

## **Acheson Open House # 1 – October 6, 2014 Acheson Fire Station**

Purpose: *The Purpose of the Open House was to highlight key changes to the draft 2012 Acheson ASP being proposed by Administration. Key changes undertaken to the ASP were identified through the six (6) facilitated meetings with the City of Spruce Grove and City of Edmonton staff.*

Attendance: *Approximately 60-65 people*

Resident Concerns raised:

1. *Alberta Spruce Industries (ASI) – acknowledgement in the ASP and potential for future development / expansion*

*Concern was raised that ASI was not identified in the Draft ASP as an existing industrial / commercial business. Concern was also raised that ASI was not identified in the proposed Staging map for future development / redevelopment Opportunities.*

*Administrative Response:*

- *Administration revised Figure 5 – Development Status to show ASI lands in the “Developed Land” category.*
- *Administration revised Figure 6 – Future Land Use Concept Map to show ASI properties as “future business industrial” (without constraints).*
- *Administration revised the ASP text to acknowledge ASI’s existing development as outside of the “constrained lands” category. Administration also acknowledged ASI (in ASP text) as an existing, developed site.*

2. *Agricultural Area A lands – potential redistricting to AGR – Agricultural Restricted in Land Use Bylaw 20-2009, and additional environmental policies and requirements.*

*Several residents had concerns with “Agricultural Area A” lands and the potential redistricting of Agricultural Area A lands to AGR – Agricultural Restricted in Land Use Bylaw 20-2009 if the ASP was to be passed. SEE ATTACHMENT 6 – ASP Comments Received – Pre Public Hearing.*

*Administrative Response:*

- *Administration acknowledged that potential for AGR redistricting as identified in Draft Policy 6.9.5.3 was due, in part, to facilitated meetings with Spruce Grove and the City of Edmonton.*
- *Administration revised text in Section 5.2 – Lands Available for Development, and in Sections 6.2 – Available lands for development. Changes removed the category name “Unavailable for Development” and replaced it with “Environmental & Land Constraints – Limited development lands”. Policies in Section 6.9 – Agriculture were clarified in Section 6.9 to allow for limited development potential on Agricultural Area A lands (as consistent with the AGR – Agricultural Restricted District in Land Use Bylaw 20-2009).*

3. Designation of “Business Industrial” lands – southerly portion of ASP area (Highway 628 realignment).

Concern was raised that Figure 6 – Future Land Use Concept identifies the southerly quarter sections of the ASP area as “Outside ASP timelines”. Concern was raised that these quarter sections should be designated “Business Industrial” in Figure 6 – Future Land Use Concept.

Administrative Response:

- Administration informed residents that development of these lands were premature due to the re-alignment of Highway 628 and ongoing work of Alberta Transportation to acquire lands for the realignment. Administration informed residents that any “resultant lands” on these quarter sections after land has been acquired would be designated for industrial and commercial development purposes.
- Administration contacted Alberta Transportation and confirmed that land acquisition for the Highway 628 re-alignment is not completed.
- Administration revised text in Section 5.2 – Lands Available for Development to indicate that “resultant lands remaining once the Highway 628 road alignment has been acquired will be identified for future industrial and commercial development opportunities”.

4. Future Uses on Agricultural Area B lands and potential expansion of Agricultural Area B lands onto NE 27-52-26-W4M.

Concern was raised by residents about future anticipated uses on Agricultural B lands, as well as the rationale for expanding Agricultural B lands onto NE 27-52-26-W4M (south of the Ranch Golf and Country Club).

Administrative Response:

- Administration informed residents that development on Agricultural B lands will be limited to uses currently allowed under Land Use Bylaw 20-2009) (NOTE – all lands in Agricultural Area B are currently districted AGR – Agricultural Restricted).
- Administration informed residents that the expansion of Agricultural Area B lands onto NE 27-52-26-W4M was at the request of the City of Edmonton.

5. Osborne Acres – expansion of 200 M setback area

Osborne Acres residents raised the concern that the 200 M setback was missing on the east side of Osborne Acres (200 M setback along the existing Municipal Reserve Lot).

Administrative Response:

- Administration revised Figure 5 – Development Status Map, Figure 6 – Future Land use Concept Map, and Figure 15 – Development Staging, to re-install the 200 M setback located on the existing Municipal Reserve parcel east of Osborne Acres.

6. Identification of existing BI – districted lands in the ASP area as “Unavailable for Development” (North of Osborne Acres)

Concern was raised by a landowner that his land was identified as “Unavailable for Development” on Figure 6 – Future Land Use Concept. A portion of the landowner’s current holdings (immediately to the east of Wagner Natural Area) is districted in Land Use Bylaw as BI – Business Industrial.

Administrative Response:

- Administration met with the landowner to discuss his concerns.
- Administration removed the “Unavailable for Development” hatching from Figure 6 – Land Use Concept for the landowner’s land.
- Administration maintained the “environmental constraints” hatching on landowner’s land in Figure 5 – Development Status Map. Administration confirmed this approach with the landowner in their meeting with him.

7. Transportation and landscaping concerns – Acheson Business Association (ABA).

Concern was raised about the potential designation of W ½ 32-52-26-W4M, and NW 29-52-26-W4M for industrial purposes (three quarter sections immediately east of Millham Gardens). Concern was that without improvements to the Spruce Valley Road / Highway 16A intersection, development of these lands is premature.

Concern was also raised about the overall landscaping standards for the ASP area – as well as the County’s commitments to undertaking its own landscaping along existing road right-of-ways (i.e. County to show a leadership role in providing landscaping in strategic areas).

Administrative Response:

- Administration met with the ABA to discuss these issues. Administration informed ABA that any potential development of the W ½ 32-52-26-W4M, and NW 29-52-26-W4M will require development of a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) – and that completed TIA’s and Development Permit applications will be referred to Alberta Transportation for comment.
- Administration informed ABA that the County will not issue Development Permits for development if Alberta Transportation opposes a submitted TIA or Development Permit application due to increased traffic and safety concerns for the intersection of Spruce Valley Road / Highway 16A.
- Administration also informed ABA that the timing for improvements to the Spruce Valley Road / Highway 16A interchange is unknown at this time.
- Administration informed the ABA that the County intends to review and potentially increase landscaping standards for “strategic locations” in the ASP. These locations include for properties adjacent to all major highways. Landscaping standards would be

*reviewed after ASP adoption, as part of potential amendments to the Land Use Bylaw.*

- *Administration expanded Draft Policy 6.1.2.19 to state that the County would “explore the potential to incorporate landscaping along right-of-ways on existing highways and existing municipal roads”. Landscaping would also “respect existing signage and display of sales materials associated with existing businesses from the highway or road”.*

### **Acheson Open House # 2 – November 7, 2014 Parkland County Council Chambers**

*Purpose: The Purpose of Open House # 2 was to highlight key changes made to the Draft ASP after Open House # 1.*

*Attendance: Approximately 40-45 people*

1. **Alberta Spruce Industries (ASI) – acknowledgement in the ASP and future potential for development / expansion**

*Concern was raised that the ASP requires full municipal servicing to support future development / redevelopment for industrial and commercial developments, and that Parkland County will not make an exception for development and redevelopment opportunities on ASI lands. Resident also stated that they have all “Alberta Transportation Permits” in place to support redevelopment of ASI lands.*

*Resident stated that they are “working with” Parkland County staff to address the issue.*

**Administrative Response:**

- *Administration directed landowner to continue working with Planning & Development management to address the issue.*
2. **Agricultural Area A lands – potential redistricting to AGR – Agricultural Restricted in Land Use Bylaw 20-2009.**

*Several residents had continued concerns with Draft Agricultural Area A policies which would (upon adoption of the ASP) see remaining Agricultural Area A lands redistricted to AGR – Agricultural Restricted in Land Use Bylaw 20-2009.*

*Landowner requested a meeting with Parkland County and City of Spruce Grove to identify the rationale for Agricultural Area A Policies.*

**Administrative Response:**

- *Administration has consulted with the City of Spruce Grove in regards to potential redistricting of lands in Agricultural Area A from AGG – Agricultural General, to AGR – Agricultural Restricted. Spruce Grove has acknowledges **that it can support the continued (current) AGR and AGG districting on Agricultural Area A lands.***

- Administration has revised Draft Policy 6.9.5.3 to state **that current AGR and AGG land districting for parcels located in Agricultural Area A lands will maintain their current districting as outlined in the Land Use Bylaw.**
  - Administration included a new draft policy 6.9.5.7. Draft Policy 6.9.5.7 would allow landowners / developers interested in future development in Agricultural Area A lands to undertake an Outline Plan that would be considered by Parkland County. The Outline Plan would need to address several identified issues with Agricultural Area A lands, as well as comply and meet all requirements defined in the County's Outline Plan Policy and Procedures.
3. Various Concerns – Trans America (submitted prior to the Open House # 2)  
 Various concerns were raised by Trans America with the draft ASP:
- a. Criteria (d) in Draft Policy 7.1.2.6 requires developers to complete all “on-site decommissioning” of oil infrastructure and to provide the County with copies of reclamation certificates before being allowed to contemplate development;
  - b. Developer requested the W ½ 11-53-26-W4M be identified for S1 development, and be designated in Figure 6 – Future Land Use Concept as available for Business Industrial and Medium Industrial development opportunities;
  - c. Minor text and map amendments.

Administrative Response:

- Administration will inform Trans America that it does not support the removal of criteria (d) in Draft Policy 7.1.2.6.
- Administration will inform Trans America that it does not support identifying the W ½ 11-53-26-W4M for S1 development, and the designation of these lands in Figure 6 – Future Land Use Concept for Business Industrial and Medium Industrial development opportunities. Administration feels that development of these lands is still premature due to existing oil production and no indication from Penn West that production will cease in the near future.
- Administration will undertake the several minor text and map amendments.