

RM of Springfield  
Special Meeting of Council – Zoning Bylaw 21-25  
September 24, 2024

WITHOUT PREJUDICE (E&OE)

LENGTH OF MEETING: 2 hours 17 minutes

**ATTENTION: I have just been advised by a neighbour that was told by RM staff that, starting in 2024, the RM of Springfield IS NOT GOING TO BE PROVIDING RECEIPTS FOR PAYMENT OF TAXES. This is terrible because people on rural properties need that to receive the Provincial rebate for the agricultural portion of their property taxes. Apparently now if you don't request a receipt, you will not receive one. I BELIEVE A GROUP RATEPAYER PROTEST should be organized to address this issue and I will be asking for an explanation of why this is the new policy of our Municipal government. GO FIGURE .... TAXES UP.... SERVICE DOWN!**

**NOTE: I noticed that the audio file ended about 2/3 through the meeting. I e-mailed Colleen at 19:57 on the 25<sup>th</sup> and she responded at 21:40 that they reloaded the file and it should all be there. I find that a little odd. How could they have two different recordings, one partial and one complete OR do they audit the audio recordings before they post them? People have asked me whether that happens. Not being very technical, I don't know how they could do that but I guess it is possible.**

**Mayor Therrien**—Thank you. Uh we'll start the uh meeting uh this is the RM of Springfield uh meeting agenda, Special Meeting at uh September the 24<sup>th</sup> at 20 uh 24 regarding Zoning Bylaw 21-25 at exactly 6 uh p.m. Uh I'm Mayor uh Patrick uh Therrien for the RM of Springfield um and to my left is uh Dan Doucet and Martin Sandhurst uh Colleen uh Draper and in the front is Joanne. Uh I'll introduce uh Council at the same time uh here and to my right in descending order is Deputy uh Mayor, Councillor Ward 1 uh Glen Fuhl, Councillor Ward 2 is Andy Kuczynski, Councillor Ward 3 is uh Mark Miller and uh Councillor Ward 4 is uh Melinda Warren.

**2. CALL TO ORDER - Mayor Therrien**—Uh so call this uh to order.

**3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA - Mayor Therrien** - Can I get uh a mover and a seconder for the Adoption of the Agenda, please? Andy and Glen (Kuczynski/Fuhl). **CAO Colleen Draper** – *Be it Resolved that the Special Meeting Agenda for September 24<sup>th</sup> be approved.* **Mayor Therrien** – Any uh issues from uh Council, additions or deletions? I see none. At this point here, can I get a show of hands for Adoption of the uh Agenda? That is unanimous and is carried.

**4. RECONVENE PUBLIC HEARING – SPRINGFIELD ZONING BYLAW 21-25 - Mayor Therrien**—Uh we are reconvening the uh the Public Hearing regarding the 21-25 from uh June the 24<sup>th</sup> um and I'll have to reread the procedures for the Public Hearings uh if uh you'll bear with me. Uh Public Hearing matters will now be heard under the uh Planning Act. Uh the Public Hearing process is as follows: 1) The Public notice uh will be read out indicating the intent of the application. 2) The Development Officer will provide a summary of information pertaining to the proposal. Uh 3) Those that wish uh to make representation and speak on a planning matter uh must sign in your name, mailing address, indicate uh for or against or informational purposes. You'll be given the opportunity to make a presentation or speak on the matter presented before Council. Uh the opportunity for uh presentation or to speak on a matter will be in the following order: um first will be a) the applicant will speak or make a presentation on the proposed application. Uh next will be b) inquiries uh this will give the opportunity to ask for the clarification of what the planning matter is proposed. Uh next will be c) those in favour, that'll give those that are in favour the opportunity to speak, uh those in opposition, well again that will be d) those in opposition the opportunity to speak. Uh when you uh begin your speaking uh please state your name and address at the uh podium, uh a reminder at all times that you have to direct your comments or questions to myself, uh and last uh, once everyone has had an opportunity to speak, 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, as Chairman, close the public hearing, no further discussions will be allowed under uh the Planning Act. Um so at this point uh hereum I'll uh turn it over to our uh Planning uh Department uh as the applicant there for their uh presentation. **CAO Draper** – Uh there's no presentation from (ok) the applicant this time. We'll just go right into hearing from those in attendance. **Mayor Therrien**—Ok. Uh then, we've got people on line, then we've got people in the audience. Uh so we'll ask uh...I'll do it in order, sometimes to on the monitor and sometimes to in the front. Uh anyone on the monitor that wishes to speak with regard to Inquiries? I see no hands. Uh in the audience, those who wish to speak with regards to Inquiries. M'am? And we'll allow 10 minutes for each uh there uh just for time uh. **Margaret Marion Akins**—I'm just asking one question. (ok) Well, and most of it's going to be answered, well hopefully it'll be answered by you. My name is Margaret Marion Akins. I'm a Springfield resident and I guess basically what I'm asking is what is going to be the format after tonight. For instance, we'll all give our concerns and our objections, they'll be recorded, Council will go back and decide what changes need to be made and then you'll make those changes and then come back and present them to us, uh the residents. Mr. Mayor, is that how it's going to work? **Mayor Therrien** – It, it could work that way or we could go to a Second Reading, we could have everybody in unison and have a resolution read out and a Second Reading tonight. Um if we find that it's, it's just too complex... **Margaret Marion Akins** – Well, you haven't made any changes as of yet to the uh uh ... **Mayor Therrien** – We did have the first uh there and we have adopted some of the uh those changes so uh if there's further changes to be done, .... **Margaret Marion Akins** – interrupting Which changes were adopted? **Mayor Therrien** – Well, there's uh the concerns with regards to 767 Main uh there uh changing it from Commercial to uh ... **Margaret Marion Akins** – interrupting So Conditional Use was put in? **Mayor Therrien** – Yes, and then uh the Conditional Use for drive-throughs uh there, hamlets and uh another one there that was ... **Margaret Marion Akins** – interrupting Mr. Giesbrecht's uh ... **Mayor Therrien** – interrupting Yes, that's right ya so those are about the four ... **Margaret Marion Akins** – interrupting And this item ...? **Mayor Therrien** – Ok. **Margaret Marion Akins** – Ok, so that's, that's what's going to be happening, ok. Hopefully we can agree but ... oh and the hamlet status, was that put in? **Mayor Therrien** – Yes. That was the other one. Yes. Mr. Unruh. **Ewald Unruh** – Ya, Ewald Unruh, uh Deacon Road. Uh ya, for clarity purposes, it would be helpful for all of us to uh if you have an outline of the changes that were made as a result of the first, the first part of this Public Hearing. So this is Part Two of the Public Hearing if I'm correct. **Mayor Therrien** – Yes. **Ewald Unruh** – So a lot of concerns were mentioned at the last meeting uh and I think those concerns still exist on the part of many and I guess what I'm just speaking for information purposes on is if we had clarity about that, uh this process might

move along quite smoothly and a lot of objections may in fact be removed so if Council um or staff could give us an outline of the changes that were made since the last Public...since Part One of the Public Hearing, that would really be helpful for us. **Mayor Therrien** –Um can we do that now or wait .... **CAO Draper** – Uh so I think kind of the list um the Mayor spoke about after the first Public Hearing uh we heard a lot of concerns regarding the drive-through um being altered from “permitted” to “conditional” in the Commercial Central District. Uh the other change is uh directly related to 767 Main Street uh so just north of the condos in, in Oakbank there, uh their suggestion to alter that from CH Commercial Highway District to RM Residential Multi-Unit District. Uh there was concern about the General Development District or GD um and the change back to HA Hamlet District. And there’s one particular property or area um around Hazelridge Road and Vernon that there’s a suggestion or a request to alter from RR Rural Residential to AR. So those are the main items that came out of the first Hearing that Council will have to vote on tonight if they proceed with Second Reading with amendments. **Ewald Unruh** – So you’re saying those, those are included as amendments or potential amendments. **Mayor Therrien** – That was the gist of uh the last uh Hearing, uh there, that’s what we put together, in order, those are the four uh there and, and we were stating that during the last Hearing. Um it made sense, the “hamlet” uh there, changing it from General Development. It just, it sounds better uh “hamlet” uh ... **Ewald Unruh** – That’s Vivian you’re talking about? **Mayor Therrien** – Ya, ya Vivian. Hazelridge believe uh might be part of that as well uh there and then Mr. Giesbrecht’s uh um umchange as well as Miss Orlan’s uh, uh petition. So... sorry, M’am, I keep on getting that wrong. I don’t do it on purpose but Ms., Mrs. Overall um and the uh ... **NOTE: I think someone in the audience says “we can’t hear you”**,ok, is that better? (yes) Um and, and the other one uh **NOTE: A man can be heard speaking in the audience**,and what was the other one there, ya so the four there are there, the main ones. **Ewald Unruh** – Ya, thank you very much. I think it’d just be helpful for the uh for the process here tonight and move it along. I’m, I’m all in favour of uh you know, moving the conversation along. And souh thank you very much. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you. Uh then we’ll go to uh any further Inquiries um on, on line. I see none. And in the audience again. Uh Darryl? And then Mr. Page. **Darryl Speer** – Darryl Speer, Springfield. Uh I guess my first question is, this information just getting to us now, uh it.... I didn’t find it on the agenda. Is there a reason for that? **Mayor Therrien** – Uh, go ahead, Dan. **Dan Doucet** – Well, the Public Hearing is still active .... **NOTE: At first, he starts speaking away from the mike and it is very faint.**The Public Hearing is still active so these are items that ... **NOTE: In the background someone I think says “Can you hear me? I can’t hear...** I said the Public Hearing is still active and these are items that Council will consider um for ton .... if they go ahead to make a decision this evening. So it wasn’t placed on the agenda as a specific item. Uh there could be other items that Council may want to consider for tonight. We’re just continuing the Public Hearing. If that makes sense? **Darryl Speer** – Well I think it would have been helpful to have something on the Agenda to this effect. **Mayor Therrien** – It is. Isn’t it on 5.1?**Darryl Speer** – But having what happened previously in the case of Oaks North, it was Multi-family changed during this process without any public participation to Commercial Highway and this other Commercial Highway that’s been brought into play too without any citizen input so when we’re talking citizen input here, then I’m you know mystified why this information isn’t available. **Mayor Therrien** – Uh Glen. **CouncillorFuhl** – Ya, I’d just like to speak a little bit to that. I think the reasoning behind it is, is because it is a Public Hearing and is Part 2. And that ... just because we talked about these situations in the last Hearing does not mean that that’s word-for-word going to take place because again, the Public Hearing is still open right now so the wording can change, things can change. So to actually put it out there that here’s what it is, you don’t want the perception out there that *oh they’re just going to go do that*, no it’s still in discussion for the Public Hearing today so that’s what this is about. Thank you. **Darryl Speer** – But these items were in contention before this most recent Public Hearing. **CouncillorFuhl** – What you’ve heard, you’ve heard what they are and we’re talking about them today again. Again, it’s open for discussion,this Public Hearing is still open ... ?**Martin Sandhurst** - That’s what we’re reporting. **Darryl Speer** – Well, I think my point is lack of communication is the issue so I guess my uh question also is, uh is it your intention to go forward in spite of all the registered objections that are posted to this topic? **Mayor Therrien** – Well, but that’s what we’re here for. We’re trying to figure out what the uh um umpeople in the RM of Springfield uh are looking at here. I took my notes back in uh June the 25<sup>th</sup> uh there and I’ve got lots of notes with regards to that uh so uh we’re ... I think Mrs. Akins had asked that same question. **Darryl Speer** – Well my understanding is we’ve got outstanding objections sufficient to push this forward to the Municipal Board. Is that what your intention is? **Mayor Therrien** – We’re not even there yet, Mr. uh Speers. **NOTE: Mayor Therrien still persists in adding “s” to the surname of Darryl Speer. He is the only one I’ve heard do that.**We uh we’ve got lots of objectionsuh there, well over uh 25 right I believe so uh we’ll so uh we’ll cross that when we get there. **Darryl Speer** – You have to not process, ok. **Mayor Therrien** – Mr. Platt?Sir. I’m sorry ... Page **NOTE: Dr. Page.Dr.Daniel Page** – Hello Council. Last night a question ... Hello, I’m Dr. Daniel Page, I’m your local computer science professor on Pineridge Road. Uh I had a question so it’s actually in the spirit of the last couple because I think it’s important, especially if you’re going to proceed to a reading, that people are aware of potential changes that can occur because as was enumerated here, there were certain items that Council may consider. I must stress that I was here for the first part of the Public Hearings and none of the concerns I raised, including some definitions to procedure, around the Designated Officer, were not even enumerated in that and residents in my area had those concerns. So I’m ... my question is very simple. Are you going to consider all the objections and concerns that occur during the Public Hearing **BEFORE** you proceed to a Second Reading in their complete sense. **Mayor Therrien** – Yes. **Dr. Daniel Page** – Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** – Uh I don’t see anymore for Inquiries. Inquiries, M’am? Sure. Yes. **Julie Leach** – My name is Julie Leach. My husband and I have a couple of concerns with the um the Zoning Bylaw as it stands. We looked on the RM Website and we saw that there was ... that there were changes in red that were up to June of ’22 um but it was also noted that there were changes from ’22 to ’24 in blue and we didn’t see them on the site so I’m not sure if what we are asking about is maybe has already had some action or some change but uh our two particular concerns ... we are on Shayelee Place up against Vernon Road so we have AG zoned right across from us, um farm fields. Uh our concern is in the Bylaw the two categories, the Agri-Business and the Agricultural Support Industry are both listed as Permitted Use rather than Conditional Use and they are quite broad definitions as we see them in, in that versionthat’s on the Website uh that could be very noisy or dusty. Agri-Business could be uh a bulk fuel station, feed and fertilizer supply, livestock Auction Mart, and with regard to the Support Industry, typical uses are aerial spraying companies, grain storage including elevators, feed mills and seed plants so um if there were to be any consideration of those uses in the future, we would like uh an opportunity to be able to speak to them, so does that mean that they would have to be Conditional Use rather than Permitted Use? We’re not sure if we’re understanding that Table correctly? But we do have a concern with those two particular ones that are listed as Permitted Use under AG zone. **Mayor Therrien** – That’s a very good question, M’am and I’ll uh uh we’ve got our experts here and Dan or Martin can answer that. **Julie Leach** – We were wondering if there could be a zone around the residential area in Oakbank itself where uh Permitted Use is not uh a thing, where it should be Conditional because some of these things could be very noisy, dusty ... like a buffer zone. **Dan Doucet** – Like you had mentioned, I’m looking at the Zoning Bylaw right now within the uh Use Tables and if you’re adjacent to agricultural land, yes, those items are listed as a Permitted Use. Um I believe the broad-spec ...spectrum was looking at all the agricultural uh land within the community of Springfield, not just the sites surrounding the uh Mun... the

uh townsites. So no, there are no uh buffer zones surrounding the townsites for those type of land uses as written. **Julie Leach** – So if someone applied to put in a seed plant right across the road from us, uh the Planning Department could approve it and there could be ... residents wouldn't have input. **Dan Doucet** – That's correct. Anything listed as a Permitted Use, Council has the author.... or uh staff have the authority as a Permitted Use to issue that. **Julie Leach** – Ok so we would like it recorded that Agri-Business and Agricultural Support Industry, we would be in favour of changing them to Conditional Use so that as a Resident adjacent to AG, that we could have input at the time for an application like that. **Mayor Therrien** – Then that's noted um M'am. Thank you, M'am. **Julie Leach** – Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** – Melinda? **Councillor Warren** – Do I get to speak on that? **Mayor Therrien** – Sure. **Councillor Warren** – Um living next door to an agri-business, I would have to agree that there should be some kind of protection for the residents. Um I've used this before uh based on the agri-business like yes, I'm not in town but I have a multi-million-dollar agri-business next to my house with a train and dust but dust in that case dust would be on the Environment office. **NOTE: Mayor Fell's Council allowed Parrish & Heimbecker to build a grain storage facility on land zoned Agricultural on Poplar Road just south of PTH 15 and allowed CN to install a large loop track off the main line and around the facility to enable cars to be loaded and shunted back to be hooked up to passing trains. The land, to my knowledge, is still zoned Agricultural. The enterprise, while dealing with agricultural and associated products, is a COMMERCIAL enterprise and should be on land zoned Industrial/Commercial. IT SHOULD NEVER HAVE BEEN ALLOWED TO LOCATE THERE! That is what Councillor Warren lives next door to. Further that is where the new RM of Springfield wells are located, a mile or so south of PTH 15 on Pioneer.** So but I'm just saying that when it comes to Agri-business and I'm ... I'm on AG land, so but there needs to be a Development Agreement or something that still protects our infrastructure. um and, and helps out the residents because I do understand. I do understand, light, noise, dust and those are all environmental. The RM has little, little capacity on that, **NOTE: What is she talking about? The RM of Springfield could simply NOT have allowed P & H to build a grain storage facility there but it was approved by Council of the day. I was there and observed it! And Pioneer Road was, and still is, gravel and there is not turn lanes on either side of PTH 15 at that intersection so heavy trucks turning often slow down traffic from both directions.** that's more of the Manitoba Environment. Um but when it comes to traffic, road conditions, stuff like that, that is a municipal and we've seen a lot of our roads deteriorate over the last couple of years and I don't want to see that all the time and I know at some point and some time businesses can be a disruption to the residential lifestyle. So, and we've never done ... we've never done that, I believe with a development agreement. But it has been done in this RM. So I'll leave you with that. **Mayor Therrien** – Well, what about a .... Like a buffer uh zone. Um there was just something on the uh the radio as I was coming up here, the City of Winnipeg, they had talked about the ... uh almost Mrs. Leach, uh you're not the same, but pretty close to that, uh ... uh a development agreement allow us to uh to put our input in there, it's not *carte blanche* but uh there where somebody will get that uh they have to have a development agreement and that is between them, a contract between them and ourselves, uh the Counciluh here and it's signed by us and agreed by us. Um we could look at the fact of getting a buffer uh zone, a setback almost ... uh you have to have a setback in your yards for putting your shed somewhere ... it has to be a certain place so if uh that is, is something that we can mitigate, I think that ... that's a very good uh something that we could ... we can discuss with Planning going forward uh there that yes, although it's permitted, we could ... could at least have some, some input uh uh looking to see what we want uh there for a kind of a buffer zone. **NOTE: Again, what is he talking about? The mitigation is to classify such facilities as Conditional Uses and force them to seek approval from Planning, through Council. A buffer zone cannot be compared to a setback. The latter is a few feet, the former is a few miles perhaps. The impact of the shed is in no way comparable to the impact of a rail line and grain storage facility or a feedlot or a seed plant etc.** Uh so that's something we'll take under our belt??? for sure, M'am. Um then uh any more uh Inquiries at all? **Allan Klippenstein** - It's like a long walk from over there. **Mayor Therrien** – Uh you took the long way around. (laughing) **Allan Klippenstein** - Ya, ya I probably could have. Uh my name is Allan Klippenstein. I'm inquiring about 767 Main Street. Um um I'm not fully sure if I'm in favour or not just cause I'm not totally certain what, what the direction is um so we are in support of keeping it the zoning that it has which is Multi-family and not changing it to Commercial Highway. **NOTE: I do hope that when considering multi-family facilities, provision is going to be made for multi-parking stalls on the facility premises because everyone in Springfield, pretty well, owns at least one vehicle and has to drive everywhere to shop, work, recreate, go to school, etc. I am not altogether sure that the current multi-family facilities in Oakbank make provisions for that because there are always multiple vehicles parked on PTH 206 within the townsite.** Uh we acquired the property when the application from the previous owner came in to change it to Commercial Highway. We would like to keep it the way that it is currently zoned. Uh we would also like to do that in such a way that, you know, it makes the most amount of sense, working with the Municipality. I know um you know, I've had a lot of support here from Colleen and Martin and Dan to kind of work on this file to try to figure out, you know, what makes the most amount of sense um and even from Councillor Mark Miller because at the last Public Hearing, uh you know, we heard that there was uh some petitions against changing it uh and, and uh so we reached out to Mark who gave us permission, or got permission for us to get in contact with uh Jill Overall and the Condo Committee. And so we were able to go there and say, hey look, we're neighbours, this is what our project is, this is what our intent is, um, just trying to give them a sense of kind of who we are and the type of project that we're working on so we would like to work with the Municipality however, however that is, to ... to keep it the way it is. Um I'm just not fully certain at this point ... you know, is, is it getting ... because there was a lot of discussion about this at the last meeting, whether it was ... you guys could do something to keep it this way or if it had to go through a different ways, I just wanted to let it be known that our intention is to keep it um uh multi-family. And so, ya, we want to work with ... you know, with the condo board over there, you know, we intend to be good neighbours through ... throughout all that. I think our project uh will bring a bunch of benefits to the municipality. I mean, one of them is um you know to bring the infrastructure from in town you know through the rail ... you know, through the railway site there, you know, to our property as well there'll be a bunch of highway improvements to make um exiting and entering the highway safely as well. **NOTE: Well, that sounds promising. This guy is a true planner.** So that is our intention. How we get there, I'm not sure that it's a complicated thing, you guys have, you know, smart staff members that can help guide us through there but we would like to keep it the zoning that it is and not have it zoned to Commercial Highway zoning, have it unzoned or rezoned later. So no questions, just .... **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you very much. Um so I don't see anybody on the screen there for Inquiries or any further in the uh uh the audience. Uh then I'll transition to uh those uh in favour and I'll look at the screen first. I don't see any hands up uh the in the audience. Uh this is for people that are in favour and I don't see uh anybody who has their hands up there. (coughing) Then I'll go to the very last one here and those are ... those are in opposition. Uh again we'll go to uh in the uh .... on the screen there. If anybody sees any hands, let me know but I don't see any uh there. Uh then I'll go into the audience uh those uh in opposition. Um Lenay? **Lenay Gutoski** – Thank you, Mayor Therrien and Council. My name's Lenay Gutoski. I live on 107080 Oakwood Road. Uh given that I was at part of these meetings that you're talking about, I've just been watching this ? closely on the subject of the conditional or permitted use of the drive-through. Now I know we've beaten this dead horse to death and I know in meetings back in late May or June, the Council actually voted against it and then it came out

again in this Bylaw. And so um as a little bit of a closer here, I just wanted to say, we've already discussed the 500 plus signature with emails being 682 plus that protest it if ... um sorry um but the point is, we're brought up, we're the very emotional citizens that live right there and they don't want to see this and know that in fact they didn't know it could be a future possibility. The other points we brought up were the many daycares ... they're including them in a Traffic Study that was picked for a time that was not representative of those that live in Oakbank. We talked about licensed establishments across the street where I myself can only say that I've seen many accidents. The Council themselves talked about how they visited other bedroom communities and in fact these kind of drive-through situations are built on the outside of town, not in the dead center of the worst intersection that could possibly ... for those of us who have been on Main Street and have witnessed it daily, weekly, monthly. So that's just to reiterate everything that we discussed in that Bylaw, I mean, it's well known ok uh one ... brought a really good point on the academic of this subject. Today I'm here to also bring to you a little bit of the um themore personal and emotional part of this. You know that I'm out there on a lot of committees in the community, community clubs or recreation type events, Chamber of Commerce. I've had occasion to talk to several hundred people, probably thousands of people on what they think. These are not people that signed petitions. These are people in casual conversation to improve the ... of students. It's undeniable that 90% of the community And I've been around to all the towns, on all accounts do not want to see a drive-in. Again it's not an indictment on growth, I'm part of the Chamber, we believe in growth in the right place with the right infrastructure. This is an indictment on a drive-through you know for a corner. But to dig a little bit deeper, and I would feel that I was not finished if I didn't say that I've also taken the time to talk to ... and I'll quote John Thompson, who's here this evening, he's not worried about competition because he produces a fine product. But if you talk to him further on the thousands of dollars that he sponsors annually for wedding socials, baseball, hockey ... and also talk go talk to Heidi ? at Back at the Ranch, where formerly a family member ran that, you go talk to Doug at Peppercorn... how about KC, the newly opened canteen at Oakbank Community Club that try to make a living, talk to the Lift, now go talk to the Middle School in their canteen in the High School and ... where half their proceeds go to school programs, now remember if we dial back, we'd be idiots not to realize that the reason this location was chosen was because it's close to the school. Talk to the students and you'll find out that they like their little 8-minute jaunt to Deacons Corner. So there's a lot factors here and it's not needed. And I reiterate, there's many slow, February, January, March nights on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday where these licensed take-out or retail businesses have to employ every student by law at a jacked-up minimum wage where they're still coming out of COVID and it is an absolute fallacy that abig corporation hires a bunch of people. I would challenge anybody that questions that on our local social media that in the middle of a middle-class community where every single student here at peak hours seems to have hockey, ringette, and equestrian, what have you ... these restaurants are left with far and few between trying to find that 15 or 16 year old because the minute they turn 16, they go to the City for the tips. It is absolutely a struggle and it is real for any of these retail restaurants to get staff. So if we're living in a bubble and thinking that one outfit that's going to hire all these kids well it's just purely not true and again, I've talked to all of them and I've been part of that industry here in this town. **NOTE: I recently went through the Drive-Through at Hortons in Oakbank. Without exception, the staff that I could see were all recent emigrees to Canada, all with heavy accents and none teenagers.** Uh so I close with this but first I just wanted to review as a closer all the academic reasons that people objected to this. But let's make this town the shining reason that you've all moved out here. I personally understand and again know that there seems to be a lot of places uh the Golden Arches in Dugald, it's slated to go ... into the development in Dugald to catch the late traffic, what have you. Is it me? No. I think its just ? ... is it me that started the construction project are talked about ... I mean in reading the RM news, I see a lot of first priorities and concerns that should be addressed, and looking at infrastructure before we try to slap something on the little town that quite frankly, in my travels, there's very few people want and again this is not an indictment on restaurants, it's an indictment on drive throughs. Thank you for your time. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, Lenay. Uh was there somebody else uh, Mr. Page. **NOTE: He is Dr. Page just like Dr. Schulz and I wonder that the Mayor cannot remember that when I, an 83 year old, can. I'm sure the Mayor would not like it if Miller or Kuczynski referred to him in Council by saying, hey, Pat, smarten up. We think you're on the wrong track so call up the dispatcher at CN and get back on the right one. No, he likes to be called Mr. Mayor. Puffs up his seemingly overinflated ego... presuming to make decisions without benefit of the opinions of .other members of Council or the constituency. But likely wearing the red serge for 35 years did the same. You never hear about his stint as a gas jockey in Oakbank.** **Dr. Daniel Page** – Good evening, Council. I'm Dr. Daniel Page, I'm your local computer science professor on Pineridge Road, uh 63087. Uh I was here for the first half of this Public Hearing, uh I raised several concerns there um from my neighbours and myself and so wrote a letter so from one of my neighbours. Um I'm here with further concerns. So I'm just going to ... I want to preface this by this...by the fact that I've grew up in this neighbourhood and I like the rural character of it. And I would like to see that the Zoning Bylaw tries first to do the best they can for residents but at the same time not to kneecap individuals that they want to create new types of businesses in this area that don't exist, at least at this time but may exist in the future. Uh but other, other things, other opportunities that can exist in this area. So I'm going to proceed to read this so I apologize if my candor, my candor becomes suddenly quite different. Um while there are several issues within the Zoning Bylaw, as I discussed in the June meeting, including expressing concerns with definitions around schools, commercial schools, and their applicability to educational businesses as employed in some areas today, for example, on-line commerce, uh the concerns I'll bring forward surround restrictions around ,, within Agriculture General, Agricultural Restricted, and Rural Residential where often these zonings have far more in common with each other than residential zoning. Agricultural Restricted and Rural Residential are very similar zone designations by lot size and/or the nature of the homes and how people may engage in business off of the said land, home businesses, home industries uh of course allowed within uh. Of course, some of these have varying degrees to that. So for instance, where there is Agriculture Restricted, focusses more on loosened restrictions on agriculture, rural residential has much lower, like it has further restrictions, like for example animal units. Um the residents within these three types of zones tend to live on larger lots and may even use their land for multiple purposes, including agriculture to varying degrees. Some properties such as our own on Pineridge Road functionally straddles the line as agri-equine as we have neighbours within a block of us that use their land in a similar way that we do even though they're zoned in Agriculture General. Um given that my understand of Agriculture General just in general if you were to go look on a map, you'll see that there is houses that similar lot size but they're in Agriculture General, Um for us I looked carefully through the Bylaw and I found some of the restrictions seem arbitrary, especially for someone like me that lives around people that are on Agriculture General and some reason Rural Residential has strange restrictions and vice versa. I want to talk about those in relation to another matter. Uh professionally I know there's some need for some specialized type of educational businesses that barely exist in our RM that straddle what is deemed commercial schools and schools could be kneecapped unintentionally by the present Bylaw if they reached a stage they may function in these capacities in these zonings, especially rural residential. I, I thoroughly express these concerns. Uh so the first and second, so these are found in Table 9(1) on Page 48 by requesting the following. So the first is under Commercial School, so the rule for Commercial School, uh make a Conditional Use for Rural Residential, like

with schools cause a school is Conditional use as well. Uh this is ... this is presently weighted allowed in Agricultural General and Agriculture Restricted. Second under School, uh make it ... make it conditional use for Agricultural General and Agriculture Preserve. This is to make it consistent with Rural Residential. In Rural Residential, equestrian establishments under 10 animal units are conditional use. Where these are allowed for operating horse=riding academies and training of horses or riders as per that definition. Why is the same not allowed for some of these zones where academies, when training for people, they seek training or academics in general conditionally? I understand that this is a novel question uh but it is one that demands consistency in an age where education is increasingly accessible to people and furthermore a lot of businesses, they start on line, they move into kind of a transition phase and perhaps they find a location in town or maybe they find something within that niche. Um third, uh I ask that Council and Planning consider re-looking at Agriculture General, Agriculture Restricted, and Rural Residential so that they have more commonality in terms of what is at minimum conditionally allowed with less restriction. While some compromises, like rural residential farming exists, as I've explained as well, not all sectors have been considered consistently. Thank you.

**Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, Sir. Um any more, we're still on opposition here, in the audience or on line. I'll look on line first. I don't see anybody. And in the audience uh there for opposition. I don't see anybody, uh there um. **Margaret Marion Akin** – Good evening. Again my name if Margaret Marion Akin from Springfield and I'd like to thank Council for uh the opportunity to object to Bylaw 21-25. I would also like to thank you guys for the uh the last Public Hearing uh adjourning and allowing us to continue on to let everybody speak. I hope Council did pay good attention to the uh June 25<sup>th</sup> Hearing as it covered many good objections and concerns which included, but was not limited to, the document not being standardized with format or the policy language, the deficiencies within the definitions, the questionable type uses, uh use types and selective properties having land use zoning changed, I'll use Dr. Page's word, arbitrarily, um and one of the big ones was uh non-conforming use and non-conformance. This was a big deal. Also the removal of agricultural **NOTE: The RMs audio file stops at this point. Fortunately I had my own recording which was complete and was able to continue transcribing. I e-mailed Colleen Draper in this regard at 19:57 Wednesday, September the 25<sup>th</sup> and she responded at 21:40 the same day "We reloaded the file and it should all be there"**, intense zones and the removal of Vivian's hamlet status protection to name a few. Additionally changing the rules of interpretation will open the door concerning graft when ambiguous words are used. The word "should" should be "shall" instead of should, should be "must" instead of "may". Concise wording like "shall" and "must" let's everyone know exactly what is. Tonight there will be more objections for Council to consider and review along with the uh June 24<sup>th</sup>, 2024 23-page letter that was sent to Mr. Doucet from the Province, uh from Manitoba Municipal and Northern Relations, Community Planning Branch, with concerns and suggestions for changes to Bylaw 21-25. Council, it is appreciated that you were willing at the last uh Hearing to accept and want to move forward in reinstating Vivian's Hamlet status, reversing the zoning uh for Edwin Giesbrecht and his neighbours' lands, uh making the drive-through a restaurant, uh the drive-through restaurant conditional use, making lands for Jill Overall and Elizabeth Hychuk....Hycek...Hyseps, uh concerns, again that was greatly appreciated. Again I'm asking Council to review all the concerns and ? that have been presented to them and instruct the Administration to request the changes be made. Zoning bylaws should be constructed to protect the Municipality's residents and businesses. Concise language creates an even, a level playing field for all. One of the Province's recommends ... recommendations and I state from the 23-page letter, Community Planning recommends that Council consider all comments received by the Government's departments and agencies as well as representation made by the Public Hearing and make any required changes to the Zoning Bylaw **before** Second Reading. The Zoning Bylaw should not be designed to be to wit *for the ease of Administration* who should or may carry out their duties unbiasedly when making interpretations on issues that come before them. In light of what happened at the last appearance before the Municipal Board, I ask Council to take the reigns on these changes to Zoning Bylaw 21-25 as Administration needs its direction corrected. Decision-making should remain reserved for those elected Councils and I emphasize **elected**, not made by paid employees. Thank you very much. I have uh made copies for all of Council members and also **it includes the top 10 concerns**, I'm not going to read them all, I'm going to give them to you Kristy right so that you can proceed, right. Ok. Thank you very much. I hope that you'll pay attention to what the Municipal ... the Province's 23 page letter said. Make the changes before Second Reading. Bring it back to us, the people, so we can see the changes, and then we'll move forward from there. Thank you. .... **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you. Then we'll open it up to uh um any more for Opposition on line? I see none. Or in the audience. I see none. Oh, Janet? **Janet Nylen** – Thank you. I was going to give you a break from me tonight but I was given a letter that ... and asked if I would read it into the record. It's from **Kyla Manaigre**. Um *Thank you for this opportunity to speak to the proposed Zoning Bylaw. At the point of adoption of a new Zoning Bylaw, residents and stakeholders will be immediately impacted by changes to land use. Zoning bylaws provide entitlement the Development Plan and Secondary Plans cannot take away once the Zoning Bylaw is in effect. Changing of land use zones or changing uses within zones or determining permitted and conditional uses of our land and the land close to us must be very carefully considered. Residents and stakeholders have the greatest reason for raising concerns prior to the adoption of a Zoning Bylaw and that's why we're here tonight. One's reasonable expectation to the quiet enjoyment of our property is relative to the neighbouring property's rightful enjoyment. If the entitlements change upon adoption of the proposed Bylaw, a property owner has the right to develop and use the property within the provisions of the zoning. Those rights are set out in the respective regulatory bylaws and legislative acts but are most immediately felt through the administration of Zoning bylaw. Entitlements is the most important term when understanding the impact of a Zoning bylaw. Under the Municipal Planning Guide to Zoning Bylaws in Manitoba, the phrase "as of right" is used in the same sense and it is the Municipality's responsibility to develop, administer, and enforce the land use laws in effect. They reflect local land use considerations and ratepayers have a legal entitlement to make representation to Council on material alterations. Residents and stakeholders request and suggest ... requests and suggestions up to now have not been recognized or addressed openly. This is part of due process. It is my recommendation to Council that in addition to following due process for alterations to the Bylaw, for your Administration, and I think it was 63 new changes, you must also consider adhering to recommendation received from the government departments and agencies and in addition to considering representation made by the public on this proposed Bylaw. We all remember the earlier presentation to Council where Council did not consider one additional change over and above the 53 changes they proposed before giving the Bylaw second reading. We also remember at the Municipal Board Public Hearing on Bylaw 21-25 that did not proceed because Springfield reluctantly admitted to not following due process. We remember the Chair of the Municipal Board admonishing Springfield and stating clearly that Council should go back and conduct consultations with the public to reduce the high number of rejections to the Bylaw before it goes back to the Municipal Board. In the interests of transparent public engagement, I would suggest that after public representations have been closed, that Council openly review all the requested changes from the public, from the Province, and from your Planning Department and decide if they should become part of our very important land use plan.* **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, M'am. Anybody else for Opposition? Darryl? **Darryl Speer** – The things I'm objecting to is .... **Mayor Therrien** – **interrupting** State your name uh Darryl for the audience here. State your name just for the people on, on line. **Darryl Speer** – Darryl Speer, Springfield. One of the things that appears

throughout the document is Designated Officer. Could you explain to me what that means? **Mayor Therrien** – Uh, I'll explain ... well. Instead of me explaining, I'll get Dan or Martin to explain that. **Dan Doucet** – So Designated Officer as written in the current Zoning Bylaw means an employee delegated certain authorities by Council to carry out a power or responsibility in accordance with the Regulations under this Act. **Darryl Speer** – What page are you on? **Dan Doucet** – That is Page 18 of the ... sorry, Page 10 uh of the uh Bylaw. **Darryl Speer** – This current Bylaw you're talking about? **Dan Doucet** – Yup. It's in the Definition Section. It's about uh mid-page. Oh you're in the Track Changes Document so uh so the numbering might be off slightly. **Darryl Speer** – I think my concern is that what kind of competence...competency is involved here. So take the Planning Department for example, you've got Development Officer, certified in planning, right, what's your credentials. **Dan Doucet** – I'm an engineering, a Certified Engineering Technologist (CET). **Darryl Speer** – Ok. Do you have a Planning designation? **Dan Doucet** – No, I don't. You don't need a Planning designation to administer the Bylaw. **Darryl Speer** – What about by language? **Dan Doucet** – Pardon me? **Darryl Speer** – But what about for Planning matters. **Dan Doucet** – I believe we are talking about a Zoning Bylaw, not my credentials. **NOTE: Who works on that Planning Bylaw? Who interprets the language contained therein? Who makes amendments to it? Who explains its contents to residents etc.? Someone doing that should have some type of academic credentials and expertise.** **Mayor Therrien** – Uh Mr. Doucet has got lots of credentials there. The Designated Officer status, that's what I understand it to be, you're, we're not going to have uhuhh you know one of our girls at the front desk to be a Designated Officer, we're going to have somebody that has some background with regards to that to make these decisions. **Darryl Speer** – It's not specified. I think it should be specified. **Mayor Therrien** – Um ya, I don't know if we have the ... **Darryl Speer** – ... have the qualifications in planning matters ... to be a Designated officer to work in this area. **Mayor Therrien** – Well, I, I guess we'll get into the weeds of that, for sure. Uh we're just not going to ... what I'm giving you is a farcical analogy. You not going to have, have the guy or the girl at the front desk to be our Designated Officer for a planning matter, we're going to have somebody that has some credentials, some backgrounds uh with, with that. That's the whole idea, that we're ... we're not going to make it uh uh a person to be a Designated Officer that doesn't have the uh background for it. **Darryl Speer** – I think it should be specified that whoever is a designated officer for planning matters has to have expertise in planning, not something as you say which is obviously not relevant to this discussion. **Mayor Therrien** – Ya. I, I, I would say "yes", that would be the, the case. **Darryl Speer** – I think that's...that's... to me it's basic. How could we entrust the different responsibilities that are there ...fifty percent on variations that's a decision of the Development Officer. Now this could be the Designated Officer. We want somebody who's got sufficient uh planning credentials to making those decisions. **Mayor Therrien** – I think we agree on that, Mr. **Speers**. **Darryl Speer** – Ok, alright. Uh the other thing that's concerning to me, it's not clear, in the matter of home business. Uh our experience has been up to this point that we've had too much latitude in allowing what would be classed as quasi-industrial operations to work as a home business. **NOTE: One historical example, Gee-Tee Holdings, that for years operated out of their home yardsite until, after countless attempts by neighbours to get the business to move, one Council finally got it done and it is now on PTH207.** And they talk about principle residence but sometimes there's no connection between the people in the principle residence and the people actually conducting the business. **NOTE: After being forced to move their business, the owners of Gee-Tee Holdings tried to have a completely unrelated person operate a business out of that very same yard site but it didn't last long as once again, they were reported by people living in the area and they finally got the message.** So I'd like to see this tightened up so that we don't have uh such a thing as trucking operations that are classed as a home business. Uh we had issues before Council here with uh actually interference between a home ... so-called home business and uh adjoining residents and we've had presentations here to Council to that effect. And I think that we've got to uh reign that in and in the matter of intensive livestock operations that were uh discussed, I think that that has definitely got to be subject to a hearing process, it can't be uh sort of allowed and, and no provision for ... even for a buffer zone. I find that difficult to follow. **NOTE: I know of a property in Anola which used to be a goat farm many years ago. The current owner has a substantial number of what you might call "not prime" horses loose out in a big field with no shelter, winter and summer. Based on a recent "special interest" piece on the news regarding the amount of horses Canada ships overseas to the Orient which are then slaughtered for human and animal food, I wonder that this might be the fate of those animals. I am not in favour of such a practice so I don't like the idea of that being situated in my ward. Cows and pigs and chickens have historically been bred for food. Not very many are kept as pets. But horses in Canada have always been held in higher regard and not traditionally eaten as food here.** Uh as was mentioned by Councillor Warren, the teenage project there, actually proceeded without proper clearance at the Council table. They've got a fertilizer operation there that did not have clearance from here. Now how this got past the Planning Department, I don't know. Was it the Designated Officer that allowed this to happen? That'd be a good question. So I ... my view is that we need to go back to the drawing board on this uh particular document and tighten up the loose spots uh that are there. And uh we've talked about, you know, how it is that suddenly zoning changes without any official uh process from our multi-family, residential multi-family to commercial highway and back again, and uh such like. Uh to me I believe that where there's enough objections out there, that I think that this thing should be put back for further review and be refreshed to uh meet the needs that have been discussed, brought up in the previous Hearing and this Hearing as well. But I think we would be farther ahead to not get ourselves into a situation where we've approved uh a document that is uh substandard and uh that we don't have things like non-conforming entities being blessed uh from here on in without being accountable for how they are in their shortcomings to what should be in process. So I'm asking you to go back and if we need a new name on this bylaw, uh 24-13, whatever, uh let's, let's clean up the loose ends here and particularly the ones that have been mentioned where we've got vague terminology, must instead of may, shall instead of may, whatever so that's, that's what I think, I would recommend we do and uh clean up the uh issues that have been brought forward in the objections and both uh on line and in the record from the previous uh hearings that have gone on. Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, Mr. **Speers**. Anybody else uh ... on the screen I see nobody, in the audience? M'am? **Elizabeth Hursak** – Good evening. My name is Elizabeth Hursak, um Navin, Manitoba, um sort of in the most southwestern portion of the Municipality. Um first off, I'd like to just say I'm very pleased, if I can address Council, and I'm very pleased with how this Public Hearing has been run this evening. Um I had a lot of trepidation, coming here this evening, not knowing what to expect, and so I do very much want to commend everyone for being able to come and share. Um my family of 4 had um is opposed to the Bylaw and we still continue to be opposed to the Bylaw as it is written. Um I did appreciate receiving or being able to look at the Provincial Report which wasn't available at the June meeting, being able to go through it. Um I too have a lot of difficulty uh trying to keep track of the changes, um the red ink versus the blue ink. Um I very much also find that in some of these meetings that we've had and um Ms. Gutoski I think said it very eloquently, um it took the issue of the drive-through to wake up a lot of people to have an interest in this entire document and if anything, it's allowed for conversation and engagement. People want to be engaged with seeing how this Municipality is going to be developed. And I don't think people are opposed to growth but I think it needs to be mindful, it needs to have forethought because what is allowed to proceed can have consequences into the future, you know, extensively, to the point where we may not be able to go back. Um

being the, I believe Springfield is the oldest Municipality in the Province, um we certainly in this time I would say, within the last 10 to 15 years, have undergone a tremendous amount of different development compared to before. Primarily we were an agricultural Municipality, we had a lot of spots of development and this, now, going into the future, if this is what Council seems to always be looking forward into the next 30 years, into the next 50 years, I do think that it needs to be done in consideration with the residents that are here, that are existing. I have personally 30 years invested in this Municipality. I would like to continue to live in this Municipality. Um and it may not be in that same location but I chose to be here in my rural area because I wanted to be in a rural area. With my well, with my septic, with my culvert and my driveway and all the things that I have to um myself have to provide, support and maintain. I enjoy my neighbours but I also enjoy the fact that my children have been able to, just like we are right now when I was coming here, um be able to partake in harvesting, be able to see where our food comes from, and with the zoning changes right now, that are proposed for my area, that will not longer be allowed. My area is now going to be Rural Residential, livestock prohibited. Thank you very much. That's not what I came here for. That's not what I would like to see my property come here for. The subdivisions that have been approved in my area, not very far, within a square mile radius now, have significantly, will significantly increase the population of our community. The potential with this rezoning will allow ... not saying it's all going to happen at once, but it will allow for a significant explosion of which we do not have the supporting infrastructure, internal roads, access to fire, we don't have piped water, we don't have hydrants um and so although that might... that potential might be there as well as the fear of being annexed by the City of Winnipeg, I don't necessarily know that that future development should be done. Just because it can be does not mean that it should be. And I would really hope that as we go through this process, that members of Council take this under consideration. I won't reiterate what everyone else has already said, I very much concur with what the past uh presenters have shared and I do hope that this process continues to be productive and fruitful on ... on both sides of, of this document. We very much want to have input and make Springfield something that all community members can enjoy. Thank for your consideration. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, M'am. Anybody else in the audience or on line uh for opposition? I see none. Um then uh as everybody has been heard, had a chance to be heard uh, then at this point here I'm prepared uh to close the uh Public Hearing portion uh on this matter and no further questions will be allowed uh ... permitted for legal reasons uh there. Oh, did they want to? Ok, Dan if you want to do that. **Wesley Mustard** - Ya, it's me. Sorry about that, had to go get my speech. Ok, Wesley Mustard, resident of Springfield. Thank you for this opportunity to speak on the proposed zoning by-law. In the current zoning by-law # 08-01, the smaller settlement centres were identified as Hamlet Zoning District (78.0) and Hamlet Area Zoning District (79.0). The identification of the larger centres of Oakbank, Dugald and Anola got treated as hamlet areas. The purpose of the Hamlet Zoning Districts established in by-law # 08-01 was: quote "intended to provide sufficient land for various types of residential, commercial, industrial, recreational and community service development in the Hamlet Areas in Springfield, in keeping with the former Development Plan". The Hamlet Area Zoning District there are 16 Permitted Uses and 46 Conditional Uses, 18 Site Regulations and 25 additional regulations for permitted and conditional uses. Vivian, Glass, Navin, Prairie Grove, Ostenfeld, and Hazelridge were recognized as Hamlets. Why Cooks Creek was not included is not known. In by-law # 21-25 Other than the three larger centres the map identifies only three smaller centres: Hazelridge, Prairie Grove and Navin. This change was done without consultation with the area residents who suspect that it has much to do with Sio Silica's production plan. There isn't a zone description for General Development in the Bylaw although it describes 7 other zones. There are 26 General Development Standards, there are 15 permitted uses, 32 conditional uses, 9 permitted accessory uses, and 9 conditional accessory uses. It is noted that the Table 5-1 Zoning Districts: that General Development is shown in the Mixed Zones column. Mixed Zoning Districts only has one symbol in it and Mixed Zoning Districts point 6.6 reads as follows: "The General Development zoning District is intended to enhance and support specific areas in the municipality, being those that are designated as General Development in the Development Plan and accommodate a mixture of land uses including various, residential, commercial, industrial and civic land uses". I object to the elimination of Vivian as a Hamlet. You can call it what you want but it should have the same land use protection that it has under 08-01, General Developments. It should be described in the Bylaw like the other districts as described.

In Vivian as shown on the ?there are no longer "mixed uses". My last objection is to the dimensional standards in the MRP zone particularly as it would apply to the land immediately south of Vivian (General Development Zone) The Municipal Planning Guide to Zoning By-law in Manitoba sets out in Bulk Table (1.2) for Industrial side yards of 30 feet and rear yards for principal buildings, 30 feet and 25 feet respectively. But in by-law # 21-25 Table 10-2 it has 10 feet minimum for both the side and rear yards. Also, the height standard is shown as 65.5 feet but in the Planning Guide it is 42 feet. Setting these standards to accommodate Sio Silica's plant is not reasonable. Standards should be set at reasonable amounts and if an applicant wants something that exceeds the by-law's standards, then they should require a variance and a public hearing on their specific application. Thank you. **NOTE: There is a space here where no one is speaking.** **Martin Sandhurst** – Thanks Dan. Thanks, Mayor Therrien. Soya um of course we as Administration um heard from the Province in their circulation on ... of the Zoning Bylaw. What the Province does is they circulate so that's the 23-page Report ... they circulate the draft of the Zoning Bylaw prior to the Public Hearing being scheduled to all Provincial departments and agencies for comment so of course we consider those comments. We also of course consider the comments that people made at the previous Public Hearing and this one and in fact we went further back because of course there was a Public Hearing back in 2021 as well so none of that's been discounted, none of it's been ignored. So what ... what this section of tonight's proceedings is before Council decides uh whether or not they're going to continue or close the Public Hearing, whatever steps they may take tonight, is this is essentially the response to the objections. I basically in that respect am acting as the applicant for this application to adopt a Zoning Bylaw for the RM of Springfield. So this might take a bit because as you guys have heard and seen, there's been a fair number of presentations and there have been a fair number of comments that have been brought to our attention so. I am a staff member from the RM of Springfield who, who works for the uh the CAO who's asked me to do this tonight.... **CAO Draper interrupting** – Mr. Speers ... **NOTE: There is a substantial pause in the recording where there is absolutely no sound so it must have been turned off.** **Martin Sandhurst** – Thank you, Mr. Mayor. So first off, Section 7 of the General Development Standards uh Clause 7(2)(3) Groundwater Protection in Appendix D, the Groundwater Sensitivity Map, the Map is uh uh from the 2018 Aquifer Capability and Groundwater Vulnerability Study that was conducted uh as one of the background studies for our Development Plan. Suggestion was made that uh both Map uh 31 and 32 be included within the Zoning Bylaw. Um our consultant for this matter, Friesen Drillers indicated to us at the time that uh the Map that we've included is the .... the proper Map. That said, we'll do some further investigation and seek additional guidance from Friesen Drillers just to make sure that that's a fact. As you guys probably know, in Zoning Bylaw 08-01 there is no map that indicates where there's groundwater sensitivity so with the current Map that's in this draft, we're better off right now. We'll make sure we have the most protections that we can have in this Zoning Bylaw moving forward. Um Zoning Bylaw 08-01 had an AI Agriculture Intensive District which was uh removed as part of the changes made under 21-25as proposed. The suggestion was made that this district remain in order to provide for intensive agricultural operations such as livestock production. So what's

perhaps not abundantly clear is although this district was eliminated from 21-25, uh it was replaced by the Livestock Overlay District L1 to L4 which can be found in Section 9.15 and in the ... in the Maps at the back of the document. This was shared during the uh 2019 to 2021 round of committee engagement with uh with members of the public. There was a suggestion uh that there's an appearance of bias uh in putting together the Bylaw. A suggestion was made that the map changes are evidence of preferential treatment of certain property owners including a Municipal employee. This suggestion was made in a written submission and a verbal presentation so as a staff member of this organization and someone who's ... who's worked in other municipalities, I have no concern with somebody pointing out uh errors in my competence or errors related to my judgement but this instead concerns integrity. I'm interested in specifics of this. I hope this isn't the case. I'm not aware of it but I won't be responding in this forum to attacks on integrity during the public hearing. **NOTE: If it were me, and I had been thusly accused, I would be more than willing to publicly, especially in a forum packed with people, to DISCOUNT THE ACCUSATION. The fact that he skirts around it would make me highly suspicious. After all, he did bring up the subject.** Section 11, the Zoning District Maps, there's ... a suggestion was made that the Zoning Maps includes changes that have not been given Third Reading by Council. The Zoning Maps now include ... or pardon me, the Zoning Maps now include all zoning map changes that Council has given Third Reading to since the initial Bylaw 21-25 Public Hearing which was conducted in October of 2021. Uh in addition uh there was a boundary adjustment for property at Hillside and Vernon. Uh that change was introduced amongst the 53 changes that were considered or were to be considered, pardon me, by the Municipal Board. That change uh has been introduced because we're having a second public hearing. Uh we have also added the Municipal Board ordered Zoning Map change to accommodate the MRP Industrial Resource Processing Districts south of Vivian. Mr. Mayor, would you like me to respond to that question? Ya, so for Council's benefit, we're responding to changes ... or pardon me, the objections that were made by citizens both in person and submitted in writing as well as the suggestions and recommendations from Provincial Departments and Agencies. We're providing a recommendation to Council and as the applicant, we're responding to the objections that were brought forth during the public hearing. Ok. Is that clear, Council? All good. Ok. So um the Zoning Maps as I say, include those changes. Um these Map changes can now be made to Zoning Bylaw 21-25 since we're conducting a new public hearing which was advertised with the Bylaw including these map changes otherwise the mapping, the zoning maps are unchanged since the initial Zoning Bylaw 21-25 Public Hearing. In terms of Provincial agency comments, the uh Manitoba Department of Transportation and Infrastructure comments included the following: the suggestion that permitted uses listed in the CH Commercial Highway District should be limited to those that cater to the travelling public. Uh the CH District in 21-25 applies to properties other than those that are immediately adjacent to Provincial roads and highways which of course is the concern of MTI. Uh the suggestion of the Department was that a few uses including special event facility, commercial school and place of worship not be permitted in the AG Agriculture General and AR Agriculture Restricted districts. For Council's benefit, these uses are proposed as Conditional Uses in these districts so Council would retain the opportunity to determine the appropriateness of applications affecting any properties adjacent to Provincial roads or highways. There's a question from the Department if the RR Rural Residential district northeast of um PR 213 and PR206 intersection is existing and the answer is yes, this area is zoned RR under 08-01 and will be under 21(25) if Council determines to approve it. Suggestion that the I Institutional District shown north of Highway 1 near the Plessis/Symington overpass does not conform to the Development Plan. Uh reply to this, this area is already developed as a cemetery and the zoning reflects that existing use. Another Department's comments are from um Manitoba Agriculture and from Manitoba Environment – suggestion that changes to the Livestock definition and to the equestrian establish definition should be made and to some of the provisions uh to the use identified as equestrian establishment. Um we've made efforts to distinguish uh equestrian boarding, recreation, and show ... show operations in the Bylaw from those operations which would include breeding and food source operations. In ... in doing so we've come across a conflict between the Manitoba Agriculture interests and their definition and provisions under the Livestock and Livestock Products Act and the interests of Manitoba Environment, uh their definition and provisions are under the Livestock, Manure and Mortalities Management Regulation pursuant to the Environment Act. So what we're going to do uh is we're going to convene a meeting with Agriculture, Environment and Springfield representatives to reconcile. This should be a fairly straightforward exercise to fix these competing interests. Section 9 Use Standards – um clauses 9.5 Dwelling Setbacks and 9.13 Anhydrous Ammonia Storage and Distribution facilities. The suggestion was that the minimum setback from dwellings to uses such as waste disposal grounds, sewage lagoons, and anhydrous ammonia facilities are inconsistent with Provincial standards. The draft setbacks in 21-25 exceed the minimum Provincial setbacks in most cases. In the cases where they do not, we would have to abide by the Provincial standards. Comments from another Provincial Department, Manitoba Municipal and Northern Relations in addition to collecting the comment and providing them from all the departments to Council. They have their own opportunity to comment on our Zoning Bylaw. One of the comments was with respect to Section 2 Administration, Clause 2.5 Conditions attached to a Development Permit. Their suggestion was that this action should be removed.... this section, pardon me, should be removed since Section 149.1 of the Planning Act was not proclaimed. In contrast, Section 2.5 does not refer to development agreements. Instead Section 2.10 captures use of development agreements in relation to other procedures such as subdivisions, zoning amendments, conditional use orders, and variance orders. Section 2.5 on the other hand, utilizes authorities granted under the Municipal Act, specifically Part 7 Division 2 Spheres of Jurisdiction. Section 2.32 as a point of comparison, these same clauses are in Zoning Bylaw 08-01. Another suggestion was the Planned Unit Development, a land use identified as permitted in the Principle Use Table 9(1) in the RS Single Residential unit, R2, Two Unit Residential and RM Residential Multi-unit and also, pardon me, the GD General Development Districts. They suggested that these should be conditional in these districts. Uh since Planning and Development cannot operate as foreseen in Section 9 Use Standards without a Development Agreement being in place, and since Section 149.1 of the Planning Act does not proclaim, in this case we will alter Table 9.1 to make Planned Unit Developments conditional in these districts. In uh consultation with our uh Development Officer, no PUD proposals have been received in the past 20 years in Springfield. We will bring forward housekeeping bylaw amendment as a follow-up in this case. There have been questions raised um concerning uh Procedures, questions regarding the quality and number of communications involved in bringing this Zoning Bylaw forward from initial contract to tonight. Um despite there being no legislative requirements beyond the Council Public Hearing before Second Reading of the Zoning Bylaw, the process to draft and approve a new zoning bylaw typically includes opportunities to engage with community members. The Manitoba Planning Guide to Zoning Bylaws in Manitoba ... A Introduction to Zonings which was produced by the Province in 2015 refers to this as a best practice. Records show numerous community engagements dating back to November of 2019 and include in-person presentations, in-person workshops, newsletters, e-mail blasts, on-line exercises, on-line surveys, in-person information sessions. These engagements ranged from inform to involved as described in the International Association of Public Participation Spectrum of Public Participation. Including in-person and on-line engagements, there were over 2,000 touch points with community members during the drafting period of this Zoning Bylaw. Further reference to alterations to the Bylaw made between the initial Public Hearing in October of 2021 and Second Reading in 2022 which ended up with a

referral to the Municipal Board in February of 2023. At the Municipal Board Hearing uh the Municipality committed to conducting a new public hearing to consider these alterations which of course commenced on June 25<sup>th</sup> and continues tonight. Concerns have been raised uh about making changes to the Bylaw during the Public Hearing. Legislation specifies that changes other than minor alterations made after the public hearing require a second public hearing prior to Council proceeding with Second Reading. It's silent on changes that Council elects to make during the Public Hearing. We have been advised that there's no case law in Manitoba to draw on that speaks to this matter. However in practice it is consistent with how Councils have dealt with matters such as this across Manitoba regarding zoning bylaws amendments, secondary plan bylaw adoption and amendments, development plan adoption and amendments, and development agreement amendments. The more relevant example that speaks to the case before us tonight and if Council chooses to make alterations to the Bylaw beyond what was proposed and included uh with respect to the public notice and what was placed on line and a copy that was available to members of the public for inspection, ummm the example is the 20 plus alterations that the City of Winnipeg made to the Winnipeg Zoning Bylaw 200/2006 that were made during the October 2007 Public Hearing but prior to Council's Second Reading of the Bylaw. These changes, these alterations I should say to be more precise, include alterations to both text and Map. Obviously different legislation, Winnipeg operates under the Winnipeg Charter Act instead of the Planning Act, however all relevant sections of both byl... of both uh Acts use the same language with respect to procedures. With respect to Table 9(2), Accessory and Temporary Use lists, a drive-through is a permitted accessory use in the CC Commercial District was to be permitted subject to use-specific standards that can be found in Section 9.1(9) Drive-through Facilities. Suggest that this... the suggestion was made that this use should be ... remain conditional in the CC District. The intent uh was to permit this use in the CC District provided the use-specific standards are met. That said, since there's no development plan or other policy basis for permitting accessory drive-throughs in this District with or without the new use-specific standards, Administration would recommend that Council alter Table 9.2 to make drive-throughs a conditional use in this District and to speak to this commitment prior to Second Reading of the Bylaw. Further Administration has proposed to Council that a planning process be initiated to determine the future of Oakbank's Main Street roughly from Willow Avenue to Oakwood Road, those boundaries could change upon consultation, so the recommendation from Administration is, let's keep drive-throughs conditional in the CC District until that process has concluded. With respect to 767 Main Street, shown on Section 11, the Zoning District Maps as CH Commercial Highway District, suggest ... the suggestion was made that this property should remain as RM Residential Multi-unit District. The intent was to apply the CH District in order to conform with the Development Plan designation of Employment. Since the property is currently zoned RM and has been before and after the Development Plan Amendment to employment designation and since the RM District is consistent with the neighbouring property to the south, Administration recommends Council alter the Zoning Map to make this property RM District and again, to speak to this prior to closing the Public Hearing and proceeding with Second Reading at some time tonight or in the future. Um as you heard from the property owner, they've spoken to representatives of the condominium board to the south about their proposed development at this location. I wasn't party to that discussion, that's my understanding from the owner of the property at 767 Main Street. There's uh been concerns expressed about delegation of responsibilities to the Designated Officer. There's a suggestion that substituting the term Designated Officer for Development Officer is confusing and violates several municipal bylaws. I expect the reference is to Bylaw 18-14, Bylaw 11-14 and possibly Bylaw 19-22. So in uh the draft uh Zoning Bylaw, Section 2 Administration, Clause 2.2, the Designated Officer section assigns responsibility for interpretation of the Bylaw to the Designated Officer. Effectively the CAO either takes on this responsibility or assigns a staff member identified as one of the Designated Officers that have been identified in the Designated Officer Bylaw. This is standard practice in most Manitoba municipalities. That said, if Council is unsatisfied with how these powers have been or will be utilized, this responsibility can be revoked. Ultimately Council is answerable for all of its bylaws. Section 2, Administration, Clause 2.7 Variation Orders assigns responsibility for issuing what are referred to in the legislation as minor variances to the Designated Officer. Minor variance authority is limited to a maximum of 15, that's one five % of any dimensional requirement, for example, setbacks to property lines, heights of buildings, uh property area, property width or to any parking space allocation requirement based on the use of property. Conventionally, the minor variance provision are included within the Zon ... the Municipal Zoning Bylaw rather than in a stand-alone bylaw. For the record, and for Council's information, Bylaw 19-22, it's been in place since 2019, already establishes Designated Officer as having this authority. The area near Plessis/Symington/the Perimeter Highway, the suggestion was made the proposed RR Rural Residential Zoning District is inappropriate and unwelcome in this area. The RR district is proposed to align with the Development Plan's Rural Residential designation for this area. The suggestion was proposed was that the RR District will limit opportunities for agricultural operations in this area. Agricultural activities – this use is permitted in the RR districts. There's a request made for the preparation of a secondary plan for this area. Um if Council determines that the secondary plan is warranted for this area, and of course is budgeted for on that basis, then of course this action could be initiated. Seeing how carved up this area is already, including 29 existing 4 to 5 acre lots and an average lot size of 12 acres and the extent of development activities that's transpired in that area over the past 50 years, I would expect that we'll likely see maybe up to another 50 rural residential lots in this roughly 860 acre area over the next 25 years plus years. As an alternative to initiating a secondary plan for this area, there may be advantages to instead reviewing the current Concept Plan that uh has been prepared for this area showing potential road and lot layouts for the overall area with the area property owners that are interested in seeing how development could transpire in this area. With respect to the properties in the Vernon/Hazelridge area, the suggestion was that the RR Rural Residential District uh for properties in the vicinity of this intersection is incorrect. A little bit of research, the former bylaw 15-75 for the RM of Springfield which was adopted by Council in 1960 allowed uh as a right, a one-family dwelling on minimum 5-acre 300 ft. wide lots in the A Rural District. When Bylaw 08-01 was introduced in 2010, the change from A to RR was made in order to apply, what's referred to as the most equivalent zoning district to these properties, that is, 5-acre sized rather than say the 80 acre size in the AG districts or the 20 acre size in the AR District. Now that said, a property owner of course retains the opportunity to apply for zoning bylaw amendment providing her or his own property as a stand-alone application at any time. Council would then consider the application on its merits. Furthermore um my understanding is the owner of one property in this area has made the request to change the zoning for his property and for other properties in the area, that it's unclear whether or not that he owns those properties. General practice in municipalities is that you cannot rezone another person's properties without their consent which we would typically want to see with them testifying in person or providing that in writing. That said, of course, Council has the opportunity tonight amongst alterations they may choose to make to uh the Zoning Bylaw as drafted. We just want to caution Council that in doing so, they may want to consider the, the applicant who is present or has submitted paperwork uh signed versus the overall area, that you have the opportunity to do it, either or in this case. With respect to the Hamlets, uh the suggestion was made at the June meeting that the zoning district change from Hamlet area to General Development was to facilitate the construction of a resource processing plant. Uh the processing plant site was not zoned HA under Zoning Bylaw 08-01 and is not proposed to be GD under the proposed Bylaw 21-25. The GD District uh as drafted has substantially similar use

and build form regulations as the current HA District and was introduced in order to align with the Development Plan designation of General Development. Further, the GD District terminology is based on direction from the Man... from the Municipal Planning Guide to Zoning Bylaws in Manitoba, component B reference binder of model zoning language which again the Province produced and released in 2015. Um furthermore the GD District is also proposed for beyond uh Vivian for portions of Hazelridge, Prairie Grove and Navin. Now with respect to that particular request, the change in name from GD back to HA, Council, if they decide they want to make that alteration, could do so, again during the Hearing, speaking to it prior to making uh or bringing forward Second Reading if you choose to do so. Um I don't think it materially changes anything in the Bylaw to do so. Um there's been references tonight and at the previous uh hearing to um the Bylaw um being presented in a non-standardized format. The suggestion is that the Municipality is not provided...following a Provincial standard for zoning bylaws. I'm assuming this uh reference is to the Municipal Planning Guide to Zoning Bylaws in Manitoba component B reference binder of model zoning language which again the Province produced in 2015. This document replaced Template Zoning Bylaw for Municipalities in Rural Manitoba which was produced in 1919. Uh this Guide is not intended to be mimicked by municipalities, instead as this uh Reference Binder states, communities should use it as a starting point in writing a new Zoning Bylaw or amending an existing Zoning Bylaw, adapting it to meet local needs and circumstances. There's a ref...suggestion that the Bylaw has been weakened or lacks clarity due to missing definitions. Generally terms are only defined in the Bylaw when they differ from common usage or when there's more than one common meaning to clarify which meaning we're referring to. Generally terms are not included in the Zoning Bylaw when they're already defined in applicable legislation or in related Provincial regulations. Also terms not used in the Zoning Bylaw are not defined. There's a reference to um the document being inadequate insofar as it gives up control. The preparation of every zoning bylaw involves balancing the degree of Council oversight on the one hand with the intent to encourage desired development through reduced regulatory restrictions. The Development Plan and Secondary Plans determine desired development. The Zoning Bylaw is to prohibit undesired development, to shape potentially desired development, and to get out of the way of desired development. Pre and post adoption efforts are typically evident to modulate this balance between a hands off and a hands on approach to any development matters or any type, any form. Note that Bylaw 08-01 and every zoning bylaw in Manitoba draws these types of lines. For example, I can't build my house in an urban area closer than 5 ft. from my neighbour's property line but I can paint my front door any colour I choose. There's a suggestion been made that this has been a rushed process preparing this Zoning Bylaw. So we're 5 years into it with the balance of the work having been done in portions of 2019, 2020, 2021. Um based on my experience in preparing Zoning Bylaws in this and other Provinces, uh I don't believe we could spend 5 more years and result am appreciative...appreciatively better Zoning Bylaw. That said, once adopted and in use, further polishing and refining will be ongoing in order to continually improve the Bylaw. Changes can be made to a Zoning Bylaw after adoption. What typically transpires in the first year or so of use of a new bylaw is errors in consistencies, some unintended consequences are caught. Those changes are brought forward to Council, typically as I say within the first year on what are referred to variously as omnibus housekeeping or errors and omissions bylaws. That, as a staff member, I've never seen a municipality adopting a new zoning bylaw and not have to make changes after the fact, that's commonplace and that's our commitment to the staff and to this Council. Um what can happen when there's a lag between a plan preparation and zoning bylaw preparation is you can, you can uh um you can get into some problems when the understanding of the purpose of each is unclear from the outset, which is our fault, or when a connection between the Plan's policies and zoning bylaws, regulations, erodes as time passes and that's a function of the further we get from the adoption of or the consultation process and adoption of the Development Plan and two secondary plans to adopting this Zoning Bylaw, what the purpose of the Zoning Bylaw and how it relates to those Plans and the desires of Council and citizens expressed during the consultation process becomes more and more remote. Just a point of comparison, another Province I've worked in, in B.C., in B.C. in their legislation, the Municipality is not required to conduct a public hearing on it's zoning bylaw provided it's consistent with the municipal development plan. Now I don't know of any examples of them actually using that authority but they have it. Um there's also a... there's a suggestion about uh competence, that preparation of a zoning bylaw requires appropriate expertise, just wanted to note that the consultant hired by the Municipality back in 2019, WSP, is an international firm with experience and expertise preparing zoning bylaws across Canada including a dozen plus zoning bylaws in Manitoba and that that firm was selected amongst 4 qualifying proposals from other firms including Landmark, Scantliffe, Miller, Murray and Urban Systems who also submitted. You should also note municipal staff has experienced adopting of the administering the Zoning Bylaw of Springfield, 08-01. I think Dan's been here long enough to have done so with previous bylaws. So with respect to capability in putting together a bylaw of this nature, as I mentioned, WSP, Landmark, Urban Systems, Scantliffe, Miller, Murray certainly have the capability to do so. Others that are on the roster of the Manitoba Professional Planners Institute that could pull it off, Catapult, HD...and Blackburn, Lombard North, Barnes and Duncan didn't submit proposals. There are many firms across North America with this capability and in future endeavours that Council may commit to, uh potentially those firms could also submit. Um there's been reference to um certain items that uh have been changed or, or uh were never considered for this Bylaw. One of them is the use of lawful and legally established. Um these refer to language that was formerly found in Section 2.1(1) Certificate of Non-Conformity in Zoning memorandum Procedures. This Section has been substantially redrafted to reflect legislative requirements. To use terms lawful, legally established are no longer used in this section. Manitoba Culture, Heritage and Tourism provided a recommendation that apparently includes reference to guidance materials which, in their words, are intended to assist municipalities with handling heritage matters within their development plan, not within the zoning bylaw. Furthermore, um these materials assist municipalities in preparing a heritage bylaw. The Springfield Development Plan, Section 3.7 includes guidance on heritage matters. Zoning regulations specific to heritage properties in the RM of Springfield are not warranted at this time. They could be introduced at a later date through amendments when Council deems it beneficial to do so. Finally there's a suggestion that pre-zoning of areas within the Municipality eliminates opportunities for development agreements. Um these areas include West Pine Ridge, the Plessis/Symington, Perimeter Highway area, and Dugald southwest, that if we pre-zone, this will allow Council the opportunity to enter into a development agreement. Um besides the Planning Acts authority to require a development agreement as a condition of zoning amendment approval under Section 81, municipalities also have the authority as a condition of subdivision, Sections 125(1) and 135 Conditional Uses, Section 106, Subsection 2 and Variance Approval. Uh Section 98 and subsection 1. Before determining whether to pre-zone areas to reflect the Development uh Plan Map, careful determination is apparent to have been undertaken to ensure that the Municipal authority to enter into a development agreement would not be squandered in these areas. So to wrap up, those of you who attended or uh tuned into the June uh public hearing when it commenced uh may recall the presentation that I made leading off, **NOTE: As one that has subjugated oneself to the torture of transcribing these meetings, I can honestly say that judging from today, no one would have been awake after the first 10 minutes.** uh my lecture, uh as one member of the community referred to it, um I brought it, I brought forward that piece, that presentation to make sure that this Council is aware of the requirements in preparing a zoning bylaw, the aims, that was stated in putting this one together and the expectations of all parties

to it. So a few questions. Does the Springfield Zoning Bylaw 21-25 as drafted and including the changes that Council may choose to propose, tonight, meet the legislative requirements spelled out in the Planning Act, specifically Section 71, Subsection 1 and Section 71, Subsection 2, YES. Does um Bylaw 21-25 stick to the provisions spelled out in the Planning Act, Section 71, Subsection 3. YES. Has the legislative requirements for the adoption of the Zoning Bylaw as spelled out in the Planning Act, Section 73(1) through 73(9) been followed. YES. Have the legislative requirements provided for under the Planning Act, Section 74 for Community Consultation been followed in preparing Bylaw 21-25. YES. Have Provincial guidelines, Zoning Bylaws as expressed in the Provincial Planning Regulations, the Planning Act Handbook, and the Municipal Planning Guide to Zoning Bylaws in Manitoba been followed in preparing Zoning Bylaw 21-25. YES. Uh Municipal policies as expressed in the Springfield Development Plan, the West Pine Ridge Secondary Plan, and the Oakbank South Secondary Plan been followed in preparing this Bylaw. YES. Have the project aims that were expressed and shared with community during the consultation process been met for preparing Bylaw 21-25? YES. Has the Municipal Board's February 2023 oral and written statements concerning procedures for adopting Bylaw 21-25 been followed? YES As a result and in order to meet the requirement that's specified under the Planning Act, Section 68, that a municipal council must adopt a zoning bylaw that is generally consistent with the development plan in any secondary plan bylaw in effect in the Municipality. Administration recommends Council adopt 21-25. You're welcome. **NOTE: In the future, whenever I am having trouble sleeping, I can just refer back to this recording of Mr. Sandhurst, that continuous monotonous droning white noise, and I will be out like a light in 5 minutes.** Mayor Therrien— Thank you, Martin. So we've heard uh uh from all four categories. Uh at this point uh hereum um I'm prepared to close the Public Hearing as everybody has uh had their input uh with regards uh to this and uh no further uh questions will be permitted for legal reasons and now we'll uh close the uh Public Hearing portion and uh discuss it amongst Council. Would anybody like to start off with regards to uh that matter there? Uh Glen? **Councillor Fuhl**— Ya, so starting off with the um drive-through um um as a conditional use, I'd just like to start the conversation that I am on side with that, in changing that to a conditional use. **NOTE: Wow! What a waste of breathe that was! Unless you believe that he is early campaigning for his next election bid.** Mayor Therrien— Thank you, uh Glen. Anybody else? I, I, I would ... sorry, Melinda. **Councillor Warren**— No, go ahead. **Mayor Therrien**— I would concur with uh uh Deputy Mayor. **NOTE: Birds of a feather ....** Um, uh as Lenay had stated, it's not the right place uh for that. It's a better location uh you know somewhere closer to the RM Office outside of uh the main area. Um and I agree, I would uh agree with that. Uh Melinda? **Councillor Warren**— I wasn't talking about that (laughing). On that particular subject or are we moving on to the next? **Mayor Therrien**— Do you want to ... well, go ahead, please. **Councillor Warren**— Well, I'm ... I'm also with the drive-through still being a conditional use um but I would like to say for Jill Overall and for Mr. Klippenstein there, to keep that as the ... as what it's zoned for right now as the Multi-family. **Mayor Therrien**— Yes. And I would agree with uh that as well just because uh we want that higher density housing. Um it's a ... it's a great location uh for uh for that uh uh there um and uh the higher density housing uh is ... is ideal uh and, and along the lines of aging in place. Um so we can have uh different levels of families, from young to our, to our older uh citizens and transition within uh the RM of Springfield. **NOTE: If a long-time resident from the rural part of Springfield moves to a condo or apartment in Oakbank, that will change their way of life substantially. I would prefer to age in place, i.e. in my place! Social services should be making more preparations to answer that future need, like having regular home care and floating nursing staff available. JUST MY OPINION.** Andy, did you have your hand up? **Councillor Kuczynski**— Yes, I did, Mr. Mayor. I suggest that we're not dealing here right now with the specific issues. Uh Martin gave us lots of information and it was almost like half an hour. So I suggest that uh we have that put in writing and presented to the residents of this Municipality and to the Council. There was lots of information and we have to absorb that and have to deal with it. So I say we don't proceed with the Second Reading until we have all that information so everybody can digest. Thank you. **Mayor Therrien**— Ok. Uh Mark. **Councillor Miller**— Um thank you Mayor. Uh um first off, thank you for everyone that came out tonight and on line who, you know, invested in this document. It's very important because it's our pathway forward. You know, this may all be for naught if Plan 2050 comes forward but that's another issue. Having said that, I really enjoy or um embrace what Councillor Kuczynski is saying here tonight because, my goodness, I took uh uh a page or so of notes as well and I don't exactly know what we're really approving. Yes, we can nitpick, I agree with uh uh redesignating of course the McDonalds, that property on Main Street, to be uh conditional and a few other things that were discussed here but we're willy nilly, I think it's only in our ... going to be to our advantage as Council and to the public to know exactly what we're ... we're um approving and changing uh uh I don't know any meeting I've ever been in where you would just verbally say uh after a presentation of 25 minutes or so, yes let's agree to it although it's thorough, thank you for that. But I think uh it would be reckoned upon us to do it uh whether it be within a week... I don't mean to kick this ... kick the can down the pathway for uh a huge duration. As you said, it's been 5 years. Many residents have been waiting for this. I think we're getting much, much closer, to where we need to be but if we adopt it tonight uh obviously there's going to be a Municipal Board **NOTE: At least two people on the Municipal Board receive my Notes. Just saying .... And they have said they value my opinion.** challenge and it's just going to be uh another loggerheads. So let's try to get it right. Let's see what we're doing, trying to prove here and maybe we can all come to a kind of ... some sort of consensus and agree to it. **Mayor Therrien**— Thank you, Mark. Melinda? **Councillor Warren**— I have a question, more for Martin than Dan. In terms of everyone is talking about uh designate officer and Development Officer, so which does the Province, like ... suggest? Designated? Ok. **Mayor Therrien**— Thank you. Uh Glen, did you have your hand up? **Councillor Fuhl**— I didn't but I do have a question for the Development Officer. Uh the question I have is, is the question that ... just give me a second to look at my notes here ... ummmm ... sorry, give me a second here, I'm just looking forrrrr ... piece here... go ahead, **NOTE: Verbatim.** Come back to my notes, just go ahead if there's somebody else wants to speak. **Mayor Therrien**— Anybody else? Um go ahead, Melinda. **Councillor Warren**— (laughing) And if we're going to talk about Hamlets, I'm ok with the word Hamlet instead of General Development. I ... I mean that shouldn't ... it's a small community, it's a ... it's ... to me a hamlet means that we're all together, that we're all you know, like ... **Councillor Fuhl**— Ya, I'm in agreement with that too. And just to come back to my notes, I had a question there was Julie had the question about being close to urban with agriculture development. Uh my question to **youse** is um is there a way in the zoning that we could present that there is a buffer of ... a zone uh to introduce that, that's my question to the um Planning Department. **Dan Doucet**— There are current setbacks right now for building a structure uh as a bit of a buffer. I believe the front yard is 125 ft. It's um there are restrictions with the uh livestock mapping, uh the L1 to L4 maps but that restricts strictly the livestock, not the uh agricultural support industries or anythinglike that. We're just going by the building setbacks, to my knowledge on the new ... on the new one. I don't know if there's any other ... plus ... if you look at the ... the agro-tourism operation that is listed as a conditional use, the agro-business is a permitted use in the AR. **Councillor Fuhl**— The question I have is are you aware of any other municipalities having a buffer zone from their major urban areas? Pardon? **Dan Doucet**— Martin was just mentioning there are Provincial legislation for additional setbacks regarding uh a lagoon or a livestock operation. Um I'm not aware of other jurisdictions having that setback from say the town limits. Ya, we could definitely look into it. **Councillor Fuhl**— Ok, thank you. **Mayor Therrien**— Thank you. Andy? **Councillor Kuczynski**— We have setbacks to

aggregate extraction so why don't we have on the agriculture? **Dan Doucet** – There are uh Provincial uh regulations, yes for the aggregate as well as agricultural but the agricultural strictly talks about the uh uh the livestock operation, the animals. **NOTE: Yes, Dan, we know what livestock means.** There are no restrictions that I'm aware of from say a grain operation or somebody harvesting uh adjacent to a rural residential town???

**Councillor Kuczynski** – We're not talking about that, we were talking about putting that facility, like you know, grain facility or some kind of factory there, right by the people where they reside. **NOTE: You mean, like Parrish & Heimbecker putting a grain storage facility on land zoned agricultural adjacent to residences, like the Brown family homes?**

**Dan Doucet** – We'll have to look into it. There's nothing that I'm aware of in this current Zoning Bylaw. **Councillor Kuczynski** – Thank you. **Mayor Therrien** – Um ok um our uh ... I'll just kind of summarize, I, I can't do any better job than um Martin uh there. I uh I think Martin's summation was very thorough um summarize everything I had in my notes back in uh June uh going forward uh there, any questions that I had. Uh um in regards to that, we're all covered. I uh we have how many uh I think we've got more than 25 oppositions there so this, this will like ...this will go to the Municipal Board. Uh my suggestion is ... is uh if we cover off uh everything that we've uh heard uh tonight uh uhwith regards to this we're, we're taking care of the drive-through, that was a big thing in our last Hearing, most of my notes were in regards to the drive-through and it makes sense, uh and like I would ... I'm not going to rehash that, from what Lenay was uh saying that uh it, it should uh be a uh conditional use. Uh as for the 767 Main Street uh and Mr. Klippenstein uh comment or inquiry there uh I ... uh that's what I'd like to see, I'd like to see our community growing in that multi-phase uh approach uh higher density housing. That's ... that's what our uh our RM uh needs uh specifically and uh the general terms of Hamlet from General Development, uh I don't like that term, it ... we have uh our uh our people in those hamlets and Western did a hell of a ... heck of a good job uh in summarizing all that and I concur with ... with regards to that. As for Mr. Giesbrecht uh there uh from the zoning change, I'm uh I'm for that uh as well. Um I specifically don't agree uh that we should incorporate the other neighbours. Uh they have to come forward cause I think that's just uh a liability that uh out there. Uh we ... no just, just hang on Edwin, Edwin, just hang on. Uh this is...this ...hang on, Edwin. No, we've already closed that, the Hearing there. No... **NOTE: I can hear a little of what he is saying .... "my issue ... it's got to be reconvened ... letter that needs to be read into Council for the record."** I think he is talking about the letter from that group in Toronto, the democracy specialists. You've had your chance uh in the Hearing ... the Public Hearing. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – I was not given my chance. **Mayor Therrien** – You didn't put your hand up at any point. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – It's up. **NOTE: Mr. Giesbrecht's argument is that someone else was allowed to speak after the Hearing was closed.**

**Mayor Therrien** – Well, we've already closed it, I can't legally ... for legal reasons ... **Edwin Giesbrecht** – Right there, right there. **Mayor Therrien** – Who? **CAO Draper** – Wesley. **Mayor Therrien** – It wasn't closed ... it wasn't closed yet, Edwin. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – Yes, it was. **Mayor Therrien** – No ... no...no...no... **Edwin Giesbrecht** – Everybody heard it. You said Hearing Closed. So ... **NOTE: I went back in these notes and here is the section they are talking about: then at this point here I'm prepared uh to close the uh Public Hearing portion uh on this matter and no further questions will be allowed uh ... permitted for legal reasons uh there. Oh, did they want to? Ok, Dan if you want to do that. Wesley Mustard - Ya, it's me... while he was about to close the Hearing, he never actually does.**

**Mayor Therrien** – interrupting We can't ... we ... we can't hear it. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – ... read this in. **Mayor Therrien** – We can't hear it. The ... it's closed uh now. **Edwin Giesbrecht** – Horse shit! **Mayor Therrien** – You know, Edwin, that's not quite manly ... **Edwin Giesbrecht** – Well, this man brought us additional information subsequent that has reflection to this ... and to the ... so ... **Mayor Therrien** – We can't ... **Edwin Giesbrecht** – ... new information, I have a right ... **Mayor Therrien** – ... summarized ... **Edwin Giesbrecht** – ... to enter my information ... **Mayor Therrien** – No, it's, it's closed. Legal...legal reasons... It is closed. It is... it ... it is closed ... it is closed ... it was open... **Edwin Giesbrecht** – ... it was never ... **Mayor Therrien** – At this point, at this point here, we have a uh Council has ... Council has a decision uh to .... **Edwin Giesbrecht** – ... corrupt ... **Mayor Therrien** – ... we made with regards uh to the Second Reading. We have 25 objections uh so the Third Reading we're not going to be able to do uh there but uh at this point here, I think all four of the major uh points um have been addressed there and then at this point here we could uh ... we can go to our uh our Second Reading and uh and vote with regards to the Second Reading and then we'll go to the uh to the Third uh Reading uh after the Municipal Board. Um then at this point here I think we could uh uhuh I've summarized everything here that I had to and everybody's had their chance to talk with regards to that, unless there's other questions uh there um we could proceed to the um to the reading of the ... go ahead, Mark. **Councillor Miller** – Uh thank you, Mr. Mayor. I echo what has been said by Dr. Page and so many other residents. Why are we preparing this document so we can see what we're actually going against or trying to put together and have the public have some scrutiny, like what's wrong with that? I don't understand what ... we keep going down this path. Let's close it, let's just get it ... move it on ... let's ... you know, I want to move this document along too, I want to adopt something that is satisfactory for the public and for our Council. **NOTE: What's the rush? I am being facetious. For a newly elected Council, one of the first and most important items of business is the Procedure Bylaw. That sets forth how they must operate. This is two years into their term and they are still discussing it.**

It ... every time we get into this loggerhead. I get so frustrated. I don't even know, as I say, why people come to this kind of a ... a forum because it's ... there's deaf ears. It's like why bother. Why am I bothering to sit here because it just ... the agenda is set, we know how the vote's going to go, and "la, la, la", the story's written. That's all we're asking for is make the changes, expedite it, do it within the week, have it available for the public, have it available for Council to make a responsible decision. I don't even know what I'm voting for, to be frank. **Mayor Therrien** – Glen? **Councillor Fuhl** – So I have to say that uh Councillor Miller, you do have validity to that. Um I would agree that we...it's always better to have a document in front of us that's been revised so we can see it. Um, having said that, **NOTE: Here we go!** I'd just like to express uh Mr. Edwin Giesbrecht ...uh I'm disappointed that you know, if you wanted to speak and you're right, he, he did allow Mr. Mustard to speak but you chose to keep quiet for a very long period... oh ... wait a minute, you, you, you, you decided to keep very quiet for a long period of time till the end which is disappointing because right after Mr. Mustard you could have stood up and spoke to that and I'm sure all of Council would agree to that. Well, as a matter of respect to the forum, Mr. Mustard was able to get up and speak after the Mayor said he closed it. **NOTE: Councillor Fuhl does not listen very well. The Mayor NEVER ACTUALLY CLOSED THE HEARING unless he did and it was not recorded. The Mayor said "I'm prepared uh to close the uh Public Hearing". PREPARED does not equate to "I am now closing the Public Hearing" or "the Public Hearing is now closed". In point of fact, the hearing is still open. Right after Mr. Mustard, Mr. Sandhurst launched into his lengthy and totally monotone dissertation at which point I am sure some, including myself, found themselves drifting off to sleep. But then there was silence ... there was silence to that after the fact for a very long time till the end. NOTE: Now there's a grammatically awkward sentence, if I've ever heard one and from Councillor Fuhl I have heard others before, that expresses nothing specific in a most non-grammatical way. Mr. Giesbrecht can be heard faintly in the background.**

I'm not ... I'm not here ... **Mayor Therrien** – We can't ... we can't ... ok ... **Councillor Fuhl** – Fair enough but please interject when you're asked to right at the time, please. Having said that **NOTE: Here we go again!** I'm on side with the um agreement uh the Zoning Plan um zoning to be approved from the Second Reading once we have it all in writing so we can review it and I'm good with that. And like you said, I'm no one to delay anything, I'm with you, I want this done. If any Councillor has

been part of the process right from the beginning to the end, that is myself, it's been a very long time, everything that Martin had said is true, we've had many open houses as I explained in the last Hearing and it's time to get this done. Once is to again to remember there is housekeeping amendments as they're going to happen, take place and also um this is a living document. It changes as we go so if we want to make amendments, we can do that. It's not set in stone. Changes can be made down the road if we find that something's not working. Thank you very much. **Mayor Therrien** – Thank you, uh Deputy Mayor, um has everybody had ... no M'am... we're just .... we're going to ... we're still conducting our discussions uh here. **At this uh point** uh here uh since it is closed, then uh it's ... it's got to go to the Municipal Board because of the 25 objections .... **CAO Draper** – No, no I'll just clarify .... **Mayor Therrien** – Just, just, just.... **CAO Draper** – ... the Public Hearing has been closed so Council can either do Second Reading tonight or postpone Second Reading to a further date so I think what I'm hearing is Council's looking at, you know, providing some of the additional information that was given tonight, there was a lot of information. We can post that publicly, Council can review it, ask questions of staff but the point is the Public Hearing has been closed so at this point it's now just a Council decision. **NOTE: Once again, I have challenged that fact. "I am prepared to close" is not synonymous with "I am now closing" or "I will now close".** Whenever that takes place, uh whether next week, two weeks, whatever Council decides. **Mayor Therrien** – So, Edwin, ... Ed... thank you. Uh Edwin or sorry Colleen uh our C ... our CAO **there** ... we, we, we can uh vote on the Second Reading uh there and adjourn it for uh another Hearing down ... down to .... **CAO Draper** – You can close the Public Hearing, it sounds like Second Reading is not required tonight, we can .... **Mayor Therrien** – Sorry ... enough. **CAO Draper** – Ya, we can bring back Second Reading at a later date when Council's more comfortable after they've reviewed all the information uh provided tonight. **Mayor Therrien** – Then uh ... **CAO Draper** – So ... **Mayor Therrien** – So that's ... that's ... the Public Hearing's done so uh what does the Council's opinion **with regards uh to** that? We could ... we could bring it back for the Second Hearing at another time and **at which point** I ... I think all the information is ... is there and I ... I would be for uh doing the Second Reading uh now but that's up to Council, uh whatever they ... their decision is ... **Councillor Fuhl** – There is no Hearing, it's now bringing the document for Second Reading. That's what we're waiting to see with all the changes, does Council agree on that? The Hearing is closed, though. **Mayor Therrien** – Here ... here ... no ... **CAO Draper** – So the Public Hearing has been closed so just to clarify for Council and the public, the Zoning Bylaw 21-25 attached to the Agenda tonight is the document being approved with the 4 amendments you talked about so those are the only additional changes being considered. So that's the drive-through, 767 Main Street, uh the GD to Hamlet, and the zoning of Hazelridge Road and Vernon Road. **Mayor Therrien** – So that's our Second Reading uh **there** and uh ... **Councillor Miller** – No. I move to propose to ... **Mayor Therrien** – We have ... **Councillor Miller** – To defer it, ya. **Mayor Therrien** – I don't ... I don't see the reason to delay this. Uh uh I think uh .... **NOTE: A man can be heard shouting ... "so I can ask some questions" ... I think it is Mr. Giesbrecht.** **Mayor Therrien** – We, we have ... we ... **Unidentified Male Speaker** - ...I wasn't given .... opportunity. **Mayor Therrien** – We, we have to uh we could vote on ... on the Second Reading at this ... at this time uh here um and uh ... **Councillor Miller** – Uh we ... no, Mr. Mayor, uh I think we have uh we can make a resolution if I have to or a motion to uh suspend this and have the document in front of us, just like the Deputy Mayor suggested, and then we have another Council meeting to discuss it and to ... **Unidentified Male Speaker** – And reopen Question Period ... **Mayor Therrien** – Well, no, we're here for this specific uh reason here so I think ... **Councillor Miller** – ... you can't make your own rules ... no, as Colleen suggested, you ... correct ... **Mayor Therrien** – It's just, it's just delaying it, delaying it but I'll go with the ... I'll ... **Councillor Miller** – That's your opinion. **Mayor Therrien** – ... I'll go with the will, I'll go with the will of Council, of course. So um I'm, I'm prepared ... I would like to do the vote uh to delay is not the ... is not doing our um us any good **there** but I'll go with the uh the majority of ... of Council. So uh... what ... **Councillor Miller** – Defer. **Mayor Therrien** – To defer it uh **there** uh what is uh the consensus of Council? **Councillor Fuhl** – Yep, leave Second Reading till we have the document with ... with all the changes. **Mayor Therrien** – Then we can get it ... ok... ok then uh how ... how do we do that? Just ... is it Adjourned. Ok. Then we'll uh...there's nothing else uh **with regards** to this.

## 5. NEW BUSINESS

### 5.1 Bylaw 21-25 Springfield Zoning Bylaw (2<sup>nd</sup> Reading) - DEFERRED

**6. ADJOURNMENT-** **Mayor Therrien** – Then **at this point here** I'm prepared uh to adjourn the Hearing. I need a mover and a seconder for that uh as well, please. Uh that'll be ...who is it? Uh Glen and uh uh Melinda? (Fuhl/Warren) At this point here, we are closing it at uh 8:17 p.m. and thank you very much.