

In July of 2021, Administration began a comprehensive review and update to the Rural Municipality of Corman Park (Corman Park) Official Community Plan (OCP) and Zoning Bylaw. The review was completed to align both documents with provincial legislative requirements, to respond to emerging market trends and to ensure their alignment with best planning practices and community goals. As the project scope expanded, it was determined that the OCP and Zoning Bylaw should have a staggered approval process, with the continuation of the Zoning Bylaw review occurring after approval of the OCP.

As part of the OCP update, Administration coordinated a number of engagement events, including special meetings with Council, meetings with local and provincial agencies, ratepayers, developers and other stakeholders. Many opportunities were provided for feedback, through newsletters, one-on-one meetings and several open houses. The engagement began in 2021 and has continued throughout the OCP project update.

### **R.M. Newsletter Updates**

Public notices informing residents of the project were included in the bi-annual Corman Park Newsletter for the Summer of 2021, 2022 and 2023, and Spring of 2022 and 2023.

Summer 2021 – The first update introduced landowners to the OCP project and informed residents the update is to align the document with provincial legislative requirements, to respond to emerging market trends and to ensure their alignment with best planning practices. It also shared a web link to an engagement survey for the project for residents to complete and share their thoughts.

Spring 2022 – This update served to remind landowners of the purpose and the ongoing nature of the study and provided residents with another opportunity to complete the online survey to provide additional feedback for the planning team.

Summer 2022 – This update provided the opportunity for residents to subscribe to OCP project email updates; and to provide contact information for the project team to residents.

Spring 2023 – This update provided the opportunity for residents to subscribe to OCP project email updates; and to provide contact information for the project team to residents.

Summer 2023 - This update provided public advertisement of the Community Open Houses occurring the months of August and September 2023.

Spring 2024 – This notice provided an update on the information gathered at the 2023 Open House sessions and the November 6, 2023 Planning Committee meeting and how this information will shape the drafting of the OCP. The update also informed residents about the Special Planning Committee Meeting to be held March 21, 2024, and of future engagement events anticipated to begin early summer.

Summer 2024 – The newsletter update provided an update on the Open Houses held in May and June (2024). Residents were informed that the OCP bylaw will be included on the July 22 Council agenda for First Reading with a Public Hearing date anticipated in September.

Administration has maintained a project webpage hosted on the R.M. of Corman Park website:



Stakeholders have been encouraged to visit the project page for updates at each stage of engagement and notification. Significant project webpage updates were included in the “Current News” and/or “News Flash” banner on the website homepage, based on the content and stage of project.

**Council Engagement**

As the elected representatives for Corman Park residents, Corman Park Council was at the forefront of the OCP drafting process. Council provided Administration with the Vision, Mission and Goals for the future of Corman Park providing the framework for the OCP, along with key policy direction and objectives.

A detailed list of meeting dates and topics discussed, along with project implications are outlined in *Table 1: Council Engagement Meetings* below:

Table 1: Council Engagement Meetings

| <b>Date</b>             | <b>Met With</b>                            | <b>Topics Discussed</b>  | <b>Implications for Project</b>   |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|
| Monday, July 5, 2021    | <b>Council at Planning Committee</b>       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- High level visioning discussion about how Council sees Corman Park developing into the future.</li> <li>- Discussion of current OCP goals and their applicability.</li> <li>- Consideration of the opportunities within each region of Corman Park</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Beginning of internal review of draft policies, creating maps, and further consultation with Council, the public, and other stakeholders.</li> </ul>                     |
| Monday, August 30, 2021 | <b>Council at Dalmeny Community Center</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Council’s vision for Corman Park</li> <li>- Reviewed current OCP goals</li> <li>- Opportunities and challenges in specific regions of the Corman Park (Land use conflicts, comments from ratepayers)</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Council’s input will help inform the vision, goals, and objectives of the OCP.</li> <li>- Led to drafting of Policy Areas Map to guide development framework.</li> </ul> |

|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
|   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Balancing of competing interests throughout Corman Park</li> </ul>   |   |
| Monday, February 7, 2022                | <b>Council at Planning Committee (In Camera)</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussed results of 2021 Ratepayer Survey</li> <li>- Discussion of draft "Policy Areas Map"</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incorporate direction provided into next iteration of OCP and maps.</li> </ul>   |
| Monday, March 7, 2022                   | <b>Council at Planning Committee (In Camera)</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continuation of previous committee meeting discussion</li> <li>- Employment nodes</li> <li>- Interjurisdictional cooperation</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incorporate direction provided into next iteration of OCP policy.</li> </ul>   |
| Thursday, April 20 <sup>th</sup> , 2023 | <b>Strategic Planning with Council</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Working session with Council led to the development of Vision and Mission Statements for Corman Park and Goals of the OCP</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vision and Mission Statements and Goals added to OCP Document</li> </ul>   |
| Wednesday, July 26 <sup>th</sup> 2023   | <b>Special Planning Committee with Council at Osler Community Hall</b><br>Judy Harwood<br>John Germs<br>Lyndon Hadiuk<br>Art Pruij<br>Bas Froese-<br>Kooijenga<br>Wendy Trask | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduction of Proposed Land Use Designations and Policy Areas for Corman Park OCP Future Land Use Map</li> <li>- Land Use Map working draft with Council</li> </ul>                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Endorsement of Preliminary Land Use Map for OCP</li> </ul>   |
| Tuesday, November 6 <sup>th</sup> 2023  | <b>Council at Planning Committee</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussion and presentation of updated Draft Land Use Map from July 2023 session</li> <li>- Discussion on policies that enable development within each Land Use designation</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alterations to draft Land Use Map</li> <li>- Continuation of drafting OCP document</li> </ul>                              |
| Thursday, March 21 <sup>st</sup> 2024   | <b>Special Planning Committee with Council</b><br>Judy Harwood<br>John Germs  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overview of Land Use Designation Intent Statements</li> <li>- Discussion of Employment Lands, and a comparison of</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Planning Department to follow up and address outstanding concerns at future Special Planning Committee meeting.</li> </ul> |

|                                     |   |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|
|                                     | John Saleski<br>David Greenwood<br>Art Pruum<br>Calvin Vaandrager<br>Wendy Trask  | Agriculture and Rural Residential land uses<br>- Draft Land Use Map discussion<br>- Implementation policy discussion   |  |
| Thursday, May 30 <sup>th</sup> 2024 | <b>Special Planning Committee</b><br>Judy Harwood<br>David Greenwood<br>Art Pruum<br>Bas Froese-Kooijenga<br>Calvin Vaandrager<br>Wendy Trask | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discussion on OCP amendment process</li> <li>- Rural Residential Land Use options in Division 1 and Division 7</li> <li>- Rural Residential subdivision design and Country Residential discussion (connectivity and Max acres out per quarter)</li> <li>- Hazard Land Discussion (South Saskatchewan River Flood Plain Overlay)</li> <li>- Growth Management (agricultural colonies, land uses around landfills, employment area expansion in Division 1)</li> <li>- Addition of Recreation and Conservation Land Use designations</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Council supports Rural Residential Draft Land Use options within Divisions 1 and 7 as reflected.</li> <li>- Council supports expanding Employment Lands north of Flying Dust First Nation (Division 1)</li> <li>- Council supports proposed maximum acres out for AR1 Zoning in Country Residential</li> <li>- The Land Use Map will identify all Recreation and Conservation Land uses on the Land Use Map</li> <li>- Administration will update and refine the definition and criteria for Agricultural Colonies</li> </ul> |

**One on One Meetings**

Throughout 2021 and 2022, the Planning Department reached out to select interest groups and stakeholders operating within the community to obtain comments and feedback about planning and development within Corman Park. The meetings provided an opportunity to learn about local priorities and pressures and help identify the competitive advantages within Corman Park. Conflicts and challenges experienced by these interest groups regarding future planning and development were also discussed

A detailed list of meeting dates, participants and topics discussed, along with project implications are outlined in *Table 2: One on One Stakeholder Meetings* below:

Table 2: One on One Stakeholder Meetings

| <b>Date</b>                    | <b>Met With</b>   | <b>Topics Discussed</b>   | <b>Implications for Project</b>  |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Wednesday,<br>June 23,<br>2021 | <b>Town of Dalmeny</b><br>Jim Weninger -<br>Administrator<br>Jon Kroeker -<br>Mayor   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Future growth areas in Dalmeny</li> <li>- Servicing capacity</li> <li>- Relationship with Mistawasis First Nation</li> <li>- Regional drainage</li> <li>- 5 per Quarter constraints area</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 5 per Quarter Constraints map</li> <li>- Inter-jurisdictional policies</li> </ul>   |
| Thursday,<br>June 24,<br>2021  | <b>Town of Langham</b><br>Amanda -<br>Director of<br>Economic and<br>Community<br>Development   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recent decommissioning of old lagoons</li> <li>- Future growth areas in the town</li> <li>- Potential plans for new elementary school</li> <li>- 5 per Quarter constraints area</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 5 per Quarter Constraints map</li> <li>- Inter-jurisdictional policies</li> </ul>   |
| Wednesday,<br>Aug 11, 2021     | <b>Mistawasis First Nation</b><br>Robert Daniels<br>– CEO Misty<br>Ventures<br>Lawrence<br>Johnston -Land<br>Manager<br>Mistawasis  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Plans for land near Dalmeny (Phase 1: Misty Ventures admin building).</li> <li>- Lands west of highway for a batch plant (cement mixing)</li> <li>- Servicing options in the area</li> <li>- Future involvement in the OCP/ZB process</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Considerations for adjacent lands</li> <li>- Need for further communication between Corman Park and Mistawasis</li> </ul> |
| Wednesday,<br>Aug 11, 2021     | <b>Flying Dust First Nation</b><br>Tyson Bear –<br>Councillor<br>Ruby Sinclair –<br>Legal counsel<br>Albert<br>Derocher – Ec.<br>Dev officer<br>Rubyn Norman<br>- Councillor<br>Peter -<br>Engineer<br>Dennis – legal<br>work | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Plans for land along highway 11 (highway frontage commercial and residential lots (60) for urban members)</li> <li>- Future involvement in the OCP/ZB and South RM ADP</li> <li>- Applying for Reserve Status</li> </ul>                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development would potentially bring services to the area</li> <li>- May be impacts on adjacent landowners</li> </ul>      |
| Thursday,<br>Aug 19, 2021      | <b>Fishing Lake First Nation</b><br>Johnny Walker<br>– GM, Fishing  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Servicing considerations</li> <li>- Future involved in the OCP/ZB and South RM ADP</li> <li>- Public consultation</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development would potentially bring services to the area</li> </ul>   |

|                        |   |  |  |
|------------------------|---|--|--|
|                        | Lake First Nation Ventures Inc. John Waller – Development consultant  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Plans for land along Highway 219 commercial and acreage residential)</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- May be impacts on adjacent landowners</li> </ul>  |
| Tuesday, Mar 15, 2022  | <b>Prairie Spirit School Division</b><br>Teresa Korol – Facilities Planner  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional school needs</li> <li>- Potential expansion of SCP elementary to K-8 in the short-medium term.</li> <li>- Coordinate future planning, particularly in the South Corman Park area where demand is high (growth in SCP is also affecting Clavet and Dundurn)</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No new school sites planned in the short term that need to be accounted for in OCP – high level policies about future planning should be sufficient</li> <li>- Include PSSD as stakeholder in future discussions</li> </ul> |
| Friday, Mar 18, 2022   | <b>Ministry of Environment</b><br>David Fortin – Manager, Cumulative Impacts and Science Branch                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shared resources for municipal climate change planning</li> <li>- Discussed strategies for working with elected officials on climate change policies</li> <li>- Examples of “natural infrastructure/assets”</li> <li>- Specific climate change risks that should be considered</li> <li>- Potential funding sources for climate change analysis or adaptation projects</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Confirmed that drought, consecutive summer storms, winter storms, flooding, grass fires, heat waves, and air quality are primary concerns facing Saskatchewan related to climate change</li> </ul>                          |
| Tuesday, Mar 29, 2022  | <b>Community Planning</b><br>Janna Morgan – Planning and Legislative Consultant<br>Riley Stefanik – Planning Consultant | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarification of SPIs and PDAs as they pertain to the new OCP</li> <li>- Discussed the merits of adopting a Future Land Use map</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Obtained additional clarity regarding hazard lands management, climate change policies, mineral resource exploration/development, comprehensive land use planning, and school site policies</li> </ul>                      |
| Thursday, Apr 14, 2022 | <b>North Saskatoon</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Challenges and opportunities facing</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NSBA had general support for the idea of designating</li> </ul>   |

|                         |   |  |  |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|
|                         | <b>Business Association</b><br>Keith Moen – Exec Director<br>Daniel Afe – Research and Policy Analyst | businesses in the Saskatoon region<br>- Corman Park’s focus on attracting industrial and value-added agriculture<br>- How Corman Park is perceived by business industry<br>- NSBA has limited ability to provide best practice research or market analysis | employment nodes if it means less red tape and quicker approvals for businesses                    |
| Thursday, July 28, 2022 | <b>Ministry of Education</b><br>Colin Levesque<br>Yvonne Anderson                                     | - Discussed draft OCP school site policies for their review  | - High level policies contained within Draft OCP regarding school site provision deemed sufficient |
| Monday, Dec 5, 2022     | <b>Saskatoon Airport Authority</b><br>Clive Stromberg – Regulatory Compliance                         | - Saskatoon Airport’s interests in development outside of P4G<br>- Discussed airport regulatory framework including rules of Transport Canada, NavCanada, and Saskatoon Airport Authority<br>- Development review/referral processes.                      | - Confirmed requirements for Airport overlay in OCP and Zoning Bylaw                               |

**Public Engagement**

**Summer 2021 Engagement Survey**

The Summer 2021 Engagement Survey provided an opportunity for residents to state their interest in Corman Park, and comment on what they value about the community, as well as provide input on policy components, and the future vision of Corman Park.

The survey was advertised in the summer 2021 Corman Park Newsletter and 2021 Tax Notice Insert. The survey was featured on the front page of the Corman Park website, and on the digital message board at the South Corman Park School; as well as the in the Clarks Crossing Gazette June 18<sup>th</sup> edition. Billboards advertising the survey were placed at five locations across Corman Park.

In total, residents were asked 39 questions pertaining to Corman Park’s policy, future planning, vision, and goals, and for issues and concerns pertaining to the community. The survey was completed by 78 respondents, with 54 of those respondents electing to be added to the project mailing list for future updates.

The results of the survey were shared with Council at the February 7, 2022, Planning Committee meeting. The OCP framework was developed based on the ratepayer survey feedback in conjunction with what was heard at the Council Visioning Session conducted in August 2021. Key topics derived from the survey included:

- Residents acknowledged some areas of Corman Park are better suited for certain types of development.
- Given current development pressure throughout Corman Park, landowners should and do expect some degree of change in their neighbourhoods; change should be reasonable and predictable.
- The three most important topics for Corman Park to focus on were efficient and sustainable infrastructure/servicing, protecting environmental resources and features, and limiting fragmentation of agricultural land.
- Good planning means locating development where services already exist or are easily extended.
- Agriculture is no longer the primary land use in some areas. Where agriculture is still the primary land use, the land is sometimes better suited to a specific type of agricultural operation.
- Residents have different expectations with respect to service provision and future growth depending on which part of Corman Park they live in or what type of property they own.
- Residents most often identified the following attributes when asked what they value about their community: quiet and privacy, proximity to urban services, the opportunity for an agricultural lifestyle, and having good neighbours.

The complete survey results were consolidated and are presented in Attachment 1.

#### Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw Virtual Information Session

In March of 2023, to encourage engagement and inform residents and stakeholders about the project, a Virtual Information Session was posted under the RM OCP & Zoning Bylaw Update page of the Corman Park website, along with a banner on the homepage directing traffic to the link.

The information session introduced the project scope, timelines and expressed the need for policy updates to occur at this time. Viewers were given a high-level, transparent idea of the overarching goals, principles and policies of the plan. Residents and stakeholders were introduced to some of the conceptual issues being considered as part of this review including:

- How to accommodate new acreage development while respecting existing agricultural uses
- The location of new industrial and commercial development
- The best way to preserve environmental features, such as the North and South Saskatchewan river valleys
- How to capitalize on Corman Park's competitive advantages related to agricultural tourism, local food production, and value-added agriculture

- Potential for new policy areas to be introduced to Corman Park in response to development pressures

The session included a presentation of some of the more detailed topics pertaining to the Zoning Bylaw update; and aimed to explain to residents the purpose and jurisdiction of an Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw, along with the information and policies that could be found within each, to educate, and encourage discussion and participation in the project. At the time of takedown, the virtual information session had been viewed 86 times.

### Community Open Houses

#### Summer 2023:

The first series of community open house sessions took place in August and September of 2023 and aimed to:

- Further notify residents of the updates to policies that are being considered;
- Ensure the goals and policies of the OCP reflect community concerns and desires; and
- To collect feedback on the Preliminary Land Use Map.

Six open house events were held on the following dates:

- Wednesday, August 9<sup>th</sup> at the Langham Community Center (4 attendees).
- Thursday August 10<sup>th</sup> at the Osler Community Hall (2 attendees).
- Two sessions in Council Chambers on Tuesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup> and Wednesday, August 23<sup>rd</sup> (11 attendees total).
- Tuesday September 19<sup>th</sup> at South Corman Park School (56 attendees); and
- Wednesday September 20<sup>th</sup> at Floral Community Center (28 attendees).

In total, there were over 100 attendees.

Advertising for the August 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, 22<sup>nd</sup>, 23<sup>rd</sup> dates were included in the Summer 2023 Newsletter. Notice for the September 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> open house dates were sent by mail for southern residents, in total 2,014 mailouts were mailed for the sessions in September 2023.

Display boards were used to guide discussion and provided the opportunity for residents to view proposed policy changes, and the Preliminary Land Use Map. Attendees were asked to leave comments and ask questions on the relevant policies and framework presented and were also encouraged to complete feedback forms in person or virtually for further discussion.

Administration received 11 completed feedback forms and 37 unique comments, totalling 48 recorded points of contact during the sessions. All feedback has been documented by the project team and was reviewed and categorized based on its content.

The display boards and digital feedback forms were made available on the project website for those who couldn't attend an open house in person. A QR code was also included on many of the display boards so that participants could access the project webpage for additional information.

Some of the recurring themes from residents during the Summer 2023 engagement include:

- Support for protecting the highest capability agricultural lands for continued cultivation;
- Support for farmers and local food processors to work towards potential local food initiatives within Corman Park;
- Support for policies that accommodate additional development on marginal lands;
- Support for the vision, mission, and goals of the plan;
- Concern about compatibility between proposed employment lands and existing residential development;
- Significant environmental areas and habitats should be protected;
- There should be potential for further re-subdivision in existing multi-parcel developments;
- Concern over increasing density, smaller lot sizes and maintaining a “rural lifestyle” in the South R.M.;
- Support for policies that enable growth in a properly planned, efficient manner;
  - Country Residential development should be reasonable and predictable.
- Servicing constraints (water, sewer, roads), especially in the South R.M., arising from increased densities; and
- Support for more options for pedestrian connectivity (bike/walking paths) and public space development.

An Engagement Update was shared with Council at the October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023, Planning Committee meeting, providing a summary report on what was heard at these sessions.

Spring 2024:

The second series of community open house sessions took place in May and June of 2024, providing an opportunity for public consultation and updated policy recommendations from the Planning Committee presentations in July and November 2023 and March 2024.

Three open house events were held on the following dates:

- Wednesday, May 8<sup>th</sup>, at the R.M. of Corman Park Council Chambers (10 attendees)
- Thursday, May 9<sup>th</sup>, at the Glen at Crossmount (80 attendees)
- Wednesday, June 5<sup>th</sup>, at the Floral Community Center (55 attendees)
  - Included presentation along with Q+A session

In total there were 145 attendees.

Advertising for the May 2024 open houses included a newspaper ad in the Clark’s Crossing Gazette the weeks of April 18<sup>th</sup>, 26<sup>th</sup> and May 2<sup>nd</sup>, along with mailouts to 1,089 landowners. The June 5<sup>th</sup> Open House at Floral Community Centre was at the request of the Division 1 Councillor. In total 432 mail invitations were sent out to landowners in Division 1. All open houses were advertised in the public notice section of the R.M. of Corman Park website.

Display boards were used to guide discussion and provided the opportunity for residents to view the project timeline, revised policy updates, the preliminary Land Use Map and Land Use Designations. The option to fill out an in-person or virtual feedback form or to leave a comment was available in person, or virtually. Administration received 15 completed feedback forms and

43 unique comments, totaling 58 points of contact during the sessions. All feedback has been documented by the project team and was reviewed and categorized based on its content.

Some of the recurring themes from residents during the Spring 2024 engagement include:

- Support for Rural Residential Land Use Designation as a means to accommodate additional development on marginal agricultural lands;
- The Rural Residential Land Use Designation within Division 1, was opposed by most ratepayers in attendance at the June 5<sup>th</sup> open house at the Floral Community Center
- Support for protecting the highest capability agricultural lands for continued cultivation;
- Concern over increasing density, smaller lot sizes and maintaining a “rural lifestyle” in the South R.M.;
- Servicing constraints (water, sewer, roads) arising from increased densities; along with ground water quality;
- An understanding that increased densities allow for more amenities and services (schools, daycares, recreation) for residents to access;

### **Discussion**

From the onset of the project, the Planning Department developed an engagement strategy intended to reach a variety of stakeholders including, but not limited to residents, government agencies, service providers, community associations, business leaders and neighbouring municipalities.

The Planning Department received feedback from across the stakeholder groups, assisting in policy creation related to:

- Priorities and goals
- The overall vision
- Opportunities and challenges in specific regions of Corman Park
- Balancing competing interests
- Ensuring Corman Park maintains, and makes use of its competitive advantages
- Future growth, servicing and land use

The Planning Department received over 168 unique comments and suggestions from stakeholders, with most comments being positive or constructive. These points of contact came in the form of survey participants, completed feedback forms, and feedback directly obtained in writing at community open house events. Each comment was thoroughly reviewed, leading to revisions in the OCP document. The feedback received enhanced the OCP, ensuring that policies and regulations will reflect the values of Corman Park’s residents and stakeholders.

### **Attachments**

1. *Attachment 1. Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw Survey Results.*

**Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw Survey Results**

**1. What is your main interest in the Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw project?**

*Response rate: 76/78*

- 88.5% (69) - I live in Corman Park
- 9% (7) - I own land in Corman Park but live in another municipality
- 5.1% (4) – I work or own a business in Corman Park
- 5.1% (4) – I am interested in development opportunities in Corman Park
- 1.7% (1) – Other (“Live in Saskatoon, preparing to build”)

**2. Please provide the land location or civic address of the land you own in Corman Park.**

*Response rate: 72/78*

**3. What type of property do you own or live on? If you own multiple parcels, select all that apply.**

*Response rate: 72/78*

- 53.8% (42) – Large agricultural parcel (80 or 160 acres)
- 26.9% (21) – Acreage other than those listed above (5 or 10 acres subdivided from a quarter section, for example)
- 12.8% (10) – Acreage within a multi-parcel country residential subdivision or hamlet, sometimes referred to as a country residential “estate”
- 2.6% (2) – Commercial or industrial land
- 0% - I do not live or own land in Corman Park
- 9% (7) – Other. Please specify.

**4. What do you value about your community today?**

*Response rate: 69/78*

- 62% (43) – Peace, quiet, freedom, privacy
- 25% (17) - Proximity to Saskatoon/urban services
- 17% (12) – Agricultural opportunities/way of life
- 16% (11) – Good neighbours, sense of community
- 12% (8) – Safety
- 7% (5) – Natural environment, wildlife
- 6% (4) – Good roads

Other responses: development opportunities, affordable/reliable utilities, diversity of businesses/residential communities, good police service.

**5. In 15-20 years, how should Corman Park be different than it is now? Is there anything that should stay the same?**

*Response rate: 68/78*

**6. What motivated you to move to, buy land, or stay in Corman Park?**

*Response rate: 74/78*

- 39% (29) – Proximity to Saskatoon
- 27% (20) – More space, privacy
- 22% (16) – Rural/country lifestyle
- 11% (8) – Family ties/have roots in the area
- 9% (7) – Opportunity to have livestock
- 9% (7) – Property fit their needs
- 4% (3) – Well-run R.M.
- 3% (2) – Access to nature/environment

Other responses: provided an active, healthy retirement; future development opportunities; create own outdoor recreation.

**7. What is unique or special about the area where you live or own land?**

*Response rate: 69/78*

- 38% (26) – Natural features of the land, environment or wildlife
- 33% (23) – Features/character of the surrounding area, types of development nearby
- 20% (14) – Proximity to Saskatoon
- 12% (8) – Neighbours/community
- 4% (3) – Services available
- 4% (3) - Nothing

Other responses: Development potential; opportunity build upper-end housing; it's where I grew up; outdoor recreation opportunities.

**8. What do you feel are the three most important topics that Corman Park should focus on with respect to planning and community development?**

*Response rate: 76/78*

- 50% (39) – Efficient and sustainable infrastructure/servicing
- 50% (39) – Protecting environmental resources and features
- 44.9% (35) – Limit fragmentation of agricultural land
- 41% (32) – Supporting local food production and sales
- 28.2% (22) – Increasing recreation and leisure opportunities
- 25.6% (20) – Continue to allow for acreage development
- 19.2% (15) – Identifying and preserving heritage sites and buildings
- 10.3% (8) – Identifying opportunities for tourism
- 7.7% (6) – Accommodate housing types other than single family dwellings
- 6.4% (5) – Supporting urban growth in Langham and Dalmeny
- 5.1% (4) – Increase the size and number of intensive livestock operations
- 12.8% (10) – Other

9. **In your opinion, is Corman Park effectively balancing agricultural and non-agricultural development?**

*Response rate: 77/78*

42.3% (33) – Unsure  
29.5% (23) – Yes  
26.9% (21) – No

10. **Why or why not?**

*Response rate: 50/78*

11. **What are your favourite outdoor spaces and amenities in the R.M.? You can include either public or private lands and facilities.**

*Response rate: 60/78*

12. **Are there any amenities, facilities, or services that you feel would enhance the lifestyle enjoyed by Corman Park residents?**

*Response rate: 58/78*

13. **Are there any amenities, facilities, or services that you feel would detract from the lifestyle enjoyed by Corman Park residents?**

*Response rate: 48/78*

14. **In your opinion, is 500 meters an acceptable notification distance for discretionary uses?**

*Response rate: 77/78*

62.8% (49) – No (9 multi parcel, 31 large ag, 8 other acreage)  
29.5% (23) – Yes (2 multi parcel, 11 large ag, 5 other acreage)  
6.4% (5) – Unsure (3 large ag, 1 other acreage)

15. **Why or why not?**

*Response rate: 62/78*

16. **Do you have any positive or negative experiences related to development or building permit applications, rezoning notification, public consultation, or other planning procedures that you would like to share?**

*Response rate: 56/78*

17. **Do you have any positive or negative experiences with home based businesses operating near you that you would like to share?**

*Response rate: 52/78*

**18. Keeping in mind that all home based business approvals are issued with the condition that the business must remain smaller scale and secondary (subordinate) to the residential use of the site, please select any businesses you think SHOULD NOT be allowed to operate as a home based business:**

*Response rate: 53/78*

- 37.2% (29) – Commercial storage units
- 34.6% (27) – Parking of semi-trucks and/or trailers
- 32.1% (25) – Automotive, recreational vehicle and/or equipment sales
- 32.1% (25) – Cannabis cultivation and/or processing
- 30.8% (24) – Outdoor storage compound (i.e. for RVs, boats or vehicles)
- 29.5% (23) – Construction contractors including storage of equipment used off site and office space
- 17.9% (14) – Retail of goods, products or equipment
- 16.7% (13) – Abattoir (butchering and packaging meat for sale and distribution)
- 16.7% (13) – Automotive, recreational vehicle and/or equipment repair shop
- 14.1% (11) – Welding, machine, or other fabrication shops
- 10.3% (8) – Brewery/distillery
- 9.0% (7) – Landscaping services (i.e. storage of equipment and materials)
  
- 17.9% (14) – Other. Please specify.

**19. To what extent do you agree with the proposed home based business regulations?**

*Response rate: 75/78*

- 38.5% (30) – Agree
- 28.2% (22) – Neutral
- 17.9% (14) – Disagree
- 11.5% (9) – No opinion

**20. Please provide any comments below.**

*Response rate: 28/78*

**21. If a secondary suite was proposed near your property, would you want to be notified?**

*Response rate: 77/78*

- 66.7% (52) – I don't need to be notified if someone proposed a secondary suite near my property
- 25.6% (20) – I want to be able to provide feedback if someone proposed a secondary suite near my property
- 6.4% (5) – Unsure

**22. What (if any) are your concerns with secondary suites?**

*Response rate: 39/78*

**23. If a garden suite was proposed near your property, would you want to be notified?**

*Response rate: 77/78*

- 70.5% (55) – I don't need to be notified if someone proposed a garden suite near my property
- 21.8% (17) – I want to be able to provide feedback if someone proposed a garden suite near my property
- 6.4% (5) – Unsure

**24. What (if any) are your concerns with garden suites?**

*Response rate: 30/78*

**25. In addition to the 3 uses listed above, do you have any suggestions for other types of industries, businesses or operations that may benefit from the ability to house employees on-site?**

*Response rate: 20/78*

**26. Garage suites are not currently allowed in Corman Park, but there has been some interest in them. Where do you think garage suites would be compatible?**

*Response rate: 77/78*

- 47.4% (37) – Anywhere
- 15.4% (12) – No opinion
- 15.4% (12) – Primarily agricultural areas only
- 14.1% (11) – Multi-parcel country residential subdivisions/estates or hamlets only
- 12.8% (10) – Nowhere
- 10.3% (8) – Other. Please specify.

**27. If a garage suite was proposed near your property, would you want to be notified?**

*Response rate: 77/78*

- 56.4% (44) – I don't need to be notified if someone proposed a secondary suite near my property
- 33.3% (26) – I want to be able to provide feedback if someone proposed a secondary suite near my property
- 9% (7) – Unsure

**28. What (if any) are your concerns with garage suites?**

*Response rate: 30/78*

**29. Guest houses are not currently allowed in Corman Park, but there has been some interest in them. Where do you think guest houses would be compatible?**

*Response rate: 76/78*

- 48.7% (38) – Anywhere

- 16.7% (13) – Primarily agricultural areas only
- 15.4% (12) – Nowhere
- 11.5% (9) – Multi-parcel country residential subdivisions/estates or hamlets only
- 11.5% (9) – No opinion
- 9% (7) – Other. Please specify.

**30. If a guest house was proposed near your property, would you want to be notified?**

*Response rate: 77/78*

- 48.7% (38) – I don't need to be notified if someone proposed a secondary suite near my property
- 43.6% (34) – I want to be able to provide feedback if someone proposed a secondary suite near my property
- 6.4% (5) – Unsure

**31. What (if any) are your concerns with guest houses?**

*Response rate: 26/78*

**32. Tourist homes are not currently allowed in Corman Park, but there has been some interest in them. Where do you think tourist homes would be compatible?**

*Response rate: 75/78*

- 44.9% (35) – Anywhere
- 33.3% (26) – Nowhere
- 10.3% (8) – Multi-parcel country residential subdivisions/estates or hamlets only
- 5.1% (4) – No opinion
- 5.1% (4) – Primarily agricultural areas only
- 11.5% (9) – Other. Please specify.

**33. If a tourist home was proposed near your property, would you want to be notified?**

*Response rate: 77/78*

- 66.7% (52) – I want to be able to provide feedback if someone proposed a secondary suite near my property
- 29.5% (23) – I don't need to be notified if someone proposed a secondary suite near my property
- 2.6% (2) – Unsure

**34. What (if any) are your concerns with tourist homes?**

*Response rate: 35/78*

**35. Do you think cannabis micro-cultivation facilities should be allowed in multi-parcel country residential subdivisions/estates, including hamlets?**

*Response rate: 77/78*

55.1% (43) – No  
33.3% (26) – Yes  
10.3% (8) – Unsure

**36. Why or why not?**

*Response rate: 42/78*

**37. How did you hear about this survey? Check all that apply.**

*Response rate: 78/78*

69.2% (54) – Flyer mailed with tax notice  
29.5% (23) – Billboards  
7.7% (6) – Word of mouth  
6.4% (5) – Corman Park website  
2.6% (2) – Newspaper  
1.3% (1) – Other

**38. What is the best way for us to provide you with updates about this project?**

*Response rate: 78/78*

64.1% (50) – Email  
34.6% (27) – Mail  
14.1% (11) – Website  
2.6% (2) – Other

**39. Please provide any general comments or feedback below.**

*Response rate: 36/78*