

**Public Meeting**  
**Rezoning Hearing – Don McKinnon**  
**Friday, April 13, 2007**

---

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

This public meeting is being held to consider adopting a bylaw to amend the zoning bylaw as follows:

Proposed Zoning Bylaw Amendment: The reason for the amendment is to allow approval of a proposed industrial subdivision of approximately 9.2 hectares or 23 acres in size on part of SE 18-19-20, W2. This will allow a proposed new manufacturing facility for mobile home units. The land to be subdivided is located east of Highway #11. The proposed subdivision is being considered for rezoning from A(Agricultural) to M(Industrial – 1) and is shown in a bold outline on a map below. Two minor changes are also proposed to the M1 industrial district. This will allow a slightly larger size to be subdivided and allow one dwelling, for an owner or caretaker, to be constructed on an industrial site. The proposed bylaw may be inspected by any interested person or group at the Lumsden Municipal Office from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. except on holidays and weekends.

So, I declare this public hearing now open for submissions. We will be open for one hour to hear submissions. If anyone has a submission they wish to make you may take the floor. I will hear submissions either for or against.

Maybe what I should do is introduce Council. I am the Reeve, Jim Hipkin.

Al Sills - Division 1  
Tracy Preete - Division 2  
Bill Marquardt - Division 3  
Adri Vandeven - Division Foreman  
Ed Thorpe - Division 4  
Mike Brodznik - Division 6  
Wayne Zerff - Administrator  
Darcie Cooper - Assistant Administrator

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Glen Samuelson is not with us today, he had a death in the family.  
I will ask all of you to introduce yourselves.  
Your name?

Rollie Thibault: Rollie Thibault.

Dave Weber: Dave Weber, adjacent landowner to the proposed subdivision.

Don McKinnon: Don McKinnon, the owner of the proposed subdivision.

Brad (?): I work with Rollie [Thibault].

Roe Dennis: Roe Dennis, a landowner.

Dan Dennis: Dan Dennis.

Wilf Brandt: Wilf Brandt.

Darrell Brandt: Darrell Brandt.

Ken Dickson: Ken Dickson.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

We have Rob and Todd here who represent the Watershed Authority and Tom Harrison from the Water people too so I guess now we are all aware of who everybody is.

Dave Weber (?):

Well, Council and Jim, I guess my question to Council is the reasoning behind changing an agricultural area to a commercial/industrial, and not only that reason but the reason for involving it as number one industrial and number two as residential in the same subdivision. I guess I have a little problem wondering which way you're going - - are you going residential or are you going industrial? If you are going industrial, what are the thoughts regarding water and servicing this site or whatever sites may be in this subdivision as well as what the extended use of that subdivision will be? So, I have a few questions for Council that I would like answered.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

I guess the reason that we proceeded down this way is that over the years there has been a lot of talk about economic development and so forth. And the Municipality really never, in their zoning bylaws and development plans, ever did indicate any areas that were industrial. It was thought that the Municipality would deal with this as individual cases for industrial development came forth. And we haven't had a lot of applications. We had the one with Heartland Agro but that fell under agricultural. This is about the first real industrial one. So, I guess we felt we had to put it out to see what the people thought.

So far as water goes, we did not consider that yet at this point but there is a lot of discussion around about a pipeline.

Dave Weber (?):

Okay. And I would like you address the residential and.....

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Well, the residential part - - it was suggested by the developer that possibly they could have a residential with this and that had to come forth in this manner to determine really what should be done, or could be done.

Dave Weber(?):

Okay. If it had to come, what was the reasoning for it? Why would you put residential and industrial in exactly the same subdivision?

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

It was requested.

Dave Weber (?):

Oh. By this developer.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

By the developer. So, that's how we got to that point.

??????:

And the proposed change recommended by our planner is discretionary use. So any residential dwelling would have to be at Council's discretion so they would consider whether it was going to fit in with the land use or not. And there was some other controls on it - - basically it has to be owner-occupied and there can only be one. So those were kind of the controls set up around the discretionary use.

Dave Weber (?):

So, it has to be owner-occupied.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Mm-hmm.

Dave Weber (?):

I see. Okay, I'll hold my later comments. As a matter of opinion, I have canvassed the local area and some of them are here and I don't want to take any of their thunder so, I will hold mine and will let you know what I found out.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Okay. That's fair.  
Any other comments?

??????:

So, my understanding is that there is no land set aside in the R.M. for commercial dwelling?

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

No. There never was any plan for commercial development. It was always felt - - when we had our meetings, when we opened the bylaws up and so forth - - that if there was commercial development for example, a good example would be something to do with potash or any other industrial-type. The person/people wishing to do that would be coming to us and they would be making a suggestion where they want to go. And so, it was thought that we didn't really have the ability to decide and we thought we would just leave it and see if we get any because we have been a municipality for 100 years or better and no one has come yet so now someone has come so I guess we have to make some decisions. And I guess one of the main considerations is when you're talking about industrial is roads and proximity to a good road and a highway. And we've got 3 - 4 highways I believe within this municipality.

??????:

I guess my other thought too - - just thinking to the future - - you know everything is growing and expanding and we're modernizing. Let's say we approve this today or whoever approves it. A year down the road, 30, 40, 50 miles at the other end of the R.M. somebody else wants another commercial....

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

The same process will have to take place.

??????:

Just depending on roads and access ability and water and....

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

The only other way I see it could addressed differently would be if when we the zoning bylaws and the development plans opened up the next time, that the people in the municipality and Council see that they want to identify that any economic development or commercial development has to go here or here and identify the spots and those be the spots and then if someone goes in those spots. It's all just a matter of us going through the procedure and approving it, but under this way we're doing it now is anytime someone comes and wants to go we have to hold such a process to determine this.

Don McKinnon:

I suppose, as the owner, I should respond and tell you a little bit about the history. I thank Council for their careful consideration of the proposal. The acreage is unique in that it's not farmable in its size and I'm not able to do it myself and that's where I wanted to find a proper use for it and I think I did. Rollie is a responsible person and a known commodity and it wasn't put out to the highest bidder, it was put out to the bidder that was best suited to fit the situation and it's pretty low-impact industry he proposes. And it will be self-contained and self-managed and I think it will be well managed because I trust him. As an ex-policeman he has the where-with-all to know how to conduct his affairs in a responsible manner. And like Jim, the Reeve, says - - each of these situations has to be judged on their own merits. And I wouldn't oppose another development

like this somewhere in the R.M. where it would fit. Those things/criteria that would lend itself to subdivision for a good purpose. So, I don't see a problem with it myself because I live right across the road. It's not a big ??? and there's sure a lot of them being developed around here and approved in the province. We're lucky not to have too many of those in our water aquifers so, there's a lot of issues for Council to look at but this is a pretty low-impact one. And as far as water goes, Rollie said he wasn't too concerned about water and it would be his responsibility to develop such. So thank you, Jim.

Carol Sakundiak:

I understand you had applied for it to be residential first.

Don McKinnon:

That was the easy route, sure.

Carol Sakundiak:

Apparently not. My question is: was it applied for first as residential? And why was that not brought forth? Like where is the difference?

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Okay. It was applied for as residential but it did not fit our zoning bylaw. And we denied it. Because of the fact that it would possibly open the door to a lot of this going on along the highway there and we weren't sure. And the other thing that, I don't know if it has gone through the other members of Council mind, but what goes through my mind is that the fact that the R.M's of Pense and Moose Jaw currently have declared the area right along #1 highway all open to industrial or commercial. If someone comes along and they go to an owner of that property along there and they want to develop some type of an industrial business along there, that the Council's have already said: Fine - - we want this development because commercial development spells more taxes. And the R.M. of Pense have been very good at this, you know, they have got some very high commercial people there and they want more and Sherwood is also interested in this and the Mayors of Regina and Moose Jaw are interested in this - - to have this economic corridor. Now, we have not declared the same thing in the R.M. of Lumsden. We're going this process which gives the surrounding people some say, and the people of our municipality some say, as to whether or not that's what they want.

Carol Sakundiak:

Okay. Your statement kind of opens up that question. Don said that this piece of property was too small to farm, although it has been farmed, I'm sorry Don but I'd just like to point out that along that whole highway stretch there are a lot of pieces of property that has been cut in half by the highway.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Every quarter section that the highway's gone past practically is carved up.

Carol Sakundiak:

Right. So, I'm just wondering if you're going to propose some kind of zoning regulation so that we know in every piece there, from what you just said, it sounds like any piece that touches the highway is open to industrial.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Well, we have another problem. That highway is a controlled access highway. There's only really proper access at Exit A, Exit B, and Exit C. There are a couple of municipal roads that intersect but those, to the best of my knowledge, are not really considered to be access that they want a lot of traffic - - they're more or less access for landowners to get in to farm that land that's there from the highway.

Carol Sakundiak:

I am right at one of the corners on the exit.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

You're at Exit B.

Carol Sakundiak:

So, I am concerned. It seems there's already problems at that corner with getting on and off because of traffic from Lumsden, Regina Beach - - that direction. And I'm concerned about more traffic at that corner. But, I'm concerned about what might be right across the road from me. I mean...

Wayne Zerff: The way the Planning and Development Act is written and the way our Municipal Zoning Bylaws are written, any land in the municipality can be - - any individual can put in an application requesting a subdivision or rezoning on it. It could be for commercial or industrial and it's up to Council to decide whether they feel that's in the best interests of the public and then they'll proceed to a hearing such as we have today where they listen to the comments and then make a decision on it. So, it was always - - most of the land in the municipality has always been open to this kind of application process. And, there is (*couldn't hear*) tracks of land dedicated to speedup any approval or development process. And there's two parts to this. There's the Rezoning and Subdivision part and then there's the Development Application and approvals are separate for each of those.

Wilf Brandt: What I'm wondering about... It seems from what I gather (*couldn't hear*) terms of reference within the Municipal Code of what can go on and what can't. It's being built with individual thought, is this correct?

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

That's correct.

Wilf Brandt: Access does worry me. There's a few other things like: water supply, sewage, and garbage. Are there going to be regulations in place for (*couldn't hear*).

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Well, the Department of Health controls everything to do with sewage and water to a large extent as well. Garbage - - there'll be no special garbage that any ratepayer doesn't get in the municipality. And we currently do not provide any garbage pickup or anything. We have arrangements with the Town of Lumsden regarding this garbage dump and we also have a bit of an arrangement with the City of Regina so that's where garbage goes and it's up to the individual, whether they be a farmer or acreage owner or somebody running a business they must look after their garbage. We don't do it.

Wilf Brandt: Another thing I was gonna bring up. When we purchased the land, I think it was about 35 years ago now, I went to apply to have an exit to come out the east - - I wanted to live close to the highway. At that time, they told me yes, they could get me a temporary exit onto the highway because there is a field crossing there but at that time they also said there was plans to put in a cloverleaf (an overpass) and if that happened I would have to have a service road all the way back to Exit B to come back on the highway. If that's still the idea - - I don't think in my lifetime that I'll see anything over top (*couldn't hear*) because we used exit a lot. It has been mentioned before there is a lot of traffic. If you're farming on both sides of it and hauling grain anywhere from 4:30 or 4:00 on a Saturday or Friday afternoon you can almost forget trying to cross that highway. So, that is a real concern that has to be addressed. I don't quite understand and you're well aware of it, because I've seen you drive through it too - - there's a stop sign on our road now. At the other end, a few miles down you come up by the graveyard there - - there's a yield sign that is hidden by the valley - - I don't know why. What are they going to propose there? Are there going to be stop signs, yield signs, or what's going to be in that respect?

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

That's down on old #11 that you're talking about.

Wilf Brandt: Yes. There's a yield sign on old #11, but there's a stop sign coming on to the municipal road on the north side. I don't follow the municipal thinking on that. (*Couldn't hear*).

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

I see what you mean. Sometimes when it comes to signs we don't always have... we have a sign sometimes but maybe isn't the sign that really is the most appropriate because the signs have been put up over time and it might be a possibility that sometimes whoever is putting up the sign maybe had a "yield" available but didn't have a "stop" or had a "stop" and didn't have a "yield" but it was put up and then it was never properly addressed. It's probably something that we need to take an overall look at maybe all over the municipality.

Wilf Brandt: Another one I mentioned. Would there be any effect on our tax assessment. And I'm thinking mostly in regards to school taxes which are sky rocketing. I'm not talking about one development, but if there are numerous.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Anytime you've got an increase in assessment, whether it be however it's achieved, whether it's putting up a commercial development that is assessable as that over bare land pasture or bare land farmland, there's an increased assessment. And when you apply the mill rate to that you get more dollars and more dollars seem to be what is needed all the time to... whether it be to run the school division or whether it's to run the municipality. It's like your farm, it costs more to do it every year. And, if we don't have our assessment rising all the time, therefore, the mill rate has to rise to continue to produce the same services or anything extra that might be required. So, it's a double-edged sword.

Wilf Brandt: I don't want to leave the impression that I'm against progress. In this case, the individual that is applying for that, you can go to the yard he has now and I can't see any of those things being a problem but I'm wondering if down the road there would be *(couldn't hear)*.

Carol Sakundiak:

I'm sorry. One other question. Is this just for one business there, or once it's sold and zoned industrial it can have a number of businesses.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

What I understand of the application and it's for one sole business. No? I think we need to hear from you Mr. Thibault.

Rollie Thibault:

The property in question - - the reason that we've considered it for what we're looking for and what we're looking to propose there is: initially what we're striving to put up a plant for production of a mobile home-like type of product. That being said, and I have no knowledge, if it's going to go any greater or be any better or ... ultimately I would like to see it really take off and be a very desirable product. Ultimately I'd like to see that plant be a huge plant to produce as many as we possibly can. Where it's going to go, I have no idea. Okay. It could end up initially what I would propose what we're looking for is an initial plant somewhere in the area of 15,000 - 20,000 square feet and that's what we'd like to see and then go into production from that. That being said we have been approached by other people with like or similar product and they're also in question wondering if it's possible to have a similar building beside us so that they could consume our product without having to transport and truck this sort of thing. Initially, right now, what I'm looking for in my own use is a single use - - a single owner. But, I understand your question and I wouldn't want to be tied, I would like to see it ultimately - - we've got I believe it's 21 acres; 21 acres is a heck of a lot of land for one particular business and if there is a suitable use for

some of the other acreage, I would like to see it being able to be utilized for that also.

Wayne Zerff: Something like that would be a separate application.

Rollie Thibault:

Correct. That's the way I interpreted it in that thing so that we could lease out part of it to another company if it met your... once the proposal was put in.

Wayne Zerff: Yes. And that would be something that would be a separate development application that Council would look at. If it was something that you were going to subdivide or Council recommended subdivision of that commercial parcel if it is created then that would be another application, another rezoning hearing like we are seeing today with more comments from the public.

Carol Sakundiak:

What if you both built the number of buildings and then leased the buildings, that would be a way to get around it. I'm not against him, I'm just questioning.

Wayne Zerff: Each building ...

*(end of tape one, side one).*

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Wayne, I guess I've got a question now. If we rezone this to industrial, upon zoning it industrial that's a leap from Ag. to industrial - - once that's done - - if Mr. Thibault sets up a plant to say to produce trailers then down the road someone wants to set up a business, separate from Mr. Thibault, to say sell trailers and maybe make another product (maybe boats) because the two of them maybe go hand in hand. We wouldn't have to rezone it. It would already be rezoned, it would be a matter of approving the extra development within the zoned area.

Wayne Zerff: It would be subdivision within the industrial, more than likely.

???: How big an area would you contemplate ....?

Carol Sakundiak:

It would already be industrial. I think you're leaving yourself open to *(couldn't hear)*.

Wayne Zerff: It would still be a subdivision because if it's another person coming to do it.

Carol Sakundiak:

But you're zoning that whole property - - talking about zoning that whole piece of land as an industrial subdivision.

Wayne Zerff: Yes, but a subdivision is actually dividing a parcel into smaller pieces so if another person comes along and wants to set up another building, more than likely it would be a subdivision that would create a smaller parcel which is an application that Council would get to decide on ultimately.

????: So what you're saying is a subdivision within a subdivision.

Wayne Zerff: Yes. It would just make another parcel.

????: Smaller?

Wayne Zerff: Yes. And that would be what Council would decide on but regardless of all this speculation... only what's been submitted can be considered by Council in this situation.

Darrell Brandt:

Maybe not this subdivision in particular but it seems to me like the R.M. has gotta have a set of guidelines. If you're going to take, like in this case, 22 acres and have it industrial and residence on it... where are your boundaries? What stops somebody from taking 80 acres, put a subdivision in and he has two businesses and 25 houses. You have to have some sort of guideline about where you're going strictly industrial, strictly residential. Like, there's quarters of land that you are forced to have 22 acres to allow subdivisions for houses on. If I was the guy that sold the land four years ago, and I was told to have that 22 acres I might be a little ticked if I find out that he can sell 22 acres and put two things on it already. Where are you stopping? When you're taking each case separate, I think you need guidelines to go by.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

You see the other thing that you get sometimes here is somebody will add 22 acres or 21 acres and they will set up what is called a home-based business and there's all kinds of them. They are around in the R.M., they're in town, villages, even in the cities - - these home-based businesses. But, the 21 acres - - residential - - those are residential subdivisions; they're small holdings and its very clear what they may do on there without coming to Council.

Wayne Zerff: The other thing is that there is a difference between industrial and commercial. So, if in the future what's being proposed is commercial - - fits under the commercial section of the bylaws then that would require rezoning as well as subdivision.

Carol Sakundiak:

What is actually commercial?

Wayne Zerff: Well, there's a whole list of things in the bylaw. I don't have that handy but there's a whole list.

Carol Sakundiak:

I understand that the property Mr. Thibault has now is *(couldn't hear)* by the R.M.

Darcie Cooper:

No, his building is assessed as commercial.

Carol Sakundiak:

So, he will actually have to apply to get that changed. And I'm just using that as an example. I could do the same thing if I wished to expand my *(couldn't hear)* shop. I'm just asking. It just seems there's no straight... we know we can do this, we know we can't do this. And it's the same thing with the 22 acres that Darrell talked about - - one person can do it and the next person can't - - and it's straight no you can't do it. I'm just curious why there is no set...

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

We try to go by the Zoning Bylaw and the Development Plan as closely as we can, *but this is different in that they're asking for it to be zoned industrial and that's the difference.*

Darrell Brandt: That's not what my question is. I don't think anybody is against the businesses that Mr. Thibault runs, but where is your boundary? Where is the size? Where's your maximum or your minimum? If you approve one, are you not setting a precedent? Like there's no guidelines of how big or how small we can subdivide off.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Well, I guess it depends on the size of the business and the size of the thing. And that's why as a Council and why the Council before that created *this zoning and development plan* you know, said we don't know how big the divisions will be. For example, the R.M. of Pense they are currently dealing with the ?>Tara Fuels. Tara Fuels came along and they bought a quarter section of land next to SaskFerco and if you get something big, you've got to be able to have a process whereby you can either go ahead with it or you go back. And for us to say well we'll only allow industrial development on 23 acre parcels or 10 acre parcels or so forth, we get ourselves in a corner and you can't always be in a corner.

Darrell Brandt: You have to have a minimum.

Wayne Zerff: There are some minimum site sizes what you're talking about.

Darrell Brandt: *(couldn't hear)*.... quarter of an acre, you have to have something of a boundary of what you're going to assess as industrial.

Wayne Zerff: In the industrial zone, the minimum site standard right now is 2.5 acres. So, when somebody proposes a development it has to be at least 2.5 acres for industrial. The maximum is 20 acres and the bylaw today is proposing that it get increased to 25 acres; that's the section that talks about "will allow a slightly larger site size to be subdivided".

And in commercial, the minimum site standard is 1 acre. So, all commercial parcels have to be at least an acre. There is no maximum on commercial.

Carol Sakundiak:

What is the regulation as to how we get that 1 acre or 2 acres or whatever? Out of a quarter section can you cut out ??140 (??) sites? Like, what's the regulation?

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Well, I guess the one thing about this particular piece is...

Carol Sakundiak:

I'm not asking about this...

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

...it's a cutoff piece. We haven't had to go to other yet to deal with such a circumstance.

Carol Sakundiak:

That's what I'm saying though; we should consider set guidelines.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Okay. Before we would do that that will be part of the process the next time that the Zoning and Development Plan is opened up for public consultation. And that is going to be driven partially by responses of what we are hearing today but at that time the whole thing will be opened up and it will be up to Council to take recommendations of the ratepayers as a whole to come up with the next step. When you review and re-do them, things can change and that's going to be the time to make the change. If it's desired by the people. I hear your question, and it's a very valid question.

Dave Weber: As a former Reeve, regarding this Rezoning and what was going on, I'll date myself a little bit. Mr. ?????? and myself sat through the rezoning as it went through the process. I learned a lot of things of rezoning of what was good and what isn't good for the R.M. and that is exactly the way you do it, you put it out to the people and the people decide what the R.M. is gonna do.

I fully believe right now what Council is looking for is some direction as to how they want this to go and I think it's of interest that I took it upon myself to canvas the neighborhood because I happen to own some of the land in the area. And I thought, as I canvassed the area, that I was well-backed with what I was doing - -

I found complete indifference. In fact, twice I said "I'm gonna rip this zoning bylaw up" because I'm not getting what I thought was complete... accepting my ideas of what I thought was agricultural land. So I think it's very interesting that Council should know that there's indifference out there, that there's absolutely acceptance for things like this. While I had some people that were against it, most people were in favor of subdivisions; were in favor of something happening within the R.M. and going on with things. I didn't bring the petition in. I did have some names on the petition, unfortunately a lot of them were mine and my family which while we are a part of the community, there are a whole lot of other people in the community that are involved in this. So that's what I think Council is looking for is an indication of what's out there.

I do have to comment on Don's opinion about Rollie being the best guy going and I will not say anything about Rollie being the best guy going, he has an operation to be very, very proud of but Rollie can sell it tomorrow. It's up to Council to watch who comes in next and to regulate what happens on these sites 'cause you're the bottom line. So, we all have great intentions and so do I, but once it's sold it belongs to somebody else.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Thank you, Dave.

Rollie Thibault:

In response to Dave's comments, he and I met and we went over it. And I'd like to think we run a pretty straight up operation as it is and I think we do a lot of economic growth for a lot of the people around here. And I sit - - don't get me wrong, I want to see my operation move forward and I want to see this new business - - I feel we have the potential there for another 40 jobs which (*couldn't hear*) as one of the biggest employers in this area. And an additional 40 pay-cheques would be kinda nice. That being said, take my business site out of it - - just as one of the people as a landowner - - I sit right on the fence myself personally; I am 50/50. I am totally indifferent one way or the other.

He did bring up a valid point, and this is just with reference to what you were asking. First and foremost, I am looking to turn this into a business. This is a commercial property. Make no mistake about it, if somebody comes forward and buys my business out; I don't want to be hog-tied and not be able to sell this business out. That is the idea of making money. That is the idea of progress - - is to build it and hopefully they will come. And I would like to go in there and say that I'm going to go in there and keep this place perfect and it's not going to impact anyone in any way, shape, or form. I personally cannot make that guarantee as to what we're gonna call an impact. Okay? That being said, everybody here are people that I know and we get along with real well and there is no animosity for yay or nay. I am with them, I am totally indifferent. But from the business end of it if I can get this property, I think I can turn it into a valuable piece of commercial property; I am looking to turn it into - - not just 21 acres of

property for me, but I would ultimately like to see it turn it into more if at all possible. Because that is growth, that is business. I thought it was a great piece for it because it impacts - - Dave's the closest guy and he's a long ways away as far as the road goes. We have good access so that if I could put up my trailer manufacturing plant there. If somebody wants to put up an axle assembly plant next to me, we would like to subdivide that off. That's what we're looking for because I don't need 22 acres but by the same token I didn't want to come into town and try to buy a piece in town that's not going to facilitate the potential need for growth. So for me to hog-tie myself and put myself into a single lot that doesn't make sense; I'm looking for growth and having 22 or 21 acres (or whatever it is) is growth and that's ultimately what it goes for. So his concern as to who is next I think is valid.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Well, I guess it doesn't really matter whether we can approve an acreage where there is a house, a dwelling going to go. And we really can't control when and who will sell. We really don't know what sort of a housekeeper they're going to be. We don't know. As Council we can drive the buy the facility that you have now, we know essentially pretty well what we've got coming - - as far as your operation. And I don't see - - there's probably no reason in your operation, but we do not know and it's impossible to know whether it's a farm we've got or what we have - - the next owner, we can't tell what they'll be like.

Dave Weber: You cannot let a used car or a wrecking car operation. You do have bylaws that tell you what they can and cannot do on that site.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

And also on this site we can put on restrictions and I guess any restrictions that the public have regarding housekeeping or that sort of thing - - now is the time to address that. It's not proper to try and address it afterwards but we are open to that type of comment.

Has any member of Council got any questions for Rollie or any of the other individuals?

Bill Marquardt:

I guess my original question was: how large an acreage do you envision that you are going to require - - originally?

Rollie Thibault:

Well, to start with we're gonna need - - I'm guessing - - approximately a 20,000 square feet building, initially. If this expands into - - Dave and I have gone through and some people here are aware of what's called park models. There's various kinds of manufacturing. The one ???? we're talking about doing - - we need approximately 20,000 square feet. If we move into the potential next size, and we have already been approached - - we haven't even built the place - - word

is out, talking and other people have approached us. I've already had two clients out of B.C. approach us looking for this product. We have been approached by the Provincial Government, the Federal Government looking for some of this potential product; it's a slight change of what we're going for but if this goes through to what it is and the potential, we could potentially foresee a plant up there of 60,000 – 70,000 square feet. I don't think that would be out of the norm. We just made an offer on another property that's 92,000 square feet of building and that's in conjunction with, and that's in a different R.M. and everything totally different. But that's the scale and scope that this could potentially go to. Realistically, you're not going to 2 x 4 on that land for at least two to three years. But, the potential is there to go larger and if we do purchase this land keep in mind that Don and I are old-school we operate on a handshake. No money has changed hands and I can't afford to buy this property to farm it because 22 acres I'm going to get a little hungry especially when I sub-lease it to Darrell. So the potential and I don't want to be handcuffed to all of a sudden to come back and say no, I'm sorry 20,000 square feet is more than we can put up or you can't go to 40,000 or 60,000 whatever. And the potential is there to go to 60,000 – 80,000 – 90,000 square feet of building to kick out this kind of product.

The impact: we're not mining, we're not digging, we don't have wrecked cars, we don't have anything else. What's nice about it is it's on the second busiest highway in the province; it's got great visibility; and it's got great access because of the natural access being on Exit B. That, keep in mind, *(couldn't understand)* based power??? For me, it's a natural. It seemed like a great spot. I think what you're going to see as far as far a economic growth goes - - you're all aware of it - - I do business in British Columbia and Alberta and you know ultimately I think there should be a few of us starting to think about what's coming this way.

?????: I realize this is a projection Rollie, but what, down the road, do you feel you would have for a staff? Like I'm thinking of the locals in the area that could probably have jobs and that sort of thing. We're talking about job creation in a plant like this too.

Rollie Thibault:

A small-sized plant like that would operate with 20 people and at a full-sized plant in area like that, the one that's operating currently in Estevan right now is employing 250 (in low season) and as high as 400 (in high season).

?????: You're talking park models more or less?

Rollie Thibault:

That's what I'm going into business to do.

Wilf Brandt(?):

We just got back from down south not long ago and we're in a park that has these all the time. The people that are producing these most of the problem is that they

don't have enough facilities to handle... like most of the time the unit is finished and they want it out of there and somebody hasn't got it out yet. You're being very modest when you're thinking 23 acres is more than you need. I would think that if your business is as successful as it would get to be, you're going to be looking for more land.

Rollie Thibault:

Well, that's when I'll be knocking on Dave's door.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

And we'll be back here.

Rollie Thibault:

It's hypothetical. Honest to God guys we haven't cut a 2 x 4 for this yet, our blueprints are just to the point now where we're going in and we have no idea where this is going to go. Brad and I are partners on it; we're entrepreneurs just starting out. We don't have a hot damn clue of where it's going to go. We're trying hard and we're gonna kick out a product. We're counting on some of our past success. We employ quite a few people around here now and we're hoping this would be a good thing for Lumsden. That being said, I don't think anybody here is disputing the fact that we will be good for the R.M. All my neighbors here. We all know that. Their concerns go beyond my business; they're procedural and I understand them and I have those same concerns, I live here. But from an economic point of view I would like to think that it's going to be a great thing. But with progress, there does come some issues.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

Well, we've got seven more minutes.

Tracy Preete (?):

Rollie, what are you proposing for water supply? What are your options?

Rollie Thibault:

Well, drinking water now has got to be trucked in - - there's no doubt about it. Everybody knows that drinking water's gotta be trucked in - - it's either processed or the Nimbus thing or whatever. Sewage in a situation likes this - - we're very, very low usage that way. The only thing that I can potentially see that's gonna have to happen in this particular facility is much like what it is now - - sewage and pumpout. Field mound and solid pump.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

And that part is - - the Department of Health will give you whatever you may do and then see that you do.

Rollie Thibault:

Domestic water - - I have no idea what domestic water is - - we haven't talked to the Water Shed guys yet. Brad was looking into that. Worst case scenario what we're looking at there is we would have to do the dugout thing. I don't know where that's going to go yet. That particular industry, that we getting into, isn't a high water usage but I would anticipate for domestic use: non-drinking water would be most likely a dugout if there's nothing - - if we can't get into the aquifer. Dave could probably tell if there is any odds of doing any well work there.

Dave Weber: I think Jim brought up the most interesting - - if a pipeline or something like this goes ... The water is not a quality water there. Certainly a pipeline coming over the hill from Buffalo Plains is, for any kind of water usage, is what's you would have be looking at.

Rollie Thibault:

Dave and I had this conversation - - what does the future hold? Take a look, take a drive out of Medicine Hat - - remember driving from Medicine Hat to Red Cliff? Now you don't. You used to drive to see the greenhouses now it's major highway and it's businesses all the way along. Go 300 or 400 yards behind and you're back into farmland but with the major accesses off of your main arteries.... That's why to be totally frank that's why we need it. This particular product (*couldn't hear*) at night - - a good time, and you can't truck on a single lane at night when you're over width, you're relegated to the four lanes so that's why we'd like it.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

I guess on my comment on the water - - there is a group that is talking about a pipeline that is probably within well, currently that line would be within two miles which in this day and age...

*(End of tape one, side two)*

...it's a possibility.

????: I've got a quick question for you. Where would your base clientele be?

Rollie Thibault:

Predominantly west.

????: Like Edmonton or Calgary?

Rollie Thibault:

No. I'm assuming you're thinking of the oil industry.

????: Well, I'm just thinking you're talking about good highway access, if you're going to go on Highway #11 and north to Edmonton that's a world of difference if

you're going to go on Highway #11 south through Regina and then out west to Highway #1.

Rollie Thibault:

To be totally honest, that's of no concern to me because once they hit the highway that's up to the truckers. Once my product is on a truck or on a set of dollies it's irrelevant once it hits the wheels, the asphalt, it's gone. Highways are highways.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

I guess we're almost to the end of our allotted time. I want to make sure that everybody is heard. If there is anyone who would like to make another comment please speak up. If not, I thank you all for coming. This has been most informative and we truly appreciate your efforts in coming out to try and help us to try and make a decision and hopefully we'll make the correct one.

Dave Weber: What's happening with Sherwood? Has Lumsden been approached with amalgamating with Sherwood or is it just Pense or what's going on here?

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

I guess what I can tell you is that I had a resident of the R.M. of Sherwood say that Lumsden should think about this. A delegation from the R.M. of Sherwood I believe attended the last Council of the R.M. of Pense and they were the two divisions on the west side of the R.M. of Sherwood. The Councillor from the R.M. of Pense was beside himself as to whether or not they wanted them because of the fact that the problem originated in the Northwest division of the R.M. of Sherwood which is the one directly south of us and the one next to the R.M. of Pense. So, I haven't talked to anyone since they were there but actually it's the provincial government that is going to make the call. I don't know if the grandstanding beforehand is going to go anywhere but I guess it was my understanding was that when they put the people in place to operate the municipality that one of the first directives was to create a voter's list to look after the operation of the municipality in the meantime. Once the voter's list is completed then there was supposedly going to be a call for nominations and they would see what came in and hold an election and see what happens. Another thing I know is that one of the members of council, and probably more than one member, there has been considerable costs in this thing over the last couple of years. Part of their costs for legal bills have been covered by the municipal system but there are costs that go way beyond that and there are members that were on council that have considerable legal bills. There is some concern as to whether or not many people are going to be very anxious to sign nomination papers. It's truly a mess.

But I guess one of my main concerns is the city. The city should, and they have wanted to for some time, annex all the industrial area to the north. If the city annexes all that industrial area to the north, there's going to be a huge amount of

school taxes which go to the city which are currently coming to this school division. And our school division taxes are plenty high enough as it is let along moving a whole bunch of assessment to the city and that I see is a major problem.

Dave Weber: Thank you very much.

Reeve, Jim Hipkin:

You're welcome.

Dave Weber: Keep your Council funds.