

Topic: Submission of a Capital Region Board letter in regards to the Shiloh Area Structure Plan (ASP).

**Introduction:**

*The report outlines Administration's request to submit a letter to the Capital Region Board (CRB) stating that Parkland County will support the proposed amendments to the City of Spruce Grove Shiloh ASP and MDP contingent upon future consultation, and the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding between Parkland County, the Town of Stony Plain, and the City of Spruce Grove.*

*This report also provides background information on Administration's concerns with recent consultation with the City of Spruce Grove on the proposed amendments to the Shiloh ASP.*

**Facts (Background Information):**

In August 2013, Administration was contacted by a consulting firm under contract with the developers of the Shiloh lands in Spruce Grove (see Attachment 2 – Plan Area). The consultants were proposing amendments to the City of Spruce Grove Shiloh Area Structure Plan (ASP).

The developer's consultants wanted to meet with Parkland County to discuss the potential extension of the collector road network into NE 29-52-27-W4M, and the use of an existing wetland at the northwest corner of this quarter-section to accommodate future storm water capacity for the Shiloh area. **NE 29-52-27-W4M falls inside the Parkland County boundary.**

Parkland County staff attended a September 5, 2013 meeting with representatives from the City of Spruce Grove, Town of Stony Plain, Lamont Land (Shiloh lands developers), Qualico, Select Engineering, and Associated Engineering to discuss potential amendments to the Shiloh ASP, as well as the extension of the road network and storm water scheme into NE 29-52-27-W4M. At the meeting Parkland County Administration did not object to the proposed road network and storm-water management scheme. The Town of Stony Plain committed to preparing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to be signed by all three municipalities to "seek formal authorization on the proposed major road alignments from senior management of Spruce Grove, Stony Plain and Parkland County". Attachment 3 is the revised Memorandum of Understanding circulated to the Town of Stony Plain, City of Spruce Grove, and Parkland County.

Parkland County received notice of a Public Open House from the City of Spruce Grove in late May 2014 (for a June 18, 2014 Public Open House) to review proposed changes to the Shiloh ASP (Parkland staff could not attend this Public Open House). Parkland County then received Notice of the Public Hearing for the amendments to the Shiloh ASP, and the supporting amendments to the Spruce Grove Municipal Development Plan (MDP) and Land Use Bylaw (LUB). The Notice was sent to the County on approximately June 25, 2014 for a Public Hearing scheduled on July 14, 2014.

Parkland County submitted a letter to the City of Spruce Grove stating its concerns with the lack of a signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on the proposed road network extension and storm water scheme. The

letter also indicated Parkland County's concern with a lack of consultation from the City of Spruce Grove and the Shiloh developers and consultants on the proposed ASP amendments (*County Administration were not invited to any formal follow-up meetings by the City of Spruce Grove or Shiloh developers after the original September 5, 2013 meeting*). See Attachment 4 – Parkland County letter to the City of Spruce Grove.

The Public Hearing was held on the Shiloh ASP amendments, and the supporting amendments to the Spruce Grove MDP and LUB on July 14, 2014. Spruce Grove City Council also gave Second Reading to all three proposed bylaws. Amendments to the Shiloh ASP and Spruce Grove MDP were forwarded to the Capital Region Board (CRB) for review shortly after the Public Hearing and Second Reading date. It is currently unknown when the CRB will be reviewing the proposed ASP and MDP amendments.

#### **Analysis:**

Approval of the amended Shiloh ASP by the City of Spruce Grove Council and Capital Region Board (CRB) is premature due to the lack of a signed MOU between the City of Spruce Grove, Town of Stony Plain and Parkland County. Of immediate concern to Parkland County is the future capital costs with construction of the road network and any on-going operational / maintenance costs. The Town of Stony Plain circulated a revised MOU on July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014. Parkland County has not signed this MOU as of yet, and it is unknown whether the City of Spruce Grove or Stony Plain has signed the MOU.

Administration also feels that inadequate consultation has been undertaken by the City of Spruce Grove and the Shiloh developers and consultants on the proposed amendments to the Shiloh ASP. Parkland County Administration have only been invited - and participated in - one meeting on the ASP amendments (September 5, 2014 meeting). While the developers did invite Parkland County to the June 18 Open House, County Administration does not feel that attendance at a Public Open House constitutes formal discussion with an adjacent municipality.

The City of Spruce Grove contends that Parkland County's participation on the City's Boundary Interface Planning Study effectively provides Parkland County's approval for servicing extensions into Parkland County. The City also states that Parkland County staff met previously with Lamont and Qualico to discuss road alignments, storm water locations, and school locations (potentially for the Shiloh lands). Administration however, feels that without a signed MOU, no formal agreement has been set between Parkland County, the City of Spruce Grove and the Town of Stony Plain for any extension of road or storm water infrastructure into Parkland County.

Administration does acknowledge that NE 29-52-27-W4M falls outside the existing Shiloh ASP boundary. (see Attachment 2 – Plan Area). That said, mapping and references in the ASP text mentions the extension of the road and storm-water network into Parkland County – creating concern for the County.

While Administration **does not wish** to oppose amendments to the Shiloh ASP and supporting MDP amendments at the Capital Region Board, Administration does request Council direction to submit a letter to the CRB. The letter (Attachment 5) states that the County will support amendments to the Shiloh ASP contingent upon future consultation with the City on the road networking extension and storm-water infrastructure into Parkland County. The letter also requests the signing of a MOU between Parkland County, the Town of Stony Plain, and the City of Spruce Grove to address these issues.

#### **Alternatives:**

1. Administration to not submit a letter to the Capital Region Board stating the County will support the proposed amendments to the Shiloh ASP contingent upon additional consultation and a signed MOU.

Administration does not support this alternative. By not submitting a letter to the CRB, Administration cannot guarantee (without a signed MOU) that capital road construction costs and maintenance costs for potential future roads extension into Parkland County will be assumed by Shiloh area developers and the City of Spruce Grove. In addition, issues related around the storm-water scheme will still need to be further addressed by these developers, the City of Spruce Grove and Parkland County.

#### **Conclusion/Summary:**

*Administration requests that Council provide direction to submit a letter to the CRB stating that the County will support the amendments to the Shiloh ASP contingent upon the City of Spruce Grove agreeing to future consultation to discuss issues around the extension of the proposed road network and storm-water management scheme into Parkland County. The letter also requests that a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) be signed between Parkland County, the Town of Stony Plain, and the City of Spruce Grove that addresses these issues.*

*Administration feels that inadequate consultation has been undertaken by the City of Spruce Grove and the developers and consultants of the Shiloh area on the proposed amendments to the Shiloh ASP, and supporting amendments to the City of Spruce Grove MDP. By submitting the prepared letter to the CRB, Administration feels that the County will be protected by ensuring capital and operation costs associated with any road extension into Parkland County will not be assumed by the County. In addition, the signing of an MOU between Parkland County, Town of Stony Plain and the City of Spruce Grove will allow the County to address in detail any outstanding issues with the road extension and potential storm-water servicing extension into Parkland County.*

**AUTHOR:** Martin Frigo

Department: Planning & Development

Date written: August 1, 2014