

RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF BJORKDALE NO. 426

The minutes of the public hearing of council for the Rural Municipality of Bjorkdale No. 426 held in the Municipal Office at 213A Forest View Drive in Bjorkdale on Thursday August 13th, 2026.

Present:

Councilor Division 1: Brett Norum
Councilor Division 5: John Andris

Administrator: Cherie Hudon
Assistant Administrator: Geraldine Fountain
Office Assistant: Brianna Vegso
Community Planner: Robin Bloski

Via Telephone Conference:

Councilor Division 2: Bert Desrosiers

Absent:

Reeve: Todd Hamel
Councilor Division 3: Steven Stewart
Councilor Division 4: James Spedding
Councilor Division 6: Jon Hudak

The meeting was called to order by Deputy Reeve John Andris at 10:02 AM

Administrator Cherie Hudon opened the Public Hearing with regards to the proposed Official Community Plan (OCP) and Zoning Bylaw (ZB) amendments which were advertised within the June 30, 2026 and July 7, 2026, issues of the Kelvington Chronicle.

Administrator Cherie Hudon identified the bylaws as being Bylaw No. 04-2026 for the Official Community Plan and Bylaw No. 05-2026 for the Zoning Bylaw.

Administrator Cherie Hudon reviewed the intent of the bylaws to be the following:

The new OCP outlines the municipal vision for future land use planning in the RM and includes local land use policies to assist decision makers in achieving this vision consistent with the provincial land use planning framework. The OCP would be adopted by Council, and all future land use decisions shall be consistent with the OCP.

The new ZB would implement the policies of the OCP and establish regulations for future growth and development within the municipal boundaries of the RM. Included are specific zoning designations to which specific permitted and discretionary uses are assigned. The ZB also contains administrative protocols, general and specific regulations, standards for land use, and other tools to guide decision making in the promotion of suitable and beneficial development for the residents of the RM.

The floor was open to hear verbal presentations.

The following is a summary of those who addressed council with a verbal presentation.

Derek Woulfe – Asked if will be promoting development or not? Examples were outfitting and camper area.

Lana Woulfe – The Zoning Bylaw effects their businesses. They still have land and if they want to sell it puts a restriction on this. If council does not allow future lakeshore development for campsites to be built this will restrict what they can do with their land in the future. Is this on all of the land or just the lakeshore? What does this mean for the gravel pits? For their campsites there is now rules on the size of the campsites that they have had for 25 years. For their outfitting business we have to inform of the equipment and buildings. Who is asking for this? Is it Community Planning or the RM? Who is enforcing all of this? This will limit what they can do with their land and you wouldn't do this to a farmer.

Robin Boski – Community Planner- This could limit the subdivision for future development and land use but would be at the discretion of council. Any development that currently exists won't need to change and is legal non-conforming but going forward it would fall under the new rules. Council is the one that decides on the campers or subdivision.

Derek Woulfe – Concerned about the loss of taxation on the campers, paying tax on the empty lots. Extra lots will raise tax dollars.

Cherie Hudon – Administrator – Currently the draft allows one camper per lot if there is a dwelling.

Chris Hanson – Was in the office last year in June and wanted to know why the bylaw hadn't been passed already?

Cherie Hudon – Administrator – This is a large document and it is taking longer than anticipated. We also had to place it on the back burner for a little while because other things have come up in the RM. Now we are focused on it.

Marlin Johnson – Disagrees with the empty lots paying an approximate \$300 for land tax with a camper on a lot. Some lots have more than 1 camper and up to 5. Either the minimum tax has to go way up or a time frame has to come in where if they don't build within a year then they can't put a camper on the lot. You should be able to have a camper on the lot when you are building a cabin, but there needs to be a timeline of how long they can build with a policy in place on it. A tax per camper is another option. This decision effects the lakes, could have a sub committee to help with the process. Whatever is decided needs to be enforced.

Cherie Hudon – Administrator – Explained that we can not tax a camper. SAMA does not assess campers.

Mark Patenaude – Development on the lakeshore that is already developed property, does it get grandfathered? And what about campers, are they legal?

Robin Boski – Community Planner – It would be looked at case by case and they would have needed a permit in place prior to this bylaw.

Derek Woulfe – Are we worried about taxes or are we worried about campers? We are at Marean Lake to camp, and it should be about fair taxes. Not everyone needs to have a mansion. Lets encourage people to come to the lake.

Allan Kowalyk – This will devalue people's property with trailer trash.

Warren Wiggins – Has been a cabin owner since 2018 and thought the camper bylaw would have been done sooner. No one is enforcing the current bylaw, and development has not been enforced. Sometimes there is 9 campers on a lot and they each have vehicles which takes up a lot of space. 9 campers across from him this morning. Is their a bylaw officer? Who is going to enforce the new one? All of the campers were never legal to begin with so they can't be grandfathered. In the Back 40 area there is 37 cabins and 40 some campers. The current map doesn't show Woulfe's camper area, can they develop? The clutter of the campers devalue his property and they belong in a campground, not with the cabins.

Cherie Hudon – Administrator – The map has been updated to show Woulfe's camper area. It is up to the discretion of council if they will be able to develop.

Allan Kowalyk – Warren Wiggins covered most of everything he wanted to discuss. I purchased a residential lot for retirement and for this family. He has to put a fence up for privacy now because of the campers next to him. They have no culverts and they are filling right up to the ditches. They have no permits. His pump is running steady and it's a new house. There is no septic tank in these lots beside him and they are draining sewage. What is the population supposed to be at Marean Lake for the lake to be comfortable? I have a dock spot but you can't even get onto the lake because there is too many people. He feels that the campers should not be there.

Derek Woulfe – Has to be fair for everyone. Cabins can have 8 people too. Need to charge for services. The answer is not no more people.

Allan Kowalyk – Put campers where they belong.

Rocky Luchsinger – I agree with Derek. 4884 sq ft for lot size, not one of those lots allows for the building of a new cabin under this. People can't afford to buy the lot. Their has to be a way to deal with the trailers. I encourage the RM to accept more written submissions after this meeting and he would like answers back in writing from the RM. He has a second lot and was refused to build a garage and refused to build a tiny home. Is it the council's intention for the conversion of lease holders or what? 150 sq ft car shelters doesn't fit hardly anything in it. There are cabins that need to be torn down if you want neat and tidy. He will do a written submission and he would like an answer back. Can you give a date of when the written submissions need to be in by and when they will be answered?

Brett Norum – Councilor – We will give 30 days to bring in any additional written comments and it will take at least 90 days to respond because we are going into harvest.

Rocky Luchsinger – A lot of the lots are not 4800 sq ft and cabins will not fit on them. We should state that the existing lots are grandfathered. The OCP and Zoning Bylaw does not indicate that. And it should recognize the 99 year leases.

Robin Bloski – Community Planner – It is stated in the planning and development act for the grandfathering information.

Rocky Luchsinger – I think it needs to be stated in our Zoning Bylaw and OCP. I will provide a written statement.

Bruce Bornhorst – I have a lot with a cabin and one that is empty beside it that I want to build a garage on.

Cherie Hudon – Administrator – You would need to tie those two lots.

Robin Bloski – Community Planner – In the new Zoning Bylaw yes you can have it if it is property that is contiguous.

Lenard Cummins - Campers while developing he is in favor of. Campers are a big issue. He understands that it takes time to put up a dwelling. Maybe the camper fee should be extended to 5 years to build to make it easier on young families. He doesn't agree with 5 or 6 campers on one lot and fees per camper need to go up.

Allan Kowalyk – They should pay the same fee as the rentals at Woulfe's and charge them a garbage fee.

Lana Woulfe – And they should have septic.

Rocky Luchsinger – People purchased on the premise that it was ok for campers to be there.

Glen Quale – There is an x where the old dump used to be and he is wanting to know why.

Robin Bloski – Community Planner - It shouldn't be there and will be removed.

Glen Quale – What about a fire guard. There should be a road on the north side all the way down to the lake for a fire guard.

John Andris – Councilor – It is a good suggestion, but bring this up to the Marean Lake board.

Glen Quale – Our councilor said their will be no more subdivisions allowed. If he can't develop and Woulfe's can't then the taxes will have to be compensated. If there are no other developments being allowed, then council needs to come forward about it.

Derek Woulfe – With the fire guard because it's poplar trees, they felt it wasn't a risk. Even on the north west side of the park there is a road allowance that is full of trees and can't have any access to the lake.

Sandy Reed – I bought a lot back in the bush and have two campers. They are worth more compared to any cabins surrounding him. He has no problem paying the camper fees. He had a lake front lot but sold it to his nephews that are young, and the other reason is he has nowhere to put anything because the lot is so small. I have no problem paying the camper fees and I have nice campers. He has 2 septic tanks on the property, but he doesn't want to have to tear it out. Having tent garages bigger than 10 x 20 would at least cover stuff up. He doesn't mind paying taxes on these either. Would we rather stuff be covered up in tarps.

Julie Stewart – When council is referring to "they" is "they" considered council?

Cherie Hudon – Administrator – It is council.

Julie Stewart – What is the final implementation date of this?

Brett Norum – This will be brought back to council at the November meeting after harvest is done.

Julie Stewart – Once those decisions are made does it go to the Marean Lake Advisory Committee or to the people?

Cherie Hudon – Administrator – Marean Lake or anyone can have a copy of the minutes that are sent to Community Planning.

Julie Stewart – How does it get presented to everyone in the public?

Cherie Hudon – Administrator – We can put out a news bulletin to everyone.

Julie Stewart – How many public meetings do you have?

Robin Bloski – Community Planner – Legislatively only one public hearing needs to be held.

The floor was closed for further verbal presentations.

Written submissions were read by Administrator Cherie Hudon.

Written submissions were received from Layne Butt and Curtis Bortis. Both written submissions are attached and form part of the public hearing minutes.

The floor was once again opened to verbal presentations.

Glen Quale – The park model trailers or mobile homes weren't allowed years ago but now they are?

Warren Wiggins – They are allowed because they are taxable.

Allan Kowalyk – We need a lot of dollars, and we have no money and these people are not paying anything with campers. Whether it is \$3,000 a lot that is charged.

Mark Patenaude – Charge the campers, but don't chase them away.

Glen Quale – If you charge then you would get rid of the squatters that don't pay.

Marlin Johnson – One problem is where there are 5 campers they are not there all the time, and how do you regulate when they aren't there all the time. They are only there on weekends some of them.

Lenard Cummins – Could the bylaw officer take note and the fine be added to the taxes if they aren't paying?

Bert Desrosiers – Councilor - Why can't we tax campers or tax their lots?

Cherie Hudon – Administrator - They are taxed on their lots already. We can charge a fee but campers can't be assessed, so they can't be taxed.

Bert Desrosiers – Councilor – Ok then charge a \$2,500 fee for example per lot then this would alleviate everything.

Several People – No you need to charge by the camper and there has to be a limit on the amount of campers per lot.

Julie Stewart – I believe camper owners are ok to help provide the longevity of the lake and would be willing to pay. But if the camper people heard how everyone was talking about them they would be mortified.

Cherie Hudon – Administrator – All of these things that everyone has talked about will be addressed by council at the upcoming meetings.

Kathy Smith – Once council makes their final decision can it come back to Marean Lake before it's finalized?

Cherie Hudon – Administrator – 1st reading has taken place. 2nd and 3rd readings will need to be read at upcoming council meetings.

Derek Woulfe – Will there be any more public meetings on this?

Robin Bloski – Depending on the changes that are made, we may have to hold another public hearing.

The floor was closed for further verbal presentations.

30 days will be granted through public notice to submit any additional written comments. Any additional written submissions received will be attached to and form part of these public hearing minutes.

The Public Hearing was closed by Deputy Reeve John Andris at 11:18 AM

Minutes approved by resolution of Council on the 10th day of September, 2026.

Reeve

Administrator

R.M. of Bjorkdale No. 426

From: Layne <buttsie22@hotmail.com>
Sent: 08/12/2026 6:50 AM
To: rm426office@sasktel.net
Subject: Proposed Zoning Bylaw / campers on vacant lots

To the Reeve and Council of the RM of Bjorkdale

Re: Proposed Zoning Bylaw – Camper Use on Vacant Lots

Dear Reeve and Council,

First, I would like to thank you for taking the time to address this issue and for doing what I believe is the right thing for our lake community by putting a zoning bylaw in place that would prohibit the use of campers on vacant lots.

As a cabin owner in the area who pays over \$4,000 a year in property taxes, I believe it is important to explain why I strongly support this bylaw.

In my area alone, there are approximately 25 vacant lots being used for camping, with some lots having as many as five campers on them. These properties are paying \$200 or less in annual taxes, yet the people using these lots have access to many of the same amenities and services available to cabin owners. They use the boat launches, garbage and recycling facilities, roadways, and other services provided by the RM and the lake community.

At the same time, cabin owners who are paying thousands of dollars in property taxes do not receive additional amenities or services that correspond to the significant difference in taxation.

The developments were originally intended for the construction of cabins, not for the creation of campgrounds on vacant lots. This was clearly stated in the developers' rules and in the legal purchase agreements when the lots were sold. Unfortunately, those rules were not consistently enforced, and as a result, only some property owners followed the original intent of the development.

We are now dealing with approximately 25 vacant lots and a total of around 54 campers. This has substantially increased the number of people, vehicles and watercraft in the area.

This also creates safety concerns. With significantly more traffic and activity on these lots, there are additional risks for children who are playing and travelling throughout the development. What was intended to be a community of cabins has gradually become something much closer to a campground in certain areas.

There is also a significant concern regarding property values. Cabin owners have invested considerable amounts of money into their properties with the expectation that the development would remain consistent with its intended purpose. Having vacant lots surrounding established cabins being used as campgrounds negatively affects the appeal and resale value of those cabins. In some cases, a cabin's

appraised value may never be recovered when it comes time to sell because of the surrounding campground-like use of vacant properties.

I understand that the RM has been left to deal with a difficult situation that developed over many years. I also recognize that this is not a problem that the current council created. However, I believe the RM is now taking the appropriate steps to correct the situation.

The proposed zoning bylaw will help restore these developments to what they were originally intended to be: communities of cabins rather than campgrounds made up of vacant lots. It will also encourage property owners to build cabins and develop their lots as intended.

In the long term, I believe this will benefit everyone. More cabins and permanent improvements will increase the tax base, generate additional revenue for the RM, and ultimately provide more funding that can be put back into the lake, roads, recreational facilities and other services that benefit the entire community.

I appreciate that implementing this bylaw may not be easy, and I understand that there may be opposition from some property owners who have become accustomed to using vacant lots for camping. However, I believe it is important to look at the long-term health, safety, property values and intended development of our lake communities.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to the concerns of cabin owners and for having the courage to address an issue that should have been dealt with years ago. I fully support the proposed zoning bylaw restricting camper use on vacant lots, and I hope Council will continue moving forward with it.

Sincerely,

Layne Butt

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

R.M. of Bjorkdale No. 426

From: Curtis <curtisbortis@hotmail.com>
Sent: 08/13/2026 12:07 AM
To: R.M. of Bjorkdale No. 426
Cc: Kali Bortis
Subject: Zoning Bylaw

Hello,

I am writing to let you know that I support the proposed zoning changes regarding the use of campers on vacant lots.

I believe this is an important issue for the future of our lake community. Over time, the use of undeveloped lots for multiple campers has changed the character of some areas and created situations that are quite different from what these developments were originally intended to be.

There is also a fairness issue that I believe deserves consideration. Owners who have invested significantly in building and maintaining cabins are paying substantially more in property taxes, while vacant lots being used for camping can have very little tax contribution despite the occupants making use of the same roads, boat launches, garbage facilities and other community services.

When these developments were first established, the expectation was that the lots would be used for building cabins rather than as seasonal campgrounds on otherwise undeveloped properties. This was outlined in the developers' guidelines and incorporated into the legal agreements associated with the purchase of the lots. However, because these provisions were not enforced, property owners have taken different approaches to how their lots are being used, with some continuing to follow the original intent of the development while others have not.

I am also concerned about the impact this type of use can have on neighbouring properties. Increased numbers of people, vehicles, trailers and boats naturally bring more traffic and activity into an area. This can create safety concerns and can also change the enjoyment and overall character of the surrounding cabin community.

Another consideration is property value. People who purchase and develop lake properties do so with certain expectations about the type of community they are investing in. Having vacant properties used as high-density camping areas can make neighbouring properties less desirable and potentially affect their future value.

I understand that this situation has been allowed to develop over a long period of time and that changing it will undoubtedly be difficult. However, I believe the proposed bylaw provides an opportunity to establish a clear and consistent standard going forward.

Encouraging owners to develop their vacant properties as intended would ultimately be positive for everyone. More permanent development would strengthen the local tax base while helping maintain the character and long-term value of our lake communities.

Thank you for taking the time to consider the concerns of property owners. I appreciate Council addressing this issue and I support moving ahead with the proposed zoning bylaw.

Sincerely,

Curtis Bortis