

Official Community Plan & Zoning Bylaw Review

Engagement Summary – Proposed Policy Changes

1. Introduction

The RM's Official Community Plan (OCP) and Zoning Bylaw review project was initiated in early 2025, five years after the bylaws were initially adopted. The purpose of the project is to evaluate the performance of both bylaws and identify areas that may need to be updated to respond to changing needs or circumstances.

Several policy areas in the OCP and Zoning Bylaw had already been identified by Administration as requiring review. Prior to finalizing the scope of the review, early stakeholder engagement was carried out to identify any areas that the community felt should also be reviewed as part of the project. Following early stakeholder engagement proposed amendments were drafted based on community feedback. The proposed amendments were then presented to the public along with a survey focused on hot-topic items or areas identified by Council as needing additional public input.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this engagement was to:

- Provide information about the purpose of the OCP and Zoning Bylaw;
- Provide information about the OCP and Zoning Bylaw review project;
- Prompt stakeholders to consider their thoughts about planning and development in the RM
- Collect & capture feedback on proposed amendments and topics previously identified as a priority to finalize and support amendments to the OCP and Zoning Bylaw

3. Methods

An online survey, accompanied by a comprehensive list of proposed amendments (**Appendices A and B**), was made available to the public through the RM's website and social media.

The survey was 10 questions long and included 2 demographic questions (stakeholder type and age). The next 5 questions focused on topics previously identified as a priority in the community and areas in which more significant changes to the Zoning Bylaw or OCP were proposed. The final 3 questions asked respondents to share thoughts about the proposed changes as a whole. The survey was intended to take less than 10 minutes to complete however due to Questions 8 and 9

covering the entirety of the proposed amendments respondents who completed these questions may have took additional time.

The survey was available from December 3, 2025, to January 5, 2026, for a total of 4 weeks and 5 days. 177 survey responses were collected during the survey period. The full survey as it appeared to respondents is included as **Appendix C**.

4. Key Takeaways









- Ratepayers and residents from across the RM engaged in the survey, however **few respondents worked in the RM**. As such responses may not reflect the interests of the business community and community members who contribute to but do not reside within the RM.
- Survey respondents repeatedly expressed **opposition to high density development and apartment buildings**.
 - Regardless of age respondents, on average, ranked apartment buildings last among alternate housing types
 - Infrastructure capacity was the number one concern regarding apartment buildings, followed by proximity to existing residences.
- **A notable portion of written responses raised concerns related to renters specifically or did not provide reasoning for their opposition to high-density development**. These comments suggest that some opposition to apartment buildings in the RM may be driven less by building form or servicing considerations and more by perceptions of who would occupy such housing.
- **The aspects identified as most important to defining character by respondents were lot size, type of housing and natural features**. Density was also commonly mentioned as an additional response. Only 1/3 of respondents indicated building design and style as an important aspect of character.
 - Note: Some respondents may have interpreted “type of housing” as “type of ownership.” The term “character” itself can function as coded language in planning discussions, often used to signal preferences for exclusivity or to resist change without explicitly referencing social or demographic factors.
- **Respondents were somewhat supportive of providing lower density alternate housing options to support aging in place, although some respondents indicated they were only in support of single-family dwellings**.
 - Survey results indicated the preferred alternate housing options were smaller lot single-family dwellings and semi-detached dwellings
- **Respondents are generally opposed to changing cannabis retail setback distance**
- **Respondents are generally in favour of or have no opinion regarding changes to acreage sizes**
- Requests for **recreation facilities and increased recreational opportunities** emerged as a common theme when respondents were asked if they had addition thoughts regarding planning & development
- Full amendment review questions (8 & 9) did not correspond well with the intended 10-minute scope of the survey

5. Summary of Feedback Received

The following is a summary of the results received for each survey question. For the purposes of this report, preamble to questions has not been included but can be found within **Appendix C**. Other written responses and responses to Questions 8-10 have been grouped by theme / sentiment and may not account for all responses. Verbatim long-answer responses and full results can also be found in **Appendix C**.

Question 1: Tell us who you are (select all that fit). (Total responses: 177)

Respondents were allowed to select multiple answers.

Answer Choices ↓	Percentage ↓	Responses ↓
 I live on a farm or acreage	12.43%	22
 I live in a country residential subdivision (like Rock Pointe, Stone Pointe, or Spruce Creek)	14.12%	25
 I live in Emerald Park	64.41%	114
 I live in another nearby town (Balgonie, Pilot Butte, or White City)	11.86%	21
 I own or work at a business in the RM	2.82%	5
 I own land in the RM but don't live here	0.56%	1
 I represent a company or group interested in RM planning	0.56%	1
 Other (please specify) Show responses	1.69%	3

2 of the 3 respondents who selected Other indicated they lived in Escott/Deneve (a country residential subdivision) and the other indicated they lived in White City (another nearby town).

The majority of respondents identified as living in the RM. Half of all respondents identified as living in Emerald Park. Few respondents indicated that they work within the RM.

Question 2: What is your age? (Total responses: 177)

Answer Choices ↓	Percentage ↓	Responses ↓	
● 18 to 24	0.56%	1	...
● 25 to 34	4.52%	8	...
● 35 to 44	22.60%	40	...
● 45 to 54	17.51%	31	...
● 55 to 64	27.12%	48	...
● 65 to 74	20.90%	37	...
● 75 or older	3.39%	6	...
● Prefer not to answer	3.39%	6	...

The majority of respondents were over the age of 35. Less than 10 respondents indicated that they were younger than 35.

Question 3: Community Character

Think about what makes your area special. Which of these aspects are most important? Pick all that apply or add your own. (Total responses: 177)

Respondents were allowed to select multiple answers.

It should be noted that based on other answers, and written responses that type of home may have been misconstrued by some respondents as relating to ownership type (renter vs. owner).

Answer Choices ↓	Percentage ↓	Responses ↓
● Lot size	80.79%	143
● Types of homes (single family, duplex, etc.)	79.10%	140
● Being in a rural setting	49.15%	87
● Building height	27.68%	49
● Building design/style	33.33%	59
● Landscaping and yard upkeep	64.97%	115
● Streetscape (the look and feel of roads and sidewalks)	49.72%	88
● Sense of community (knowing your neighbours, local history, family ties)	67.80%	120
● Natural features (trees, parks, ponds, open spaces)	80.23%	142
● Other (please specify) Show responses	33.33%	59

Other Responses

The majority of other responses overlapped with one of the provided answer choices.

In particular:

- Type of homes – 35
- Rural setting – 4
- Natural features / park space – 4
- Large lots – 3
- Sense of community – 2

Other responses included discussion related to:

- Density – 21
- Mention or describe a “small town feel” - 3
- Safety – 2
- Privacy - 1
- Diversity - 1

Multiple responses related to type of home or density were specifically against rental properties. Ownership type was not included as an option in this section of the questionnaire as the RM does not have a say in whether a property is owned or rented.

Question 4: Cannabis Retail Businesses

Do you support the reduction of minimum separation distances between cannabis retail stores and any of the following uses? (Total responses: 177)

	LEAVE AS 200 METRES	REDUCE TO 100 METRES	REDUCE TO 60 METRES	TOTAL
Private schools and tutoring services	88.07% 155	6.82% 12	5.11% 9	176
Recreational facilities	85.06% 148	8.62% 15	6.32% 11	174
Parks/playgrounds	89.27% 158	5.08% 9	5.65% 10	177
Day care facilities	89.08% 155	5.17% 9	5.75% 10	174
Community centres/youth centres	89.60% 155	4.05% 7	6.36% 11	173
Places of worship	76.88% 133	8.67% 15	14.45% 25	173
Other cannabis retail stores	70.59% 120	5.88% 10	23.53% 40	170
Tutoring services	83.53% 142	8.24% 14	8.24% 14	170

A large majority of residents were against reducing setback distances for all uses. The most amount of people supported reducing the setback for places of worship.

Question 5: Acreage Size

The RM wants to give landowners more flexibility by allowing slightly bigger acreages if needed to fit existing yard features (like trees, dugouts, or farm buildings) when subdividing a yard from the rest of the quarter section. Do you agree with this change? (Total responses: 176)

Answer Choices ↓	Percentage ↓	Responses ↓
Yes	46.02%	81
No	9.09%	16
Maybe - I need more information	29.55%	52
No opinion	15.34%	27
Total		176

The results of respondents who indicated they lived on a rural acreage or farm closely resembled the results for the entire of the survey group.

Answer Choices ↓	Percentage ↓	Responses ↓
Yes	45.45%	10
No	13.64%	3
Maybe - I need more information	36.36%	8
No opinion	4.55%	1
Total		22

Question 6: Housing Options

Consider your current needs, future plans, and what you'd like to see in your community. Please rank the housing types below from most to least preferred. (Total responses: 175)

The average ranking was as follows:

1. Detached single family dwellings on smaller lots
2. Semi-detached dwellings (two units side-by-side sharing a wall)
3. Garage suites
4. Basement suites
5. Duplexes (one unit above the other, usually one below ground and one above)
6. Townhomes
7. Tri-plexes or four-plexes (three or four units within the same building, above or below ground, but generally resembles a large single family home)
8. Apartment buildings

Over 90% of respondents ranked apartment buildings as the least desirable option, however 2 respondents ranked apartment buildings as their most desirable option.

For respondents over the age of 65 average ranking varied slightly:

1. Semi-detached dwellings (two units side-by-side sharing a wall))
2. Detached single family dwellings on smaller lots
3. Duplexes (one unit above the other, usually one below ground and one above)
4. Garage suites
5. Basement suites
6. Townhomes
7. Tri-plexes or four-plexes (three or four units within the same building, above or below ground, but generally resembles a large single family home)
8. Apartment buildings









For respondents under the age of 35 the average ranking also varied slightly:

1. Detached single family dwellings on smaller lots
2. Basement suites
3. Garage suites
4. Semi-detached dwellings (two units side-by-side sharing a wall))
5. Townhomes
6. Duplexes (one unit above the other, usually one below ground and one above)
7. Tri-plexes or four-plexes (three or four units within the same building, above or below ground, but generally resembles a large single family home)
8. Apartment buildings

Question 7: Apartment Buildings

The RM has heard a lot of feedback against apartment buildings in Emerald Park. Below is a list of concerns we received that relate directly to the Zoning Bylaw. Please pick the two concerns that influenced your opinion the most. (Total responses: 173)

Respondents were able to select two options.

Answer Choices ↓	Percentage ↓	Responses ↓
 Height of the proposed buildings	16.18%	28
 Architectural details of the proposed buildings	5.20%	9
 Proximity of the development to existing residential development	53.18%	92
 Infrastructure capacity	57.80%	100
 Number of parking spaces provided	10.98%	19
 Landscaping	3.47%	6
 I was in support of the proposed apartment buildings	4.05%	7
 Other (please specify) Show responses	54.34%	94

Other Responses

A large proportion of other responses did not express a specific concern related to apartments; all but one of these responses indicated they were opposed to apartments. Some responses indicated all of the listed options were concerns. One person indicated they have no concerns.

- Did not express a specific concern – 27
- All of the above – 4
- Indicated they have no other concerns - 1

A large proportion of the other responses also indicated an opposition to the apartment buildings, as they were rentals and included associated concerns with rentals.

- Opposed to proposal being for rentals – 21
- Concerned with high density – 15
- Crime or safety concerns – 13
- Doesn't match character / intent of area – 9
- Traffic or infrastructure concerns - 5
- Concerned by potential influx of residents – 4
- Feel apartments are not needed - 4
- Opposed the location of the development – 2
- Worried about property values - 2
- Proposed units too small – 1

Question 8: The full list of proposed amendments to the Official Community Plan can be viewed [here](#). Do you have any comments you'd like to share about the proposed changes?

(Total responses: 66)

The list attached to this question can be found in **Appendix A**.

- **32** responses indicated they were opposed to apartments, multi-family dwellings and/or higher density
 - The majority of these responses did not specifically comment on the contents of the proposed amendments
- **16** responses specifically referenced density
 - 15 of these responses indicated they were opposed to apartment or high-density development
 - 3 of these responses noted they supported the proposed amendments to remove high-density wording
- **9** responses referenced a specific amendment or section
 - 3 of these responses provided specific suggestions related to formatting, definitions, annexation, farm dwellings, the inclusion of traffic when discussing road infrastructure, and the inclusion of monitoring in section 5.1.4
 - 2 responses provided broad suggestions regarding the consideration of leisure activities and the protection of wetlands

- 2 responses specifically referenced Sec 3.11, one indicating that the need for multiple housing types should be formally demonstrated in a factual study
- 7 responses expressed the view that Council/Administration needs to listen better to the ratepayers / the community
- 7 responses indicated that reviewing the amendments would take longer than indicated, the amendments were presented in a way not understandable to them, or an open house was needed to discuss further.
- 3 responses discussed the positives of the inclusion of aging in place.
 - 1 was supportive of a diversity of housing types, also emphasizing the importance of housing for the younger generation
 - 2 were supportive of a diversity of housing types, excepting apartment or rentals
- 2 responses mentioned concerns related to the Zoning Bylaw, and not the OCP
- 2 responses questioned the priority levels within the survey or survey methods
- 2 responses reported some form of tech issue
 - 1 person could not view the amendment list
 - 1 person could not locate the Indigenous Engagement Strategy on the RM website
- 1 response indicated they were against the expansion of subdivisions on farmland
- 1 response indicated that references to indigenous consultation were overused, and not required

Question 9: The full list of proposed amendments to the Zoning Bylaw can be viewed here. Do you have any comments you'd like to share about the proposed changes? (Total responses: 48)

The list attached to this question can be found in **Appendix B**.

- 16 responses indicated they were opposed to apartments, multi-family dwellings and/or higher density
 - 5 of these responses specifically referred to the R3 Zoning District
- 7 responses referred to a specific amendment / section (other than R3 Zoning)
 - 4 of these responses indicated that current public notification distances, particularly in the Emerald Park area, are not sufficient
 - 1 response indicated the sea container limited in CR2 should be increased to 2
 - 1 response supported maintaining 200m cannabis setbacks
 - 1 response was supportive of the change in wording in 6.1.8
- 6 responses indicated that reviewing the amendments would take longer than indicated, the amendments, were presented in a way not understandable them, or an open house was needed to discuss further.
- 3 responses contained comments that were contradictory, unrelated to the question, or irrelevant
- 2 responses expressed support for a reduction of maximum building heights in residential zones
- 2 responses expressed approval without other comments.
- 2 responses expressed the view that Council/Administration needs to listen better to the ratepayers / the community
- 2 responses questioned the priority levels within the survey or survey methods

- 1 response expressed concern related to the dominance of Emerald Park residents in community dialogue
- 1 response reported some form of tech issue
 - 1 person could not view the amendment list

Question 10: Do you have any other thoughts about planning, development, or community building that you'd like to share? (Total responses: 114)

General Sentiments

- 48 responses contained negative sentiments
- 2 responses contained positive sentiments or stated that the RM was doing a good job
- The remainder of responses were neutral

Themes

- 52 responses expressed opposition to high density development or apartment buildings
 - 3 of these responses expressed that they would support transitional housing types such as townhouses
- 15 responses called for more recreation facilities and opportunities
 - Park, sports facilities, playgrounds, pools and rinks were all specifically mentioned
- 15 responses urged Council/Administration to listen to the ratepayers / the community
- 9 responses expressed dissatisfaction with the survey
 - Question 6 in particular was misconstrued by those opposed to all housing types other than single-family residential
 - 1 respondent indicated they felt the survey was geared specifically towards Emerald Park residents
- 7 responses indicated they were opposed to growth or development in general
- 6 responses praised or called for a return to large lot sizes
 - Some of these respondents suggested a larger minimum site size
- 5 responses discussed maintaining natural features or expanding the urban forest
 - 2 of these responses indicated a desire for increased tree canopy along walking paths
- 6 responses discussed developer accountability or responsible development
- 5 responses indicated a lack of understanding as to how planning initiatives and Council decisions must benefit the entire RM or what falls under municipal planning jurisdiction
- 4 responses expressed a need for more / better community engagement or transparency
- 3 responses discussed a lack of or need for increased amenities or services
- 3 responses mentioned annexation attempts by White City
- 2 responses expressed a desire to maintain rural character
- 2 responses discussed a need for greater enforcement
- 1 response was in support of alternative housing, without caveats
- 1 response suggested closer collaboration with the Ministry of Highways regarding the Highway #1 corridor
- 1 response suggested allowing multiple dwellings on agricultural properties

- 1 response was strongly opposed to reduced cannabis store setbacks
- 1 response cautioned against letting the voices of a few dictate what's best for the community
- 1 response called for careful development of hazardous sites such as recycling and composting plants
- 1 response specifically mentioned water quality
- 1 response specifically mentioned the sewer system
- 1 response specifically mention keeping traffic outside of residential areas
- 1 response called for operating costs to remain within the annual inflation rate
- 1 response called for division alterations
- 1 response indicated that Emerald Park should leave the RM

Appendices

Appendix A – List of Proposed OCP Amendments

Appendix B - List of Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendments

Appendix C – Full Survey Results

For more information, contact the RM of Edenwold Planning and Development Department
at 306-771-2522 or planning@edenwold-sk.ca

