



RM of Edenwold
Meeting Minutes
Public Hearing Meeting October 22, 2025 - 06:30 PM

Minutes of the Public Hearing Meeting of the Council of the Rural Municipality of Edenwold No. 158 held on Wednesday, October 22, 2025, at the Emerald Park Fire Hall, located at 102 Hutchence Road, Emerald Park, Saskatchewan, to receive verbal and written submissions in regard to:

Discretionary Use Application: Three (3) Apartment Buildings (Greensview) at Blk/Par BB, Plan 102138342, Ext 0 in SE 22-17-18 W2

The following members of Council and staff were present:

Reeve: Al Trainor

Councillors: Division #1 Carmen Leibel
Division #2 Stan Capnerhurst
Division #3 Nichole Posehn
Division #4 Karen Kotylak
Division #5 Stephen Werner
Division #6 Tim Brodt
Division #7 Darren Bezborotko

Chief Administrative Officer: Shauna Bzdel

Administrator: Karen Zaharia

Manager of Engineering and Public Works: Clark Gates

Manager of Planning and Development: Paige Boha

Administrative Assistant III: Jessica Schoenroth

Communications Officer: Lee Chambers

Call to Order

Reeve Trainor called the Public Hearing to order at 6:30 p.m.

Discretionary Use Application: Apartment Buildings (Greensview) - Blk/Par BB, Plan 102138342 in SE 22-17-18 W2

Reeve Trainor introduced the discretionary use application for three (3) apartment buildings (Greensview) at Blk/Par BB, Plan 102138342 in SE 22-17-18 W2 in Emerald Park, Saskatchewan.

In accordance with the RM's Council Procedures Bylaw No. 2023-29, Reeve Trainor invited the applicant to present first.

Dustin Weiss (P. Eng) with WCE Design Inc. presented on behalf of the applicants. In his opening remarks, Mr. Weiss provided the following information about the proposal:

- The application consists of three apartment buildings with 59 units per building for a total of 177 units. The estimated population of all three buildings combined is 408 people.
- No government subsidies or funding are being received.
- Each floor will have fully accessible units and accessible parking stalls will be provided.

- A total of 244 parking stalls will be provided, resulting in a ratio of 1.4 stalls per dwelling unit which exceeds the minimum requirements of the RM.
- There are no concerns about sewer or water capacity based on the developer's modelling or third-party engineering reviews.
- The school board (Prairie Valley School Division) was consulted and indicated that they do not have capacity concerns based on their population forecasting.

Verbal Submissions

Reeve Trainor asked for any verbal submissions.

Verbal submissions were presented by Kelly Morrow, Dale Bonner, Karen Cicansky, Charlene Meldrum, Daryl Schwartz, Anne Panter, John Panter, Terry Herback & Sherry Herback, Randy Schulz, Verdella Kattler, Lil Morris, Randy Johnson, Marco Giannini, Arnie Kowalchuk, Bob Moldovan, Randy Swan, June Mitchell & Kevin Mitchell, Ben Kuzmicz, Kathy Bechard, Dean Grobowsky, Barbara & Jack Opfergelt, Pamela Anderson, Cheryl Delmaire, John Barabe, Jacqueline Herman, Trevor Silzer, Christa Weber (via Trevor Silzer), Kenda Ashton, Michelle Bruce, Troy Corbett, Josh Dumalski, Kara Moore, Katherine Williams, Sheri Ziegler and Shawn Milligan.

Out of the thirty-five (35) verbal submissions, all thirty-five (35) submissions were opposed to the application. The recurring themes and concepts identified in all the verbal submissions are summarized below:

Community Character & Social Cohesion

- Strong opposition to changing Emerald Park's small-town, single-family home atmosphere.
- Concerns that development will disrupt neighborhood identity, quiet, safety, and familiarity among neighbors.
- Fears that a sudden influx of apartment renters may affect social cohesion and community dynamics.
- Long-standing homeowners feel their investment and lifestyle are being threatened by rapid urban-style changes.

Governance, Planning & Transparency

- Skepticism about discretionary use procedures and how zoning changes are being handled.
- Allegations of inadequate public notification and consultation, leading to distrust in the planning process.
- Concerns that the Official Community Plan (OCP) does not support this type of development.
- Calls for better transparency, community engagement, and responsiveness to resident concerns.

Education & Services

- Schools (especially elementary) are reportedly full or over capacity.
- Anticipated need for new schools, daycares, and increased school bus services.
- Worries that emergency services, RCMP, and recreational facilities may be strained by population growth.

Infrastructure & Environmental Concerns

- Infrastructure (roads, water, sewer, power) seen as insufficient to support increased density.
- Frequent mentions of water pressure issues, sewer backups, and garbage overflow.
- Fears that upgrades will be costly and outweigh any tax revenue benefits.

- Concerns about drainage issues, flood risk, and environmental degradation from construction and traffic.

Mobility & Accessibility

- Anticipated rise in traffic congestion and noise, especially near schools and residential streets.
- Parking ratios (e.g., 1.44 stalls per unit) viewed as inadequate, risking overflow and safety issues.
- Limited public transit options increase car dependency and reduce feasibility of high-density living.

Economic & Housing Implications

- Fears of declining property values and future tax assessments.
- Belief that residents should not bear the cost of developer-driven infrastructure.
- Doubts about rental unit maintenance and concerns over absentee landlords.
- Mixed views on housing affordability—some support it, others argue apartments don't fit community needs or character.
- Perception that the RM is prioritizing profit over community well-being.

Business & Economic Development

- Some residents acknowledge potential benefits to local businesses from increased population.
- Emphasis on the need for balanced, thoughtful growth aligned with community values.

Social & Safety Issues

- Concerns over increased crime, noise, and graffiti.
- Preference for owner-occupied homes; skepticism about renters maintaining properties.
- Some submissions included discriminatory or stigmatizing remarks about renters and ethnic groups.

Alternative Development Ideas

- Suggestions for downsized single-family homes or senior-friendly housing.
- Support for infill development that respects existing architectural controls.
- Preference for developments like Silver Oak over high-density apartments.

Following all verbal submissions, Dustin Weiss provided a response on behalf of the applicants. In his closing remarks, Mr. Weiss provided the following responses to comments made during the public hearing:

- At the time the parcel was rezoned to R3 – Urban Residential 3, a public hearing was held and several local residents attended.
- Although the CDP shows townhomes for Phase 2, this has not been confirmed and the developer sought feedback from the community about what they would like to see for Phase 2 at their open houses. It may not necessarily be more multi-family housing. He acknowledged that development of Phase 2 will be subject to its own approval processes.
- The RM is undertaking a traffic impact assessment that will consider the cumulative effects of the proposed apartments as well as other developments in the area. He acknowledged that the developers would be required to undertake and financially contribute to any traffic improvements required based on the findings of the study.
- Locating higher-density residential development between commercial and single-family residential to act as a buffer is a common community planning practice.
- Existing ponds will accommodate current stormwater flows and there is a plan in place to control the rate of run-off exiting the site. He acknowledged that the site currently receives run off from the north and the drainage design

will allow the site to continue to accommodate this runoff post-development.

- Although the public raised concerns about there not being enough water and sewer capacity, they have not been made aware of any capacity issues.
- Greenspace provided on site, including pedestrian trails connecting to existing pedestrian networks.
- The population estimate was based on the assumption of 2.3 people per unit, which is the industry standard in most planning and engineering work.

Res. No:
2025-10-01

Acknowledgement of Verbal Submissions
Moved By: Councillor Kotylak

THAT we acknowledge there were thirty-five (35) verbal submissions in regard to the discretionary use application.

CARRIED

Written Submissions

Administration presented Council with a total of one hundred and forty-six (146) written submissions in regard to the discretionary use application. Out of the one hundred and forty-six (146) written submissions, ten (10) were in favour of the discretionary use application. The remaining one hundred and thirty-six (136) submissions were opposed to the application citing the same themes and concepts as the verbal submissions listed above.

Res. No:
2025-10-02

Acknowledgement of Written Submissions
Moved By: Councillor Leibel

THAT we acknowledge there were a total of one hundred and forty-six (146) written submissions received in regard to the discretionary use application.

CARRIED

Res. No:
2025-10-03

Adjournment
Moved By: Reeve Trainor

THAT we hereby adjourn the Public Hearing with the time being noted as 9:09 p.m.

CARRIED

Al Trainor

Reeve

Karen Zaharia

Administrator