MEADOWS DEVELOPMENT

What We've Heard at Open House 2

Monday, July 13, 2026 | Attendance: 28 Total

This document summarizes the questions received during the second 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 **Property tax revenue assumptions: What are the specific assumptions behind the $3 million municipal and $5 million school tax figures? How many units, what lot sizes, and what home values were used?**

The $3 million and $5 million figures were calculated by taking the projected number of homes to be built, approximately 2,300 units across the full site, and applying the current 2026 mill rates (property tax and school tax mill rates) against estimated market values for those homes.

The calculation was not done on a per-square-foot basis. Instead, the team used ranges of anticipated market values based on the three broad home-value categories presented in the engagement materials: homes under $700,000, homes between $700,000 and $1 million, and homes above $1 million. Those value ranges were informed by looking at what homes in similar developments are selling for today and applying that to the proposed mix of housing types on this site. The current mill rates were then applied to those assessed values to produce the tax estimates.

On the question of whether the RM has input into these numbers: yes. The RM sets the mill rates, and if those rates change, the annual tax revenue figures would change accordingly. The capital levies of up to $40 million are separate from and in addition to the ongoing annual property tax revenue.

---

2 **Lot sizes in the development: What are the actual lot widths and depths being proposed for the single-family homes? Can you express that in square footage or acreage?**

Lot widths in the development will vary by zone and housing type:

- **Back-lane townhouse lots:** approximately 26 to 28 feet wide
- **Front-lane single-family lots in the village neighborhood:** approximately 30 to 36 feet wide
- **Lots in the village edge:** approximately 36 to 44 feet wide; lookout and walkout lots: approximately 50 feet wide

Depths range from approximately 110 to 120 feet for standard lots, with the deeper pond-front lots extending up to approximately 170 feet.

In area terms, most lots will be smaller than one-eighth of an acre (approximately 6,000 square feet). Some will be smaller than that. These lot sizes reflect what the Secondary Plan calls for compact, urban-scale residential development, and are consistent with lot sizes already found in parts of East St. Paul today, such as Country Villas and Gateway Point.

#	QUESTION & ANSWERS
3	**Long-term municipal sustainability: Is the development team making the business case to the municipality that the long-term operating costs of this development will be covered by the revenue it generates? The numbers don't seem to add up.** The team responded to this on two levels. **On the specific numbers:** the \$3 million in annual municipal property taxes and \$5 million in school taxes are annual, ongoing contributions. Combined with the up-front capital levy injection of up to \$40 million, the development generates substantial revenue for the municipality and the school division over time. Higher-density development is also inherently a more efficient use of infrastructure, more units are serviced per kilometre of road and pipe than on large-lot estate properties, which means lower per-unit operating cost for the municipality. **On the broader point about mill rates and long-term funding sufficiency:** the development team agreed this is a legitimate question but one they cannot answer on behalf of the municipality. Mill rates are set by the RM, not the developer. If property taxes across the municipality are insufficient to cover long-term operating costs - a concern that applies to all growth, not just this development - that is a policy question for the RM and Province to address. The developer's contribution through capital levies and ongoing tax revenue is a significant and tangible input toward that. The resident's underlying concern, that municipalities often pool general revenues without allocating them to the specific infrastructure they are meant to maintain, was acknowledged as a fair and real problem, though one that is not within the developer's control to resolve.
4	**Density and the Secondary Plan — Is this meeting a negotiation or just an explanation? Can the density be reduced, and by how much? Do residents have to formally request changes, or will council consider them?** This exchange covered several related points. **On whether density can be reduced:** yes, the density could be lower. The development was designed to the maximum density permitted under the applicable zoning, 13 units per acre across the site. A reduction in building height to three storeys could produce approximately 400 to 500 fewer units. Larger individual lot sizes could also reduce overall unit count, though the Secondary Plan policies push toward smaller lots in this location. **On the nature of this meeting:** this is a public engagement process, not a formal negotiation. The place for formal decisions is the public hearing, scheduled for July 21, 2026. Residents who want changes should attend the public hearing and present their views directly to Council. Council has the authority to approve the application with conditions, including conditions on height, phasing, density, or other elements, or to refuse it. **On the General Development Designation versus the Secondary Plan:** the application is legally reviewed under the General Development Designation (RRPD By-law 272/19), which is significantly more permissive than the Secondary Plan. The development team has voluntarily aligned the design with the more restrictive Secondary Plan standard. The team acknowledged that if they were designing purely to the General Development Designation, the development could look very different.

#	QUESTION & ANSWERS

5 **Building height and three-storey economics: You say going to three-storey buildings would compromise the commercial component and the walkable vision. But isn't that simply because you'd make less money?**

The team's response drew a distinction between developer profit and builder economics.

The development team (land developer) does not build the apartment buildings directly. They sell serviced land to builders. In Winnipeg, multi-family land sells for roughly $20,000 to $30,000 per door. With capital levies in excess of $15,000 per multi-family unit, the net return for the land developer on multi-family is not large.

The economics of the builder are more significant. Three-storey wood-frame construction is no longer the standard in the industry, it was common before building code changes allowed wood-frame construction up to six storeys. That change caused virtually all multi-family builders to move from four-storey to six-storey construction, because six-storey buildings are only marginally more expensive to build per unit than four-storey but generate significantly more revenue. Three-storey buildings, by contrast, are not economically efficient under current construction costs and are rarely built in Winnipeg today.

The consequence for the Meadows is that a three-storey cap would likely mean multi-family buildings are simply not built for a long time, the economics would not support it until costs or market conditions change. This would also eliminate the ground-floor commercial component, which requires density above it to be financially viable.

The team confirmed: if Council imposes a three-storey cap, the project will comply. But the practical effect is likely to be a significantly slower build-out and the loss of the mixed-use commercial component.

---

6 **Ethical responsibility: The school division is in deficit and can't fund new schools, Birds Hill School is already short of teachers, and emergency services are stretched. Doesn't the development team have an ethical obligation not to make those problems worse?**

This was one of the most substantive exchanges of the evening, raised by a resident who is a teacher in the local school system.

The resident's position: the *River East Transcona School Division* is currently operating in deficit and has taken out a loan to fund operations, something one of the residents described as unusual among school divisions. Birds Hill Schools do not have enough teachers for its current classes. The province does not have money for new schools. Emergency services are already stretched. Adding thousands of new residents makes all of these problems worse, and the development team cannot simply say "that's on the school division" or "that's on the RM."

The team's response: the developer contributes to these services through $40 million in capital levies and approximately $5 million per year in school taxes. The developer is also responsible for either providing a school site or contributing financially toward one. Beyond that, the team acknowledged they have no ability to direct how the province funds schools, set mill rates, hire teachers, or address provincial underfunding. If the argument is that the province is underfunding public services, the developer cannot resolve that regardless of whether this development proceeds. If population growth itself is the problem, then by extension no growth should occur anywhere, which the resident challenged as a false equivalence. The exchange did not reach resolution on this point.

The daycare chairman subsequently noted that the need for childcare in East St. Paul is acute regardless of this development - there are currently only 34 spaces in the municipality - and that the already-built daycare facility on the Meadows site represents $5.5 million in provincial investment sitting idle.

#	QUESTION & ANSWERS

7 **Secondary Plan and building height: The Secondary Plan already caps buildings at three storeys. You are not doing residents a favour by reducing from six to three - you are simply being required to comply with the plan.**

This point was raised directly and the team accepted it and responded: "You're correct. There's no point debating that."

The resident's position was: the development team has been framing the reduction from six storeys to three storeys as a concession made in response to public feedback, when in fact the Secondary Plan already limits buildings to three storeys. If the Municipal Board upholds Council's approval of the Secondary Plan, the three-storey limit is not a favour - it is the law.

MRA team noted that the Secondary Plan is currently under appeal at the Municipal Board and that while it is under appeal, the development team is legally permitted to bring forward an application that differs from it. The application must be assessed against the General Development Designation, not the Secondary Plan, until the Municipal Board makes its determination.

The team's position on this remains consistent: the project will comply with whatever Council and the Municipal Board determine. If the Secondary Plan is upheld at three storeys, the development proceeds at three storeys.

---

8 **Daycare: What is the status of the daycare facility on the Meadows site, and what is holding it up?**

The chairman of Created 4 Me - the local non-profit daycare operator - addressed this directly at the open house. Key points from his statement:

- Created 4 Me currently has 34 daycare spaces in the municipality. The need is acute regardless of any new development.
- The $5.5 million daycare facility built on the Meadows site was funded with provincial tax dollars and was intended to serve East St. Paul residents.
- The municipality declined the opportunity to provide municipal land for the daycare. The Peguis Real Estate Trust and the development group stepped up to provide the land on the Meadows site.
- The daycare board had the keys and was ready to open, with staff and children enrolled. It has been held up by provincial and municipal issues - not by anything the development group caused.
- The chairman asked residents to contact their local council members and ask what the situation is, and indicated that the board will put something publicly forward so that people can get more involved.

The development team confirmed their position remains the same as at Open House 1: questions about the daycare's legal and financial status, and its path to opening, should be directed to the Province and the Peguis Real Estate Trust. The private development group building the majority of the site had no involvement in the daycare.

#	QUESTION & ANSWERS

9 **Lot size and zoning: Will the single-family lots all be R1-8 zoning, or will there be a range? And where exactly will municipal services connect to the site?**

On zoning: the lots will not all be R1-8. The development includes a range of lot sizes and housing types across the site, as outlined in the site plan available on the project website and displayed at the open house. The proposed "RMX Meadows Zone" is site-specific and is designed to accommodate the mix of uses and lot configurations proposed.

On servicing: the intention is to connect to East St. Paul's municipal water and wastewater system. The connection point for wastewater will depend on where the upgraded or expanded wastewater treatment facility is located. For water, if the treatment facility north of the site remains in its current location, the development would connect there. All on-site infrastructure - roads, water, sewer, and drainage pipes - will be paid for by the developer. Off-site connections and their costs will be determined through the Development Agreement with the RM. The team confirmed a commitment to paying for the infrastructure required to service the site, including off-site runs if required.

10 **Wenzel Road damage: Road repair was promised for the spring and has still not been done. Residents have been waiting for months.**

The team acknowledged this directly and did not dispute it.

They confirmed that two quotes have been received for the repair work, and that it will be completed by September 2026.

11 **Population increase: How many people would this development add to East St. Paul, and over what timeframe?**

Using an average of two residents per dwelling unit across all housing types, a conservative figure that accounts for the full life cycle of a household (young families, empty nesters, seniors), the development would add approximately 4,500 to 5,000 people to East St. Paul over the 15 to 20 year build-out period.

A breakdown by type:

- Approximately 700 single-family homes: at 2.5 persons per unit, approximately 1,750 people
- Townhomes: likely slightly under 2.5 persons per unit
- Apartments: likely closer to 2 persons per unit or less

Spread over 15 to 20 years, this represents gradual growth — not a sudden population increase. East St. Paul's current population is approximately 9,745.

12 **Mr. Gudmundson: There was a person identified as Mr. Gudmundson who was given time to speak but declined, stating he would prefer to make his comments at the public hearing on July 21 where they would be formally recorded.**

He indicated he had concerns or information he wished to put on the public record, but chose to reserve those comments for the formal public hearing on July 21, 2026, where the session would be officially recorded and reach a larger audience.

#	QUESTION & ANSWERS
13	**Accountability and the RM: A resident argued that many of the problems being raised - daycare, schools, density - are ultimately the RM's responsibility, not the developer's, and that it is an election year.** A resident made the point directly that the development team is playing within the rules established by the RM, and that residents' frustration should be directed in large part at the RM, which approved the General Development Designation, the Secondary Plan, and the decision to lift the servicing moratorium. Density and population growth in East St. Paul are the RM's responsibility to manage. The resident also noted that it is an election year and that Council has not always governed in accordance with the wishes of the people who pay their salaries, implying that the public hearing and any subsequent election are the appropriate mechanisms for accountability. This view was contested by others in the room who felt the developer also bears some ethical responsibility for the downstream effects of a large development (see Q6). The development team did not take a position on the political dimensions of this exchange.