which have been pretty dry. Has some concerns about

tonight's proposal and the rezoning. This is first time residents from the community have seen a proposal with 6 lots on it. The last had 7 lots, not 6. These are different sizes and configurations and it came as a bit of a surprise. I'm a Civil Engineer, this land is like a pool table, water lays in any undulation it can find. Few misconceptions of Plan. Six inches means a lot on a pool table. No grading on plan, just elevations, and a ditch that shows about 1 1/2 inches of grade on about 100 ft., about twice the length of this building. We have that on Wild Rose Lane. We have 0.15%. They've had to clean the ditches twice since it was built. And that is called moving water uphill. Water has resistance to the bottom of the ditch, to wind, to all kinds of things. When you try to move water at that rate, these swales become ...they fill up with water, they become retention ponds. **Mayor Fell** - So is your concern that the Drainage Plan is going, it's going to flood on to your property. **Jim Bertrand** - No, I'm concerned that it's not going to work the way it's designed to work. You can construct them but the problem is when you get heavy, heavy snows and you get the snow melting in the Spring, and you get rains and then you get people that build houses and structures on these properties, and they build them up, these people are not going to be flooded. They might have water pooling on parts of their property but that water is going to have difficulty getting into these ditches to flow. **Mayor Fell** - So your concern is the water is going to sit on the property. **Jim Bertrand** - No, I'm concerned what it's going to do is it's going to actually, more water is going to go into less place than had to go before and it's actually going to overflow on to the neighbour's property. The neighbour that's in the middle and the neighbours directly to the north of this property. **Mayor Fell** - And those already exist? **Jim Bertrand** - They already exist and problems already exist on both of those properties or all three of the properties. As a matter of fact, those properties are not even constructed to the approved grading plans for those properties because if they do, they flood out their neighbours. This is a big problem with where the water goes in this area and if you start putting more, the snow is going to come down the same, the rain ditto, the melting is going to happen but you have less place for it to go. It's going to squeeze to the only place it can go and they want it to come uphill...over land uphill. The only reason is appears it is going downhill is cause they've dug a ditch that's 40 inches wide and between 4 inches and 28 inches deep. That's what the plans show but you have to interpret what's on the plans. They're flowing water uphill by digging a ditch that's a little over 2 ft deep. And water in a ditch that runs 100 ft. doesn't run. It sits. So before you get enough pressure that's going to push...and the water has to get into the ditch, there's all kinds of low spots on these properties that it will flow into and flow overland and end up in the northeast corner. That's where we have problems right now to the point where those residents have to pump water across Dawson Road with pumps into the ditch that's on the east side because that ditch flows down about a mile to Rikers Ditch because that's downhill. This plan is showing water flowing uphill. We already have that problem in this area. **Dan Doucet** - We have an application here for a rezoning, we're not debating a drainage plan. If Council would look at the Page 10 of their packages it gives a contour map prepared by the Provincial Government showing the elevations 774 uh but an elevation in the north east corner of that property and as it sheds to the south it goes to 772. That drainage swale that is provided in that cross section, does it not say 7 meters? **Bob Gallagher (lives in the centre property) 54046 Dawson Road** - I am not against the rezoning but concerned about the drainage plan and they have done some reassuring things and will do something with to prevent with berms but previous water pooling has killed a number of his trees on the south side, and so if that gets built up it's going to do the same thing on the north side. As long as the drainage concerns can be addressed and what Jim has said there is concerns with respect to the flow, I'm not sure whether the actual east-west swale penetrates through the row of trees. If it doesn't, there's going to be a problem. It should come further east so that it can drain Lot #3 because right now it no longer flows through those trees, it flows through my property. **Colleen Draper** - *Be it resolved that second reading be given to By-law No. 20-10 being a by-law of the RM of Springfield to re-zone Lot 2 Plan 37115 within the southeast 1/4 of 3-10-4 from DR Development Reserve Zoning District to RR Rural Residential Zoning District.* **Councillor Fuhl** stated he had met with residents immediately affected with the subdivision and they had also met with the Planning Officer on conditions to be applied to the drainage plan so I ask that we pass the Second Reading but Defer the Third Reading till all changes are made to the drainage plan. **Councillor Williams** - Concurr with deferring Third Reading. This whole area of Prairie Grove is has flooding issues and my concern is this subdivision will become very much like the Premier subdivision, Premier Housing subdivision, which has Wild Rose Lane going through it. They have drainage issues now and this whole area is in a flood prone designated area and approving this will add more issues to the Municipality for maintaining this area. We've done quite a bit of work trying to alleviate the problems of the Wild Rose Lane Development in terms of flooding issues that continue to this day. I am concerned that there is an overall area drainage issue. We recently heard there was a study undertaken that I believe was to provide some type of flood proofing but the cost was somewhat significant so it was not approved by the Councillor of the day who said they were not prepared to spend that kind of money to do further flood proofing, rather we will not allow any more subdivisions. Neither of those things has happened. The flood proofing is not done but subdivisions have happened. Until we locate the study, which staff is trying to find, a significant amount of money would be required to render this area flood proofed, so he is not prepared to do Third Reading. **Councillor Wilson** - Since 1825 there is a history of flooding in this area....FLOODING...not drainage. The flood levels to which the floodway protects Winnipeg will see this land and at least a mile in every direction flooded right up to Deacons Corner. The TransCanada Highway is going to serve as a dike to keep water to the south, i.e. to this area and away from the Winnipeg water reservoir and Hydro's new Riel Station. Springfield's development plan allows for volumes of 5 acre lots in areas that are not flood prone. It makes no economic or socially responsible sense to allow flood prone area to be subdivided. This is a given, has been happening since 1826. Manitoba allows development in flood plains and this is what happened in Breezy Point, at Grand Point. 1997 Breezy Point and Grand Point flooded and all kinds of heartache and compensation and revision of building elevations. This is a DISASTER WAITING TO HAPPEN. **Second Reading - Carried 4-2** **NOTE: Who are the 4 who after listening to all the facts that would dictate from a position of COMMON SENSE not to approve, APPROVED THIS?** I can tell you in all probability, RALKE, BREDIN, FELL but not sure who the 4th was.

**10.3 Conditional Use 20-29 2208 Springfield Rd - Automotive Sales & Repair - Arambu/Amsel - Doucet** recommended it be postponed until owner can find space on the property to park all his vehicles and get them off the right of way. If approved, he had 4 conditions. **Wilson -** Should be 15 lots suitable for display that don't involve moving vehicles around. No parts cars etc. should be parked in front of building. Units 1,2 and 3 at front and 4, 5 and paint booth at back. Fire Chief and Building Inspector mentioned that spray booth already in there and does not appear to meet code or have permission of Fire Commissioner. Many issues with site. **NOTE: Doucet says he has to get more history on this case. My question is, why was it even put on the agenda if the necessary research had not been done, especially considering he already knows the Fire Commissioners Office has issues with the ability of fire fighting equipment to get behind in the event of fire. He has been the Planning Officer for over 10 years. Why is he not better at doing the job?**

**THIS IS AN E-MAIL I SENT TO MY COUNCILLOR, MS. RALKE and her preliminary response.**

**Re: Frost Boil on Pleasant Road**

**Heather Erickson** <heatheranderickson@gmail.com> Sun, 1 Nov, 21:21 (17 hours ago)

to Val

On the list of accounts for September, as presented at the October 20, 2020 meeting, there are two cheques listed for Tri-M Trucking, \$11,513.30 but also one for \$82,631.13 annotated for a Frost Boil, I presume repair, on Pleasant Road A Base. This is a rather large expense and I am wondering if there was any effort made to tender this repair in order to obtain competitive pricing for the repair. That amount seems rather large to repair one frost boil. In a municipality our size, and considering Manitoba winters, our road repair budget would be cost prohibitive if we were to have any number of frost boils requiring repair. On October 27, 2020 I had occasion to be out on Pleasant Road and decided to investigate why there was a Road Closed sign. I found a piece of equipment and a fellow down in the excavation with a different machine digging out the road base. The orange piece of equipment says HD Accurate on it. The bid for the job was won by Tri M Trucking (Greg Mozil, I believe) but none of this equipment is marked with that logo, including the truck. The Public Works Manager, Blaine Moffat, has always maintained that the reason Tri M Trucking is often chosen for the job is that they have the necessary equipment, but the foregoing would seem to suggest that they merely rent the equipment and manpower from other contractors and I have heard from a number of other sources that this is indeed the case. I believe that in addition to both being residents of Ward 4 of the RM of Springfield, Mr. Mozil and Mr. Moffat are related. Can you please investigate this matter and let me know whether the job was tendered and how the contract was awarded.



**Val Ralke** 1 Nov 2020, 21:38 (16 hours ago)

to **Tiffany, Colleen, Blaine, Jody**, me

Good evening Ms. Erickson

Thank you for bringing these concerns to lite. I have forwarded your request to our Public Works Director, the CAO and Manager of Finance to allow for a clearer explanation of the concerns you mentioned.

As soon as we have responses to your questions I will ask that each Administrator respond to you directly, using the reply all function so we can all be kept apprised of the results.

Thank you for your email.

Valerie Ralke