

Rural Municipality of McKillop No. 220

**STATEMENT REGARDING THE FUTURE OF
DEVELOPMENT IN THE RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF
McKILLOP NO. 220**

The current Council of the Rural Municipality of McKillop No. 220 does not intend to cease approval of new development within the boundaries of the Rural Municipality.

The current Council of the Rural Municipality of McKillop No. 220 has commenced the process of re-evaluating the requirements for all developments to ensure that high standards are set for new developments that are put before Council for consideration and approval. These standards will be reflected in the Official Community Plan and Zoning Bylaw that are being established.

While the current Council of the Rural Municipality of McKillop No. 220 sees the need for development and is supportive of development, there is also a strong understanding that all developments must be considered with a view to taking a cautious approach to ensure environmental preservation and long-term financial stability both for the area to be developed and the areas surrounding the area proposed for development.

Preliminary Assessment Report for the RM of McKillop No. 220
May 2, 2015 Public Meeting 1:30-3:45 pm
Bulyea Community Hall

Preliminary summary of public comments

The majority of speakers (19/26) indicated they were neither for nor against development “in principle,” but could support growth provided it occurs in a planned and prudent manner. Six of the speakers holding this view suggested that a moratorium should be placed on further development until the appropriate planning has taken place. Most speakers noted that RM 220 infrastructure (roads in particular) was not sufficient to support the current population. They held that if additional development were to take place, the appropriate infrastructure upgrading would need to occur – and that costs of expansion would need to be clearly understood and supported by ratepayers.

Only two speakers suggested they were opposed to development under any circumstances. And there was only one speaker who was unabashedly pro-development.

Development challenges

A number of speakers identified specific development related challenges. These included long-standing tensions between farmers and resort property owners such as: ATV trespassing; garbage in fields; higher road use and maintenance costs (with both sides being attributed with responsibility), and; the need for a new lagoon.

Several speakers indicated concern about infrastructure costs, lifespans and engineering considerations. The condition of roads and plans for road improvement were stressed. Some speakers encouraged the RM to pursue regional cost sharing for infrastructure. The lagoon project was widely viewed as an unavoidable necessity. However, cost apportionment is an issue of concern.

Planning process

A number of speakers provided advice on the planning process. There was support for the OCP plan, albeit there seems to be confusion as to whether a plan is actually in place or under development. While some speakers complained that resort development has been haphazard, others indicated that current planning standards are much more rigorous and take many of the concerns being raised into account. For example, planning regulations account for public space, slump zones and wildlife access. Some speakers noted that more environmental and geophysical information is required to properly assess development issues. Concerns were expressed about the monitoring and control of lake levels.

Environmental issues

Several speakers claimed that unregulated development is having an adverse impact on natural ecosystems and wildlife. There were a few comments to the effect that the RM was already over-crowded with respect to environmental sustainability and recreational enjoyment.

Kudos to council

Council was commended by most speakers for hosting the meeting.

Public Meeting details

Attendees

Reeve and Council

Reeve Gary Gilbert; Councillor Marilyn Labatte; Councillor Andy Kuderewko; Councillor Norm Smith; Councillor Brent Johnson; Councillor Olga Thompson; Councillor Murray Wild.

Administration

Administrator Michele Cruise-Pratchler; Assistant Administrator Crystal Mytopher; Clerk, Susan Hillier
Moderator, Keith Schneider

Recorder: Jim Warren

Ratepayers

Registration records indicate 160 municipal ratepayers were in attendance.

Media

One television reporter and at least one print journalist were in attendance.

Speakers

There were 26 speakers (speaker 17 did not appear) who presented comments and/or posed questions. There were approximately 12 informational interjections by council members.

Preliminary coded analysis of proceedings

Rank	Comments/questions	No.
1	Kudos to Council for hosting the meeting: including efforts to publicize the event	18
2	Neither for or against development provided that it is planned and prudent. "Change will happen, it is how it happens that we need to be concerned about." "what are the costs: roads, lagoon, garbage." "Development for the right reasons." "Orderly managed growth."	12
3	Neither for or against development provided there is a moratorium in place until the appropriate planning and due diligence have occurred, "proceed cautiously." 3yrs-10yrs mentioned. Development has surpassed the capacity of road infrastructure – choices are to find a way to repair and upgrade the roads and/or put a halt to growth until these problems are solved.	6
4-5	More development will increase challenges for farmers: ATV trespassing, ruts and garbage in fields, wear and tear on roads, open gates, cut fences.	5
4-5	Roads: What can be done? What is being done? How can we develop when they are in such bad condition? What about water affecting roads? Farm machinery, farm trucks, concrete trucks, septic trucks, etc.	5
6-10	The lagoon project is a given. We know it must be built – but it presents problems such as lengthy hauls for some, and added stress on roads. We need the new lagoon because land spreading is unsustainable – the smell of detergent persists for years.	4

6-10	How certain are we that the new lagoon and garbage dump can withstand a higher water table, will have reasonable lifespans?	4
6-10	Development needs to account for green space and public spaces, e.g. playgrounds.	4
6-10	Development needs to better reflect ecological principles and habitat preservation.	4
6-10	There is need for significant environmental and geophysical assessment of the lake and lakeshore. Questions about the sustainable capacity of these systems have not been done. Natural habitat is disappearing. Better management of lake “why is lake not drained until after the Jamboree?”	4
11-14	There is an OCP in place: it should be more closely adhered to	3
11-14	There should be greater inter-community cooperation regarding the sharing of infrastructure. Will resort villages be contributing to the lagoon? What is the status of RM 220 residents to the lagoon near Silton-Saskatchewan Beach? Are fees being collected from communities?	3
11-14	Will new bylaw enforcement efforts deal with noise, ATV trespass, etc? Dutch Elm question.	3
11-14	All development should cease – permanently (one speaker, non-ratepayer) the natural environment is already over-stressed. Too crowded, no room for wildlife, lake to remain pristine? How will any more development benefit me? Someone needs to answer that?	3
15-20	The OCP is underway and should incorporate a balancing of interests	2
15-20	Lagoon cost apportionment – farmers should not have to pay (significant applause from half the room).	2
15-20	Developers should shoulder a significant portion of infrastructure costs	2
15-20	Development standards have improved in recent years. Today, developers are required to account for slumping, ecological conditions and public space. Three examples including Pilot Butte	2
15-20	Development is inevitable: population is growing, baby boomers want homes outside the city. Elitists to stand in the way. Properly managed farmer-resort conflict reduced.	2
15-20	Out of order: rumours about office relocation, current road repair program	2
21	Development is beneficial, it provides increased opportunity and economic activity – jobs for our kids.	1