



111 Pinehouse Drive, Saskatoon &  
Live Streaming via GoToMeeting.com  
Monday, March 15, 2021  
Call to Order @ 10:13 a.m.  
Meeting Adjourned @ 11:08 a.m.  
Meeting Time: hr. 55 mins.

## Planning Committee Minutes

### Present

**Attending:** Reeve Harwood, Councillors: Germs, Chuhanjuk, Haduik, Greenwood, Pruim, Froese-Koojenga, Vaandrager and Trask

### **Absent:**

**Staff:** Adam Tittlemore, Administrator; Rebecca Row, Director of Planning & Development; Craig Clements, Director of Finance; Brittney Beckie, Planner II; Jessica Williams, Engineering Assistant; Audrey Shoard, Treasury/Corporate Records Clerk; Nicole Bowden, Administrative Assistant.

### 1. Call To Order

Chairperson Pruim called the meeting to order at 10:13 a.m.

### 2. Adopt Agenda

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

7. Saskatoon Freeway Alignment – Councillor Germs

Haduik: That the Planning Committee Agenda be adopted.

**Carried Unanimously**

### 3. Planning Carryforward Action List

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

#### ➤ **Recommendation:**

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

**Carried Unanimously**

### 4. Proposed Textual Amendments – Blumenheim Policy Framework

#### **Background:**

Council will recall considering a report at the February 8, 2021 meeting in relation to the proposed textual amendments to the Agricultural Residential 3 (AR3) Zoning District in the R.M. Zoning Bylaw. At that meeting, Council asked for revisions to include regulations to address the existing Intensive Livestock Operation (ILO) located in Blumenheim. This report outlines options on how to regulate ILOs within the AR3 zoning district.

#### **Information on Existing ILO:**

The current ILO has existed in Blumenheim since the late 1970's as a dairy farm. However, no development permit was ever issued for the ILO. The ILO did however receive approval from the Ministry of Agriculture in 1978 for 42 animal units. In addition, many of the buildings on the property do not conform to setbacks and do not have approved permits.

In 2006, under AG zoning, the landowner applied for a discretionary use to obtain approval for the ILO. However, not all co-existence agreements were obtained and the application was never considered by Council. It was typical of the time that conditions of approval and recommendations to Council were not presented unlike

what is done currently at the R.M. so if co-existence agreements could not be produced, the application did not proceed forward.

In 2007, the new AR3 zoning district was created and an ILO was not added as a permitted or discretionary use within the AR3 zoning district. As a result, any subsequent discretionary use applications received by R.M. Administration could not be considered by Council as the use is not included in the AR3 District.

In 2008, new owners took over the ILO and in 2015, a discretionary use application was submitted to increase the number of animal units to 300. At the time, the R.M. indicated to the owners that the use is non-conforming. The owners could continue to use the site as long as no expansions or changes in operation occurred. The discretionary use application was withdrawn as it could not be processed. The ILO did however receive approval from the Ministry of Agriculture for 300 animal units.

**Analysis:**

Based on feedback and consultation, R.M. Administration proposes the following options:

1. Maintain status quo. ILOs would not be added as a discretionary use.
  - The existing ILO would continue to be considered a non-conforming use that would not be eligible for expansion.
  - Ratepayer feedback to date has suggested this would be the preferred option.
2. Introduce ILOs as a discretionary use within the AR3 zoning district for existing operations only and maximize the number of animal units at 450.
  - This option would allow Council to consider expansions for existing operations up to a maximum of 450 animal units. In this option new ILO's will not be permitted but existing ILO's zoned AR3 would be able to apply for expansions.
  - R.M. Administration spoke with the ILO operator who indicated that 450 is the number of animal units they would like to expand to. Council can modify the maximum number proposed for this bylaw regulation should they like the approach but not the maximum number.
  - Without an application to review, the Ministry of Agriculture cannot confirm if they would support more than 300 animal units at this location.
  - Ratepayer feedback to date has been against allowing the existing ILO to expand. A maximum number may be more palatable however this has not been previously discussed as feedback had suggested not including it as an allowable use.
3. Introduce ILOs as a discretionary use within the AR3 zoning district, do not restrict them to existing only and have no cap on the number of animal units permitted.
  - This option would treat ILO's very similar to other agricultural zoning districts. New and expansions to the existing ILO could be considered by Council with the regulations following the normal bylaw provisions.
  - Other options for Council to consider are allowing for both new and expanded ILO's but providing a maximum number or not allowing for new ILO's but expansions having no maximum number.
  - Ratepayer feedback to date has been against allowing the existing ILO to expand and against allowing new ILOs to locate within Blumenheim. It is expected this would be the least supported option.

Based on ratepayer feedback to date and consideration of potential land use conflicts, R.M. Administration would recommend option 1 where the ILO could exist as a non-conforming use. However, should Council want to allow for an expansion to the ILO, option 2 would be recommended. Council should determine which option is feasible so R.M. Administration can proceed with finalizing the bylaw and posting it for Blumenheim ratepayer feedback. A summary of the feedback would be brought back to Council to consider prior to first reading.

➤ **Recommendation:**

Pruim: That Council support Option 2 to introduce ILOs as a discretionary use within the AR3 zoning district for existing operations only and cap the number of animal units at 300.

Recorded Vote:

For: Chairperson Pruim, Reeve Harwood, Councillors: Germs, Haduik, Greenwood, Froese-Koojenga, Vaandrager

Opposed: Councillors: Chuhanuik, Trask

**Carried**

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

**Background:**

The last Regional Oversight Executive Committee (REC) meeting was held on February 25, 2021; discussions included a presentation on the draft North Concept Plan, an update on the P4G Zoning Bylaw, discussions on the proposed Green Network Phase 2 (East) Drainage Study and an overview of the 2020 P4G Annual Report. The next REC meeting is scheduled for March 25, 2021 and the next Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) meeting is scheduled for April 29, 2021.

The drafting of the District Zoning Bylaw is working through its final phases. A draft bylaw was provided to all P4G municipalities for review and comment to provide any major flags or areas of concern; final comments have been provided. The District Zoning Bylaw is now undergoing legal review/final edits. At the REC meeting, it was determined that P4G will post the draft bylaw for public review prior to first reading; dates to be determined subject to the legal review. It is expected the District Zoning Bylaw will be forwarded to Corman Park for a public hearing and bylaw readings after the April ROC meeting assuming there are not substantial revisions required after the public consultation.

Following Corman Park approval, the P4G District Official Community Plan, P4G Planning District Agreement, and P4G District Zoning Bylaw will be sent to the Province for review and ministerial approval and establishment of the P4G Planning District in summer 2021.

Work continues on the P4G North Concept Plan; a final plan was provided for municipal review and comment by February 5, 2021. Based on this municipal review and comments provided at the REC meeting, additional revisions are required to the final plan. Meetings are being coordinated with the project team to address the remaining issues including regional transportation connections, urban mixed use and regional infrastructure land uses and the future regional community services node. More information will be provided once available.

➤ **Recommendation:**

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

**Carried Unanimously**

6. **South Saskatchewan River Flood Plain Mitigation – Feasibility Study**

**Background:**

Council will recall a presentation at their October 19, 2020 Planning Committee Meeting with respect to the flood mitigation study to analyze three different dyke options for flood mitigation of the South Saskatchewan River, south of Saskatoon. A draft technical memo had been completed and Barr Engineering provided an overview of the results. Since the hydrology services division with the Water Security Agency (WSA) had yet to complete a technical and quality control review the presentation was only received as information.

WSA has now completed that review and no updates were required. The final report can be received as information and the project closed out. No major changes or edits have been made to the report since Council last saw it in October 2020.

The concept level cost range for each alternative is listed below. These cost estimates are based on concept-level designs, quantities, and unit prices. Costs will change with further detailed design. Operation and maintenance and construction administration costs are not included. Time value-of-money escalation costs are not included.

Description	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
High end of cost range (+50%)	\$8,700,000	\$24,000,000	\$39,700,000
Median cost	\$5,800,000	\$16,000,000	\$26,400,000
Low end of cost range (-25%)	\$4,300,000	\$12,000,000	\$19,800,000

Council should determine if any or all, of the options are feasible and any next steps they would like to consider. As previously reported, the province has indicated dykes are not the preferred or endorsed method for protecting new development. Council should consider how they may liaise with the WSA to proceed with dyke options for flood mitigation should they consider any of the options to be feasible. This may be an important step to consider prior to completing additional detail design, geotechnical work or cost-benefit analysis.

Council is also reminded of the intent to communicate the outcomes of this feasibility study with area residents through the current policy phase of the flood study which kicked off in January 2021. This engagement is confirmed as one of the policy study deliverables.

➤ **Recommendation:**

Greenwood: That Council receive the Final Floodway Reduction Feasibility Analysis Technical Memorandum from Barr Engineering as information.

**Carried Unanimously**

**7. Saskatoon Freeway Alignment**

Councillor Germs brought forward a question regarding the availability of comments received by the Ministry of Highways on phase 2 of the Saskatoon Freeway functional planning study. Administration updated planning committee on the study timeline, other engagement opportunities and administrative involvement in the study.

**8. Adjourn Meeting**

Chuhaniuk: That the Planning Committee meeting be adjourned at 11:08 a.m.

**Carried Unanimously**



Administrator