

## **SUMMARY OF COMMENTS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

**PROPONENT:** Fantasy Lake Golf Club Inc.  
**PROPOSAL NAME:** Fantasy Lake Golf Club  
**CLASS OF DEVELOPMENT:** 2  
**TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT:** Recreation  
**CLIENT FILE NO.:** 4425.00

### **OVERVIEW:**

The Proposal was dated March 4, 1999 and was received on March 12, 1999. The advertisement of the Proposal read as follows:

“A Proposal filed by Mr. Ron Osadac to construct an eighteen hole Par 3 golf course on a 64 acre parcel of land located on part of the NW ¼ 6-10-5 EPM in the Rural Municipality of Springfield. The property consists of 2681.30 feet of frontage on Settler’s Road between Provincial Trunk Highway 1. A Conceptual Plan for the development has been prepared by the Fantasy Lake Golf Club Inc. Construction is scheduled to begin in the Spring of 1999 with completion projected for the Spring of 2000.”

The Proposal was advertised in the Winnipeg Free Press on Saturday, March 20, 1999. Copies of the Proposal were placed in the Main Registry, the Manitoba Eco-Network, the Centennial Public Library. It was also distributed to the "Recreation" TAC members for comment. All comments were requested by April 16, 1999..

### **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

**Rural Municipality of Springfield** Letter dated April 12, 1999. Enclose a copy of a Resolution of Council No. 99-217 opposing the proposal on the basis that it is incompatible with the spirit and intent of Plan Winnipeg and the Springfield Development Plan '98. Advise that according to the Springfield Development Plan '98, the property is located within an “agricultural preserve area” with the surrounding land used primarily by the agricultural sector. Commercial recreational uses are already occupied inside the Perimeter Highway.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE:**

**Manitoba Rural Development** The property encompassing the Fantasy Lake Golf Club is designated Rural Areas by the Greater Winnipeg Development Plan. A draft R.M. of Springfield Development Plan (as given 2<sup>nd</sup> reading) designates the property as

Agricultural Preserve. However, the present Springfield Planning Scheme designates the property as “A” Rural District which permits golf courses in this zone.

Disposition: Rural Development’s position on the Proposal is based on the existing R.M. of Springfield planning Scheme. The R.M. of Springfield advise that they are guiding their current land use decisions by the policies outlined in the new plan, as noted in their comments on the Proposal. *See Recommendation below.*

.../2

**Project Review Summary**  
**Page -2-**

**Historic Resources** No concerns with regard to the project's potential to impact heritage resources.

**Mines Branch** No concerns.

**Urban Affairs** No concerns.

**Environment (Water Quality)** Recommend the following:

1. The use of mercurial based compounds should not be permitted.
2. Soil test results should be required to confirm that retention ponds are lined with a sufficient clay layer to restrict seepage into the groundwater column.
3. The water quality tests noted in the Proposal should be included with the proposal as baseline conditions.

Disposition: The above WQ comments can be accommodated as conditions of licencing

**Environment (Winnipeg Region)** The Winnipeg Region have concerns with regard to the disposal of sewage in subsurface sewage disposal fields constructed in heavy clay soils. Recommend that the proponent seek the advice of qualified sewage disposal system designers to examine alternate methods of sewage management.

Disposition: The above comments can be accommodated in the Licence by requiring that prior to the construction of a sewage disposal system the proponent submit an Engineering Report to the Director for approval. It is recommended that the Report outline the following:

- a) the results of a soil investigation of the proposed sewage disposal area.
- b) a detailed design for the sewage disposal system based on the soil investigation study results; and
- c) approval of the detailed design for the sewage disposal system by a Design Engineer.

**Natural Resources** A Water Rights Act Licence is required for the project. DNR reports that they do not have a record of an application for Water Rights Act Licence having been made, as stated in the Proposal. DNR also reports that the project may be impacted to a greater extent by two alternative routes for the Seine River diversion project, than indicated by the Proposal. Recommend that the proponent seek clarification from DNR regarding these matters.

Disposition: The Director Approvals advised the proponent in writing of these comments on April 20, 1999. *See Recommendation below.*

.../3

**Project Review Summary**  
**Page -3-**

**Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency** Based on the responses submitted on the Proposal from federal reviewing departments, application of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act will not be required.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Approvals Branch advised the proponent in writing on April 20, 1999 that the R.M. of Springfield had passed a Resolution opposing the Proposal and that the Environment Act review of the Proposal would therefore be held in abeyance pending any future decision by Council to permit the Development to proceed. A copy of the Resolution was faxed to the proponents. At the same time the proponent was advised of the Natural Resources comments regarding the alternate Seine River diversion routes under consideration and the requirement for a Water Rights Act Licence.

**FOLLOWUP**

The proponents made a presentation to the R.M. of Springfield Council regarding the land use decision on April 27, 1999. As a result the R.M. of Springfield agreed to rescind their previous motion and review the matter. On May 25, 1999 Council passed a Resolution approving the land use for the golf course as proposed. The proponent also advised that they have been in contact with Water Resources Branch and are aware of Seine River diversion routes under consideration. The proponents are confident that they can design the golf course to minimize the impact of the diversion on the golf course. The

proponents acknowledged that they have not applied for a Water Rights Act Licence but intend to do so, once the Council's decision on land use becomes known.

It is recommended that the Proposal be licenced pursuant to The Environment Act in accordance with the terms and conditions described in the attached Environment Act Licence.