

County of St. Paul No. 19

Municipal Development Plan & Land Use Bylaw

Residents can help by filling out the Questionnaire tonight or returning it to the County office by May 31.
Put a check mark for your choices on the following questions, and write your comments in the space provided.
All information collected will be kept confidential and used only in aggregated form.

		Don't Know	Agree	Agree, but . . .	Disagree
1.	I am concerned with the loss of agricultural land within the County.				
	What is the generally accepted amount of arable and/or pasture land for residential use on a quarter section of land. Does the community see value in protecting agriculture or does the community see value in maximizing individual profitability of arable and/or pasture lands.				
2.	The County should try to ensure that no more than 20 acres per quarter section shall be consumed with non-agricultural uses.				
	Same as above, only sets parameters for how much land would be lost. Explanations will help to establish benchmarks that the community sees fitting. Also used to determine validity of question 1.				
3.	The minimum parcel size on agriculturally zoned land for residential uses shall be 1 acre and the maximum parcel size for residential uses shall be 5 acres.				
	Another suggested benchmark. What is the acceptable size to the community for residential parcels.				
4.	Developers should be required to consult with neighbours prior to the Council public hearing on an area structure plan, rezoning for multi-parcel residential (a subdivision application that contains three or more residential lots) and recreational uses, and any rezoning for industrial and commercial uses.				
	New concept that is proposed within the LUB/MDP. It tells us if the community is engaged in land use decisions. Does the community see value in the process or do they consider it unnecessary?				
5.	I want the County to protect the shorelines of water courses and water bodies, which includes enforcement of environmental reserve encroachments.				
	Proposed 30m Environmental Reserve setback. Does the community see value in establishing larger environmental reserves? Does the community value riparian areas?				
6.	Metal clad (including metal Quonsets) accessory buildings (such as shops and garages) should be allowed within all residential districts.				
	Proposed guidelines to eliminate Quonset style structures in certain land use districts. Does the community want more metal clad structures? Less? And in what areas does the community generally accept the construction of these structures.				
7.	Garage suites (suites both on the ground level and on a second floor) and garden suites (park model trailers to accommodate family members) should be allowed within all residential districts.				
	New proposed concept with the LUB/MDP. Is the community planning for elder care? What provisions should be permitted for the care of family members?				
8.	Land use planning regulations should be enforced fairly and equitably across the entire County.				
	Do you think our regulations are too stern? Not stringent enough? Are there any issues that are not currently addressed by the Land Use Bylaw/MDP that you feel should be? What regulations do we have that you like or dislike?				
		Don't Know	Agree	Agree, but . . .	Disagree
9.	Dugouts – Rural landowner should be required to obtain development permits for dugouts. Due to potential liability when placed too close to roadways. Please see attached pictures.				

	The County should waive permit fees for dugouts. Question of clarification. While the proposal is to require permits, the proposal is NOT to charge for those permits.				
10.	No animals other than domestic pets should be kept on parcels less than 0.5 acres in size (i.e. no chickens, horses, cows, sheep, etc.). Is the community open to livestock in residential areas?				
	On agriculturally zoned parcels less than 20 acres in size, certain numbers of livestock should be permitted (3 cows/horses, 5 sheep, 20 poultry, 20 rabbits per every 4 acres; provisions to allow additional "miniature" animals (i.e. horses)).				
	If they are, what does the community view as acceptable numbers of livestock in residential areas?				
11.	On all parcels fronting onto lakes, only precast concrete self-contained sewage pumpout/haul away systems should be permitted.				
	2 fold: Is there an issue with on-site sewage management within lake communities? Examines validity of question 5.				
12.	Wind energy conversion systems (windmills) should be allowed in the County.				
	Provincial grants are currently available. Is the community accepting of alternate energy systems?				
13.	Older manufactured homes and single detached dwellings should be allowed to be moved into the County, regardless of age and condition . A manufactured home shall include a dwelling that would be considered to be a single detached dwelling if the roof pitch were > than 1:4; if the depth of eaves were > than 18 inches, and if the ratio of depth vs. width were < than 2.5:1. If the roof pitch is < than 1:4, or if the depth of eaves is < than 18 inches, or if the ratio noted above is > than 2.5:1, the dwelling shall be considered to be a manufactured home.				
	Proposed wording changes to better define mobile homes as well as provide guidelines for structures being moved in. Does the community have concern over the age and condition of units being brought in? Once again, are regulations too strict, too liberal?				
14.	The number of RVs to be permanently located on a Country Residential zoned property (i.e. within multi lot subdivisions) should be limited to 2.				
	Is the community accepting of residential lots being used as recreational lots instead of residential? If they are accepting, what is the threshold for numbers of generally accepted units?				
15.	The creation of a Light Industrial Residential district, accommodating a single detached dwelling and an owner operator industrial/commercial business, is a good idea.				
	New proposed district. Does the community agree or disagree with the acknowledgement of Light Industrial Residential as a use of land within the community?				
16.	The creation of a Recreation Vehicle land use district where subdivisions can be created which contain only campers and RV trailers a good idea.				
	Validates question 14. Introduces another potential land use district. Does the community see a need for a Recreation Vehicle district?				
18.	I care about the appearance of development adjacent to the highways and believe architectural controls should be implemented. New proposed concept within the LUB/MDP. How does the community feel about regulating the gateways to individual communities within the County of St. Paul? Is this regulation too strict? Not strict enough?				