

Councillor Request Report

March 22, 2016

#	Elected Official Name	Subject	Req type	Meeting date	Due date	Resp Dept	2nd Dept	Request	Reponse date	Reponse	Status
3	CARR Roxanne	Online Voting Records	Information	05/11/2013	11/15/2013	LLS		Research other municipalities best practices regarding online voting records.		LLS is currently looking into an electronic meeting management system. Online voting records will be part of this initiative.	In Progress
				23/09/2014	03/10/2014	LLS		Please provide and update on the status of online voting.		Commencing January 2015, Strathcona County will start rolling out modules of the electronic meeting management software (eScribe) that we purchased. The electronic voting module is anticipated to be rolled out in March. Prior to March, LLS will provide Council with different options on how we can display our voting records online.	
28	CARR Roxanne	Alberta Community Partnership Program	Information	11/03/2014	3/21/2014	CPIA		Please provide a report on actions taken by Administration to create applications to the Alberta Community Partnership Program at the May 13, 2014 Priorities Committee Meeting.			Outstanding
								Further dialogue will be required regarding this request. To be discussed at the June 17th Priorities Committee meeting when the request for Community Group Collaboration Fund (Councillor Smith) is discussed.			
33	SMITH Paul	Community Group Collaboration Fund	Program	22/04/2014	5/13/2014	RPC	FCS	Create parameters and budget for a fund that would facilitate and enable community organizations to work together for success and viability. The outcome would be a system that would enable joint initiatives with access to funds, facilities, expertise and training. This request has been directed to Community Services Division- FCS & RPC			In Progress
								Please bring this program request back for discussion to the June 17, 2014 Priorities Committee Meeting. (The request was to be brought forward to the May 13, 2014 PCM however Councillor Smith will not be in attendance for the May 13, 2014 PCM)			
35	BIDZINSKI Victor	Community Halls Renovation/ Replacement Plan	Information	06/05/2014	5/16/2014	FAS		Provide information on ways we could augment the costs that will be associated with the renovation/replacement of Strathcona County's Community Halls in the future. (Was stated that 19 million dollars will be required)			Outstanding
86	BIDZINSKI Victor	Spray Decks	Information	9/29/2015	10/9/2015	RPC		Please provide information regarding the status update and maintenance/ revitalization plan report on spray decks in Strathcona County.	10/05/2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strategy phase of outdoor aquatics planning is projected to take place in Q1-Q2 2016.• This strategy will look at outdoor aquatics as a whole, throughout Strathcona County.• Additional public engagement and assessment of community needs will be included in the study.• Study will look at both the older, existing spray decks as well as strategic options for future sites as identified on Page 8 of the 5-year Open Space Recreation Facility Strategy (OSRFS) update, outdoor aquatic infrastructure strategy/concept stages to be completed within the 2014-2018 timeframe.• Based on this timeline, RPC will be in a position to make strategy recommendations and move into the concept/design stages as early as the 2017 budget cycle.	In Progress
92	CARR Roxanne	Promotion of Local Businesses	Information	01/19/2016	01/29/2016	EDT		What does Strathcona County do to promote local business? Please provide information on the top three municipalities in Alberta and what they do to promote local business.	15/03/2016	An email response was sent to Council and Executive Team. Due to the length of the reponse it has not been included on this report	Complete

#	Elected Official Name	Subject	Req type	Meeting date	Due date	Resp Dept	2nd Dept	Request	Reponse date	Reponse	Status
96	ANDERSON Dave	Traffic/ Noise Attenuation	Information	02/02/2016	02/12/2016	TAS		Please provide information regarding when the last noise assessment was done along the Sherwood Drive/ Coachman Way area. When is the next planned assessment for that area, given the increased traffic volumes with the addition of the Sherwood Drive interchange, Fire Station/ RCMP expansion and Emerald Hills development?	02/22/2016	The Sherwood Drive corridor along Clover Bar Ranch was last monitored for noise in 2008 and 2011. These results showed readings of 52 dBA and 54 dBA respectively. As per the Noise Policy, existing neighbourhood noise measurements of 65 dBA are required in order to warrant action from the County. Additional noise measurements at this time are not recommended due to the re-routing of the Anthony Henday construction activity. Once complete, traffic patterns will normalize over two to three months and more accurate and representative measurements are possible. Additional noise measurements would be recommended in the spring of 2017. Noise measurements require the consent of a home owner and occur over a 24-hour period. Current traffic volumes along Sherwood Drive are approximately 26,900 vehicles per day, with a classification breakdown of roughly 83% passenger vehicle, 16% bus/truck, and 1% tractor trailers.	Complete
97	BOTTERILL Brian	Traffic Requirements for Developers	Information	02/02/2016	02/12/2016	PDS		Please provide information regarding traffic requirements for developers and when the requirement will be reviewed next considering the upcoming potential growth within our community.			Outstanding
98	HOWATT Carla	Investing Guidelines - Recreation Facilities MR Lands	Information	02/16/2016	02/26/2016	RPC	PDS	Please provide information regarding policies and guidelines that guide the decision making process when investing in recreation facilities on MR designated lands.	03/01/2016	At the Area Structure Plan stage, through the joint planning committees with Strathcona County and the school boards, discussions regarding site plans and any opportunities for recreation facilities are reviewed. In cases whereby the lands are subdivided and held for future school purposes the County has a toolbox of strategies which guide decision making on community recreation infrastructure. The first is the Open Space and Recreation Facility Strategy which identifies overarching recreational needs to 2023. It lists emerging requirements as well as ways in which to protect existing assets through revitalization. In addition to that, the County has created the following Master Plans and Strategles which look at more specific land areas and recreational infrastructure needs: 1. Sportsfield Strategy 2. Trails Strategy 3. Aquatic Strategy 4. Ardrossan Community Recreation Master Plan 5. Josephburg Community Recreation Master Plan 6. Dog Off-Leash Framework 7. South Cooking Lake Park Master Plan 8. Brentwood Park Master Plan 9. Heritage Hills Park Master Plan 10. Kinsmen/Westboro Park Master Plan In addition to the numerous strategic documents which help the County guide decision making on MR sites, operationally, Recreation, Parks and Culture uses the following methods to stay in touch with recreational users to assess their needs and ensure we are on track: Annual surveys, Comment cards, Program evaluations/surveys, User group meetings Evaluation of participation numbers at events Some ways in which we could establish a more formal administrative process on how the County acquires, designs, constructs, maintains and programs park space could be done through a Parks Management Plan, and a Future School Site Study. Each of these would allow the County to create policies that support their direction.	Complete

Councillor Request Report

March 22, 2016

#	Elected Official Name	Subject	Req type	Meeting date	Due date	Resp Dept	2nd Dept	Request	Reponse date	Reponse	Status
99	BELAND-QUEST Fiona	Dog Licesnses	Information	02/23/2016	4/3/2016	RCMP&ENF		Please provide information regarding when the Dog Control Bylaw was last reviewed, when it is due for next review as well as how we compare to surrounding communities, and what best practices other municipalities have to educate residents regarding the bylaw.	03/03/2016	Enforcement Services last reviewed the dog bylaw in 2006. Since this review there was only changes to the fee structure with fine increases. Enforcement Services is in the process of reviewing the dog bylaw which includes looking at best practices of municipalities in the capital region. This review has been diary dated for March 10, 2016. A report will be completed by March 31, 2016 to outline the outcomes and recommendations of the review.	Complete
100	RIDDELL Bonnie	Growth Study History	Information	03/01/2016	03/11/2016	LLS		<p>That the following information be provided to Council by the next council meeting (March 22, 2016):</p> <p>As per the article in the Sherwood Park Independent Weekly dated Feb. 24/16, Councillor Bidzinski referenced the following: That the initial growth plan areas that were identified in 2006 were compared taking into consideration social factors, agricultural capabilities, environmental impact, infrastructure capabilities and an extensive fiscal impact analysis. I would like a list of any and all studies of this nature that were commissioned in 2006 to address these areas.</p> <p>He goes on further to state: "The one node north of highway 16, east of highway 21, today known as Bremner, was clearly delineated by council as the number one area with future urban potential. I would like a copy of the Council decision supporting this statement.</p> <p>Additional statements reference decisions of the previous council and specifically the following statement was made "I now believe this was contrary to the decision of a previous council but nothing was brought forward indicating the discrepancy" (in reference to the 2012 MDP update to bring us in line with the Capital Region growth plan). I would like a list of all formal motions made on this subject matter within this time frame and an administrative response in terms of the perceived discrepancy.</p> <p>'A claim was made that in 2013 Council made motions to initiate the growth study for Bremner and then at a later date made the decision to initiate the growth study for Colchester. Again the statement is made that these motions are contrary to decisions made by a previous council and I would like a listing of all motions made in regards to both growth areas and an outline of the process to date.'</p> <p>Finally, a statement is made as follows: "I would like a legal opinion on whether those decisions by a previous council should have been debated, and rescinded if we were to move forward in the direction we did. I would like to be certain we are moving in the right direction legally..." To my knowledge this concern has not been brought to this administration and/or council. To ensure that council has followed due process I would like our administration to address this matter and provide information back to council.</p>	03/11/2016	Response was provided via an email sent on Friday, March 11, 2016. A Copy of the email is included as Appendix 1 of this report.	Complete

In response to Councillor Riddell's Information Request presented at the March 1, 2016 Council Meeting regarding Growth Study History:

No studies were commissioned in 2006 on the growth plan areas; however, on May 23, 2006, Council received the following studies for information:

1. Urban Systems – Future Urban Areas Feasibility Study (2001)
2. Stantec – Evaluation of Urban Growth Options (2003)

These two studies are attached to this email.

Additionally, Council passed the following motion on August 22, 2006:

7.4

Municipal Development Plan Review

Draft 2

File: PDRS Admin.85984, 85732 & 85843

MOVED by L. Osinchuk:

543/2006

THAT Council authorize Administration to enter into discussions with the Design Centre for Sustainability at UBC, with a view to having the Centre review Strathcona's growth node options from the perspective of the Strathcona County Sustainable Development Model.

**CARRIED
UNANIMOUS**

IN FAVOUR: A. Dunn, J. Fenske, B. Jewell, G. Lawrence,
K. Lesniak, C. Olesen, L. Osinchuk, P. Włodarczak

OPPOSED:

At the June 27/29, 2006 Council meeting, in giving direction for preparation of the second draft of the Municipal Development Plan (MDP), Council passed and defeated the following motions:

8.1

Municipal Development Plan (MDP) Review

Council Direction

File: PDRS Admin.84630 & 84631.ppt

(continued)

Council provided direction to Administration on what is to be included in the second draft of the new Municipal Development Plan. Council's direction is summarized in the following motions.

Potential Growth Node***29-1** **MOVED** by L. Osinchuk:

***481/2006 THAT Draft 2 of the MDP identify potential growth area(s).*

**CARRIED
UNANIMOUS**

IN FAVOUR: A. Dunn, J. Fenske, B. Jewell, G. Lawrence,
K. Lesniak, C. Olesen, L. Osinchuk, P. Wlodarczak
OPPOSED:

29-2 **MOVED** by J. Fenske:

***482/2006 THAT Draft 2 of the MDP identify Growth Node 4
 – West of Highway 21 as a potential growth area.*

CARRIED

IN FAVOUR: A. Dunn, J. Fenske, G. Lawrence,
K. Lesniak, C. Olesen, L. Osinchuk, P. Wlodarczak
OPPOSED: B. Jewell

Recess (9:55 – 10:05 am)

** (Denotes Slide Number - Question Number of the PowerPoint presentation attached to Administration's report)*

MOVED by G. Lawrence:

****483/2006**

*THAT Draft 2 of the MDP identify Growth Node 1A
- Colchester – North of Highway 14 as a potential growth area.*

DEFEATED

IN FAVOUR: G. Lawrence, C. Olesen, L. Osinchuk, P. Włodarczak

OPPOSED: A. Dunn, J. Fenske, B. Jewell, K. Lesniak

MOVED by K. Lesniak:

****484/2006**

*THAT Draft 2 of the MDP identify Growth Node 2
- East of Highway 21 as a potential growth area.*

CARRIED

IN FAVOUR: A. Dunn, J. Fenske, B. Jewell, K. Lesniak, P. Włodarczak

OPPOSED: G. Lawrence, C. Olesen, L. Osinchuk

MOVED by B. Jewell:

****485/2006**

*THAT Draft 2 of the MDP identify Growth Node 3
- South of Yellowhead as a potential growth area.*

DEFEATED

IN FAVOUR:

OPPOSED: A. Dunn, J. Fenske, B. Jewell, G. Lawrence,
K. Lesniak, C. Olesen, L. Osinchuk, P. Włodarczak

**** (Aug 22/06 - Minutes were amended by adding the word "potential" to Motions 481 to 485/2006)**

Recess (10:50 – 11:02 am)

Transition Area #2**31-1****MOVED** by B. Jewell:

486/2006

THAT in Draft 2 of the MDP, the Urban Service Area boundary be expanded to include the Country Residential Policy area south of Sherwood Park.

DEFEATED**IN FAVOUR:**

OPPOSED: A. Dunn, J. Fenske, B. Jewell, G. Lawrence,
K. Lesniak, C. Olesen, L. Osinchuk, P. Wlodarczak

31-2**MOVED** by J. Fenske:

487/2006

THAT in Draft 2 of the MDP, the Rural Hamlet boundaries be expanded beyond the current Area Structure Plan boundaries.

**CARRIED
UNANIMOUS**

IN FAVOUR: A. Dunn, J. Fenske, B. Jewell, G. Lawrence,
K. Lesniak, C. Olesen, L. Osinchuk, P. Wlodarczak

OPPOSED:

The motion instructing Administration to include Colchester (483/2006) in the draft MDP was defeated. A motion was passed to include Growth Node 2 (Bremner) in the draft MDP as a potential growth area.

On March 6, 2007, Council gave first reading to Bylaw 1-2007 – The Municipal Development Plan (MDP). The MDP included two growth areas one urban reserve (North of 16 or Bremner) and urban/ rural transition (Colchester). The report presenting the bylaw did have an error in the Council History section, as it indicated that motion 483/2006 (above) was passed. This error was repeated in the May 22, 2007 report, when the MDP bylaw was given second and third reading.

The Capital Region Growth Plan was finalized in 2010. Section 3.5 c) ii of the Capital Region Land Use Plan Policy requires that a municipality bring its MDP into conformance with the Capital Region Growth Plan within one year of applying to amend its MDP.

On October 23, 2012, Council passed the following motion:

15.2 **Growth Management Strategy**

Document: 3609229

Presenters: Peter Vana, Stacy Fedechko, Vernon Parker, Charles Nash

MOVED by P. Wlodarczak:

665/2012
Carried

THAT Council direct administration to initiate a Growth Management Strategy and Timeline for the Urban Reserve Area (Bremner).

In Favour: C. Alexander, V. Bidzinski, J. Gariepy, L. Osinchuk,
 P. Wlodarczak

Opposed: R. Carr, L. Delainey, B. Riddell

Absent: B. Botterill

On November 20, 2012, Council passed the following motion:

MOVED by L Delainey:

706/2012
Carried

THAT Council direct administration to commence preparation of the Growth Management Strategy for the North Colchester Rural/Urban Policy Area immediately, or sooner if directed by Council following completion of the Bremner Urban Reserve Growth Management Strategy.

Councillor Wlodarczak asked for a FRIENDLY AMENDMENT to the motion to delete the words, "immediately, or sooner if directed by Council".

The Chair Called the Question on the Main Motion 706/2012 AS AMENDED which now reads as follows:

MOVED by L Delainey:

THAT Council direct administration to commence preparation of the Growth Management Strategy for the Colchester Urban/Rural Transition Policy Area following completion of the Bremner Urban Reserve Growth Management Strategy.

In Favour: C. Alexander, V. Bidzinski, R. Carr, L. Delainey, J. Gariepy,
L. Osinchuk, P. Wlodarczak
Opposed: B. Botterill, B. Riddell

On December 10, 2013, Council passed the following motion:

MOVED by L. Delainey:

581/2013 THAT Council direct Administration to commence preparation of the Growth Management Strategy for the North Colchester Rural/Urban Transition Policy Area immediately.

MOVED by B. Riddell:

582/2013 THAT Motion 581/2013 be **AMENDED** to:

Carried
Unanimous

- i. delete the words "commence preparation of" and replace with the words "prepare a proposed plan and timeline for"
- ii. delete the word "immediately" and replace with the words "for information by the end of January 2014".

The Chair **CALLED THE QUESTION on Motion 581/2013 AS AMENDED** which now reads:

THAT Council direct Administration to prepare a proposed timeline for the Growth Management Strategy for the North Colchester Rural/Urban Transition Policy Area for information by the end of January 2014.

In Favour: R. Carr, V. Bidzinski, D. Anderson, B. Botterill, C. Howatt,
P. Smith, L. Delainey, B. Riddell, F. Beland-Quest

On November 20, 2012, a public hearing was held and Council gave Bylaw 42-2012 – Amendment to the Municipal Development Plan Bylaw (Bylaw 1-2007) first reading. On February 19, 2013, Council gave second and third reading to Bylaw 42-2012, a Bylaw that amended the Municipal Development Plan (MDP) to conform to the Capital Region Growth Plan, including clarification of the two potential growth areas.

Our procedural opinion is that once the original MDP was passed in 2007, there was no need for Council to rescind or renew any motions related to instructions for preparation of the draft bylaw. A bylaw can only be amended by another bylaw, pursuant to section 191 of the MGA. Once a bylaw has been passed, it is not necessary to revoke any of the instructions given by way of resolution for its preparation; a bylaw has a higher legislative ranking than a resolution.

The remainder of motions passed with respect to the growth area discussions are set out below:

Council History

September 23, 2014 – Council received the Bremner Growth Management Strategy as information.

333/2014

MOVED by: B. Riddell

THAT Council receives the Bremner Growth Management Strategy document for information.

In Favour: R. Carr, D. Anderson, B. Botterill, C. Howatt, P. Smith, B. Riddell, F. Beland-Quest

Opposed: V. Bidzinski

Abstain: L. Delainey

Carried

March 31, 2015 – Council received an update on the Colchester Growth Management Strategy process.

8.1 Colchester Growth Management Strategy

The Priorities Committee was provided with an update on the work plan, public engagement, and timelines of the Colchester Growth Management Strategy.

July 07, 2015 - Council received an update on the Colchester Growth Management Strategy. Council directed Administration to proceed with Part 2 Optional Work, being the Recommended Concept and Policy Direction, and complete the Colchester Growth Management Strategy.

252/2015**Moved by:** C. Howatt

THAT Council direct Administration to proceed with Part 2 Optional Work, being the Recommended Concept and Policy Direction, and complete the Colchester Growth Management Strategy.

In Favor: R. Carr, V. Bidzinski, D. Anderson, C. Howatt, P. Smith and F. Beland-Quest

Opposed: B. Botterill and B. Riddell

Abstain: L. Delaine

Carried

September 29, 2015 – Priorities Committee received an update on the Colchester Growth Management Strategy, specifically to present the results of the fiscal impact analysis of the three initial design concepts, as well as the draft community design concept.

7.1 Colchester Growth Management Strategy Update

The Priorities Committee was provided with an update on the Colchester Growth Management Strategy, specifically to present the results of the fiscal impact analysis of the three initial design concepts, as well as the draft community design concept.

November 24, 2015 – Priorities Committee received an update on the Colchester Growth Management Strategy, specifically to present the draft recommended community design concept, as well as the draft policy directions.

9.2 Colchester Growth Management Strategy Update

Council was provided with an update on the status of the Colchester Growth Management Strategy, specifically to present the draft recommended community design concept, as well as the draft policy directions.

January 26, 2016 - Administration presented an overview of the Draft Colchester Growth Management Strategy to Priorities Committee.

8.6 Colchester Growth Management Strategy

The Priorities Committee was provided with an overview of the final draft of the Colchester Growth Management Strategy.

February 2, 2016**2016/ 32****Moved by:** P. Smith

THAT the Colchester Growth Management Strategy Final Report, as set out in Enclosure 1 to the February 2, 2016 Planning and Development Services report, be received for information.

In Favour R. Carr, V. Bidzinski, D. Anderson, C. Howatt, P. Smith, and
 F. Beland-Quest

Opposed B. Botterill and B. Riddell

Carried**2016/ 33****Moved by:** C. Howatt

That Administration bring a report to the February 16, 2016 Priorities Committee meeting, with a draft matrix developed for the purpose of comparing Colchester and Bremner growth strategies; and provide a second report to the March 8, 2016 Priorities Committee meeting with a completed matrix.

In Favour R. Carr, V. Bidzinski, D. Anderson, B. Botterill, C. Howatt, P. Smith, B.
 Riddell and
 F. Beland-Quest

Carried Unanimously**February 16, 2016****7.6 Bremner and Colchester Draft Comparison Matrix**

The Priorities Committee was provided with a draft unpopulated matrix developed for the purpose of comparing the Colchester and Bremner Growth Management Strategies.

March 8, 2016**6.7 Comparison Matrix of Bremner and Colchester**

The Priorities Committee was provided with a populated comparison matrix of the Bremner and Colchester Growth Management Strategies for their review.

2016/ P12

Moved by: P. Smith

THAT the March 8, 2016 Planning and Development Services department report entitled Comparison Matrix of Bremner and Colchester be referred to Council for debate and decision on the Growth Management Strategies at March 22, 2016 Council Meeting.

In Favor: R. Carr, V. Bidzinski, B. Botterill, C. Howatt, P. Smith, B. Riddell and F. Beland-Quest

Abstain: L. Delainey

Carried Unanimously

Mavis Nathoo

Director, Legislative and Legal Services

Strathcona County

2001 Sherwood Drive

Sherwood Park, AB T8A 3W7

Phone: 780-464-8137

Fax: 780-464-8194

mavis.nathoo@strathcona.ca

www.strathcona.ca



Find us on:

