



111 Pinehouse Drive, Saskatoon & Live Streaming via GoToMeeting.com
Monday, July 5, 2021
Call to Order @ 9:39 a.m.
Meeting Suspended @ 11:06 a.m.
Meeting Resumed @ 11:21 a.m.
Meeting Adjourned @ 12:15 a.m.
Meeting Time: 2 hr. 21 mins.

Planning Committee Minutes

Present

Attending: Reeve Harwood, Councillors: Germs, Chuhaniuk, Haduik, Greenwood, Pruim, Froese-Kooijenga, Vaandrager and Trask (Electronically).

Absent:

Staff: Rebecca Row, Director of Planning & Development; Craig Clements, Director of Finance; Joel Cardinal, Director of Public Works; Brittney Beckie, Planner II; Jessica Mitchell, Planner II; Kylie McLean, Senior Planner; Audrey Shoard, Treasury/Corporate Records Clerk; Nicole Bowden, Administrative Assistant.

1. Call To Order

Chairperson Pruim called the meeting to order at 9:39 a.m.

2. Adopt Agenda

The Committee approved the Planning Committee Agenda with the following additions:

- 9. Crossmount Sewage Lagoon – Councillor Chuhaniuk

Greenwood: That the Planning Committee Agenda be adopted.

Carried Unanimously

3. Delegation – 9:30 a.m. – Wallace Insights & Firebird Business Consulting – Planning Fee Review

As Council will recall, earlier this year the R.M. contracted Wallace Insights, Firebird Business Consulting and V3 to undertake an update to the R.M.'s planning fees and subdivision servicing fees. Alan Wallace and Doug Ramage were in attendance to provide Council with an understanding of the project and introduce the project scope, schedule and deliverables.

➤ **Recommendation:**

Haduik: That the presentation from Alan Wallace and Doug Ramage on the planning fee review be received as information.

Carried Unanimously

Meeting Break 9:59 a.m. to 10:04 a.m.

4. Delegations – 10:00 a.m. – Garry Derenoski & Sheldon Giesbrecht – Casa Rio

Garry Derenoski and Sheldon Giesbrecht, ratepayers in Division 2, addressed the Planning Committee separately regarding development concerns including effects on health, safety, water and sewage disposal based on density of proposed and/or approved development and the professional recommendations being provided by R.M. Administration.

➤ **Recommendation:**

Chuhaniuk: That the presentation from Garry Derenoski be received as information.

Carried Unanimously

Handwritten initials: "cl" and "JA" at the bottom right of the page.

➤ **Recommendation:**

Germ: That the presentation from Sheldon Giesbrecht be received as information.

Carried Unanimously

The Planning Committee Meeting was suspended at 11:06 a.m. to go to the Administration Committee Meeting.

The Planning Committee Meeting was resumed at 11:21 a.m.

5. **Planning Carryforward Action List**

The Committee was presented with the Planning Carryforward Action List and updates pertaining thereto.

➤ **Recommendation:**

Greenwood: That Council receive the Planning Carryforward Action List as presented.

Carried Unanimously

6. **Saskatoon North Partnership for Growth (P4G) Update**

Background:

The next Regional Oversight Executive Committee (REC) meeting was rescheduled from June 24, 2021 to July 29, 2021 and the July 29, 2021 ROC meeting was cancelled in lieu of the rescheduled REC meeting and scheduled September 30, 2021 meeting.

The District Zoning Bylaw was given first reading at the June 14, 2021 R.M. Council meeting. A public hearing is being held on August 16, 2021. The District Zoning Bylaw is the final document necessary to create the P4G Planning District. Since the planning district only includes lands within Corman Park, the R.M. is the only municipality required to pass the District Zoning Bylaw.

Following Corman Park approval, the P4G DOCP, Planning District Agreement and District Zoning Bylaw will be sent to the Province for review and ministerial approval and establishment of the P4G Planning District.

Work continues on the P4G North Concept Plan; a revised draft plan was provided for municipal review and comment. Final comments are being provided with more information on finalizing the North Concept Plan and bringing it forward for approval expected at the upcoming REC meeting.

The P4G Director, Neal Sarnecki, has resigned effective July 30, 2021; a strategic planning session will be undertaken this fall by the P4G members to discuss the requirements for staffing of P4G. R.M. Administration will be working with the P4G Director over the coming weeks to insure there is no effect on establishment of the P4G Planning District or ongoing P4G related projects. At this time, no major effects on the R.M. are anticipated by the resignation; more information will be provided once available.

➤ **Recommendation:**

Froese-Kooijenga: That the Saskatoon North Partnership for Growth (P4G) update be received as information.

Carried Unanimously

7. **South R.M. Ratepayer Survey Summary**

Background:

Council will recall discussing the South R.M. Ratepayer Survey at the May 3, 2021 Planning Committee Meeting. The survey was motivated by the desire to gather

al
A

feedback on several policy topics that Council had identified as being important to residents and sometimes controversial in nature. The survey was available on the R.M.'s website from June 7 to 30 (24 calendar days). Advertising methods included the following:

- Approximately 1250 mailouts to each landowner in the survey area;
- 6 portable signs placed along high-traffic corridors;
- Ad placements in the Clark's Crossing Gazette and feature article in the June 18 edition;
- Advertising on digital message board at South Corman Park School; and
- Feature on front page of R.M. website.

To help understand which advertising methods were effective, survey respondents were asked how they found out about the survey. The most common answer was the mailout, with billboards being the second most common. However, due to the timing of the newspaper advertisements, some people may have responded before the ads were published which may somewhat skew the response. Based on the number of responses received, it appears that the combination of advertising methods used was successful, particularly the new approach of using portable signs along busy roadways.

At the time of writing (June 29), a total of 239 surveys were completed, which is a 19% response rate based on an estimated 1250 landowners in the survey area. This includes three (3) paper copies submitted of approximately 10 individuals who requested a hard paper copy from the office.

Based on the methods used and the response rate achieved, R.M. Administration is satisfied with the methods of communication used to promote the survey and would recommend similar methods for future surveys. R.M. Administration would also recommend that Council continue to consider online surveys as an option when looking to obtain ratepayer feedback.

High Level Overview of Results

- Respondents were asked if they live in a multi-parcel country residential subdivision, on an acreage outside of a multi-parcel subdivision, or on a farm residence. Results are still being tabulated however initial results suggest the response was even across sectors and that there was no one property type that was over-represented.
- When asked which services/infrastructure landowners had concerns about, the top three responses were roads (53.1%), wastewater (46%) and solid waste disposal (garbage and recycling (40.2%)).
- When asked to identify the three most important topics that Corman Park needs to address, the top three responses were road maintenance (53.1%), restricting the number of new country residential subdivisions (52.3%), and groundwater protection to prevent wells from being contaminated (46.4%).
- 45.6% respondents indicated they felt sea cans should be allowed in country residential subdivisions, while 39.7% of respondents felt that sea cans should not be allowed. 13% had no opinion.
- 59.4% of respondents were open to re-subdivision in certain instances, where feasible, 13% said residents should be able to re-subdivide in every circumstance, and 22.6% said under no circumstances should residents be able to re-subdivide their property.

A more comprehensive summary of the survey responses along with R.M. Administration's recommendations on project scope for the South R.M. Concept Plan and any other potential projects will be brought to Council at a future meeting once a detailed analysis has been completed.

➤ Recommendation:

Chuhaniuk: That Council accept the South R.M. Survey Summary as information.

Carried Unanimously

A ce

8. **R.M. Official Community Plan Update**

Background:

Council will recall receiving a report at the April 12, 2021 Planning Committee Meeting identifying the proposed R.M. Official Community Plan (OCP) and Zoning Bylaw internal project to update the two documents. Since that time the project has kicked off and is in the first phase. The purpose of this report is to provide information about the importance of an OCP and to facilitate a discussion with Council about what their vision and goals are for Corman Park so that it can be articulated in the new OCP. Similar feedback will also be obtained through upcoming engagement sessions with R.M. ratepayers, rights holders and stakeholders to get a variety of perspectives and information to be incorporated into draft policies for review at a later time.

Analysis:

Official Community Plan

An OCP provides the overall framework for achieving organized, sustainable and planned development. It outlines the long-term vision of communities through a broad set of goals, objectives and policies. An OCP includes policies related to land use, transportation, culture, utilities and recreation.

The OCP provides the overall guiding principles and policies for Corman Park's development. An OCP is required to implement a zoning bylaw, and to enable zoning bylaw regulations. All applications are reviewed to ensure they meet the policies and regulations of both the OCP and the zoning bylaw.

The Planning and Development Act, 2007 (PDA)

The PDA is a legal document outlining the regulations for everything affiliated with planning including responsibilities, subdivision, zoning, OCP, appeals, servicing fees, etc. Within the PDA, requirements are outlined for what *must* be included in an OCP such as; sustainable current and future land use and development, current and future economic development, source water protection, management of environmentally sensitive lands, etc. It also contains what *may* be included such as; policy regarding the use of dedicated lands, maps that denote current or future land use or policy areas, contain concept plans, etc. As R.M. Administration begins to draft the policies, vision and goals of the OCP, feedback will be included from R.M. ratepayers and Council while also incorporating the required regulations for the OCP.

Statements of Provincial Interest

The current R.M.'s OCP was drafted in 1994. Since that time the province has released the *Statements of Provincial Interest (SPIs)* which are an additional set of policies municipalities are obligated to follow when drafting their OCP and zoning bylaw. There are 16 SPIs that must be incorporated into all planning documents.

The SPIs and current OCP have been reviewed, and R.M. Administration has identified where the document is lacking in meeting the SPIs. Most sections require only a few updates to fully meet the SPI. For example, the Inter-municipal Cooperation SPI will be met by addressing land in areas of common interest including updating the 5 per ¼ constraints boundaries around Dalmeny and Langham and protecting lands for future development. Below are the two SPIs that have not been addressed within the current OCP:

- **First Nations and Metis Engagement** – Although this is current practice from Corman Park, there are no policies around engagement with First Nations and Metis communities within the OCP.
- **Economic Growth** – There is no policy currently that considers the economic benefits/opportunities of development. New policies are required to address this SPI.

Updated and new policies will be included in the new OCP to address all 16 SPIs.

Corman Park versus P4G Official Community Plans:

It has been acknowledged that an update to the OCP is required in part due to the new Saskatoon North Partnership for Growth (P4G) OCP coming into effect. There has been suggestion to use the P4G OCP as a baseline for Corman Park's OCP. Although some policies can be brought over to Corman Park's OCP, that is not the case for the whole document. Corman Park and P4G are two different planning entities, both managed by the R.M., however have different goals and objectives in some policy areas.

A cl

The P4G OCP is a regional plan with the intent of managing rapid growth and economic development while considering the opportunities and challenges of five different municipalities. One of the goals of the P4G OCP is creating a planning framework to transition land from rural to urban development and identifying the amount of land needed to grow the region to one million people. Policies in the P4G OCP must address the conditions created by the high level of density, the proximity to urban municipalities, and the amount of development pressure experienced in the region. There are also policies that address unique features in the P4G Planning District such as Wanuskewin Heritage Park, the agricultural research hub along Highway 41, and the Corman Park-Osler Agri-Food Node.

In order for Corman Park's OCP to be as effective as possible, it must address the specific opportunities, demographics, and economic conditions in areas outside of P4G. While it is expected that growth will be experienced throughout the entire municipality, areas outside of P4G do not need to consider future urban expansion to the same extent. There may be some types of development that are accommodated more easily outside of P4G, like sand and gravel extraction, wind or solar farms, and value-added agriculture. There may also be some different considerations when it comes to servicing and infrastructure outside P4G versus within it.

Visioning Exercise:

Given the above considerations, the overall vision of Corman Park will differ from the vision of P4G. R.M. Administration wants to ensure that feedback on the direction of the OCP's overall vision and goals are provided by Council. The intent of the OCP update is to refresh and realign the R.M.'s policies and goals with the changing economic and development climate, as well as to ensure the vision for the area outside of P4G addresses the requirements of an OCP as per the PDA and SPIs.

R.M. Administration recognizes the varied landscape and opportunities Corman Park provides outside of P4G, and wants to ensure the vision captures the diversity and complexity that Corman Park represents. Recognizing the vastness and diverse landscape of Corman Park, R.M. Administration is reviewing the potential for creating policies based on specific areas as opposed to all policies covering the entire R.M. An example would be sand and gravel. Major sand and gravel resources are concentrated in specific areas in Corman Park, and likely some policies could be specific to known gravel areas over other areas. The policies would not prevent gravel extraction from occurring in other areas, but would identify and highlight areas for other types of development and what conflicts could occur, such as developing multi-parcel residential adjacent to these major sand and gravel areas.

R.M. Administration requests feedback on the following, with a focus on the R.M. areas outside of P4G. An overall map and individual maps were attached for reference, focused on the differing challenges/opportunities presented in each area. There are seven (7) individual maps:

1. What is Council's overall vision for Corman Park?
2. What does the municipality (or the different areas) look like in 15-20 years? How would it differ from the present?
3. What makes the individual areas unique and what makes them the same, if anything?
4. Does Council know of any unique features in these areas that should be protected/enhanced/avoided?
5. Does Council consider all areas equal for development? Or does each area represent something different to Council where the vision, goals and policies can be tailored to address its uniqueness?

The current OCP planning framework is premised at a high level on the following goals and objectives:

- A. Maintain the agricultural character as the primary land use, preserving productive land and preventing fragmentation;
- B. Land use policies supporting balanced and orderly growth of an array of diverse uses;
- C. Planned country residential development for a diversity of lifestyles can occur as long as it does not conflict with agriculture and results in minimal costs for the R.M.;
- D. Rational framework for the rural/urban fringe that will not compromise the R.M.'s growth potential;
- E. Industrial development should balance economic benefit with avoiding environmental conflicts;

A ce

- F. Create commercial development that provides service to the residents and travelling public;
- G. Preservation of the natural features and environmental integrity; and
- H. Sound and efficient management of the planning and administration process.

Are these goals and objectives still valid? What would you change, add or remove?

Discussion ensued and Council provided questions and comments to Planning Administration.

Councillor Chuhaniuk removed her addition to the Agenda at this time.

9. **Adjourn Meeting**

Chuhaniuk: That the Planning Committee meeting be adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Carried Unanimously



Acting Administrator

A al