



# Public Presenter Form

## Applicant Information

Name: NYLEN JANET  
Last First Middle

Address: 16 PECAN BAY  
Street Address Apartment/Unit #

City: OAKIBANK Province: MB Postal Code: R5N 0J9

Email: jnylen16@mymts.net Phone Number: 204-444-3092

Preferred method of contact: ☒ Email ☐ Phone

## Presentation Information

Proceeding Before the Board: RM OF SPRINGFIELD ZONING B/L 21-25 FILE No

If you are making a presentation to the Board, please check one or more of the following boxes, as applicable: ☐ Written Presentation ☐ Oral Presentation ☒ Both Written and Oral Presentation 22B3-008

All Presenters: Please check one of the boxes and specify below your interest in presenting in this proceeding: ☐ Support ☒ Object ☐ Unsure

**Written Presentations:** Please *briefly* specify the reason(s) for your support or objection regarding the subject matter of the proceeding and provide any relevant information that supports or explains your views. Please attach your written presentation to this form.

**Oral Presentations** may be limited to 5 minutes. This time limit applies to a presenter who decides to read the written presentation that has been previously submitted to the Board.

If you require service in French or require assistance due to a disability please notify the Municipal Board office 15 days prior to the hearing.

**Please note:** The Board reserves the right to set time limits for presentations and submissions. Additionally, the Board *will not* accept any information or evidence *after* the hearing has been adjourned. The Board may disallow presentations that do not comply with the rules set out in the applicable hearing procedures, or are not relevant to the scope of the hearing.

Please submit the completed Form with attached written presentation, as applicable, to the Manitoba Municipal Board via email, mail, or fax, 10 working days prior to the hearing.

Contact Information: 1144-363 Broadway, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3C 3N9  
Phone: (204) 945-2941 Fax: (204) 948-2235 Email: MuniBrdGenMail@gov.mb.ca

If you require additional assistance, please contact our office.

January 30, 2023

Janet Nysten

email: jnylen16@mts.net

16 Pecan Bay

Oakbank, Mb R5N 0J9

Municipal Board

1144-363 Broadway

Winnipeg, Mb R3C 3N9

Re: Springfield Zoning By-law No. 21-25 Your File No. 22B3-008

Thank you for this opportunity to state my objections and concerns regarding the RM of Springfield Zoning By-law # 21-25.

I have not attached the following documents that I will refer to but I expect that the Municipality will be providing them as part of their package to you. Once I have had opportunity to review the Municipality's submission, I will confirm that all the documents have been made available to the Board or I will provide same. In my submission, I will try and explicitly indicate where my quotes and references can be found.

Documents to be referenced are:

1. The Planning Act
2. Springfield proposed zoning by-law # 21-25
3. Springfield current zoning by-law # 08-01 and amendments thereto
4. Change table to Zoning by-law # 21-25
5. Agenda for October 28, 2021 Springfield Planning Meeting
6. Minutes for October 28, 2021
7. Agenda for June 23, 2022 Springfield Planning Meeting
8. Minutes for June 23, 2022
9. The Municipal Planning Guide to Zoning By-laws in Manitoba
10. Correspondence from Larissa Sveinson, Regional Manager, Province of Manitoba Community Planning Branch Beausejour office, dated October 26, 2021 Re: RM of Springfield New Zoning By-Law No. 21-25
11. Springfield Development Plan By-law No. 18-09

## Summary of Issues resulting in this objection to By-law 21-25:

- The 53 changes to the by-law at second reading were not all minor, some effected permitted uses and some conditional uses.
- The 53 changes were not referenced in Resolution # 22-250.
- The Public Consultation was not completed in a manner that was inclusive of planning decisions that reflected the interests in future planning for a large number of residents. This led to strong opposition to the by-law that has not been identified in the minutes of the Planning Meetings or the 53 proposed changes.
- The by-law eliminates by making several uses permitted and changing the zone of some specific properties greatly reduces opportunities for public consultation and hearings, which existed in By-law #08-01.
- The by-law has permissive language and has left out a number of definitions, conditions, and specific rules for future development which could allow subjective application for administering the by-law.
- There are oversights on the map and omissions.
- A few typos and grammar errors have been identified and will be listed near the end.
- A number of amendments to By-law #08-01 that were approved since first reading of By-law # 21-25 are not reflected on the zoning map of the new by-law.

## Preliminary Matter:

At the June 23, 2022 Planning Meeting, the municipality had attached to its Agenda (document 7) which referred to By-Law 21-25 Springfield Zoning By-law (Second Reading) with attachments listed as Zoning By-Law 21-25 – (Tracted Changes) and Change Table – Springfield Zoning By-law.

On the top of the Change Table was the word 'Minor'. My first point is to question by whom and how were these changes determined to be "Minor". If they were not all minor, it is my interpretation of the Planning Act, that the Municipality must hold a second public hearing. 74 (2) of the Planning Act (document 1) reads: Alteration to zoning by-law " If, after the public hearing, the board or council proposes to alter the by-law, a second public hearing must be held in accordance with section 168." Section 168 speaks to Notice of a Public Hearing.

The Act goes on to state in Section 74(3) No hearing for minor alteration. "A second public hearing is not required if the alteration is a minor one that does not change the intent of the by-law". The key words I read were **Not change the intent of the by-law**. I sought out a legal opinion and an opinion from a professional planner and both concurred that if the changes effect permitted use or conditional use, or change the Map showing the zone boundaries, the changes would not be considered minor changes. The lawyer went on to say that if the By-law is given third reading without a second hearing, that it could also be challenged in court under Section 383 (1)(d) of the Municipal Act.

I would suggest to the Municipal Board at this time, this Hearing is premature because the municipality failed to hold the required second public hearing. I cite as examples of changes set out in the Change Table (Document 4) that to other than the previous council would not be considered as minor:

Changes to Table 9-1, the Principal Use Table: points 16 through 27

Changes to Table 9-2, the Accessory and Temporary Use Table, Points 28, 29,30, 31



Point 33: 9.9.3 Aggregate Operation: Delete 9.9.3

Point 34: 9.10.1 Commercial Composting Facility: Section 9.10.1.a to be amended to remove setback distances and instead refer to the Waste Management Facilities Regulation M.R. 37/2016 as well as any other applicable Provincial regulations.

Point 38: 9.16.4 (now 9.17.4) Bed and Breakfasts: Remove reference to RM in a. and CR in b.

Point 41: 9.20 (now 9.21) Home Occupations, Businesses and Industries: Delete Home Occupation

Point 52: 11.1 Springfield Zoning District Map: Legend and labelling to be updated as change "CR" Commercial Recreation to "R Recreation and "PN" Parks and Natural Lands to "N" Natural Lands

Point 53: 11.1 Springfield Zoning District Map: Zoning By-law map should be adjusted slightly, by expanding the MX zone to the east, to reflect the same alignment as the Aggregate designation in the Development Plan for the RM owned property at 25082 Hillside Road 67N.

My next issue to bring to the attention of the Municipal Board is the question if Council by way of Resolution No. 22-250 (refer to Document 6 Minutes of the Planning meeting of October 28, 2021) did in fact approve the 53 changes on the Change Table (Document 4) by passing said Resolution. It reads as follows:

Moved by Glen Fuhl

Seconded by: Howard Bredin

BE IT RESOLVED THAT second reading be given to By-law No. 21-25 being the RM of Springfield Zoning By-law to regulate and control the use and development of land and buildings also know as the Rural Municipality of Springfield Zoning By-law.

Carried (5-0)

The point I would like to make is that there is no reference to By-law # 21-25 as being amended, or that the 53 Track changes were part of the resolution. The fact that it was an item attached to the Agenda does not mean that Council had to approve of it in whole or in part. I believe that was their intention but Minutes are to be a accurate record of what occurred in a Planning Meeting, and anyone looking back on the legal record of the minutes would not know that By-law # 21-25 had been amended by the wording of Resolution 22-250.

To be clear and up front to the Board, I have previously reached out to the previous council and the new council and raised these two key concerns and suggested methods to correct the oversights before this Public Hearing was called. Neither council opted to either amend the resolution or hold a second public hearing.

## Zoning By-law # 21-25 Process and lack of Public Engagement Opportunity

I would much rather have preferred to bring my specific concerns regarding this by-law before my local Council than raise these issues before the Municipal Board but the opportunity for residents to address their concerns before Council were greatly limited. I think most residents were aware of the need to amend By-law # 08-01 due to the Adoption of the New Development Plan by-law No. 18-09 in February of 2019. Many also participated in the public consultation process that was conducted by the Contracted Consultant WSP. Perhaps it might have happened anyway, but the public engagement process was greatly worsened by COVID. I would describe the Public Consultation Process as falling off the rails in 2021. At the time, public gatherings were limited. Council had at first committed to not holding any Public Hearings because of the limitations. As time went on, Council had to hold a Public Hearing on the Financial Plan in May, so they arranged for it to take place in the Fire Hall Garage area to be able to accommodate a larger number of people than council chambers could. They also introduced virtual participation opportunities, which was soon recognized to have limitations in many areas of the municipality and for many residents.

Fast forward to October 2021, for the Public Hearing on the Zoning By-law it was not treated like the Public Hearing on the Financial Plan. In fact, it was not treated any differently than a site-specific Zoning By-law amendment application. Well, that's not exactly true, the supporters and objectors for those hearings were given unlimited time to speak, while presenters for the zoning by-law were limited to 5 minutes. Furthermore, there was limited attendance (at first it was 8 people, but later they allowed 15 people into the council chambers) and anyone wanting to appear in person had to register with the Planning Office for permission to attend. Opportunity did exist for zoom participation or via phone. By-law # 21-25 was the 12<sup>th</sup> planning item on the Agenda (Document 5). The Public Hearing was Scheduled to happen at 7 p.m. but it was more like 9 p.m. when the item was heard. Was this intended to discourage a number of people from participating, I cannot prove that but it definitely was the outcome. It was at the onset of this Public Hearing, the Mayor put in the new rule which was to limit presentations to 5 minutes. People who had waited 2 hours then had to edit their presentation to highlight just some key points. I realize that the Board can't do anything about how this Public Hearing was conducted but I feel it is important for you to understand why the Board will be hearing some concerns that could have been handled better and earlier in the process. One last point I would like to raise about the Public Hearing is the record of the Public Hearing: the Minutes (Document 6: if you read page 8 Item 6.10.1 Zoning By-law 21-25, it shows In Attendance: None. I can assure you that I was there, so was Meagan Bowles, consultant planner for WSP, Development Officer Dan Doucet, Jennifer Lim, Edwin Giesbrecht, Darryl Speer, and more. In the minutes only 9 names are listed as "For Information" In Opposition 3 names are listed and 1 in Support. There is no indication of the written objections submitted which were over 200, I believe. I raise this to point out to the Board that this By-law is more contentious than the minutes reflect. I believe that the Planning Act supports that written objections should be considered representations (Section 172(1) of the Planning Act) and in my opinion should be part of written record.

My next concern is that after first reading was given to By-law # 21-25, the municipality continued to allow for amendments to By-law # 08-01. The text of By-law #21-25 states that by-law 08-01 and all amendments thereto will be rescinded. There have been at least 6 amendments and 2 Secondary Plans

that were passed between September 2021 and today. As of June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2022, I have studied the Map for By-law # 21-25 and can see at least 2 amendments are not reflected on the Map and 2 that are reflected incompletely. I refer to By-laws 22-12 and 21-20, and then to 21-28 and 21-21, both of which I could provide you with, if you feel it is required I would ask that the Board keep the status of these 4 amending by-laws in mind as you are finalizing your ruling.

## Specific Objections to By-law 21-25

### A. Permissive Language

A zoning by-law should be clearly written to divide the municipality into zones, prescribes permitted and conditional uses for land and buildings within each zone, and sets out the procedures for applying for and issuing development permits, non-conforming certificates, zoning memoranda, and similar documents. Wording such as “in the opinion of council” or “in the opinion of the Development Officer and/or council” is not appropriate in a zoning by-law due to subjectivity. Proposals should be evaluated based on consistency with zoning provisions, and Development Plan policies where applicable. Also the word “may” is used multiple times (+20). In some cases it is appropriate but in others it leaves it open to subjective and inconsistent interpretation. The document would be better served if a review of where the word “may” is used and where needed change it to “shall”.

### B. Section 2 Administration

- 2.2.1 (page 2) The Development Officer shall be any person appointed by ( suggest inserting by Resolution or By-law of) Council to occupy the position of Development Officer.
- 2.5.4 (page 3) insert the wording suggested by the Planning Branch (Document 10 page 6)
  - o A) A development permit for a major development
  - o B) A development permit for a development that requires new construction, or expansion of existing sewer and water, waste removal, drainage, public roads, connecting streets, street lighting, sidewalks or traffic control works.
- 2.5.6 (page 4) delete in the second last line “to the satisfaction of the Development Officer and”
- 2.5.7 (page 4) Suggest Adding in g. “in designated vulnerable areas approved septic waste systems” This would be in accordance with Development Plan By-law # 18-09 (Document 11 page. 10) Ground Water Protection Policy 3.5.2, 3.5.3, and 3.5.4
- 2.6.5 and 2.6.6 (page 5) delete the words “Council reserves the right” and replace with the specific conditions that were in the previous zoning by-law # 08-01 (Document 3. Page 62) 17.0 Conditional Uses point 6)  
Also 2.6.6 replace the wording “a time limit” I suggest returning to the previous “limit of 12 months”
- 2.7 Variation Orders 2.7. (page 5) replace the wording “at the discretion of Council” with the wording “before the 12 months lapse”.
- 2.7.4 (page 5) Council remove “council reserves the right” I suggest replacing it with the wording from By-law 08-01 “in accordance with the provisions of the Act”
- 2.10 Development Agreements: Suggest that insert wording from by-law that 08-01 (Document 3 page 57) a) to construct, or pay for the construction of, or improvement to, a public roadway required to give access to the development; to specify the location and



number of vehicular and pedestrian access point to sites from public roadways, including the construction, or payment for the construction thereof or improvements thereto; c) to install or pay for the installation of, utilities that are necessary to serve the development, or pay the recovery costs of services which have already been installed; d) to repair, improve, or to pay for the repair, improvement or reinstatement, of any street furniture, curbing, sidewalk, boulevard landscaping and tree planting which may be damaged or destroyed or otherwise harmed by the development or building operations upon the site; and e) to construct, or pay for the construction of, or improvement to land drainage works that are necessary to serve the development; in lieu of point h).

Note: I have been advised that Springfield has not conducted any review, inspection, or recording of buildings or uses that do not conform to rules under By-law # 08-01. Everything existing could be grandfathered as conforming as the wording now allows.

- 2.11.2 (page 6) Non-Conformance : wording lawful or lawfully is open to interpretation and I would suggest the wording I found used by other planning jurisdictions “ unless otherwise provided for herein, an existing building, structure or use that was illegal under the provisions of any planning scheme or zoning by-law and amendments thereto shall not become or be made legal solely by reason of the adoption of this by-law; and to the extent that, and in any manner that, said illegal building, structure or use is in conflict with the requirements of this by-law, said building, structure or use shall remain illegal hereunder”.
- 2.11.4 (page 7) replace the word lawful (see above)
- 4.2 General Definitions: (starting page 11)

Note: There are a surprising number of definitions that were in By-law # 08-01 but do not appear in by-law # 21-25 Of the approximate 25 definitions removed it includes: aggregate, aggregate extraction, aggregate quarry, aquifer, flood plain, flood risk area, ground water, peat moss, performance standard, pollution, rehabilitation, surface water. At times the definitions deviate from those in the Planning Act, the previous zoning by-law, and at others seem to be drafted to suit a particular situation or motive. I would ask that many of them be returned and included in the by-law #21-25.

- Conditional Use: means a use or development that may have unique or widely varying operating characteristics and may have potential operational or other impacts on adjacent properties or site development demands, specified as conditional in this by-law. I suggest that that the words “or development” be deleted.
- Council: definition is out of alpha order and should be located below Construction or Constructed.
- Farm Based Commerce “means a class of business operations that are accessory to a principal farming operation and location the same site but not necessarily agricultural in nature. Farm based commerce may entail occupations or industries related and accessory to the farm only and are intended to diversify on- farm economic activity”. This definition seems unnecessary or should be reworded to be more in line with Agricultural Uses (page 24) or Farm Diversification Operations Use standards such as 9.20 Farm Diversification Operations (page 60)

- Non-conforming: (page 16) is a new definition even though there is a section under Administration concerning Non Conformance (page 6). It also contains the wording "lawfully existed". I would ask that the definition be removed but in particular the words containing the undefined word lawful not be used.
- Resort: (page 21) means a commercial recreation establishment consisting of one or more buildings and/or uses, which may include lodging, recreational facilities, spa and service facilities, retail facilities, eating and drinking establishments, natural area and/or event spaced. The word "recreation" could be included in many uses but the totality of the definition is more suited to commercial. However, in the Principal Use table (page 48) the use is conditional in commercial CC or CH zones but permitted in Recreation zone. I would ask that the word recreation be removed from the definition and the Principal Use Table be changed to remove the permitted use under Recreation. The development of these uses could better be addressed through a re-zoning to the correct use.

#### 4.6 Industrial Use Class Definitions (starting at page 21)

- Aggregate Operation "means the extraction of sand, gravel, and ores from their natural occurrences on affected land and the distribution of extracted materials, including the excavation, processing or distribution of clay, gravel, stone..... then the definition is changed under point 6 on the Change Table (Document 4) In the report from the Province (Document 10) page 6 a name change to aggregate and mineral operations or Natural resource development was also recommended. Citing it would be clearer. The use was also changed (point 17 on the Change Table Document 4) from permitted to conditional in the Principal Use Table (page 48) The by-law is not clear about Aggregate and did not include any definitions for either aggregate, aggregate extraction, or aggregate quarry which were in By-law # 08-01. Further confusion could occur with the wording of the Industrial Zoning Districts 6.3.3 (page 29) that states "The Industrial Extractive Zoning District is intended to accommodate aggregate quarries and mining operations. The by-law is almost bare of any reference to mining even though there is a current application before Environment and the CEC to mine sand.
- 4.6 Industrial Use Class Definitions: General Industrial, Light (page 22) includes wording that differentiates it from General Industrial, Heavy with the wording a "low level of nuisance" It is not clear in the by-law how to or who would distinguish between low level of nuisance and high level. The word may is also too broad for any consistent enforcement purpose: "may have a high level of nuisance" To further confuse administering this by-law there is reference under 6.3 Industrial zoning districts (page 29) the 6.3.1 Industrial Business Zoning District which is intended to accommodate Industrial developments of light to medium intensity with lower levels of nuisance. Then 6.3.2 The Industrial General Zoning District is intended to accommodate industrial development of medium to heavy intensity with higher levels of nuisance. There is no definition of "medium" and no direction on how it would be differentiated between light and heavy. Also, the reference to "noise" as a nuisance which had been in By-law # 08-01 has been removed and should be included as a nuisance.



-4.7 Civic Use Class Definitions: (page 23) Government Service means a development providing public services directly to the public.... And goes on to give examples. I question why these types of public services would be permitted uses in AG and AR zoned land (page 49 Principal Use Table). The Development Plan includes Policies to discourage urban-related uses in rural areas that would compete with uses in the urban settlement centres and General Development Areas; (Document 11. Page 6 3.2.5)

4.8 Agricultural Use Class Definitions (page 24) Agriculture Support Industry “means an industry, commercial service or retail business in which the major product or service being bough, sold or processed is intended mainly for, from or by farmers. Typical uses include aerial spraying companies, grain storage including grain elevators, feed mills and seed plants”. (peat moss was removed as change number 9 on the Change Table (Document 4). I would support the suggestion from Provincial Planning (Document 10 page 7) that the definitions of Agri-Business and Agricultural Support Industry be combined and revised with the definition found in the Municipal Planning Guide to Zoning By-laws in Manitoba (Document 9 page B31) “ Agri-Business means an establishment that provides goods or service to the agricultural sector, including (but not limited to) farm equipment and machinery repair shops, feed operations, livestock auction marts, and commercial seed cleaning plants.” Also, I would ask that if the definition is not changed that Agriculture Support Industry be changed on the Principal Use Table (page 49) from a permitted to a conditional use.

After Agricultural Use Class Definitions, it would be expected that there would be a Use Class Definition for Mixed Use but there is no definition for it but there is a definition for Accessory Use and Temporary Use. On page 30 there is a 6.6. Mixed Zone District Description. There should be a definition for Mixed use because on the Principal Use Table (pages 47-50) there are 10 permitted uses and 15 conditional uses as well as 19 permitted and conditional uses in 9-2 Accessory and Temporary Use Table. There are several areas identified as General Development on the Zoning Map

6.4.3 in the Civic Zoning District (page 29) The natural Lands Zoning District is intended for those areas that are unsuitable for development due to flooding, unstable or poorly drained soils as well as areas with unique natural or wildlife habitats. I would ask that the 5 permitted uses showing on the Principal Use Table (page 48 to 50) and the 4 permitted uses on the Accessory and Temporary Use Table (Pages 51 and 52) be changed to conditional uses to ensure public involvement in review of any proposed development and allow the opportunity for the municipality to impose appropriate conditions and a development agreement.

11.6 Planned Unit Developments (page 53) should not be a permitted use (9-1 Principal Use Table page 47) in RS, RT, RM or GD and be better considered as a conditional use. This would ensure public involvement in the review of any development application and the opportunity for the municipality to impose appropriate conditions and development agreements.

9.9 Aggregate Operation (page 54) This section makes reference to the municipal aggregate by-law twice, but at the current time there is no such by-law. The previous council denied it at 3<sup>rd</sup> reading. Reference should reflect to the current gravel by-law # 73-22 to Regulate and control the operation of gravel pits until a replacement by-law is enacted. Also, I would ask that the deletion of 9.9.3 in by-law # 21-25 suggested by point 33 on the Change Table (Document 4) on the by-law be reversed and reinstated.

9.10 Commercial Composting facility (page 55) I would ask that the deletion of the portion of 9.10.1 a) i.e. distances not be removed as per point 34 on Change Table (document 4).

9.20 Farm Diversification Operations (page 60) This use requires a permit but there is no reference to that in this section. I would also ask that the wording in point e and point i "in the opinion of the Development Officer of Council be removed.

9.21 Home Businesses and Industries (page 61) I ask that the removal of Occupations as point 41 of the Change Table (Document 4) be reversed and the wording kept in the by-law.

Table 10-1 Residential and Mixed Zoning District Dimensional Standards (page 70) I oppose the reduction in the RS of the minimum site area down to 5, 000 sq. ft, minimum width down to 50 ft, minimum front yard to 25ft, minimum interior yard to 5 ft. and minimum rear yard to 20 ft. These standard lot sizes, in my opinion are too small and with the opportunity for the Development Officer to vary the sizes by a further 15%. To allow for these sizes in all the area zoned RS would greatly increase the density and change the nature of urban areas in Springfield.

#### Comments on the Zoning Map

It is concerning that the insert for Vivian was removed, and the former land zoning changed without and public hearings. This is a very controversial action because there is a current Environment Application and CEC Hearing regarding a sand mining application. Vivian is an established community much more so than Prairie Grove and use should not have been changed or not acknowledged.

The zoning map does not meet the checklist criteria from the Provincial Guide to Zoning By-laws in Manitoba (document 7) page B35 and show the 2 locations of waste disposal areas, the regional lagoon and their related buffer areas.

All the Industrial zoned area along railway lines in urban centres have been eliminated. This takes away any notification of heavy industrial use in the urban areas (shown as inserts).

There are no references to AI (Agriculture intensive zone). There were over 18 different sites in by-law # 08-01 including some close to urban centres.

The map shows most of the West Pine Ridge Secondary Plan but not the portion south of Garven Road (NE ¼ 34-11-4)

The map does not show Oakbank South Secondary Plan.

The map shows all the land for Wheatland Estates Part 3 as RS but zoning B/L 21-28 also included RT zoning in the corners of the development. It is confusing if the area currently zoned RT will revert to RS if this by-law is passed and a further zoning amendment will be needed.

There are changes in zones for specific areas on the zoning map that were done without any public consultation via a public hearing.

1. SW 27-11-5 on the east side of PR 206 just north of the North Oaks condo development situated on the east side of PR 206 as you drive into Oakbank from the north. It was zoned RM now show as CH (highway commercial) CH zone has 18 permitted uses (some of which the Province has indicated do not meet the criteria of uses for the travelling public). Permitted uses include auto service centre eating and drinking establishments, funeral parlour, gas bar, Hotel/Motel, self or mini storage, vet clinic or hospital. There was a development plan amendment in 2021 to re-designate the land to purportedly a self or mini storage. There was objection but the amendment was passed. If the CH zone is allowed to remain, then any of the permitted uses could be developed on that site without any further public hearing process or conditions attached.
2. A large area south of Dugald and west of PR 206 has been changed from AG to RS. This is west of land recently rezoned for Wheatland Estates (Ventura Homes) B/L 21-28.
3. An area east of PR 206 across from the municipal office has been changed from Ag to RS. This is over and above the land recently rezoned for Qualico via B/L 21/16

Note: in the past year or so, Springfield has approved approximately 200 residential lots and to rezone additional lands without conducting public hearings is not warranted nor appropriate.

#### Typos, mis-spelling, and Grammar Errors

1. On page 1 , point 1.5.1 e There should be a comma between development and agreement
2. On page 3, point 2.4.1 e missing word between unless and will: suggest "it"
3. On page 3, point 2.5.2 last line "regulations, and matter raised: should read matters do not matter.
4. On page 6, point 2.9.3 "An existing undersized lot may be increased in area of frontage: suggest it should read "or" frontage
5. On page 8, point 2.14.5 "Any person who undertakes, or cause or permits". Suggest it should read "causes".
6. On page 11, point 4.2 "Development means: e) the deposit of stockpiling or materials": Suggest it should read "of" materials
7. On page 8, point 2.14.5 " Any person who undertakes, or cause or permits": Suggest it should read "causes"
8. On page 8, point 3.1.1 e " the phrase used for includes..." should be in italics
9. On page 31, point 7.3.3. "structure" should read as "structures."



## General Requests

Add definitions for the following:

Natural Resource Development, Mobile Home Park, Model Homes, Farm Produce, Aggregate, Aggregate Extraction, Aggregate Quarry, Aquifer, Flood Plain, Flood Risk Area, Ground Water, Performance Standard, Pollution, Rehabilitation

## Summation

I have spent a great deal of time regarding this by-law. Attending public consultations, council meetings, and reviewing the documents. My sole intention is to ensure that my community develops in an orderly, transparent, fair and consistent manner. A zoning by-law should represent the vision of the people, not be designed to reduce administrative requirements, or facilitate special interests and unadopted interests.

I submit these recommendations to the Board and ask that by virtue of the failure by Council to conduct this process properly, and with the number of changes required, that you deny third reading to By-law # 21-25.

Thank you,



Janet Nysten