

RM OF SPRINGFIELD
Special Meeting and Public Hearing
June 25, 2024

WITHOUT PREJUDICE (E&OE)

LENGTH OF MEETING 3 hour 31 minutes 35 seconds

2. CALL TO ORDER – Mayor Therrien – Well, good evening, ladies and gentlemen. We're going to **put this meeting into order???** here. Um just as an introduction, I'm uh Mayor uh Patrick uh Therrien from the RM of Springfield. Uh today's meeting is on June the 25th of 2024 at exactly 6 p.m. We're starting um the uh Special Meeting of Public Hearing. Um and **at this point here** I'd like to introduce uh some of the people around the uh um the area here. Uh to the left uh is uh Colleen Draper, our CAO and next is Martin Sandhurst, then Dan uh Doucet, both from the uh Planning Department, uh I've already introduced myself, uh next is Councillor and Deputy Mayor, Glen Fuhl, **number one???**, next is Councillor Ward 2 Andy Kuczynski, uh Councillor Ward 3 is **Andy Miller???** **NOTE: His name is actually Mark Miller. Perhaps the Mayor is nervous due to the amount of people attending.** and Councillor Ward 4 is uh Melinda Warren. What's that? Oh, what did I say? Oh, Mark Miller and then uh Andy uh Andy Kuczynski. If I mis ... oh, then um how's that? That's better. Ok uh thank you, folks. Uh then I'm going to uh call the meeting uh to order uh that's been done.

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA - Mayor Therrien – Then we'll go to Adoption of the Agenda. Can I get a mover and a seconder for that uh please. Melinda and Glen (Warren/Fuhl). **CAO Colleen Draper** – *Be it Resolved that the Special Meeting Agenda for June 25th be approved.* **Mayor Therrien** – Any additions uh from Council? Mark? **Councillor Miller** – Uh thank you, Mr. Mayor. Just for clarity for the public and actually for Council and as a Councillor in Ward 3, I'm just wondering why this Special Meeting was called. It was kind of abrupt. It wasn't planned 2 weeks out and it didn't give a whole lot of opportunity for the public to uh be informed and come prepared, in fact, uh I'm not entirely sure that I have all the documentation I need to respond but I'm just wondering who called the meeting and what was the purpose of doing it so abruptly. **Mayor Therrien** – Um I called the meeting uh **there** uh um I spoke with the CAO. This is a chance like any other where we can have one item on the uh on the agenda and that is our public hearing for the uh um for this uh new zoning uh Bylaw. So this is a chance for us to do it all at one session at one time. **Councillor Miller** – Uh thank you for that response, Mr. Mayor and now where in your explanation did you say you consulted with any of the other councillors which is kind of disrespectful but I mean it's just the way that things are. Beyond that, Mr. Mayor, um I'm just wondering if the public will have the opportunity to engage and full wholeheartedly with the concerns they have because uh again you're not consulting with Council, I'm not sure what you're going to be doing with the public but it's kind of disrespectful to, to the whole process, to be frank. **Mayor Therrien** – I don't think it's disrespectful, we've done it before uh in the past. **NOTE: Ah, but two wrongs don't make a right...and yes, before would be "in the past".** It's not unheard of. It's not, it's not unheard of, just doing it all in the one time here, there's plenty of time, no more, no less, any other time, so yes there'll be time just like any other public uh hearing where we could uh have the public uh make some inquiries uh express those in favour and uh those in opposition. So yes..... that's it. Alright. Uh any other questions? Then **at this point** here if I could get a show of hands of those in support of the Adoption of the Agenda. That's uh Melinda, Glen and Patrick (Warren/Fuhl/Therrien). Those opposed? Uh Mark and Andy (Miller/Kuczynski). And it is hereby passed.

4. PUBLIC HEARING – Springfield Zoning By-law 21-25 - Mayor Therrien – Then we'll get in to the... the public uh hearing uh portion uh **there**. Can I get a mover and a seconder **with regards to** that please. That's uh Melinda and Mark (Warren/Miller). Then uh I've got to read this uh this long procedure uh out of the Planning Act. Uh public hearing matters will now be heard under the Planning Act. Uh the public hearing process is as follows: uh Number 1) The Public Notice will be read out indicating the intent of the application. The Development Officer will provide a summary and information pertaining to the proposal. Uh those that wish to make uh representation and speak on a Planning matter um must sign in and print on the sign in sheet at the front. Uh you'll be given the opportunity to make presentation or speak on the matter uh presented before Council. Opportunity for presentation or to speak on the matter will be in the following uh order. Uh first will be, the applicant will speak and make a presentation on the proposed application. Uh there'll be an inquiries uh portion which will give you the opportunity to ask for clarification uh what the planning matter is proposed. Uh those in favour of this will be...we'll give those that are in favour the opportunity to speak and those in opposition. This will give those that are in opposition the opportunity to speak as well. When you begin speaking, uh please state your name and address and a reminder that at all times coming up to the front uh her uh to address the questions uh to myself as the chairperson. Uh and four and final, once everyone has had an opportunity to speak, uh Council may close the public hearing on the matter, after which further input from the public will not be permitted for legal reasons. It is important that if you wish to speak and be heard on a planning matter, now is the time to make representation. Again once I uh the chairperson close the public hearing, no further uh discussion will be allowed. Um to start off there, I think we have a total of 122 objections uh that were noted. Um a strong majority of those were against the uh uh drive-through uh **thereum** not allowing it to be uh uh permitted to use um and the other one would be **in regards to** the Oaks uh north of the town here in changing the uh uh designation the uh the field or the space, I think it's 30 acres just attached uh to the Oaks. Uh so that uh said uh **thereum** we read all the objectors, uh all the objections uh **there** for basically both the uh objectors **there**. Um we're going to have a long uh night here but as I state that, you have the right to come up here and express your uh your opposition to it but that said, if it's going to be the same one again and again uh **there**, if, if you're just prepared to come up and, and state your name uh and say, I, I agree with those conditions and I oppose it uh um and we have your name on file, it should give you incentive through there???, that's an option where uh that person or persons uh can do that, that'll allow us to uh to expedite the matter. Again we read all the objectors, all the objections uh **with regards to** this uh matter. Um then **at this point here** I'm prepared to uh start the uh process and we'll look for the applicant to speak which is the RM of Springfield um and I'll turn it over to uh Dan Doucet. **Dan Doucet** – This evening is the public hearing for Zoning Bylaw uh 21-25. Uh Zoning Bylaw 21-25 is the document that regulates land use which was created in order to stay current and reflect the needs of the community following the adoption of the Springfield Development Plan 18-0....18-09. A little bit of background and history, September 23rd, 2021 a resolution of Council uh 21-421 was first reading of the Bylaw. On October 28th, 2021 we had the Public Hearing, the first Public Hearing. Uh on October 28th as well there was a resolution of Council to defer a decision on that Second Reading, on June 23rd we had a resolution from Council to grant Second Reading, uh then we had a Municipal Board Hearing was scheduled back in February 15th, 2023, however the Board uh heard from our Municipal solicitor that while the amendments to the Zoning Bylaw uh taken, were taken individually but

still in the opinion as minor, taken as a whole resulted in major change to the proposed Bylaw. All the participants in the Hearing agreed that the changes made after the First Reading of the proposed Bylaw were not minor. Uh March uh March 7th, 2023 there was a Resolution to rescind uh the Second Reading of the Bylaw. On April the 17th, 2023 the Municipal Board Order, we had received it, it had stated that the uh Municipal Board ... Municipal Board concluded that the referral to the Zoning Bylaw to the Board was not valid and that the Municipal Council had an obligation to conduct a second Public Hearing which is this evening's second Public Hearing. **NOTE: Over a year after the Board Order! Maybe the RM thought if they delayed it for a long period of time, the public would forget their objections to it.** Uh May 14th to 16th the Zoning Bylaw uh Council uh directed staff to hold information sessions. They were held at Dugald, Cooks Creek, and the Anola Over 50 Club, June the 10th... the 19th the Zoning Bylaw information boards were also displayed at the Administrat.... Administrative Office and this evening is our second Public Hearing. Uh the legislative requirements uh May 27th Notice of the Public Hearing, the Bylaw and Appendix were e-mailed to the Minister the... the of uh the Minister of Manitoba Municipal Relations surrounding the Municipalities and uh the surrounding Planning Districts. Also on May 27th Notice of the Public Hearing was posted at the ... on the Municipal Website. June the 5th Notice of Public Hearing was posted at the Municipal Office and the Planning Office. May the 6th and May 13th uh Public Notice was advertised in the uh Clipper Weekly and the Winnipeg Free Press. We have received some comments uh from various agencies, uh East St. Paul had sent out comments. Uh at the time of the uh Report was written, we did not receive the Community Planning Report. Uh it was received yesterday, approximately 4:30. It has been posted on to the Municipal Website and proved to Council. Uh there were concerns raised, the majority of the concerns were the drive-through which Mayor Therrien had mentioned, also there was uh concerns raised regarding the Zoning Map, regarding the CH Commercial Highway Zoning District to go back to RM Residential Multi-Family and that would be located just to the north of uh the railway tracks by the Oaks Nor... the Oaks Condos. Uh there was also a request to redesignate land which... uh from Rural Residential back to AR Agricultural Restricted Zoning District. Um there were also comments on some of the uh uhuh the class defin...definitions as well. If Council were to consider this uh uh Zoning Bylaw 21-25, Council has a few options: um review the concerns and objections presented and consider a decision at a later time. Consider altering the Zoning Bylaw which must be identified with a resolution, then grant Second Reading. Consider the Zoning Bylaw as is and grant Second Reading or Council may pass a resolution not to proceed with the Bylaw. Thank you, Mayor Therrien.

Mayor Therrien – Thank you very much. Um then **at this point here** I'll open it up uh uh ... **Dan Doucet** – Uh one thing... Mr. uh Martin Sandhurst did have a bit of a presentation on the uh Planning end of it so uh I will turn it over to Mr. Sandhurst. **Martin Sandhurst** – Ok. Melinda, can you hear me? Mark? Andy? Go ahead. Patrick. Ok. Good to go. Alright uh briefly as you guys just heard from Dan and from uh Mayor Therrien. We have a single agenda item tonight. Council has a copy of the proposed bylaw uh the Designated Officers Reports, the Community Planning Branch Report, and of course the community members submissions. Uh I'm up here uh primarily to provide some, some context um to give a little bit of perspective on the Zoning Bylaw itself and how it's distinct from other tools that we have available to us under the authority of the Planning Act. Next slide please. So key to... key to the idea of understanding uh what a Zoning Bylaw, what it does, what it's job is, so typically it's described as a tool that assists municipalities with the implementation of the Municipal Development Plan and in our case, our two Secondary Plans. So it's an implement, a single tool. Uh it's not the only tool. I think it's important to understand that it's one of many that are available to the Municipality so we can't see it as being entirely responsible for implementing the Development Plan and the Secondary Plans on its own. Uh it's also distinct from uh the Development Plan insofar as it's not aspirational, it's not capturing what you hope to achieve. Uh it doesn't chart a course for you. **NOTE: Already I am irritated by this monotonous, plodding rendition of what most people already know. What a time waster.** That's the job of the Development Plan, not the Zoning Bylaw. Instead the Zoning Bylaw is actually kind of a passive to... it doesn't do things for you so much as it prevents stuff that you don't want to have happening from happening. So it helps you stay on that course. Um so in that sense, uh a Zoning Bylaw has a particular role and function. It's good at some things. It's not so good at some other things and it's particularly bad at a whole bunch of other things. It has one job to do. It is not a multi-tool. So we need to make sure that it does the job that it sets out to do and as provided for under our legislation. Next slide please. So you guys are probably familiar with uh the image that's on the left side, that's Planning Hierarchy, that image ... you might have seen it in a different form. This one happens to be out of the Provincial Planning Act Handbook. So I'm trying to demonstrate with this slide and that image that there's a fit between the Development Plan, Secondary Plans, and also above it with the Planning Act, the Provincial Planning Regulations and obviously our own Municipal bylaws and policies. Uh and you'll see Zoning Bylaws are in there. So the image on the right you probably haven't seen unless you've been in one of my classes **NOTE: Heavens Forbid! That would be enough to make me quit school,** but I refer to it as ... again it's a different perspective. It's not a hierarchy. The plan, the Development Plan, is what I'm referring to in this case. That's what's in the middle. That's ... that's the key tool that we have. The Province requires us to prepare a Development Plan. On the left of that under the heading Techniques, that's the stuff that we do to prepare the Development Plan. So there's a whole host of things. We're obviously doing a background report, there's a bunch of servicing studies and reports that we have to undertake, the legislation requires municipalities now to hire a registered professional planner to be involved in the process whether it's leading it or taking a uh uhuh a larger role in its preparation and essentially overseeing that the work undertaken in the Municipality is in accordance with the legislation and the regulations and goof practice for that matter. That's also the techniques would also include things uh that we do to engage stakeholders and the community. **NOTE: "Engage" or "Brainwash"... in my case at this point "ENRAGE". He is wasting valuable ratepayer's time.** So we're talking about workshops and surveys and newsletters and on-line surveys and in-person encounters. So all that stuff is taken into consideration and that feeds into the aims, the objectives, and of course the policies that are then captured in the Development Plan. So once Council adopts the Development Plan, and in our case it was adopted, the one that we're using at the moment, in February of 2019, clearly before my time here. So since then uh we hired a consultant team to prepare the two Secondary Plans and the Zoning Bylaw. So again Zoning Bylaw as I mentioned, it's only ... it's only one tool. So some of the other tools that we might use to implement the...the objective, our aims in the Development Plan are things like obviously private investments uh um Municipal Capital Projects, Development Incentive Program might be something you want to utilize. Uh Strategic Property Acquisition and Disposition. Uh Development Agreements. Uh potential Intermunicipal Service Agreements. Annexation. We don't have to use these things. The Province doesn't tell us we have to but we can use these things. And these are...with those tools, each have their own job to do. And their job tends to be different than what the Zoning Bylaw is intended to do. The next slide please. So this is what the Planning Act tells us we have to do. **NOTE: Fortunately I fell asleep and missed this or by now I would have been getting ready to drive down to the Administration and protest this person taking up all the time.** So we, we have to adopt a Zoning Bylaw, there's no option here. Um that's under Section 68. Um Section 71(1) and 71(2) specify what the Zoning Bylaw must include in terms of its content and, and role. Um Section 71(3), next slide please Dan identifies things that we may do within our Zoning Bylaw so again, it's discretionary. This is stuff that uh some zoning bylaws include, others don't. Uh there are cases where you'll see all of these. **NOTE: Is this going to be on the exam???? And to**

think my tax dollars are paying this person's salary! Um ours incorporates a lot of the "mays" on top of the "musts". Uh next slide please. So I don't have the actual um excerpt from the Planning Act but Section 73(1) through 79 outline the adoption process for um putting in place the zoning, I mean, the Municipal Zoning Bylaw so this is expressed in the diagram that's also from the Planning Act Handbook and that the...uh the uh procedures in terms of First Reading, Public Hearing, Second Reading uh if sufficient objections are received, the procedures on that, Third Reading and/or referral to uh the Municipal Board. So again those are... those are specified in the Act. We must follow these procedures. Dan next slide please. So that was the uh the direction provided in the Act. This is the capture of the process that uh was followed in preparing this uh Zoning Bylaw. This shows the process from the time that the consultant was hired which I believe was in August of 2019 up to and including the uh the Public Hearing which was September of 2021, again before my time with the Municipality. Uh Mayor Therrien, can I respond directly to those in the audience. (yes) So through the Mayor, the consultant was uh WSP. **Mayor Therrien** – Go ahead, uh... **Martin Sandhurst** – Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Ok next slide. So um is there any other guidance provided uh other than the Act. So obviously uh on the left there's the Planning uh Regulations otherwise known as the Planning and Land Use Policies of Manitoba so there's more detailed information in uh and obviously we have to follow what's in there as well and essentially what it lays out are the Provincial interests in planning uh all told and of course there's those interests in... in many cases they work together, in some cases they can uh they can uh they can conflict. Um we need to figure ways to balance these when we're working on tools such as our Zoning Bylaw. In the middle is the Planning Act, Handbook which we also look to for guidance and on the right is also a Provincial document that was prepared, I think it was put out in 2015 and this is the ... it's a... this is the cover of one of the 3 binders that were put out by the Province and it's essentially a guide to putting together a Zoning Bylaw. Next slide please. Oh, before I speak to this one, um well, you know what, we're on course, don't worry about that. So obviously **NOTE: If it is so obvious, why doesn't he and his slides leave and let the ratepayers have their say,** we're also looking uh for guidance in preparing the Zoning Bylaw because these 3 documents are the Development Plan and the two Secondary Plans. They provide uh policies and our Zoning Bylaw has to generally align with the policies in those 3 plans. So we have to consider those policies in putting together our Zoning Bylaw. Uh in addition to ... to the um the legislative and regulatory framework and our own Municipal policy, obviously we're taking into consideration experience, expertise, local knowledge, we're balancing interests, um different interests, sometimes competing. And in putting together the bylaws, anybody who's involved in this process from 2019 on understands there's testing the bylaw, there's drafting of it, there's revising, there's calibrating, there's fine-tuning, there's revising again and probably again so this process ... it, it goes on. Some of it uh with opportunities to engage the public in the input process and in other cases testing the waters, we'll put together sections, we'll ask for feedback on it, in other cases we'll go directly to stakeholders and see what they have to say about it to see if their interests are being considered and looked after to the extent that we're able to do so. Next slide please. So when, when the consultant team and staff here set out in the process to prepare this Zoning Bylaw, it's stated aims were and generally so this is, before we get to this one, let's stay on this slide Dan. Uh the statement was, and this is shared with the public directly, was that an effective Zoning Bylaw is user friendly and understandable, uh helps administrators, developer, and the public to make informed decisions about what can be built and where it can be built. Uh and it also provides a level ...it is intended to provide at least a level of predictability for new development and this is the key part, it's consistent with Provincial and Municipal development policies. So specific to this process and that might be a little bit hard to see **NOTE: The only hard thing is having the patience to listen to this person, for whom we are paying, drone on and on stating nothing but the obvious in grandiose professorial fashion, wasting everyone's time in his effort to appear useful to the process,** but this is, this is shared as well all along the way in uh in putting this Bylaw together so um specific to the uh Springfield uh Zoning Bylaw, the proposed bylaw under Bylaw 21-25, our review focused on adding standards and provisions to reflect new policies from the Development Plan or the Secondary Plans. It also focused on consolidating zoning definitions. It focused on consolidating zones to reduce unnecessary repetition and complexity, it focused on revising format to make it easier to find relevant information, it focused on revising Maps to ensure accuracy, consistency, and finally it focused on reviewing standards, clauses and provisions against issues raised by Council, Administration and community members. Next slide please. So a lot of work went into this. A lot of time spent on this. Um how did we do? Did we succeed? Uh the Manitoba zoning, Guide to Zoning which I referenced earlier uh the guide to putting together zoning bylaws offers this, and this is distinct from again what is uh a Development Plan. **A zoning bylaw is a tool that helps to implement the objectives and policies that are in the Development Plan by setting out specific rules for development and land use within a community.****NOTE: That sentence is all he needed to say, TOTALLY. He has just wasted a large portion of this hearing and he isn't stopping yet.** So objectively based on the stated aims it has accomplished its aims and it does the job as laid out under the legislation and regulations. Subjectively of course it's a matter of perspective. Does it uh... does it do what you as a specific person or family or interest group do depending on your specific purpose? And professionally um although I wasn't involved in the preparation of this Bylaw, I too am an RPP uh so professionally um my perspective is, is it the best zoning bylaw ever? Probably not. Uh is it the worst? Definitely not. I've viewed some pretty bad zoning bylaws in my time. Is it fundamentally flawed or does it fail to deliver on what it was intended to and must achieve? No. Not in my opinion. And finally is it better than our current Zoning Bylaw, uh Springfield Zoning Bylaw 08-01? Well, it would have to be since that bylaw, the one we're using right now was intended to help to implement Development Plan 98-22, not the current Development Plan and not the Secondary Plans. That's all I have. **NOTE: Thank heavens. Mayor Therrien** – Thank you very much, uh Martin. Very well done. **NOTE: Really!!!!** **Martin Sandhurst** – You're welcome very much. **Mayor Therrien** – Um then we'll open it up uh to uh uhuh the public on line because we have uh a lot of people on line, we're going to go from on line and to the public maybe 2 and 2 uh just so everybody has a chance to.... **there** to uh express their opinion. And like I said before, I, I don't want anybody to leave here saying that Mayor Therrien is trying to uh narrow down uh expression uh of coming up here, I'm just saying that if we've got a whole bunch of people that there ... you know, there's a lot of talking going on ... talking, I don't particularly mind that, it's just that it's disruptive as well. Um so I'm uh I'm, I'm ...I'll reiterate what I was saying before, is that uh if it's the same uh you know somebody has got the same uh uh ideas and the same opposition, cause that's the vast majority of what uh is uh before us, I would think uh ... we got 122 objections and the vast majority of those are about the uh um the uh changing the uh drive-throughs uh uh**there** and like I say, if the person in front of you says the same thing, you want to just register your opposition by stating your name and so on uh then that's...that's fair but we read every ... every objection uh **there** as well. **NOTE: Cockwomble!!!! Great Scottish word! Just my opinion to which I am entitled.** Um so we'll start with uh inquiries. Uh and that's uh uh this will give you the opportunity to ask for clarification on what the uh planning matter is proposed. Uh on line. I see none. And in the audience for any inquiries. Janet. **Janet Nylen** – Thank you for that mike. Janet Nylen from Oakbank. Um I'd like to question the validity and version of the Bylaw that we're dealing with tonight. I'd like to ...yes I can do that. I'd like to question the validity and version of the Bylaw we're looking at tonight. Um this was the copy that I was given. Is this the one we're talking about tonight? **Dan Doucet** – That's correct. Those are copies made and it's on the Website as well. **Janet Nylen** – The problem I have with.... the problem I have with **NOTE: People are talking in the**

background and Ms. Nysten pauses as a result. The problem I have um that this Bylaw is.... it shows a number of proposed track changes that have not been adopted. Now does Council recognize that on February 7th it passed Resolution 23-035 that rescinded Resolution 22-250 that uh gave Second Reading to Bylaw 21-25 so by rescinding that resolution, we're going back to the First Reading. **Dan Doucet** – Correct. **Janet Nysten** – Right. The one you're circulating has all those changes incorporated and on Page 3 it identifies itself as the Bylaw as of the 23rd of September 2021. That's not correct. That's not what we had at September 23rd, 2021. This is what we had so when I was trying to put together my objections, I don't know if I'm going to the one at First Reading which was the submission I had given in October of 2021 which was then changed for the Municipal Board Hearing but then now we have another version again. So I think that ... I think we're looking at a very convoluted thing, I'm going to be challenging this before the Municipal Board as a procedural error again. What I would recommend to Council and what I think I had already said, why don't we start with a new bylaw. It can be this one here. Give it a new number. Call it 24-10 or whatever the next available number is and let's start with that and we know what we're talking about. Can I get some answers, please. **Mayor Therrien** – Um I can't really answer that. It's more of a Planning one uh Martin or Dan. **NOTE: More chit-chat in the background.** **Martin Sandhurst** – So correct me, Ms. Nysten, but the question that I heard was to confirm if the version of the bylaw that you had in your hands that you picked up at the Planning office is the one that's Council's considering tonight? Is that your question? **Janet Nysten** – That was the first part, the first question, yes. And I think it was answered, that Dan agreed it was. **Martin Sandhurst** – Yes. What is the follow-up question? **Janet Nysten** – Well, this Bylaw was not the one approved on September 23rd, 2021. You are suggesting that it is, are you not. **Martin Sandhurst** – That's not... that's not my suggestion. That... **Janet Nysten** – What does that say right there? **Martin Sandhurst** – Well, we started with a Bylaw and we gave it First Reading on that date. (yes) Then we went to Public Hearing. **Janet Nysten** – With that Bylaw. This Bylaw says First Reading. This Bylaw **Martin Sandhurst** – **interrupting** And then we went to Public Hearing (yes) and then we went to Second Hearing or Second Reading, pardon me, then we went to the Municipal Board. **Janet Nysten** – Before you went to the Municipal Board, you rescinded Second Reading. **Martin Sandhurst** – No, we rescinded uh Second Reading after the Municipal Board. **Janet Nysten** – No, no you submitted it to the Board the week before. **Martin Sandhurst** – We submitted ... **Janet Nysten** – There is a copy of the resolution ... **Martin Sandhurst** – We...no... we did not. If that's your question, that's the answer, that's as good as I can do. **Janet Nysten** – My next question is will you consider starting with a new Bylaw, giving it a new number, it can have all the same content as this and stop the confusion because we have ... I have 5 copies of this...this Bylaw. I have the one after Second Reading, with all the changes and the tracked changes in it and I have ... no, I guess I have four ... **Martin Sandhurst** – So the question was, will we consider having the same content uh for a different bylaw number? **Janet Nysten** – Give a new bylaw ... a new ... give it a new number and give it First Reading. And then hold a Public Hearing on... on this document, whatever you want to call it. **Martin Sandhurst** – Well, we call it Zoning Bylaw 21-25. **Janet Nysten** – Ok but, this... this is.... **Martin Sandhurst** – **interrupting** So we've given it First Reading to it.... **Janet Nysten** – No, you have not. This, this Bylaw has a number of changes **Martin Sandhurst** – **talking over her** We've given First Reading to it and then we had a Public Hearing (well) and then we had Second Reading and then we went to the Municipal Board and then we rescinded Second Reading and now we're having a Public Hearing. **NOTE: In the background someone says "with one exception..."** **Mayor Therrien** – Ok, Edwin... no disruptions. Edwin, Edwin, Edwin, Edwin you're out of order. Edwin, you're out of order. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – But it's not, Sir. **Mayor Therrien** – No. The facts is coming from here and we're answering uh that's enough, Edwin. That's, that's the first warning, alright. **Janet Nysten** – The last time we went to the Municipal Board, they refused to hear it ... the item because you had failed in doing your procedure properly. You didn't have the Second Hearing on the proposed changes because some of them were deemed to be not minor. I don't want to go to the Municipal Board again on a procedural error by Council. I'm asking you to correct the process so we just move forward as smoothly as we can. Thank you. **Martin Sandhurst** – I, Ms. Nysten, I agree 100%. We don't, we don't want to move forward with a procedural error either. **Mayor Therrien** – Ok, thank you, any other inquiries on line or in the audience. Then we'll move it to uh opposition uh **there** uh um sorry those in favour, um on line. I don't see any uh **there**. In the audience, those in favour? Uh Sir. **Adam Rossol** – RDI Ladco uh Dugald, Manitoba. Just want to be on record that I am in favour of the Zoning Bylaw. Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, Sir. Then we'll go to uh those in opposition um on line. (I'm on line) Just one second. Ok Sir that's on line Unidentified Male Speaker – (that turned out to be Vatre) Ya, 328438 Manitoba Limited. I'm in favour of the Bylaw. **Mayor Therrien** – Ok, Sir, can I get your uh name? **Louis Vatre**- Louis Vatre, 527 Main Street. **NOTE: Both of those individuals are involved in residential/commercial development companies.** **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, uh Louis. Ok um there's somebody else uh in the audience? **Edwin Giesbrecht** – I have a request uh Mr. Mayor. **Mayor Therrien** – Well, are you in opposition or in favour? **Edwin Giesbrecht** – It depends on the outcome of this tonight, Mr. Mayor. **Mayor Therrien** – Why don't we get this out of the way, then we'll do your request after. So why don't we get those in opposition then. Can I get a show of hands, those in opposition? Ok. Uh then we will start with uh Neoma, I see you back there. You're the first. Unless you don't want to go first, uh ... whoever wants to come up uh please uh come up. Uh Mark. **Councillor Miller** – Uh thank you, Mr. Mayor. Just a point of clarity. Uh Colleen uh is it advisable or is it permitted that Council ask questions to those who are presenting? I can't remember the process. **CAO Draper** – For Council to ask questions of the people speaking? **Councillor Miller** – In favour and opposed. Maybe ask.... **CAO Draper** – Ya, questions can be asked through the Chair, ya. **Councillor Miller** – Of course. Of course. (ya) So uh backing up too, then, unfortunately I wasn't able to ask but I would ask the representative from RDI and maybe uh Mr. Vatre uh they are in favour and that's their position and that's great, uh just wondering uh what makes this so attractive to you being in favour of the document. It would be helpful to the public, Mr. Mayor, for them, for the people to know. **Adam Rossol** -Do I have to say my name again. **Mayor Therrien** – Uh, yes please. **Adam Rossol** – Adam Rossol, RDI Dugald, Manitoba. Quite frankly, I've been following the... this entire process, for several years at this point. Um we always consistently hear from the Council chamber to make sure that we are as cost-effective and permitting as possible. I think at this point uh the entire procedure has gone on for a very long time um and we're talking about you know some grammar errors and, and some small clericals. So from that standpoint, from a due process um angle uh and to be as cost-effective and not waste any more of the RMs resources and time and money, that is why I'm in large favour of this. Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you. Did you want to speak to Louie? **Councillor Miller** – Uh if he has an answer to that I guess. Is there any economic interest in the uh passage of this document? **Mayor Therrien** – I don't know if that's an appropriate question, like it's **NOTE: Again there is a lot of conversation heard in the audience.** why... what is.... **Councillor Miller** – Why, is that, Mr. Mayor. **Mayor Therrien** – If, if they're going to gain economically from this? **Councillor Miller** – I think it, it.... **Mayor Therrien** – **interrupting** I would think they're not doing it for free. **Councillor Miller** – Well, I don't think you expressed ... you don't share their point of view, in other words, if they have an answer to that question, I think it would be very helpful. Usually people, when they are in favour or opposed, sometimes they do have an economic interest and that should be disclosed, right. **Mayor Therrien** – If you want to answer that if not uh the ... just state your name, Sir. **Michael Rossol**– Mike Rossol, RDI. We're trying to build affordable housing, we're trying to abide by the rules, this document are the rules that we're trying to abide by. So if you want to continue to change them, how do

we come up with a development plan if the rules keep changing. We have developed to the Plan that was in existence and that was being worked towards. Does that answer your question? **Councillor Miller** – I'm all embracing of affordable housing, ... when you're able to uh make \$200,000 homes, I'm going to be giving you two thumbs up. ???**Michael Rossol** - Well, then get started. Help us out. Stop... stopping the process. **Mayor Therrien** – Sir, you've got to be at the podium uh to make comments but I, I don't think what we're doing is uh **there**. Any other questions? Uh, Louis, are you on line? Did you want to answer that? ???**Louis Rossol** - Ya, I am on line, thank you. You know, I...it's ... it's very similar, I mean, we've...we've got a piece of land that we want to develop and we, we wanted to put ... we wanted to put affordable ... we wanted to put some housing on it before now but it was declined and now we want to put a development on there that's going to bring a lot of good ... good jobs, good part-time jobs to uh to Oakbank and uh probably fifty part-time jobs, probably a half a dozen full-time jobs, it's going to bring some um good infrastructure into, into the town which is going to be paying, you know, at the tax rate. So you know building a 5,000 sq. ft. building, developing the property so um we... it's, it's time really to um.... this, this bylaw really is the, if you want bake a cake, you need a recipe and this, this is what this is, is us as owners of property to develop property and there's a, a fair uh uh you know set of rules to go by. So is there economic development, I'm not sure who asked the question but um you know I can go back in time when I lived, when I lived, our, our family's lived in that town for 55, since nin...since the early 1950s. When the developer came into town uh many years ago there was, you know, no one wanted the developer to come and, and look what it's done to the town of Oakbank. It's fantastic. This is just a progress along the way. This document is needed to move that along. Thank you. **Mayor Therrien**- Thank you, Louis. Any other questions? **NOTE: I heard someone in the audience say "I think it's bigger than Oakbank."** Uh Ewald. **EwaldUnruh**- Uh yes, thank you, Mayor Therrien. I understand from what was said just a few minutes ago is that the Development Plan was approved in 2019. We are now in 2024. In other words, we've been without a current Zoning Bylaw for almost 5 years. Council has spent thousands and thousands of dollars to get us to this point. I would suggest that it is irresponsible financial management to delay this any further. I appreciate uh Mr. Kuczynski and Mr. Miller and their frugality. They are constantly calling to us about how we should not spend money on this or that and we should not cost taxpayers money. Let me give you one little example. Personally my family and I made a subdivision application. Because this Zoning Bylaw was not in force, it cost me \$2,000... \$2,000 personally in order to get a rezoning approved. Mr. Miller, Mr. Kuczynski, can I get a refund on that? You.... you don't want to cost me money as a taxpayer. So I'm tired of the hesitation. I think Council needs to stand up and make decisions, get on with it, and yes, do it properly. Uh you have expert uh team members uh who have uh trained others to do the same thing and I think that it's time that we move on. Uh yes take the corrections that have been given, take the issues that are salient such as, you know, what does drive-through ... where is drive-through allowed etc., make those adjustments but I think it's high time that we get on with it. **NOTE: I am not a fan of this gentleman. People like him have their opinions, and occasionally come out to voice them, but where are they when it comes to doing their community service by putting their name up for a term on Council?** So it's clarification ... not so much, I'm speaking in favour of this uh and ... thank you for listening and uh I hope we get going. **Mayor Therrien**- Thank you, Ewald. Um ok uh questions? **Councillor Miller** – Uh, thank you, Mr. Mayor and thank you, Mr. Unruh for your comments. As you know, I try to be frugal and I have opposed expenditures uh many times uh on things that I thought were frivolous and I'll continue to do that in the public interest. But what I have to say is we have 3 developers here who see special interest to proceed because of course they want to make affordable housing as do every developer across Canada. **NOTE: Whatever that is! Personally, I don't find \$200,000 affordable but I guess it means one can afford the monthly payments on the loan. I never had a mortgage so I would not know. I saved up and took a small personal loan from my Credit Union which I paid off in less than 2 years.** You can watch it on the National News. Affordable housing isn't, isn't affordable to most people, that's the first point. Second point is, Mr. Unruh, uh you're saying fast-track this document as imperfect as it is, I'm not so sure that I want that responsibility or I want that legacy, to fast-track a document and I'm not naive to know that it can't be proofing, absolutely perfect, but when we have loopholes that will potential allow uh development in our community and in an absolutely much broader than Oakbank and Dugald and Anola, I live in the rural area and I need to protect my area and the people who live in it because we want to live in a rural community and uh and having said that if this, if that negates that and, and puts in a position where my community is, the fabric of the community is going to change, then that is not just a trivial change. And having said that, that's why I'm so cautious. Again I don't want to uh barrier this, I think we need to get on with it, there's no question about that but let's hear what the public has to say and if we have to tweak it further, then let's take those weeks to do it, not years, not months, let's fast-track it with the improvements that the public is going to share with us tonight, that's all I'm asking for. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you. Andy, uh you had a question. **Councillor Kuczynski** – Yes, I would like to respond to Mr. Unruh. You stated that we should compensate you for the money that you spent. That was your decision, Sir, not mine or not uh Councillor Miller so we did it and at the time it was 08-01 and you agreed to it. So now you cannot say "sour grapes", I want the money back. We didn't force you to make that decision, you did it on your own because you didn't want to wait until the new Zoning Bylaw was going to be approved by the public. We have, we have community here and we respond to our community. It's not only Dugald and uh and uh other communities uh running this Municipality, we are responsible for the whole people, who, who taxpayers for this Municipality and that is what we're fighting for. We want to have good documents and strong documents that protect the residents of this Municipality. That's who's paying our wages and we're working for, for people in our Municipality. Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** – Ok, uh those uh in opposition uh then uh um Jill, sorry... it's a 10 minute timer uh on this otherwise we'd be here uh till midnight. **Gill Overall** – I don't think, I don't think I need 10 minutes. Um but I'm not here with deep pockets and I'm not trying to develop anything, I'm just trying to protect my.... **Mayor Therrien** – **Interrupting NOTE: And I consider that "rude"...** M'am if you could just uh come... uh show ... **Gill Overall** – It says it's on. **NOTE: Once again, there is a bunch of conversations going on in the background, indecipherable, until one voice rings out "Hats off ... or you leave by law". The talking continues.** Hello, hello. Hellllloo. Testing. **NOTE: Evidentially the mike is not working, conversations heard in the background, and Mayor Therrien laughing and saying "uhhhhhh".** **Mayor Therrien** – Just...just look at me, M'am. **Gill Overall** – I am kind of talking to my fellow residents but ... **Mayor Therrien** – They, they can hear you. **Gill Overall** – Um I'm not here with deep pockets, I'm not here to .. to make any developments and I have to disagree that it's not just dotting some "i's" and crossing some "t's" that we're talking about here in 21-25. We're talking about a wide range of things in this Zoning Bylaw. And um my name's Gill Overall. I'm a long-time resident of Springfield and I'm not here to talk about the Rossol development or about a Big Mac in town, um I'm here to talk about the Oaks North Condos and I represent 34 people and those 34 people are objecting to the proposed Bylaw 21-25 on the basis that we believe it's flawed and that there are a number of issues related to it. Uh I did hand in 34 letters of objection last week to Mr. Doucet. One issue that directly affects these 34 people is the proposed refilling of the land at the north end of town beside the Oaks North Condominiums. This property is also the very first lot, lot of land as you drive into the town of Oakbank on 206 from the north. This property is currently zoned RM Multi-Family Residential but under the new Zoning Bylaw 21-25 it would be zoned CH Highway Commercial. In this new proposed Bylaw, there are at least 18 businesses that would

automatically be permitted and another 20 businesses that could received conditional approval without any objection from me and without any input from my Councillor and my Mayor. Some of those permitted businesses are listed as bulk storage, contractor service area, a fleet service, RTM Manufacturing and Sales, Transportation Terminal, Agribusiness or Agricultural Product Storage. Some of the Conditional Uses could be a storage facility, been there, done that, uh freight or trucking operation, heavy equipment sales, or warehouses. So these are not the type of businesses that any of you would want beside your house. The second issue with this new Zoning Bylaw, if you approve it, is that residents could not go and appeal these type of businesses moving in next door to their homes. You will take away our voice. Highway commercial businesses do not fit well into a residential area. And the third issue that concerns me is that these zoning and planning decisions would now be taken out of Council's hands. So Council and the Mayor, you wouldn't have to make those decisions, you couldn't make those decisions. It would fall to our CAO and our town planner and they would be the only decision makers in what I feel are huge decisions that I think that my elected official should have some say in. The Development Plan is a long term plan. Just because a permitted use appears in this new proposal, it doesn't mean it should automatically happen by applying Bylaw 21-25. These are separate processes for a reason. The land owner could and should have to apply for any changes to land use. It should not just be one of many zoning use changes that the Municipality are proposing at that moment. And why would our Mun...Council and Mayor even consider giving up any such responsibility and power in the development of our community? And we gave you that power when we elected you. We put you there. We didn't give the CAO, the town planner, that power. **NOTE: One would not be out in left field if they had suspicions as to the motives of the CAO et al. That is my opinion. It is the CAO and staff that prepare submissions, i.e. resolutions and draft bylaws to present to Council at meetings. One might wonder why responsibility is being taken away from those over whom the public has some influence because they are the electorate. Go figure.** So if you pass this bylaw 21-25, not only will residents like me lose our voice but you, our elected Council, will lose your voice in many municipal land use decisions. It makes no sense to me unless you've been convinced somehow that this new bylaw makes your job easier uh or maybe you think that there's someone better than you as to what should be built and developed in our community. So you didn't listen to the 600 people that spoke against a poor location for a big chain restaurant at the center of town, you did not listen to the 1200 residents who petitioned against the borrowing bylaw, and I'm hoping you've got your listening hats on tonight, Councillors and Mayor, and that you vote against Zoning Bylaw 21-25. **Mayor Therrien** – Mark. **Councillor Miller** – Thank you, Ms. Overall, for that question and those uh inputs. You know, what fundamentally irks me the most is what you said on a couple of your issues, one being that it takes the ability of the public, they're unable to oppose a development like this, in other words to express it publicly and to reach out to their councillor who are duly elected. If I wasn't elected uh to continue to engage the public throughout my term, I would think I'm just warming this seat and focusing on special interests that I might have or other people have. And so I think it's absolutely integral for us to uphold the public interest by having Council deal with these kinds of issues uh on an ongoing basis and yes, it's more work for us by I embrace that. I think ... you know... the most important thing, the most uh motivating element of me being in this chair is to hear the concerns of the residents. This would just dissipate it and not allow it and unless uh our Planning Officers can share differently, uh does it give you the ability to take...to make decisions, take it out of our jurisdiction or Chair here uh as was represented here? **Mayor Therrien** – I'll have a question for you, M'am, uh after Dan here. **Dan Doucet** – Council is the authority under the Zoning Bylaw. Council could put what zones they want in what areas subject to the uh Development Plan and if it's listed as a permitted use, the yes that permitted use uh authority is delegated to our Department. Any conditional use is delegated to Council through a public hearing. That's the process. **Councillor Miller** – And thank you for that. And so I think that's the danger of what Ms. Overall is saying is that uh if we allow that to happen, Council and the public will not have the ability to protect Oaks North or any other residential application that come forward. In other words, you're trying to scrutinize that and you're doing your best ability, I'm not criticizing but what I'm saying is the public needs to uh reach out to us and we have to have the ability to, to react, to uh safeguard the public as you said, whether it's 600 people or whatever. I, it makes my decision a lot simpler when I see that people are opposed to it and I would support those people fundamentally because it's going to affect their personal lives, maybe financially and a whole bunch of other reasons but uh so this is the concern I have. I, I, I, it's a ... some have termed it a power grab but I would not like to maybe represent it that way, I think um power grab by the bureaucrats or by the Administration and um sure you're trying to streamline our work but to be frank, as I say, we always have to uh extend that hand to the public on issues like this that is so important to the community. **Dan Doucet** – If Council wants to take that responsibility, I'm quite good with that. **Mayor Therrien** – This is...Jill, I've, I've got a question here. Is it the contiguous uh growth that you're looking at uh **there**. Uh from... like the transitioning... you've got Mr. Stanley's uh house uh **there**, then you've got the Oaks and then what's next uh **there**, what you're visualizing that's not the appealing part uh there um for the record, I ... I'd much rather see the multi-housing. It's...it's something that we need in this community and our new Water Treatment Plant will allow us to do that but it's...it's the family housing, the affordable housing that will allow us that. **Gill Overall** – It's definitely the family housing. Um the family that lived beside the condo building, they also signed the petition. **Mayor Therrien** – The Stanleys, Mr. Stanley... **Gill Overall** – I don't know their last name but **NOTE: Mr. Stanley was the Vice-Principal of Springfield Collegiate Institute when I was a Hall Monitor.** Uh they live in the converted school house, the old schoolhouse. **Mayor Therrien** – Ya. **Gill Overall** – Ok. And I mean that's the last 5 acres ... I think it's not quite 5 acres at the end of town. Um we did rally and we fought when we thought you were allowing ...you were approving a storage facility and we did petition against that because no one wants to live beside a storage facility. I mean, these are people's houses, you know, there's, there's 26 units, there's 45 people living there plus the family that lives next door, I mean, it, it was multi-residen ... it was multi-family residential and then someone thought they could make money and took their house off it and put it up for a big price and here we are. I mean, the whole area was multi-family residential. We'd like it to go back to that ... stay at that. **Mayor Therrien** – That answers my question. Thank you very much, M'am. Uh next in opposition? And again, people ... if it's the same, I'll just reiterate that, uh then I haven't yet said, Tangi, who ... ok, Tangi... if you have to leave. Uh 10 minutes, M'am. **Tangi Bell** – Thank you very much for that. I appreciate that. I have to get going. Uh Tangi Bell um Anola, Manitoba. I object to the generality of the bylaw. 08-01 defines and protects residents through relatively clear definitions, defines site regulations, details development agreements hearings, cross-references including increased setbacks for certain types of development to existing residents. These are lacking in this document and will result in existing residents' potential loss of enjoyment of property and financial value. The purpose of the Zoning Bylaw is to set out specific rules for development and land use and give existing residents opportunity to place limits to reduce land use conflicts. This Bylaw does not. 4.7 Specific Use Class Definitions reads "wildlife or conservation reserve means land that has been designated by the Government of Manitoba for the retention and conservation of wildlife and may include wildlife management areas. I'd like it to change to read "and include wildlife management areas", Natural Land Zoning District isn't intended for those areas that are unsuitable for development due to flooding, unstable or poorly drained soils as well as areas with unique natural or wildlife habitat. However, this Bylaw allows for development on these lands. This is unacceptable and should be fully restrictive. I ask that you

prohibit development, allow only for one wildlife or conservation reserve as the above-noted ...as my uh um my change above. Uh natural lands should be in their own use class. They do not fit in the definition of civic uses which relates to a city or town suitable for development.

4.9 That's Accessory Use Class definitions and this, oddly enough, was also one that led into natural lands zoning as a permitted use. It's solar energy panels means an electrical generating system intended to primarily serve electrical needs of the on-site user or consumer either behind the meter or off grid rather than produce power for resale. This includes rooftop collectors and free-standing systems. I'd like it to replace the "rather than produce" to read "not intended to produce power for resale". Draft 21-25 continues to fail. Heritage Resource I'll just skip to that, there is a ... recommendations for the Historic Resources Branch, I'd like to see this Bylaw provide for a heritage resource zone. Um livestock, the operations 9(15)(1) the livestock expansion in I(1) and I(2) ... these must be conditional, again for area residents to comment as well as for new or expanding an I(1) and I(2) conditional as well. Uh 7(4)(6) restricted and prohibited development quote "when development is proposed in suspected hazard areas, the applicant may be required to complete professional environmental geotechnical or hydrogeological studies that would provide recommendations on preventative and mitigation measures to eliminate or reduce the risk". I'd like the change from "may be" to "will require" and the "or" to include ... to read "and". Uh 7(23)(1) groundwater protection in quotes "development in areas sensitive to groundwater contamination as outlined on the groundwater sensitive to ... may require a site specific hydrogeological assessment completed by a professional engineer licensed to practice in Manitoba or a manure management plan approved by the Provincial authority having jurisdiction. Again the "may require", please have it read "will require". Appendix D the groundwater sensitivity map, it's Figure 32 and that's from the Aquifer Capability and Groundwater Vulnerability Study. This intrinsic vulnerability map in Appendix D must either be replaced fully or used in conjunction with Figure 31 and that's the pollution hazard map. Now although the two maps and I quote from these studies generally coincide, Figure 32 does not highlight some of the more localized and isolated deposits identified in Figure 31, another quote from it ... groundwater sensitive areas within the RM are represented by the high vulnerability class on Figure 31. So I ask that ...uh Figure 31 is ... is um ...done so so that we can allow for proper identification of these sensitive areas. And the Bylaw should also identify the detailed recommendations provided in the Aquifer Study for certain development of subdivisions, landfill, aggregate mining etc. and apply them to the corresponding section in the Bylaw for clarity. There's opportunity through Zoning Bylaw 21-25 to protect the environment, water, and the health and well-being of residents to be consistent with our Development Plan to provide clear development rules to ensure greater certainty, predictability and stability for existing property owners. I would really like to see that in the Bylaw, however I do not. I am opposed and object to Bylaw 21-25. Thank you for letting me speak. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, M'am. Mark. **Councillor Miller** – Uh Miss Bell, first off, thank you for raising those very critical and important issue. I will be very short because I know you have to run. As you know, the United Nations has recognized biodiversity as every community must take this as a responsibility. We need to do that at the grassroots hear... hearing tonight and we can't just shove it off to another councillor or just say, oh we'll worry about that at some future time, it's ... the time is now to act, the time is now to ... to include the wildlife areas, it's ...include sensitive uh zones uh natural lands and so on and so on and so on. Thank you very much. Thank you so much for what you did for uh for recognizing what you did in the SIO Silica dilemma as well, you're a champion in our community and I give you two thumbs up. Thank you so much. **Tangi Bell** – Thank you as well. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, M'am. Um who's next? Sir. **Daniel Paige** – Hello. My name is Daniel Paige. I'm your local computer science professor at 63087 Pineridge Road in Sunnyside. Uh I'll be speaking uh on behalf of a neighbour as well uh Cynthia Sinclair who sent her opposition in as well under Opposition #2. Uh she asked me to speak along with the neighbours because she couldn't be here for medical reasons. Before I do, I want to ...I want to just highlight a couple of my oppositions which can be found under the Opposition #3. Um I just wanted to mention just a couple of things just for...it's a lot more detailed in my opposition letter. I just want to touch upon a couple of quick things uh before I get to the primary one which is in the letter that I'll be reading. Um so the first one is, I just want to just highlight that uh the infrastructure is improving in the Municipality, especially for Internet and on-line. Uh a lot of small businesses do engage in on-line commerce. That also means that some engage in different types of activities. Um so for example uh some may engage in educational or instructional. Uh in the language in the Bylaw uh under say Commercial School and schools, it uses the language of instruction. Now as a professor that's taught at least 5 different universities in Canada and the U.S. uh I think the language of instruction is too vague. I think that it should be made a bit more precise to mean the more traditional meaning, something like a physical state. Kind of like the definition for community hall like whereas a physical space where you're engaging physical activity of an instruction, you know, something of that nature. Um but also I do hope that...there is language in the Bylaw under Section 3 and I believe at the beginning of Section 4 that does...that may offer protections for on-line businesses so they aren't...they don't fall under the use class ... but uh ... far more clarification but I didn't want to waste too much time about that here. Um uh the other thing I just want to quickly highlight ...just because I've spoken to some neighbours and including us, we're a little confused about uh cause we live on Pineridge Road where we're zoned for Rural Residential um and we've also had uh we've had the ability of livestock and other things of that nature on our property. Um but it was rezoned under I(4) uh for I believe it's uh livestock overlay uh but I know in the Bylaw, there's actually a chain of reasoning for which we have, I believe, I believe actually with an email to Dan Doucet to one of our neighbours just to clarify and it could be clarified after um just involving just I believe it's residential uh related farms that permits such things. But we just want...it would be nice to be able to kind of clarify in the language for just making sure that like, that the overlay, just make it a bit more precise in this specific section for...just so it's easier for other people to understand cause I do see that there's like a line of reasoning to allow it. But there's also an I(4) restriction say on our road for 10 acre lots uh that...it makes it a little confusing at first but I think it could just be made a little bit more precise. It's, it's, hopefully I'm at least ... at least I'm understanding it correctly but that can just be discussed after. Um I want to talk now...I'll go to this letter just because I want to be respectful of time um so I'm just going to read this letter so for uh let me read this now, uh Mr. Mayor and esteemed Councillors, I'm here this evening respectfully in opposition to the Bylaw 21-25 due to several key issues of concern which I know several people will speak to this evening. However I wish to highlight 3 areas of concern that I believe will require clarification or rewording as I believe they underpin many of the other issues of concern. Firstly I object to the wording in Section 2.2 which changes the Development Officer to Designated Officer. Uh while I am sure Council will say changing the wording, so 21-25 can be consistent with the Provincial Planning Act, it makes little sense to make this change. It can potentially create more confusing results, more confusing resulting in inappropriate land use decisions. The Provincial Planning Act uses this terminology to cover all the possible Municipal Governmental structures within the Province, i.e. not every Municipal ... not every Municipality may have the position of Development Officer. There are a number of designated officers in Springfield including the CAO, Fire Chief, the Police Chief etc., none of which should have the responsibility of making interpretation and decisions about permits and land use issues. Un in addition the bylaw does not state how and when such a designate will be appointed. Will there be multiple designates used for different situations? These designates could potential make zoning and land use decisions without proper knowledge of the issues or public consultation as to permit it for conditional land uses or other planning options such as variance. Uh if

the intent is to maintain the position of Development Officer, let's continue to use that wording in the Bylaw. **NOTE: The term Development Officer was originally used because the current incumbent cannot be referred to as a Planning Officer, not having the required credentials.** Secondly the proposed 21-25 gives such designates ... the designates...uh the power to make zoning and land use decisions for minor variances without uh public consultation or other due process. Minor variance is not a term described in the Provincial Planning Act, nor does it, nor in Bylaw 21-25 describe what is meant by minor variance as it does not appear in the definitions. The taxpayers and voters in Springfield deserve to know what this means. Uh so as it stands, uh it appears to be a blatant attempt at gaining the power to make unilateral decisions that could potentially affect us all. Had this bylaw been in effect when I presented my position opposing Mr. Rooprai's proposal to rezone agriculture preserve to rural residential, it is possible the decision would have been made by the designate with or without even Council's input but even more worryingly, without public input. Um and this pristine farm land would have been permanently and irrevocably changed. In addition, I oppose the wording in Section 2.5.4 as development agreements resulting from rezoning or subdivisions should be further required in the bylaw to address and include appropriate concerns raised during public hearings ... they, that they may be included part of the development agreement that then must be registered as a caveat on the property. In addition, enforcement of all conditions should be clearly spelt out. Uh tidying up this wording would ensure that not only public cons... public consultation occurs but also that peoples' will is acted upon, thus preserving the very basis of democratic rights as citizens. And last, **NOTE: Could I be that fortunate....** last and most important, it is my opinion that this Bylaw is ... if this Bylaw is passed in its present form, with so many "shalls" changed to "mays", the loopholes that allow unqualified people to make decisions about land use or even interpret Provincial planning laws and the blatant attempt to consolidate power within a few individuals on Council or within the inner circle is a direct assault on Canadian democracy. This Council was elected to serve the people of Springfield. It is a sacred trust. The decisions made by Council should be carefully considered to reflect the majority opinion and the needs of our residents. Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council for your attention and consideration. **Mayor Therrien** – Who's that letter from, Sir. **Daniel Paige** – Cynthia Sinclair. **Mayor Therrien** – Cynthia uh Sinclair. Ok um I've got one question for you, what were you thinking about the on-line uh the schooling part, were you thinking bricks and mortar uh there... **Daniel Paige** – Ya, ya, ya, that's sort of like the classic meaning of a school right ... **Mayor Therrien** – Ya, just for... **Daniel Paige** – ... like a brick and mortar school (ok) versus say, say because in terms of a definition, like say for example for a commercial school, as it is, like if put... like if you read it literally, it could sound like somebody that's just doing like little dance schools they do in their living room, just doing like .. like yoga classes or something or an art class. It could be made just a little bit more precise especially after the post-COVID era, you know, we're kind of past this period where not just professors, you're thinking now about instruction in other ways, a lot of people think about on-line learning in person, that's something that it's become a little more in common language which is something that the Bylaw talks about with physical consideration and common use language and I believe that's in ... I think it's in the beginning of Section 4 I think. **Mayor Therrien** – Ok, Sir. Dan had a question for you, Mr. Paige. **Dan Doucet** – It's not a question. It's more clarification. Uh the very first public hearing that we had, we had in the Bylaw Development Officer. It was challenged by members of the public to change that to Designated Officer so we did that to follow the Planning Act. Now you're saying you want to revert it back to Development Officer. So I just want to make that clear. Um the I(1) to I(4) represents a livestock operation. The definition of a livestock operation is 10 animal units or greater. And so if you had 10 or under, this Bylaw allows you to have a residential-related farm with some livestock subject to the Animal Unit Table and also uh I believe ... can't remember the exact name of the use but it's poultry, those are both permitted uses in the current Bylaw or sorry, in the proposed but the current Bylaw it's a conditional use. So just for clarity ... I just wanted to mention ... **Daniel Paige** – Ya, we know. I just wanted to base your intention of livestock because if you.... **Dan Doucet** – ... you can and again, a livestock operation is greater than 10 animal units. Thank you. **Daniel Paige** – Well, thank you so much. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, Mr. Paige. Uh on line. Oh. I don't see anybody. Oh, go ahead. **Dan Doucet** – Mr. Paige, if I ... I forgot to mention one out of... one other item, and that was the comment on the minor variance. Under Planning Act, Section uh 102(1) it states "a Board or Council may by bylaw authorize a designated employee or off...or officer to make an order to vary ... these are the minor variances for height, distance, and area, size or intensity of use with the Zoning Bylaw, no more than 15% of that setback or size. And uh the number of parking spaces required within the Zoning Bylaw. I have a bylaw in place that Council had passed. Uh there was one item that Council did not grant me the authority and I believe that was uh the intensity of use or the parking spaces, I'd have to look at it. It's been a number of years back. **NOTE: True but he should remember as those are the rules within which he operates.** Um so it is in the Planning Act and it is regulated uh so we reference the Planning Act instead of this Bylaw. Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you. Anybody else? Mr. Kuffner? **Richard Kuffner** – My name is Richard Kuffner. And I am against uh the Bylaw. There's just a couple of things in there uh that kind of strike me uneasy. It's Mr. Doucet and uh Colleen making decisions on the part of the residents of this Municipality where if they were elected, if I wanted them to make decisions on my behalf, they should run for Council and be elected by the people in general and no be appointed by whoever is going to ... whoever is doing the appointing of these people to pass the laws or uh recommendations that Council wants. It's the people that vote for the Councillors and uh Reeve or Mayor and that's the ones who I want making decisions for me, not the bureaucrats that work for ... within these uh walls. Uh, that's...that's my comment on that. The other thing is, for the builders. Uh you're talking about you're wanting to do a \$200,000 home and that's great. I'd like to get a home for \$200,000 to live in, that's not a problem but the only thing is, why put it on the backs of the whole Municipality and all of the other builders, when they build, when their building and construction, that's put into the cost of the home. The water and sewer is in the cost of the home. And it's not put on to the general public. The uh our taxes, our assessment, on our land and this is part of it, everybody in town gets uh on the assessment they have to pay uh certain monies to the assessment but the farm land, to the farmers who have to pay on not only the home but on the land as well. And our land, the assessment went up our land this year 45%. I talked to the Assessment Branch. 45% on the land, 15% on the home and 45% on the land which is totally unfair to the farmer and to the land holders of this Municipality. Um that's my whole thing. I thank you for the time and again, if I want somebody making decisions on my behalf, I want to vote for that. Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, Mr. Kuffner. Ok um uh anybody, next. M'am. **Irene Mandella** - Mayor, Mr. Mayor, and elected Councillors, ok, thank you. My name is Irene Mandella and I am a resident of Vivian and I oppose Bylaw 21-25 as it is written. We bought land in uh... we bought the land in Vivian which is a sleepy little hamlet of approximately 30 residences. That's why we are there. It's quiet and yes, there is a train that runs through, a handful of times but it's not menacing. It would have been had there been approval for SIO Silica to use land for the mining of silica sand. That was one dragon that was recently slain. I am speaking for myself now and I believe that yet again there is another proposal to change the Bylaw uh number 21-25, to amend the Bylaw No. 01... uh 08-01 to the change in zoning designation for Vivian from Hamlet Area Zoning to General Development, meaning that the zone change is intended to provide a wide range of residential, commercial and industrial uses within the smaller settlement area. The permitted principle uses are dwellings, single unit, two unit and up to 12 rooms, garden center/nursery, office, retail, outdoor market, restaurant, park, funeral home, police, fire station, uh

library, cultural facilities, school, public works facility, it goes on. This was taken from the Municipal Planning Guide to zoning bylaws in Manitoba. This change is proposed to be without any local public consultation or consideration to area residents and is inconsistent with how other hamlet areas of Springfield have been treated in this proposed bylaw. Do the residents of Glass, Hazelridge, Prairie Grove, and Navin Road understand what the proposed changes are if this is an overall Municipal Plan to zoning bylaws in Manitoba? Has there been consultation with the residents of these areas, the residents of these hamlets are not able to truly vote and acknowledge the changes that are being proposed. Seriously, when I'm making a presentation here and 29 signatures in Winn...sorry in Vivian have been obtained, however for various reasons, 14 signatures have been disqualified, more than half have qualified in a petition against this proposed change. The residents of Vivian had to be canvassed to understand what changes were being introduced within Council. Can you honestly say you've done your due diligence or is it simply that you've done what has been required? Does that mean that you speak on behalf of your voters? How can you justify changes in zoning without a discussion, a town hall or otherwise consulting with the residents in the Hamlet of Vivian? I simply want this Zoning Bylaw to be cancelled and I simply want status quo. Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you very much, M'am. So M'am, I've got a question uh for you. Uh so you'd rather it stay a **Irene Mandella** – A hamlet. **Mayor Therrien** – A hamlet. **Irene Mandella** – A hamlet. Um the residents have also spoken by planning a petition... **Mayor Therrien** – Ya, we've read it or I've seen it.... **Irene Mandella** – Ya and so ya, we're kind of out there in the middle of nowhere by ourselves and it would be nice if the ward councillor or somebody came and spoke to us about these detailed little things that could affect the way we're living in Vivian. Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, M'am. Mark? **Councillor Miller** – Uh Ms. Mandella, thank you very much for your presentation and thank you for sharing your point of view and the point of view of people in Vivian. That's an area I don't get to and I didn't canvass so I'm as guilty as anyone but you've brought their attention to my ears and that uh I will respect going forward but I have to ask you a very important question. Why wouldn't you want to have a multitude of affordable housing in Vivian like we've heard today by the developers who are more than willing and eager to do that? **Irene Mandella** – Ya, it's country living. Well said from the audience. It's country living, we're on 10 acres, we have trails, uh I walk the trails with my dog every single day. Um there are bear that walk across, there are um coyotes, uh there's a lot of wildlife in the area and um we prefer that. I have an 800 head of garlic garden uh growing, um it's an allium garden so there's onions and all sorts of different things and uh ya with full stop, there's a train that goes through every so often. I know when SIO Silica was doing their presentation, they were saying, "oh man, there's a train that goes through there all the time, constantly". Well, it's paradise. I can hear the birds, it's paradise but that's why. **Councillor Miller** – And if I can respond to you, that's exactly why I live in Ward 3 is because I wanted to continue to have that fabric of the rural culture and so forth. And so I applaud you for, for loving Vivian just as I love uh Cooks Creek and so.... **Irene Mandella** – I'm from East St. Paul. Uh I lived in Winnipeg my entire life, brought our children up in East St. Paul and in retirement, we found a mecca. **Councillor Miller** – You've got my commitment, I'm going to uphold what you and 2/3 of this uh Springfield Rural Municipality want to do is uphold their rural life style and that's what I'm committed to do. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you M'am. Andy? **Councillor Kuczynski** – Yes, I want to tell everybody that you're not forgotten in Vivian. **Irene Mandella** – Thank you. **Councillor Kuczynski** – I was working very hard putting signs up against SIO there. So we remember you, a small community but you're part of this community, of the Municipality of Springfield...the Rural Municipality of Springfield. **Irene Mandella** – Springfield, yes. **Councillor Kuczynski** – So I thank you for your presentation too. **Irene Mandella** – Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you. Uh who's next? Mrs. White? **Carolyn Whyte** – Good evening. Carolyn Whyte, Springfield. Firstly before I begin my presentation, I think I'd be speaking for other residents when I say that um what Janet Nysten brought up is kind of concerning. So it seems quite confusing um and I would appreciate that I'm not sure how Council is going to let the public know about what's going on with this, what... you know um what this adoption process of the Bylaw or has it been done correctly, has it not been done correctly, so just reiterating that we would like clarification. Ok my presentation is I object to Bylaw 21-25 based on a drive-in restaurant changing to a permitted use instead of the previous conditional use in the current Bylaw 08-01. This applies to the drive-through application in downtown Oakbank which is the Commercial Central Zone or CC Zone. So I think everyone kind of knows about this one. **NOTE: People are objecting to the new Zoning Bylaw based on the recent actions of Council. Instead they should be objecting to the contents of the Bylaw, the changes in the wording that take decision-making from Council and put it in the hands of bureaucrats and the fact that the word "shall" has been replaced by "may" which allows a lot more discretion and less hard and fast rules.** Um currently a drive-through application in Oakbank is a conditional use which requires a public hearing. Bylaw 21-25 changes it to a permitted use. This means that the Planning Department and possibly also Public Works Department would review the drive-through application and have the power to approve it if it meets the zoning criteria. Council would not be required to review it and no public hearing would be allowed. Coincidentally on May 23rd McDonalds restaurant made a conditional use application for a drive-through restaurant in downtown Oakbank on the corner of Willow and Main. Council was presented with a 533 person petition as well as 75 written objections with a total of 600 people objecting to this proposed downtown Oakbank drive-through. Council defeated the application unanimously 5 – 0. I call this real public input by residents. So the Planning Department has confirmed now that nothing in the new proposed Bylaw would prevent McDonalds or any other eating or drinking establishment with a drive-through to establish at this same site meaning the corner of Willow and Main. They would need to make sure the drive-through is not located along the residential properties but is along the road, the building or eat-in portion after the separation, much like the Tim Hortons set up so my comments today are not a debate on the pros and cons on the McDonalds drive-through at the corner of Willow and Main nor is this an argument against development, that's missing the point. The fundamental point we're discussing is the Municipal Board ordered that Springfield residents shall have input into creating their new Zoning Bylaw and that it should not be dictated by our Administration. Reviewing a story board presentation, in my opinion, is not input by residents. The real story board happened on May 23rd when the community witnessed true democracy in action. 608 Springfield residents provided input, expressed how a downtown Oakbank drive-through development would have impacted their rights to enjoy their property. If this drive-through designation changes to a permitted use, it effectively has three significant implications and this might apply to other parts of Bylaw 21-25, not just the McDonalds Drive-Through. It would potentially silence the voice of these residents. Council needs to listen to the public and not silence their input. It would essentially take away adjacent property's owner's rights of intervention. It would potentially remove the developer's chance to be a better neighbour and to hear residents' concerns and try to address them. So this is just one recent example of where Bylaw 21-25 is not good for Springfield residents. There are many other ones that people are bringing up. There are many instances of changes in Bylaw 21-25 that will have negative long-term impact to existing property owners who until development of adjacent lands occurred, will have no idea how it will change their rights and entitlement to the enjoyable use of their property. So I respectfully ask Council to keep in mind how you voted on May 23rd when you voted unanimously 5 – 0 to defeat a motion after listening to input of residents. I ask you to keep drive-in food service to be a conditional use in downtown Oakbank, a CC zone, like it is designated in current Bylaw 08-01. As this is not the currently the case, I cannot support Bylaw 21-25 and I object to it. **Mayor**

Therrien – Thank you M'am. If...maybe if we can hold off on the applause and save it to the very end. **NOTE: My, my. That's a departure from his normal message which is NO APPLAUSE.** Uh, um any questions for Mrs. White? Thank you, M'am. And uh next. Before you go, M'am uh how many, by a show of hands, how many people are here that are going to object to the uh uh drive uh drive-through component of this uh **Carolyn Whyte** – Will you repeat the question. We can hardly hear you? **Mayor Therrien** – Um how many people here, just a show of hands, are going to object to the uh uh the permitted uh use drive-throughs **there** like Mrs. White had uh just uh stated quite well? Ok. Thank you very much. Go ahead, M'am. I just wanted to get an idea. **Helen Garrett** – Helen Garrett, a resident of Springfield. Uh I wish to register my objection to Zoning Bylaw 21-25. The Municipal Board ordered that the RM of Springfield Municipal Administration must not dictate a revised Zoning Bylaw to the residents. Rather it is a requirement the residents of Springfield must have significant input into creating a new Zoning Bylaw. The previous Open Houses with story board presentations did not meet the requirements of a public hearing or consultation. One of the drastic changes that would be allowed under the new Zoning Bylaw would remove the identification of agriculture intensive zones. Currently this zoning specifically identifies and includes such uses as feed lots, hog barns, chicken barns, and so on. These uses have been specifically addressed in the past because of their potential to have a detrimental impact on the land and a serious impact on the quality of life of neighbouring properties. **NOTE: Not to mention the inhumanity of raising birds and animals in a crowded building and then slaughtering them for food, having never seen sunlight or rain etc. One such barn was built on the north side of PTH 15 between Dugald and Anola in recent years where a grain farm had once stood. One cannot tell what is being raised in that rather long and narrow building and I have never seen any activity near it. It would be located on top of the Sandilands Aquifer just as my property is. I had many dogs kenneled here over the years but I always collected the manure and composted it in one location, within a walled and floored compost receptacle.** The impacts include odors from livestock and manure stockpiling and groundwater contamination. Noise from machinery is another concern. There would be fewer public hearings for new businesses, disallowing neighbouring residents to have any input into restrictions on business operations. New residents coming to the Municipality with certain expectations could experience many controls removed from neighbouring land uses. The size of residential requirements will be reduced from the current 20-acre requirement to 5 acres in a number of areas. Currently our Municipality does not enforce the Bylaw in many respects because the Province has jurisdiction. Allow me to offer an example of an extreme variance that was granted more than 2 ½ decades ago to an existing property currently zoned as Agriculture Restricted. Application was made to build an addition of a stable on to an existing barn and to add a riding arena which far exceeded the guidelines. The minimum requirement for such a facility is 20 acres but the variance was granted on a property that was only 6.73 acres. That's more than a 15% variance and it was allowed a maximum of 6 horses. I might add that this property is situated in an area that has been identified as having high groundwater sensitivity, another reason to monitor these types of properties closely. No consideration was given to the fact that approximately a third of the property is marshland and always has been continuously wet and unsuitable for the intended use. Most of the dry lands on the property are now largely occupied by buildings, the house, yard site and driveways. There's no pastureland on this property, only a small paddock for the horses. In a wet year like this year, there is very little dry land for the horses so they are standing in mud for much of the time. Apart from the obvious transgressions, no consideration has been given to the welfare of livestock. In fact, the Municipality seemingly paid more attention to the potential increase in the tax base which took precedence over animal welfare. The Municipality would only remove the variance in the event that no horses were housed on the property for a period in excess of 1 full year. Variances should be reviewed every time a property changes hands. New owners should have to reapply for the variance to ensure that the usage going forward strictly complies with current regulations and damages to the environment should be reassessed. Neighbours who now have history with this particular property should be able to have input. The idea that existing properties with extreme variances should be grandfathered in without a major review could create a myriad of future issues. The Planning Department confirmed that the Municipality does not assume much responsibility for enforcement and it would be rare to remove the variance. Violations are largely the responsibility of the Province, especially with regard to distances between manure stockpiles and wells on the property and potential related health concerns to people and animals. I strongly object to the 53 recommendations in Bylaw 21-25 because the significantly water down the guidelines, creating nebulous procedures to control intensive agriculture which would leave much to interpretation by the Municipality. Neighbours will have much less say with regard to the fit of new and existing businesses within a neighbourhood. I object to the changes as summarized in Bylaw 21-25 and ask the Municipality to have a proper public consultation to improve the existing bylaw rather than allow these changes which will render it more nebulous. **Mayor Therrien** -Thank you, M'am. Mark? **Councillor Miller** – Uh, thank you, Mr. Mayor and thank you, Ms. Garrett for presenting your information, it was very helpful to me. Um I wanted to ask you, because the argument will be there that there was a series of open houses and you know, we had a ... I think we have the stats, there was 8 at Cooks Creek and there was 10 at uh Anola and whatever it was but um that doesn't seem to represent a broad spectrum of people throughout the community, in fact I'm pretty sure people in Hazelridge and Cooks Creek uh um a large component of people weren't able to participate but having said that, um I know the Administration does take it upon themselves to give an opportunity for the public to engage, right, and so it's difficult from them and also as Councillors to know what is the best process to engage in, in other words having this document on the Website, is that showing uh due diligence in terms of providing the information? Does an Open House here and there provide enough and adequate information to the public? Uh can you suggest to us or provide guidance, information on what you would have liked to have seen or what you would like to see going forward even because we still have an opportunity to have the public engaged. As you said, the Municipal Board really believes that we ought to engage much better than what we've done before so there's still an opportunity to get people involved and understand what we're getting into. It's an inadequate document. I've heard already several flaws in it whether it be a professor or uh you know residents from all parts of our community. Uh how can we ensure that more people are engaged and have input and most important, understand what this document will do to our community going forward? **NOTE: That is the question! I have tried with my notes to stimulate interest over the years but there is still only a handful on my mailing list relative to the size of our population.** **Helen Garrett** – Well, it's ... many people have pointed out the seating. There's a lot of confusion of about what the current Bylaw means and what was passed and what was presented and recommendations that uh a new Bylaw number be put forward and we start back in the beginning. And in my opinion, there were not adequate public consultation. Like presenting, putting up a bunch of story boards and a few people coming in and reading them, that's not a consultation. It should have been much more uh adequate uh uh ... maybe a presentation by the Municipality, not just story boards, and more opportunity to comment. I was going over the Bylaw the last few days and the more I read it, the more confusing I find it. So I consider myself um reasonably...you know a person who can reasonably understand something that should be quite straight-forward, but I actually just found it confusing. So I would really suggest that uh you know, the proper public consultation and input uh be required going forward and uh... well, the other thing I considered.... Sorry, do you have another question? **Councillor Miller** – No, I'm echoing what you're sharing. I know when I do Cabinet submissions and/or documents to

high level executives, that what we do is we provide the impacts of that decision or that uh proposal. In other words, how will this uh document uh not necessarily line by line, but how will that effect and impact residents in a broad perspective. That's what people would want to understand. I can assure you that if I give this document to many of my neighbours, they'll read through it and they won't have a clue what it is really going to do so the impact and the analysis ... providing the public ... not the legalize but the actual impact that it'll have on residents going forward, that would make it in simple language for people to understand, I think that's what you're kind of **NOTE: Whatever happened to the phrase "in the future"? Everyone seems to be replacing it with "going forward". A correct use of "going forward" is "the man is going forward with his idea to provide more menu choices to his customers". In fact, I can think of far better ways to express the same idea such as "the restaurant owner has recently increased the choices offered on his menu" or "what could happen, given the way this bylaw is written, is that the RM will lose any control they might have had with respect to planning".** Helen Garrett – Yes, and I actually think I should be, personally, in a better position to understand this because I worked as a real estate appraiser for 3 ½ years so it was a requirement to understand zoning bylaws and planning documents and all those things. I just found it confusing. And I uh...just a comment on the uh open houses and story boards. I understand a lot of people did not show up at these presentations and um I just feel that, based on past experiences, probably many people thought they they...even if they commented, that they might not be heard. And I'm looking at the agenda this evening and the last two points are New Business. Bylaw 21-25, Springfield Zoning Bylaw Second Reading and Bylaw 21-25 Springfield Zoning Bylaw Third Reading. So are we just window dressing here tonight or what? So that's my comments. **Mayor Therrien** – That's not the case, uh M'am. Thank you. Anybody else? Uh M'am. **NOTE: Everyone knows that expression, you can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time. The Mayor and CAO should take note of Lincoln's words.** Karen Insley—make the most of this.... uh you guys won't have to listen to me for very long because I've you know, told it at other meetings. Um Karen Insley. Um I wasn't proposing to speak tonight but I just...because I reiterate a lot of the rural residents' comments here... I live rurally, you guys know that we picked where we live because we want to live in the country, I wanted to live like I did in England. We didn't want to live in the city so we moved to Oakbank, chose to live in a rural residence and I think it was Councillor Kuczynski said that there's 900, is it, ... of developing ... land that could be developed, not right on top of other people's doorsteps. Um but Mr. Sandhurst, is that correct, have I got your name correct yup um I would have to list to what you said earlier but you said that these bylaws are supposed to serve the best purposes of the stakeholders uh and wants and needs and I honestly am not going to talk for long but Municipal stakeholders means residents of the Municipality as well as other individuals, organizations, or persons that may have an interest in, or are affected by a decision made by the Municipality. I am a stakeholder in Springfield and this bylaw does not serve my purpose, my needs, my wants or the wants of the environment and the land that I live on. That's what I have to say. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, M'am. Uh Sir, did you have uh did you want to make a comment? Ok. Uh anybody else uh in opposition? **Bob Fraser** – Bob Fraser, Dugald, Manitoba. First off, thank you, Mayor, uh and thank you, gentlemen, for trying to bring progress to the RM of Springfield. I oppose this bill, this Bylaw. When I came to a reading for the Bylaw a while ago, there's numerous questions being asked and I've not heard any answers coming from that one. There's also numerous flaws in this Bylaw that people pointed out tonight. With that, it should automatically be a vote No tonight. Now I'm new to the RM, I've been here 5 years. I bought in the Wheatland Park and when we bought there, we were one of the first houses in Wheatland Park. There's still numerous built houses that are sitting vacant. As much as affordable housing is great, people are not buying houses right now. So to rush in to build houses is not the answer. Infrastructure ... you want to build houses and build up the area but people are struggling to move around this area. How does your infrastructure for transportation help. People in Dugald, they get sick, how are they getting to Oakbank where they have the hospitals??? or have the Dynacare labs and the clinics and such. **NOTE: Dugald is also maybe 3 miles from Transcona where there are numerous medical facilities to choose from.** There ... it's just very poorly thought out at this time. This is the second meeting that we've had for this in under a week where you rushed out the second and third reading. Anything that's good you shouldn't be trying to rush out. You were all voted to be the voice of the people. I applaud you for listening when it came to the drive-through and listening to what the people said and voted No for that there. It seems after listening, that this Bylaw started in 2019 with the former Mayor. **It seems the former Mayor is still very much alive and running this Council.** **NOTE: Laughing and talking in the background.** We're rushing through things ... **NOTE: Someone says "here just...thank you, thank you"** we're rushing through things right now in the same manner that the Mayor did in the past. **NOTE: Oh, you mean, like the "grain storage facility" on Poplar Road by our Municipal wells? Those huge elevators in the middle of land zoned agricultural and near residences that have been there for years?** And that is what scared and annoyed a lot of residents and stakeholders. I was at the last meeting where there was a huge outcrop that did not want that to go through. You... you as a Council pushed it through. Tonight I've heard 4 people in agreement and numerous, numerous people saying No. So I'm hoping that you as councillors are going to listen to your people, uphold that you are the voice of the people and vote No. At this time, I move that all further readings of Bylaw 21-25 should be tabled ... not table... until such time as all questions and concerns have been publicly addressed. Thank you. (hear, hear) **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you. Uh opposition again. Lenay? **Lenay Gutoski** – Thank you. I wasn't going to speak. I had actually reached out to the academics of the RM today and had a really intelligent conversation on where this Bylaw had actually ... where it was warranted, um why it was being brought up to the forefront again and what is development ... and leave development alone, we're talking hamlet in Vivian which is think there was a petition. If we're talking development over by Oaks North....I sympathize with your situation. I want to dial it back, though and first of all, thanks to the Council that voted against the specifics and under this umbrella which is the drive-through and We heard the litany of reasons, the 533 uh petitions signers, 108 or whatever it was letters because it was really ...it was passionate, everyone was ... but I applaud you for listening to people. We talked safety... we talked actually witnessed I think...we talked the fact that um there's 4 or 5 daycares in this area, we talked that it's a non-aligned intersection, it even had gas remediation in the past. We talked about the fact that the owner has not been from this Province for 30 years. We talked and had restaurants, talked about how this is not a petrie place for hiring 50 people at any one of the surrounding retail or restaurants or businesses, it was an upper middle-class town where your teenage staff and your part-time staff are at the cottage and/or in extreme ??? ask anybody. It's not a big employment petrie dish.**NOTE: On my last visit to Oakbank, I noted that all the employees in the Tim Hortons appear to be non-residents of Springfield and perhaps recent arrivals to Canada judging by their accents.** It is a dangerous corner, it's an ugly corner, so it's a good chance for litigious right here. Mayor Therrien, did you not say to me that one of the reasons you would have liked this pushed through was because it was an ugly corner. Did you... **Mayor Therrien** – When did I say that? **Lenay Gutoski**– You said that and I could give you the date, I wrote it down. It was an ugly corner and you didn't like it and you knew it wasn't policed well from the licensed establishment which I said I had witnessed accidents from in the past. So you did in fact say that and I say then we go to the slum landlords ... and fix it up because it is an ugly corner and it could be much more attractive. **Mayor Therrien** – Lenay, I'm not saying ... I'm not saying I didn't say that, I, I trust you. **Lenay Gutoski** – Oh no, you did say that. Ok. So if you were ... did you not say after the meeting

where you were seated, you went on for 4.3 minutes inaudible...looking down at the ground and trying to talk about an amendment when the vote was already tallied. Well, did you not? **Mayor Therrien** – I did. And this, this... **Lenay Gutoski** –Well, did you not see... did you not see ... an ??? on your motorcycle when you asked me Lenay, can I talk to you ... and I said the people spoke and again, you looked at the ground and I'm being honest, I'm not throwing you under the bus, you were like a dog with a bone, you wanted to see it pushed through. **Mayor Therrien** – No, I didn't. Can I, can I talk now, Lenay. **Lenay Gutoski** –No, now I'm talking. **Mayor Therrien** – Ok. **Lenay Gutoski** –It's true. So at the end of the day, we gave you about 15 reasons, it was defeated. I applaud, I applaud the Council, I applaud you Melinda for going out and doing research. We're a small community towns and villages that have like-minded ...rising business go on the outside of town, you saw it for yourself. I applaud you, Mark and Andy for listening to the people. I haven't always agreed with you but you know what, for the last year, I've got to tell you, I really see a line where you are agreeing with the people. Glen, I know that you listen because of last time around and I know Pat you have to listen. I've had intelligent conversations with Dan and I really respect WSP Engineering, I work in construction, I don't always respect engineering (laughter) But that said, that said, as a sustainable system that we're supposed to be ...environment... oops, lost that ... as a person in a sustainable building, I appreciate Tangi Bell's take on all of that. As, as the fellow resident in commercial zoned Oakbank, I don't think that this Bylaw should be down to anything but the voice of the RM and its people. That power shouldn't be taken away. I think that each and every site away from the silo should be looked at individually, we're not a hamlet in Vivian or a drive-through and it arguably the worst corner in Oakbank. Ok. And I don't think it should be looked at like the ... the Development Plan southward of Dugald or even towards the Oaks. I think every single situation has to be looked at individually. I think the people have to be listened to and please put it on record I object to 21-25 and I hope that you listen and once again, have the voice of the people. Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** –Go ahead, Dan. Lenay, Dan's going to reply. **Dan Doucet** – Ms. Gutoski, for the record, Mr. Sandhurst is not with WSP, he is with our Planning team. **Lenay Gutoski** – No, thank you, I apologize. **Dan Doucet** – He's a professional planner who taught at the University of Manitoba. Thank you. **Lenay Gutoski** – I understand. Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** –Uh next.Sir. I know it's not John, it's got to be Richard. (laughing) **Richard** - I'll speak gladly, sure. I'd just like to say I'm in opposition to 21-25 uh mainly because of the permitted use change to the drive-through um and I'm not going to say anything else because pretty much everything has been said already. Councillor Miller, you asked what could be done to help communicate better. I know myself what would help me out is that a document came out, you could just blast it out through the e-mails, you know you've got that e-mail distribution list where here's what the current bylaw says, here's what the proposed change is and why we're making that change. Those 3 things together, everyone can just skim through and look at what's important to them and ignore the rest instead of trying to read a Bylaw that's 91 pages long. That was very difficult to do so I just thought I'd mention that so ... **Mayor Therrien** –Thank you very much. Um how many...how many people are still to talk in opposition mainly because of the uh drive-through uh changing it from permitted uh to conditional or vice versa. How many people are still to talk **with regards to that?** The drive-through uh provision uh there. Oh I'm sorry, how many uh how many people are still to be heard **with regards to** uh what uh Lenay was talking about uh and uh Mrs. White. Uh about the permitted uh use for drive-throughs, uh objecting to that or in opposition I should say. Has everyone been heard in regards to that? Um the reason I'm saying that is that uh we, we've listened to uh many people **with regards to** the opposition uh **there**, not as many as I thought but we've read all the uh opposition uh and letters, emails uh **therewith regards to** that um and this is a proposal uh I'm not sure if I can really do it or not uh **there**, if we were to make a resolution ... can we do that uh where we could uh change it uh now um the 21-25 to uh, uh excuse me, excuse me, to uh uh back to conditional use uh for drive-throughs, is that something that we could ... through a resolution. Does Council understand? If we were to make a resolution that would uh change it to uh to conditional use for uh drive-throughs. No this... are we able to do that uh by resolution? **Martin Sandhurst** – Uh the key...yaPatrick, it's a little tricky but I mean, there's examples certainly where in the course of a public hearing, a Council has uh has heard from the applicant and community members and on that basis, uh say a zoning amendment application that was advertised and applied for as say a high order commercial uh zoning district uh Council based on what the applicant proposed and what was heard at the hearing, decided we're not going to give you that higher order commercial zoning district, we'll give you a low order one and they've made that decision before closing the public hearing uh without having to go through the process of oh now we have to advertise again. It's pretty important that to understand that that specific individual site zoning amendment application, it's also important to understand that Council couldn't do the opposite which would be if somebody came in and asked for a lower order commercial and without advertising, and coming forward again at a later date uh approving a higher order commercial zoning category. So with respect to what we have in front of us today, the Planning Act is explicit that after the public hearing closes, uh before giving Second Reading, if Council makes changes after closing the hearing, the second Public Hearing will be required to deal with those specific changes. It's silent on if you can make a change based on public testimony at the public hearing before closing but examples from my experience uh and case law suggests that you have the authority to do that. If you speak to the change you want to make and then close the hearing, you can then proceed down the path, obviously in accordance with the Planning Act to Second Reading. If it goes to the Municipal Board, obviously we can't go to Third Reading until we hear from them. If it does, we can go to Third Reading. **Mayor Therrien** – Alright, it's extremely complicated uh **there** uh so still learning the uh...so what, what I'm saying is uh I think we got uh a large majority of 122 uh objectors that are objecting to the uh the drive-through, the commercial central district. Uh sorry there seems to be a uh a vast majority of the people that are, are opposed to it uh being permitted for the uh drive-through in the Commercial Central District, I think that's what is was maintained as **there** so having, are we allowed ... is it uh advisable, allowed uh that we could uh uhuh make a resolution or do a vote **with regards to** uh changing the textural wording uh **with regards to** this? **Martin Sandhurst** – Well, I think uh Patrick, as a general observation, you'd want to make sure that's the will of all of Council to proceed on that basis. **Mayor Therrien** –Ya, I was just wondering. Just hang on M'am, hang on, just hang on... just, I know the we'll, we'll get to that. **NOTE: The audience is very vocal at this meeting.** Uh Glen. **Councillor Fuhl** – I think the important part here is keeping ... excuse me.... uh keeping the public hearing open while we're discussing **NOTE: He pronounces it "discussion" this...** this and make sure that we do not close this until we've had the full discussion between Council so that we can make a forward decision going forward prior to close it, ok so the discussion again is that around Council we've heard the public here, everything that they said and if anybody wishes to speak again, I...through the Mayor, would say speak now. Because now we're coming to that point where the discussion of Council so anybody wishing to add anything or subtract anything, please do now. Mark? No, No, we're talking here now. We're going to be ...uh Mark. **Councillor Miller** – Uh ya thank you, Mr. Mayor. And I appreciate what you're trying to do, you're hearing uh what people are saying and I know what Councillor Fuhl is saying but absolutely Parliamentary procedure would say you have to continue to hear representation cause you can't nitpick one issue and say ok let's amend it here and now and change it, we've got to hear the whole dialogue as Councillor Fuhl is doing and then ... and then assess it uh what we need to do. Obviously, it's pretty evident that it's 8 o'clock, it's pretty evident that there's going to be a whole host of changes that people are recommending and I can't see frankly how I would support it as it's proposed anyway but I still want to hear the

other elements because there are people beyond McDonalds and other issues that have, as Councillor Fuhl says, may have issues that they want to share with us so ... **Mayor Therrien** – No, I agree and uh I agree with what uh Councillor Fuhl was saying but uh Mrs. Overland uh there um Overall, sorry Jill sorry, uh but that as well, there's ... there's a strong uh uh opposition and uh I put it down to uh 767 Main Street, changing it uh uh changing it to Residential uh Multi-Use District so that would even be two uh text-provisions that uh I thought that uh...just as a thought, that we could change uh that speaking to Jill's uh **there** and plus uh the numerous objectors uh uh to uh the commercial uh drive-through uh uh position, keeping it as conditional use under 21-25. **NOTE: That speech was "painful". The Mayor must be upset because his dialogue is worse than usual.** So but then I ... as far as I could tell, I think we've spoke to most of the people that were in opposition. We've gone through all the favours uh **there** um and uh so we've got two more then. Ok Darryl. **Darryl Speer** – She says don't touch it. (laughter) My problem is that this podium is not accommodating for people to try and make a presentation to Council. Can we resolve that? Make a bigger area. **Mayor Therrien** – We've got other bigger issues right now but ya, we'll look at that. **Darryl Speer** – I, I think it actually diminishes the people that are trying to make presentations to Council not having ... not being accommodating, either through sound or through an appropriate uh podium to make the presentation and the idea that we can't consult or include the audience in our conversation, I think is not a good position to take ok. **NOTE: He is talking about the fact that the podium has the mike set up on it so there is no room to put one's papers down from which to read. Even without the mike, the podium is rather small.** I, I have a couple of concerns and uh I think by the discussion tonight, I don't see how you can propose to amend something that's actually can't be approved based on the number of objections that were already tabled before ... well long before the meeting. So that is, ...am I missing something here? Could I have an answer? **Mayor Therrien** – What's ... you're asking whether it's to be ... whether it's to be approved if there's 25 objectors uh then uh we will ...it'll go after that. **NOTE: What does he mean "if" there's 25 objectors? Is he awake? And they knew that before the meeting.** We won't go to the Third Reading. **Darryl Speer** – Well, you can't even go Second Reading. **Mayor Therrien** – We can do the Second uh **there**. **Darryl Speer** – Well I (laughing) I don't know how you propose to do this and try to amend it mid-stream is, is like ... is that proper procedure? **Mayor Therrien** – Well, we've got a ... **Darryl Speer** – Mr. Sandhurst? **Mayor Therrien** – Well, we've got a ... we've got a majority uh a strong majority of people that are opposed to those two, the drive-throughs and the uh 766 Main Street Oaks uh **there**. Uh so changing...changing that uh **there** uh I just threw it out there. Whether we can do it or not ... I think we can. **Darryl Speer** – Well, I'm asking ... the gentleman here gave us a lecture ... how is this possible ... do we... to modify the whole thing mid-stream here? **Mayor Therrien** – Then I'll uh ask uh Mr. Sandhurst to look at that. Mark? **Martin Sandhurst** – Mr. Speer, I gave an example of from my experience of where at the public hearing a change has been made to a Zoning bylaw. Um that's my experience and what I can also say is nothing in the procedures is laid out in the Planning Act to prevent Council from doing something similar to what Patrick proposes but of course it would ... we'd need a resolution and we need a Council vote on that. What the, what the Planning Act is explicit on is that if we're making a change, we can't make it after the public hearing is closed. **Darryl Speer** – Let's...let's go back to the beginning, let's go back to the beginning **Mayor Therrien** – Listen, people. Hey, somebody's talking here, let him talk. Be respectful. **Darryl Speer** – Let's go back to the beginning ... beginning when Janet Nylen raised the question this event here is not appropriate so now we're going to add to it more amendments? I, that's like...I cannot actually follow this at all. Uh I think this is ...one of the things that was raised by a couple of others is that I don't think we've had what's called a proper consultative process and the idea that we can put up story boards uh in ... in the community halls like they've done recently and we can't have a meeting with the affected residents to discuss their concerns without having at a controlled environment where you can't talk now, you can't say this, you can't say that and so on and so forth. **NOTE: Doesn't much resemble democracy, in my opinion.** I think that uh uh this is one of the issues that we've got, people don't understand what it is, a designated officer means. We need to have that clarified. And what is the designated officer's uh role in, in ...and what level of expertise uh does this person have uh in making uh recommendations flowing out of a decision. And so I think this is all im ... you know, important. The uh...I think one of the things we've got is ... is a lot of generalities in this particular bylaw that are not defined properly and I think that needs to go back to the drawing board. Now whether it is basically uh shall we say deferred, delayed but certainly not uh going to any kind of a decision at this point and that is too important as has been put out here by some people very eloquently. So I think that uh we've got uh unfortunately uh issues in this RM that give us a cause for pause and that is, ok, let's assume for a minute that we had uh the ...go forward for the McDonalds and then we end up with issues arising out of that that don't conform to what was committed to. Our problem is that we've got many examples of this where we don't have proper uh controls, we don't have proper enforcement, things go forward and then it becomes nebulous and, and our ...probably a prime example of that is that we've got uh aggregate operations that are basically uh not following our existing bylaw, Bylaw 73-22 which is fifty years old and we can't even uh deal with the very simple provisions that are required there. Uh we've got uh major transgressions happening that we keep being pushed off to the Province to resolve and they, they you know don't get on with it and it should be upon us to make sure that we deal with ... with the issues as was mentioned earlier about the hazardous uh impacts there are in the uh water sensitivity zones, we don't have proper management plans there and that should be uh part of the whole equation that we've got going down. Uh you know we've uh...I don't see how we can move forward on this thing tonight. I mean, like just based on everything that's been tabled into the meeting, before the meeting, at the meeting, I think that it, it needs to uh uh perhaps go back to square one. Uh just putting a paint coat on it and calling it 24 – 0 something or other is not the answer as far as I'm concerned. So I would also suggest and this has come up in talking about the SIO Silica uh uh application, they did not engage in an appropriate level of experts to deal with a very complex situation and I think that's one of the problems we have here. We have a Development Officer and we want to change that to a designated officer. It's not clear what their credentials are for such a move and say, whoa, just a minute, this is beyond our level of expertise so for this application, we need to have engagement, you know, outside independent experts to advise Council, the Planning Department, on how this should be structured or not. So I think there should be some provis...allowance made for when we're up against something we don't have the expertise for, that we should actually have that included in this bylaw or its successor is the, is the deal. So I think we've got too much slack in our machine, it needs to be tightened up and I don't see that this bylaw is doing it. So anyways I'm open for questions. **Councillor Miller** – Uh thank you Mr. Mayor. Thank you, Mr. Speer for sharing your perspective as well. You know, any time you take out responsibility and accountability within a bureaucracy, it's very difficult to know who the public should go to and who they can hold accountable, right, so the designated officer is someone within the fluffy zone of the RM so I'm concerned with that but you know what, what most people don't know is that you were in fact on the Aggregate Task Force and that was a very, very important Task Force because it led to what was supposed to be the protection of our water in that zone, in the gravel pit zone so are you concerned at all, my question being, are you concerned at all that of course now it was dispensed, we don't have an Aggregate Task Force which I personally would love to bring back but are there vulnerabilities within the gravel uh zone. Uh we have had feedback uh I guess it's Chris Lorenc, head of the Heavy Construction Association of course, who is in support of this uh proposal and he'd need to be because he represents those individuals and it's like a lobby,

right, **NOTE: That's putting it mildly. Lorence, Chabot, Funk, they're all part of the cartel.** you represent who you're paid for or get paid by so my question to you, do we have enough safeguards in this to protect our aquifer in the aggregate zones throughout our Municipality, not just the Garven Road **NOTE: Thank you. There is a gravel pit adjacent to the east end of my property, on Monominto Road and several more in the vicinity. There are gravel pits on 302 south and on the north side of Highway 15 in that vicinity and in Vivian. There are gravel pits on Stoneridge Road near Anola.** but uh whether it be in the far reaches of our community. **Darryl Speer** – Uh no we don't and one of **Mayor Therrien interrupting** – Uh just for clarification, you're not a hydrogeologist, you're not an engineer by trade at all so I'm not sure if that's a proper question to ask, it's an opinion. **Councillor Miller** – Well, I'm asking for an opinion and I don't think you need to discredit Mr. Speer, I think.... **Mayor Therrien interrupting** – I'm not discrediting him, I'm just saying I wanted... his credentials aren't that he's a geo-scientist at any way... **Councillor Miller – interrupting** ... no but he's highly engaged and very knowledgeable in all these issues. **NOTE: And let's face it, neither am I but if you dig below the water table and have an open pit with heavy machinery working in it, with transmission fluid, oil, gas, porta-potties etc., it doesn't take a Rhodes scholar to figure out that the possibility of contamination of the water is at high risk. Sure makes me wonder whose side the Mayor is on and why? That's my opinion.** **Mayor Therrien interrupting** – Then that's the opinion. Go ahead. **Darryl Speer** – I, I thank you for your question. Uh I can assure you that uh this has been a concern of mine for many years and I've come to Council numerous times, at budget time, uh asking for actual resources to be allocated for the protection of the groundwater. And each time it's... I've been pushed aside in favour of a skate park, a water slide, take your pick. **NOTE: And previous council members ridiculed him in spite of all the evidence he brought, in the form of many, many pictures of infractions. When the Aggregate Task Force was around, the Springfield Police under Chief Pheby used to patrol the Garven gravel pit area regularly which acted as a deterrent to some extent.** It's not happening. The fact is, this is still going on. And as a matter of fact, we're proposing this \$29.4 million dollar water treatment plant to compensate for the fact that we have not protected our aquifer, particularly the one we draw water from Oakbank for 30 years and have supplied Dugald and that continues as we speak. And yet we are not protecting our water source. There's other entities drawing water from Springfield. East St. Paul is drawing water from Springfield for years and they are proposing to add another well this year to augment their capacity and also the water bottling plant, Sky Blue, is drawing water from Springfield and we are in a situation where we have to go to a very expensive water treatment plant when they're drawing water from here at minimum expense. So that's not right but furthermore when you've got all the open aggregate properties that are open, basically sinkholes for refuse, those uh properties that ... those open waters are feeding the aquifer that many private well owners are drawing from. So I think we need to be very vigilant ... more vigilant and that should be part of this exercise here, to protect and conserve and recognize that our future and the future of the RM should not be mortgaged to ideas that avoid being responsible for the environment. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, Sir. Anybody else? Janet, no, Janet's next. Oh, ok, somebody made a very uh inappropriate remark referring to somebody uh ... I can't even say the word. It's just disgusting that ... that word so uh whoever that person was, uh time to grow up, alright. Uh uh that's an insulting word to uh anybody and I think a lot of people heard it, uh. **NOTE: Someone in the audience confesses and apologizes. Apparently it was Chabot.** Thank you very much, Mr. Chabot. Ok. **Janet Nylen** – Thank you. Janet Nylen from Oakbank. I just wanted to give you my opinion on what is happening tonight. This is the Bylaw 21-25 that has First Reading. These are the changes that Council is proposing to the bylaw. You ... when you uh close the Public Hearing you can make or not make any of these changes and as well any of the comments and request from the public. You can vote on them independently, then you list them in your ... somehow you know and attach it to a resolution giving Second Reading how you proceed with this and anything that comes from the Hearing in my opinion. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you. **Janet Nylen** – So I'm hoping that this Public Hearing will be much more conducive to civic engagement um and that the public's concerns will receive due consideration because after all, land use zoning is one of the most impactful bylaws that Council considers because it can affect every property owner, what they can or can't do on their property, what their neighbours can or can't do next door to them. It really is a measure to expect, to enjoy a standard and a quality of life. I'm unsure of the time that I will be given so I will not do an itemized um presentation. Uh I'll list my objections by topic and provide the list at another date. Perhaps it will be at the Municipal Board. My first concern is **permissive language**, briefly language used should have more clarity and specified definitions when an applicant or a perspective purchaser applies for a rezoning, conditional use, or variance. True the Province suggests a standardized format and policy language but this Bylaw does not follow those Provincial guidelines. They do not reflect the best planning practice and standardization which makes it far easier for area residents and Administration to readily understand the contents and process required of the Zoning Bylaw. The Province's format makes administration of the Bylaw far more consistent than it is now the way it's formatted. Standardized policy wording and language can of course be tailored to meet with the needs of the respective municipalities but it can and should also make the administration of the Bylaw more consistent. **Three – Definitions.** The Municipality has made efforts to remove definitions that are very much needed to consistently and clearly administer this Bylaw. There are fewer definitions in this Bylaw than there was in 08-01 and I submitted 21 suggested definitions in October of '21. And as well there are a number of Provincially held standardized definitions that you may consider as well. These definitions would make the administration of the Bylaw far more consistent and transparent. **Questionable use types and Select Zoning Areas** – There are several use types that have been considered by this Bylaw that aren't characteristic of the zoning classifications and that in some instances don't meet with the test of general consistency with the Development Plan Bylaw. Five select properties have had their land use zoning changed on the uh Zoning Map. Now this has been done without any specific rezoning process or public hearing. Although the properties generally align with the Development Plan designation, the area residents that will be impacted by the change have not had a fair entitlement to have their concerns heard. Furthermore the automatic rezoning of properties eliminates the opportunity for the Municipality to enter into development agreements to address any concerns either from the Municipality or from nearby property owners. This subjective and autocratic change in land use goes beyond the scope of revising the terms and conditions within the general Zoning Bylaw. **The previous Mayor** was heard to say more than once that her intention was to streamline planning to facilitate development and reduce the red tape including public engagement. I believe that the intent of many of the **zoning changes found in this Bylaw were intended to do just that, facilitate development and reduce public engagement.** **NOTE: I am not alone in thinking that the CAO is intent on delivering on the plans and policy of the former mayor and her associates.** The problem I have and hope that this Council will recognize is that these changes come at the expense of current residents, current landowners who could have their right to continue enjoyment of their property grossly affected. A change in land use that has never been specifically identified, (excuse me) explained or gone through a rezoning process should not be included in this Zoning Bylaw. A few examples of land being automatically rezoned include one that was referred to the Municipal Board which is the Rossol Development. Another is the land north of Oakbank that would permit 18 permitted uses and 4 conditional uses. Permitted uses there without any kind or type of public consultation could include hotels, motels, gas bars, eating or drinking establishments, outdoor or indoor, and as an accessory use a drive-through and as a conditional use, a crematorium. I spent hours reviewing the Map for Bylaw 08-01 and comparing it

to 21-25. There are some required um changes by terminology but there are also **numerous land use zone changes** that I have identified. I have identified over a dozen. Some of the changes go from Agriculture Restricted to Rural Residential, maybe smaller sized acreages would like to subdivide but others will not be um be prohibited from having um larger farm operations and farm animals. For example, in the southwestern part of the Municipality, there have been a number of applications to subdivide but they're limited to being on existing roads. What about the back part or the interior lands? I project that a better approach to accommodating development in this area would be to prepare a Secondary Plan that would not only provide future opportunity for subdivision but it would address the other issues that come along with development like traffic, drainage, septic disposals, etc. Also the **removal of the Hamlet Zone and calling it Development Zone should not be approved**. I'm not even sure what the Development Zone is. It lacks definition and it also lacks any site regulations including setbacks, etc. In a Municipality as large as Springfield, that has several historical and/or recognizable communities, it is very (excuse me) sad to see that they are not being identified in a common and understandable way. I have always wondered why Cooks Creek was never referred to as a Hamlet because it is one of the more active communities of churches and recreation centers that draw the community together but it is wrong for Hazelridge with a school and a hockey rink to lose this distinction. Vivian is suspiciously the community that has the most to be concerned about because of pending implications if SIO Silica plant goes again. Some of the land use zones, they just seem to reflect a bias of sorts. Either they have been part of a previous zoning application or land owned by a large developer or on land purchased by the RM or even land that is owned by a family member of a Municipal employee. These changes in zoning, like others that I have not identified, should not be allowed to occur as part of the General Zoning Bylaw but rather should have to go through a separate rezoning process. **Lack of Clarity** – The proposed Bylaw should remain consistent in its choice of wording and not use terms that make the Bylaw's interpretation potentially ambiguous such as legal, lawful, non-conforming, they're used within the Planning Act but they're described in a clear way, but not in this Bylaw. A parcel or use that exists that is not lawful or is not non-conforming should not be grandfathered or not allowed just because a new bylaw has been passed and the previous one has not adhered to or been enforced. Zoning Amendment Bylaw 08-01 that occurred after September 23rd 2021 aft... 2021 some of the adopted amendments ... I don't know, I think I meant up to September 23rd 2021...no, I guess it's between the First Reading of the Bylaw and up to now um appear in the information sessions uh presentation boards and their suggested amendments to Bylaw No. 21-25, however there are some that are included that have not been given Third Reading by Council. One states pending Municipal Board approval, another says pending Council approval. These applications should not be shown as approved on the Map. It is confusing to note that most, that all of West Pineridge Secondary Plan appears on the Zoning Map as RR and that Oakbank North Secondary Plan was not even identified. It is perplexing to note that **many** of the amendments to By-law 08-01 since 2010 to date have been identified in the story boards and incorporated in the proposed changes to the Zoning Map but **not all of them**. I must strongly object to the two zoning amendments uh Bylaw 23-11 Antoniuk and 23-13 Rossol um that have not received Final Reading because they are before the Municipal Board and being included in the Zoning Map in the same manner as those that were adopted. **NOTE: Unless the decision of the Municipal Board is a foregone conclusion!** **Now Designated Officer**. The intent of changing the terminology from Development Officer to Designated Officer has ignored two bylaws of the RM of Springfield. Bylaw 18-14 establishes designated officers within the Municipality. Those listed are Animal Control Officer, Assistant CAO, Bylaw Enforcement Officer, CAO, Development Officer, Building Inspector, Director of Engineering and Environmental Services, Director of Public Works and Emergency Operations Manager, Fire Chief and Manager of Finance and Police Chief. It is unreasonable to think that all but the Development Officer should be making decisions on land use planning matters. Bylaw No. 19-22 does delegate duties to the Development Officer but only to grant or refuse minor variations not to exceed 15% of the requirements of a Zoning Bylaw. If Council keeps the designated officer terminology in the Bylaw, it must change uh Bylaw 18-14 or pass another appropriate bylaw. I have raised a number of these points before at a public hearing on October 28, 2021 and in my submission to the Municipal Board Hearing on February 15th, 2023. Please, this is my presentation ... a copy of the presentation to the Municipal Board and I don't think Springfield Planning Administration staff have um paid much attention to it. Uh any of my concerns or suggestions I don't think have not made a difference and from the most important issues to the more insignificant ones such as the 9 typos I pointed out, my opinions and suggestions have fallen on deaf ears. In this version of Bylaw 21-25 it has not really changed. I would go on but I'll sum up by saying the land use rights of property owners should be respected and not ignored for a former Council's idea of promoting development at the expense of Springfield residents. I am a retired Municipal Administrator that has lived in Springfield for most of my life. I take no pleasure in criticizing the Municipality or airing our dirty laundry before the Municipal Board again but I will do that. I spend my time and effort on Springfield issues because I care about the future of my community, protecting the values that we have, and ensuring that as we grow, it would be in a fair and sustainable practical way. I seek no financial gain. I have been involved with the Planning Board, Development and Planning and Zoning for 4 different municipalities. Each was unique in its own way but I think that they understood that there are rules and laws in place, guidelines and policies to follow so that an owner's rights regarding land use are fair and consistent. I ask each member of Council if you are fully aware of all of the aspects and changes that this Bylaw will bring and if you are not, then do not give this Bylaw Second Reading. **NOTE: Ms. Nysten has many years of experience in Municipal planning. The Council and Administration should be grateful to her for taking the time and effort to scrutinize the Bylaw, identify problem areas, and suggest changes. Such advice could have cost the Administration a lot of money.** **Councillor Miller** – Well, thank you, Mr. Mayor and thank you, Ms. Nysten for your in-depth (big sigh) expose on this document. You dove into the weeds, you showed us a lot of inad ... inadequacies, you showed us where things...there's risks if we move forward with the existing document so I have one quick question for you. In your opinion, is this document adequate to move forward in the best interests of the Rural Municipality of Springfield and all the rest of the residents or is it not? **Janet Nysten** – The quick answer is **not as it is written now**. I think it has the bones but I think it needs to get fleshed out. **Councillor Miller** – Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** – Any other questions? Thank you, M'am. Is that it, uh then? M'am? **NOTE: Again a lot of conversation in the gallery can be heard.** I don't have a presentation, I just wanted to address something really quick. Um just being here today, I learned about all of the che...just being here today, I've learned about how all of these changes impact the community. I **Mayor Therrien interrupting** – Can you just state your name Sir, uh M'am for the record uh there. **Joanne Zurawski** -Joanne Zurawski. **Mayor Therrien** – Alright.**Joanne Zurawski** – Thank you. Just being here today, I am learning about all the changes uh that you guys are proposing and how it impacts the community um and just so you guys know, the reason why you have an overwhelming number of objections to the drive-through clause is because you have public people here in the crowd like Carolyn um Lenay who are speaking to all the people and basically doing your job and telling everybody how that affects them. Um the other item, I don't think we're sufficiently addressed um to the community and I just want you to consider the broader issues at hand as well as the drive-through. Ok. **Mayor Therrien** –Ok, M'am. Edwin? **Edwin Giesbrecht** – Edwin Giesbrecht um Municipality of Springfield. I think Council knows why I'm here today and it's an extension from June the 18th where I presented a delegation and I was requested um by you, Mr. Mayor, to come back in through our Planning Department. And I

reached out to Mr. Doucet. I thank him for his excellence and his concurrence that indeed we could have a vote here today in the regards of taking Rural Residential and reverting to Agriculture Rural. And this is in regards to petition that has been ongoing, the fellow residents and I and my father have not been afforded very kindly any due process by this Municipality from '2 to 22, to 23 to 24. So I'm going to ask here, shortly for a vote. I'm going to appeal that request in the most kindly way but before I do that, there's a couple of thoughts that came to my mind here listening to some of the residents this evening. And one of them was unfortunately a thought that came to mind where Councillor Kuczynski and Miller were singled out by a resident. I didn't think that was... some of their actions very appropriate. But what came to my mind was the Meech Lake Accord. And in the Meech Lake Accord there was only one Canadian politician that stood in objection with his Eagle feather in hand and in many Canadian's minds, saved Western Canada if not Canada itself. So singling an individual out for standing for democracy, I just don't think that's fair. The Tangi Bell and others, Ms. Nylen, uh referred to the importance of use uh that identifies under Zoning Bylaws. And that use is absolutely imperative. **NOTE: I will just state here that I believe my property is classified Rural Agriculture. Believe me, nothing but mushrooms, willows, black poplars, scrub oak, a few white poplar on the built up parts, and high bush cranberries can be grown on this property. So obviously use is not the only determinant.** And more so I think than even the residents and this bench grasp, Mr. Mayor in that although Confederation, 1867, repatriation of our constitution, 1982, the fact remains under property rights in this country, our titles, our negotiable instruments that we buy and sell our properties with, under the Constitution, we are entitled Federally, constitutionally, to the use and enjoyment of our property. God forbid people start taking this Zoning Bylaw adverse to the Constitutional use and enjoyment. That opens up a whole Pandora box. So I'd also like to state, because it has been questioned by some of the residents' opinion as to the entire processes here with respect to the Zoning Bylaw. And my experience is, it has been completely lacking from the previous Administration and of this Administration in regards to a mediating mechanism for residents to come forward with their issues or what they want to have put to a vote in order to resolve all issues. And I might remind under the Constitution uh of use and enjoyment that even extends here to the Rossols as an incorporated citizen. They have the right to their Constitutional right corporately. So the problem here is there has not been a full engagement where in fact we could actually have resolution, problems solved before ever coming here. **NOTE: Rules and regulations are set. They are not to be manipulated to fit a certain situation. I personally feel that the Planning Act should not be managed to fit specific issues. It should be applied fairly across the board. There are avenues to alter Acts but not in piecemeal fashion, in my opinion, and not through manipulation of terminology to fit certain needs.** Now I'm going to leave that one alone there for plausible thought um. What I am going to read you is the very last portion of my dissertation June 18th and what I stated was "I reassert for a vote today and urge a vote of Yes to revert from Rural Residential Zoning (which enabled the Giesbrechts to separate their residential property from their Business property and for others to purchase small residential lots on predominantly agricultural land zoned Agriculture) to Agriculture Rural". I ask the inclusive of past, present, and future for the reason of irrevocability, especially in light that should the overall Zoning Bylaw 21-25 draft fail to its final approval, that we need not visit this matter again even if the distinct possibility of a new Bylaw be drawn to necessarily replace Bylaw 21-25. In that light, what Council may or may not be aware of is I reached out to the Manitoba Municipal Board in regard to its order on 21-25 which was I believe April of 2023 subsequent to Second Reading uh being rescinded in March of 2023. So the order came after the supposed exercise of rescinding the Second Reading and in that light, yes they identified a referral within the Order and what I proposed was some concern for that wording and the wording that was signed off by the Chair and the Secretariat of the Manitoba Municipal Board was quote, unquote "that the referral of the proposed Bylaw No. 21-25 to the Municipal Board is not valid". That's it. Within the conclusions, interpretations, suggestions um to go back and try and resolve all of this prior to a Second Reading procedurally doesn't say that. It says 21-25 is not valid. When you want to argue, what is this referral. It's a Municipal referral to the Manitoba Municipal Board. It's not the individual objectives. It is the Municipality referred to the Municipal Board. And the Municipal Board said "You're not valid". Now this has gone above the actual office of the Municipal Board. I have recent communication here uh from The Administrative Secretary, Ms. Lemare, uh dated June the 20th, 2024: *Good afternoon, Mr. Giesbrecht. Your emails were forwarded to management for response.* I have asked for distinct definition and clarification as to is 21-25 valid or not based on the specific wording of the Order itself. It has been referred to Management. I don't have an answer here today. I don't know how we could possibly proceed today. It would procedurally, the Manitoba Municipal Board hasn't given its clarification and definition of not valid. So I urge you to be very concerned in decision-making to that regard but immaterial of these issues, my appeal to this Council is to bring relief to my fellow residents and finally, after almost 4 years, no longer avoid or evade the petition and try and just move it down the track until it finally entraps into the dirty laundry that gets shoveled over to the Manitoba Municipal Board at which they made it very clear they're getting tired of it. So I would ask for a vote here today or if you're not going to do it here today, I would ask that you defer this Hearing and that we have a vote prior to the hearing of any Second Reading if in fact once the Municipal Board gives indication that in fact First Reading itself is even valid. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – Any questions Mr. Mayor? **Mayor Therrien** – Nope. No questions. Thank you, Edwin. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – As far as a vote, uh um can you provide me an answer. I concurred with Planning, I followed your instructions, we can have a vote, (no) can I at least be given a date for a vote? **Mayor Therrien** – Um you have to go through Planning uh Edwin. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – I did. I went through Planning. **Mayor Therrien** – And this is something you'll have to work with them. We're not going to vote on... **Edwin Giesbrecht** – I did work ... it's all in. In fact, I emailed all of Council including you, Mr. Therrien. You can't duck and dodge forever. **Mayor Therrien** – There's no ducking and dodging, Edwin, absolutely none. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – It came through Dan. I've got the emails from Dan. **Mayor Therrien** – Now I'll let uh Dan ... **Edwin Giesbrecht** – It's in his Report on this Hearing. **Mayor Therrien** – If you'll allow me ...uh Dan will uh respond. (laughter and talking in background) **Dan Doucet** – Am I on? (ya) I will check to make sure my mike is on. There you go. The mike is on. Well good. Uh as stated by Mr. Sandhurst, if Council wants to debate some of the issues we've ... for closing...sorry, as Mr. Sandhurst uh mentioned, Council has the right to debate and discuss some issues prior to closing the Public Hearing, the drive-through, uh Ms. Overall uh thank you uh property to name a few items. Council could pass a resolution prior to closing that Public Hearing. After Council passes a Public Hearing, I'll go back to my Report, Council has uh a bunch of options under the Planning Act. Council may review the concerns and objections presented and consider a decision at a later time, that's one option. Council can consider alterations to the Bylaw which must be identified with a resolution and thence pass second reading, Council can consider the Zoning Bylaw as is if they want and uh postpone a decision until a later date or grant Second Reading this evening, they cannot go to Third Reading because there's been over 25 objections. Council may... Council may pass a resolution also not to proceed with the Bylaw. Those are some of the options under the Act. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – I concur with you uh Dan 100%. I said I appreciated your excellence. And in that regard, what you have said is in fact we could move forward right here with a resolution. I believe if my ward Councillor would make a motion and it was seconded, that maybe we could get a vote here. **Dan Doucet** – I don't disagree with you. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – There. We don't have disagreement from Planning. I came through Planning, Mr. Mayor. There's no reason to throw us under the bus and wash us out with the dirty laundry. **Mayor Therrien** – You

have to make ... as far as I can tell through all this, um **there** and I'm not a ... **Edwin Giesbrecht** –You're not a planner, Sir. **Mayor Therrien** – I'm not a ... no I'm not (no). You have to make uh an application, a property bylaw amendment ... **Edwin Giesbrecht** –That was already done. **Mayor Therrien** –... because you're talking ... **Edwin Giesbrecht** – That was done in email and accepted into... **Mayor Therrien** –No, we have to do it by resolution. **NOTE: I am not going to transcribe this part because the two of them are trying to outshout each other and gain their point.** It has to go before Council. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – No, no, that is wrong. You don't...I don't have ... I can make an application for anything period ... **Mayor Therrien** –There's no reason, there's no reason to yell. **Edwin Giesbrecht** –I don't need your resolution to make an application. **Mayor Therrien** – But we have to vote on it. **Edwin Giesbrecht** –But that's what I'm asking for. **NOTE: This is not a Planning Meeting. Individual applications are handled at Planning Meetings. Tonight an amendment to the actual Bylaw is proposed. They are two different issues.** **Mayor Therrien** –No, it's ... it's ... **Edwin Giesbrecht** –No ... yes. Don't say no, yes. **Mayor Therrien** –Edwin, Edwin ... what's the Planning... **Edwin Giesbrecht** –Stop saying No, start saying Yes.**Mayor Therrien** –What's the Planning Department ... I need a response **there**. Councillor Fuhl is uh uh wants to make a comment. **Councillor Fuhl** – Ya, the comment I want to make and maybe this is for the Planning Director or uh Martin. Um my understanding again is that we could look at all these items and we can put.... either Council agrees to put it as all one resolution or piece it out into individual resolutions. We have that option as far as I'm concerned and that is part of the discussion, Edwin. And I think that's where, you know, just in my opinion specifically if Council agrees, that like say 5 changes are to be voted on, we can make them all as one or we could do them individually so just give us some patience and let's run through the process and we will get through this. **Edwin Giesbrecht** –And, and you see, this is exactly what I'm talking about. Engagement for resolution. And my big concern from the point of view of logistics is that this engagement comes down to ultimately a resolution of your conscience as Council and as decision as to a vote and in the event that that vote is positive, there's no objection, is there and there really has never been an objection. It has always been a request for a simple amendment, that's all it has been for 4 years. Four years. **Councillor Fuhl** –And through this process is basically amendments cause uh we've heard more than one today so I'm sure Council will take that all into consideration and that discussions needs to be had with our round table. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – And my concern, Deputy Mayor, is that whatever the conscience and will of Council is, in process, that this happens prior to or within the second hearing portion and not after Second Reading has been given Second Reading because then I'm pooped **NOTE: Never heard that verb used before. The more common one starts with an "Sc"**, and so is the petition and we're back down to the same baby in the bathwater over to the Municipal Board and we all know it so just be ... not to be facetious, to be polite. **Mayor Therrien** –Go ahead, Dan. **Dan Doucet** – If Council were to make uh close the public hearing and then make a decision, a Mapping change as per your parcel of land, then another public hearing would be required ... **Edwin Giesbrecht** –Don't... **Dan Doucet** –... so I'm just indicating the process. If Council passes a resolution prior to closing the public hearing on some modifications to the Bylaw, no second public hearing is required. **Edwin Giesbrecht** –That is exactly my point to the Deputy Mayor and to the entire bench, the Council. We can resolve this, resolve it, it takes a meeting of the minds, at least of the majority of this Council. **Mayor Therrien** –Ok, thanks very much uh **there** Edwin. I uh no, no just hang on **there**, M'am. So the uh doing this, you can sit down **there**, Edwin. So doing the uh text amendments uh **there** for the drive-through uh uh change from permitted to conditional use plus the 766 uh Main Street uh Oaks uh changing it to uh a Residential Multi-unit uh District uh we can do that before, it has to be before the uh closing of the uh Procedural or the uh ... right so that's the two, the two major issues are those... just hang on, Mrs. White. Just... just be uh uh patient. I'm still talking here and you're getting up...I don't see that why you do that. So if we're doing these two um through text uh through uh through Council uh **there** um before the public uh hearing is over then we're actually amending the 21-25 uh to show that uh uh we are uh you know, voting on that so how we vote is, is up to the Council. Would Council be in agreement uh with those two issues uh the drive-through and the changing ...? **Edwin Giesbrecht** –Well, I would like the third issue, Mr. Mayor and that's the one I've just tabled. **Mayor Therrien** –767 uh Main Street? Uh would Council be in agreement with that? **Edwin Giesbrecht** – Three issues, Council, please. **Mayor Therrien** –Just ... I'm talking Edwin. **NOTE: Some lady is talking in the background.** Well, maybe, ok, ya we'll, if we do one issue at a time, and we can include the hamlet, that issue as well. I... I don't see that is a big issue ... **NOTE: Some man in the audience is saying, no, point of order** no, we're talking here. So we've got the three issues **there** as per Edwin's uh **there**, I don't know how we could do that through...through a resolution. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – Well, just like you're going to do McDonalds or anybody else. **Mayor Therrien** – Just, just let me talk. Let me talk Edwin. Stop being so **bloody** rude, alright. **NOTE: He must have got that word from listening to me. It's a Cockney word that I picked up from my grandparents.** **Edwin Giesbrecht** –Sir, I am not being rude, you ...the petition... **Mayor Therrien** – **interrupting** You are. I'm talking, I'm talking here **NOTE: Sounds just like the House of Commons! Children masquerading as politicians.** **Edwin Giesbrecht** – ... is way out of line, Sir. **Mayor Therrien** –I'm talking. **Edwin Giesbrecht** –It's a breach of trust. **NOTE: Where is the CAO in all of this? She should be intervening and getting them back in order.** **Mayor Therrien** – I'm talking. So how does that work, then, Dan? This with Edwin's **there**, is that uh done through uh, after the public hearing? **Dan Doucet** – Can everybody hear me? Um as per the other two items that were discussed, the drive-through and the uh multi-family uh site through resolution, uh Edwin's property can be considered as well by Council if they want to pursue it. **Edwin Giesbrecht** –By the petition but yes, thank you, sure. **Dan Doucet** –That is... **Edwin Giesbrecht** –No. It's the area. It's the petition. Fifty percent. Complying with the Act. Same difference. **Dan Doucet** –I don't know about the entire property. Remember the map I provided with a green uh selected property that you had sent ... **Edwin Giesbrecht** – ... your alteration and in fact I responded to you in that and in fact I can read you the.... **Dan Doucet** –**interrupting** There are a couple of options for Council if they want to modify uh Mr. Edwin ... Mr. Giesbrecht's property only or if they want to look at a cluster, they have that opportunity um but I don't ... Mr. Giesbrecht, you said you have everybody's uh consent on that. **Edwin Giesbrecht** –I have 50%, that's all that's required under the Act and they could be petitioned in order to revert the zoning. Fifty percent. That's been discussed, 21, 22, 23, 4. It is a fact. **Dan Doucet** – That'll have to be a Council decision. **Edwin Giesbrecht** –Well, then it's Council's decision but it's a ... it is a fact. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, Edwin. Uh so I was just thinking aloud here when I was doing the, the drive-through and the 766 ... 767 Main Street um the Oaks Project so to make it like an omnibus bill **there**, I don't think that would work. It would have to be like one at a time um and we can include the Hamlet of ... of Vivian... I'll be with you, Mark, uh the Hamlet of uh Vivian uh **there** uh changing it back to hamlet. Ya, ya. No, I'm just saying aloud and then we'll, we'll talk to the Council and then we could do Edwin's as well. What does Council think **in regards to** that? I'm just talking to Council first. Go ahead. **NOTE: Someone is talking in the gallery but you can't hear what is being said clear enough to transcribe.** I have heard her already so I'm just asking Council and she will have a chance. Sit down, Mr. Kuffner. She will have a chance. She will have a chance. She will have a chance to speak when I finish with Council. **NOTE: Wow, hot time in the old Chamber tonight! I'll bet the RCMP didn't prepare the Mayor for this kind of pushback!** We're talking here now with Council. You guys agree with uh the four. Go ahead. **Councillor Miller** – Well, first Mr. Mayor, I'd like to yield my comments to Ms. White first to make whatever uh evidence into the file. It would be helpful but then I have a comment after. **Mayor Therrien** –But she was, I was going to let her up here so just uh the fact... it doesn't ... I was, ok. So what were you

going to say. **Councillor Miller** – Well we have other comments to it. I know there's others who want to comment but what I was going to propose because there's lots of detail, there's lots of devil in the detail, I don't know how we can pull out the Hamlet issue, we can pull out McDonalds and just say it's a complete document, this is going to take some time and effort, I mean, Martin and Dan, you can stay here 'til 4 in the morning if you want but I don't think we're going to get it right. So why don't we ...what I would say is, place the proposed Bylaw into abeyance for further updating based on the stakeholder input suggestions and that priority be placed on this process to reintroduce um in a timely manner. So in other words we're going to take all the suggestions including yours, Mr. Giesbrecht, and any others that we haven't yet heard and they can rewrite the document in a timely manner, not 6 months from now, not even 2 but at your first priority of the CAO and Council sees it as a priority to move forward with but to ram it through in the next 3 hours or 4 hours, I don't think it would be just and I don't ... I couldn't approve it because I don't have just time to reflect on it or have the public's input on the revised amendments uh going forward. It's going to take a week or two, right, let's be realistic. To get it right, to get it right, invest in a week or two. The developers aren't going to start anything in a week or two, I'm sure that's true. **NOTE: Some woman is making a suggestion from the gallery.****Mayor Therrien** – Ok um ok that's noted uh Mark uh **there**. Um Mrs. uh White, do you want to comment. Edwin, you can sit down. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – I just had a comment with **Carolyn Whyte** – I just wanted to echo um what the Mayor....what Councillor Miller said because Mayor Therrien had started to say that he was willing to incorporate the two changes, McDonalds and Oaks North and then um Development Officer Dan Doucet repeated it that those two things could be changed um, CouncillorFuhl said maybe let's do a resolution for 5 changes, um Mayor Therrien said let's do a resolution and I've been hearing people in the background saying, no, no but what about that so I'm echoing, there are a lot of really thoughtful, well researched, well put together presentations that could impact people's properties, right, tremendously if they're missed so let's take the time and effort to go through them thoroughly like Councillor Miller said and let's just put a hold on tonight, that's my comment cause if the Hamlet is important, those definitions are important, um Janet Nylen's um presentation, we need to respect that and look at it. That's my opinion. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you. **Edwin Giesbrecht** –I was, I was just saying, Mr. Mayor, I was just saying Mr. Mayor that the Provincial Planner, I did discuss this matter with, Dan, as you have. **Mayor Therrien** –Edwin, Edwin, this lady wants to talk. M'am, you can come up. No, Edwin, this lady is going to talk now, right. **NOTE: Mr. Giesbrecht is in the background saying something but all I caught was "on the same page".****Edwin Giesbrecht** –So are you demanding I sit down? **Mayor Therrien** –Ya. You want to sit down, sit down. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – You're demanding. Now I want to or I go. **Mayor Therrien** – You can't stand at the podium while another lady is talking there. Go sit down then you can come up if you have to. **Edwin Giesbrecht** –Well, I don't know how many times you can tell me to stand down and sit up and stand down and sit up, uh you know I've got a certain disability, Sir, and you have a duty to accommodate and this podium doesn't do it. Now I've asked you twice, now this is the third time. You don't need it in a Zoning Bylaw, it's rights under the Human Rights Commission Accommodate, Sir. **Mayor Therrien** –This ... ok, M'am. **Elizabeth ???Hersak** - My name is ElizabethHersakfrom Navin. I submitted a letter of objection to Council for this evening. I too like many of the individuals here have also been voicing objections since 2021 um and I would like to know if my area which also was changed to being completely Rural Residential from an area that was a mix of Rural Residential and Ag Restricted, if we're able to provide a petition of people's names that would like to have it reverted back to as it was for the original Bylaw, 08-01? Would that be applicable to our area as well? **Mayor Therrien** – Do the same thing as Mr. Giesbrecht, you mean? **Elizabeth ???Hersak** –I've...I've heard from Irene in Vivian, I think I'd go live in Vivian if it wasn't for SIO Silica. Um you know it's ... this is again this trying to avoid the piecemeal bit list. We need to revisit things. We're supposed to be a community. Urban-ish ... downtown Main Street, rural whether you have water, whether you don't have water and you have your own well and septic, we all choose to live here for various reasons and especially since 2021 with the last Council, um this is probably the most in my 30 years living in Springfield that I've been to Oakbank other than to vote. And on one hand, it's shameful but on the other hand, I would not have had the opportunity to meet so many of the wonderful and knowledgeable people that I've had the privilege and it has been a privilege to be interacting with. And the people that are here this evening, you might think it's not a large number, it's a very busy time of year with the Bermuda Triangle of busyness with parents that have young children, people heading off on holidays, year end wind ups etc. but please don't equate that, please don't equate that to people not being interested. Um I also concur that I've really tried to follow those bylaws. Um the printing, the ink cartridges, you.... I have a separate binder on keeping up with the versions and trying to compare them has been quite difficult. And so for an individual that perhaps is not as interested, it can be very overwhelming. And I would really implore that if we are to try to make this document better, that we also try to ... if we can have some sort of consensus as I said, as residents, as ratepayers, as our members of Council of this Municipality. We are the largest municipality in the Province. Take the good ...take the good from what is already extended and existing and carry it forward. This is not to say that anyone is adverse to development. I've made a choice not to live in Oakbank. I like being in my little piece of paradise and I would like to keep my little piece of paradise. If development is going to happen, though, in my area, I would like to be involved in that process. I would also like other individuals to be able to come and have their input. And it should not be us against them, you're on one side of an issue versus another, it's we're all trying to make this better, at least I hope so. And all I'm asking today is what can we do. Please do not vote for this Bylaw as it is written. It is vague, ambiguous, I even have questions in the area that it pertains to me. Originally we should be rural residential 5 acres but when we're within the Floodway, we can go down to 4 acres but then if I'm in the Floodway, I can't have a horse because I need to have a larger amount of acreage. For someone coming into this area, it's extremely confusing. Maybe I would like to have chickens, maybe I'd like to have bees. I would like to know that without this Bermuda Triangle of bylaws and negotiations and navigating and having to figure out what if I'm walking through this field of landmines, what am I agreeing to and what is that going to be down the road. So please, if anything, can we please defer, can we please agree to try to work together and make this better and COMMUNICATE. Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you. Mr. Mackie. **Gordon Mackie** – Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Gordon Mackie. I am a Springfield resident. This ongoing public hearing has revealed many, many strengths in the Municipality from the practical. You Sir, suggested that we needed a 3-column document, What We've Got, What We Want, and Why. I think I'm probably the only person in that room that's ever drafted either Provincial or Federal law. Anybody else? Okay. One. Okay. So Mark, you ... Councillor Miller, you begin with 3 columns. What you've got, what other jurisdictions have got, what you really want, and why. And you distribute that, and you distribute that and the lawyers get involved and the legends of Councils get involved and eventually you've got it honed so you can take it to Cabinet one of the dumbest groups and need to have 3 columns, you're right. From the very practical matter to the subtleties and the complexities of Janet's...Janet Nylen's presentation, Mr. Mayor I think that Dan gave you a great list of options with one exception. You have it within your power now to adjourn to a certain time and place and pick it up then. And between now and then, you can meet with your colleagues, you can hear from the public, but as soon as you end the public hearing, you can't hear from the public anymore. I suggest sincerely, I know I'm always offering the procedural advice and maybe it gets under your skin but **I THINK YOUR BEST MOVE IS TO ADJOURN AT THIS POINT AND RESUME THE PUBLIC HEARING AT SOME OTHER TIME.** **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, Sir.Mark?

Councillor Miller – Thank you, uh Mr. Mackie. And thank you, Mr. Mayor. Uh so I'm going to do exactly that. I'm going to move to adjourn to some future date that we'll make public and uh ensure that the public is engaged. So my motion is **TO ADJOURN THIS MEETING**. A date, well.... **Mayor Therrien** –No, let's discuss that as Council then, uh to adjourn. **Councillor Miller** –It's procedural, it's not debatable, I'm afraid, Mr. Mayor. **NOTE: Someone in the audience says, "you can give a timeline"**. **Mayor Therrien** –So to adjourn this to another, another date. Well we have...we have to as Council we have to discuss it ... **Councillor Miller** –You can't, you can't debate it but I do need somebody to second it. **Councillor Kuczynski** – I'll second it. **Councillor Miller** –So is that reasonable, I mean that's optional, uh thirty ... I mean, we're in the midst of summer. **Mayor Therrien** –Well, what does the rest of Council think? Glen? **Councillor Fuhl** – I'm going to, I'm going to ...I'm going to share some information with **you**. I've been on Council for 3 terms and **I've learned a lot over the last 3 terms** but I can tell you this, that what my concern here is that I have no problem adjourning it because I'm all about hearing about the people and I think people that know me well know that. Having said that is what my concern is here, now listen to this please, is that we have people coming up and now we're starting to talk about picking apart our Development Plan. **NOTE: No, Councillor Fuhl, it is NOT doing anything to the Development Plan. The Development Plan is enacted by Council with Provincial approval. This is creating a Zoning Bylaw that delivers on that Development Plan, but one, unlike this one, that is correctly written and truly reflects what was in the original approved Development Plan, not what certain might want to see today.** We went through that process. We had 18 open houses, we did everything possibly we can. We had people come out around the round tables. If you weren't at the round tables, that's not Council's fault because we did mailers out, we did it in the, in the Clipper, we did it all over. Some people just don't get involved until I'm sorry, it's in my backyard, that's the way it works. I was no different. I did the same thing. Unless it was in my backyard, I didn't, I wanted... I voted the councillor in to do his job. So I'm just asking to just bring it back a bit because if we start tearing it apart, it's going to be horrible, I can tell you that right now because we worked hard to get where we are today and if everybody did a great job that was involved and it wasn't trying to not bring people involved, we did our best. We went out and advertised. We did the 18 open houses. Even today I don't take away what Administration did, we had 3 open houses. I was there. Nobody showed up, there was like 2, 3 people showed up. Where was everybody but now, now we have a public hearing. You were, there, Mackie. **NOTE: Now that is "rude". You refer to someone as Mr. Mackie, not Mackie. How would Councillor Fuhl like it if everyone addressed him as "FUHL". I've actually heard worse. Further it is highly inappropriate of Councillor Fuhl to single out one person in the audience just because he happens to recognize that particular person.** I saw you there. We talked to each other, right. And how many people were there? Because people don't tell it back to you in your backyard then it becomes an issue, that's how it works. **Mayor Therrien** – Ok, ok, now this is getting...ok, this is getting uh a little bit out of control here. **NOTE: Major understatement. The whole meeting has been badly run.** He, he asked ... **Councillor Fuhl** – Ya, how many people were there? **Gord Mackie** – Well, when I arrived there was just 2 and I ... and uh... so that was it. So we chatted a bit and ... and I said ... you must be very pleased ... there have been times when no one showed up. **Councillor Fuhl** –So, so there was ... having said that, there was options, there was more than the one open house, ok no, no this is not an excuse, this is the truth, ok. I'm speaking from the truth. There was 3 open houses. If it was that important to you, why didn't you you couldn't make that one, make another one. I know for sure if it was for my case, that I was important for the subject, I would be at either??? one of the 3 or 4, whatever the case may be but again, I'm just trying to share with you, don't start nit picking this apart all into pieces because I'm going to tell you what, it's going to be horrible. No and I agree with you but the last comments here was now we're going to start tearing apart the Development Plan **NOTE: Mr. Mackie said nothing about the Development Plan. The trouble is that Councillor Fuhl cannot distinguish between what the Development Plan is and what the Zoning Bylaw does. Further he is obviously agitated,** and that worries me because we went to a lot of work getting that done ok because of what, again I'm just sharing that we have to be careful that we don't go down the rabbit hole that creates a lot more issues, that's all I'm saying. So having said that is I'm ok with deferring it for a couple of weeks ok. I don't want to defer it until 6 months or a year because that's not helping anybody. We have a Development Plan, we have Secondary Plans, we're trying to bring the zoning in to make it work for the Development Plan and the Secondary Plans and that's the key to this so I'm ok with that for a couple of weeks. You know, at the very most 30 days because we do need to get on with this. I do agree with that. And we need to work together as all RM not...and again and I said this before, rural and urban needs to work together. **NOTE: The Administration has had 4 years to create a Zoning Bylaw that delivers on the Development and Secondary Plans and now Councillor Fuhl is of the opinion that this flawed proposed Zoning Bylaw can be First Aid...ed into a better document in just 30 days. It is not rural versus urban that is the problem here if that is his expectation! In fact, throughout this entire meeting, I did not get the impression that the problem was urban versus rural. The biggest problem in my opinion is that too much power and control is being given to staff without the possibility of any oversight whatsoever. That is the biggest issue. My own personal issue is peat moss. For years now I have been singing the same song. Peat moss is not an agricultural product. Agriculture is a business where one sows something and then later harvests it. Granted peat is vegetative but no one planted it. It is the result of many centuries of sedimentation and pressure brought to bear on that sediment. Further it is classified as a mineral, not an agricultural product. Someone in our RM staff is great at manipulating things. One example that still irks me to this day is the fact that a commercial enterprise, i.e. Parrish & Heimbecker, was allowed to situate on land zoned agricultural because the "powers that be" in our Administration and the Council of the day said that a grain elevator is an agricultural enterprise. The definition of Agriculture is *the science or practice of farming, including cultivation of the soil for the growing of crops and the rearing of animals to provide food, wool, and other products.* Parrish & Heimbecker is a Canadian, family-owned agribusiness ...their operations include grain merchandising, crop inputs (that is the sale of seed, fertilizer etc.), flour milling, and feed mills (they don't "rear" animals, or operate feed lots, they operate feed mills that process feed for animals). They are termed Agribusiness because their business is dependent on farming enterprises, i.e. agriculture, rather than the production of electricity, or the refining of petroleum products, or the manufacture of clothing etc. etc. **THAT IS MY PET PEEVE OF THE DAY.** Yes, there is different ...yes there is different issues **Mayor Therrien** –Mr. Kuffner, Glen is talking. Sorry Sir, I'm not finished yet and I'll tell you what, we are listening to the people because we now, I seconded, or Andy seconded that so I'm in favour of that so **Mayor Therrien** –Melinda, did you want to say something? **Councillor Warren** – Ya, I am in favour of, of postponing it um but I have a question. So can we still like um amend it so that people know that we are serious about the designation for the drive-throughs before we like give it a 1-month halt. Like we've heard everybody about the drive-throughs, that it should go back to conditional use, uh we said that on May 23rd and with the amount of emails that have come across this and phone calls, we know what the residents are thinking and we are listening to them. As for the Overall, that was another concern so if we can put it out there already and amend it so that when we sit down again um in a month before everybody disappears on holidays.....**Mayor Therrien** –Let, let her **Councillor Warren** –... I'm asking, I'm asking, I'm asking...uh sorry ... did that... **Councillor Miller** - Actually, it's a point of order. I don't frankly mind. Parliamentary procedure wouldn't allow debate as we've had but uh I guess we're uh uh a banana court if you want to call it so it's a ...uh what I mean is that we, we want to engage. I don't want to cut it off**

...people and I think it's important what Councillor Warren is saying is absolutely fantastic, we need to engage and we have what, a series of 8, 10 amendments that we want to put forward into this document so we're not rewriting it....no I think there's more than 4 but uh **Mayor Therrien** –There's 4 ... ok ... ok go ahead, Dan. **Dan Doucet** – If Council wishes to defer a decision this evening I would recommend not closing the Public Hearing. Then we look at some different verbiage that might work with Council, bring it back at a new Public Hearing but we have to decide on a date tonight so we don't have to re-advertise and then we save \$14,000. on re-advertising. **Mayor Therrien** – Ok, I guess I'm the last one really to comment on it **there**. I'll go with the majority of uh Council um and then we could uh find a date uh to adjourn it to. Uh 30 days you said and I, I don't see any reason uh Melinda why, why we would vote on this now, we could do it uh in 30 days with the proper wording cause we're going to take oh ok, well let's ...oh that's right um let's try it but if 30 days doesn't work, we have to have ...leave here with a date, right.**Unidentified Male Speaker in Gallery** - so me Mr. Mayor for the fact that it's going to be summer and that if Council needs to seek advice from anybody, that they may be away on summer holidays. Would it be inappropriate to turn around and schedule this for the beginning of September because we do need to seek maybe outside advice. You might not be able to get it. That's when people may be away on their summer vacations. **Mayor Therrien** –That, that's a good ... **Unidentified Male Speaker in Gallery** – It would be inappropriate to ask for such. **Mayor Therrien** –That's a good point uh Sir. We're going to try to find a date here... uh we're, Rod, we'll, we'll talk to you later. **Unidentified Lady Speaker in Gallery** – September 3rd.**Mayor Therrien** –What date?**Dan Doucet** –Colleen had mentioned August the 27th. **NOTE: Someone says "send me an email"**,**Mayor Therrien** –August the 27th. For the adjournment. Andy? **Councillor Kuczynski** – Mr. Mayor, I would suggest that uh we have a presentation to people and that's why nobody showed up. But we have a lot of people, public hearings, and that's what the Municipal Board advised us, to have public hearings with them, get involved with the community and we're not doing that. People if we allow people Question Period, just talk whatever is on their mind, that will help quite a bit and delegation and just open delegation. We wouldn't have this problem right now because we would get a lot of feedback from our residents **Mayor Therrien** –But this ... **Councillor Kuczynski** –They want to work with us and we're restricting them from coming and once they come, then we want to kind of solve the problem very quickly, not necessarily for the best interest for the residents of this Municipality so more public hearings because that's what's required to run this Municipality correctly. **Mayor Therrien**– This is a public...or note Andy, this is a public hearingso a hearing... **NOTE: And it is in essence at the time and place of a regular meeting of Council which is only advertised on the Municipal website. Thanks to some energetic and informed residents, the Chamber is full this evening but normally there is hardly ever anyone that attends Council meetings except for a handful of regular followers of Council actions.****Councillor Kuczynski** –I understand but this is only one public hearing that we have in a long time. We didn't have a public hearing like this even for SIO. **Mayor Therrien** – Ok, so August the 27th is the date. No, I've already heard everybody uh **there** so I ... I'm satisfied...we'll, we'll go with that date. **NOTE: Whoopee! A little over a month to repair a document that resembles Swiss Cheese ... i.e. it has many holes in it. The protest from the audience is very obvious on the audio file of the meeting.**It's the 27th of August ... 22nd. **NOTE: The 22nd is a Thursday when Planning meetings are held.**27th of August. Is that good with everybody? Well, you know, what can we do? That's, that's the best that we can do. There's never going to be a good day or a bad ... you know, this is the best that we can do, the 27th of August. **Councillor Miller** –I don't know, the middle of August or end of August, people are going to be engaged. We're going to be in the same pickle again. In fact people are saying you guys are nuts, you're putting a meeting uh in the middle or the end of summer, like in all due reality, I know, I don't want to push this back, I really don't want to push this back but really, we've got to be realistic about this. **NOTE: Again, plenty of background conversation going on. Someone mentions kids going back to school.****Mayor Therrien** – (aside) No, I don't think that'd work. September 24th. Ya, yes? **Councillor Kuczynski** –Mr. Mayor, secondly I want to say we have residents here, we want to hear everybody here, even if they're coming a second time but as, as the meeting progressed, they have a lot more questions and probably answers for us so I would appreciate that we let people speak. We still have time to ... you know, until 10 o'clock or 10:30 that we could have this meeting continue because let the people speak. This is a very important issue for everybody. **Mayor Therrien** –We've ... we've let everybody speak ... to have a question upon other question. I see one hand up uh we'll.... (Mr. Mayor) ... come up to the podium. Instead of coming down with the hard dates right now **Mayor Therrien** – Come down what? **NOTE: At this point, the Mayor has totally lost control of the meeting.** **Unidentified Male Speaker** -Instead of coming down with the hard dates... **Mayor Therrien** – We have to give a date. You can give a time line. **Mayor Therrien** –No, we have to give a date.**Unidentified Male Speaker** -You can give a time line, Sir. **Mayor Therrien** – No ... the Planning Act uh unless you know something different, we have to give a date. That's what the Planning **Unidentified Male Speaker** -You're adjourning... **Mayor Therrien** –That's what the Planning, the Planning guys were saying, we have to do that. That's their expertise. It's a deferment **Unidentified Male Speaker** -You can go with "in this amount of time we'll set a date" instead of trying to bag a date now **Mayor Therrien** – No, no. It's a date. Ok so what day were we thinking? September 24th, does that work. Ya, 6 p.m. At 6 p.m. **NOTE: More background discussion.** **Edwin Giesbrecht** – That's fair Manitoba Municipal Board ... September that would be more than adequate time ... action make that decision as to clarity of a definition of their order. **Mayor Therrien** –Ok so September 24th. Then what. Am I adjourning or just deferring it. Do I need a mover and a seconder to defer it? **CAO Draper** - Um so I have a mover and a seconder and the resolution reads *Be it Resolved ... Be it Resolved that Council adjourn the hearing to September 24th, 2024 at 6 p.m.* **Edwin Giesbrecht** – Adjourn or defer. **CAO Draper** –Well, adjourn means we're just adjourning it and we reconvene on September 24th. We're not closing the Hearing so it'll remain open. **Mayor Therrien** – Can I get a show of hands of those in support? **CAO Draper** –At the Council Chambers.

5. ADJOURN THE PUBLIC HEARING - Mayor Therrien – That's Andy ... ok uh and thank you. Ok, we'll adjourn the Hearing uh as well, that's ... that covers that as well? **CAO Draper** – Yep. And that's it. **Mayor Therrien** – Alright, thank you. **NOTE: The discussion carries on in the background and foreground in spite of the closure of the meeting.**

6. NEW BUSINESS - 6.1 By-law 21-25 Springfield Zoning Bylaw (2nd Reading) 6.2 By-law 21-25 Springfield Zoning Bylaw (3rd Reading) NOTE: Supposedly deferred until September 24th, 2024 although no resolution or statement to that fact was ever spoken.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Zoning bylaws:

- Regulate how land, buildings and other structures may be used.
- Divide the whole or part of an area into zones, name each zone and establish the boundaries of those zones.

- Specify permitted uses for different areas of the community and assign specific regulations to these areas to guide development.
- Include regulations with regard to density as well as the siting and sizing of buildings.
- Are legally enforceable and construction or new development that doesn't comply with a zoning bylaw is not allowed, and the municipality will refuse to issue a building permit.

A SITUATION THAT HAS DEVELOPED AT MILLBROOK ROAD AND HIGHWAY 15. The property on the southwest corner of Millbrook Road and Highway 15 is being drowned out due to the fact that presumably either the Province or the Municipality built a berm that is diverting groundwater through the east and back of the private property to the east of it, the short stretch between the railway track and the highway, which has resulted in water building up to the extent that there is apparently now a sign on Millbrook warning of deep water by the railway tracks. That property was never before flooded. There used to be a large agricultural barn there for many years. This was reported to me by a concerned, long time resident.