

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 DECEMBER 5, 2016

CALL TO ORDER

The Chairperson, J. Smith, called the meeting to order at 4:09 p.m.

PRESENT

Members: J. Smith, M. Gunderson, D. Mattson, J. McCuaig, R. Underwood
Clerk: D. Tymchyshyn, Supervisor, Legal and Legislative Services
Recording Secretary: L. Tyerman, Administrative Assistant, Legal and Legislative Services
Legal Counsel: G. Stewart-Palmer

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Moved by M. Gunderson that the December 5, 2016 Agenda be adopted as presented.

CARRIED

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

No unadopted minutes available

NEW BUSINESS:

4:10 p.m. Appointment

Reconvene an appeal of a decision of the Development Authority to conditionally approve Development Permit No. 16-D-597, Group Home, Limited – For up to six residents excluding staff, with a 10' high chain link fence around dwelling at PLAN 8220233, BLOCK 3, LOT 12, Municipal Address #25, 51515 Range Road 32A.

The Chairperson opened the Hearing at 4:13 p.m.

The Chairperson asked if anyone affected by the Appeal had any objections to the Board members hearing the Appeal, there were none.

The Chairperson introduced D. Tymchyshyn, Clerk to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board. The Chairperson advised that it is the Board's practice to have the Clerk participate in private and in-camera discussion with the Board and asked those present if there were any objections, there were none.

Present Administration Staff

C. Thomas, Supervisor, Development Planning
F. Long, Development Planner

The Subdivision and Development Appeal Board Clerk introduced the Appeal into the record.

The Chairperson asked if any affected party present planned to provide any written materials not provided to the Clerk in advance of the hearing. No one came forward.

Submission of the Development Authority

Ms. Long read the Administrative Report into the record and provided the background of the subject file regarding Development Permit No. 16-D-597. Ms. Long stated that:

- The subject property is located within the Hamlet of Keephills, and is located in the Rural Centre District under the Land Use Bylaw.
- The proposed development will consist of a residential group care home.

- There will be no variation to the exterior appearance of the dwelling with the exception of a new 10 foot high gated chain link fence surrounding the sides and back of the property.

Submission of the Appellant, Stacey Lauder

Ms. Lauder stated that she is a long time resident of Keephills and lives near the subject property. Ms. Lauder submitted the following comments and questions:

- She and other residents have concerns regarding the lack of information provided by the Applicant.
- Why did the Applicant choose Keephills as a Group Home location?
- There are concerns regarding the fact that the Group Home will be located 30 minutes from the nearest emergency services.
- The neighbourhood is very community focused, with Lots 9, 10 and 11 of Block 3 being leased to the Keephills Community Association.
- The subject property is located near a school which is currently closed but could re-open.
- There are concerns regarding licensing requirements, if there are less than 4 residents the Appellant worries that the Group Home would not be required to be licensed.
- Ms. Lauder asked why the Group Home would require a 10 foot fence. She pointed out that the plan does not show the fence covering the front entrance. No other homes in Keephills have a 10 foot high fence.
- Concerns that if the front door is unlocked could the Group Home residents come and go as they pleased? What would be expected of Keephills Community members if a Group Home resident leaves the premises?
- Ms. Lauder indicated that she and other residents of Keephills had questions regarding the meaning of "forensic concerns"
- Will the Group Home house residents with addictions?
- Would the Group Home residents be introduced to members of the community?
- Ms. Lauder stated that she believed there would be 2 staff members for each resident. She said that with 6 residents, the number of staff members coming and going would be 12, and up to 3 shifts per day. She felt that this would cause much more traffic on the 1 narrow road into Keephills. She compared the 36 possible traffic movements to and from the Group Home per day to the small amount generated when the school is open, which is only 5 teachers coming and going per day.
- There are concerns regarding the training of staff, and questions as to how many staff members would be on-site overnight.
- There are concerns with fire as there are a lot of dry pine trees and fallen pine needles in the Hamlet, there is a worry that discarded cigarette butts could cause a fire.
- Ms. Lauder asked that the Board deny the Development Permit Approval, but if approved she asked that 3 additional conditions be imposed:
 - No residents with criminal convictions or addictions;
 - The fence be a maximum of 6 feet high; and
 - That there be a setback area for the fire pit.

When questioned by the Board, Ms. Lauder indicated that the Keephills community consists of between 40-50 residents. Ms. Lauder stated that her main concern was safety of the community, especially with regards to the increased traffic along the narrow road into the Hamlet.

Submission of the Applicant, I Have a Chance Support Services

Greg Worms, Executive Director spoke first. Mr. Worms made the Board aware that I Have a Chance Support Services has been in business in the area of Parkland County, Spruce Grove and Stony Plain for 30 years. Mr. Worms said that representatives of I Have a Chance Support Services had attended a Community Meeting in Keephills. Mr. Worms indicated that after the meeting an Appeal was filed against the development, and at that time the Applicant decided to stop answering resident's questions surrounding the development, instead choosing to answer questions at the hearing. In response to the Appellants question of "Why choose Keephills as a Group Home location?" the Applicant said "Why not?" He furthered stated that:

- People with disabilities are no different than anyone else although they may need help with cooking or cleaning etc.
- There is no difference between Keephills residents and Group Home residents being 30 minutes from emergency services.
- If the residents of the Group Home wish to live in a rural setting they should be allowed to do so.
- The Group Home will house residents who require assistance with their daily needs from care givers.
- The Group Home is not a treatment center for addictions and not a detox facility.
- The chain link fence is required because residents of the home may be vulnerable, for example, they could be hearing impaired, or non-verbal. A 5 or 8 foot fence does not provide the security necessary for the residents of the Group Home. Another Group Home operated by I Have a Chance Support Services was robbed. This necessitates the 10 foot chain link fence in this location.
- There will be 1 staff member for every 2 residents, so a maximum of 3 staff at a time.
- Residents of the Group Home are allowed to come and go from the house with a staff member. The door will not be locked as it is not a jail.
- The residents may have physical or mental disabilities.
- Alberta Government requires licensing only if there are 4 or more residents. As an agency, I Have a Chance Support Services is reviewed and accredited by the Alberta Council of Disability Services once every 3 years. The facilities are inspected by staff, health services and fire services.
- The residents of the Group Home will be primarily long term residents, a mix of Parkland County residents and residents from other areas.
- I Have a Chance Support Services runs 16 locations. Some are rural, the farthest Group Home from an urban center is 11 kms.
- The use of emergency services varies, but is not excessive.
- Staff are trained in first aid, food safety, medication administration and abuse prevention and response. Training is ongoing.

When questioned by the Board, Mr. Worms stated that it would be up to the Group Home residents to decide if they wanted to be introduced to the Keephills community.

When questioned by the Board, Mr. Worms answered that prior to accepting a client a background check including government social history, criminal records, a psychiatrist and the Client Relations Manager then review the information and make a decision on the suitability of the client.

When questioned by the Board, Mr. Worms said that of the 16 properties owned by the Applicant there are currently 2 with 10 foot fences, the proposed development would be the third. Mr. Worms continued to say that in an urban setting a 6 foot fence is adequate, but in a rural setting a 10 foot fence is required to ensure the safety of the vulnerable residents.

When questioned by the Board, Mr. Worms answered that I Have a Chance Support Services does have a waiting list of clients.

Mr. Thomas, Supervisor, Development Planning, requested to provide clarification to the Board. Mr. Thomas stated that when the Development Authority considered the application, they gave consideration to the use of the property. He continued to say that the Development Authority did not feel the proposed development would affect the neighbouring properties.

Submission in Support of the Applicant, Ms. Reeves

Ms. Reeves is a Client Relations Manager at I Have a Chance Support Services. Ms. Reeves stated that:

- The clientele of the Group Home will be people just like anyone else. Some could be low functioning, some may be high functioning.
- The clientele are usually kind people who engage in community events.
- Some clientele may be stimulated by traffic and activity, making the rural setting of the proposed development a good fit for these people.
- The Group Home residents and employees would be no different than a family of 6 people living in the home with children.

Submission in Support of the Applicant, Lory Morgan

Ms. Morgan is a Licensing Coordinator at I Have a Chance Support Services. Ms. Morgan made the following statements:

- I Have a Chance Support Services is a highly accredited organization.
- Visits the residences with her staff frequently to ensure health and safety guidelines are being met.

Submission in Support of the Applicant, Darren Nigel

Mr. Nigel is a Human Resources Assistant at I Have a Chance Support Services. Mr. Nigel said that:

- I Have a Chance Support Services primarily hires people with experience and certificates in childcare or healthcare. On occasion they will hire individuals with no experience who are able to work higher functioning clients.
- All staff are trained in Core Competency, CPR, First Aid, Food Safety and Incident Reporting as well as additional ongoing training.

Closing remarks of the Applicant, I Have a Chance Support Services,

Hollie Reeves, Client Relations Manager delivered the closing statements. Ms. Reeves stated that the Applicant had made themselves available and tried their best to answer questions that community members had at the Keephills community meeting. I Have a Chance Support Services wouldn't be in business for as long as it has without high standards. Ms. Reeves asked that the Keephills Community welcome I Have a Chance Support Services and its clients into the community.

The Appellant asked for a recess to prepare closing remarks.

The Chairperson called a recess at 5:26. The Chairperson re-opened the hearing at 5:32.

Closing remarks of the Appellant, Stacey Lauder

Ms. Lauder thanked the Applicant for answering some of her questions during the hearing. Ms. Lauder asked if there will be a designated smoking area to ensure that residents are not flicking cigarette butts through the fence. She asked for clarification of what the term "forensic concerns" means. Ms. Lauder asked if the training would need to be completed prior to beginning work at the Group Home. Ms. Lauder stated that she feels a 17

hour shift is a long time, and wonders if the staff will be awake or sleeping during the evening shift. Ms. Lauder concluded by stating that she does not feel a 10 foot fence is required in this case and would not be a good fit for the community.

The Chairperson asked the affected parties if they had any concerns with the process of the hearing that were not previously raised. There were no concerns from either party.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairperson closed the hearing at 5:36 p.m.



CHAIRPERSON