

Town of Drumheller COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

October 22, 2012 at 4:30 PM
Council Chamber, Town Hall
703-2nd Ave. West, Drumheller, Alberta



PRESENT:

DEPUTY MAYOR:

Tom Zariski

COUNCIL:

Andrew Berdahl

Jay Garbutt

Lisa Hansen-Zacharuk

Sharel Shoff

Doug Stanford

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER/ENGINEER:

Ray Romanetz

ACTING DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES:

Bill Wulff

DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY SERVICES:

Paul Salvatore

RECORDING SECRETARY:

Linda Handy

ABSENT:

Mayor Terry Yemen

Director of Infrastructure Services - Allan Kendrick

1.0 CALL TO ORDER 4:38 PM.

2.0 MAYOR'S OPENING REMARK

- 2.1 Deputy Mayor T. Zariski proclaimed the week of October 21st to 27th Central Alberta Child & Family Services Foster Parents.
- 2.2 Deputy Mayor T. Zariski proclaimed October 25th "Be a Fan Day" for Special Olympics.
- 2.3 Deputy Mayor T. Zariski congratulated the Anglican Church of St. Magloire who are celebrating their 100th Anniversary on October 28th
- 2.4 Councillor S. Shoff announced that there will be a Health Advisory Community Engagement Session on November 8th at the Badlands Community Facility. She encouraged the public to engage in dialogue about local health issues.

3.0 PUBLIC HEARING

4.0 ADOPTION OF AGENDA

MO2012.143 Garbutt, Stanford moved to adopt the agenda as presented. Carried unanimously.

5.0 MINUTES

5.1. ADOPTION OF REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

5.1.1 Regular Council Meeting Minutes of October 9, 2012

MO2012.144 Shoff, Stanford moved to adopt the Regular Council Meeting Minutes of October 9, 2012 as presented. Carried unanimously.

5.2. MINUTES OF MEETING PRESENTED FOR INFORMATION

5.2.1 Municipal Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of September 6, 2012

5.3. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

6.0 DELEGATIONS

7.0 COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE RECOMMENDATIONS

8.0 REQUEST FOR DECISION REPORTS

8.1. CAO

8.1.1 Report from Brad Wiebe, CEO / Director of Planning, PRMS re: Request for Subdivision Time Extension Legal Plan 1259JK Block 2 Lot 2

B. Wiebe referred to File No. 80/110 (2010-043) which is a subdivision application applied for in late 2010 by applicant Electra Holdings Ltd. affecting the former St. Anthony's school property (approximately 2.55 acres) located on 7th Avenue SE. The subdivision proposed to separate the school facility from the green space. He explained that the request is before Council for consideration of a time extension in order to complete the conditions of the subdivision for registration. He further explained that the file was approved in early January, 2011 and in accordance with the Municipal Government Act (MGA), the applicant has one year to meet all the conditions of the subdivision and register with Land Titles. Section 657 of the MGA states that Council may extend the timeframe whether or not the time period has expired.

B. Wiebe explained that one condition of the subdivision approval has not been met: *"Prior to further subdivision into individual titled lots, land use district amendments or development, a concept plan / ASP (area structure plan) shall be required in accordance with the Town's*

Municipal Development Plan (MDP) to provide a planning framework and public consultation to determine the future land use potential of the site". He explained that at the time of the original subdivision application the applicant was proposing future residential uses. He further explained that since the application was approved with conditions there have been a number of considerations that have occurred. *"The existing St. Anthony's school facility on the site has been proposed as the Hope College site and the redevelopment of the site may require different site requirements including building footprint, setbacks, parking considerations, etc. and the pre-subdivision of this site may constrain potential future land uses. Secondly, the applicant has recently submitted the residential development concept plans. The pre-subdivision of the site appears to constrain the potential future subdivision and development options on the site within the division of the existing parcel with an arbitrary line".* B. Wiebe concluded by stating that due to recent proposed developments on the site, it may be prudent to deny the request for the extension which would allow the applicant to submit a new application. He explained that this process would improve transparency in the surrounding area.

B. Wiebe advised that the matter was discussed at the Municipal Planning Commission and he read the following excerpt from their minutes of October 4, 2012 *"The MPC would like to recommend to Council that they expire this subdivision request in light of the Hope College's future development plans. Parking will become a large part of the Hope College needs should the future plans become reality. Parking became a question when the Residential Subdivision concept plan was brought to the Municipal Planning Commission in July 2012. The Commission looked at the College's future potential and asked the question, "where will the staff and students park?"*

R. Romanetz advised that in terms of parking requirements for Hope College, the developer has advised that the ATCO trailer will be removed from the site to allow for additional parking. He stated that with the removal of the ATCO trailer, there is adequate parking to meet the current requirements for the first phase of Hope College (naturopathic care) for which a development permit has been issued. When the application for Hope College is presented, all parking requirements will need to be met to the satisfaction of the MPC. The MPC however has taken a different viewpoint on this matter.

Developer - Art James stated that one of the reasons for the delay in meeting the conditions of approval is the length of time it took to complete the new St. Anthony's school. He stated that the question of parking seems to be an issue however there is no certainty when Hope College would move forward. He stated that regardless, there is adequate off street parking. He further explained that he does not want the proposed residential development to be held up by a decision that

may not move forward. He explained that as a matter of courtesy, he presented the proposed residential development to the MPC however they were of the same opinion that there was not sufficient parking to accommodate Hope College. He explained that he intends to develop 15 residential lots, with the frontage of the lots varying from 48.5' to 60' and 20 ft. laneway on the west boundary for emergency access. He stated that if the building is used for Hope College, the zoning would not change and the parking requirements would be 4 stalls per classroom for a total of 60 parking stalls identified as NW corner 27 stalls, NE corner 25 stalls and 15 stalls once the playground equipment is removed.

Questions from Council:

Councillor J. Garbutt asked Art James what a refusal to the extension would cost him. A. James explained that the costs to restart the process would be in the range of \$8,000 (original application fee of \$2,000 and MPE consulting services fees of \$5,000-\$6,000). Councillor J. Garbutt stated that there was an issue with street parking with the former St. Anthony's school and he would anticipate a similar problem for Hope College. A. James stated that it would be unfair to deny an extension based on a presumption that Hope College would occupy the building. He further stated that it is unreasonable to hold up a much needed residential subdivision based on an uncertainty. A. James further explained that CN might be agreeable to lease their adjacent right of way for overflow parking if the request is based on community use.

Councillor A. Berdahl stated that the request for extension should be granted as the original subdivision application was recommended for approval by the MPC and there are no substantial changes. He further stated that any future development on either site will continue to be involved at the MPC level.

Councillor T. Zariski asked if there was a requirement for an area structure plan? R. Romanetz stated the residential subdivision will require an area structure plan and land use amendment to R1. He further explained that both processes must go before Council for approval and a public hearing held.

Councillor S. Shoff stated that she feels the request should be denied based on no firm commitment from Hope College. She asked B. Wiebe to clarify PRMS's recommendation for refusal. B. Wiebe stated that their reason is based on the arbitrary line that PRMS has to work around in order to accommodate the proposed residential development. He further stated that when the original application was approved it was assumed that the school was abandoned and the second development would not impact the first development. R. Romanetz stated that if a development permit is applied for that does not meet the Land Use

Bylaw requirements, it will not be approved. He further explained that when an application comes before the MPC, they will determine parking requirements at that point based on the development proposal.

MO2012.145 Berdahl, Hansen-Zacharuk moved to accept the application for extension to File 80/110 PRMS#2010-043 as presented.

Vote on Motion

4 in favor – Hansen-Zacharuk, Zariski, Berdahl, Garbutt

2 opposed - Shoff, Stanford.

Carried.

Clarification on Motion:

Art James asked for the timeframe for the extension. Council agreed that the extension would be for a one year period. Councillor Stanford recommended that the timeframe be included in the motion. Councillors Berdahl and Hansen-Zacharuk agreed for the friendly amendment to the motion.

MO2012.145A Berdahl, Hansen-Zacharuk moved to accept the application for extension to File 80/110 PRMS#2010-043 for a one year period as presented.

Vote on Motion

4 in favor – Hansen-Zacharuk, Zariski, Berdahl, Garbutt

2 opposed - Shoff, Stanford.

Carried.

8.1.2 RFD - Town Hall Relocation / Renovation Tender Award

R. Romanetz presented the tender results for the Town Hall project as well as the recommendation from the Architect, Group2. From their review, Group 2 is recommending that the contract be awarded to the low bidder, Govan Brown in the amount of \$1,741,377.00. This amount includes alternate and separate prices to include the supply and install of glass railings, new exterior windows, feature wall in Council Chambers, feature ceiling in meeting room and polyurethane insulation. The architects have advised that Govan Brown is a reputable firm with extensive experience and will be capable of doing the project as per the specifications stated. The consultant's estimate was \$2,000,000 including consulting fees. The total project cost of \$2,045,458.00, which includes a 5% contingency and professional consulting fees, falls closely within the approved capital budget of \$2M. R. Romanetz advised that the interior demolition is approximately 2-3 weeks away from being finalized and is not included in the \$2M capital budget. He further explained that a separate price for the boiler in the amount of \$200,000 has been identified and this work is not being approved at this time. It is hoped that an application through the TAME Energy Program will be approved for this work by the end of the year. He requested that the cost for the boiler be included in the 2013 budget deliberations. Administration is recommending that the tender be awarded based on the recommendation from Group 2.

MO2012.146 Shoff, Berdahl moved that Council award the tender bid for the Town Hall Relocation / Renovation Project to Govan Brown in the amount of \$1,741,377.00 (not including GST).

Discussion on Motion:

Councillor J. Garbutt stated that the true budget is closer to \$2.5M as the security system and furnishings have not been purchased. R. Romanetz advised that the furnishing budget was identified as an additional cost item and was not included in the construction budget when Council approved this project in the 2012 capital plan. He further stated that these additional costs will be expensed from the 2013 MSI (Municipal Sustainability Initiatives Grant) operating and capital grants. It is expected that the Town will receive \$1.8M from MSI dollars for 2013. Councillor J. Garbutt stated that although aesthetics may be important, he felt it may not be prudent to expend dollars for the feature wall and ceiling in a time of fiscal restraint. He further explained that there will be opportunity for displaying the culture and art of the community rather than purchasing these items. R. Romanetz stated that these details are not an extravagant cost and will improve the aesthetics of the building. Councillor T. Zariski agreed, stating that Town Hall needs to make a first impression with visitors if we want to sell the community.

Vote on Motion:

Carried unanimously.

8.2. Director of Infrastructure Services

8.3. Director of Corporate Services

8.4. Director of Community Services

9.0 PRESENTATION OF QUARTERLY REPORTS BY ADMINISTRATION

9.1 CAO's Quarterly Report from July 1st to September 30th, 2012

In response to questions from Council, R. Romanetz provided the following responses:

- BCF deficiencies are ongoing; Kiosk should be opened by third week in November;
- Town entrances – approval next 30 days;
- Town has agreed to the installation of the Rotary Rink and the first ice surface following which cleaning of the ice surface will be carried out through the Rotarians;
- Paving of areas in the downtown core where the water line was replaced will be carried out as soon as the weather cooperates;
- Pruning of trees has been carried out on the north side of BCF;
- Councillor A. Berdahl stated that the Heritage Garden looks great and extended appreciation to their Committee for their work on the project; and

- Council requested a report on the Newcastle Garden on their water consumption and where their produce was donated.
- 9.2 Director of Infrastructure Services' Quarterly Report from July 1st to September 30th, 2012
- 9.3 Director of Corporate Services' Quarterly Report from July 1st to September 30th, 2012
- 9.4 Director of Community Services' Quarterly Report from July 1st to September 30th, 2012

10.0 PUBLIC HEARING DECISIONS

11.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS

12.0 NOTICES OF MOTIONS

13.0 COUNCILLOR REPORTS

- 13.1 Councillor S. Shoff provided the results of the Communities in Bloom Friends Evaluation Category – the Town of Drumheller received four out of five blooms. She stated that the evaluation was based on tidiness, environmental actions, heritage conservation, landscaping and flower displays. Councillor D. Stanford asked if the Town was going to follow through with the recommendations. Councillor S. Shoff stated yes.

14.0 IN-CAMERA MATTERS

There being no further business, the Deputy Mayor declared the meeting adjourned at 6:35 PM.

Deputy Mayor

Chief Administrative Officer