CITY CLERKS -WPG '25 NOV 13 13:30

Manitoba

The Municipal Board

1144 – 363 Broadway
Winnipeg MB R3C 3N9
Phone: 204-945-2941
Fax: 204-948-2235
www.gov.mb.ca/mr/municipal_board

November 7, 2025

Carlos Gameiro
City Clerk
City of Winnipeg
510 Main Street
Winnipeg, MB R3B 1B9

Dear Carlos Gameiro:

RE: REFFERAL OF OBJECTION TO THE CITY OF WINNIPEG BY-LAW NO. 36/2025 WITH RESPECT TO 22 GRANITE WAY IN THE CITY OF WINNIPEG (DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO. DASZ 46/2024)
PURSUANT TO SECTION 236.1(7) OF *THE CITY OF WINNIPEG CHARTER*
FILE NO. 25D2A-0001

As per Section 236.1(8)(c) of *The City of Winnipeg Charter*, and as per your letter to the Municipal Board dated April 28, 2025, we now submit a copy of the Board's Report and Recommendation No. D-25-006 with respect to the above mentioned matter.

Yours truly,

E. Wills

Erin Wills
Secretary/Chief Administrative Officer

EW/amn/enclosure

c: Kalyn B. Bomback, Legal Services Department, City of Winnipeg

THE MUNICIPAL BOARD OF MANITOBA

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

REPORT DATE: November 7, 2025

Report No. D-25-006
File No. 25D2A-0001

MATTER: Zoning By-law Referral
The City of Winnipeg Charter
Section 236.1(7)

LOCAL AUTHORITY City of Winnipeg

BY-LAW NO: 36/2025

HEARING DATES: August 26, 2025
August 27, 2025
August 28, 2025
September 8, 2025
September 9, 2025
September 10, 2025

PANEL: Lori Lavoie, Chair
Daryl Carry, Member
Saadia Maryam, Member

PARTIES AND APPEARANCES:

for the City of Winnipeg
Kalyn Bomback, Legal Counsel, Legal Services Department
Daniel Iskierski, Planner, City Public Service
Richard Mahé, Land Enhancement Administrator
Gordon Chappell, A/Manager, Real Estate and Land Development

for the Granite Curling Club Inc.
James A. Mercury, MLT Aikins LLP, Legal Counsel
Melanie Wire, MLT Aikins LLP, Legal Counsel
Kyle Doering, General Manager
John Read, President
Reginald Turnbull, First Vice President
Christian Pierce, Secretary
John Wintrup, John Scott Wintrup Consulting Ltd.

Public Presenters (oral and written)

Donnavan Woodstock	Cindy Tugwell
Evan Pritchard	Dylon Martin
James Hay	Melanie Marginet
Barry Gorlick	Jeremy Read
Luc Dauriac	Bruce Peloquin

INTRODUCTION

This hearing relates to the referral of objections from the City of Winnipeg (the "City") to the Municipal Board (the "Board") regarding the City's By-law No. 36/2025 (the "Proposed By-law"). The Proposed By-law seeks to approve the subdivision of land, and to amend Downtown Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 100/2004 (the "Zoning By-law") to re-zone land located at 22 Granite Way in the City Centre Community (the "Subject Property") pursuant to Development Application No. DASZ 46/2024 (the "Development Application").

The Development Application seeks to subdivide the Subject Property into two parcels as follows (the "Proposed Subdivision"):

Proposed Lot 1: 39,390.4 square feet ("Lot 1").

Proposed Lot 2: 19,923.6 square feet ("Lot 2").

The Development Application also seeks to re-zone Lot 2 from "R" Riverbank Sector to "C" Character Sector (the "Proposed Re-zoning"). Lot 1 is to remain "Riverbank Sector".

The Subject Property is owned by the City and leased to the Granite Curling Club (the "GCC"). With the authorization of the City, the Development Application was made by the Land Enhancement Administrator for the Housing Accelerator Fund (the "HAF") Team, Richard Mahé, for subdivision and zoning approval.

As approving authority under *The City of Winnipeg Charter* (the "Charter"), City Council (the "Council") gave First Reading to the Proposed By-law on March 27, 2025. After giving notice, the City received sufficient objections to the Proposed By-law and, in accordance with Section 236.1(7) of the Charter, the objections were referred to the Board on April 28, 2025 (the "Referral").

The Board held a public hearing to consider the Referral on August 26, August 27, August 28, September 8, September 9, and September 10, 2025 (the "Hearing") at the Norwood Community Centre in Winnipeg, Manitoba.

The Board notes that pursuant to Sections 236.1(6) and (7) of the Charter, the Board's jurisdiction on the Referral pertains to the re-zoning matter only. The Board therefore will limit the scope of the Referral and its Report and Recommendation to the Proposed Re-zoning under Section 236.1(8) of the Charter. While the Board refers to the Proposed Subdivision in the Report and Recommendation to Council (the "Report and Recommendation"), it is for context purposes only.

ISSUE

Whether the Board should recommend to Council to approve the Proposed By-law, with or without conditions, or reject the Proposed By-law.

LEGISLATION

The following provisions of the Charter are relevant to these proceedings:

General Requirements

236 (1.1) A zoning by-law must be consistent with the development plan by-law and any applicable secondary plan by-law.

Notice of first reading: sufficient objections

236.1(6) As soon as practicable after a proposed zoning by-law is given first reading under subclause (5)(b)(i), the city must give notice to every person who made submissions at the hearing conducted by the designated committee of council respecting the proposed by-law, stating that

(a) council has given first reading to the proposed by-law; and
(b) any person who made submissions at the hearing respecting the proposed by-law may file an objection, with stated reasons, with the city within 14 days after the day the notice is given.

Referral to Municipal Board

236.1(7) If the city receives sufficient objections within 14 days after the day the notice is given, the city must, before council gives second reading to the proposed by-law, refer the proposed by-law to The Municipal Board.

Hearing by Municipal Board

236.1(8) If a proposed zoning by-law is referred to The Municipal Board, the board must

(a) subject to subsection 24(3.2) of *The Municipal Board Act*, conduct a hearing respecting the proposed by-law within 120 days after the by-law being referred to it;
(b) at least 14 days before the hearing, give notice of a hearing respecting the proposed by-law in accordance with clause 230(1)(a) (hearing by Municipal Board), which applies, with necessary changes, and by publishing a notice of the hearing on a website available to the public; and
(c) within 60 days after conducting the hearing, submit a report, with recommendations, to council in respect of the proposed by-law.

Restrictions on adoption of by-law

236.1(9) Council must not pass a proposed zoning by-law that has been referred to The Municipal Board unless the proposed by-law conforms to the recommendations that the board has made in its report to council in respect of the by-law.

BACKGROUND

The relevant background of the Referral, with timeline, is as follows:

- On August 30, 2024, the Development Application was made by Mr. Mahé.
- On or about November 14, 2024, the Development Application was deemed complete and circulated to stakeholders.
- On January 2, 2025, an administrative report was prepared by the City's Urban Planning and Design Division of the Planning, Property and Development Department (the "Public Service") with respect to the Development Application (the "Administrative Report").
- The Public Service recommended the approval of the Proposed Subdivision and Proposed Re-zoning subject to 12 recommendations listed in the Administrative Report, to ensure the development meets the City's planning and development standards (the "Public Service Recommendation").
- On February 6, 2025, the Development Application came before the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development (the "SPC") for public hearing (the "SPC Hearing").
- Due to a tie vote at the SPC Hearing, the Development Application was submitted to the Executive Policy Committee (the "EPC") without recommendation.
- On February 18, 2025, the EPC concurred in the Public Service Recommendation, with the following amendment, and submitted the matter to Council:

  Add the following new Recommendation 4, and renumbering the remaining recommendations accordingly:

  4. That prior to the issuance of a development permit, the Public Service be directed to work with the proponent and the GCC, to develop an adequate parking plan in order to support the operational sustainability of the club, to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works and the Director of Planning, Property and Development (the "Parking Plan") (the "EPC Recommendation").
- On February 27, 2025, Council concurred in and adopted the EPC Recommendation.
- On March 27, 2025, Council gave First Reading to the Proposed By-law.
- Notice was given to all persons who made submissions at the SPC Hearing, and the City received sufficient objections to First Reading.

- On April 28, 2025, the City submitted the Referral to the Board.

SUBMISSIONS AND EVIDENCE

The City:

Daniel Iskierski, Planner for the Public Service, made the following submission:

- He authored the Administrative Report.
- Included in the Administrative Report is the Report of the Administrative Coordinating Group dated December 16, 2024 (the "ACG Report").
- Neither Report is binding on Council.
- The Development Application seeks to subdivide the Subject Property into two parcels:
  - Lot 1 would retain the existing "R" Riverbank Sector zoning and would continue to operate as the GCC with its curling club building (the "Club Building") and eastern surface parking lot (the "East Parking Lot").
  - Lot 2, the western surface parking lot (the "West Parking Lot"), would be re-zoned to "C" Character Sector.
- The intention is to facilitate the development of affordable housing on Lot 2.
- A letter of intent was included in the Development Application (the "Letter of Intent").
- A letter of intent is a high-level outline of a proposed development.
- The Letter of Intent describes the proposed development, in part, as follows:
  - The City is partnering with the University of Winnipeg Community Renewal Corporation (the "UWCRC 2.0") to develop a unique residential development in the heart of the Downtown. The City will be re-zoning and subdividing the parking lot adjacent to the GCC abutting the Colony Street right-of-way to the Community Sector zoning district. The UWCRC 2.0 is proposing a 123-foot-tall residential multi-unit building with 110 residential units. 56 units (51%) will meet the HAF Program's definition of affordability (the "Proposed Development").
- Further details of the Proposed Development are, in part, as follows:
  - The gross building is approximately 94,000 square feet and the net rentable square footage is approximately 77,000 square feet. There will be 35 parking spaces at grade, including two spaces that are accessible parking spaces. 15 of the at-grade parking spaces will be located underneath the proposed building. The parking spaces will be shared with the GCC. A private agreement will be put in place between the two parties to ensure parking spaces will be shared in a manner that meets the needs to both the residential building and the GCC. In discussions with Public Works, and Water and Waste, it was decided that a new

approach would be needed from Granite Way. Originally, we had wanted to take advantage of the current approach along the Colony Street right-of-way, but in discussions with those departments it was determined that using the existing approach was not viable.

- The City will be leading the re-zoning and subdivision of the property. The City will then enter into a new lease agreement with UWCRC 2.0 based upon a similar lease arrangement with the City for Marketlands across from City Hall. The City will also renew the lease with the GCC operators.

- The following background is relevant to this matter:
  - On July 13, 2023, Council approved a Motion to support the HAF application to the Government of Canada ("Canada"), which included creating a Land Enhancement Office (the "Enhancement Office") under the direction of a HAF Manager, as amended on November 23, 2023, with additional zoning requirements.
  - The HAF Office was to identify surplus City-owned land that could be leased or sold to affordable housing developers/providers and, if required, prepare land by ensuring proper subdivision and zoning to facilitate future development.
  - On December 5, 2023, Canada through the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (the "CMHC") entered into an agreement with the City for $122.4 million in federal funding from the HAF. This funding is based on the City achieving 3,166 net new building permitted housing units and 14,101 in total (including 10,935 units projected to be permitted with HAF) over the next three years. One of the key actions in the HAF application was the creation of the Enhancement Office.
  - The Enhancement Office's mandate is to support the development of affordable, supportive and mixed income housing on City-owned land. This initiative focuses on making land available to non-profit, supportive, and Indigenous housing providers to create affordable housing. The office was created to identify, acquire, consolidate, and rezone sites for higher density residential development.
  - On September 26, 2024, Council approved CentrePlan 2050 as the City's Secondary Plan for Downtown Winnipeg (the "CentrePlan").
  - CentrePlan contains direction relating to overall downtown development and includes an Action Item related to development of the surface parking lot on the west side of the Subject Property, the West Parking Lot.
  - On September 26, 2024, Council passed a motion that designated several parcels of City-owned land as priorities for affordable housing development including the West Parking Lot.
  - By-law No. 104/2020, the City's Development Procedures By-law

(the "DP By-law"), sets out the procedures for the processing and approval of development applications.
- The DP By-law was amended in 2024, in part, to:
  - Add a definition of "HAF" which means the CMHC's Housing Accelerator Fund Program (the "HAF Program").
  - Delete the "pre-application" definition and process.
  - Add the authority of the Director of the City's Planning, Property and Development Department (the "Director of Planning") as follows:

    Section 3(6) provides in part: "...to determine a form and submission requirements for development applications initiated by the City that are different from the form and submission requirements for development applications submitted by applicants other than the City.

- The City has spoken with the GCC about the impact of the Proposed Development on the West Parking Lot and has looked at options to address the GCC's parking concerns.
- Details relating to private parking agreements are not typically included or required in a Development Application or Letter of Intent.
- These types of matters are required in latter stages of the development process for variance applications, conditional use applications and development permits.
- It is premature to discuss parking plans as the Development Application is at the subdivision and re-zoning stage, which is the first stage of the planning and development process (the "First Stage").
- Private parking arrangements, and matters like flood proofing, riverbank stability requirements, and Building and Fire Code requirements are addressed *after* the approvals in the First Stage.
- The Administrative Report recommends the approval of the Proposed Subdivision and Proposed Re-zoning as they meet the objectives in:
  - Our Winnipeg 2045, the City's official Development Plan ("Our Winnipeg").
  - Complete Communities Direction Strategy 2.0, the City's Secondary Plan ("Complete Communities").
  - CentrePlan.
  - Winnipeg Climate Action Plan.
  - Winnipeg Poverty Reduction Strategy.
  - The Zoning By-law.
- The Administrative Report points to the following:

1) <u>**OUR WINNIPEG POLICY ALIGNMENT**</u>

Our Winnipeg 2045 Goal: City Building

Objective 1: Responsibly plan, prioritize and accommodate growth in areas that best support *Complete Communities*

principles, to achieve this Plan's sustainable development goals.

- Facilitate growth and change strategically within Winnipeg's unique transformative areas and established neighbourhoods, to enhance the ability of the urban environment to contribute towards this Plan's goals.

Objective 2: Integrate resilient land use, transportation and infrastructure planning, and investments.

- Ensure that land use, transportation, and infrastructure planning are aligned to provide the conditions for compact, complete and connected communities, supported by sustainable transportation options and municipal infrastructure capacity.

Objective 3: Facilitate development opportunities that complete established communities, and plan new communities as complete and connected from the outset.

- New and existing communities are complete when they demonstrate: universally designed environments; mixed income neighbourhoods; a continuum of housing types; multi-modal connections within and to elsewhere in the city; heritage conservation; opportunities for physical activity, social interaction, and access to health food, daily needs, employment, education, recreation, and green infrastructure.

Applicable Policies for Downtown

6.6 Intensification Target

- Achieve the intensification target by making development in intensification target areas easier and more desirable and predictable, as directed by *Complete Communities*.

6.15 Transformative Areas

- Designate Downtown, Corridors, mixed Use Centres, Major Redevelopment Sites and New Communities as Transformative Areas within the Urban Structure in Complete Communities, representing lands that provide the best opportunities to accommodate significant growth and change.

6.17 Downtown Economic Investment

- Support development that reflects the Downtown's designation as a Transformative Area and preeminent complete community, as detailed in Complete Communities.

6.18 Downtown Economic Investment

- Facilitate the intensification of Downtown commercial and office uses, innovation, and local enterprises that promote the Downtown as a primary location for economic activity.

6.19 Downtown Economic Investment

- Facilitate the intensification of Downtown residential development that supports the diversity of housing needs, and builds on the character of existing Downtown districts and destinations.

2) **WINNIPEG CLIMATE ACTION PLAN ALIGNMENT**

Strategic Opportunity #4: Facilitate Compact, Complete Development and Increase Density

- **Key Direction 4.1:** *Increase strategic infill development that provides access to and capitalizes on existing and planned corridors with frequent transit service.*
- **Key Direction 4.2**: *Ensure new areas of growth are designed according to the principles of Complete Communities.*

3) **WINNIPEG POVERTY REDUCTION STRATEGY ALIGNMENT**

The Proposed Subdivision and Proposed Re-zoning would allow the City to lease or sell the Subject Property to an affordable housing developer to provide affordable housing as per the criteria set out by the CMHC or the Province of Manitoba.

4) **COMPLETE COMMUNITIES**

Section B1. General Growth

Goal 2 - Encourage strategic intensification

Setting an intensification target

2.1 Aim for a minimum of 50% of all new dwelling units to be located in the intensification target area.

2.2 Aim to establish a minimum of 350 new dwelling units per year in the downtown each year until 2030, and 500 dwelling units per year after 2030.

Section C1. Downtown

Goal 2 - Reinforce downtown as the primary focus for economic activity through residential, commercial, and office intensification.

Vacant and underutilized properties

2.2 *Facilitate the redevelopment of vacant or underutilized properties, such as surface parking lots, to support increased residential and mixed-use development, when servicing allows, to achieve a sustainable, inclusive and vibrant Downtown.*

Goal 4 - Ensure land use decisions reduce the impact of automobile use to enhance the pedestrian experience downtown.

Strategic surface parking

4.1 Reduce the number of surface parking lots Downtown, and discourage the creation and expansion of standalone surface parking lots, particularly in areas with high pedestrian activity, in accordance with the downtown parking strategy.

Goal 5 - Facilitate an amenity rich, enjoyable, and beautiful urban environment that contributes to a high quality of life, to reflect downtown's importance as the city's preeminent complete community.

Supporting residential growth

5.1 Encourage development with uses and amenities that support the downtown residential population.

5) **CENTREPLAN**

1.1 Goal: Embrace and elevate downtown's unique neighbourhoods and districts.

Legislature and University of Winnipeg

1.1.20 Explore the feasibility of redeveloping the surface parking lot next to the granite curling club to include both market and non-market housing that supports club operations and/or building maintenance.

1.2 Goal: Play leadership role in Downtown housing.

1.2.11 Help non-market and Indigenous housing providers overcome hurdles to developing adaptable no barrier, transitional, supportive, *and social housing. This could include assistance with downtown land or building assembly, streamlining development and permitting process is, and/or development incentives.*

3.2 Goal: Ensure public spaces meet needs of a growing residential population.

3.2.8 The City shall look for opportunities (including existing rights of way, surface parking lots, derelict properties, and land acquisition) to develop new parks.

6) **The Zoning By-law**

"R" Riverbank Sector is intended primarily for the use and enjoyment of the public with uses supportive of and accessory to continuous linear Parkway and public gathering nodes being encouraged. This sector permits public or private development that is integrated with the functions of public space, such as accessory restaurants, retail, or services. It also accommodates public recreation and entertainment uses such as recreation centres, performance venues, galleries or museums.

"C" Character Sector is intended to encourage a compatible, fine-grained mix of uses rather than a separation of uses in these diverse areas. The built form is key in this sector, more specifically for this site, relating to the monumental Tyndall stone buildings near the legislative buildings. This sector permits residential development, and the maximum building height is limited to 100 feet.

- The Public Service recommends the approval of the Proposed Subdivision and Proposed Re-zoning for the following reasons:
  - Housing on Lot 2 will help achieve residential intensification targets.
  - It specifically relates to CentrePlan's intent to redevelop the West Parking Lot.
  - It ensures affordable housing options are integrated into the Proposed Development which will contribute to the surrounding neighbourhood and provide additional housing options.
  - Any development will better utilize existing infrastructure including the street network, public transit, water and wastewater service capacity and city services such as library and recreation.
  - Zoning that permits higher density housing is compatible with the surrounding context, which includes a mixture of housing types with higher residential densities.
  - It aligns with HAF goals to increase housing availability including affordable units, with a focus on downtown, as well as the Enhancement Office's mandate to support the development of

affordable, supportive and mixed income housing on City-owned land.
  - While it does not advance policies related to public space and riverbank acquisition, this is an area with significant open space.
  - The Subject Property is located in a transitional area between Downtown and the West Broadway neighbourhoods and housing will provide a 24-hour presence to enhance safety and vibrancy.
  - If it remained "R" Riverbank Sector it is unlikely to become public park space but would remain as a substandard surface parking lot.
  - Given the surrounding context of lower rise buildings with historical significance and adjacency to the West Broadway neighbourhood, which is outside the Downtown boundaries, the "C" Character Sector is the most appropriate zoning district for Lot 2 to enable the sale or lease to an affordable housing developer to develop it for housing.
- With respect to the Parking Plan, it directs that, prior to the issuance of a development permit, the Public Service work with the GCC to develop an adequate parking plan to support the operational sustainability of the GCC.
- It sets out what needs to occur prior to the issuance of a development permit. It does not require that the Parking Plan be in place prior to the approval of the Proposed Subdivision and Proposed Re-zoning. It is premature at the First Stage.
- In response to a report prepared by John Scott Wintrup (the "Wintrup Report"), regarding alleged outstanding issues and information in the planning process, Mr. Iskierski advised as follows:
  - Floodproofing: Will be addressed after the First Stage at the Wastewater Permit Stage.
  - Riverbank Stabilization: Will be addressed after the First Stage at the Waterway Permit Stage.
  - Building and Fire Code: Building and trade permits will be addressed after the First Stage at the Building Permit Stage.
  - Arborist Report: Although this can be required at the First Stage, there is only one tree on Proposed Lot 2 so there is no concern.
  - Building Elevations and Legislative Control Zone: Will be addressed after the First Stage at the Development Permit Stage. Variances and a Conditional Use Permit may be required at that time.
  - Floor Plans: Will be addressed after the First Stage.
  - Formal Proposed Plan of Subdivision: The requirement that a licensed surveyor formalizes a Plan of Subdivision is forthcoming.
  - Rigorous Planning Engagement: This is a voluntary process and not required. There was public engagement which will be addressed in Mr. Mahé's submission.

Mr. Mahé, Land Enhancement Administrator for the HAF Team, made the following submission:

- The purpose of the National Housing Program is to increase the housing supply in Canadian cities.
- The City is to receive annual installments to create 14,101 units (approved permits) by December 2026. This will also include 931 affordable housing units (permits).
- The goal of the Enhancement Office is to create a housing supply at an accelerated pace by facilitating development of affordable, supportive and mixed income housing on City-owned lands; and identifying "surplus lands", which come in a variety of locations and sizes, suitable for different housing needs.
- The City is in a housing crisis and needs more affordable housing in downtown Winnipeg. This is driving a lot of the City's action.
- Council has identified the Subject Property as a priority site for affordable housing under the HAF.
- The location is ideal for residential development, and is within walking distance of multiple shopping districts, park space, and frequent transit services.
- The City is the owner of the Subject Property, the GCC is the tenant, and UWCRC 2.0 is the proposed developer.
- He prepared and submitted the Development Application, on behalf of the City.
- The City will enter into Lease Agreements with the GCC and UWCRC 2.0 once the First Stage is complete.
- Financing will also be finalized once the First Stage is complete.
- Currently, there is no funding in place for the Proposed Development.
- The fundamental question at the First Stage is: "Is there policy justification to support the Proposed Subdivision and Proposed Re-zoning for the intended use?"
- Policy justification is found in the following:
    - OurWinnipeg.
    - Complete Communities.
    - CentrePlan.
    - Climate Action Plan.
    - Poverty Reduction Strategy.
    - Downtown residential development.
    - Downtown surface parking repurposing.
    - Affordable housing development.
    - Residential development near high-frequency transit.
    - Investment in a heritage asset.
- The Vision for the Subject Property is as follows:
    - Providing much needed housing downtown.
    - Long term affordability, including deeply affordable units.
    - City maintains ownership of riverbank land.
    - Preservation of a historical City asset which will provide greater

certainty in sustaining the GCC.
- Maintains East Parking Lot, and 15 stalls remain in the West Parking Lot for the GCC.
- Building at this location could be a model for how City-owned lands are used for affordable housing with high social impact.

- He specifically contacted UWCRC 2.0 because of its track record to meet the City's vision under narrow timelines.
- UWCRC 2.0 has an existing housing template which protected a heritage building, the All-Saints Anglican Church (the "Church"), at 167 Colony Street.
- The housing project (the "West Broadway Commons Development") won the 2023 Heritage Conservation Award for protecting an existing structure of high historic or architectural value.
- The West Broadway Commons Development provides financial contributions ensuring sustainability of the Church.
- UWCRC 2.0 is a not-for-profit developer mandated to create and maintain long term affordable housing on land leases and holds preferred builder status with CMHC.
- UWCRC 2.0 has a proven track record in Downtown Winnipeg, including the Subject Property's neighbourhood.
- He first met with Christian Pierce, Secretary of the Board of the GCC, on June 7, 2024. They covered the following topics:
    - The City would like to meet HAF requirements and particularly the HAF targets of 611 units by December 2026.
    - The Proposed Development will ensure public ownership of key downtown riverbank land and the continued sustainability of the GCC.
    - The Proposed Development will protect a City-owned heritage building in terms of building maintenance and riverbank stability.
    - The Proposed Development, with mixed income housing, and a significant portion of affordable housing units, will meet HAF targets on City-owned lands.
- A follow-up meeting occurred on July 8, 2024, at which representatives of the City, UWCRC 2.0 and the GCC were in attendance. They discussed, and provided, the following:
    - The City would be making a Development Application and needed to move quickly to apply for a HAF capital incentive grant.
    - The participants supported UWCRC 2.0 applying for such grant.
    - Conceptual plans of the Proposed Development were shared.
- UWCRC 2.0 also shared pro forma information with GCC in a July 10, 2024, e-mail. Such information has never been shared with an external group which shows the City was acting in good faith.
- Another meeting took place on October 9, 2024, with representatives of the City, the GCC and UWCRC 2.0. The following occurred:
    - The GCC raised parking concerns and their desire for clarity on an annual heritage fund.
    - Questions about the pro forma and site plan for the Proposed

Development were posed.
  - The City clarified it was exploring the feasibility of developing the Subject Property including applications and studies.
  - The GCC asked: "If we object, will the City proceed?"
  - The City advised that the Subject Property was not for sale.
  - The City explained the urgency of funding timelines.
  - The GCC advised of its interest to have an equity stake in the Proposed Development. The City followed up with Mr. Pierce to determine what equity the GCC could provide. UWCRC 2.0 was copied on the e-mail. The GCC did not respond.
  - While the City would appreciate the GCC's support for affordable housing, the Proposed Development is not contingent on support.
- On October 22, 2024, the City spoke to Canada Life representatives, the landowner across the street from the Subject Property, who advised:
  - They have a long-standing informal agreement to allow GCC curlers to use their surface parking lot for free after hours on evenings and weekends.
  - They are not looking for revenue in association with sharing their parking with the GCC.
  - They would love to see housing on the Subject Property as more people living in the area will mitigate safety concerns.
- On November 7, 2024, the GCC provided a proposal to the City in which the GCC would support the Development Application on various terms. GCC's request was unrealistic as it sought an annual City subsidy in the hundreds of thousands of dollars.
- Although there was no requirement to do so, the City met with key stakeholders including West Broadway Biz, West Broadway Community Organization, the GCC and Canada Life about the Development Application. There was no Public Open House.
- To reiterate the development process, we are at the First Stage. The goal is to get zoning rights in place prior to securing financing.
- Thereafter, applications for various permits including Development Permits, Waterway Permits and addressing flood proofing requirements will be advanced and secured by the City.
- The Parking Plan must be in place prior to a Development Permit being issued.
- Council's approval of the Proposed Subdivision and Proposed Re-zoning, with the Parking Plan Requirement, ensures a Development Permit will not be issued, and the Proposed Development will not proceed, until a Parking Plan is in place.
- Through dialogue, he is hopeful a path forward to a parking solution will be found.
- The final permitting stage involves an occupancy permit after which the building may be occupied.
- The DP By-law was amended to minimize Development Application submittal requirements for City-owned lands under the HAF Program.

Gordon Chappell, Acting Manager, Real Estate and Land Development (the "Real Estate Branch") made the following submission:

- The City acquired the GCC through tax sale in 1975. Prior to this time, it was owned by the GCC.
- On May 4, 2009, the SPC approved the most-recent lease with the GCC to lease the Subject Property, with a gross annual rent of $20,500 plus GST, intended to represent the cost of annual realty taxes.
- The initial term of the lease was five years with an option to renew for a further five years upon expiration. The renewal term expired on December 31, 2019, and the GCC has been in an overhold status since (the "GCC Lease").
- In 2019, the GCC expressed interest in purchasing the Subject Property.
- On March 29, 2022, along with other leasehold properties in the City, the City declared the Subject Property surplus. The City was looking for ways to divest its leasehold portfolio.
- On October 16, 2023, he wrote to a number of tenants of City-owned properties including the GCC, to inquire whether they had any interest in purchasing the Subject Property and, if so, under what terms. The e-mail stated: "*The City seeks tenant feedback on a possible sale of your location…*".
- In late 2023, the GCC reiterated its desire to purchase the Subject Property on the following conditions:
    - Purchase price of $1.
    - No increase in property taxes.
    - Insurance coverage to be provided by the City.
- On May 16, 2024, representatives of the Real Estate Branch, including himself, met with representatives of the GCC to discuss the sale of the Subject Property. He advised he would get an appraisal of the Subject Property to determine an initial sale price.
- On July 16, 2024, Mr. Pierce wrote to him stating the GCC was still interested in acquiring the Subject Property; and requesting the appraisal.
- On September 23, 2024, he notified the GCC that the Subject Property was no longer available for sale because an objection to the sale had been received from an internal stakeholder, the HAF Office.
- Further discussions with the GCC regarding a sale were paused pending discussions with the HAF Office.
- In subsequent meetings between the GCC and the HAF Team, it was reiterated that the Subject Property was not for sale.
- In those meetings, representatives of the GCC expressed the loss of parking as a major concern and their desire for an equity stake in the Proposed Development. The HAF Office indicated that any equity stake discussion would have to be between the GCC and UWCRC 2.0.
- On November 7, 2024, the City received an e-mail from the President of the GCC, John Read, with an attachment "Proposal to the City of Winnipeg: For Mutual Resolution in the Matter of Future Land

Development at 1 Granite Way, Winnipeg" (the "Proposal").

- The Proposal contained several terms that were never previously discussed with the City. The scale of the request was concerning as the GCC sought nearly $1 million in annual subsidies.
- On January 16, 2025, Bridget Peterson, Senior Property Manager at the Real Estate Branch, e-mailed the GCC. The e-mail, which he reviewed prior to it being sent, provides in part, "My understanding is Council supports the residential use on a portion of the Granite property to develop affordable housing. The result of this initiative impacts the leased area that will remain for GCC's ongoing use under a lease".
- Ms. Peterson proposed terms for a new long-term lease and indicated that, as it would take time, the City plans to terminate the existing lease and enter into a short-term use agreement for the reduced lease area, which excluded the West Parking Lot.
- A short-term use agreement (one year less a day) can be approved by City Administration. Thereafter, there would be time to prepare a lengthier lease, with the intention that it would have a 5-year term.
- In an e-mail dated January 22, 2025, he advised the GCC, in part, as follows:

  > While the City would appreciate the Granite's support for affordable housing, the development of affordable housing on site is not contingent upon a new lease with the Granite or their support. The City would be pleased to provide more information regarding the proposed leased terms and the opportunity to create a capital fund at the Granite. There is no reason to delay the public hearing as the Granite can be provided with an interim lease while the long-term lease is negotiated.

- On January 20, 2025, he provided the following details of possible terms for a long-term lease with the GCC:
  - 15 parking stalls will be provided to the GCC in the West Parking Lot.
  - The GCC can do what it likes with the parking stalls (rent them out during the day, if necessary).
  - The City is going to suggest that UWCRC 2.0 pay a land rent of $50,000 per year which will be deposited into a City account for the creation of a GCC Capital Fund.
  - UWCRC 2.0 believes there could be more funds to provide but there remains a lot of moving pieces and funding commitments to secure.
  - The GCC should be aware that, because of the annual contribution and the 15 stalls, UWCRC 2.0 is making a very slim profit which may impact its affordability.
  - The annual contribution will need to be reviewed at the end of 20 years to ensure that UWCRC 2.0 affordability targets can be maintained.
  - Capital funds will be accessed by the GCC similar to the Land Dedication Reserve Fund process.

  - Use of the funds is intended to preserve the City's asset.
  - Funding requests to access the funds will be made to the Director of Property to ensure the request meets policy guidelines i.e. the money is to be used for capital work at the GCC.
  - The capital funding can accumulate but not go into a deficit i.e. there will be no overdraft and no ability to finance future costs.
- In addition to the above, he confirmed that he would be prepared to recommend to Council to reduce the GCC's annual rent from $20,500 to zero and to waive annual real property taxes.
- The Real Estate Branch negotiates leasehold terms with potential tenants and makes recommendations to the SPC, which has jurisdiction on land matters including leases and sales of property. SPC is the final decision maker in these matters.
- Council is the final decision maker in Development Applications. They are separate authorities, with Council having no authority to approve lease terms.
- The land development process is within the jurisdiction of Council, while the SPC is the decision-making authority on leasehold matters.
- Considering all of this, the annual benefit to the GCC would be:
  - $50,000 - The GCC Capital Fund.
  - $20,000 – Potential rent from 15 parking stalls in the West Parking Lot.
  - $20,500 - Reduction of rent.
  - (unknown) - Waiver of property taxes.
- He facilitated a meeting between himself, Canada Life representatives and Mr. Pierce to discuss possible parking at Canada Life.
- In a letter dated August 6, 2025, Canada Life confirmed that, while GCC could continue to use its parking lot after hours and on weekends via the existing informal arrangement, Canada Life could not commit to a formal agreement with the City, GCC, or a developer to do so in the future.
- There may be other parking options to address the loss of parking in the West Parking Lot, but it is premature to have these discussions now. He is awaiting the outcome of the Hearing.
- If Council gives the Proposed By-law Second and Third Reading, he will pursue the Parking Plan as follows:
  - He will follow up with Canada Life to consider other options.
  - There may be parking potential at the lift station, on the park area along the river on the west side of the Subject Property, and street parking.

Granite Curling Club Inc.:

Christian Pierce, Secretary of the GCC Board of Directors, made the following submission:

- The Subject Property was owned by the GCC from 1912 to 1975.
- Since that time, GCC has been leasing it from the City, currently on a

month-to-month basis.

- The GCC has 1,283 members and is the largest curling club in the City, with 9 sheets of ice.
- There are 80 parking stalls at the GCC, the majority of which are in the West Parking Lot. The Subject Property also has a limited number of parking stalls in the East Parking Lot.
- Street parking has been impacted in the last 5 years with the addition of a bike lane, which has resulted in the loss of 14 parking stalls.
- The East Parking Lot is sublet to The Beer Can from April 15 to September 15 every year which results in a loss of 20 parking stalls during this time.
- GCC patrons have used Canada Life's South parking lot after regular business hours to alleviate deficient parking for the GCC's existing needs. This is an informal arrangement which Canada Life may terminate at any time.
- The GCC leases parking spaces in the West Parking Lot to Canada Life employees and others during regular business hours. This generates approximately $41,000 of annual revenue for the GCC.
- The GCC filed a petition, with over 1000 signatures, for the SPC hearing. It illustrates the strong opposition to how the City has handled this matter.
- This is not how the GCC wanted this situation to unfold. The City has moved forward in a way that lacked transparency, good faith dealing, and fairness.
- Representatives of the GCC met with Mr. Chappell to discuss the GCC purchasing the GCC back from the City.
- On June 7, 2024, he met Mr. Mahé at the Beer Can to discuss the potential of developing the West Parking Lot. He asked whether, if the GCC purchased the Subject Property, it would count toward the HAF goal. Mr. Mahé advised he was not sure.
- He asked Mr. Mahé if the City could proceed with the Proposed Development, without the GCC's involvement and support, and was advised that is not how the City wanted to proceed.
- Mr. Mahé also advised that the City had a not-for-profit developer in mind and, when asked about other developers, Mr. Mahé advised they likely would not meet the criteria for this type of project with the HAF.
- Mr. Mahé advised of the GCC's riverbank stability condition. On a scale of one to four, he advised it was at a Level 3. He advised the Proposed Development was a way to access federal funding for riverbank stabilization work the GCC may need in the very near future.
- After several months, Mr. Chappel advised that he received an objection to the sale of the Subject Property to the GCC. "Our housing folks are interested in entering into a long-term lease with the curling club".
- At the meeting with the City and UWCRC 2.0, Jeremy Read, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of UWCRC 2.0 advised he had a full pro forma and site plans for the Proposed Development.
- In a subsequent e-mail, Mr. Read advised that he assumed a 50%

revenue distribution to the GCC after the payment of certain costs, equating to approximately $70,000 annually to the GCC. He corrected that number in a follow-up e-mail saying they will be able to deliver $75,000 to $125,000 annually to the GCC.

- He had a few telephone calls with Mr. Mahé in July of 2024, one call with Mr. Read, and a further meeting with Mr. Read and Mr. Mahé on October 9, 2024.
- During these calls and meetings, he asked Mr. Mahé for a written explanation of how the revenue distribution would flow from the Proposed Development to the City and back to the GCC. The GCC never received an explanation despite repeated requests.
- The GCC continued to express interest in buying the Subject Property but was told it was not an option.
- The GCC advised it would only be interested in the Proposed Development if it was the same deal as between the Church and UWCRC 2.0, which is a 50/50 joint venture.
- Mr. Mahé e-mailed the GCC asking whether the GCC had any equity to contribute to the Proposed Development. The GCC questioned why it would give money to a development in which they had "no say" and no clarity on how it would be structured between the parties. The UWCRC 2.0 wasn't putting a dollar of equity into the Proposed Development, according to their pro forma.
- The GCC wanted the entire process done properly, with a full Request for Proposals (the "RFP"). In an RFP, adequate parking for the GCC would be required.
- Mr. Chappell advised that purchasing the Subject Property was no longer an option, to which Mr. Mahé agreed.
- The GCC learned the City had filed the Development Application on October 8, 2024, the day prior to the October 9, 2024, meeting. He questioned why Mr. Mahé chose not to disclose this to the GCC.
- Throughout all of this, there was no mention of the Letter of Intent nor the Development Application. The GCC was completely shut out of the review process of the Development Application which was being vetted by various governmental departments and agencies.
- On November 7, 2024, after receiving no written assurances to GCC's concerns, how the City would address parking, or a new long-term lease and revenue share from the Proposed Development, the GCC sent the Proposal to the City to get negotiations started in writing. The Proposal was also e-mailed to Councillor Sherri Rollins. The GCC requested separate meetings with Mr. Mahé and Councillor Rollins.
- After no response, the GCC's Board President followed up on November 14, 2024. Mr. Mahé said he would be in touch to schedule a meeting. The Development Application was deemed complete that very day but, Mr. Mahé chose not to advise the GCC about such matter.
- On November 25, 2024, the GCC met with Councillor Rollins to review the Proposal and its concerns. Regarding parking, Councillor Rollins advised the City was talking to Canada Life and she was confident an

agreement could be reached. She did not mention the Development Application.

- GCC followed up with Mr. Mahé on November 28, 2024, after which he completely withdrew from dealing with the GCC.
- On January 6, 2025, the GCC received the e-mail from Ms. Peterson providing initial feedback to the Proposal. Two key matters were communicated: GCC would be responsible for negotiating any parking agreements directly with Canada Life, which was contrary to Councillor Rollins' assurances; and the City planned to terminate the existing lease and enter into a short-term use agreement for the reduced lease area. This would remove the West Parking Lot from the leasehold area, a parking lot used by the GCC for over 100 years.
- The GCC was blindsided as it showed the City had no intention to negotiate with the GCC in good faith to address its concerns.
- The GCC received a Public Hearing Notice for the SPC Public Hearing stating that the City had filed the Development Application before it had given formal notice of terminating the GCC Lease.
- On January 17, 2025, the GCC requested that the SPC Public Hearing be adjourned, which was denied.
- The City's decision to cut the GCC out is backwards, and its concerns must be addressed before the Development Application.
- The City knew that the GCC and Manitoba curling community had a vested interest in the Development Application but the City deliberately kept everyone in the dark. That is not an open and robust planning process that one would expect in the City.
- After months of asking about the revenue share, the GCC received its first written communication from the City on January 30, 2025, one week before the SPC Public Hearing.
- Mr. Chappell advised UWCRC 2.0 would be able to offer $50,000 annually in revenue share, which is a far cry from the $125,000 figure in Mr. Read's previous e-mail.
- Mr. Chappell stated the $50,000 contribution and 15 parking stalls in the West Parking Lot would result in UWCRC 2.0 making a very slim profit which may ultimately impact affordability.
- The GCC questions whether the Proposed Development is even feasible and if an annual contribution is even possible.
- Why is the City cutting out the GCC from the Proposed Development and sole sourcing it to a corporation like UWCRC 2.0?
- The GCC has been a steward of this heritage building for over 100 years and should be an equal partner in any development of its current leased property and West Parking Lot that serves the facility.
- How can the City sole source the Proposed Development without an RFP?
- The GCC has put $1,600,000 into the Club Building since the 1990s. The GCC has put in time and effort into reviving the GCC. The GCC is finally in a position where it is financially stable and has the capacity to purchase the Subject Property. The GCC should be at the table.

- The GCC agrees that infill housing should be explored. The GCC is opposed to revenue flowing off-site and wants to ensure the Proposed Development supports the GCC.
- CentrePlan contemplates redeveloping the West Parking Lot with housing that supports club operations and/or building maintenance. The GCC is certain the Proposed Development will not support club operations and building maintenance.
- This is to be contrasted with the West Broadway Commons Development, which is a full partnership, years in the making, with full buy-in from the Church. The Church is a 50% joint venture partner, entitled to share 50% of the profits.
- At most the GCC has been told that the City would suggest to the Developer to provide $50,000 per year to a fund controlled by the City. This is a far cry from what is needed.
- The $50,000 won't cover the loss of rental parking revenue of $41,000 nor the loss of members which is inevitable with the loss of parking.
- The Proposed By-law directed the City to work with the GCC on a Parking Plan. The GCC has had one meeting with the City since the First Reading of the Proposed By-law, which was initiated by the GCC.
- The City needs to provide a solution for parking, whether it is an expansion of the East Parking Lot of no fewer stalls than the GCC currently has, a design change to the Proposed Development to allow for additional parking in the West Parking Lot, or put the Proposed Development at Mostyn Park, to the West of the GCC.
- The issue of parking is relevant at the First Stage of the planning process.
- If parking was not an issue at the First Stage, why did the City list it as a consideration in the Letter of Intent and take some steps to address the issue up until the SPC Public Hearing?
- It appears the City knows they can't find a parking solution that will allow the GCC to remain operationally sustainable.
- The following is a summary of the GCC's concerns:
    - For parking, the City has not provided a Parking Plan and is refusing to advise what options they have explored.
    - For revenue share, no updates have been provided on any revenue share agreement with the UWCRC 2.0 and the City.
    - For riverbank stabilization work, which was a big sell from Mr. Mahé saying that federal dollars would be used to perform the work for the entire length of the riverbank, the last update is they may not do any of that work at all.
    - The City has stopped working with the GCC on a new long-term lease.

Kyle Doering, General Manager for the GCC, made the following submissions:

- Parking is a critical component of any successful curling club operation.
- The loss of the West Parking Lot will cost the GCC at least 45 of its 80

stalls.

- Including the GCC there are only 10 curling clubs operating in the City. Six clubs have closed since 2011 with the GCC being the only curling club currently operating in the City's downtown core.
- With clubs continuing to close, the Development Application disregards the tight budgets that curling clubs operate under and the community that exists already.
- The City should preserve and protect the most historical club in Western Canada, the birthplace to curling in Manitoba and its long-established community.
- City Mayor Scott Gillingham is on record saying that Winnipeg is the curling capital of the world and the City lives and breathes the game.
- Losing the West Parking Lot will result in substantial operational losses and will put the long-established curling community at risk.
- There has been no meaningful effort to engage with the GCC.
- The GCC has over 1,200 members with 9 sheets of ice. The full draw load is 72 curlers with the overlap load of 144 curlers.
- The GCC is the largest club in the City by sheet count and the second largest based on membership. Reducing the West Parking Lot to 35 stalls and less than 20 street stalls would put the parking below that of the smallest clubs in the City.
- The GCC cannot and will not survive without adequate parking.
- Street parking is very limited.
- Members and staff already voiced concern regarding safety with having to walk to the West Parking Lot at night. Having members try to find parking many blocks away and walking at night is a safety risk.
- Members pay dues to use the GCC and the GCC would like to provide value to them.
- One solution is to rely on Canada Life's parking lot. This is not a safe long-term solution.
- In his first eight months as General Manager, the GCC will have hosted two national championships. This will net approximately $100,000 with sponsorships, grants, banquets, etc. This money is critical to the GCC's future. Without parking, the GCC's bid strength would be impacted.
- The Proposed Development presents an immediate and significant threat for future revenues generated through events at the GCC.
- Mr. Mahé stated there would be no access to the West Parking Lot during construction. This would be for two curling seasons which means the GCC would have 20 parking stalls for its growing membership.
- This is a double hit to the GCC as it wouldn't be receiving any revenue share from the Proposed Development.
- The loss of revenue from losing members during those two seasons, loss of parking rental revenue, and no funding from the City would put the GCC into an operational deficit.
- At most, the City has said that they will suggest UWCRC 2.0 contribute $50,000 into a CGG Capital Fund managed by the City.

- This is not a sweetheart deal for the GCC.
- A lack of parking will cost the GCC membership. A loss of 100 members would cost $30,000 to $40,000 in dues plus the reduction in food and beverage sales.
- The GCC is the only club in the City that does not contract out its kitchen. It offers dining for its members and the public in the form of banquets and catered events. This revenue could be lost as how does one host a 200-person banquet without parking?
- The Board has discussed turning the GCC into a year-round facility by converting the ice rink floor from sand into concrete. This does not make sense without a Parking Plan.
- If the GCC loses the West Parking Lot without a parking solution, it loses its ability to control future projects, goals and its long-term sustainability.
- The GCC employs 20 people and serves a broad membership demographic.
- The GCC acknowledges the need for affordable housing in Winnipeg.
- Developing the West Parking Lot will lead to devastating consequences to the GCC's operational future and jeopardize the community that has been established through generations.

John Read, President of the GCC Board, made the following submission:

- This situation is not about parking versus affordable housing.
- The Proposed Development is an existential threat to the continuing prosperity of the GCC, even its very existence.
- Despite the iconic status of the GCC and its world-wide reputation, it is still mainly a local club.
- The West Parking Lot is not just a parking lot, it is an integral, functional, component of a thriving community centre that draws its members from all parts of the City and beyond.
- Canada Life has generously allowed the GCC to use some of its parking opposite the GCC as overflow parking. This is just a handshake arrangement that can change at any time.
- The GCC has five main sources of passive income.
- Advertising on barn walls and under ice, grants, and the sale of Grey Cup tickets are three sources of passive income that would not be impacted by the Proposed Development and the resulting reduced membership.
- The two sources of passive income that would be impacted by the Proposed Development are as follows:
    - Beer Can - over $60,000 is earned per year from this endeavour. The GCC provides the East Parking Lot, the kitchen and bathroom facilities via a long-term contract. The proprietors of the Beer Can are concerned the Proposed Development will damage their business to the point of needing to relocate.
    - Canada Life parking revenue of $41,000 per year.

- Over the past 20 years, the GCC has invested over $1.6 million in repairs and leasehold improvements. The City has invested nothing in a property they own. One example, the GCC spent over $100,000 to repair the roof. This is not part of a normal landlord-tenant relationship.
- The purpose of the Proposal was to initiate all-encompassing negotiations with the City to settle the parking issue and a new lease.
- With respect to the Parking Plan, the GCC has heard nothing.
- He understands that the ability of the City to get a Development Permit is contingent on the City working out a Parking Plan with the GCC. He expected that the City would have come back with a parking proposal.
- It is not the GCC's objective to have a veto power over the Proposed Development. The objective is to maintain the viability of the GCC with parking.

John Wintrup, Professional Planner with John Scott Wintrup Consulting Ltd., made the following submission:

- The Proposed Re-zoning and Proposed Subdivision conflicts with the City's Secondary Plan, Centre Plan, as follows:
    - Goal 1.1.20: Action: Explore the feasibility of redeveloping the surface parking lot next to the Granite Curling Club to include both market and non-market housing that supports club operations and/or building maintenance.
- Policy Section 1.1.20 clearly states that the redevelopment of the parking area is to support club operations and/or building maintenance.
- The evidence from curling experts is that redeveloping the parking area next to the GCC to include market and non-market housing does not support club operations and/or building maintenance.
- Information from impartial experts is missing regarding necessary flood proofing, riverbank stabilization and Building and Fire Code impacts on club operations and/or building maintenance.
- The City cannot decide ad hoc not to adhere to their own policies that run contrary to adopted by-laws. The City needs to either meet the policy or formally amend the Secondary Plan as contemplated by the Charter. The amendment would have to make it clear that the redevelopment of the West Parking Lot is not subject to supporting the GCC's operations and/or building maintenance.
- The Development Application is deficient in several ways normally addressed in a rigorous planning process. The omission of technical studies, analysis, opinions and information from impartial accredited professionals raises deep concerns that matters have not been addressed or considered.
- The following is a list of routine concerns typically raised by City Administration during a regular rigorous planning process for Development Applications:
    - Flood Proofing:
        - The Subject Property falls entirely within the designated

floodway and fringe area regulation.

- The flood fringe area was identified in the interim flood risk maps.
- Section 7 requires every structure in the flood fringe area to be constructed on a site raised by fill or supported by piles.
- Administration has required other subdivision applications to have multiple professional engineers to attest that flood proofing is achievable and the method is compatible with the surrounding lands and buildings.
- Where developers subdivide parcels to create multiple lots, they have generally required a viable and effective flood protection concept for all lots and commitment to restructure the communal aspects of those works.
- There is no evidence that such an analysis has been considered, completed or reviewed by a professionally registered engineer or submitted and reviewed by City Administration as done in the normal planning process.

- Riverbank Stabilization:
  - The Subject Property falls entirely within the City's Waterway By-law No. 5888/92 which regulates development within 350 feet of each side of various waterways in the City.
  - Professional engineers' comments on current riverbank stability conditions are typically submitted in support of development applications where there is potential riverbanks stability being impacted for abutting lands and buildings.
  - Engineering feedback on riverbank stability is needed if the proposed flood proofing methods place additional weight on the riverbank, impacting nearby buildings and properties.
  - There is no evidence that such a riverbank stabilization analysis has been considered, completed or reviewed by a professionally registered engineer or submitted and reviewed by City Administration as done in the normal planning process.
- Building and Fire Code:
  - The existing Club Building west wall against the proposed new property line lacks any analysis considering the Building and Fire Code.
  - An analysis of the current Club Building wall abutting a proposed new property line is typically submitted indicating the number and percentage of openings in such wall in the context of the Fire Code.
  - Details on the construction materials of the current wall is typically requested by City administration to determine if

the existing wall meets or is deficient under the Fire Code with a proposed new building being potentially located in close proximity due to a proposed new property line.

- Subdivision conditions require the identified deficiency in the Fire Code for the existing walls to be upgraded prior to the City releasing subdivision mylars.
- There is no evidence that such an analysis of the Fire Code for the existing west wall of the Club Building has been considered, completed or reviewed by a professionally registered architect, or submitted and reviewed by City Administration as done in the normal planning process.

- Rigorous Planning Process Outstanding Information: City Administration typically requires specific materials for a full analysis of a development application prior to it being deemed complete. The following is a list of materials typically required but absent in the Development Application:
  - Arborist Report: Existing trees on lands subject to development applications require an Arborist Report prepared by a certified arborist which identifies existing trees suitable for preservation and their expected ability to withstand construction stress. The means by which protection will be provided for those trees is also required.
  - Building Elevations:
    - Building elevations of all existing buildings, all four sides and including the number of openings of the existing wall facing a new property line.
    - Building elevations of all new buildings, all four sides. Or, with building height indicated in feet measured from grade to parapet.
  - Floor Plans:
    - Typical floor plan layout of each floor illustrating the number of dwelling units per floor.
    - Floor plans to include uses for each room on each floor.
  - Manitoba Land Surveyor:
    - The formal proposed plan of subdivision under seal of a licensed surveyor with the precise dimensions to the existing structures with respect to the proposed new lot line is required in submitting a plan of subdivision application that contains an existing building.
  - Legislative Control Zone (Height):
    - The Subject Property falls within the lands defined in The Public Works Act, C.C.S.M. c. P300 (the "PW Act").
    - Section 7(1) of the PW Act deals with the restriction on height of buildings in the Legislative Control Zone.
    - The "C" Character Sector permits a maximum building height of 100 feet whereas the "R" Riverbank Sector

permits a current maximum building height of 50 feet.

- There is no indication that the proposed height of the new building at 123 feet has been considered by a registered planner or architect within the context of the PW Act; or has been considered or approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

- Conclusion:
  - Land use planning requires a proactive approach to making decisions about the use and development of land and resources. The focus is to move toward a common vision that represents the public interest. It is not simply restricting or regulating development but guiding developments to identified areas to provide a degree of certainty for landowners, neighbours, investors, etc. of what we expect to happen as the highest and best use of lands.
  - City Administration typically employs a proactive approach and requires a rigorous planning process for development applications demanding contributions from various accredited, impartial professionals to provide a degree of certainty on preventing undesirable outcomes such as flooded bridges, collapsing riverbanks, demise of mature trees, severe fire, and negative impacts on the Provincial Legislative Building.
  - There is no indication, explanation or rationale as to why such a proactive approach is not appropriate for this Development Application.
  - CentrePlan Policy Section 1.2.20 underlies Council's commitment that undesirable outcomes should be addressed and reconciled to avoid harmful impacts. Redevelopment of the West Parking Lot is to support club operations and/or building maintenance.
  - No matter how compelling or how persuasive may be the matters that a development application seeks to advance, good planning does not allow for the relaxation of all the typical requirements that City Administration believes is needed to be addressed in a proactive planning process to prevent undesirable outcomes.
- The Development Application was initiated by the Letter of Intent on August 29, 2024, and deemed complete in November of 2024.
- Some development applications take over 300 days until they are deemed complete.
- In a typical development application, it is circulated to City Departments after it is deemed complete and more questions and information is requested before the Public Hearing. He reviewed the file material relating to this matter, and none of this occurred.
- Although the City has advised that this information will be required at the Development Permit Stage, other clients are never given this option. They have to provide it at the First Stage.
- Decision makers need all the information to make their decision under

the legislation.

- The amendment to the DP By-law does not say that the City does not have to comply with various requirements. It states that, if the information is available in another department at the City, there is no need to get this information at the front end.
- The Approving Authority needs all information so they can make a decision on whether the Development Application complies within the planning context. The policy and regulatory framework dictates what the Approving Authority needs to make its decision.
- The Director of Planning can determine what is required on a case-by-case basis regardless of who owns the land. The planning documents, however, set out what is necessary for the Approving Authority to make its decision.
- City Administration needs certain information to deem a development application complete. The information that was provided for the Development Application was very basic.

Public Presenters

Cindy Tugwell, Executive Director of Heritage Manitoba, provided the following submission:

- Heritage Manitoba objects to the Proposed By-law.
- The GCC has an important architectural and social history.
- The GCC cannot be re-purposed and used otherwise.
- The adjacent green space is also very valuable.
- Economic viability and financial solvency of the GCC are very important.
- James Chisolm was the architect.
- Riverbank stabilization is very important.
- Taking care of an 112-year-old heritage building must be done. There is an outrage to a lot of Winnipeggers that GCC's needs were not addressed at the front end.
- A Heritage Impact Risk Assessment is important to assess structural issues with the GCC. How will the proposed new building impact the Club Building and riverbank?
- Affordable housing should not come at the peril of Winnipeggers who work and play at the GCC.
- The GCC should have been consulted. Heritage Winnipeg could have been the mediator in the best interests of the citizens of Winnipeg.
- She represents the heritage community. She worries that the HAF funding deadline was pushing this matter forward at lightning speed.
- The City needs to be subject to everything that other developers are subject to.
- Heritage Winnipeg was not even asked to participate.
- A strong financial plan is needed to protect the GCC in perpetuity.
- This needs to happen now, not at the Development Permit Stage.

- The Church is benefitting from a profit-sharing arrangement.
- We do not want the GCC, purpose-built for a curling club, to become vacant. It would be cost prohibitive to retrofit the GCC.

James Hay, Member, Volunteer and Past President of the GCC Board, made the following submission:

- He objects to the Proposed By-law
- The removal of the West Parking Lot without a solution will kill the GCC. It cannot survive financially without adequate parking for members and guests.
- He has curled for 55 years, the last 36 of which has been at the GCC, and has been a member at almost every curling club in the City.
- He was the GCC General Manager for 9 years, retiring in March of 2025. He knows the business of curling.
- While the GCC is a non-profit organization, it is still a business. Businesses fail when they don't make a profit.
- Thirteen curling clubs in the City have failed mostly because of financial reasons. Only 10 remain.
- The GCC had almost 1,300 members last season. The age group of 25 to 35, are joining curling clubs in unprecedented numbers. The GCC's central location draws members and guests from across the City.
- The GCC is internationally known as the Mother Club.
- It's a City historic building and has had many championship teams both nationally and internationally.
- The GCC was designed and built in 1912 by the same architects and builders as the Manitoba Legislative Building.
- The GCC owned the Subject Property from 1912 until 1975 when it was hit with the City's back taxes and riverbank stabilization costs in excess of $700,000, which is equivalent to $4.9 million today.
- In the last 25 years the GCC has spent over $1.6 million in maintenance and improvements to the City-owned building.
- After losing the GCC in 1975, the GCC entered a lease with the City. The GCC pays $20,500 per year, while other non-profits pay a $1.00 per year lease amount.
- He advised about other matters relating to loss of the West Parking Lot including lost parking revenue, declining membership, and loss of large events.
- The City will then be stuck with a 112-year-old unoccupied historic building.
- The GCC is a year-round operation, a curling club in the winter and the Beer Can during the summer months. Two viable businesses will be jeopardized.
- The City has recently announced a plethora of other sites being proposed for affordable housing. He asks that the GCC be spared from certain failure.

- The Proposed Development should not be built in the West Parking Lot because it will cause the historic and iconic GCC to fail.
- The City should re-enter negotiations for the sale of the GCC back to the GCC.

Barry Gorlick, Member and Volunteer at the GCC, made the following submission:

- He objects to the Development Application on the foundational principle that iconic community-centric heritage elements of our glorious City must be preserved.
- The Development Application strikes at the heart of the responsibility of the City and its elected representatives to preserve irreplaceable elements of heritage.
- The GCC is one example of an irreplaceable element.
- This supersedes and trumps the overly simplistic question of whether to prefer parking lots over housing or housing over parking lots.
- One must not lose sight of the greater question of preservation.
- The GCC has existed for 145 years, 112 of those at its present location.
- The GCC is an example of a sporting facility with a reputation throughout the worldwide curling community.
- The GCC is a bedrock facility perched at the entranceways to Osborne Village and Wolseley.
- The GCC is an architectural masterpiece in the most central of all locations, within eyesight of the Golden Boy, and accessible and used by curlers from everywhere in the City and beyond.
- The GCC is a creatively used seasonal facility that in summer lends its East Parking Lot to the operation of the community social hot spot, the Beer Can. The GCC is an example of an asset far greater than the sum of its parts. It is much more than a curling club and much more than a place to park.
- The uncontradicted and irrefutable evidence is that the GCC cannot survive without adequate parking adjacent to the Club Building that houses its 9 sheets of ice, locker rooms and restaurant.
- If curlers are offered to visit a curling club anywhere in the world, the unanimous choice is the GCC.
- The GCC is not just another building in the City's inventory; it is a community hub.

Jeremy Read, CEO of UWCRC 2.0, made the following submission:

- The Proposed Development is a mixed income housing development conceived as a twin tower to the West Broadway Commons Development. This is not merely in terms of its physical form but in terms of its spirit and intent to support an environmentally sustainable inclusive housing project that also serves to support historic and cultural infrastructure that has values to the communities they serve and to the citizens of Winnipeg at large.

- The West Broadway Commons Development and the Proposed Development are similar in many ways including:
    - Both projects are adjacent to designated heritage structures, and both needed current and ongoing repair.
    - Both owners recognize the need for ongoing capital and operating funding to support the preservation of the Owner's designated historic structure.
    - Both projects create a revenue share structure benefiting the Owner of the heritage structure.
    - Both projects proposed low residential parking requirements, and, under "C" Character District, downtown zoning does not require residential or other parking.
    - Both projects need or will need to comply with Downtown "C Character District zoning requirements and have successfully received or will need to receive height variances within the Legislature Area.
    - Both projects face time pressures around accelerated housing delivery for funding eligibility which create risk to project delivery.
- The West Broadway Commons Development differs from the Proposed Development in some ways including:
    - The City owns the GCC and therefore the GCC is in a different position than the Church relating to joint venturing opportunities, control, land value and guarantee capacity.
    - He is unaware of the GCC's full capabilities to raise capital for such a purpose as the GCC has not responded to UWCRC 2.0's invitation to produce a joint venture capital proposal.
    - UWCRC 2.0 will pay $1.6 million over 30 years, approximately $53,300 per year.
    - In the case of the GCC, there is an existing lessee who is opposed to the City's desired future land use which is atypical in that most lease agreements do not permit lessees to interfere with an owner's land rights regarding the future development of land.
- He sees a dangerous land rights precedent being set for private and public landowners in Manitoba, if lessees are permitted to have a veto right over a lessor's future uses or development plans of their own lands.
- Once the ability to proceed with the Proposed Development is known, UWCRC 2.0 can begin to address the GCC's concerns as follows:
    - Revenue sharing with the City to the benefit of the municipally-owned heritage asset.
    - Parking on the site (be it 0-5 daytime parking stalls and/or additional evening parking).
    - Any impact to the existing heritage structure emanating from a new development.
    - Construction staging concerns.

    - Shoreline stabilization, if necessary.
    - Any other existing or emerging matters.
- UWCRC 2.0 has heard GCC's concerns regarding the Proposed Development in previous meetings, as part of the SPC Public Hearing, and during these Board proceedings.
- If all matters proceed, UWCRC 2.0 would seek to engage in problem solving in a manner to contribute to the protection of the heritage asset and make the current and future uses of the overall site, mutually reinforcing rather than mutually exclusive.
- UWCRC 2.0 also believes that this mutually reinforcing end has always been the intent of City administration and Council.
- The Proposed Subdivision and Proposed Re-zoning of the Subject Property are prerequisites for various federal, provincial and other public funding and financing programs, some of which have already reached their sunset. The HAF funding for $8.5 million closed applications for future major grants and loans this past July.
- UWCRC 2.0 asks that the Board recommend approval of the Proposed By-law conditional on the City's satisfaction that parking issues have been resolved as part of Development Permit approval process.
- The Proposed Re-zoning is also necessary for the GCC's continued use of the Western Parking Lot for revenue generation in a legal manner as the GCC is currently generating revenue from a non-permitted use in contravention of the current "R" Riverbank Sector zoning.

Bruce Peloquin, Member of GCC, made the following submission:

- If an archaeological assessment was done and parking was agreed upon, he may not be here to object.
- The Fort Rouge Curling Club, where he is also a member, is barely getting by because expenses are exceeding income.
- Two new leagues are starting at the GCC this Fall and four new leagues were established previously. The membership has increased, and new members need parking.
- Community centres, hockey arenas, and other public places have surface parking lots.
- There are other locations in the City where a comparable development could be located. The Proposed Development is not appropriate for the West Parking Lot.
- The best solution is to build on City property at the pumping station West of Granite Way.

The Board also received written submissions and Public Presenter Forms from Objectors and Supporters of the Proposed By-law prior to the Hearing.

The areas of concern from Objectors are summarized as follows:

- On the face of it this seems like the City saying to a business: "We're taking your parking lot because we need it for other purposes, and we don't care whether you like it or not". It's a ridiculous situation to put that business in. Can you imagine the City doing this to any other business?

- Although the City could use more affordable housing and support efforts to create such housing, would it take a space that is actively used by a business rather than a space that is not being actively used, like a vacant lot?
- There are several vacant lots in the City including several in the vicinity of the GCC that would be better for development.
- The loss of parking could easily discourage people from curling at the GCC. Having fewer members at the GCC will significantly impact its business

Supporters expressed the following:

- Allowing affordable housing to be built on City-owned land is exactly the kind of land development we must pursue, especially in the City's core.
- Currently the Subject Property only serves to park 60 cars.
- Opposition has framed the loss of the West Parking Lot as being an existential threat to the GCC.
- The GCC is a wonderful asset to the community with a long legacy.
- The GCC has survived through world wars, global pandemics, floods of the century, general strikes, and more. It is hard to believe that the GCC will cease to exist if it loses 60 parking stalls given the context of the area.
- Surrounding the GCC is an ocean of parking. Not only is there ample parking available on both sides of Granite Way there is street parking in the neighbourhood and at Canada Life.
- Time and energy should be spent to maximize available parking rather than fighting the Proposed Development.
- Parking is not necessary for the GCC to continue; it's simply the most convenient option.
- The Board is being asked to deny a development approved by City Council, elected by Winnipeggers.
- Those opposed to the Proposed Re-zoning are asking the Board to place the value of 60 parking stalls over the value of affordable housing for 200 people.

LEGAL SUBMISSIONS

Kalyn Bomback, Legal Counsel for the City, made the following legal submission on behalf of the City:

- The core matter before the Board today is the Development Application for the Proposed Subdivision and Proposed Re-zoning, which comes down to approved land use in accordance with City policies and enactments.
- The Subject Property was declared surplus in September of 2024.

- Affordable housing was identified as a priority by the City.
- The issue is whether the Proposed Subdivision and Proposed Re-zoning meet the objectives in OurWinnipeg, Complete Communities, CentrePlan, and the Zoning By-law.
- Where the debate and the basis for the Referral is rooted, is primarily in concerns over loss of parking.
- The Subject Property is City-owned and not held for public use.
- Parking arrangements are a matter of private negotiations between tenant and landlord and therefore not a matter properly before the Board.
- Once zoning rights are in place, City Administration will then move forward to secure financing. Thereafter, the City will look at matters related to Development permits, building permits, waterways permits, heritage permits, flood proofing matters and so on.
- Lease agreements and parking agreements will also be addressed at the Development Permit Stage as per the Parking Plan adopted by Council as part of First Reading of the Proposed By-law.
- Discussions with Heritage Winnipeg will be important at the Heritage Permits Stage.
- Capital reserve funds will also be dealt with at the Development Permit stage by City Administration.
- Matters related to the lease of the West Parking Lot, parking issues, and the potential sale of the Subject Property occurred through staff of the City's Real Estate Branch whereas the Development Application was managed by staff of the HAF Office.
- The amendments to the DP By-law and the authority of the Director of Planning to determine when a development application is deemed complete, are not before the Board for consideration.
- The DP By-law was amended to embrace the new HAF process, and gave the Director of Planning new powers to adjust the form and submission requirements for City-owned lands that are different from other applicants.
- City Administration, through the evidence of Mr. Iskierski, showed that the Proposed Re-zoning complies with OurWinnipeg, CentrePlan, and the Zoning By-law.
- With respect to CentrePlan Policy and Action 1.1.20, the City is directed to explore the feasibility of redeveloping the surface parking lot next to the GCC to include both market and nonmarket housing that supports club operations and/or building maintenance.
- The meaning of Policy 1.1.20, within the context of all by-laws, does not mean that all development must support club operations and/or building maintenance. The focus is on *exploring* the feasibility. This is the most important part of this Action Item.
- The City has explored what zoning uses are available for development. It has also extensively explored, through Mr. Mahé and Mr. Chappell's offices, leasing options, capital funding models, and so on.
- The City has acted in good faith and has explored options to redevelop the West Parking Lot that supports the GCC's operations.

- The previous negotiations to purchase the Subject Property did not bind the City to sell the Subject Property to the GCC.
- The EPC Recommendation, adopted by Council via First Reading of the Proposed By-law, contemplates that, prior to the issuance of a Development Permit, City Administration will develop an adequate Parking Plan. Certain action needs to be taken on parking.
- The City is not delaying discussions on parking. It is dealing with land use right now and must address the Proposed Subdivision and Proposed Re-zoning prior to moving on to the next process. This is outlined in the DP By-law.
- City Administration is at the First Stage, as stated by Mr. Mahé. Parking, leasing, the capital fund, and Mr. Wintrup's concerns as stated in the Wintrup Report, will be addressed in the next Stages.
- With respect to Mr. Wintrup's evidence, the evidence of the City's planners and witnesses must be given the most weight. They work with these matters all the time, not Mr. Wintrup.
- Mr. Wintrup's examples do not relate to Downtown Winnipeg nor are they part of CentrePlan and the Downtown Zoning.
- The Development Application process included engagement with Stakeholders including West Broadway Biz, West Broadway Community Organization, the GCC and Canada Life.
- Riverbank stabilization will be dealt with at the Waterway Permit Stage and the Arborist Report will be addressed at a later stage.
- The building elevation and building height restrictions are not limited in the way Mr. Wintrup stated. The 123-foot height restriction can be resolved through a variance under the Zoning By-law. In addition, 123 feet is conceptual only and may change.
- The City asks the Board to recommend approval of the Proposed By-law as it exists. The City cautions any amendments being made to the Parking Plan to include "to the satisfaction of the GCC". This would create a very dangerous precedent as it would erode property and ownership rights for developers everywhere and would create veto rights of a lessee.
- The City has continued to work with the GCC and only stopped when the Referral came to the Board.
- The City understands the historical significance of the GCC and there has been no effort to undermine the importance of the GCC.
- The City has a DP By-law which includes a process, that has been fully complied with by the City.
- The City is at the very early Subdivision and Zoning stage, the First Stage of many more stages.
- The City will continue to work with the GCC at the Development Permit Stage on all matters relating to parking, the capital fund and the ongoing lease.
- The Development Application aligns with the Policies for Downtown for the following reasons:
    - It will enable housing on the Subject Property to achieve

    residential intensification targets.
    - The Proposed subdivision and Proposed Re-zoning specifically relate to CentrePlan's intent to develop the surface parking lot to the West of the GCC.
    - It will ensure affordable housing options are integrated into the development positively contributing to the surrounding neighbourhood by providing additional housing options.
    - Any development will better utilize existing infrastructure including the street network, public transit, water and wastewater service capacity and City services such as library and recreation.
    - Zoning that permits higher density housing is compatible with the surrounding context, which includes a mixture of housing types with higher residential densities.
- The Development Application also aligns with the HAF goals to increase housing availability including affordable units with a focus on Downtown as well as the Land Enhancement Office's mandate to support the development of affordable, supportive, and mixed income housing on City-owned land.
- If the Subject Property was to remain "R" Riverbank Sector, it is unlikely it would ever become public park space but instead would remain as a substandard surface parking lot.
- The City has been in conversations with the GCC about the Development Application impacting the City-owned West Parking Lot and about the City's initiative to repurpose it for affordable housing.
- In response to parking concerns impacting the GCC's members, the City has engaged with Canada Life about a potential parking arrangement.
- The East Parking Lot, with approximately 20 stalls, will continue to provide parking for the GCC's users.
- There is also potential for a parking arrangement to be made with the GCC on the site of the Proposed Development as well as off-site.
- The Development Application aligns with the previously mentioned Zoning sectors given the surrounding context of lower rise buildings with historical significance and adjacent to the West Broadway neighbourhood which is outside the Downtown boundaries. The "C" Character Sector is the most appropriate zoning for the West Parking Lot to enable the sale or lease to an affordable housing developer to develop the site for housing, including the provision of affordable units.
- The Proposed Subdivision and Proposed Re-zoning will result in the establishment of a multi-family residential development that is consistent with Policies in OurWinnipeg, Complete Communities, and it will increase residential density in the Legislature Neighbourhood, thereby increasing housing options in this pedestrian-oriented, bikeable, transit connected, amenity rich, mature neighbourhood, as well as helping the City to achieve its Residential Intensification Targets.
- The Proposed Development will utilize existing infrastructure including the street network, public transportation, water and wastewater service capacity and City services such as library, recreation and education.

- The Proposed Development will add over 100 units including several deeply affordable housing units thereby addressing the critical shortage of housing in the City and homelessness.
- At no time have the objectors opposed the proposed land use and specifically the subdivision of the Subject Property into two parcels with the new parcel being re-zoned to "C" Character Sector and the residual parcel to remain "R" Riverbank Sector.
- The City recommends that the decision of City Council proceed to Second and Third Reading.
- The City has continued to work on a solution that will address the parking concerns raised by the GCC in addition to the private agreement.
- The HAF Office has also tried to mitigate the concerns.
- The City's administration worked hard to act in good faith with the GCC to maintain a heritage asset.
- While the Proposed Development will result in a net loss of parking, the City has committed to providing 15 parking stalls on the West Parking Lot post-development and will allow the GCC to rent out those spaces to Canada Life workers.
- As it relates to the financial contribution to the GCC from the Proposed Development, the HAF Office has ensured a development arrangement with UWCRC 2.0 that up to a 50% cash distribution from revenue would be provided for capital improvements to the Club Building and property. This would include future riverbank stabilization work, if required. The Real Estate Branch has committed to a $50,000 annual contribution for capital costs of the GCC.
- The Real Estate Branch is also currently negotiating a new lease with the GCC and is supportive of adding the GCC to the community groups occupying City-owned facilities to exempt it from property taxation. The City has committed to making this recommendation, which would save the GCC a significant amount of money annually.
- GCC's Proposal sought over $1 million which was not achievable.

James Mercury and Melanie Wire, Legal Counsel for the GCC, made the following legal submission on behalf of the GCC:

- The City has failed to establish that the redevelopment of the West Parking Lot will support club operations and/or maintenance of the Club Building as mandated by CentrePlan. As such, the Proposed By-law runs contrary to the applicable Secondary Plan and must be rejected pursuant to the Charter.
- The process by which the Proposed By-law swiftly passed by Council was grossly inadequate, procedurally unfair and fails to respect the City's own procedures and good planning practice.
- The applicable Secondary Plan is Centre Pan. One of the stated goals is to embrace and elevate the Downtown's unique neighbourhoods and districts.
- Of utmost significance is Clause 1.1.20 of CentrePlan which speaks to

the Policy and Action Item to "explore the feasibility of redeveloping the surface parking lot next to the Granite Curling Club to include both market and nonmarket housing that supports club operations and/or building maintenance".

- It is insufficient for any redevelopment of the West Parking Lot to have a negative or even neutral impact on the GCC's operations. It must support the GCC.
- There is no evidence of support for the GCC aside from general expressions of optimism from Council Members and City Administration that "something will be worked out in the future".
- That is hardly the comfort that is needed in any Development Application let alone one where the future viability of the GCC is at stake.
- The weight of the evidence strongly suggests that the GCC will not thrive following the Proposed Development.
- There has been no commitment that the GCC will receive any funding from the Proposed Development, and it is not a condition of the Proposed By-law that revenue be shared with the GCC.
- The latest communication from Mr. Chappell was that he would suggest that UWCRC 2.0 pay $50,000 per year into a City account for the creation of the Granite Capital Fund. He also stated the contribution would be reviewed at the end of 20 years to ensure that developer affordability targets can be maintained. Further, for the GCC to access the capital funds, it would need to submit a funding request to the City.
- The GCC receives approximately $41,000 of annual revenue by leasing parking stalls. All that revenue will be lost if the Proposed Development proceeds. Even if there was a contractual commitment to receive $50,000 per year, the net annual profit for the GCC would only be $9,000.
- That potential funding, which is not guaranteed, would not be provided directly to the GCC. The GCC will have to apply to the City to access the funds from the Granite Capital Fund.
- This also assumes that the GCC will not lose members, and therefore revenue, because of the loss of the West Parking Lot.
- For the City to suggest that there is any meaningful plan in place to support the GCC is unfathomable.
- The record is clear that the City wanted to access HAF funds quickly, to build affordable housing. That was their top priority and the Development Application was pushed through.
- The City did not inform the GCC about the Letter of Intent or the Development Application until months after being filed. This speaks to the City's lack of good faith intentions to deal with the GCC in a respectful and responsible manner.
- Rather than deal with concerns head on, the City kept the plans to themselves and the GCC was blindsided when it first read of the Development Application in the newspaper weeks before the SPC Public Hearing.

- In rushing to have the Development Application approved, the City has left the GCC in an untenable situation.
- No comparable recreation facility could be expected to survive after losing this many parking stalls.
- While the City has suggested the use of Canada Life's parking lot, Canada Life has advised it cannot provide a short- or long-term parking solution.
- The following matters remain unanswered:
    - How is a full-service curling club going to survive the loss of at least 45 parking stalls?
    - What funding is to be provided to the GCC from the Proposed Development and how is it going to be accessed?
    - How does the GCC make up the lost revenue from the inability to lease parking stalls?
    - How will this heritage building be maintained if the GCC ceases to operate?
- Without concrete answers and solutions, all evidence points to the GCC being unable to continue operating.
- If the Proposed Development proceeds as is, the GCC will lose members and substantial revenue. The Proposed Development will not support the GCC's operations as CentrePlan mandates.
- To threaten the GCC's continued existence is also inconsistent with CentrePlan's goal to embrace and elevate the Downtown's unique neighbourhood and districts.
- The West Broadway Commons Development and the Proposed Development are two different projects with different considerations:
    - The Church is a part owner of the land at 167 Colony Street and it entered a joint venture with UWCRC 2.0.
    - There is no partnership between the City, UWCRC 2.0, and the GCC on any aspect of the Proposed Development. The GCC has not even been consulted.
    - The West Broadway Commons Development ensured the Church was financially sustainable for years to come, unlike the GCC.
- Mr. Wintrup advised that the City cannot simply decide ad hoc to not adhere to its own Policies that run contrary to adopted By-laws. The City needs to either meet the Policy requirements or formally amend CentrePlan. The amendment would have to make it clear the redevelopment of the West Parking Lot is not subject to supporting the GCC's operations and/or building maintenance as currently stated in Policy Section 1.1.20.

- Mr. Wintrup also comments on several deficiencies in the planning process and omissions from what one would reasonably expect:
    - There is a failure to address flood proofing issues and the applicable provincial regulations.
    - There is a failure to address riverbank stabilization issues and requirements in City by-laws.

- There is no analysis of Building Code issues.
- There is no record of an arborist report to address the removal of trees.
- There is no discussion of building elevation restrictions.
- There is an absence of detailed floor plans.
- There is no evidence of a formal plan of subdivision under seal of a licensed surveyor.
- The Development Application fails to address building height restrictions in the Public Works Act.
- There is no indication, explanation, or rationale as to why a proactive and rigorous planning process as mandated by the Province is not appropriate at this location or for the Proposed Development.
- There is no indication why the City has not complied with CentrePlan Policy 1.1.20 or the Parking Plan. Undesirable outcomes should be addressed and reconciled to avoid harmful impacts.

- The City has lost sight of very basic principles that guide development in the City. While everyone agrees that affordable housing is a laudable objective, it is not at any cost.
- The loss of the GCC would not only be a tragedy for Downtown but for the City, the Province and beyond.
- The Proposed By-law does not comply with CentrePlan and the Charter requires that it not be approved.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

In making the Report and Recommendation, the Board carefully considered the written and verbal evidence and legal submissions presented at the 6-day Hearing and at the SPC Public Hearing, the video recording of which all Panel Members watched. The Board also carefully considered the applicable Charter provisions, OurWinnipeg, Complete Communities, CentrePlan, the Zoning By-law, the DP By-law, and the Proposed By-law.

The Report and Recommendation addresses the Proposed By-law relating to the Proposed Re-zoning only. While the Proposed Subdivision is also part of the Proposed By-law, the Board's jurisdiction on the Referral is limited to the Proposed Re-zoning under Section 236.1(6), Section 236.1(7) and Section 236.1(8) of the Charter.

In assessing the Proposed Re-zoning, the Board is guided by the general requirements for zoning by-law approval under Section 236(1.1) of the Charter which provides as follows:

> A zoning by-law must be consistent with the development plan by-law and any applicable secondary plan by-law.

With respect to the Proposed Re-zoning of Lot 2 from "R" Riverbank Sector to

"C" Character Sector, the Board must consider whether the Proposed Re-zoning is consistent with the City's Development Plan, Our Winnipeg, it's the Secondary Plan Complete Communities, and the Secondary Plan for Downtown, CentrePlan. The Board will undertake its own analysis to determine whether, in its opinion, such consistency exists.

Prior to undertaking its analysis, it is important for the Board to stress that, in its opinion, the GCC is unique and unlike other lessees of City-owned properties in Winnipeg. Once as the owner, and presently as a tenant, the GCC has made a valuable contribution to the City, the Province and greater curling community in its operation of a purpose-built curling club for 112 years. It has also been the steward of the GCC for 50 years, after it lost the Subject Property to tax sale in 1975 for back taxes and riverbank stabilization costs. While a tenant of the Subject Property, the GCC has paid, in addition to property taxes and annual leasehold payments, over $1.6 million dollars in capital improvements to the Club Building.

The economic viability of the GCC has ebbed and flowed throughout the years. In recent years, however, its membership base has expanded in number and diversity, and there are plans for future upgrades to make it a year-round facility. The GCC Board and Management has also diversified the GCC's profitability by leasing out space to the Beer Can, renting parking stalls in the West Parking Lot to Canada Life employees and others, hosting national curling championships and catering large events and banquets.

The Board heard that the GCC was finally in a financial position in 2023, to pursue the purchase of the beloved Subject Property. Active negotiations began in 2023 and, while awaiting a City-generated appraisal of the Subject Property, the GCC was advised that the Subject Property was no longer available for sale. While the City had never committed to selling the Subject Property, the Board can appreciate that this news was very disappointing to all involved at the GCC.

Despite changing its course of dealings with the GCC from pursuing a sale of the Subject Property, to negotiating a short-term use agreement (with the removal of the West Parking Lot), re-negotiating a long-term lease, and attempting to resolve parking-related concerns, the evidence supports that the City was in active communication with the GCC. The Board acknowledges that, at times, the communications between the GCC and the Real Estate Branch and the HAF Office were disjointed as the two City Departments were doing two very different things. Although this created confusion and frustration for the GCC, the Board does not find that the GCC was treated by the City in a manner that lacked transparency, good faith dealing, and fairness.

The Board does find, however, that the involvement of UWCRC 2.0 at the earliest stages of discussions, created confusion, and perhaps suspicion, on the part of the GCC. The GCC was aware there was no RFP for the Proposed

Development, yet it appeared that UWCRC 2.0 was the sole sourced developer. While Mr. Mahé of the Land Enhancement Office very appropriately met with the GCC to discuss parking concerns, riverbank stabilization issues, and so on, UWCRC 2.0 added a complexity, from a perception perspective, that somehow it was being given standing as the developer when no such standing existed. The Board notes, in its viewing of the SPC Public Hearing, that questions arose from Council Members who had similar concerns.

Mr. Read of UWCRC 2.0 spoke in support of the Development Application as a Public Presenter. Although he did not give evidence as one of the City's witnesses, his presentation clearly advocated on behalf of the City. While recognizing UWRCR 2.0's contribution to the City in innovative developments such as West Broadway Commons, which received a prestigious 2023 Heritage Conservation Award, the evidence indicates that UWCRC 2.0 has not been contracted to be the developer for the Proposed Development. Therefore, comments about what UWCRC 2.0 is prepared to do to address the GCC's concerns if the Proposed Re-zoning is approved, are not helpful at this time.

With respect to the concerns relating to the "lightning speed" at which the Development Application proceeded from first submission to being deemed complete and coming before the SPC for Public Hearing, the Board agrees with the City that the amendments to the DP By-law and the authority of the Director of Planning to determine when a development application is deemed complete, are not before the Board for determination. While the Board appreciates the detailed Wintrup Report which sets out typical submission requirements for development applications in the City, the Board acknowledges that the Director of Planning, in her discretion and authority under the DP By-law, determined and deemed the Development Application complete. The Board accepts that the DP By-law was amended to embrace the new HAF process and the changes gave the Director of Planning additional powers to adjust the form and submission requirements for City-owned lands that are different from other applicants.

The City's witnesses have attested under oath that, if the Development Application is approved by City Council, most if not all of the matters identified by Mr. Wintrup will be addressed in the later stages of the development and planning process. The Board agrees that addressing matters relating to flood proofing, riverbank stabilization, Building and Fire Code issues, and a heritage impact assessment will be crucial, within the scope of a rigorous and complete planning process, to avoid undesirable outcomes such as flooded bridges, collapsing riverbanks, demise of mature trees, severe fire, and negative impacts on the Provincial Legislative Building and the Subject Property, which includes the Club Building.

With respect to whether the Proposed Re-zoning generally complies with OurWinnipeg, Complete Communities, and CentrePlan, the Board accepts the analysis in the Administrative Report, that such compliance exists. Specifically, the Board agrees that the Proposed Re-zoning will permit:

- Housing on Lot 2 which will help achieve residential intensification targets, as contemplated in Policy 6.19 of OurWinnipeg.
- Development that specifically relates to CentrePlan's intent to redevelop the West Parking Lot, as contemplated in Policy and Action Item 1.1.20.
- Affordable housing options which will contribute to the surrounding neighbourhood and provide additional housing options, as contemplated in Objective 3 of OurWinnipeg.
- Development of the Subject Property to better utilize existing infrastructure including the street network, public transit, water and wastewater service capacity and city services such as library and recreation, as contemplated in Objective 2 and Objective 3 of OurWinnipeg.
- Higher density housing, which is compatible with the surrounding context, and includes a mixture of housing types with higher residential densities as contemplated in Complete Communities.
- Development which aligns with HAF goals to increase housing availability including affordable units, with a focus on downtown, as well as the Enhancement Office's mandate to support the development of affordable, supportive and mixed income housing on City-owned land.
- Housing in a transitional area between Downtown and the West Broadway neighbourhoods that will provide a 24-hour presence to enhance safety and vibrancy.

With respect to the types of uses permitted in the Proposed Re-zoning, as opposed to the current zoning, the Board also agrees with the City that if Lot 2 remained "R" Riverbank Sector it is unlikely to become public park space but would remain a surface parking lot. Given the surrounding context of lower rise buildings with historical significance and adjacency to the West Broadway neighbourhood, which is outside the Downtown boundaries, the Board finds that the "C" Character Sector is the most appropriate zoning district for Lot 2 to enable the sale or lease to an affordable housing developer to develop it for housing.

While generally agreeing that the Proposed Re-zoning is consistent with the City's Development Plan, the Secondary Plans, and the Zoning By-law, the Board does not agree with the City's interpretation of CentrePlan Policy 1.1.20 which provides:

> Explore the feasibility of redeveloping the surface parking lot next to the granite curling club to include both market and non-market housing that supports club operations and/or building maintenance.

Specifically, Legal Counsel for the City submits that the meaning of Policy 1.1.20, within the context of all by-laws, does not mean that all development must support the GCC's operations and/or building maintenance. The focus is on exploring the feasibility. The Board heard that the City has explored in good faith what zoning uses are available for development on the West Parking Lot, and through Mr. Mahé and Mr. Chappell's offices, leasing options, capital funding models, and so on to support GCC's operations and/or building maintenance.

While recognizing the efforts of the City, the Board agrees with Legal Counsel for the GCC that any redevelopment of the West Parking Lot must support the GCC. The evidence is clear from GCC Board Members and Management, which included curling experts, that the loss of parking in the West Parking Lot will negatively impact the ongoing operations and sustainability of the GCC. The Board agrees that parking is integral to the success of the GCC in maintaining and growing its membership, sustaining its leasing relationship with the Beer Can, and attracting and securing contracts for large revenue-generating curling championships and banquet events.

The City Councillors at the SPC Public Hearing also recognized the importance of parking to the ongoing sustainability of the GCC and much debate arose as to how to best address this issue. While the SPC was unable to make a recommendation, the EPC Recommendation, which includes the Parking Plan, specifically directed the Public Service to develop an adequate parking plan to support the operational sustainability of the GCC prior to the issuance of a development permit. Such recommendation was concurred in and adopted by Council in its First Reading of the Proposed By-law.

The City's witnesses consistently submitted that the Parking Plan will be developed with the GCC prior to the issuance of a development permit. The GCC has argued, however, that this is too late. The Board heard that the GCC is worried that their power to negotiate an adequate Parking Plan with the City will be compromised the further the Development Application moves into the development process. They specifically point out that there are no avenues of appeal relating to the development permit and other decision-making processes that take place in the later stages of the development process. The GCC therefore submits that an acceptable Parking Plan needs to be secured at the First Stage.

The Board agrees that the development of the West Parking Lot for market and non-market housing is specifically contemplated by Policy 1.1.20 of CentrePlan. The Board also appreciates that the City is doing its best to address a housing crisis, meet the need for affordable housing, and to maximize HAF funding opportunities to undertake the Proposed Development. This is, as well, consistent with the Province's commitment to address the housing crisis throughout Manitoba.

The Board heard the impassioned presentations from the GCC Board and Members, Ms. Tugwell of Heritage Winnipeg, and acknowledgement from the City itself, that the GCC is a historically and architecturally valuable community asset. The Board also heard that affordable housing should not come at the peril of Winnipeggers who work and play at the GCC.

RECOMMENDATION

In balancing the City's stated desire to redevelop the West Parking Lot for market and non-market housing to address the housing crisis, with the need to ensure the ongoing operational sustainability of the GCC, as a cherished and important historical and community asset, the Board recommends that Council proceed with Second and Third Reading of the Proposed By-law subject to the EPC Recommendation with the following amendment:

4. That prior to the issuance of a development permit, the Public Service be directed to work with the proponent and the Granite Curling Club, to develop an adequate parking plan in order to support the ongoing operational sustainability of the club, to the satisfaction of the Granite Curling Club, the Director of Public Works, and the Director of Planning, Property and Development.

The Board stresses that the use of the word "adequate" in Recommendation No. 4 means a Parking Plan that is reasonable and negotiated in good faith by the City and the GCC. The Board encourages the City and the GCC to find accessible, adequate, and ongoing parking to replace any parking that is lost, and to ensure that parking is available during construction. It also encourages the City and the GCC to continue discussions about such matters as the GCC Capital Fund, waiver of annual property taxes, and zero rent as part of a long term lease arrangement. As offered by Ms. Tugwell, the City and the GCC may wish to engage Heritage Winnipeg as an impartial mediator to assist them in these negotiations.

The Board does not agree that this amendment creates a dangerous precedent that would erode property and ownership rights of developers everywhere and would create veto rights of a lessee. As stated earlier, the relationship between the City and the GCC, as stewards of a beloved heritage asset, is unique and the amendment to Recommendation No. 4 recognizes this unique relationship. It also recognizes the unique facts relating to the City's stated desire in CentrePlan to ensure that any development of the West Parking Lot for market and non-market housing supports club operations and/or building maintenance.

THEREFORE, THE BOARD RECOMMENDS:

1) That with respect to City of Winnipeg Zoning By-law No. 36/2025, the City of Winnipeg Council **APPROVE** the Proposed Re-zoning and proceed to Second and Third Reading of Proposed By-Law No. 36/2025, subject to the amendment of the EPC's Recommendation No. 4 as follows:

4. That prior to the issuance of a development permit, the Public Service be directed to work with the proponent and the Granite Curling Club, to develop an adequate parking plan in order to support the ongoing operational sustainability of the club, to the satisfaction of the Granite Curling Club, the Director of Public Works, and the Director of Planning, Property and Development.

FOR THE MUNICIPAL BOARD

November 7, 2025
Date

Lori Lavoie, Chair

E. Wills
Erin Wills, Secretary