

**R.M. OF LUMSDEN No. 189
MINUTES OF THE MURSELL REZONING PUBLIC HEARING
HELD ON OCTOBER 9th, 2008**

The Lumsden Rural Municipal Council convened the Mursell Rezoning Public Hearing in the Council Chambers of the R.M. Office, on the afternoon of Thursday, October 9th, 2008 at 3:00 p.m. with Reeve Jim Hipkin presiding.

Present:	Reeve:	Jim Hipkin
	Councillor:	Al Szeles, Jim Atcheson, Herman Wagner, Bill Marquardt, Tom Harrison (arrived at 1:25 pm)
	Administrator:	Wayne Zerff
	Asst. Administrator:	Darcie Cooper
Absent:	Councillor:	Kent Farago
Attendees:		Kevin & Dianne Mursell Lorilee Davies Jack Glen

Reeve Hipkin read the public notice that was advertised in the New Waterfront Press and sent to Adjacent Landowners.

Darcie Cooper:
We have one written submission

Reeve Hipkin:
One written submission, Okay. This comes from adjacent residents dated October the 8th. Do I read this Wayne?

Wayne Zerff:
We don't have to read it out.

Reeve Hipkin:
We don't have to read it out. Okay

Tom Harrison (speaking to Lorilee Davis):
Do you want to talk to it?

Wayne Zerff:
They can make a verbal presentation.

Reeve Hipkin:
Yes you can make a verbal presentation, even though you've sent in the letter, that's no problem.

Lorilee Davies:
So did you want me to do that now?

Reeve Hipkin:
If you do, identify yourself and make your presentation.

Lorilee Davies:
Okay, my name is Lorilee Davies, I live across the road of the proposed development Portion of NE 9-21-22. My husbands' signature is one of the ones on that document but I have some other points I'd like to bring up, if I could do that?

Reeve Hipkin:
Yeah go ahead

Lorilee Davies:
Okay

Darcie Cooper:
Could you just have her move in closer to the mic?

Reeve Hipkin:
Just maybe move in here a little closer, because we have a mic that records the procedures.

JRH WZ

Lorilee Davies:

So I've mentioned, I live across the road from the proposed development, and when we first heard about it, we were upset at the notion of the development, we have lived out at our property for a couple years now and moved out there to get away from city living we both have stressful jobs and deal with people and work shift work and that sort of thing so the peace and quiet was really one of the things we wanted when we bought this property and that's obviously what we have at this point and would like to continue, and are worried of course at 6 or 7 additional neighbours that that may change especially being directly across the road from us. And just sort of in preparing a presentation, I did note that in the RM Development Plan, the basic premise is that Agriculture is a priority and rural lifestyle including farm, open spaces and that's obviously what we strive for as well and so I guess, our hope is that the RM would sort of continue with that priority of keeping land agriculture and not moving to a medium density.

Also of course we're concerned that if this is approved, that it opens the door up for adjacent properties and surrounding areas to do the same and so we're not faced maybe with the proposal of one property but the fact that maybe our neighbours would consider doing the same as it was precedent setting and so instead of having 6 additional neighbours we could have many more if it is approved and other people decide that that's the route that they want to go to as well. We also have a concern in relation to increase traffic, as you may be aware that road is very busy, the lagoon for the Town is just down the road from there and so there is a lot of traffic in relation to the septic trucks and in the summer especially there is also a lot of traffic with people going to and from the resort communities so there is a lot of traffic on that road and again would be concerned with increased traffic as well as what that does to the road. I think that road is hard to maintain because of the high volume of traffic and the weight of the vehicles that are on it and so we're obviously concerned with increased traffic that that would be a problem.

The water issue, of course, that you have pointed out in the letter in front of you, we're concerned as well obviously that – has there been feasibility studies done in terms of will that water be coming from the same location? Is there enough water to support the additional uses? so that is obviously a big concern of ours as well. There's a concern that we have, I know that there have been issues with the landfill at Regina Beach, that they're concerned about increased usage to that and what the future may hold for that and so with more people using that facility you know is that going to speed up the time maybe that that facility has to close or further restrictions put on residents that live there now in terms of increased use for that as well.

And wildlife, I mean, you increase the number of people that live there, obviously you're cutting down the wildlife, you know it's nice to sit out on my deck and see the deer going by you know that sort of thing, so certainly the more people that you have living there the less wildlife you're going to see, like I said that was one of the big reasons that we moved out was to get away from city living and town living and you know our fear obviously is that if it is approved that that is going to change for us. And just another question that I have is, and I'm not sure if maybe you can answer that but if there would be a restriction placed on the people that are buying this property if it is approved that they have to build within a certain amount of time. Some developments have that limit on there that you have to build a property within one or two years so I guess our question would be in terms of time frame if, that is an issue obviously if people have two years to build we're going to see a lot of traffic and increased usage right away. I guess those are the comments that I wanted to make and would be curious just about where this goes from here but maybe you'll address that at the conclusion of the presentations. I'm not sure.

Reeve Hipkin:

Okay, I'll address that. In order for it to come here, council gave it first reading now once this procedure's over today, council will consider the pros and cons. We have to consider what our bylaws and zoning restrictions say. We consider the situation of water, that they would have potable water and we hear the concerns of the residents around and at that point, council decides whether to give it second reading, we may give it second and third reading both today, we may only give it 2nd reading we may not give it 2nd or 3rd reading. We may go back and ask for some areas to be clarified or some other information from the proposed developer but those are all the things that we will, you know, before we leave today we'll have done one or bits and pieces of all of those things.

Lorilee Davies:

Thank you and I just know that in speaking with my husband and obviously some of the neighbours that they would have very much like to have been here today to do a presentation to you face to face but unfortunately, just weren't able to get away from work and so don't presume that their lack of attendance is a lack of interest because I know that they are very interested in this process.

Wayne Zerff:

There's no time limit on building either

JRH wby

Lorilee Davies:
Okay thank you

Reeve Hipkin:
Okay is there any further, other comments. Jack good to see you.

Jack Glen:
Thank you, just got a few words not too volatile. I perhaps have more of a historical viewpoint than most of you. Whether this proposed rezoning is in the best interest of land owners of the RM 189 at this time is the question. (Mr. Glen proceeded to read his written submission)

Thank you gentlemen.

Bill Marquardt:
Good to see you Jack

(couldn't hear – Is there any questions?)

Reeve Hipkin:
No I don't think so. I've heard most of these arguments more than once.

Tom Harrison:
Kevin, do you want to say something.

Kevin Mursell:
Well I don't know, I'm just here to answer questions that anyone has.

Reeve Hipkin:
I don't know whether any of you have any questions for the Mursell's.
(pause)

Tom Harrison:
I've received several calls since this hit the paper, not only from people that are here but you know some other people that aren't here number one issue that has come up is water both from a contamination stand point and a depletion standpoint. I talked with Kevin, and I just asked him to address those concerns and the other issue that has come up, in addition to these people, with agriculture as a priority in this area is the basic premise and I think people have sort of identified as well. Those are the 3 things, other than, I guess traffic was brought up as well too. I'm just going through some of the notes, you know, that some of the people expressed to me. I don't know if Kevin, if you want to address some of the water issues and the agriculture issues.

Kevin Mursell:
Yeah

Tom Harrison:
Go ahead.

Kevin Mursell:
We were in contact with Sask Water and we haven't had a chance yet to have a meeting with them because they're busy and we have been in contact with a drilling company to come out and do test holes I want to have a meeting with Sask Water and find out the surrounding area, what the pump out rates are so obviously we're going to do that, we're going to find out what is there for water and, I mean if there isn't sufficient water then maybe we could look at cutting it back to four or whatever the case may be I mean until we have that from Sask Water there's really nothing to address there so we want to talk to them. As far as contamination I have spoken to Sask Environment and we've already agreed that probably holding tanks would be the way to go for septic. There'd be no pump outs allowed. As far as traffic goes, I mean 6 more people on that road, well you live on the road in the summer time, you know what the traffic is there. It's not going to change much.

Lorilee Davies:
There are business operating on that road out of homes and there's a petting farm that also (end of tape) things are going to dramatically as much as petting farms (couldn't hear)

Kevin Mursell:
And as far as the landfill goes it is my understanding that if there is garbage to be hauled out they would also haul to the landfill in Lumsden, correct, because that is the RM landfill. So I don't know if the Regina Beach landfill would be a concern so but I'd say the water to me is the most important one and if I could've had a meeting with the fella from Sask Water I would've but he just wasn't available so I've got it scheduled for next week to go talk to him.

IRW W3

Wayne Zerff:

What type of water system are you proposing? Individual wells?

Kevin Mursell:

Yeah, pretty much everyone around there has pretty shallow wells so there seems to be lots of water there. But as I say until we do a test hole we wouldn't really know for sure.

Reeve Hipkin:

So have you had an engineer look at the area regarding as to what would be acceptable building sites because I've lived in this area a long time and, all my life, and is the area, the area is close to the area where the water table is quite high?

Kevin Mursell:

Yes

Reeve Hipkin:

So I guess, my concern would be has an engineer looked at, you know, whether or not basements can be successfully created in this type an area?

Kevin Mursell:

Yeah, we had a meeting with John Wolfenberg and he didn't, at that time, he told us, he didn't see any building site concerns per say. Ourselves, we don't have a basement, we have a crawl space.

Dianne Mursell:

We can put that on as a restriction (couldn't hear)

Kevin Mursell:

Yeah if someone says that that's a concern, that you shouldn't probably have a basement here then that would just be a pre-requisite of building a house there is that you can go up but you can't go down. I don't know if that answers the questions or not, but that's about as far as we've got at this point in time and like I say, as far as the water issue I'm hoping to meet with the fella, I wrote down his name here, next week, John Fahlman, at the Watershed Authority so I've a phone call in to him, but he was away this week so. I spoke to Rob Walsher, but he was also, I couldn't meet with him. Their schedules are such that they were just not available.

Reeve Hipkin:

So anyway you're currently in between small holdings to the south of you, 21 acre parcels and 21 acre parcels to the north of you.

Kevin Mursell:

That's correct

Reeve Hipkin:

And I guess it's a full ¼ section to the east

Kevin Mursell:

To the east, yes

Reeve Hipkin:

And then to the west you've got Mr. Glen's and then it appears there was a first parcel out of that ¼ where the Davie's live

Kevin Mursell:

Yes

Reeve Hipkin:

Yeah okay

Tom Harrison:

And then the community pasture comes down

Reeve Hipkin:

And the community pasture comes down to the corners by the road there. Okay so has anyone else got anything to present. If not does anyone on council have any questions.

Tom Harrison:

JRH WJ

The only comment that I'd like to add, was you know in my conversations that I've had, nobody, and everybody was saying that this was not a personal attack on Kevin or Dianne this is an issue around the subdivision and nothing personal. They wanted to make sure that that's very very clear.

Reeve Hipkin:

So therefore, probably what their questioning is the size of the parcels in this subdivision, being the first one that has come about because of the annexation of the Sinclair property into Regina Beach which allows for parcels smaller than 21 acres. That is the issue. Okay

Kevin Mursell:

Thank you very much

Reeve Hipkin:

Okay you're welcome. Would, if there's no further comments, would someone move this public hearing adjourned.

Adjournment:

Wagner: "That we adjourn this public hearing at 3:21 p.m."

CARRIED



Reeve



Administrator