

**R.M. OF LUMSDEN NO. 189
MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING
HELD ON MARCH 18th, 2010**

The Lumsden Rural Municipal Council convened their special meeting in the Centennial Hall in Lumsden, on Thursday, March 18th, 2010 at 7:10 p.m. with Reeve Jim Hipkin presiding.

Present:	Reeve:	Jim Hipkin
	Councillor:	Kent Farago, Al Szeles, Jim Atcheson, Bill Marquardt, Tom Harrison (left at 9:20 pm) Dale Srochenksi
	Administrator:	Wayne Zerff
	Asst. Administrator:	Darcie Cooper
	Municipal Planner:	John Wolfenberg

Council held a special meeting to review a draft Official Community Plan prepared by municipal planner John Wolfenberg.

John Wolfenberg reviewed the changes council wanted from Draft 6 and presented those changes as Draft 7 of the Official Community Plan.

Section 2 Agricultural Issues Discussion:

- Council felt that the last paragraph in Section 2.1 should indicate that the logic for changes made to the Intensive Livestock Operations (ILO) were due to the dense population of the municipality and that there weren't sufficient separation distances from residential sites based on the attached map with a 3200 meter circle around each residence in the municipality.
- Council discussed how an ILO is to be defined. Discussion was that an ILO would be in excess of 300 animal units that are confined, animal units in proximity to a watercourse. John and Tom were going to work on an ILO definition.
- Council indicated that they did not want to have to issue permits for non-intensive agricultural operations
- Discussed manure spreading practices and separation distances
- Discussed focussing on manure handling practices and winter feeding for Subsection 4.1 B 5 instead of Non-intensive livestock operations
- Discussed a manure spreading setback of 300 metres from multi parcel residential
- Discussed using the proposed existing ILO separation distances for manure spreading areas as well
- Councillor Harrison volunteered to create guidelines and manure management criteria that the municipality can use if they receive complaints by residents.

Transportation Discussion items:

- John wanted to know if council wanted all class 6 roads identified in the Opportunities map or just the Class 6 with existing residents
- Discussed criteria for location of clusters to be along a good quality road but not limit the development there just adding an increased costs if they want to develop along a poorer quality road through off site servicing fees and road development agreements.
- Discussed that "cluster development" needs to be defined as well as the criteria the municipality can use when they are requiring a road development agreement
- Discussed problems with residences along a poor quality of road and there are no criteria to impede development along these poor quality roads until the road is improved. Increase development, increase traffic, increased problem
- Discussed how the municipality might go about improving a poor quality road with residences along when a new application comes in and how a cost-share percentage might be arranged.
- Council felt that, in consideration of the Opportunities Map being a visual tool only, that John could use the current gravel roads as priority for cluster development, Class 1-5 roads.

Residential Discussion items:

- Council discussed the fact that the medium density development would be limited to 80 acres and the high density be limited to 160 acres and didn't agree with limiting the development in this manner
- Council requested John to remove the restriction that the Low Density subdivision fronts

WZ
JRH

a municipal road.

- Council discussed the wording the terms of the Low, Medium and High Density objectives and what they might encompass
- John asked that council give some consideration to what they may like to see for maximum lot development for the Low, Medium and High Density objectives
- Council discussed the water and sewer aspects of the development and Administrator Wayne Zerff indicated that they should refer to compliance with provincial standards so that they are always current
- discussed using areas from Watershed guidelines for residence distances from wells as a basis for minimum parcel sizes
- council recommended using parcel sizes instead of a maximum land usage for residential subdivision development
- John indicated that if council wanted to be less restrictive for subdivisions, they could include a minimum size and no maximum size.


John requested that council review pages 26-31 of the Official Community Plan for the next meeting.

John indicated that he would try to have this meeting's revisions out to council by March 25th. Once the information has been received a meeting will be set.

Adjournment:

110-10 Farago: "That we adjourn this meeting at 10:17 p.m."

CARRIED



Reeve



Administrator