Council Planning & Economic Development Meeting

MINUTES

Friday, February 15, 2019, 9:00 AM
Council Chambers
County Administration Building
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Jarvis Grant, Development Officer
Amber Tripp, Recording Secretary
Erin Ballhorn, Recording Secretary
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1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The Council for Planning and Economic Development meeting for the County of Wetaskiwin No. 10 was called to order by Reeve T. Van de Kraats in the Council Chambers, of the County of Wetaskiwin Administration Office, commencing at 9:00 a.m. on Friday, February 15, 2019.

2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Resolution PD20190215.001
MOVED: by Councillor K. Adair
that the agenda be accepted as presented.

Carried Unanimously

3. **MINUTES APPROVAL - JANUARY 10, 2019**

Resolution PD20190215.002
MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop
to approve the minutes of the Council for Planning and Economic Development Meeting held January 10, 2019 as presented.

Carried Unanimously

4. **DEVELOPMENT OFFICER REPORT**

4.1 Development Report January 2019

During the month of January there were ten (10) development permits completed with an estimated value of $1,505,000.00. The following table depicts the activities for the month of January.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>January</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Development Permits</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Development Permits</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Development Permits</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administration recommended that Council approve the Development Report for January 2019 as presented.

Council discussed the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board hearings and development permits processed throughout the month of January. Discussion also ensued regarding interpretation of the Land Use By-law and several definitions which are found within related to the use or storage of heavy trucks within Country Residential subdivisions.

Administration provided clarification regarding a commercial development permit applications processed and the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board hearing results.

Resolution PD20190215.003
MOVED: by Councillor L. Seely
that the Land Use By-law Committee review the definitions and allowances for minor and home based business within the Land Use By-law.

Carried Unanimously

Resolution PD20190215.004
MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop
that Council approve the Development Report for January 2019 as presented.

Carried Unanimously

5. PUBLIC HEARING - 9.30 a.m. - Loov Environmental Reserve

Reeve T. Van de Kraats declared the Public Hearing open at 9:32 a.m. and a delegation consisting of Gordon and Marjorie Loov entered the meeting.

5.1 Marjorie & Gordon Loov - Change of Designation for Environmental Reserve (Roll 1406.04)

On May 20, 2016, County Administration became aware through the installation of a neighbouring rural address sign that the primary access point or driveway into Plan 7722461, Block 2, Lot 2, owned by Gordon and Marjorie Loov, was directly onto a County Environmental Reserve. The Reserve land is described by the short legal description of Plan 7722461, Block 2, Lot R4.

With the driveway that provides the primary access to the Loov's lot crossing over the Environmental Reserve, it is in contravention of Section 671(1) of the MGA as the Reserve lands are not in their natural state.

On August 14, 2018, a delegation to Council was held where Marjorie and Gordon Loov presented their desire to purchase a portion of Plan 7722461, Block 2, Lot R4. The purpose of the purchase and consolidation would be to rectify the encroachment
of their driveway onto the Environmental Reserve. At this same meeting, Administration provided both Council and Mr. and Mrs. Loov an estimation of the different fees and that could potentially be encountered to sell and consolidate the necessary portion of the Environment Reserve to Mr. and Mrs. Loov.

At the September 13, 2018 Council for Planning and Economic Development meeting it was moved by Council "to sell a portion of Plan 7722461, Block 2, Lot R4 (County Environmental Reserve) land to the Gordon and Marjorie Loov with Option 2 as outlined by the figures below:

Option 2: No County Costs & No Subdivision Costs
- Assessed land value - $1200.00
- Loov legal counsel - $1,000.00;
- Plan of Survey Showing Consolidation - $800.00 plus taxes ($40);
- Real Property Report - $1,000.00 plus taxes ($50);
- public hearing cost for boundary change - $160.00 per week with a required two week period and $17.70 for notification to adjacent landowners.

Total costs could potentially equal $4,427.70"
(Ref. Resolution #PD20180913.1017)

On December 27, 2018 the following letter was received from Marjorie and Gordon Loov:

"Dear Mr. Hawken:

RE: Environmental Reserve Access

It is with deep regret that Gordon & I have made the decision to purchase the portion of the Environmental Reserve as outlined in the letter by Jarvis Grant dated September 24, 2018, for potential costs of $4,427.70 to rectify the encroachment of the existing driveway.

It is very wrong that we should have to pay all these costs due to an error or omission that the County of Wetaskiwin will not take the responsibility to complete or correct their mistake or oversight of the situation after 34 years.

We trust that there will be no additional costs whatsoever to be paid on our part. Please advise when payment is required.

We look forward to having this complete in the most efficient manner.

Sincerely,

Marjorie Loov"

The current Public Hearing is held in accordance with Section 676, Changes to environmental reserve’s use or boundaries, which states:

1. A council may by bylaw, after giving notice in accordance with section 606 and holding a public hearing in accordance with section 230, d. change the boundaries of an environmental reserve or environmental reserve easement in order to correct an omission, error or other defect in the certificate of title, or to rectify an encroachment problem or other concern.

The Notice of Public Hearing was advertised in the January 31, 2019 and February 7, 2019 issues of the Pipestone Flyer and was mailed to the landowner and adjacent landowners on January 23, 2019.

On February 13, 2019 the following letter was received from Melanie Daniels, Consultation Coordinator, Louis Bull Tribe:

"Good Day,

I am writing in response to the notification dated January 21, 2019 regarding the "proposed change of designation and disposal of portion of the environmental reserve boundary within NW 32-45-25 W4"

Please be advised that the Louis Bull Tribe has the following concerns:
1. These lands fall within the Traditional territory of the Louis Bull Tribe where Louis Bull Tribe citizens carry out their constitutionally protected Aboriginal and Treaty Rights,

2. we are concerned that if the amount of protected lands within Wetaskiwin County is reduced our rights maybe negatively impacted due to loss and further fragmentation of wildlife habitat as well as loss of valuable culturally significant plants,

3. we are concerned with the increased amount of clearing that has been carried out by land owners in recent years, thereby making protection of environmental reserve lands more of a priority,

4. we are concerned that if the reserve boundary is disposed of these lands will be cleared resulting in fewer trees to uptake CO2 and dispel oxygen required for life,

5. we are concerned that the watershed around Bearhills Lake may negatively impacted should these lands be disposed of,

6. we are asking the County of Wetaskiwin to work with us to protect these lands, waterways, wildlife and plant populations to ensure that our future generations may carry out, in peaceful enjoyment, their traditional uses, Indigenous rights and way of life within the County.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment. Please ensure to inform us of the decision made.

Kind regards,

Melanie Daniels B.Sc
Consultation Coordinator

Louis Bull Tribe”

Administration recommended Council provide three readings of By-law 2019/07 for the boundary readjustment of Plan 7722461, Block 2, Lot R4 to Gordon and Marjorie Loov to rectify the encroachment within the lot.

Reeve T. Van de Kraats declared the Hearing closed at 9:41 a.m.

By-law 2019/07 is a By-law in the County of Wetaskiwin No. 10, in the Province of Alberta, for the boundary readjustment of Plan 7722461, Block 2 Lot R4 to Gordon and Marjorie Loov to rectify the encroachment within the lot.

**Resolution PD20190215.006**

MOVED: by Councillor L. Seely

that By-law 2019/07 be given First Reading.

Carried Unanimously

**Resolution PD20190215.007**

MOVED: by Councillor K. Rooyakkers

that By-law 2019/07 be given Second Reading.

Carried Unanimously

**Resolution PD20190215.008**

MOVED: by Councillor K. Adair

that By-law 2019/07 be presented for Third Reading.

Carried Unanimously

**Resolution PD20190215.009**

MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop
that By-law 2019/07 be given Third Reading and it be declared finally passed and the Reeve and Chief Administrative Officer be authorized to sign and affix thereto the corporate seal of the County of Wetaskiwin No. 10.

Carried Unanimously

The delegation left the Hearing at 9:45 a.m.

9. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

9.1 Amendments to Requirements for Area Structure Plan (ASP) Policy 

The Requirements for Area Structure Plan (ASP) Policy #61.1.6 was reviewed and amended to make the Policy current in content and formatting. This Policy was created in 2002, with the most current version amended in 2016 by Resolution #PD20160211.1011.

At the January 10, 2019 Planning and Development Council meeting, Council reviewed the proposed amendments to Requirements for Areas Structure Plan Policy #61.1.6 and tabled discussion to allow Administration to review wording regarding Conservation Reserves. At this time a spelling error was also corrected.

(Ref. Resolution# PD20190110.014)

Administration has since reviewed the process for obtaining Conservation Reserve and determined that as per the MGA, Conservation Reserve is listed under Section 664.2 and is defined within that Section. It should be noted that landowners must be compensated if the municipality is to take Conservation Reserves (subsections (2) and (3)).

Municipal and School Reserves

Section 666 (2) of the MGA sets out the following:

- (2) The aggregate amount of land that may be required under subsection (1) (subsection (1) essentially refers to basic options to secure MR) may not exceed the percentage set out in the municipal development plan, which may not exceed 10% of the parcel of land less all land required to be provided as conservation reserve or environmental reserve or made subject to an environmental reserve easement.

In addition, Subsection (3) discusses the total amount of money that may be required to be provided under the cash in lieu scenarios within Subsection (1). That like Subsection (2) also is less the Conservation and Environmental Reserves that may be required. This Subsection essentially states that should the landowner pay cash in lieu for Municipal Reserves owed, Conservation Reserve areas are separate, independent or deducted from the original land base and that determines the Municipal Reserves owed.

In response back to Council about Conservation Reserves, the clarification will include that we outline a basic principle that landowners must be compensated for Conservation Reserves and if so the total of Municipal Reserve must also be less the amount of Conservation Reserves required, just as are Environmental Reserves. In looking at our italicized amendments in the proposed ASP amendment document presented on January 10th, we should be adding references to Conservation Reserves and overall amendments in the following highlighted sections done in bold. This would then be the actual part of the amended ASP Policy for Council to approve:

**Portion of Section 6.5:**

*Provision of Environmental, Municipal and Conservation Reserves:*

*Environmental Reserve is to be dedicated to the County in any area where land is of a sensitive nature and needs to be protected from development. Examples of land dedicated as ER include: the shorelines of lakes, rivers, and streams; wetlands, bogs, or marshes; steep slopes, gullies, or ravines; and floodplains.*
Conservation Reserve is to allow for the dedication of lands to the County if the land, in the opinion of the development and/or subdivision authority, has environmentally significant features, and could not be required to be provided as environmental reserve, therefore allows for the County to protect and conserve the land. Note: Unlike Environmental or Municipal Reserves, the municipality . . . "must pay compensation" (for Conservation Reserve lands) "to the landowner in an amount equal to the market value of the land at the time of application for subdivision approval was received by the subdivision authority".

Municipal Reserve is to be dedicated to the County in the amount of 10% of the total development area less the area dedicated as Environmental and/or Conservation Reserve. For example, if the development area is 160 acres and a combination of Environmental and Conservation Reserve add up to 10 acres are dedicated as environmental reserve, then:

\[(160 \text{ acres} - 10 \text{ acres}) \times 0.1 = 15 \text{ acres of Municipal Reserve required}\]

Municipal Reserve should be dedicated in such a way that it provides real use for the proposed development. MR is often used for walking trails, parks, etc. Likewise, it can often be used to provide a buffer zone between the proposal and an adjacent parcel if required.

Section 6.6 Community Lots and Reserve Dedications: In limited cases, the concept of having a Community Lot or Lots has been part of a tentative plan of subdivision. A Community Lot is typically situated in a location that benefits all lot owners within a plan of subdivision including lots allowing for community storage or access to a feature in or adjacent to the subdivision including a Lake. In the event that a developer wishes to have a Community Lot, credit for having land set aside for a Community Lot will not be granted for Municipal Reserve owed or Environmental Reserve required as a Community Lot does not meet the intended purpose of either a Municipal or Environmental Reserve.

As a recap of the presentation during the January 10th Council meeting, the proposed amendments to this Policy, Administration notes there are several changes proposed to be made to this Policy, specifically in relation to Schedule A, Preparing an Area Structure Plan in the County of Wetaskiwin No. 10, with the most significant changes being:

- **Section 5.3** The removal of the statement: "Such report shall follow the guidelines and address the required elements of the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Countries and Alberta Municipal Affairs "Model Process for Subdivision Approval and Private Sewage". Information on the Model Process for Subdivision Approval and Private Sewage can be found at the following Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Countries Site: "AAMD&C.com" then click on the "Advocacy Tab" then go directly to "Reports" and this page will list all the information necessary on the Model Process for Subdivision Approval and Private Sewage. Alternately, you may contact the County’s Planning and Economic Development Department for assistance.”

- **Section 5.3** Addition of statement: "For further assistance and guidance, please contact the County’s Planning and Economic Development Departments.”

- **Section 6.3.2** Amendment of statement to read: "Any land included in the Intermunicipal Development Plan between the County of Wetaskiwin and a neighbouring municipality, if within 3.2 km of the Plan Area.” This Section originally listed several Summer Villages.

- **Section 6.3.3** Amendment of statement to include First Nations Reserves and increasing of the distance from 0.8 km to 1.6 km in which adjacent municipalities and reserves shall be identified to coincide with approved Intermunicipal Development Plans.

- Relocated information/statements regarding Environmental, Municipal Reserves within the document.

- Section 6.5 Addition of statement regarding Conservation Reserves: “Conservation Reserve is to allow for the dedication of lands to the County if the land, in the opinion of the development and/or subdivision authority, has environmentally significant features, and could not be required to be provided as environmental reserve, therefore allows for the County to protect and conserve the land.”
• Section 7.2 Update Documents Submitted to read digital copies, no disc ready originals.

• Section 7.5 Addition of Safety Codes Council, Natural Resources Conservation Board (NRCB), and Alberta Energy Regulator (AER) in the list of Additional Contacts.

Policy Statement

The Council of the County of Wetaskiwin No. 10 receives requests from landowners who wish to develop their parcels into multi-lot subdivisions or propose recreational, multi-residential, commercial, and industrial developments without subdivision. In order to provide fair and consistent decisions regarding multi-lot subdivisions or proposals without subdivision of recreational, multi-residential, commercial, and industrial developments, Council deemed it necessary to establish this Policy.

Administration notes that the Policy Statement for this Policy has not changed, but rather the contents of Schedule A, which have been outlined previous.

This Policy was approved by Directors and is provided for review by Council. (Ref. Resolution #DM20181212.009)

Administration recommended that Council approve the proposed amendments to Requirements for Area Structure Plan (ASP) Policy #61.1.6 as presented.

Council discussed the following:

• The requirements of an Area Structure Plan and the involvement with assisting ratepayers in the completion of an Area Structure Plan by Administration;
• The history of the Waiver of Area Structure Plans and the recent results of previously presented Waiver of Area Structure Plans;
• The implications of removing the ability to Waive Area Structure Plan from Policy 61.1.6;
• Future amendments to the legislation governing sewage treatments.

Administration commented on the different requirements of an Area Structure Plan for subdivisions of varying magnitudes; and compared the costs to Waive an Area Structure Plan versus completing an Area Structure Plan.

Resolution PD20190215.010

MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop

that Council approve the amendments to Requirements for Area Structure Plan (ASP) Policy #61.1.6 as presented with the additional amendments removing:

• The statement: "This Policy may be waived by resolution of Council when, in the opinion of Council, no purpose would be served by preparing an Area Structure Plan."
• Section 7.3 Council’s Option to Waive: The requirement for an ASP may be waived by resolution of Council when, in the opinion of Council, no purpose would be served by preparing an Area Structure Plan.

Recorded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favour:</th>
<th>Opposed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reeve T. Van de Kraats</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor J. Bishop</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor B. Krahn</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor D. Woitt</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor K. Adair</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor K. Rooyakkers</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. NEW BUSINESS

10.1 Amendments to Approach Installation Policy #61.1.1

The Approach Installation Policy #61.1.1 was reviewed and amended to make the Policy current in content and formatting, this Policy was created May 2016, with the most current amended in May 2018 by Resolution CG20180510.1022. There was one significant change made to this Policy which included the addition of the following:

12. TEMPORARY APPROACHES:

12.1 Industry requiring temporary approach access must provide the County with a survey and sight lines and enter into a Road Use Agreement. After signing the Road Use Agreement the User shall contact the County’s permitting agency to obtain inspections for the temporary approaches. These approaches do not have to meet the County’s approach standards (no culvert or gravel required). Fees charged as specified in the “Fees & Charges By-Law” and are based per approach per inspection completed.

12.2 If the temporary approach is not removed within the 14 days after construction the County shall undertake the work with all charges being the responsibility of the User at the rates indicated in the Custom Work Fee Schedule Policy #32.0.2.

Policy Statement:

1. POLICY STATEMENT

1.1 This Policy shall apply to proposed and existing approaches related to subdivision or non-subdivision situations including accesses to private lands and resource installation or extraction activities such as pipeline installations but, does not include wellsite approaches.

1.2 In all districts except Agricultural, each lot shall only have one approach unless valid reasons exist that would necessitate a second approach. In such cases, a written request including supporting information must be provided to the County and in accordance with this Policy and other applicable 61 series policies for Subdivision Land and Development.

1.3 Agricultural districted lands may in certain circumstances have more than one approach subject to this Policy and other applicable 61 series policies for Subdivision Land and Development.

1.4 The County of Wetaskiwin No. 10 will allow Resource Extraction Companies, private landowners and others to install or upgrade approaches from privately owned land to a constructed grade within a municipal road allowance in a manner which does not interfere with safety of motoring public or regular maintenance of the road right of way and grade.

1.5 Pursuant to the Highways Development and Protection Act, depositing any material on a highway without authorization is an offence.

All private approach installation or upgrades must be constructed to predetermined standards and be approved by a designated County Official. Failure to comply with this condition will result in penalties or fines as described in of the Highways Development and Protection Act. Costs for all approaches not meeting the County’s criteria for approach installation shall be the sole responsibility of the parties constructing the approach.

This Policy was approved by Directors and is provided for review by Council. (Ref. Resolution #DM20190123.015)

Administration recommended that Council review the proposed amendments to Approach Installation Policy #61.1.1 and approve as presented or amended.

Council asked the following questions:
• That if a quarter does not have an approach, does the County still install the first access free of charge?
• Who is responsible for the road up to a quarter if an approach is required?

Administration confirmed:
• That the County does still provide the first approach free of charge if no existing approach has ever been present on a quarter section. These circumstances are very rare.
• That if a road is required for access, the developer is required to complete the road construction to County standards prior to the County installing the first approach to a quarter section.

Resolution PD20190215.011
MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop
that Council approve the amendments to Approach Installation Policy #61.1.1 as presented.
Carried Unanimously

10.2 Amendments to Commercial and Industrial Development in the Highway 2 Corridor Policy #61.1.12

The Commercial and Industrial Development in the Highway 2 Corridor Policy #61.1.12 was reviewed and amended to make the Policy current in content and formatting, this Policy was created in 2005. There were several changes made to this Policy, the most significant being:
• Section 2: added statement: “and potentially up to 1600 metres” when referring to the distance of a subdivision or development to a highway which will require approvals from both the municipality and Alberta Transportation.
• Section 4.1.4: Update the name Hobbema to Maskwacis.
• Section 4.1.5: Remove part of the statement: This site has therefore been excluded from this study.

Policy Statement:

Close to 20,000 vehicles use Highway 2 each day in the County of Wetaskiwin. A business exposed to this volume of traffic could have a great advantage over one on a lesser used road. Industrial activities can also benefit from direct access to a highway with high load limits.

Experience in Leduc, Lacombe, and Red Deer Counties suggests that it will not be long before the is asked to approve large scale commercial and industrial land uses at the places where there is access to Highway 2. This policy paper sets out some of the considerations which will apply when the Council of the is asked to approve subdivision or rezoning for such uses.

This Policy was approved by Directors and is provided for Council’s review. (Ref. Resolution#DM20181212.010)

Administration recommended that Council review the Commercial and Industrial Development in the Highway 2 Corridor Policy #61.1.12 and approve as presented or amended.

Council discussed the following:
• That the County is committed to the development of all types of business along the Highway 2 Corridor;
• The future servicing of lots along the Highway 2 corridor, including both sewer and water;
• Examples of development within surrounding municipalities;
• Removal of Section 3 as it contradicts the intent of Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.3;
• Section 3 states "that retail activity is still seen as belonging mainly in the urban places" and "the Highway Interchange Commercial District, with the allowable uses strictly defined so that the interchanges are not used for big box stores, retail malls, auto sales, or other uses which should remain in urban areas".

• Section 4.1.1 states "Highway 616 intersection: This site is only fifteen minutes south of the International Airport and it could attract overspill development from the Nisku industrial park. Highway 616 is also used as access to the north side of Pigeon Lake (about 1,250 vehicles a day, rising to 1,460 a day in the summer), so it might be being attractive to businesses providing goods and services to recreationists."

• Section 4.1.3 states "Highway 13 intersection: Most of the traffic going to the south side of Pigeon Lake uses this intersection. Traffic on Highway 13 here averages 2,840 vehicles a day, rising to 3,350 in the summer. A recreation oriented development might find this a good site. The north-west quadrant (SW 13-46-26-4) is high, level, and open; whereas the other quarters have problems with drainage."

• Section 5.1.1 Type of development: List the proposed land uses and show why they need to locate at a highway interchange instead of in town.

Administration addressed rural development, the requirements of in depth and comprehensively designed Area Structure Plans required for future development, land values, and the economy's effect on large scale development.

Resolution PD20190215.012
MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop

that Council table the amendments to Commercial and Industrial Development in the Highway 2 Corridor Policy #61.1.12 to allow for further review and revisions and for the Policy to be brought forward at a subsequent meeting.

Carried Unanimously

10.3 Amendments to Design Guidelines and Construction Standards #61.1.13

The Amendments to Design Guidelines and Construction Standards Policy #61.1.13 was reviewed and amended to make the Policy current in content and formatting, this Policy was created in 2005. There were several changes made to this policy, the most significant being:

• Removal of statement: The cost of a Design Guidelines and Construction Specifications Manual shall be $50.00 for a bound paper copy and a $25.00 for a compact disc.

• Inserted statement 2.2: Individuals requiring further information are directed to the County of Wetaskiwin Website for the Design Guidelines and Construction Specifications Manual. The guidelines can be found by searching Engineering Services.

Policy Statement:

1. In order to allow a process for the review of other standards presented by Developers which may be of a different standard than that outlined in the County of Wetaskiwin's approved Design Guidelines and Construction Specifications Manual and are of a generally accepted Engineering standard and to provide Developers with the cost for the copies of the Manual, the following provisions will apply:

This Policy was approved by Directors and is provided for Council's review. (Ref. Resolution#DM20181212.011)

Administration recommended that Council review the Amendments to Design Guidelines and Construction Standards Policy #61.1.13 and approve as presented or amended.
Council discussed the elimination of the cost of the manuals. Council also reviewed the recovery of costs for reviewing engineering plans provided by the developer and examples of when such recovery would be beneficial and implemented.

Administration confirmed that cost recovery is addressed with developers through specific conditions in the Development Agreement. The County is able to consider alternative standards provided by developers, however, these standards will require review to ensure they meet long term expectations.

**Resolution PD20190215.013**

MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop

that Council approve the amendments to Design Guidelines and Construction Standards Policy #61.1.13 as presented with the additional amendments of removing:

- 1.1 "and to provide Developers with the cost for the copies of the Manual"

**Carried Unanimously**

**10.4 Recess**

The meeting recessed at 10:43 a.m.

**10.5 Reconvene**

The meeting reconvened at 10:52 a.m.

**10.6 Amendments to Pavement and Per Lot Road Contribution Fee Policy #61.1.15**

The Pavement and Per Lot Road Contribution Fee Policy #61.1.15 was reviewed and amended to make the Policy current in content and formatting, this Policy was created in 2009, with the most current amended in 2010 by Resolution PD20100812.1019. There were several changes made to this Policy, the most significant being:

- Section 2.3, Removal of statement reading: "in consultation with EXH Engineering and Public Works and has over the past two years" and addition of "and the County" when referring to the acceptance of the $2000 fee by Developers and the County as a reasonable per lot fee for funds toward improvement of County roads providing access to multi-lot subdivision.
- Section 8.1, Addition of the word subdivision to clarify statement.

At the February 5, 2015 Council for Planning and Economic meeting, Council was presented with three options for updating fees for recreational district development. At the time Council approved that Policy 6615 be amended to confirm a rate of one-half (1/2) the standard residential rate or six months be added for recreational district development.

(Ref. Resolution #PD20150205.1004)

- Section 2.3, Addition, for Recreational Zoned properties that involve recreational vehicle resort developments or campgrounds the Per Lot Road Contribution fee is $1,000.00 per lot. The recreational vehicle resort developments or campgrounds must not run more than 6 months in a calendar year, or will be subject to the full Per Lot Road Contribution Fee of $2000.00 per lot.

Policy Statement:

1. The Council of the County of Wetaskiwin believes multi-parcel subdivisions are better served when situated closer to existing or potential water and sewer services and paved roads. To better accommodate higher densities proposed in our rural areas, the provision of pavement within those subdivisions, pavement linking subdivisions to existing pavement, and contributions to the improvement of County Roads required to give access to proposed multi-parcel subdivisions must all be considered part of developing a multi-parcel subdivision. For the purpose of this Policy, the term "linking road" shall mean that segment of road between the subdivision or development area and a paved road.
This Policy has been approved by Directors and is provided for Council’s review and approval. (Ref#DM20181212.012)

Administration recommended that Council review the Pavement and Per Lot Road Contribution Fee Policy #61.1.15 and approve as presented or amended.

Council discussed the following:

- That the current offsite levy required by campgrounds is $1000.00;
- The current road contribution amounts required by Developers;
- Pavement requirement costs versus payment of the road contribution fees;
- How surrounding municipalities address road contribution fees. For example, a per acre fee for road contribution;
- The manner in which road contribution fees are collected;
- The phasing of subdivisions to allow multi lot subdivisions more than three years to sell lots;
- The circumstances surrounding subdivision extensions;
- Whether Section 2.2.3 is interpreted to encourage developers to move further away from the highway;
  - “Section 2.2.3 For multi-lot residential subdivisions with a proposed density between thirteen (13) and twenty four (24) lots, the Developer shall be required to pave a linking road from the subdivision to an existing paved arterial, collect or resource road identified in the County’s Rural Road Study or other paved County road if the linking road is within one (1) mile or less to such paved road;”
- The requirements of a developer to pave a road during development;
- Removing the paragraph after Section 2.2.4, if a developer pave the linking road, they would not be required to still contribute a road contribution fee;
  - “Section 2.2.4 A developer who paves a linking road in accordance with this Policy is still responsible for the payment of the per lot road contribution fee, unless payment of the per lot road contribution fee is specifically waived by Council.”
- Section 2.3 Per Lot Road Contribution Fee, removal of the specific date and the annual review for the road contribution fee in the following statement as the deadline is unrealistic: The per lot fee amount shall be adjusted to take into account the industry standard cost increases for contracts, materials and labour at the beginning of each year and adjusted accordingly no later than March 1st of each year. The adjustment shall be calculated by a qualified engineering firm;
- Section 2.4 Waiving of Fee in Lieu of Paving or Preparation of Paving: Wording clarification was requested;
- Recommended replacement of the words "in lieu" for Sections 2.5.3 and 2.5.5;
- That in Section 2.5.6, five (5) years is too short of a period to be effective. Recommended ten to fifteen (10-15) years;
  - Portion of Section 2.5.6 Administration believes that five (5) years should be used as an effective time period for Endeavour to Assist clauses. The County shall not be expected to assist a Developer with any recovery from future benefiting developers after a five (5) year period; and
- The removal of Section 2.8.1 Exemptions: Per lot road contribution fee applies to subdivision of multi-parcels but does not apply to first parcel out subdivisions.

Administration addressed Councils inquiries with the following:

- That campgrounds are indeed charged a $1000.00 offsite levy;
- That road contribution fees are intended to address the impact of additional vehicles resulting from a subdivision;
- The road contribution fee amount is currently under review to ensure the amount charged is sufficient;
- Discussed the different mechanisms available for collecting road contribution fees throughout the development process;
- Verified that levies can be implemented for road improvement. However, these situations are rare; and
• That there is a requirement for a bylaw in the event funds shall be collected or the County would work with the developer as an Endeavor to Assist. In the event a developer makes upgrades, the funds as road contribution fees would be forwarded to the developer at that time.

**Resolution PD20190215.014**

MOVED: by Councillor J. Bishop

that Council table the amendments to Pavement and Per Lot Road Contribution Fee Policy #61.1.15 to allow for further review and revisions and for the policy to be brought forward at a subsequent meeting.

*Carried Unanimously*

12. **ADJOURN**

**Resolution PD20190215.015**

MOVED: by Councillor D. Woitt

that the Council for Planning & Economic Development meeting be adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

*Carried Unanimously*

_________________________
REEVE

_________________________
CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER