



111 Pinehouse Drive, Saskatoon &
Live Streaming via GoToMeeting.com
Monday, May 3, 2021
Call to Order @ 9:16 a.m.
Meeting Adjourned @ 10:52 a.m.
Meeting Time: 1 hr. 36 mins.

Planning Committee Minutes

Present

Attending: Reeve Harwood, Councillors: Germs, Chuhaniuk, Greenwood, Pruim, Froese-Kooijenga, Vaandrager and Trask

Absent: Councillor Haduik

Staff: Rebecca Row, Director of Planning & Development; Craig Clements, Director of Finance; 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 9:16 a.m.

2. Adopt Agenda

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

6. Intensive Horticulture – Councillor Greenwood
7. R.M. Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw Review – Councillor Froese-Kooijenga

Froese-Kooijenga: 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:**

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

Carried Unanimously

4. Saskatoon North Partnership for Growth (P4G) Update

Background:

The next Regional Oversight Committee (ROC) meeting is scheduled for May 27, 2021 and the next Regional Oversight Executive Committee (REC) meeting is scheduled for June 24, 2021.

The drafting of the District Zoning Bylaw is working through its final phases. The draft District Zoning Bylaw was posted online for public review April 15-29, 2021. Comments received are being reviewed by the P4G Director and discussed with P4G. It is expected the District Zoning Bylaw will be forwarded to Corman Park for a public hearing and bylaw readings sometime after the upcoming 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/early fall 2021.

Work continues on the P4G North Concept Plan; a draft plan was provided for municipal review and comment by February 5, 2021. Based on this municipal review and comments provided at the February REC meeting, additional revisions are

required to finalize the plan. Meetings have been 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, however a ROC recommendation to endorse the final plan at the May meeting is expected.

➤ **Recommendation:**

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

Carried Unanimously

5. South R.M. Ratepayer Survey – Divisions 1 - 3

Background:

Council will recall approving the South R.M. Concept Plan (SRM CP) as part of the 2021 Planning Department Work Plan. The project includes creating a land use map and servicing strategy for Divisions 1, 2, and 3 south of the City of Saskatoon to address current and future development goals as well as promote partnerships. A number of other policy topics of interest such as re-subdivision have been proposed to be considered in the project scope.

The area currently has a mix of land uses including agriculture, numerous multi-parcel country residential acreage communities with small pockets of commercial development. Many developers have proposed new concepts including higher density residential development in addition to new areas of recreational, commercial and industrial development. There are numerous transportation and utility lines that criss-cross the area creating barriers to development which need to be identified and managed. In the past, servicing within Corman Park has been on an individual basis for each site without a comprehensive servicing strategy. Creating a vision for the area will ensure that existing and new development is complimentary to each other, and that services are provided as efficiently as possible.

A Request for Proposals (RFP) will be prepared for the SRM CP to hire a consultant to complete the work. R.M. Administration recommends doing targeted pre-consultation to help define the scope of the project to ensure the appropriate deliverables are included in the RFP. Depending on the outcomes of the consultation, Council may choose to remove deliverables from the scope of the SRM CP. For example, if the overwhelming majority of R.M. ratepayers do not want to revise the re-subdivision policies, Council can determine if that should still be included in the scope given the feedback from ratepayers or if alternatives should be explored such as including this policy work within the R.M. OCP and Zoning Bylaw update. The intent is to report back after the survey prior to posting any RFP for consultant work on the SRM CP.

It should be noted that Council has previously expressed a desire to conduct ratepayer surveys on a broad variety of topics. Council should determine if this survey should only be focused on topics related to the SRM CP such as density, servicing and re-subdivision or if the survey should be broadened so Council can receive input on other issues from the selected divisions. The intent would be to only do a survey in the SRM CP study area (see attached), even if broader questions are asked the intent is to not survey the entire R.M. at this time; Council would have to consider a process for other surveys at a later time.

Overview of Proposed Survey Topics:

Below is a list of themes R.M. Administration is proposing to include in the survey and an example question. Council should determine if the general themes capture the intent of the survey, and if they have specific examples of questions they want included they should be provided at this time:

- 1. Re-subdivision within existing multi parcel developments.** The intent is to determine if there is sufficient interest to warrant a review of the policies around re-subdivision given that both R.M. Council and Administration have received mixed feedback on this topic. The intent of the survey questions will be around scale, general desires and concerns.

Ex: "Should all property owners within multi-parcel residential subdivisions be able to re-subdivide their property into smaller parcels or should re-subdivision

only be allowed for those properties that are 'larger than average'? Why or why not?

2. **Increased density within the area.** The intent is to determine if residents are interested in seeing higher density multi-parcel residential developments than what is currently permitted within our policies. R.M. Administration has received proposals in the past representing these types of development. This information will provide direction on whether Administration should consider this as part of the SRM CP.

Ex: Is there a location within the study area where higher density multi-parcel residential developments could be located? Why or why not?

3. **Other land uses.** The intent is to determine if residents would like to see other land uses within the area such as commercial, recreational and light industrial. These types of land use represent the proposals seen by R.M. Administration over the past number of years in the study area. Obtaining this information will allow R.M. Administration to provide direction for the land use map portion of the project for Council to consider.

Ex: Generally speaking, are there locations within your division that you think are suitable for commercial/recreational/light industrial development?

4. **Service provision and infrastructure.** One of the deliverables of the SRM CP will be to develop a high level servicing strategy for the study area including a review of opportunities for regional servicing collaborations. The intent of these questions is to identify any specific areas of concern related to infrastructure and services. Obtaining this information will allow the R.M. to align project deliverables with community priorities.

Ex: Do you have any concerns with the following services/infrastructure? Please specify the service/infrastructure type and nature of the concern (maintenance, availability, reliability, cost, etc.)

Types: Potable water, overland drainage, septic, shallow utilities (power, gas, telecommunication, etc.), roads, waste disposal (including recycling), other

5. **Other topics.** As noted in this report, Council could consider questions in this survey for feedback on a variety of issues including shipping containers (seacans), nuisance abatement issues, recycling/garbage pickup, etc. An open ended 'provide feedback on anything R.M. related' could also be included in the survey. Council is also reminded that there will be upcoming engagement on the R.M. Zoning Bylaw where a ratepayer survey could be done for the whole R.M. on a number of issues such as home based business or garden suites as new provisions are expected to be rolled out to match P4G. The intent is to focus this survey as much as possible on information related to the study area.

R.M. Administration is requesting Council highlight any other specific items or topics of interest at this time in order to confirm the final survey questions and report back on the SRM CP project scope. R.M. Administration will finalize the survey, share it with the division 1-3 Councillors and notify all landowners within the study area when the survey will be available on the R.M. website. A summary of the feedback received and a project update for the SRM CP will be provided to planning committee prior to releasing the RFP. It is expected to have the survey open for a 3-4 week period.

Discussion ensued and Council provided feedback regarding potential survey questions.

6. **Intensive Horticulture**

Councillor Greenwood brought forward questions regarding Intensive Horticultural applications/definitions.

Discussion ensued.

7. **R.M. Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw Review**

Councillor Froese-Kooijenga brought forward a question about the timing of and adoption of P4G bylaws and how that relates to the overall timescales of the R.M. Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw review and priority items to amend.

Discussion ensued.

M-11 (a)

8. Adjourn Meeting

Froese-Kooijenga: That the Planning Committee meeting be adjourned at 10:52 a.m.
Carried Unanimously



Acting Administrator