

BRR - Bareland Recreational Resort District

What We Heard

January 2024 Open House

The BRR – Bareland Recreational Resort District Amendment project was undertaken to support the Land Use Bylaw ReDesign project. This project involved the detailed analysis of Arizona rooms and then produced recommendations for their regulation within the Bareland Recreational Resort (BRR) District. This project was completed to optimize user functionality and contribute to the Council's Strategic Vision. The BRR District Amendment project is being worked on, in tandem, with the Land Use Bylaw ReDesign project.

Open House

On Tuesday, January 16th, 2024, at the Wabamun Jubilee Hall, a public open house was conducted to allow the public to ask questions and share their feedback regarding the proposed BRR District amendments. An open house provides an avenue for dialogue with landowners and area stakeholders, allowing them to be informed of the project and engaged in its production.

Advertisement for public consultation included:

- Placing an ad in the local newspaper;
- Uploading content on the project webpage;
- Emailing subscribers from the Land Use Bylaw ReDesign Project;
- Posting the advertisements on digital billboard signs ads in the Hamlets of Wabamun and Entwistle; and
- Mailing advertisements to specific landowners affected by this project.

In total, there were 11 attendees at the open house. Display boards were presented at the event, each detailing how this project connects with the Land Use Bylaw ReDesign Project, research completed to date, and proposed amendments (shown in Appendix A). Comment cards were made available for attendees to provide written feedback.

Outcomes

At the open house, participants were able to ask questions and provide their thoughts about the proposed amendments for the BRR District. Overall, many of the participants expressed their satisfaction with their questions answered. There were conversations about why these amendments were being proposed, how the amendments will affect existing developments, and how the BRR Amendment project contributes to the larger Land Use Bylaw ReDesign Project.

Multiple participants asked two general questions:

- What happens to developments that are non-conforming as a result of the proposed amendments?
 - The project team addressed these comments, noting that developments that are non-conforming are allowed to remain in their existing form and function, with restrictions as to how they can be renovated or modified in the future, in alignment with the regulations in the Land Use Bylaw and the Municipal Government Act.
- Will the change in setbacks significantly alter the built environment?

The project team noted that part of the study included analyzing how current lots within the BRR District may be affected by the proposed amendments. The findings identified that the majority of the lots would not be overtly affected by the proposed changes, specifically because of the lot coverage not changing.

One participant had questions and feedback about an existing development that is districted as BRR (shown in Appendix B). The project team answered the participant’s questions and provided contact information to follow up with written responses if they chose to. The participant sent a follow up email, with the summary of their comments identified below:

Summary of Comments	Response
<p>Concerns about increasing the “External Parcel” setback.</p> <p>The participant expressed that it is unreasonable to have external parcel setbacks on an external parcel that is adjoining an internal parcel.</p> <p>The participant recommended having a wording change to state " the external boundary of external parcels" or , give discretion to the permitting authority.</p>	<p>This concern is addressed in existing regulations for setbacks in the BRR District.</p>
<p>Concerns about defining “seasonal” in the Land Use Bylaw definitions as it was unclear whether or not permitting seasonal use in the district meant there could be enforcement of seasonal use.</p> <p>The participant stated that the County has two avenues that covers seasonality of the district: whether the Development Agreement approval captures the word seasonal and whether the restrict covenant placed on each title has wording capturing that the building should not be a primary residence and restricts occupancy to 365 days consecutively.</p>	<p>The current Land Use Bylaw does not define “seasonal” although Parkland County has seasonal residential areas. Adding the definition for seasonal clarifies the use of term seasonal throughout the Land Use Bylaw.</p> <p>To clarify the intent of the BRR District, ‘seasonal’ was added to the purpose of the district. By doing so, it highlights that the BRR District and its associated uses are seasonal in nature. Seasonal is not used in any regulations, and therefore it isn’t an enforceable item from the county’s perspective.</p>

Concerns about defining “addition” within this project because the definition would not only affect regulations within the BRR District, but the whole Land Use Bylaw.

The participant interpreted that Arizona rooms that are created to be a heated living space and sunrooms or covered decks which are not heated are all defined in their condominium bylaw as “accessory structures.”

Additions can be defined as adding to the existing structure which becomes a part of the original structure. The participant stated because a park model is the original structure under the CSA building code Z-241, the maximum square footage is 538 sq.ft. and defining the Arizona room as an addition would add to the square footage of the park mode. Because Arizona rooms require a separate permit which makes them separate structures.

The participant recommended that there should be wording added to the “addition” definition that captures additions of Arizona rooms in the BRR district. The definition should consider Arizona rooms as separate structures that do not add square footage to the existing structure.

Currently, there is regulation within the Land Use Bylaw that states:

“Accessory buildings attached to the Principal Building are considered to be part of the Principal Building and shall comply with the Setbacks applicable to the principal building for the applicable land use district.”

By defining “addition”, it clarifies the distinction between structures attached to the primary building and those not attached to the primary building (accessory buildings). The definition for accessory buildings is proposed to be refined by providing examples of what is considered an accessory building, such as a fence, permanent hot tub or swimming pool, platform structure, sunroom, patio, radio antenna, flagpole, and other similar structures.

Next Steps

Thank you for participating!

Your feedback will help us shape the final recommendations and amendments to the BRR District. When we develop the recommended amendments, we will post them to the project webpage for your review at yourparkland.ca/brr. Have questions about the project? Email us anytime at buildingparkland@parklandcounty.com