

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF LETHBRIDGE COUNTY HELD SEPTEMBER 18, 2014 IN THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE, LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA.

PRESENT:

Division No. 1	- L. Hickey, Reeve
Division No. 3	- H. Doeve, Deputy Reeve
Division No. 2	- J. Willms
Division No. 4	- K. Benson
Division No. 5	- S. Campbell (present at 1:58 p.m.)
Division No. 6	- T. White
Division No. 7	- M. Zeinstra

ADMINISTRATION PRESENT:

Chief Administrative Officer	- R. Robinson
Director of Corporate Services	- T. Anderson
Director of Municipal Services	- K. Viergutz
Recording Secretary	- D. Irwin

REEVE LORNE HICKEY IN THE CHAIR

CALL TO ORDER Reeve Hickey called the meeting to order at 10:11 a.m.

Note: S. Ashbee, Sunny South News present at 10:11 a.m.

AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Rick Robinson, Chief Administrative Officer and members of Council made the following additions and deletions to the September 18, 2014 agenda.

- 11. CUPE Local 2800 & Lethbridge County Re: Contract Negotiations 2014-2015

441/14 M. ZEINSTRAS MOVED that Council approve the agenda as amended.
CARRIED

CONFIRMATION **B1. Confirmation of Minutes**

442/14 J. WILLMS MOVED that the September 4, 2014 Council Minutes be approved as presented.
CARRIED

REPORTS **D1. Reeve's Report**

443/14 K. BENSON MOVED that County Council receives item D1. Reeve's Report for information.
CARRIED

MUNICIPAL SERVICES

F1. 2014 Lethbridge County Road Tour

444/14 M. ZEINSTRAS MOVED that County Council chooses the date of September 30, 2014 for the 2014 Lethbridge County Road Tour. CARRIED

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

F2. ASB South Region Conference - October 29, 2014 - Lethbridge County Hosting (Readymade Community Hall)

- 445/14 M. ZEINSTRA MOVED that any member of County Council wishing to attend the ASB South Region Conference scheduled for October 29, 2014 at the Readymade Community Hall be authorized to do so.
CARRIED

F3. Agricultural Service Board Provincial Conference January 20-23, 2015 – Fantasyland Hotel, West Edmonton

- 446/14 M. ZEINSTRA MOVED that any member of County Council wishing to attend the 2015 Provincial Agricultural Service Board Conference in Edmonton scheduled for January 20-23, 2015 be authorized to do so.
CARRIED

COMMUNITY SERVICES

G1. University of Lethbridge Applied Studies Student to Assist Economic Development Officer During Fall 2014 Academic Semester

- 447/14 H. DOEVE MOVED that County Council receives item G1. University of Lethbridge Applied Studies Student to Assist Economic Development Officer during Fall 2014 Academic Semester for information.
CARRIED

G2. Alberta Innovation & Advanced Education & Community Futures Lethbridge Region Re: Export / Import Session – October 16, 2014

- 448/14 K. BENSON MOVED that County Council receives item G2. Alberta Innovation & Advanced Education & Community Futures Lethbridge Region Re: Export / Import Session scheduled for October 16, 2014 at the Coutts Community Centre for information.
CARRIED

APPOINTMENT

E1. S.D. Application #2014-0-084 - Klok - SE1/4 29-10-23-W4M

- 449/14 T. WHITE MOVED that the agricultural subdivision of SE1/4 29-10-23-W4M (Certificate of Title No. 111 030 282), to subdivide a 20.93 acre (8.47 ha) cut-off parcel from a title of 143.74 acres (58.17 ha), for agricultural use; BE APPROVED subject to the following:
RESERVE: The 10% reserve requirement, pursuant to Sections 666 and 667 of the Municipal Government Act, be provided as money in place of land on the 20.93 acres at the market value of \$1,700 per acre with the actual acreage and amount to be paid to Lethbridge County be determined at the final stage, for Municipal Reserve purposes.
CONDITIONS:
1. That, pursuant to Section 654(1)(d) of the Municipal Government Act, all outstanding property taxes shall be paid to Lethbridge County.
2. That, pursuant to Section 655(1)(b) of the Municipal Government Act, the applicant or owner or both enter into a Development Agreement with Lethbridge County which shall be registered concurrently with the final plan against the title(s) being created. The agreement may address approaches to the parcel and future development of the service road as required.

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

3. That any conditions of Alberta Transportation be met prior to the finalization of the subdivision, including the applicant providing a 30 metre wide service road right-of-way perpendicular to and across the highway frontage of the subject property.

4. The applicant must provide at their expense a professional geotechnical report and soils analysis by an accredited engineer to ensure a suitable building site which addresses at a minimum: depth to the water table, potential for flooding, seepage, and ability for the installation of a private on-site septic treatment system.

REASONS:

1. Alberta Transportation has no concerns and does not anticipate that the creation of the parcel would have any appreciable impact on the highway provided the service road condition is met.

2. The proposal complies with the Land Use Bylaw as the proposed subdivision conforms to the bylaw definition of a cut-off (fragmented) parcel. The Subdivision Approval Authority of Lethbridge County has determined the main irrigation canal draw is a significant physical barrier that is present. CARRIED

E2. S.D. Application #2014-0-110 – Collin - Block F, Plan 705AA within NW1/4 6-10-21-W4M (Hamlet of Diamond City)

450/14

K. BENSON

MOVED that the residential subdivision of Block F, Plan 705AA within NW1/4 6-10-21-W4M (Certificate of Title No. 941 083 464+1), to subdivide a 0.83 acre (0.336 ha) parcel by creating two 0.14 acre (0.06 ha) lots, or approximately 50' x 125' each in size, and one 0.55 acre (0.22 ha) lot, or 192 x 125 ft. in size, all for hamlet residential use; BE APPROVED subject to the following:

CONDITIONS:

1. That, pursuant to Section 654(1)(d) of the Municipal Government Act, all outstanding property taxes shall be paid to Lethbridge County.

2. That, pursuant to Section 655(1)(b) of the Municipal Government Act, the applicant or owner or both enter into a Development Agreement with Lethbridge County which may be registered concurrently with the final plan against the title(s) being created - each lot must have separate municipal water and sewer services. The applicant is responsible for all development costs and any applicable municipal hamlet infrastructure installation fees associated with servicing and providing stub-ins to the subdivision proposal.

3. That the applicant removes the 'lean to addition' on the west side of the existing garage so that there will be no encroachments over the property line between proposed Lots 1 and 2 as a result from the subdivision. Verification of the removal of the 'lean to addition' must be provided prior to final endorsement, to the satisfaction of the Subdivision Authority, or an encroachment agreement may be provided to the satisfaction of the Subdivision Authority.

4. That the applicant removes any building or structure encroachments into municipal road right of way to the satisfaction of Lethbridge County prior to finalization.

REASONS:

1. The proposed subdivision complies with both the Municipal Development Plan and Land Use Bylaw.

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

2. This subdivision is possible with the provision of municipal water and sewage in the hamlet and the proposed lot sizes conform to the Land Use Bylaw minimum standard.

3. With the condition imposed to address the slight building encroachment issue, this proposal meets the land use criteria and is deemed suitable for the purpose. CARRIED

E3. S.D. Application #2014-0-112 – Holmberg - Lot 4, Block J, Plan 0811302 in NW1/4 6-10-21-W4M (Hamlet of Diamond City)

451/14 H. DOEVE MOVED that the residential subdivision of Lot 4, Block J, Plan 0811302 in NW1/4 6-10-21-W4M (Certificate of Title No. 081 102 088+1), to to create a 0.14 acre lot (0.06 ha), or 50' x 125' in size, from a title of 0.35 acres (0.14 ha) for hamlet residential use; BE APPROVED subject to the following:

CONDITIONS:

1. That, pursuant to Section 654(1)(d) of the Municipal Government Act, all outstanding property taxes shall be paid to Lethbridge County.

2. That, pursuant to Section 655(1)(b) of the Municipal Government Act, the applicant or owner or both enter into a Development Agreement with Lethbridge County which may be registered concurrently with the final plan against the title(s) being created. The applicant is responsible for all development costs and any applicable municipal hamlet infrastructure installation fees associated with servicing and providing stub-ins to the subdivision proposal. The agreement may also address the required improvements to Clarke Ave and the rear lane with consideration for the 2007 Development (Service) Agreement as registered on title that should be updated/implemented as necessary, or a new Development Agreement entered into with the applicant.

3. That any conditions of ATCO Gas, including an easement if required, be finalized prior to the endorsement of the subdivision.

REASONS:

1. The proposal is determined to be suitable for the purpose as hamlet water and sewer stub-ins are available for the east lot to support the creation of a separate title.

2. This proposal conforms to the County's Hamlet Residential land use standards of the Land Use Bylaw which requires a 50 x 100' minimum lot size. This subdivision is possible with the provision of municipal water and sewage in the hamlet.

3. With the conditions imposed on the subdivision approval, the Subdivision Authority has determined that this subdivision is suitable for the intended purpose. CARRIED

CORPORATE SERVICES

H1. Tax Penalty Waiver Request – Hope-Rapp

452/14 T. WHITE MOVED that County Council deny the 2014 tax penalty waiver request on Roll #54270200 and that Mrs. Hope-Rapp be notified as such. CARRIED

H2. Chinook Arch Regional Library System Re: Approval of the Chinook Arch 2015-2018 Budget

453/14 J. WILLMS MOVED that Lethbridge County Council approves the Chinook Arch Library Board 2015-2018 Budget (*Annual per Capita Municipal Levies*). CARRIED

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

ADMINISTRATION**I1. CUPE Local 2800 & Lethbridge County Re: Contract Negotiations 2014-2015**

454/14 T. WHITE MOVED that County Council receives the CUPE Local 2800 & Lethbridge County Contract Negotiations 2014-2015 correspondence for information. CARRIED

Reeve Hickey recessed the meeting at 11:45 a.m. and the Reeve and Council presented a cheque to the Lethbridge 4-H District Council represented by Elizabeth Tokariuk, President along with Steve Tokariuk, Ambassador and Alley Handsaeme, 4-H member.

The meeting reconvened at 1:58 p.m. with all members of Council present as previously stated with the addition of Councillor Steve Campbell.

Reeve Hickey recessed the meeting at 2:00 p.m. to proceed with the Public Hearing for Bylaws #1426 and #1427 DRT Farms - Area Structure Plan & Land Use Bylaw Amendment Sec 5-8-20-W4 Lots 1-3 Block 1 Plan 0814065.

APPOINTMENTS**E4. PUBLIC HEARING Bylaws #1426 & 1427 DRT Farms - Area Structure Plan & Land Use Bylaw Amendment Sec. 5-8-20-W4 Lots 1-3 Block 1 Plan 0814065**

455/14 M. ZEINSTRA MOVED that the Public Hearing for By-Laws #1426 & 1427 DRT Farms - Area Structure Plan & Land Use Bylaw Amendment Sec 5-8-20-W4 Lots 1-3 Block 1 Plan 0814065 open at 2:00 p.m. CARRIED

Reeve Hickey welcomed the delegation to the meeting. The delegation consisted of:

B. Vibholm	S. Draffin	S. Sauer
W. Vibholm	M. Heninger	A. Sauer
I. Franks	W. Heninger	B. Virostek
S. Bilcik	J. MacDonald	S. Smith
K. Echlin	K. Perry	G. Perch
J. Bar	S. Clements	J. Prim
C. Hay	K. Clements	C. Skretting
D. Lanier	L. Richards	T. Skretting
M. Hasegawa	K. Richards	J. Baranes
L. Coe	T. Birch	F. Taylor
R. Edwards	E. Heidt	R. Heidt
R. VanderHeiden	R. Reichert	K. Taylor
F. Joss	K. Odell	S. Sterk
J. Nakamura	R. Taylor	G. Tiffin

Reeve Hickey asked Council and Administration to introduce themselves to the delegation.

Reeve Hickey declared the public hearing is being held pursuant to the Municipal Government Act as amended for By-Law #1404 Land Use Bylaw Amendment.

Reeve Hickey invited Ms. Hilary Janzen, Development Officer/Senior Planner to give an overview of the application.

Ms. Janzen stated the following:

- Hasegawa Engineering on behalf of the landowner, Ray Taylor of Dar Ray Farms, has prepared the 508 Agri-Business Park Area Structure Plan. The

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

subject properties are legally described as Lots 1-3, Block 1, Plan 0814065 (portion of Section 05-08-20-W4). To the north of the proposed plan is an area of residential with some home based businesses. To the west is an area with a larger concentration of Grouped Country Residential Parcels and some smaller agricultural parcels. To the south of the proposed Area Structure Plan are a few acreages, agricultural lands and grain handling facilities that take advantage of the proximity to the railway tracks. To the west is the CP rail line and Highway 4, across Highway 4 is predominantly agricultural lands. The subject properties currently have a grain handling facility and an auction that runs 4 times a year on the east side and the remainder of the lands are farmed but are not irrigated.

- The Area Structure Plan is located in an area that would lead to good visibility for any future businesses and has excellent access to regional transportation networks. The parcel is located at the intersection of major highway (HWY 4) and a secondary highway (HWY 508). The proximity to CP the rail line which runs parallel to the east side of the site and the Lethbridge Airport are also assets for this proposed Area Structure Plan.
- Submitted concurrently with the application to adopt the Area Structure Plan Bylaw is an application to rezone the parcels from Rural Agriculture (R.A.) to Rural General Industrial (R.G.I.) on the east side of the plan area and Business Light Industrial (B.L.I.) on the west side of the property (Bylaw 1427).
- The draft Area Structure Plan provides a framework for the future develop of the site for industrial parcels that may result in 25 parcels, with an average parcel size of 3 acres. The number of parcels could vary depending on the businesses that choose to locate in the business park. The number of lots was reduced from 41 to 25, as to take into consideration the nearby residents and reduce the amount of traffic that would be generated from the business park. The proposed plan also includes a stormwater/drainage plan, internal road network, traffic impact assessment, green space, and provisions for communal sewage disposal and potable and non-potable water.
- A review of the proposed Area Structure Plan by County Administration showed that the applicant met all the requirements outlined in the Municipal Development (6.2.3.e) for an Area Structure Plan. The proposed plan meets the policies of the Municipal Development Plan as the development is adjacent to major transportation corridors and servicing is available. The proposed plan also meets the strategic direction of County Council by promoting clustered development in an area that already has industrial development and ensuring that proper planning is in place with regards to stormwater, road network, and servicing.
- The application was circulated internally and after discussion with the applicant, Administration has no concerns with the application. The application was also circulated externally to ORRSC, Fortis, Triple W Gas Co-op, Telus, SMRID, AESRD, and Alberta Transportation. Comments have been received from Triple W Gas Co-op and Fortis and they have no concerns regarding the proposed plan or rezoning. No other comments were sent in regarding the proposed Area Structure Plan. ORRSC has provided addition comments which Steve Harty will speak to. The City also provided comments on the proposal this morning and had concerns regarding the impact of drainage into Six-Mile Coulee. A public notice was advertised in the August 19, August 26, September 2 issues of the Sunny South News. A notice was sent to 72 landowners, who were within 1 mile of the proposed Area Structure Plan. The County received a few phone calls requesting further information on the process for approval, 4 emails in opposition to the proposed plan, and 1 letter in opposition to the proposed plan. The concerns raised by those in opposition were with regards to the proximity of a business park to residential properties, industrial waste that will effect land and animals, increased traffic, noise, and decrease in property value. In addition two more letters and an email were received after this report was completed, but they are included in the agenda package. The County also received two

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

letters in support of the development and also a petition which included 15 neighbouring landowners who support the proposed business park.

- It is believed that the proposed plan addresses the concerns of the nearby residents. With regards to noise, and views, the proposed Area Structure Plan includes a 10 metre wide green space on the west side of the development adjacent to the canal to further mitigate any potential negative impacts (i.e. view/site lines) to the country residential lots across the canal. The canal also acts as a buffer to the residence to the west as it is the main canal for the St. Mary's River Irrigation District and is 65 metres wide. The Business Light Industrial is proposed for the properties backing onto the canal, to ensure that the uses will have minimal impact (i.e. noise) on the residential lands across the canal.
- With regards to traffic, the Traffic Impact Assessment has provided recommendations to handle the increased traffic on Highway 508, including moving the entrance to the business park further to the west, appropriate lighting at the intersections, turning lanes into the development, and mitigating safety concerns at the railway crossing through the installation of crossing gates.
- The plan has addressed stormwater run-off and drainage as to not impact neighbouring properties and the communal sewage disposal system will ensure groundwater is not contaminated. The plan also contains architectural controls that ensure that any development in the business park is to a higher standard including enhanced entranceway landscaping and signage and building and lot design (i.e. consistent setback, enhanced building fronts and landscaping requirements).

Reeve Hickey enquired if Council had any questions of Ms. Janzen. There were none.

Reeve Hickey invited Mr. Steve Harty, Senior Planner at the Oldman River Regional Services Commission (ORRSC) to come forward with his comments.

- Mr. Harty stated the Area Structure Plan (ASP) has been submitted as support for the application to adopt the ASP as a bylaw of Lethbridge County and ultimately allow and guide for the redesignation (bylaw amendment) of land from *Rural Agriculture* to *Rural General Industrial (RGI)* and *Business Light Industrial (BLI)* per Lethbridge County's Land Use Bylaw. The intent is for the ASP to provide a basis for evaluation of future applications for subdivision of parcels and building development for business and industrial type land uses.
- The proposal is to enable the future development of approximately 57.1 ha (141 acres) of land. The site lies at the junction of Highway 4 and Highway 508 in the south area of Lethbridge County. The lands are bordered by the main CP railway and Highway 4 to the east and by Highway 508 to the south. The western edge of the property lies adjacent to a major canal belonging to the St. Mary River Irrigation District. Also to the west, west of the canal, are a number of grouped country residential developments.
- In making decisions on industrial land use proposals, the County's strategic plans and Municipal Development Plan (MDP) provide a number of directives, including the following:
 - Lethbridge County will strive to present solutions or options that will provide economic opportunities while respecting the principles of managed growth.
 - It is a priority County goal to identify suitable or ideological locations for industrial/commercial nodes within the County, and to guide non-residential type development to appropriate and desirable areas based on rationale planning policies and Lethbridge County strategic growth objectives.
 - An objective in the current MDP is to "support commercial and industrial development that will diversify employment opportunities within the

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

- County. Further intentions are to provide a positive environment for development, encourage development in suitable locations and mitigate potentially negative impacts to local residents and the environment.”
- The MDP also contains policy to accommodate non-agricultural (i.e. industrial and commercial) land use activities on parcels of land within the municipality, particularly in proximity to transportation (highway and rail) corridors.
 - Lethbridge County also has a strong interest and need to expand its non-agricultural tax base, as particularly reflected in the Strategic Plan for the County.
 - In respect of the aforementioned and the Lethbridge County MDP policies applicable to industrial development, the proposed development appears to align with most of these policies and objectives, as outlined:
 - The site is located adjacent to the junction of two paved, major provincial highways (Highway 4 and Highway 508),
 - The location has quick access/convenience to major transportation/shipping routes, with Highway 4 being designated as part of the Canamex trade corridor;
 - The land is adjacent to the main inter-continental (Canada-United States) rail line operated by the CPR, and has the potential for spur-lines (it is also noted that the County has only 2 operating rail lines, the east/west Highway 3 corridor, and this north/south Highway 4 corridor line, thus suitable and much needed track frontage is becoming limited in the County);
 - The site does not contain any sensitive environmental, cultural or historical features;
 - The site already contains existing industrial and agri-businesses, and would allow a larger industrial “node” to be established (with cluster development being a facet of managed growth in regards to development and land use);
 - The additional lands involved have been historically used for agriculture, they are not considered high quality as the soils are generally Class 3 and they are not irrigated;
 - The property is an irregular shape and is further delineated by the main irrigation canal on the west side, and the rail-line and highway on the east side;
 - The land is located “downwind” of the main country residential uses in proximity, which is desirable in consideration of southern Alberta’s prevalent westerly/south-westerly winds;
 - The tract of land is large enough to provide for a range of users that should help provide economic opportunities and growth for the County.
 - If the resource sector (oil and gas) does expand in the southern part of the province, this location may be ideal to help accommodate businesses associated with that activity.
 - It is recognized there are concerns expressed from area residents regarding the proposal for industrial type land use. It is unfortunate that a number of residents are located in proximity; however, this is a historical situation that exists (note: some of the earlier subdivisions were approved by the old provincial Alberta Planning Board, not the County). The question is if the two uses can coexist with minimal conflict or concerns. Thus, the challenge for Council is to determine if the site specific issues of the parcel can be adequately addressed to allow the proposal to proceed, while taking into consideration the concerns raised by residents and if they can be mitigated. This may be possible through proper planning, specific land use controls, and separation areas/buffers amongst other things.
 - In regards to land use, it should be made clear that none of the land is proposed to be designated as heavy or noxious industrial. The proposed redesignation to the land use districts of *Rural General Industrial (RGI)* and *Business Light Industrial (BLI)* in the Land Use Bylaw does not include noxious or hazardous uses, as these are generally restricted to the *Rural*

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

Heavy Industrial district. The purpose of the BLI is to allow low intensity businesses, light industrial and other compatible development in those areas of the County considered most suitable, typically in a planned business centre or office park, which is located in a highly visible and accessible location and displays a higher standard of design and appearance. The stipulated permitted and discretionary uses include some minor service functions and mixed-use developments, while prohibiting noxious uses. The purpose of the RGI district is to apply use restrictions and additional regulations to reduce the risks to public safety and minimize nuisance associated with heavy industry. Thus overall, typical uses for this industrial business park may include such things as offices, shops, indoor storage and warehousing, equipment sales, grain handling and storage, trucking operations, agri-related business and storage yards for example. It should also be noted that due to the current lack of availability of high volumes of treated potable water from a piped source, more intense forms of development involving processing, food, chemical, or other, would not be a viable option in any event.

- Land use controls, such as through the ASP and architectural controls (restrictive covenants), can also be effective to regulate the appropriate and acceptable land uses that may be allowed in the business park. Noxious and other potential negative uses (i.e. off-site potential for dust, odours, glare, etc.) as defined in the Land Use Bylaw, can be prohibited from being allowed. Land use control is somewhat contemplated in the proposed plan, as the west portion (closest to the County residential uses), is identified to be designated as BLI which is for low impact developments and does not allow for hazardous or noxious uses. The architectural controls can also be detailed and apply specific design standards, especially in regards to storage, screening, design, landscaping and appearance, etc.
- Key service items are proposed to be provided to the development. Shallow utilities, which include natural gas, telephone, and electric, are readily available and no major issues are apparent. Some of the main services or infrastructure items, such as sewer, water, fire suppression, storm water management and roads are the main items of interest for the County.
 - A preliminary soil study was performed for this property with mixed results and indications of a high water table in some areas. Therefore, instead of multiple individual on-site private septic treatment systems, a communal septic system (which will be a treatment mound type) is proposed. Such a communal system must be located no closer than 300 metres to the nearest residence and must obtain an approval by AESRD. The proposed location appears to be outside any required 300 metre setback, but this will need to be confirmed by a legal land survey at a more detailed design stage or on a subsequent tentative subdivision plan.
 - The plan states that lots will be between 2 to 7 acres, with the average lot size being 3.0 acres, and this will result in approximately 25 lots. With the lots being 2.0 acres or more in size, this complies with the Land Use Bylaw minimum 2.0 acre parcel size. However, it is anticipated some developments may want to utilize a larger land base, which would be possible through lot amalgamations, so the overall density could be much less.
 - Since the treated water supply has a definite limit, high water use businesses that require treated water would not be appropriate within the development area unless a more substantial water supply is established. This is stated in the plan and may also be reinforced in the architectural controls, as well, the new county Land Use Bylaw has regulations which allow the Development Authority to deny permits if suitable water provisions cannot be met as required by the applicable use.
 - A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) was completed to analyze the impact of the development on the adjacent road network, which indicated limitations for access from the site to Highway 508 (one entrance), which is not ideal, but must conform to Alberta Transportation requirements. The proposed Agri-Business Park is anticipated to add a significant amount of

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

traffic to the surrounding road network resulting in road network improvements required to accommodate the proposed site generated traffic volumes. The TIA also indicated upgraded safety measures are warranted at the railway crossing on Highway 508, the need for a right turn lane into the development area, and that illumination at Highway 5/Highway 508, the Highway 4/Highway 508 and the development entrance is warranted. These would need to be provided by the developer and addressed through the terms of a future development agreement with the County, in consultation with Alberta Transportation and Transport Canada. It is recognized that the proposal would likely place increased traffic onto Highway 508, which may be a concern for some of the area residents, but it would also allow for improvements to be made.

- Internal roads are proposed to be paved and must meet County standards, which should also assist with dust control and any such concerns.
- The site has poor existing drainage and all storm water will collect and need to be pumped. A storm water management plan has been prepared, which must be acceptable to both the County and AESRD. The storm water plan and detention pond will require approval from and registration with AESRD as a municipal storm water management pond prior to construction. Any further refinement, if required, may be provided at the subdivision stage on direction from the County or AESRD.
- The amount of Municipal Reserve (10% of gross area) not provided as land in the development, would be required to be provide as cash-in-lieu at the subdivision stage to the County (this would be based on approx. 9 - 13 acres of land area required for MR). Additionally a 10 metre wide green strip will be established between the canal right of way and the nearest industrial lot boundary which may form part of the MR dedication. Trees and a walkway are proposed to be established along this boundary to help create a sound and visual barrier between the development and acreages to the west, and to become an area park feature rather than strictly be utilitarian in design. The plan illustrates that the green space for MR may be approximately 2.4 acres, with the actual calculation to be determined at the subdivision stages.
- As noted, the western portion is proposed to receive the BLI classification (approximately 25% of the industrial land use area) as opposed to the RGI classification to reduce the impact on acreages west of the canal. By developing the site in strategic phases, with the last area to be developed on the west (and north) along the canal, should help area landowners for some time to have an undeveloped buffer area between them. Landscaping, fencing, screening and siting or setback restrictions may be imposed at the development stage for each lot in accordance with the bylaw to further assist with this.
- If it is determined that the proposal may be acceptable if properly managed, it is suggested that the architectural design controls be required to be registered on title. The criteria and standards for infrastructure, including the provision of roads, storm/fire ponds, and storm water management, may also be further dealt with at the subdivision stage and through the development agreement.
- In respect of the aforementioned and in considering the suitability of the proposal, the proposal appears suitable if all servicing matters can be addressed to the satisfaction of the County. The ASP and proposed architectural controls have outlined specific standards of development to help mitigate either real or perceived impacts of industrial uses to residential uses in the area. However, if additional items are brought forward and are warranted, these could be added to the provisions of the architectural controls.
- If Council is of the opinion that there are some issues with the proposal, but they can be addressed through additional regulations or text revisions being made to the ASP bylaw, then any such amendments discussed at the public

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

hearing may be added to the bylaw. In such circumstances, the bylaw may then be passed "as amended." If Council determines that concerns raised in regards to the bylaw cannot be adequately addressed, then Council may at its' prerogative, defeat second reading of the bylaw. If such a decision is made, there is no reapplication of a same or similar proposal for 18 months, unless Council has given direction on elements/regulations it may consider in adopting such a bylaw, and a subsequent application was made to address Council's concerns and Council accepted it on that basis. As the ASP is to support the suitability and provide a framework for the development of the proposal, it is apparent there would be no justified reason to then redesignate the lands at this time if the ASP bylaw is not adopted by Council.

- Council, at its' prerogative, must determine if the proposed ASP bylaw and the proposal is suitable for the purpose and the parcel, and decide to adopt the ASP bylaw and subsequent land use amendment to allow for the redesignation. If infrastructure and servicing items are provided to the satisfaction of the County, the land and proposal appears to align with County plans and growth objectives. Overall, provided land use control mechanisms can be adequately implemented to mitigate potential impacts, our review would suggest that the proposal is located at a desirable location as it pertains to agri-business/industrial land use and meets or supports many of the County's long term planning goals, MDP policies, and Strategic Plan.

Reeve Hickey enquired if Council had any questions of Mr. Harty. There were none.

At this time Reeve Hickey invited the applicant, Mr. Ray Taylor and the engineering firm of Hasegawa Engineering to speak on behalf of their application regarding Bylaws 1426 and 1427.

Mr. Ian Franks of Hasegawa Engineering addressed Council and noted the following:

- During this entire application process, Mr. Taylor and ourselves have followed every regulation and suggestion set out by the County as to how the application be put together for the re-zoning of the surrounding land use.
- It was very intentional to use the two types of zoning for the surrounding land use, Business Light Industrial along western boundary and Rural General Industrial for the interior. It was also very intentional not to include Rural Heavy Industrial.
- The generation of traffic was noted as a major concern from surrounding landowners and at the open house held by the applicant a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) was completed.
- The original design had two entrances to the property but because of the issue raised by the TIA it has been reduced to one entrance to the west.
- The TIA determined there would be an increase in traffic, but the level of service at the key intersection of Highway 508 and Highway 4 would not be increased at key hours, because traffic that would be generated would be going in an opposite direction. TIA's are rated A to F, with Level A having the most minimal impact. For this particular scenario the TIA is classed at a Level A currently at the intersection of Highway 508 and Highway 4 and there is expected to be no impact seen during commute time.
- The TIA also identified a number of safety measures that should be implemented, including a westbound right turning lane into the development, increasing the safety measures at the railway crossing and increasing lighting at the main intersection entering the property as well as the intersection of Highway 508 and Highway 4.
- Regarding storm water management, the site is to be designed to direct all run off to the storm water management pond which is to be sized to capture and contain all the run off; it is not to be a continuous release from this pond. Release is only to occur when there is sufficient capacity downstream

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

receiving volume which currently is the drainage which leads to the Six Mile Coulee. Originally this was to be the main canal but at the County's request it was moved to drainage. The pond is to capture and hold water until there is sufficient capacity as we do recognize that there are drainage issues in the County and immediate release of the water would not be warranted. The storm water pond is separate, contained from a second pond which is for raw water and water for fire protection to offer a higher level of service.

- Sewage Treatment was another concern raised at the open house in regards to what would happen to the sewage. The original concept was for the east lot to have its own septic treatment system through a septic field. Soil testing showed that some of these lots would not be able to do this and would have to go to a septic mound or a holding tank. Following the open house the County also suggested a communal system would be more appropriate so the design concept was incorporated into the ASP to have this communal system, which will have an overall less septic area where treatment can occur and decrease the impact on the soil and the ground water.
- It was hoped to have some buffer between the acreages and the development and the additional buffer zone was originally designed but following the open house this has been increased to 10 meters with tree planting criteria.
- A lot of concerns were expressed about the appearance of an industrial park so architectural controls were also added to the Area Structure Plan as a result and they focused on things like landscaping the edges and frontages and the appearance of the actual buildings and things such as fencing and lighting. The controls are not fully detailed at this point but would be at the subdivision stage.

Reeve Hickey asked if Council had any questions of Mr. Franks.

Council enquired if Hasegawa Engineering would seek Alberta Environment approval before construction of the storm water pond.

Mr. Franks stated they would have to obtain approvals at the subdivision stage from the Water Act, Environment Protection Act, for the communal system and the storm water pond.

Council enquired how many inches can the storm water catch basin hold or pick up.

Mr. Franks stated that the basin is designed to hold a 1 in 100 year 24 hour storm, which is equivalent to 110 millilitres.

At this time Reeve Hickey invited Mr. Ray Taylor to speak on behalf of his application.

- Mr. Taylor thanked Council for reviewing the application. Seven months ago I asked a County representative about what I could do with my area out there as I was downsizing. Consequently I met with Ms. Hilary Janzen, Senior Planner and Development Officer and Mr. Martin Ebel, Economic Development Officer and the idea of this agri-business park evolved.
- Over the next few months I met with Hasegawa Engineering and Hilary to come up with a tentative Area Structure Plan.
- Following the ASP, an open house was held and we heard all the concerns so that today we are presenting the final plan.
- The only thing we haven't addressed is that the development was supposed to start with 40 possible lots and the proposal is now down to 25. I have learned a lot about what the County needs in terms of setback and sewage treatment.

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

- Please trust that it will be a very good industrial park, I would like to model it after Broxburn Business Park. It will not be an eye sore and it will not drag on forever. Our goal is to have this park be a value to everyone.

Reeve Hickey asked if there was anyone else that wished to speak in favor of Bylaws 1426 and 1427.

Floyd Joss addressed Council and noted the following:

- I have a small farm adjacent to the land under consideration for rezoning. My legal description is part of the NW 5-8-20-W4. My land adjoins the Taylor land on the north and is separated from most country residential acreages by the SMRID main canal. I actively farm my land and anticipate harvesting a good barley crop. The rezoning and development will not interfere with my farming or my enjoyment of country living.
- I have had a chance to review the plot plans and documents for the rezoning and I believe that it is an excellent site for this kind of development. Agricultural continues to be the principal economic engine in our area and needs many support businesses to function efficiently. These businesses need commercial property where they can exist with access to highways, rail, power, natural gas, sewer and water while providing some separation from residential property. I am confident that this property provides all of these.
- The property in question is already home to a very significant agri-business which has been owned and operated by the Taylors for at least the 12 years that I have owned property here on Range Road 20-5. This business has been maintained and upgraded over the years and is a testament to their eye for aesthetics as well as function. In the last few years Richie Brothers has used the site to hold large machinery auctions. These events have been managed well and are a credit to all involved.
- I could say more but I will close by encouraging you to do your part to provide this space for the development of future agri-business. Some have said that I am supporting this with the hope that my land will be developed next. I am 67 years old and it is unlikely that I will live long enough to see development on my property. I am supporting this development because it's the right thing to do.
- Additionally, I have known the Taylors for at least the last 12 years and they do things first class. Their place is tidy with many upgrades and is a credit to their community. I live on 20-5, I expect to continue to live here as long as I can, and I don't think we'll have any traffic issues.

Reeve Hickey asked three times if anyone else wished to speak in favor of Bylaws 1426 and 1427.

No one came forward.

Reeve Hickey asked if anyone wished to speak in opposition of Bylaws 1426 and 1427.

Mrs. Linda and Dr. Ken Richards addressed Council and stated the following:

- I am Linda Richards. I am speaking on behalf of my 50 neighbors whose residences immediately adjoin Mr. Taylor's proposal.
- We need your help. And we have come here today to help you to make your decision.
- We are vehemently opposed to Mr. Taylor's third development plan. We ask you to not accept this plan to change the land use designation of this property. If you open this residential community to an industrial development, you will never be able to change it back.

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

- We have prepared a Power Point to illustrate Mr. Taylor's plan. We have created an accompanying packet which includes the slides from our Power Point for your future review. We have distributed the map on the top page of that packet to other members of the audience.
- I am sure that Council recognizes the need for careful scrutiny of a plan that so alienates 80% of the neighbors who live near the proposed development. (We have the petitions available to confirm that opposition.) We appreciate the wisdom of the two previous County Councils who rejected other plans Mr. Taylor created for this land in the past, and we hope this Council will see the serious errors of changing the land use designation of this property from Grouped Country Residential to include an industrial site. Our photo indicates the existing grouped homes in 1995 or '96 before Mr. Taylor had any buildings in place. Bylaw 1404 I am sure was created to plan and protect communities in the County. Its purpose reads, "To provide for a high quality of clustered residential developments in the area where no conflict with agriculture or industry type land uses can be anticipated pursuant to the Municipal Development Plan. Uses which are incompatible with the primarily residential character of this district are encouraged." You cannot want to break this bylaw ratified in October of 2013.
- In a general overview – residents are immediately concerned about change. We developed or bought our beautiful acreages adhering to the mandates required by the County. Our investment and lifestyle are being threatened by the unknowns generated by Mr. Taylor who assumes our whole neighborhood should bow to his desire to develop a piece of land he seems unable to sell as farmland. We live by the bylaws of the County. We gain no confidence as we drive along Highway 4 past Stewart Siding where Mr. Taylor was one of the industrial developers. There seems to be little care or accountability to homeowners, businesses, or the County. There seems to be no supervision and no control enforced. As we went from door to door with a petition, our residents repeatedly questioned the reason why we pay high residential taxes if our country life is going to be blighted with another industrial eye sore.
- Combined property value of the 50+ homes most closely affected would exceed \$25,000,000. Our taxes to the County coffers must be \$150,000 to \$200,000 per year. We have been willing to pay for the quality of our country residences and lifestyle because of the beautiful area in which we live. But add another mess down the road – a road packed with speeding vehicles, long lines of traffic waiting to cross the railway, noise, air pollution.
- This picture shows the grouping of our residences. More than 50 homes within a mile of Mr. Taylor's property. Although Mr. Taylor says his property is of "poor farming quality", most of the land in the County is the same Class 3 quality. This photo shows Mr. Taylor's crop this year without use of irrigation.
- Let me address our objections to the Area Structure Plan under consideration.
- Mr. Taylor's development objectives are surprisingly inconsistent. At first he wants to "create a high quality environment...to provide services to the agricultural base." In the land use classification he speaks of adding "resource development", and the engineers in their Executive Summary speak of the "oilfield businesses" of this development. We do not trust what kind of businesses will be permitted to invade our community. A further surprise occurs as you look at Mr. Taylor's plan to see the second development plan being drawn on the engineers plan for an additional development by Mr. Joss. The Joss development is in the engineering blueprints developed for Mr. Taylor. The County must refuse to endorse the nightmare created with more than 200 acres of agricultural land being covered by buildings and asphalt with these twin proposals. They are not separate and distinct proposals; they are already conjoined in the engineer's plan. The impact of the Joss development cannot be ignored. Look to the County's Land Use Bylaw 1404. This proposal will conflict with the purpose stated in LUB 1404.

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

- Let me point out some of the problems with this/these proposals. I am sure that as the Council members read through Mr. Taylor's proposed Area Structure Plan they recognized the terrible handing off of responsibilities from this developer to the responsibility and liability of the County. It is startling to see that these half-baked plans will be handed over to the County.
- Proposal item 4.1 "Lethbridge County will assume ownership and responsibility of the sewage treatment system..."
- 4.2.1 "Lethbridge County will assume responsibility of the potable water system upon completion of the infrastructure."
- 4.2.2 "Lethbridge County will assume ownership and responsibility of the non-potable water system..." What County employee is free to supervise all of those responsibilities for one development? That employee hasn't come to see me in the three months I asked for advice and help when my property was being flooded June 16, 2014.
- Water is a huge problem with this plan. Although Mr. Taylor has three shares in the County of Lethbridge Rural Water Association, this Co-op has agreements with the City and the County to: Quote 1 – "not to provide water to industrial sites". Quote 2 – "There is no current water capacity for sale or distribution in that part of their system." That means no drinking water from the Water Co-op.
- Look at the 4 acres diagrammed of non-potable water to be stored adjacent to the SMRID main canal. That canal is empty for approximately six months of the year. 25 to 41 businesses on Mr. Taylor's development are going to require a lot of hauled drinking water and bathroom water all winter long? And Mr. Joss' development of an additional 90 acres of industrial site will compound that need. As previously quoted in the Area Structure Plan, does that delivery become the responsibility of the County?
- At the beginning of April, before water had been released into the main canal, and before we had our heavy spring rains, ground water was discovered by Mr. Taylor's engineering consultants/hydrologists at a depth of 1 ½ meters. Engineers tell me, "normal fields yield only about 15% or less of the volume of rain as runoff (until saturated) whereas an industrial area can yield up to 90%+ of the rainfall as runoff (especially if paved, compact soil). Again, look to the depth and proximity of his two holding areas and consider the potential ground water contamination and pollution of the SMRID main canal. How many families down water from this site will hold this County and you County Councillors responsible for contamination of their drinking water from this source? Remember Walkerton, Ontario.
- Let's talk about runoff water at this site. This plan speaks of moving the entrance road to this property closer to the SMRID main canal. Roads into the property will be paved and runoff water is to go to the ditches on either side of the road. We assume buildings would be constructed and asphalt laid. Engineers calculate the impact of runoff in hard surface areas increases the runoff 5 to 6 times that which is covered by soil. Ground water was at 1.5 meters in April before the SMRID canal was running, and no mention was included in the hydrology report of ground water depth when the canal was running. Will there be a problem with the volume of water in the bottom of these 2 meter deep ponds even before the SMRID runs its water? Take a drive tonight around Stewart Siding to see the sloughs of water and mud standing in those lots.
- Thinking of soil contamination...Did anyone feel assured that the land being drilled in the Taylor proposal could tolerate the amount of septic waste and solid waste being produced on site? Look at the septic area on the map – perhaps 3 acres of septic. Mr. Taylor's hydrologists say the advisability of septic field infiltration is "undetermined", requires, "further testing", on page 6 even says is "unsuitable". How incredible that they think Lethbridge County will assume ownership and responsibility. Note the proximity of the septic area to the runoff water and non-potable water dugouts. If this proposed plan doesn't work, who do we call? I want to put that phone number on the speed dial of at least 50 households in this area. Then imagine this Council

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

explaining that contamination to SMRID water users from here to Medicine Hat.

- And we haven't even considered Mr. Joss' drainage dugout. The engineer's illustration shows it covering several acres of land with no plan included as to how it would be drained.
- So now millions of gallons of water are in Mr. Taylor's runoff dugout. His plan is to put a pipe under the SMRID main canal very carefully. Once it is on the other side of the canal he plans to dig a swale to carry the water above ground toward the Six Mile Coulee ditch. On-route, the water passes by the property of seven landowners many of whom have dugouts which they fill from SMRID for their potable water supply. I feel terrified that ground water seepage of the Taylor water will contaminate these dugouts. Here are the pictures of water leaving the area behind these seven properties I just mentioned and passing below 20-5 .5 miles west of Mr. Taylor's property. Note the overload of water passing into a culvert much too small for its reception. How much more water will it take from this new swale to result in flooding of those acreages and dugouts?
- The whole Six Mile Coulee system is overloaded and needs repair. Flooding and slumping are the issues currently. You can't imagine dumping further water into it such as this development would create. I contacted City of Lethbridge Development Services and Infrastructure Services. No one I spoke to was aware of this dump of water into their system via Six Mile Coulee. SMRID, Alberta Environment and Alberta Health would not allow you to discharge contaminated water into the SMRID canal. Now this developer plans to dump his same/possibly contaminated water into the Oldman River. You, of course, see the danger and liability of this dumping. Earlier you saw the 2011 contract between SMRID and the County indicates that once the County accepts the drainage plan and passes it onto SMRID and Land Titles, then the County becomes "the owner of and responsible for any damages". Alberta Environment assured me that this developer would have to talk to them before implementing any of this plan, and they would not grant approval without an acceptable Storm Water Management Plan.
- Our residents are rightly concerned with surface and ground water contamination. The 1991 Robertson et al research in Ontario found that one septic field has a ground water plume contamination 10 meters wide and 130 meters long. Imagine the potential of 40 units in the Taylor plan and more in the Joss plan.
- While we were looking at the water going under the little 20-5 Range Road, I realized you may not know the impact of traffic on this range road. At present this road links access between Highway 4 and Highway 508. For people who have looked at the projected CANAMEX Highway development, you will know that this RR 20-5 access to and from Highway 4 is projected to be closed if and when CANAMEX is built. Industrial traffic for Mr. Joss' development would come down narrow Range Road 20-5 past the largest body of grouped residences. Think what kind of impact that noise and traffic will have on those property owners. Note Bylaw 1404, "no use shall be approved which should generate traffic problems in the district." Think what it will do to the breakdown of that soft country road.
- Here are our final points:
 - Noise – Our residents want you to imagine the noise that will be brought about by the 800 vehicles estimated in Mr. Taylor's proposal to come to his property and the 800 cars, trucks, transports that will leave it each day. His landscaper speaks of planning to plant a line of trees to shelter residents from the noise of his industries. He obviously has not planted trees on his property, and residents feel no confidence this plan will muffle the noise created by so much industry and the vehicles that service it.
 - Risk – We are fearful of the dangers of so many vehicles crossing uncontrolled railway crossings, speeding down country roads with very steep ditches. It will end practices of riding one's bike or horse along the road, taking your dog for a safe walk. These are current practices of our

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

residents. We have no idea what toxic materials and contaminants may be used or stored close to us.

- Redundance – We believe there is industrial space available in the County's existing industrial sites which would not require imploding into our residential area.
- Discomfort – Threat to our investment. Residents/taxpayers have invested their lives and finances building their homes and community. We are fearful of air pollution, noise, fire hazard, light pollution, smoke, invasion of privacy. What chance would these families have to sell their properties at fair value when they can no longer stand the noise and pollution.
- This is the third proposal from Mr. Taylor this community has had to defend itself against. We are distressed to have to repeatedly defend our homes and lives to our elected representatives.
- Help us. Deny this application for re-zoning.
- Safeguard our community from this and other proposals which will damage the quality of our lives and the integrity of our land.
- We ask you to represent our wishes in your vote on this matter. 41 of the families visited said "no" to this proposal and several families have been away.
- Please reject the plan to change the land use designation for this/these properties.

Council enquired, of the fifty residents within a one mile radius of this proposed development, what is the size of the lots?

Mrs. Richards stated that most are 3 to 4 acres and some are 8 acres, there are a variety of sizes.

Council enquired as to what type of waste disposal system is used.

Mrs. Richards stated that most use a septic system, there must be some drain fields, some residents have them pumped out every 2nd year.

Reeve Hickey asked if anyone else wished to speak in opposition of Bylaws 1426 and 1427.

Mrs. Susan Sauer approached Council and stated the following:

- My husband and I own an acreage south SW ¼ 4-8-20 for the last 34 years and have experienced two overland floods in 2008 and 2014 that have now destroyed our shelter belt, damaged our septic fields and caused others great pain and expense.
- Our acreage as well as the Taylor properties have been plagued with flooding due to the lay of the local land.
- Our property is directly south of Secondary Highway 508, Taylor Farms and adjacent to the CPR that runs along our land.
- We represent many of the local 50 plus residents and we are absolutely opposed to the dangers of bylaws 1426 and 1427.
- The changes in the bylaws will allow Mr. Taylor to develop an enormous industrial park that would provide huge negative results to all or surroundings and affect resale values in the future.
- The proposal is in total disagreement with the County's mission statement posted on the website. 'We ensure a high quality of our residents through managed growth and infrastructure. We offer an excellent quality of life'.
Who wrote those words; who is enforcing them?
- The proposal will affect our quality of life by creating larger volumes of noise, increased traffic and increased accidents.

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

- Presently there is a constant roar of engines coupled with severe ear ringing, super-bee grain haulers who are constantly using brakes as they enter and exit the Taylor Farms at various hours.
- We have existed with Ritchie Brother's sales three times a year.
- There is the noise factor with the increase in Ritchie / Taylor traffic and the noise especially before, during and after the sale.
- Over the recent years we have noticed the increase of traffic on Secondary Highway 508 as it provides easy access to Highway 5 and avoids the congestion of the many box stores on the south end of Lethbridge.
- The acreage rural traffic and high speeds have increased our safety when entering and exiting our homes and is especially unsafe for cyclists.
- Our quality of rural community life has not just been altered but destroyed. We can no longer sit outside and enjoy the great outdoors due to the constant roar of engines. You cannot imagine the impact of development to us and all the residents on Secondary Highway 508.
- Due to the increase in rail safety in recent years, there are more opportunities for accidents and traffic delays. In the past slower moving trains carried local grains to the market, but today there are faster trains carrying explosives and hazardous material. Due to the large volumes of traffic at our intersection what are the chances the we might experience a train derailment and a fiery explosion, similar to Lac-Mégantic Quebec in 2013. EMT and fire safety volunteers are 10 miles away and operate out of Coaldale.
- Last fall I witnessed a two vehicle collision and roll over at our intersection of Highway 508 and Highway 4. The most frustrating time was trying to notify 911. We rely on the RMCP detachment from Raymond, 10 miles south of our place. We don't need another workload added to this already busy force.
- A recommendation of placing railroad crossing arms at our intersection would be criminal – the constant noise and flashing lights from approaching trains would be unbearable.
- The concept of an additional spur-line to the north would be a complete disaster.
- We already have an existing spur-line that offers services to P&H, LA Grain and Wilson Siding one half mile from our home that create long delays, sometimes half an hour; have blocked the traffic on the highway at the intersections going west and on Highway 4.
- There are heart stopping moments during the night with crashing and banging of cars as they load and unload their cars on the two sites. Then there are the engineers who idle their locomotives beside our house.
- There is additional spur-line at the Bateman intersection and Secondary Highway 845. If the County is in need of additional rail services, industrial size, why do you not consider using Trimark and Vitera, which would not impact existing residents.
- We purchased the land and spent vast amounts of money to beautify our acreages and we expect to live a promising good lifestyle. Stop the destruction now.
- Fire safety is also an issue. Who is responsible for the safety and health of our citizens? Who supervises the overall operation and enforces the rules? Who is the keeper of our land? There are so many great areas and too many unknown factors in regards to the daily development. Where are the enforcement rules for Stewart Siding and now another unsightly excavation dump and Highway 4 and Broxburn Road, which showcases cement blocks, dirt and weeds. You, the County officials are accountable and will provide good governance to this business. Please help us keep our home and families safe. Say no to the proposed changes.

At this time Mrs. Kathleen Clements approached Council and stated the following:

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

- My husband Stan and I join with the 50 other homeowners around Secondary Highway 508 in strongly objecting to the development by DRT Farms.
- We are located directly across from Highway 508 to the south, about 20 yards from the property under the proposed re-zoning.
- There were 32 homes in existence in this area the last time this came up for rezoning in 2001 and now there are 51 homes.
- These two land usages, residential and industrial, are simply not compatible; acreage living and farming are.
- Mr. Taylor is operating four businesses now where I understood from Mr. Paladino years ago that one use and one secondary use was allowed under the current zoning, those were farming and grain handling.
- We have several concerns around the proposed development. However I want to speak only to what is specific to us and leave the 'Big Picture' concerns to another member of our community.
- Mr. Taylor shows his latest development to include trees and grass. I have my doubts of this landscaping actually happening as there has not been one tree or bush planted in the past 15 years. Is it all being left to lot owners to beautify their individual lot sites? This is unlikely to happen in a paved or graveled industrialized area. The buffer shown along the canal is quite simply not adequate for anything and will likely fail to screen anything as it is too narrow.
- Our property seems to have become a dumping place for all the excess water accumulated around Wilson Siding in the past few years, as has Wilson Siding itself. Until the flooding of land in this area is resolved how can the County approve a development that will add hugely to the problem?
- Will we, the taxpayer, be responsible for the cost of monitoring certain aspects of this proposed development when they will subsequently be turned over to the County? Is that fair, when we object to the development in the first place, or will the monitoring be left to the various industrial owners? Who will ultimately be answerable to the problems we can see happening in the future if this rezoning is approved?
- We have experienced a number of irritants since Mr. Taylor has leased his land to Ritchie Brothers Auction and prior to that, the auction usage is questionable but I was told it was a grey area.
- It is very much a commercial operation which does not come under its current zoning of Rural Agricultural.
- There is frequent burning of garbage with smoky pollutants entering the surrounding atmosphere. Several more industrial sites, up to 40 proposed, Mr. Taylor tells us it's now down to 25, but once it is rezoned, that number can spin around and be 40 again.
- They might also use the expediency of burning to get rid of their garbage that will make the air very hazardous for those of us who live there, as well as raising the hazard of out of control fires.
- We had one of Mr. Taylor's silos blow across the highway into our hedge on our farm property. If the bushes hadn't been there it would have severely damaged our Quonset. Who is to say this kind of thing wouldn't happen again with industrial sites possibly storing loose material on their lots, and being buffeted by strong southern Alberta winds.
- Traffic noise will seriously inhibit what enjoyment we might have left of our property. Even now we have vehicles coming in and out of Mr. Taylor's property day and night, it doesn't seem to matter the hour, 2:00 p.m. or 2:00 a.m.
- We have only become aware that Mr. Taylor's son operates a trucking business from that property which must be why we are weekly treated to the roar of breaks. The constant sound of back-up signals from the Ritchie Brother's site is also fraying on the ears and the nerves.
- This is the third time we have had to appear before County Councillors in defense of our homes. It has become more and more stressful each time we have had to do this. Mr. Taylor's plans become bigger and more complicated for both ourselves and the County each time.

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

- We have lived on our property for 42 years and have developed it from a sheep pasture to the home we use today. This proposed development by Mr. Taylor is not only going to impact negatively on our daily life, our property's market value and possibly our health. We feel that the relative security we have now will also be lost with the higher public traffic exposure.
- We therefore respectfully ask the County Councillors to deny again the rezoning request from DRT Farms. Nothing has changed from 2001, except 20 more homes have been approved by the County and built in this area.

Reeve Hickey asked if anyone else wished to speak either in opposition or in favour of Bylaws 1426 and 1427.

Mr. & Mrs. Chad and Tracey Skretting approached Council. Mr. Skretting stated the following:

- As the adjacent residential landowner directly west of the affected lands and located on Hwy 508 I would like to officially object to this proposed development and rezoning. If the land is rezoned from Rural Agriculture to Rural General Industrial and Business Light Industrial and such developments are subsequently built; myself (and family) as well as my neighbours will experience negative impacts on our quality of life and investments. Before listing these negative impacts I would like to quote Lethbridge County and remind you to consider these statements at each point of consideration during your review of the proposed rezoning and development.
- Lethbridge County Vision Statement reads: "Lethbridge County is an innovative and prosperous community offering quality country living." Lethbridge County Values read: Our Citizens; Our Staff; Accountability; Agriculture; Managed Growth

In no specific order here are some of my concerns and reasons for objecting:

- Increased traffic – noise, road safety, property security (crime), increased commute times. Some of these points will be emphasized near our residence since the access to the development will be moved much closer to our home to meet Alberta Transportation requirements.
- Unsightly and uncontrollable site conditions (regardless of a tree barrier that may die off and requires time and maintenance to be effective)
- Drainage issues resulting from the storm water pond drainage into Six Mile Coulee (SMRID drainage canal) - The overland drainage has potential to introduce toxins, chemicals and other waste into the surface and ground water ultimately reaching our dugouts/drinking supply and gardens.
- Noise Pollution
- Odour Pollution
- Light Pollution – removing our country living experience of starry night skies.
- With no mention of internet services being provided, businesses will tap our already oversubscribed wireless internet service providers further decaying our already lacking experience.
- Decline in property value and less desirable location making selling much more difficult.
- We as citizens have made the choice to have the "Quality Country Living" experience by deciding to call the area centered on Highway 508 our home; an area that for over 20 years has been zoned as Rural Residential and Rural Agriculture. There are roughly 50 homes in this area that choose this lifestyle.
- We've lived in the city and enjoyed many benefits by doing so, we decided to give up those benefits for this life and now with this proposed rezoning and development we would still be out the benefits of city life but now would have our governing body take from us the values and experience country living provides us that outweighs the urban amenities.
- I for one am not opposed to growth and development in our County but I believe that there must remain a welcome balance between affected

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

landowners/citizens and such developments. I was disappointed to say the least hearing that the County approached Dar Ray Farms and has been working with them so closely in order to meet technical criteria for such an application to be passed without considering and first approaching adjacent and affected neighbours.

- This to me shows that Council and County staff has forgotten or does not care about our County values and vision, specifically neglecting the Citizens, accountability, agriculture and quality of life.
- As the proposal goes through its various stages of approvals I encourage each of you to always consider yourself living in the shadow of a massive industrial park, not the dreamlike vision a developer may have of the project but the worst case scenario that could result due the uncontrollable aspects of such places. Then ask the question: “Is there a better location for such a development?” if the answer is no the next question is “Do we HAVE to have this development to prosper as a County?” if the answer is yes then consider how you can ensure this development impacts us in the least negative manner possible. Think about adding further restrictions and implementing a plan to ensure the measures taken to reduce the negative impact are maintained and accounted for.

At this time Mrs. Skretting addressed Council and stated the following:

- We have lived at Lot 7, Plan 9112201, SW 05-08-20-W4M for almost 3 years now. We moved here in order to escape the city and raise our children in a much more wholesome manner. When we purchased this acreage we did inquire about the neighbouring property and since it was zoned Rural Agriculture we weren't too concerned about the future we would have in this home for raising our children and eventually retiring.
- When we heard the County wants to rezone the land we couldn't help but be devastated. We understand that there is a chance for development there but I can't help but have certain reservations about the project. I know many of my neighbours will be focusing on other issues but I would like to focus on the quality of life and how it may be affected and show that there are ways to potentially reduce the impact on neighbouring residents.
- My first inquisition is whether this really is the most ideal location. There will be many landowners affected (approximately 50) by this development. Is it really worth diminishing their quality of life when the development could be moved to a different location? I can only imagine the traffic on Hwy 508 will increase due to the development. In regards to the traffic, there is conflicting information on this topic. One area says most businesses will be entering the industrial park via Hwy 4 therefore traffic on Hwy 508 shouldn't increase much. However, if this is the case, then there is no reason for the development to be at the intersection of Hwy 508 and Hwy 4. A location could therefore be selected somewhere else along Hwy 4.
- However, if the development goes through, there could be some ways to mitigate the affect the traffic will have on the surrounding residents. One solution could be that the speed limit on Hwy 508 be reduced to 80 km/h from Hwy 4 westward to the end of the properties along Hwy 508. This will alleviate some of the traffic noise and the potential accidents that could occur due to highway speeds interfering with the many driveways along the road. Also, the use of engine retarder breaks should be banned in the rural residential area.
- The increase in traffic will be a huge contributor to the quality of life being diminished due to this development. But that won't be the only form of pollution. Neighbouring properties will have to deal with various forms of pollution like light pollution at night, noise pollution during the day, smells and a less than ideal visual. There is also the potential of soil and water pollution if ground water isn't handled properly.
- There are of course steps that can be taken to help with the pollution – restrictions on yard lights for at night, restrictions on how many decibels of

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

sound a business can make, plant more trees to help with the visual pollution and smells, and putting in a pipeline for the storm drainage from the development to the drainage ditch that goes to Six-Mile Coulee.

- The trees that are to be planted along the canal are of particular interest to me. Ideally I would like to see at least 3 rows of trees: a variety of fast growing trees for a minimum of 2 rows and a variety of established evergreens for at least 1 row in order to have an adequate barrier. Also, in my opinion the trees should be planted before any development takes place so that they're well established to ease the noise, smell and air pollution that will come from developing the land. There should also be plans in place where the trees must be replaced with similar sized trees if they die, with a proper maintenance program in place for the trees as well as a maintenance program in place for the storm retention pond. The trees will not only help be a visual block, but can act as a barrier for noise and air pollutions. It would also be nice to see a row of trees planted along Hwy 508 in the development.
- In conclusion there are many ways to lessen the impact of all the pollutants that would affect the surrounding residents, as well as ways to help with the noise and safety issues caused by the increase in traffic. As much as I would not like to see this development go through it would be nice to see more considerations being taken to the impact on the surrounding resident's quality of life as well as the air, soil and water quality.

Reeve Hickey asked if anyone else wished to speak either in opposition or in favour of Bylaws 1426 and 1427.

No one came forward.

Reeve Hickey asked if anyone else wished to speak either in favour or opposition to Bylaws 1426 and 1427.

Floyd Joss approached Council and stated the following:

- I want to address one point regarding how water would be provided from the SMRID when the canal is shut off from October to April. I would remind the Council that one of the premiere industries in our County is the feeding industry. Many of our feedlots cover a quarter-section and have 25,000 head capacity and those cattle are watered all winter from a dugout that is filled in October and it hasn't run out by April. A 25,000 head of feeder cattle are going to use way more water than any of these projects would use during the winter and I point it out as an example to address some of the concern that's been raised that I don't think has been based in fact.

Elaine Heidt approached Council and stated the following:

- I am neither for or against this application. My two concerns are the noise and the smell. We are on the east side of that proposed development and we are already dealing with bad noise and smell and more development would make it worse. Township Road 8-0 is now used as a major cut-across, especially with Ritchie Bros; all their equipment gets moved across that road and back especially on sale days. Would that be changed or paved, who will maintain it? Those are my questions.

Council stated that Alberta Transportation has some concerns regarding that road, but to date we have no firm commitment from them as to what they may or may not wish to do with it.

Reeve Hickey announced last call for presentations regarding Bylaws 1426 and 1427.

No one came forward.

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

Reeve Hickey asked if Council had any questions regarding the presentations.

Council enquired to Hasegawa Engineering, would it be possible to use some of the storm water as raw water for businesses if they desire at all?

Mr. Franks stated that yes it is, it would have to be worked out with Alberta Environment as to how that would occur.

Reeve Hickey noted that this was the last call for anyone wishing to speak.

No one came forward.

456/14	T.WHITE	MOVED that the Public Hearing for By-Laws #1426 & 1427 DRT Farms - Area Structure Plan & Land Use Bylaw Amendment Sec 5-8-20-W4 Lots 1-3 Block 1 Plan 0814065 close at 3:27 p.m.	CARRIED
--------	---------	--	---------

457/14	T. WHITE	MOVED second reading of By-Law 1426 and 1427.	CARRIED
--------	----------	---	---------

Reeve Hickey thanked the delegation for attending the meeting. The delegation retired at 3:28 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

458/14	H. DOEVE	MOVED the meeting adjourn at 3:28 p.m.	CARRIED
--------	----------	--	---------

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer