

**R.M. OF LUMSDEN NO. 189**  
**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**HELD ON JUNE 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009**

The Planning Advisory Committee convened their meeting in the Council Chambers of the R.M. Office, on the evening of Tuesday, June 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2009 at 7:32 p.m.

**Present:** Chairman: Tom Harrison  
Committee Members: Attendance Sheet attached

Municipal Planner: John Wolfenberg  
Administrator: Wayne Zerff

**Minutes:**

The minutes of the May 12<sup>th</sup> meeting were reviewed.

**General:**

- Tom advised the committee that at the last Council meeting there was a general consensus among Council members to complete the review process and have John present the policies in July or by September at the latest. Council will review the policies proposed and look at bringing the PAC back in the fall to review and comment before sharing with the public.
- Some members agreed that most topics were hashed out very well and that some definitive policies need to be developed to further the process.
- This will be the last PAC meeting until after the policies have been submitted to Council.

**Revised Goals, Objectives and Policies:**

- The committee discussed the pros and cons of creating areas to encourage development
- Ground and surface water protection was discussed – protecting water sources within the municipality from contamination and depletion was clarified as a goal.
- The CLI section and current wording was reviewed by John.
- After some debate, it was agreed that the terminology “avoid” and “minimize” should be utilized.
- There was a general agreement that sections 2.3 and 2.4 should be combined per John’s question for direction.
- Direction on market gardens and greenhouses to be added by John.
- It was commented that section B2-CLI land 5-7 would be more environmentally sensitive land than class 3-4. There was further discussion regarding this as all did not agree that CLI should be utilized in the final policies. John indicated that he could be more specific in this area as it is only meant to be a yellow flag in the review process. There was a concern that the list may end up being too broad. It was also felt that soil texture and soil features should play a role. It was felt that undisturbed natural areas should be distinguished from natural areas. It was commented that native prairie can be mapped for identification purposes. There was a comment that we need to go beyond this and be proactive rather than placing the onus on the Developer in the application process.
- Visual impact on the Rim of the valley – John indicated that he is trying to get a consensus from the committee in this area. Twin Valley road development was used as an example where the 100 foot easement could have allowed a public view of the south end of Last Mountain Lake from this location. A 1 or 2 acre municipal reserve view spot would have added to the long term appreciation of the valley. It was commented that the scenic protection of the valley rim from houses is more complex than securing a view point for the public. There was a comment that there should be a supplementary study on the local future direction of protecting the valley rim from houses as it affects the public’s view of the valley.
- No Net Loss-mitigation model is needed in policies but the No Net Loss is a compensation structure.
- Ian supplied some Residential Land Use Policies for review and discussion by members. It was indicated that areas should be established where Council would promote residential development, even though there will be winners and losers with this concept. Another indicated that the new plan needs to have vision on where the development in the future will proceed. It was indicated that Council needs to be proactive in defining where the development will happen. Some areas would be desirable for single lot development, while others would be better suited for cluster development.

*AWB*

- Minimum size for residential parcels was discussed referring to parcel sizes from 2.5 to 12 acres while some felt that a greater land size may be desirable for various reasons.
- John indicated that he was considering 1 acre to a maximum of 5 acres for a single lot with no animals.
- Discussion was held on policies to limit a new development until existing approved developments have reached a certain point to avoid saturation of an area with residential or commercial development.
- John reviewed the written comments provided from the Administrator on the proposed policies that were discussed at this meeting.
- Dave indicated that a phone call reminder would be helpful in the fall as not everyone is on the computer regularly unless they are expecting something.

**Revised Plan Maps:**

- John handed out some new maps for natural and manmade constraints and pointed out the changes made since the last meeting.

**Next Meeting:**

Tom indicated the next meeting would most likely be in the fall.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:02 p.m.

  
Chairman

  
Administrator