

**Town of Mundare**

**Special Council Meeting Minutes  
July 21, 2010**

**Present** Mayor Mike Saric, Councillors, C. Gargus, M. Greening, F. Rosypal, K. Sprague,

**Staff** CAO Colin Zyla, Jane Dauphinee-Municipal Planning Services

**Call to Order** Mayor Saric called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**Adoption of Agenda**

**10/164** Sprague: that the agenda be accepted.

Carried

**Business** (a) **Public Hearing-Municipal Development Plan (MDP) and Land Use Bylaw (LUB)**

Mayor Saric opened the public hearing and the procedure for the meeting was explained.

Jane Dauphinee-Municipal Planning Services

- the process of creating a MDP and reviewing the LUB started in 2008 with a public open house in November

- the Town currently doesn't have a Municipal Development Plan
- the MDP

- future vision document

- has visions, goals, objectives

- map of future development

- should be reviewed every five years

- the LUB

- regulations of what you can do on land today

- other government agencies were contacted-comments received from Alberta Transportation

-short recess from 7:04-7:06

- first draft of the MDP and LUB presented to council for input in winter of 2009

- a number of meetings were held with council to ensure documents reflect councils vision

- MDP is new

- has a community profile section

- vision and goals for land use and development

- policies to encourage smart growth, phased development, diversity of housing types, and mixed use developments
- policies to discourage incompatible land uses and encourage infill development and pedestrian oriented businesses
- industrial land use policies aimed at expanding employment opportunities and encourage environmentally safe and sustainable industry
- policies for community development and transportation
- environmental management policies
- LUB
  - expanded definitions
  - new development authority regulations
  - changes to home occupations
  - changes to manufactured homes regulations
  - new regulations of neighbourhood convenience stores
  - new regulations for group homes, day homes and child care facilities
  - new regulations for wind energy and solar energy conversion systems
  - proposed new district-R2A-Low density residential district
    - Whitetail Crossing zoning consolidated into one district
    - will apply to whole town
- the statistics in the MDP need to be updated
- when developing the MDP and LUB-looked at the Avi Freidman report Retooling Mundare-also looked at the Town sustainability plan
- let people know about the subdivision authority bylaw, MPC bylaw, and development authority bylaw-not part of the hearing but are related to the MPC and LUB
  - development authority-currently the CAO-under the new bylaw the CAO can approve permitted uses-a MPC made up of 3 members of council and two members of the public at large decide discretionary uses and any variances
  - permitted uses –only the process can be appealed
  - discretionary can be appealed
  - subdivision authority-a different person from the development authority
- home occupations-split into major and minor-based on number of outside employees and number of visitors
- significant changes to the LUB zoning map
  - along 50<sup>th</sup> street south of highway 15-change to C1
  - a couple of other properties change to C2 & C3

## Public Presentations

### Roger Yaremko

- concerns with C1 district on the South Side of Town
- existing main street-13 lots unoccupied
- there are 14 lots available on 50 Avenue that can be zoned C1
- on the South side there are 12 acres that are proposed for commercial with highway frontage
- there are 55 business registered in Town-4 have closed
- the Town is having problems getting main street to develop
- C1 development stops other development
- South side would be a good place for residential development
- don't need 100 commercial lots

### Bill Wruck

- the improvements on main street is to help increase the population
- there are empty lots and buildings on main street
- questioned why redevelopment of main street stopped at the railroad tracks
- for road to golf course-a better vision and better environmentally with residential instead of commercial
- the lots along the highway can be commercial

### Jeff Ulan

- what is the logic behind changing the property to commercial
  - Mike Saric-to plan for the future-looking 50-60 years into the future
- has a house on the South side-doesn't want commercial
- South side cut short on development
- to put in commercial have to dig up the road
- Jane Dauphinee provided some clarification
  - there are three commercial districts in the LUB-each has different permitted and discretionary uses
  - highway commercial is different from the type of businesses in a C1 district-C1 meant to be for walk in business
  - need to think long term about connecting Whitetail Crossing with the North part of Town

### At this time there was a general discussion

- row housing is a better way to connect Whitetail Crossing to the North side
- high density best for that area
- hard to make a living in a bedroom community-hard for a commercial business to establish itself
- heart of Mundare is on the North side

- residential properties moves easier than commercial
- C1 does allow for a residence as accessory to a commercial business(JD)
- what happens if there is a business and a residence on the same property and the business stops operating
- residential is a better option
- North Side-more visible, better curb appeal
- if the property is zoned C1 it is harder to subdivide the land
- it was noted that there was conflict between the MDP and LUB maps
- Urban reserve is a holding zone-no a residential district
  - very limited development
  - need to rezone for some issues
- have to look to the future(MS)
- in C1 district –single use residential is not permitted-is discretionary(JD)
  - if house burns down-not allowed to replace
  - no major renovations allowed

Recess from 8:05-8:15 p.m.

- accessory buildings have more discretion
- two ways to protect existing landowners if a C1 district(JD)
  - allow single residential on certain properties
  - allow single family homes as discretionary-allows for decision to build a home
- are residences on main street assessed as commercial
  - houses are assessed based on their use-no land zoning(CZ)
- what if the C1 strip was narrower(MS)
- urban reserves property cannot be subdivided (JD)
- residential is more logical for the area
- if property is subdivided-a sewer system needs to be installed
- highway frontage should be commercial
- it is more likely that someone would move to Mundare for residential not necessarily for commercial
- maybe have a longer setback from 50 street on existing parcels so that a residence can be built
  - 150 or 125 feet included a twenty foot backalley

CAO Colin Zyla reviewed his concerns with the bylaws

-MDP

-pg 4-last bullet at the bottom-do we want to say residential instead of homes?

-pge 9-second paragraph-the sisters still run the mission but they do not operate the Hospital. It is now operated by Covenant Health.

-LUB

-definitions -#(43)-front line is the shortest of the property lines which determines front yard-we do have some house that face towards the longer line of the property-this also relates to side yard-definition # (113)

-3.3(3)(40(5)-clarification on the meaning of the clause

-3.4(7)-there is not corresponding area marked on the LUB map-the same applies to (14)

#### Schedule B, part I

-1.5(1)the wording is not complete

-1.5(4)-requested clarification on the section

-1.5(5)-asked if 10% was to high

-1.7(1)(b)-verify the number of non registered vehicles

-1.8(5)-it appears that the wording for the eaves projections is not correct

-1.14-question if the property line is not located next to the roadway

#### Schedule B, Part II

-2.10(2)(4) and 2.11(3)(4)-believe these sections are duplicates

-2.11(5)-is a maximum of three reasonable

-2.11(7)-got clarification of the clause

-2.15(1)-why a height limit on property greater than 0.5 acres

-2.15(7)-not sure we need to know if they have made application if we do not need to know if it was accepted

#### Part III

-3.1-(v)(d)-really restricts residential-especially along main street

-noticed that playground are permitted in R1, R1A, R1B, RE2A and discretionary in R2 and R3

-3.6(3)-starts at (vii)-assume there was suppose to be more in front

-3.9-(3)(b)-believe the density numbers are reversed

-noticed that the lot sized and front yard requirements for RMH2 (3.9) different than from RMH1 (3.8)

-3.10(g)-the regulations for dwelling units the same as the regulations for apartments in R3-however, these regulations would not apply on main street as the lots on main are smaller-no front yards etc or does this apply to only individual dwelling units like a house-not included with a commercial building

-3.17-do we want to make one family dwelling on existing parcels discretionary

The public hearing was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

A recess from 9:45 to 10:00 p.m.

Discussion took place regarding the MDP and LUB and concerns brought forward

- setback on 50<sup>th</sup> street a concern

- Jane Dauphinee will work on regulations that would allow a single family residential home on UR land by 50<sup>th</sup> street with a setback of at least 125 ft

- the zoning along 50<sup>th</sup> street will either be C1 or residential and allow for 105 ft lots

-Jane Dauphinee will do the necessary changes and create a change bylaw for council. A second public hearing will have to be held

**Adjournment** Mayor Saric adjourned the meeting at 10:55 p.m.

---

Mayor

---

Chief Administrative Officer