MEADOWS DEVELOPMENT

What We've Heard at Open House 1

Wednesday, June 24, 2026 | Attendance: 57 Total (Including 12 Peguis Members)

This document summarizes the questions received during the first open house, along with the corresponding responses. It has been prepared to provide clear and transparent information to the community and address the comments, concerns, and feedback received during the event.

#	QUESTION & ANSWERS

1 **Who owns the daycare? Who developed it? And who will run it?**

The Peguis Real Estate Trust and a provincial entity hold title to the daycare property. Questions regarding the contractor responsible for constructing the facility, the current status of the construction lien, and the Province's anticipated opening date should be directed to the parties involved in the daycare project.

The development group responsible for the Meadows project has had no involvement in the daycare project. It is not attempting to deflect questions concerning the daycare. Rather, it does not have the information or authority required to address those matters.

The daycare project, including the construction lien and any other daycare-related matters, does not and will not have any legal or financial impact on the broader Meadows development or its development timeline.

---

2 **Building height and project economics — Is it a deal breaker if all buildings are limited to three storeys? And is higher density being pursued simply for profit?**

The higher-density component of this development is not simply about profit. Lower-density serviced development — single-family homes, parks, and greenways — requires the higher-density component to be economically viable. That is increasingly the reality of how mixed developments of this type are structured.

On the deal-breaker question: if Council requires three-storey buildings, the project will comply. There is no point in being ambiguous about that. What the team has raised — consistently on the website, in the online sessions, and here tonight — is that a strict three-storey limit across the entire site creates tension with other Secondary Plan objectives related to compact, walkable, mixed-use development.

The Secondary Plan originally contemplated five storeys, was then reduced to four, and Council ultimately landed at three. The development team's view is that some policies in the Plan are difficult to satisfy if building height is held to three storeys everywhere — for example, ground-floor commercial, compact mixed-use blocks, and structured parking. If it is three storeys, the total unit count would be reduced by approximately 400 to 500 units from the current proposal.

The development team's position is the same as it has been throughout: if it is three storeys, it is three storeys. But that decision should be made with a clear understanding of what it means for the complete community the Secondary Plan envisions.

#	QUESTION & ANSWERS
3	**Ownership structure — Who owns which portions of the site, and who is responsible for repairing the road damage caused by previous activity on the site?** The land was originally purchased by the Peguis Real Estate Trust from a development group in 2021. In 2024, the land was sold to a company associated with Andrew Marquess. A development partner, Sahil Garg of Alia Custom Homes, has since joined the project and will develop the lands not retained by the Peguis Real Estate Trust. The Peguis Real Estate Trust retains approximately 16 to 17 acres, located primarily along McGregor Farm Road and toward the southern portion of the site. These lands consist mainly of commercial and multi-family development areas and form a shape resembling a crescent. The private development group will develop the remaining approximately 160 acres. The ownership group is responsible for repairing the road damage. A copy of the title is available on the project website. Residents may also conduct their own title search.
4	**Hal Sutherland (Peguis Real Estate Trust) — What is the Real Estate Trust's financial capacity to complete this development, and what is the Trust's role going forward?** Hal Sutherland, speaking on behalf of the Peguis Real Estate Trust, addressed this directly at the open house. The Trust sits on a fund valued at approximately $160 million. The Trust also has access to a $40 million loan program and a $20 million line of credit, which currently sits at zero, having been used and fully repaid to fund a $15 million arena. In total, the Trust has access to approximately $200 million in resources. The Trust confirmed it has the financial resources to complete the projects it is undertaking and expressed a clear desire to be good neighbours in East St. Paul — to stand side by side with residents and contribute to making this a successful and attractive community. The Trust also acknowledged that the daycare has been a real headache for trustees, but confirmed that the daycare situation is entirely separate from the capital and financial structure in place for the broader development.
5	**Soil hauling, truck activity, and lack of communication — Months of truck traffic, early and late operating hours, road damage, a large soil pile, and no communication to nearby residents. Why is the proposed site entrance near our property, and what will be done differently?** That experience was not acceptable, and the team acknowledges it directly. Residents should not have been left without a contact or advance notice of what was happening. To be clear, going forward, there will be no further soil hauling or development activity on the proposed site until development approval is in place and water and wastewater servicing is confirmed. No homes can be built before those issues are resolved. The team has heard the concern about communication and is committed to using the project website and direct contact channels so that neighbours are not left without information or a way to raise concerns during any future activity. Regarding site access, the two access points are on McGregor Farm Road and Wenzel Road — these are the only viable frontages given the site's configuration. The exact relationship between the current soil stockpile and the final access location was not confirmed at this meeting.

#	QUESTION & ANSWERS
6	**Financial capacity and daycare — How can residents be confident that the development will be completed? And how was the daycare built and permitted to sit unfinished, with a construction lien against it?** On the development itself, servicing approximately 168 acres requires roughly $80 to $100 million in capital investment. The development team has a clear understanding of what that requires. As is standard practice in Manitoba, the developer will be required to post securities and letters of credit through the Development Agreement with the RM before any work begins. Protecting ratepayers through those assurance mechanisms is the municipality's responsibility, and it is common practice in developments across the province. On the daycare: it was built with permits by the general contractor, and the municipality was aware of it. It was a joint federal and provincial program. The private development group that will be building out the majority of this site had no financial interest in, and made no financial commitments to, the daycare project. Questions about the daycare's current status, the lien, and its path to opening should be directed to the Province. What happened with the daycare does not affect the capital structure or the development agreement framework for the proposed development.
7	**Infrastructure installation and renewal — Who pays for roads, water, sewer, and drainage? Who pays for renewal when those assets reach the end of life after being transferred to the municipality?** The developer is responsible for installing and paying for all on-site roads and underground water, sewer, and land drainage infrastructure. Once installed and inspected, those assets are transferred to the municipality — the roads and underground pipes become municipal property maintained through general revenues, property taxes, and capital levies. On renewal: the standard practice is that future renewal costs are managed by the municipality through tax revenue and levy contributions from the development. On the question of whether the developer would consider contributing to the first renewal, the team heard that request and said it would follow the Council's direction. A specific proposal with defined scope, timing, cost basis, and legal mechanism would need to be on the table for a meaningful response.
8	**Water supply and wastewater capacity — Where will the water come from, how will wastewater capacity be addressed, and who pays for the required plant upgrades?** On water: East St. Paul does have an untapped capacity option — a well north of Birds Hill that could be developed and connected to the municipal network. There are choices available, but the final decision on water supply rests with the RM and its engineers, not the developer. The RM will determine which option best matches the development's demand with available supply. On wastewater: the team fully acknowledges that the existing treatment plant has no additional capacity and that the current infrastructure is at or near the end of life. A confirmed solution and timeline for increasing wastewater capacity must be agreed upon between the developer and the RM before construction can begin. There is no scenario where homes are built without a functioning connection. The developer contributes to this through capital levies — estimated at up to $40 million over the build-out — and is open to conversations about whether there are ways to financially accelerate the needed infrastructure upgrades beyond what is formally required.

#	QUESTION & ANSWERS
9	**Schools — Where will children from this development attend school? Birds Hill, Dr. Hamilton, and Robert Andrews Middle School are already at or near capacity.** This is a legitimate and important concern, and the team does not dismiss it. School capacity and the construction of new schools are the responsibility of the Province of Manitoba. The River East Transcona School Division (RETSD) is included in the formal circulation of this application and will provide written comments as part of the public hearing record — that is, the appropriate stage for agency responses of this nature. The Secondary Plan identifies two potential future school sites to the north of the Meadows site. The Peguis Real Estate Trust was not consulted during the Secondary Plan process, so how those locations were determined is not entirely clear to the development team. If the Province or the school division determined that a school site was needed within the Meadows lands themselves, the most likely location would be in the multi-family zone on the western portion of the site, which could be reconfigured to accommodate it. The development is expected to generate approximately $5 million annually in school taxes — a significant ongoing contribution toward school infrastructure in East St. Paul. The development team is prepared to advocate to the Province on school capacity and recognizes that the issue will only grow if not addressed.
10	**Mandatory connection to municipal services — Will existing nearby properties be forced to connect to municipal water or wastewater when services come close to their land?** The developer has no role in requiring a neighbour to connect. Provincial regulation may require connection where municipal wastewater services come within a prescribed proximity, but municipalities have a mechanism — a buffer strip — that can be put in place so that large-lot rural property owners are not obligated to connect. The developer whose development is encroaching on a property would initiate the buffer process. Participation by affected large-lot owners was described as voluntary — it depends on what those landowners want to do.
11	**Land use adjacent to McGregor Farm Road — We were told for years that single-family homes would be built closest to McGregor Farm Road residents. Now it sounds like it could be commercial and multi-family.** Three multi-family buildings are proposed in the extreme southwest corner of the site. The land adjacent to McGregor Farm Road, and the residents beyond that corner, are identified as single-family residential. The commercial component — which is on the lands retained by the Peguis Real Estate Trust — would come in on the west side of the site at the entrance off McGregor Farm Road, not immediately abutting existing rural residential properties.

#	QUESTION & ANSWERS
12	**Traffic safety on McGregor Farm Road — The road is already unsafe due to speeding. An exit onto McGregor Farm Road will increase traffic past homes where children play. What are the plans?** There will be access points at both McGregor Farm Road and Wenzel Road. The Stantec Traffic Impact Study — available in the Reports section of the website - identifies Wenzel Road and the Perimeter Highway as the principal traffic routes for the development. Required improvements include an additional turning lane and a possible acceleration lane at the Wenzel/Perimeter intersection. Some traffic is expected to flow north on McGregor Farm Road to Highway 59, with intersection improvements at the lights also required. Traffic choices cannot be fully controlled — residents of the development will choose their own routes. Questions can be directed to the traffic engineer consultant on our website www.meadowsdevelopmet.ca before the next open house to explain route assignments, projected volumes, and the modelling in plain language. On road damage during any future construction: the contractor is responsible for repairing damage to local roads caused by construction activity.
13	**Noise study — Is a noise study included in the traffic report? Residents near the highway are experiencing worsening noise, and any new traffic from this development will add to it.** A noise study is not included in the current traffic report. The team noted this as a fair point and will consider whether a separate noise analysis or mitigation assessment should be undertaken.
14	**Evidence of housing demand — Where is the information coming from that East St. Paul residents want the housing types being proposed? No one has ever canvassed or surveyed the community.** That is a fair challenge, and the team will be straightforward about it: no formal survey or statistically significant poll was commissioned. The observation that drove the analysis is that East St. Paul is overwhelmingly single-family detached housing — over 90% — and there are essentially no options for residents who want to downsize or access a different housing form while remaining in the community. Combined with the demographic data showing 60% of household maintainers are over 55, the team concluded there is an unmet need. That is not the same as a formal demand study, and the team will not overstate it. The Secondary Plan also identifies the need for diverse housing as a policy objective, so this is not solely a market observation — it is also a planning direction.
15	**Lot sizes and unit counts — What are the actual lot sizes being proposed, how many units will be in each housing category, and how does this compare to what currently exists in East St. Paul?** To be direct: the lots in this development will generally be smaller than most existing lots in East St. Paul. The Secondary Plan calls for smaller lots in this area. The team is not suggesting otherwise. What the team has tried to demonstrate is that smaller lots do not necessarily mean lower home values — the property assessment data for East St. Paul shows that home values are relatively consistent regardless of lot size. The team acknowledged, however, that the distinction between lot size and home value is not the same as the feel and character of a community, and that is a fair point. The team committed at this open house to publish a clear comparison table — showing lot size ranges, number of lots and units by type, land area by type, and a side-by-side comparison with existing East St. Paul development patterns — before the next session.

#	QUESTION & ANSWERS
16	**Use of the term 'aging in place' and whether east of Highway 59 is really part of the East St. Paul community — The Government of Canada defines aging in place as living safely and independently in your own home, not moving to high-density development. And is a site separated by a major highway really a 'familiar community' for East St. Paul seniors?** Two important points were raised together in this exchange. On the terminology: the concern is well made, and the team accepts it. The phrase "aging in place" will not be used going forward. The intent was to describe housing options that allow people to remain in East St. Paul as their needs and life stage change — downsizing, reducing maintenance, having accessible options — but the team acknowledges that "aging in place" has a specific meaning rooted in health, housing, and social supports in one's own home, and using it in this context is not accurate. Future materials will describe the housing objective without that phrase. On the question of whether the site east of Highway 59 constitutes a familiar community for East St. Paul residents, the resident raised a genuine and thoughtful point. Highway 59 is a significant physical barrier, and the team acknowledged that. Andrew responded that the site is legally part of East St. Paul and he believes it to be part of the community, but accepted that some residents do not feel that way and that this is legitimate feedback. The team's view is that for residents who have lived in East St. Paul for much of their lives and want to remain, this development offers an option that currently does not exist — rather than being forced to move south or to Winnipeg when they wish to downsize. Whether that resonates with residents is a fair question for the community to consider. The resident also asked the team to quantify how many residents had expressed interest in the proposed housing options. The team acknowledged that no formal survey was done and that the basis for the demand observation was informal and word-of-mouth, not statistically significant. They committed not to overstate it.
17	**Council briefing — Was Council briefed before the application was submitted, and did Council express support for the proposal as presented?** The development team met with Council prior to submission. Council did not give a clear indication of support or opposition — they did not provide a thumbs-up or thumbs-down. The principal concern raised by at least one Council member was building height. The development team conveyed the same position it has expressed throughout this process: the project will comply with a three-storey limit if that is the Council's direction, while noting the perceived tension between that limit and other Secondary Plan objectives.

#	QUESTION & ANSWERS
18	**Secondary Plan risk and Municipal Board appeal — The Secondary Plan is in limbo. It could be changed by the Municipal Board, which could affect the height limits and other parameters on which this proposal is based. Does the development team see that as a risk, and what happens to this proposal if the Municipal Board changes the Secondary Plan?** This was one of the most substantive questions of the evening, raised toward the end of the session. The resident correctly identified that the Secondary Plan is currently under appeal at the Municipal Board and could be changed — potentially to the development's benefit or detriment. The team confirmed this is a known and considered risk. The development team's position is that whatever decision the Municipal Board and Council ultimately make, they will be required to implement the plan to comply with that decision. If the Municipal Board changes the Secondary Plan — for example, reverting to five or six storeys, tightening other policies, or altering the land use framework — the development would need to be amended accordingly. The team acknowledged that if changes were radical enough, they would have to assess whether to proceed or not. On the building height specifically, the team noted that a change from the current proposal's taller buildings down to three storeys is a relatively straightforward adjustment — fewer units per building, commercial space potentially converted to residential, and overall density pulled back in line with economics. The plan, in the team's view, is malleable enough to accommodate a range of outcomes. On the broader point about whether the Secondary Plan's current uncertainty makes this an awkward time to be bringing forward a proposal: the team acknowledged the timing is not ideal and that some council members could have done more to address the conflicting policies — particularly the compact, walkable, mixed-use vision alongside a three-storey height cap — before the plan was finalized. However, the team also noted that under the current legal framework, the application must be assessed against the General Development Designation (which is far more permissive), while the Secondary Plan can be used by Council for guidance. The current legal framework is the General Development Designation — not the Secondary Plan. The team has voluntarily aligned the design with the more restrictive Secondary Plan standard where applicable.
19	**School site within the development — If the Province requires a school on this site rather than on the lands identified to the north, where would it go?** If the Province or school division determined that a school site was required within the Meadows development itself, the most likely location would be the western end of the site in the multi-family zone — some of that land could be repurposed or reconfigured to accommodate a school. The team noted that the Peguis Real Estate Trust was not consulted during the Secondary Plan process and did not participate in the selection of the school locations shown in that plan. The team is open to working collaboratively on a school-site solution if required.
20	**Total unit count and emergency services — Does the 2,300-dwelling figure apply to the entire site? And how will volunteer fire, RCMP, and other emergency services cope with thousands of new residents?** The approximately 2,300-dwelling figure refers to the entire roughly 183-acre site. The development is expected to take 15 to 20 years to build out — it will not arrive all at once, and the municipality will have time to plan and resource emergency services accordingly. Capital levies and annual property tax revenue from the development — estimated at approximately $3 million in municipal property taxes and $5 million in school taxes per year at full build-out — provide the financial base for the municipality to fund those services. How those revenues are allocated is the municipality's decision, not the developer's.

#	QUESTION & ANSWERS
21	**Development timing — Could this development start in the next few years? And can it proceed before the wastewater issue is resolved?** No homes can be built, and no one can move in until wastewater capacity is operational. That is not a preference — it is a physical constraint. Water capacity can likely be addressed more quickly, but the wastewater treatment plant is the gating factor, and even under the most favourable conditions — all decisions aligned and moving — that is likely a minimum of two to three years away. The development team is open to conversations with the municipality about whether there are financial mechanisms that could accelerate that timeline, even where the developer has no formal obligation to fund plant upgrades.
22	**Highway traffic noise and sound wall — Will the project provide any noise mitigation for residents near McGregor Farm Road? And why would residents not simply use Wenzel Road rather than McGregor Farm Road to access Winnipeg?** A sound wall was not part of the current plan, and the team did not identify a clear location or basis for attributing noise mitigation costs to this development specifically. The team acknowledged the concern and said it would look at this further. Questions can be directed to the traffic engineer consultant on our website www.meadowsdevelopmet.ca before the next open house to explain route assignment modelling and address this question properly.
23	**Local business engagement — Has the team received feedback from local businesses, and will there be a specific engagement effort with the business community?** Mailers have been sent to both residents and businesses throughout East St. Paul. However, a dedicated conversation with local business owners has not yet happened, and the team agreed that it should. This will be addressed before the next open house.

Learn more and stay informed by visiting our website at

www.meadowsdevelopment.ca