

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PARKLAND COUNTY SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT APPEAL BOARD HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS IN THE COUNTY OFFICE AT PARKLAND COUNTY, ALBERTA ON MAY 9, 2016

CALL TO ORDER

The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

PRESENT

Members: D. Mattson, R. Underwood, T. Melnyk, M. Gunderson, J. Smith
Clerk: D. Tymchyshyn, Manager, Legislative & Administrative Services
Recording Secretary: L. Tyerman, Administrative Assistant, Legislative & Administrative Services.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by D. Mattson that the Agenda be adopted.

CARRIED

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

January 18, 2016

March 21, 2016

Moved by R. Underwood that the January 18 and March 21, 2016 minutes be adopted as presented.

CARRIED

NEW BUSINESS:

4:00 p.m. Appointment

Reconvene an Appeal of a decision of the Development Authority to conditionally approve Development Permit No. 15-D-172 for Tourist Campground/Destination at W4-26-50-31-NE/NW and Lot 1 Plan 9020086 W4-26-50-31-SW.

PRESENT-ADMINISTRATION STAFF

C. Thomas, Supervisor, Development Planning

K. Kormos, Development Planner

The Chairperson opened the Hearing at 4:04 p.m.

The Chairperson asked if there were any new materials to present. The Appellant, Mr. Robert Burn announced there were new documents he would like to submit. The Clerk advised the Chairperson that copies of the new information would need to be produced and circulated. The Chairperson agreed to this, and asked the Applicants to move forward with their comments while copies were made and distributed.

Submission of the Applicants, Riverview Properties, Mark Kirwin and Dean Paprotka

Mr. Kirwin began by introducing the engineers who completed the expert reports that were submitted for the Boards and Appellants review May 2, 2016. Present were;

- Mr. Bob Quazi, Engineer who authored the Hydrology Report.
- Mr. Ryan Batty, Engineer who authored the Traffic Impact Assessment.
- Mr. Eddie Noton, Associate of Tetra Tech who authored the Biophysical Report.

When questioned by the Board, Mr. Kirwin deferred to Mr. Batty, Mr. Batty responded that peak hours were analyzed and showed that during morning rush-hour, there would be approximately .4 trips anticipated, and in the afternoon during peak hours there would be approximately .96 trips per site.

He added that hours outside of peak traffic times were not factored in due to the high capacity of the intersections near the site.

When questioned by the Board, Mr. Kirwin answered that to his knowledge the comments from Parkland County's engineers were applied to the reports and were finalized.

When questioned by the Board, Ms. Kormos referred to the comments from Dwayne Hollet in Development Engineering, regarding the Stormwater Management Plan. Ms. Kormos said that some of the conditions of approval in the memo were an agreement between the Development Engineers and the Applicants. She explained that some of the conditions are beyond the Development Authority's control therefore they were not applied and conditioned in the Development Permit Approval.

The Chairperson asked if there was anyone present in the audience who would like to speak in support of the Applicants.

Submission of Bryan Wallace, Graminia Road

- Lives approximately 1.5 miles from the proposed development.
- Has lived in the area for 30 years and has witnessed a lot of uncontrollable trespassing.
- 30 years ago may have opposed this development but now feels that it would be helpful in lessening the amount of trespassing, garbage dumping, and fires.
- Feels that the development will bring some control to the area.
- Thinks the tenants who use the campground will appreciate the beauty and be considerate.
- Wholeheartedly supports the proposed development.

Submission of the Appellant, Mr. Burn

Mr. Burn explained to the Board that upon reviewing the Biophysical Report he had noticed that there were pages missing from the information. This was a worry to him as he would like to review the full document to address some of his concerns, such as; 3.6.2.1 Unnamed Watercourse -- pipelines that have been washed underground along the creek, and damage done to the water course due to horse traffic. He also feels that the topography is susceptible to erosion high traffic will stop vegetation from growing in this area.

The Clerk, D. Tymchyshyn addressed the Board and made them aware that it had come to staffs attention that the Biophysical Report was missing pages. He continued that it appeared during the last hearing, staff were provided with one sided copies of a double sided document to scan and distribute. The Clerk said that upon realization of this, staff had pulled the complete report from the Development Permit file and made copies to circulate at this hearing.

The Chairperson called a recess at 4:29 p.m., to allow the Appellant and Board time to review the complete report.

The Chairperson called the hearing to order at 4:40 p.m. with all Board Members present.

Mr. Burn asked Administration to show on a map the Environmentally Sensitive Area referenced in section 2.2. Ms. Kormos mentioned that the Environmental Management Plan is only accepted as information not adopted as policy. The Environmentally Sensitive Area in question is a small creek that runs alongside of the campground, farther to the east.

Mr. Burn asked Administration if section 4.2 which mentions environmentally significant and protected areas, refers to the creek as well.

Ms. Kormos asked that the author of the report provide Mr. Burn with the answer. Mr. Eddie Noton, Engineer, Tetra Tech, answered that section 4.2 refers to the portion of the property which was deemed an Environmentally Sensitive Area, including the creek.

Mr. Burn addressed Mr. Noton regarding section 4.3, which states that during work, care should be taken. Mr. Burn asked how 200-300 campers would alleviate the vegetation problem. Mr. Noton responded that 4.3 refers to the construction phase, and added that once the campground is fully functional, topsoil and vegetation will be added, erosion shouldn't be an issue at that point.

Mr. Burn stated that section 4.4 which refers to Vegetation Resources identifies that creeping thistle and common tansy should be controlled. Mr. Burn said that the trench Riverview dug along the Road Plan and filled from the berm resulted in the spread of toadflax.

Mr. Burn asked the Board to review the three photos that he had submitted today.

- Photo 1 is a view of the berm that has been there for many years and is covered in toadflax.
- Photo 2 is of stripped topsoil.
- Photo 3 is a close up shot of the trench with the berm in the background. Mr. Burn feels this should be cleaned up before any further development takes place.

The Chairperson asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak in support of the Appellant, there were none.

Closing comments of the Applicants, Riverview Properties, Mark Kirwin and Dean Paprotka

1. Mr. Kirwin stated that Riverview Properties purchased the subject lands from Mr. Bailey 13 years ago. Since then the previous oil well sites have been cleaned up and gravel operations wrapped up.
2. He noted that the gravel permits were still in place but that Riverview would prefer to proceed with the proposed campground development. The history of Riverview's involvement in the area included consulting local residents, County Staff, The Mayor and Law Enforcement. Riverview Properties feels that given the lands zoning as Agriculture Nature Conservation under the Land Use Bylaw, a campground would be the best use of this property.
3. Riverview properties has experience with this sort of development as they own a similar operation in Crowsnest Pass. The neighbouring community of Coleman has welcomed them. The people using the sites live a quiet lifestyle. There were issues of trespassers in the area as well, and having the campground has helped alleviate that, particularly with regards to trespassers accessing the river.
4. Mr. Kirwin feels that the issue of trespassing near the proposed campground site will resolve with the development moving forward.
5. Mr. Kirwin mentioned that on Range Road 23 South of Stony Plain an abandoned gravel pit was attracting vandals and trespassers. Parkland County turned this into a day use park to help control the issues.
6. Submitted that the proposed development is an appropriate use of the land, and asked that the Appeal be dismissed.

When questioned by the Board, Mr. Kirwin said that Riverview Properties had purchased the land in Crowsnest, performed clean-up of the coal processing site and developed the land in the last 3 years.

Closing comments of the Appellant, Mr. Burn

1. As a third generation adjoining landowner has witnessed the destruction of a unique space.
2. The oil and gravel companies have taken what they need and left behind a mess to clean up, is Riverview Properties going to do the same?
3. Feels that reclaiming their gravel operations prior to starting work on the proposed development is necessary.
4. Mr. Burn stated that the trespassing situation is out of control.
5. The ditch Riverview Properties dug did not deter trespassers, and has caused ecological harm.
6. Feels that without large fences built around the site, trespassing will continue to be a large problem.
7. Campgrounds belong in an industrial park.

The Chairperson asked the Applicant and Appellant if they feel they were allowed a fair hearing. Both agreed they had.

The Chairperson announced that a written Decision would be handed down within 15 days.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairperson closed the hearing at 4:55 p.m.



CHAIRPERSON