

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



Final consultation for the update OCP began March 2, 2021. Each stakeholder package described that this is the first stage of the OCP update. This included meetings with both major development companies. The second and much smaller stage will see a review of the document for alignment with the District OCP once that document is approved by the province later this year. Alignment to this OCP will occur at the same time as the other partners complete their alignment review.

Current Bylaw = Bylaw 17-2008 and amendments

Proposed Bylaw= draft Bylaw 2-2020

DOCP = pending District OCP with the P4G framework. Adopted by City Council but not yet approved by the Province.

	Community Planning Preliminary Review Comments	Bylaw wording	Proposed Direction
1	Comment: Removing the “existing, future and potential” identifiers from the future land uses is a good decision, as this often creates confusion and is unnecessary.	none	Agreed. No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.
2	There are a few areas where the Future Land Use designation is changing. Many are likely municipally owned which is not a problem; however, there may be a couple that are privately owned. Although the PDA only requires landowners be notified of zoning district changes, it may also be a good idea to let landowners know if there will be significant changes to their FLU designation that they are not aware of, to eliminate any surprises. For example:	none	No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parcel in the NW corner. Was industrial and is now arterial commercial. This does not match the zoning, so maybe the landowner is already aware? 	none	Owner is aware and agrees with alignment of bylaws.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parcel in NE corner. Was industrial and is now reserve, parks and open space. 		City Owned lands
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parcels in SW corner. One was subject to growth plan and is not urban holdings. 		Used and assessed as full commercial. Was changed in 2015 to reflect potential residential development on back half of

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



	another was residential and is now arterial commercial.		property. Has not occurred. Property owner made aware of change to reflect actual usage of property.
6	Sec 3.3.1 Policy for home based business- Some of the policy statements regarding home based businesses are quite detailed, and may be better suited as discretionary use criteria in the zoning bylaw. The zoning bylaw appears to have quite extensive criteria for this use already, therefore the City may want to double check that the policies in the OCP aren't duplicating those already in the zoning bylaw. If it is duplicated, the specific requirements could likely be removed from the OCP in favour of the more general policy statements.	<p><i>3.3.1 Home-based businesses are either Discretionary or Permitted uses depending on level of activity and potential effect on neighbourhood character.</i></p> <p><i>.2 Home-based businesses must demonstrate they:</i></p> <p><i>.a are clearly secondary and subordinate in size and scale to the principal residential use of the dwelling unit;</i></p> <p><i>.b are compatible with nearby residential properties</i></p> <p><i>.c do not change the character of the overall residential environment.</i></p> <p><i>.d do not generate external nuisances (e.g. noise, dust, vibrations, odour, traffic, storage, etc.) that are not normally found in the residential environment.</i></p>	No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.
7	Section 4.4- The title is "mixed-use transitional corridor" and the text refers to the FLU map, however I believe the area on the FLU map is labelled as "Commercial Transition Zone". It may be clearer if the labels match.	Map amendment Figure 2	Amended map accordingly.
8	Sec 4.4- This section contains the restrictions to be applied to the area shown within the dashed line on the FLU Map. It does seem a bit confusing that within the dashed line, the FLU is still shown as residential and community service, when the long term goal appears to be more commercial and mixed use in nature. To more clearly indicate intent, I wonder if the other FLU designations within the dashed line could be removed. Or perhaps the dashed area could become its own future land use designation for mixed use specifically, which would align with the zoning bylaw.	Map amendment Figure 2	Amended map to show mixed use as a different color.

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



9	<p>Urban Reserves- Section 12 This section is very interesting. It is definitely an important matter.</p>	<p>12.5.1 In all cases Council will review and approve an agreement pursuant to part 9 of the Treaty Land Entitlement Framework Agreement before an Urban Reserve is created. The Agreement shall be negotiated in good faith by the City, and will be based on the objectives noted above.</p> <p>.2 The Agreement will consist of any or all of the following matters:</p> <p>.b Mutual Recognition clauses, which acknowledge the individual legislative and jurisdictional authority of each party and the Treaty rights of the First Nation, including the right to Self-Government;</p> <p>.c Bylaw Compatibility clauses, which recognize the right of each party to pass their own Bylaws, the extent to which the First Nation’s Bylaws should be compatible with City Bylaws (and vice versa), procedures to ensure continued Bylaw compatibility for each party to use as their Bylaws are prepared, discussed, adopted, enforced and changed;</p> <p>.d Tax Loss Compensation clauses, which recognize that after the new Urban Reserve has been created, the First Nation will be exempt from paying City taxes (which pay for municipal services), describe how the City will be compensated for loss of these taxes, recognize the types of and costs for those City services which the First Nation plans for the new Reserve and describe the responsibility for collection and the procedures and timing of payments;</p>	<p>Agreed. In bylaw since 2008.</p>
---	---	---	-------------------------------------

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



		<p>.e Dispute Resolution clauses, which will describe the formal procedures for resolving disputes over the application, interpretation or administration of the Agreement; and</p> <p>.f Other Issues, which may include but are not limited to, regular meetings of the Band and City Councils, procedures for sharing information between the Administrators of each party and between the Elected Councils of each party, incentives, exemptions, rebates and abatements of servicing costs, etc., access to property for maintenance, repairs etc.</p>	
10	<p>Minor Variances- According to sections 49(h) and 60(1) of the PDA, minor variances are supposed to be included in the Zoning Bylaw. I see that they were included in the previous OCP, however it is recommended they be removed from this draft version and placed into the zoning bylaw instead.</p>	<p>Current and Proposed Bylaw: 14.6.1 <i>"In making a decision to grant a variance of up to 10% of any yard requirement or minimum required distances between buildings for a permitted use as specified in the Zoning Bylaw, the Development Officer shall consider the following:</i></p> <p><i>.a if there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the subject site that do not apply generally to sites in the same zoning district;</i></p> <p><i>.b if the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right of the applicant and to prevent unreasonable property loss or unnecessary hardship;</i></p> <p><i>.c that the variance would not be detrimental or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity of the subject site, or to the public health, safety or general welfare;</i></p> <p><i>.d that the variance would be in conformance with the goals, policies and objectives of the Official Community Plan and the purposes of the Zoning Bylaw, and would not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent</i></p>	<p>Agreed. Move to Zoning Bylaw.</p>

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



		<p><i>with limitations on other properties in the vicinity and in the same zoning district; and</i></p> <p><i>.e that cost to the applicant of strictly complying with the regulation in question is not the primary reason for granting the variance.”</i></p>	
11	<p>Although you confirmed there is currently no rail within the City, in order to address PDA Sec 32(2)(k) we recommend that municipalities consider adding some form of reference, such as this which is included as an example: “there are no rail lines within the city; however, if any new lines are proposed in the future, the City shall consider best practices and work with the rail company to establish setbacks to address safety concerns.”</p>	<p>Seek guidance from City. Rail line is highly unlikely to be extended into Martensville given the level of country residential between existing lines and City Limits.</p>	<p>The existing rail lines would have to transect country residential development to bring a spur line anywhere near City limits. No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.</p>
12	<p>In some cases, the maps throughout the document are a bit fuzzy. If it is at all possible to include clearer versions, that would be beneficial.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Maps are undergoing correction to clarity as recommended and will be completed in time for Public Hearing. No changes to map lines, land uses proposed, or intent from map presented at first reading.</p>
13	<p>Section 32(2)(j) of the PDA requires that an OCP contain policies regarding municipal reserve for school purposes. Such policies are to be developed in consultation with minister who administers the Education Act, 1995 and any school division within the boundaries. Has the city consulted these authorities? If not, it would be beneficial to do so in order to develop more specific policy about whether or not there is a need for new school sites, and if so, being able to obtain land for the school site as municipal reserve. Although there are some references to school sites in the draft OCP, I think additional detail could be added, specifically including the dedication of municipal reserve for future school sites</p>	<p>Proposed Bylaw: 8.1.4 <i>“Sector plans and concept plans for new residential development areas must include consultation with the Prairie Spirit School Division No. 206 and the Greater Saskatoon Catholic Board of Education to ensure that any requirements for new schools have been satisfactorily addressed in the proposed neighbourhood plans.”</i></p>	<p>Add “and the Ministry of Education” to ensure that any requirements for new schools have been satisfactorily addressed in the proposed neighbourhood plans and “that the new schools will be located on Municipal Reserve” meets the PDA requirements.</p> <p>8.1.4 <i>“Sector plans and concept plans for new residential development areas must include consultation with the Prairie Spirit School Division No. 206 and the Greater Saskatoon Catholic Board of Education and the Ministry of Education to ensure that any requirements for new schools have been satisfactorily addressed in the</i></p>

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



			<i>proposed neighbourhood plans and that the new schools will be located on Municipal Reserve.”.”</i>
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For example, the West Sector concept plan shows a potential school site, however there is no mention in the plan if there is a need for another school in that area or not. 		Consultation was conducted to develop the West Sector Plan and there were no concerns with the plan at that time. No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ You could consider including wording such as the following if there is not currently a need for additional schools: “At the time this bylaw was approved, there was not an identified need for a new school site. If the need for a school site is identified in the future, the municipality will work with the Ministry of Education and the (school division name) to ensure the dedication of municipal reserve to accommodate the creation of a site suitable for that purpose, and amend the bylaws accordingly.” ○ 		As Sector Plans must include consultation with the Ministry of Education and provision of school sites on MR, this clause is no longer needed. No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



	Comments from Stakeholders	Bylaw wording	Proposed Direction
1	Legible page numbers would be handy on all pages.		Agreed. Page numbers made more legible.
2	Section 2.2 Goals- I know Martensville has always had a strong support for business. We were just wondering if that shouldn't be strengthened in the Goals maybe along the lines of " To support and enhance business initiatives in the City of Martensville"	Current and proposed bylaw: "To enhance Martensville's commercial and industrial tax base, while maintaining the City's small town atmosphere and lifestyle."	Recommend amending goal statement as suggested. " To support and enhance business initiatives in the City of Martensville "
3	Question of clarity. The density of 7 units per acre.....is that gross or net?	OCP Policy 3.1.4 <i>"Densities will rise over time. Approvals of new projects will support the P4G Planning district requirement to attain a minimum average as defined in the District Official Community Plan."</i> P4G Plan DOCP Policy 15.3.18 <i>"Urban Residential Neighbourhood Area Density – 17.3 housing units per gross developable ha (7 units per dev acre) or 50 residents and jobs combined per gross dev ha (20.2 residents and jobs combined per gross dev acre)."</i> DOCP Policy 15.3.7 <i>"Mixed Use Nodes must have a minimum density of 75 residents and jobs combined per gross developable ha (30.4 residents and jobs combined per gross developable acre)."</i>	The density of development will be required to meet the overall gross developable area for both residential and mixed use node areas as outlined in the DOCP that was as adopted by Council. No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.
4	Figure 1 & Figure 2: why is there MR, parks and open space shown outside of current municipal boundaries? How was that info derived? For example, does it show park space currently maintained by the city? Not suggesting there is a concern just wondering about why this specific area and land use being shown as no others are shown outside of municipal boundaries.	none	The map is informed by the Sector Plans and informs GNSA work for the small portion that lies outside of the current boundaries. – no change proposed to draft bylaw.

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



5	<p>Section 3.2.3.- Location of affordable housing may not be viable to be close to amenities. This is often the most expensive property.</p>	<p>Current bylaw: <i>“Generally speaking, a land use pattern that reflects higher density residential development (i.e. increased multiple unit developments) in proximity to existing commercial areas, future community centres and green space, will be encouraged through residential and other zoning designations.”</i></p> <p>Proposed Bylaw: 3.2.3 <i>“Affordable housing will be located in close proximity to public amenities, shopping and destinations within the community.”</i></p> <p>3.1.6 <i>“The City will encourage high-density housing as either entirely residential or a mixed-use development provided that it:</i> <i>.a is in proximity to employment centres, shopping and other community amenities</i> <i>.b is adjacent or near park space or linear open spaces;</i> <i>.c addresses the impact of additional traffic on the surrounding neighbourhood and does not route vehicles through lower density areas to access major roadways; and</i> <i>.d is supported by the existing infrastructure capacity.”</i></p>	<p>This clause is meant to provide guidance to developing a balance of all housing values throughout the community as opposed to delegating affordable or high-end housing to particular streets or areas of the City. This can also include a mix of unit values within a single development as well. A sustainable neighbourhood plan takes into account equal access to amenities such as schools, parks and retail should for everyone living there. Eg walkouts along lake for single family dwellings and multiple family dwellings near a recreation facility, park space, transit areas or retail outlets are already common in Martensville.</p> <p>A definition of “affordable” is to be added to the Zoning Bylaw. Definitions are included in the Zoning Bylaw for both the OCP and the Zoning Bylaw. No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.</p>
6	<p>Section 4.1 objectives - Double up on the text</p>		<p>Agreed. Removed duplicate text.</p>

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



7	4.2.1 - Clarity around Commercial centers and the latitude of services.	Proposed bylaw: 4.2.1“ <i>The area shown as Commercial Centres on the Future Land Use Map Figure 2 will be regulated to include retail, offices, service, commercial, and compatible community service and service industries.</i> ”	Concern around they must include all or certain % of each use listed. Change policy by changing “will” to “may” and removing “be regulated to”. 4.2.1“ <i>The area shown as Commercial Centres on the Future Land Use Map Figure 2 may include retail, offices, service, commercial, and compatible community service and service industries.</i> ”
8	4.2 - The 'commercial centre' category includes centres with city-wide and 'sub-regional' market areas. The policies should address how the effects on regional partners are identified and addressed (for example, the effects of regional and sub-regional commercial centres on others' existing and planned commercial areas, and on upstream and downstream infrastructure such as roads and interchanges).		Part of alignment of Martensville OCP and DOCP later this year. No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.
9	7.1.4 - Clarification around Arterials and multi-modal transportation and pedestrian and bike pathways.	Proposed Bylaw: 7.1.4 “ <i>Arterial streets that run through neighbourhoods should facilitate multi-modal transportation by including:</i> <i>.a separated multi-use pathways for pedestrians and cyclists;</i> <i>.b wider boulevards with street trees;</i> <i>.c accommodation for future transit routes and stops; and</i> <i>.d landscaped medians with turning lanes if required; and limited direct access only to higher density residential and commercial uses.</i> ”	Looking for more detail of City expectations for this category so they can complete their concept plan. Details to be included in Design Standards Manual. Definition of multi-modal to be added to the Zoning Bylaw. No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.
10	10.1 - The P4G OCP density target for mixed-use nodes should be reflected (75 residents and jobs combined per gross developable hectare [30.4 residents and jobs combined per gross developable acre]), similar to the residential density target.		Part of alignment of Martensville OCP and DOCP later this year. No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



11	<p>Section 10.1, under Objectives, 5th bullet: discuss boundary changes “...based on long-range future growth studies...”, but there is no mention of coordination with P4G/RM. Is there guidance somewhere in this plan that outlines the criteria for what a future growth study contains. I.e. direction it has to be in alignment with P4G policies/land use map</p>	<p>Section 10.1 Objective: “Where required, to alter the City limits based on long-range future growth studies to provide rationale for boundary changes and promote orderly urban growth.”</p>	<p>Long-Range Future Growth Studies would be conducted according to Section 12 – Co-operating with Others Policy 12.1.1.2 “<i>All attempts will be made to align plans within Martensville with other plans within the region to ensure that all interests are accommodated.</i>” Long range future growth studies include plans such a Master Transportation, Recreation, Infrastructure, etc. Plans, Market Studies, population and absorption analysis, etc and all are tools to inform policy makers. Further, the tools necessary to make decisions vary from project to project. Basically said, a Growth Study is not always just one document completed at one time. Further, growth studies need to be completed in a regional context to best inform any plans and this can not be done without regional coordination or consultation. No change to the draft bylaw recommended at this time.</p>
12	<p>Section 10.2 there is no referral to P4G/RM as part of creating Sector Plans. The sector plan level is a good time for a RM referral and endorsement. A change to a concept plan is a little more internal to Martensville, however the Sector Plan would be the level we see being engaged at. Not sure if that is clearly coming across by leaving it to just 12.1.1 as an example.</p>		<p>Section 12 covers off aligning with others and as such, sector plans would be presented to partners as part of the open communication Policy 12.1.1 “<i>All major growth initiatives and major policy amendments will be communicated to key stakeholders prior to adoption.</i>” Policy 12.1.1.2 “<i>All attempts will be made to align plans within Martensville with other plans within the region to ensure that all interests are accommodated.</i>” Policy 12.1.3 “<i>Synergies between Martensville and key regional stakeholders will be sought which relate to housing, employment, recreational, climate change, environmental</i></p>

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



			<p><i>stewardship, transportation and other important issues which lead to mutual benefit.”</i></p> <p>No change to the draft bylaw recommended at this time.</p>
13	<p>Section 10.5 there is no mention of coordinating with P4G/RM on boundary alteration, yet it is included in P4G OCP – Section 15.2d. Is this an area Martinsville intends to come back and address afterwards as part of the alignment statement?</p>	<p>DOCP Objective: 15.2 d “Coordinate urban expansion and staged boundary alterations in future urban growth planning”</p> <p>Proposed Bylaw: 10.5.1 “<i>Annexation of land should be preceded by a Future Growth Study or Studies which determines the need for more land to accommodate growth.</i>”</p>	<p>Boundary alterations require consultation with the RM as per the Municipalities/ Cities Act. OCP states City will abide by all provincial legislation. Section 12 discusses working collaboratively with our partners and within P4G. No change to the draft bylaw recommended at this time. Review at again when aligning Martinsville OCP and DOCP.</p>
14	<p>10.5 – To minimize the potential for boundary alteration disputes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The criteria for boundary alterations should reflect the P4G OCP, and ○ Land use and density requirements immediately after boundary alteration, but before urban development is imminent, should reflect the P4G OCP wherever possible. 	<p><i>.2 Annexation will be guided by policies contained in the Official Community Plan which calls for comprehensive growth and sustainable patterns of development.</i></p> <p><i>.3 Upon annexation, the City will encourage land to be used in an unfragmented state until sector plans and concept plans are adopted and servicing extends into the area.</i></p> <p><i>.4 Until such a time land is to be developed at an urban density, agricultural uses and other uses requiring large, unserviced areas of land will be encouraged.”</i></p> <p>Proposed Bylaw 12.3.1 “<i>The City of Martinsville will be a full participant within the P4G partnership to resolve regional development issues of mutual interest to all partners.</i>”</p>	<p>Part of alignment of Martinsville OCP and DOCP later this year.</p> <p>No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.</p>

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



15	Figure 12 identifies South-East Sector outline; however, this area is not identified as an Urban Growth Area in P4G, it is Rural Commercial/Industrial. Curious as to the rationale for inclusion of non-urban growth lands?	none	This is the area of the North Concept Plan overlap. SE Sector Plan is planning the area for residential as studies have determined it is serviceable. No change proposed to draft bylaw.
16	Section 11 there is no mention of GNSA and refinement requirements at the Concept Plan/ Sector Plan stage, yet it is included in P4G OCP – Section 17.3. Is this an area Martensville intends to come back and address afterwards as part of the alignment statement?	DOCP Policy 17.3.3 “prior to the development of a region-wide study, the GNSA may be refined by a concept plan or other detailed assessment.”	Part of alignment of Martensville OCP and DOCP later this year. No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.
17	Section 11.6.3 – caution on language around ‘development will be planned outside of floodplain’ only in that it could be very limiting for the city. Development in the floodplain, specifically the flood fringe may be very acceptable. Floodway is one thing but just don’t limit yourself too much on language directed to the floodplain; just a caution.	11.6.1 “ <i>Floodplains should be identified and development will be planned outside of identified floodplain areas.</i> ”	Consultant has suggested to add “whenever possible” to this policy. 11.6.1 “ <i>Floodplains should be identified and development will be planned outside of identified floodplain areas whenever possible.</i> ”
18	12.1 - The approach that was taken with Saskatoon’s OCP was to align as much as possible with the relevant provisions of the (then-draft) P4G OCP, so we don’t have to revisit and amend it later. To align with the P4G OCP, policies emphasizing the need to work with partners in the region are placed throughout the OCP. The regional aspects of the economy, service delivery, transportation and the environment are recognized in each relevant section of the OCP, with specific objectives and policies.		Martensville stated this in one statement rather than be repetitive through each section of document. 12.1.1 “ <i>Synergies between Martensville and key regional stakeholders will be sought which relate to housing, employment, recreational, climate change, environmental stewardship, transportation and other important issues which lead to mutual benefit.</i> ” That being said, this will be looked at again as part of alignment of Martensville OCP and DOCP later this year. No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.
19	Section 12.1.1.2 “All attempts will be made to align plans within Martensville with other plans within the region...” should this be a requirement, not just an attempt. What would be an example of a situation	12.1.3” <i>All attempts will be made to align plans within Martensville with other plans within the region to ensure that all interests are accommodated.</i> ”	This plan articulates the statutory requirement for alignment with the Regional Plan. When it comes to smaller non-statutory plans or plans that have not yet become appended to the

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



	where meeting the plan is not acceptable? We understand that the P4G land use map for example can change, but unless an amendment has been made to alter it we would assume any sector/concept/development plans have to meet that. Unsure of your intent/approach to the clause.		statutory plans, the City will need to work with partners to find common ground to ensure alignment. As there is an element of negotiation that this will involve, the statement that the City will take the time and effort to align with these plans within the region is correct. No amendment to the draft plan recommended at this time.
20	12.1.1.4 - For something with a wide range of implications for regional partners, perhaps more detail on regional collaboration on critical infrastructure is necessary. For example, Saskatoon’s OCP (G5.3 – Extension of Infrastructure and Services Beyond City Limits) provides criteria for this type of infrastructure extension (i.e. contiguous, capital and operating cost recovery, volume, alignment with other regional plans, agreements).	12.1.1.4 Increase the city’s resilience by collaborating for municipal critical infrastructure with regional, First Nations and Métis, provincial, and federal partners to promote and strengthen coordinated preparedness, planning and recovery.	Part of alignment of Martensville OCP and DOCP later this year. No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.
21	Section 12.3, under Objectives, 2nd bullet, “Participate in a forum which allows the growth and development of Martensville to be articulated to other regional partners.” The word ‘articulate’ doesn’t send the right message, should say something along the lines of share, coordinate, collaborate.	Objective: “Participate in a forum which allows the growth and development of Martensville to be articulated to other regional partners.”	Recommend amending objective to change the word “be articulate to” to “share with”. “Participate in a forum which allows the growth and development of Martensville to share with other regional partners.”
22	12.5: ○ In our experience, the myth cited has not been a prevalent myth and does not merit highlighting. Urban Reserves level the playing field for all Treaty people by fulfilling a long-outstanding Treaty obligation.	Section 12.5 Objective: “Commercial and employment growth results from the creation of urban reserves. It is a myth that urban reserves create an unlevel playing field in the commercial or employment sector. Urban reserves add to the tax base of a municipality and pay an equal share for municipal services as compared to non-reserve lands.”	While Martensville acknowledges all Treaty people and, therefore, all businesses should have the same level playing field, there is also a recognition that not all residents and business owners may have the same understanding and knowledge about the impacts new investors entering a particular market may have as Saskatoon residents and businesses do with the inception of multiple urban reserves in that City.

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



<p>○ 'Tax base' and 'taxes' are loaded terms in this context; assessment base and fees for services are more neutral.</p> <p>The Guiding Policy could be higher level, similar to the approach in 12.4. The focus on protecting the tax base and setting out the specific terms of an agreement may be overly detailed and inadvertently convey anticipated conflict. Our experience has been that fee for service and land use compatibility negotiations are straightforward. The more-frequent challenge is the lack of municipal information (e.g. development phasing and servicing, infrastructure upgrades) available to First Nations before land is purchased, resulting in disconnects with the First Nation's economic development plans. To help address that, we need to build relationships so that First Nations are comfortable contacting municipalities early in their land selection process.</p>	<p>Guiding Policy: 12.5.1 In all cases Council will review and approve an agreement pursuant to part 9 of the Treaty Land Entitlement Framework Agreement before an Urban Reserve is created. The Agreement shall be negotiated in good faith by the City, and will be based on the objectives noted above. .2 The Agreement will consist of any or all of the following matters: .b Mutual Recognition clauses, which acknowledge the individual legislative and jurisdictional authority of each party and the Treaty rights of the First Nation, including the right to Self-Government; .c Bylaw Compatibility clauses, which recognize the right of each party to pass their own Bylaws, the extent to which the First Nation's Bylaws should be compatible with City Bylaws (and vice versa), procedures to ensure continued Bylaw compatibility for each party to use as their Bylaws are prepared, discussed, adopted, enforced and changed; .d Tax Loss Compensation clauses, which recognize that after the new Urban Reserve has been created, the First Nation will be exempt from paying City taxes (which pay for municipal services), describe how the City will be compensated for loss of these taxes, recognize the types of and costs for those City services which the First Nation plans for the new Reserve and describe the responsibility for collection and the procedures and timing of payments;</p>	<p>The Guiding policy has the detail it has because the City has no other bylaws or policies in place to guide urban reserve development. Perhaps once more of a framework is developed this can be looked at and amended at that time. The consultant has recommended we leave this section alone at this time. No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.</p>
--	---	---

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



		<p>.e Dispute Resolution clauses, which will describe the formal procedures for resolving disputes over the application, interpretation or administration of the Agreement; and</p> <p>.f Other Issues, which may include but are not limited to, regular meetings of the Band and City Councils, procedures for sharing information between the Administrators of each party and between the Elected Councils of each party, incentives, exemptions, rebates and abatements of servicing costs, etc., access to property for maintenance, repairs etc.</p>	
23	12.5 - Service fees for Urban Reserves were not discussed. Are they a requirement?	See guiding policy listed in line 22.	<p>Add a new clause</p> <p>12.5.1.2 .e <u>“Contributions to Development Charges, which recognize the agreement to establish Urban Reserves will take into account the payment of applicable, standard development levies in place at the time.”</u></p> <p>The other clauses will be renumbered to include this clause.</p>
24	Question of clarity: What is the process for swapping MR ?	14.9.1 <i>“To facilitate the goals and objectives of this plan, Council may, from time to time consider acquiring land or sites, either through purchase or exchange, for the purpose of facilitating land use compatibility and/or economic development objectives.”</i>	14.9 Land Exchange and purchase – enables land exchange to occur. Lands, once dedicated will have to follow Dedicated Lands Regulations and Act. No change recommended to draft bylaw at this time.

What We Heard: Draft OPC comments and proposed alterations to Draft OCP prior to first reading
March 2021



	Comment from Administration	Bylaw wording	Proposed Direction
1	In consultation with land developers, there have been questions around what is required prior to actually breaking ground on a new development. In Consultation with Wallace Insights, it is recommended that additional wording be added to the bylaw. This wording mirrors Saskatoon’s OCP .	none	Add the following to section 11.2.6 <i>“In advance of a Concept Plan, subdivision plan, or development permit for a permanent use being approved for an area, any application to excavate, strip, grade, or remove vegetation from the land will require a development permit issued under the Zoning Bylaw.”</i>