

**CITY OF LLOYDMINSTER/COUNTY OF VERMILION RIVER NO. 24  
INTERMUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**ACTION BY**

Thursday, July 6, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. @ City Hall

PRESENT

**City of Lloydminster**

Alan Cayford, Alderman  
Herb Flieger, Alderman  
Roger Brekko, City Manager  
Rick Collins, Director of P&PW  
Kevin Ng, Urban Planner  
Sheila Girard, Recording Secretary

**County of Vermilion River #24**

Don Whittaker, Reeve  
Peter Green, Councillor  
Glenda Thomas, Administrator  
Ken Rogers, Economic Devt.  
Officer

**Consultants**

Greg Hoffman, G.T. Hofmann & Associates

REVIEW OF LAST  
MINUTES

The last minutes were reviewed. No changes were made.

IDP WRAP UP

IDP is now finalized and approved. A copy of this document is on the City's website. A draft accounting of costs was distributed. R. Brekko asked if the County had anything additional outstanding, and if not, the City will double-check these numbers and finalize the total costs for this project. The County requested an invoice be sent for their share (\$10,000).

R. POWER

PREPARATION OF  
OPERATING  
PROCEDURE FOR  
COMMITTEE

**Terms of Reference** - Committee discussed a Terms of Reference for this new Committee (similar to the LPDC). Ken Rogers will send Kevin Ng comments and Kevin Ng will prepare a draft for the Committee to review. Page 52/53 of the IDP document basically outlines what this Committee's function would be.

K. NG/  
K. ROGERS

**Record Keeping** – County suggested one location for the records. It was agreed that until the Terms of Reference were finalized, each host would set up until we get the new rules in place. In the meantime, Kevin Ng will handle the records on the City's side of things, and Ken Rogers will handle the records from the County's side of things.

K. NG/  
K. ROGERS

**Name** – "City/County Intermunicipal Liaison Committee" was agreed.

IWANIC OUTLINE  
PLAN NE ¼ 34-49-  
1-W4 CENTRE UE

R. Collins showed a draft of the Brentwood Developments proposed Outline Plan. We now have one for the entire quarter.

**Gas Line Easement** - A copy of this Outline Plan was provided a copy to Ken Rogers previously and his comments came back regarding the natural gas line that runs through the parcel. The gas line in question is currently a pipeline right-of-way and runs on the east side of Peavy Mart, and then across the Highway, and would run through the center of the proposed Brentwood Development. Ken Rogers noted this is a 200 psi line so it is considered high pressure. There is currently no intent to move this corridor. The main consideration was that nothing

**CITY OF LLOYDMINSTER/COUNTY OF VERMILION RIVER NO. 24  
INTERMUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**ACTION BY**

be built overtop other than asphalt. Initially, when Peavy Mart was proposed, it was discussed, and the County suggested it be moved totally to the roadway, so it was moved on a permanent basis, but agreed that as long as there is cathodic protection on it, it would not have to be moved. It's been there for over 30 years. Now, with the new development proposed, this issue once again comes up. Rick Collins suggested we would run it through to the back of the new development and then run it east going between the commercial and the light industrial areas and then south again along 75 Avenue. You don't want it running through residential either. Some felt it was fine where it is with what is proposed for development. Others questioned whether it was too close to the proposed building according to design standards. Depth and size would help determine this. If it has to meet grade depths and they have to move it, it might as well be moved to run right down the front of the commercial over to 75 Avenue and then south. If it is already deep enough, we should still obtain a proper Easement, and this can be requested as part of the Development Agreement process. At this point in time, it would be easier to redesign the development or where the buildings are located than to move the line, and possibly the Developer should be consulted as well. Greg Hofmann noted that there are guidelines in the Subdivision and Development Regulations, enabled by the Act, for high pressure sweet gas or sour gas lines, and legally, he thought you were allowed to build right up to the pipeline, but not over it, other than asphalt, and there are varying widths based on pressure. The City would have to regulate any setback as the Province does not accept any liability in this area. It was suggested Kevin Ng could contact the AEUB and AB Municipal Affairs to find out what the required setbacks or measurements were. If we agree that it has to be moved, the Development would pay for these costs. It impacts 3 quarters (1 ½ miles). If NUL wanted a main feeder line to feed that area, possibly they could be combined and moved. We need to plan on a corridor for future development. Moving it would be ideal, but may not be required. This decision will have to be finalized after more research, but there is no point moving it if it's not required.

R. COLLINS/  
K. ROGERS

Outline Plan – Committee reviewed Figures 1 to 6 on the Outline Plan handout. Storm Water Management was discussed in some detail. In terms of roadways, Administration has made sure the proposed development ties into the Parkview development at the southeast corner of the Plan. Ken Rogers asked what will be south of the lake? There is nothing designed yet, but it will probably include park/green space and tie into a school site. They like to be located right off main collectors. City staff are working on a Master Plan with Associated Engineering on both Sanitary and Water Servicing. They plan to come in off 75 Avenue from the east through the existing utility right-of-way easement. Development Statistics were also provided. There is very little MR showing in this quarter of the Outline Plan (2.85%), but when you get into another neighborhood, we would have to balance the

**CITY OF LLOYDMINSTER/COUNTY OF VERMILION RIVER NO. 24  
INTERMUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**ACTION BY**

percentages out. The other option is to take cash in lieu so you can purchase or trade it elsewhere, but you still have to allocate it. Ken Rogers noted that even if we are deferring the caveat, the County would still use AB Regulations of 10%. SK Regulations are proposed (5-10% split), but the County is not comfortable with using SK Regulations. Their practice is to take 10% regardless whether it is commercial or residential, however, if you develop this percentage in each neighborhood, you end up with 4 pocket parks per quarter, one in each neighborhood, and neither one is very big, virtually useless. Rather, deferring the MR allows planning for one or more larger parks or a school site space in the center of all 4 neighborhoods. It makes more sense for most of this space to be in the residential area, even if you have to take 10% of the industrial land or cash in lieu. It doesn't make sense to locate a park in an industrial area anyway. City agreed that we would still take the 10% in cash and locate the park in a future development, deferring the acres to the residential development with no forfeiting of any reserve owing. It is actually policy.

R. COLLINS/  
K. ROGERS

Approval - Rick Collins asked if the County had any other concerns other than the gas line as the City plans to move ahead within the next week or so on this Outline Plan. There were none. Roger Brekko asked about procedure and if we should have a motion from each Council approving the Outline Plan before proceeding with anything in the IDP area? We have to be careful we don't delay the process by taking too much time to obtain these approvals, as Development Permits could end up pending on these approvals, but to jointly approve would be preferred. This particular one is on City land and is more just for the County's information, but it is within the IDP area. It was felt that a motion similar to what the City provides on the County's proposed subdivisions would suffice. The County would not essentially be approving the Outline Plan, but accepting as information and offering comments or objections if they had any, but the City would formally approve the Outline Plan. The City can advise their Council that they have met with the County on the matter and then we're not holding up the Development. Process has to be consistent with both parties all the way through.

**MOVED by Alan Cayford, Seconded by Don Whittaker, that the Intermunicipal Liaison Committee recommends the Brentwood Developments Outline Plan to their respective Councils for approval/acceptance, subject to the Easement Plan being finalized. CARRIED.**

**ADMINISTRATION**

WIST STORM  
WATER DRAINAGE

On the Cliff Wist development, we were requesting a License from Alberta Environment with regard to the dugout/pumpout system proposed. They have replied that they will not issue a license since this was an established drainage already. Now the County needs to seek approval from City on Dave Marts Report of the outflow at 45 litres per second, which is currently what the gravity feed is for the

**CITY OF LLOYDMINSTER/COUNTY OF VERMILION RIVER NO. 24  
INTERMUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**ACTION BY**

pump. They have a Development Agreement prepared for Cliff Wist to sign, but prior to sending it out, will strike the reference to AB Environment's license. They now require confirmation from the City on whether they feel the outflow/discharge coming from the pump at this proposed rate is acceptable. Associated Engineering has indicated that 25 litres per second is the recommended minimum rate. If the pumping takes place during a major rainstorm during the construction period, it could probably overflow and flood out the development, so until there is a permanent channel is created, there should be a requirement to phone before he pumps and preferably, only pump Monday to Friday. Going back to a gravity system in the long-term is being recommended.

Drainage of the entire area was discussed. To get to the drainage pond (northeast corner of County Energy Park), this has to be connected to a proper channel someday down the road (40 metres is required for a storm channel). One option is to drain along the railway track. The other option would be to talk to Glenda and Terry Elkow and try to secure a channel going straight east from the outfall from all properties on the south side of the Highway where development is proposed that connects to the existing storm channel. If that route is better and addresses the entire area, maybe we should pursue that one for the long term from an Area Structure Plan perspective. The only thing is it should be outside the 150 foot north/south arterial (Range Road 13). A short ditch along RR 13 from the proposed Developer, which would also act as storage, draining to a culvert to the north, would work in the meantime, until we're at the next stage. We have no report on the proposed Agland or Car Wash sites either to see where their flows will go. These will all tie into a Master Plan. Securing a storm channel would add value to the lands involved as the surface drainage is already figured out, so there is a plus for the Elkows, too, as it would make their land more easily saleable or developable. We can have backup options, but the best direction would be a drainage channel and would have to discuss it with Elkows. The City and the County, along with Greg Hofmann, could best deal with it as an Area Structure Plan issue and see if we can get their buy in. There is a chain reaction of things waiting that can be tied into this, so the sooner we figure this out, the better. This ties in with all the proposed Development on the south side of the Highway, running east and west. We have another ILC Meeting scheduled for July 20<sup>th</sup> and can put this back on the Agenda for that Meeting. In the interim, we can set up a meeting with Elkows and try and get some direction to report back to that next meeting. July 18<sup>th</sup> @ 4:00 p.m. was suggested as a date that would work with everyone (Glenda, Ken, Roger, Rick and Greg) to meet with the Elkows. Greg Hofmann will call and set it up.

G. HOFMANN

The Cliff Wist drainage matter was put on hold until we have had a chance to discuss a storm channel right-of-way with the Elkows.

NEXT MEETING

**CITY OF LLOYDMINSTER/COUNTY OF VERMILION RIVER NO. 24  
INTERMUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**ACTION BY**

Ken Rogers noted that with regard to RR13, Page 44 of the IDP document, Clause 4.8(b) references sufficient road widening to the 150 foot right-of-way along the “Highway Bypass”, not the arterials, but the section is labeled arterials. He asked if we plan on obtaining the 150 feet on RR 13 as this is an arterial and he has to talk to Cliff Wist about this. RR 13 is 100 feet now, so we would require 25 feet more on each side, so another 50 feet in total. He would like to refer to the IDP document. It was agreed that the 150 foot requirement was the assumption made throughout the document, but if that wording ever gets challenged, we need to ensure we have documented backup on this matter. Greg Hofmann will look through the IDP document once more as he feels that was the intention that this would apply to all arterial roadways and it is noted in the document somewhere, or if not, should have been. All agreed.

G. HOFMANN

Peter Green noted that Alberta Transportation has requested the Developer pay for the acceleration and deceleration lanes on and off Highway #16 at RR 14, on the proposed Agland development, which is going to be a major cost. This may end up being the case with RR 13 adjacent property owners as well (just a heads up). Agland is in the process of appealing this, however, have run into some time contraventions, so not sure what the outcome will be. Don Whittaker noted that 5 municipalities and some oil companies made a presentation to the Government about the impact heavy oil traffic has on our infrastructure in our region and the role transportation plays in our economy, and they have requested the Minister to come down regarding the Agland issue along with a few others, but it looks like this won't be until possibly August. In Strathcona, they have an Area Study and Alberta Transportation is covering all the costs of the work done along Highway #16 up there. Possibly we should consider doing a Corridor Plan as well. Not knowing the reason they are covering these costs, it should be researched further first. It may have been work that they had on their list anyway. Most of our Highway traffic is proposed to migrate to Airport road or 12 Street, so they may even want to spend less on Highway #16 itself.

INFORMATION

**AREA STRUCTURE  
PLANS**

**Priorities of Municipalities** – A list will have to be created, however, we will have to deal with hot spots as we go. Those on the list to address immediately are:

1. RR13 South
2. RR14 South
3. East of County Energy Park – drainage and road issues.
4. Everything on both sides of the tracks and north and south of the Highway (4-5 quarters) – drainage and road issues.

(Associated is already looking at the area north of the tracks, north of Kromrey (Quist), which will ultimately tie into the areas listed above that the County would like to address. Won't have this until later this

**CITY OF LLOYDMINSTER/COUNTY OF VERMILION RIVER NO. 24  
INTERMUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**ACTION BY**

year or next year. Associated will try to incorporate the Northwest Drainage Plan with this work.)

*(Greg – you might want to clarify this list and the locations better in #4 above – it was pretty hard to decipher when you were all discussing a map that I didn't have. I think they were talking about 4-5 specific quarter sections.)*

**Proposed Terms of Reference/Budget** – Tentative Terms of Reference was attached to the last meeting. Lots of things impinge on it. There are already things in the IDP that are important to address. It is a specifically tailored direct control district. We need to get a regulation and implementation layer so there is a district in place that this will fall under. There are little bush fires that will need attention in the meantime in addition to the list of priorities. As an Urban Expansion Area Structure Plan, there is no template to follow. What we need to do is identify the major variables that have to be planned around. Once those are nailed down at a reasonable level of certainty, that's the first phase. Then you look at what can occur in the interim. It is important that there is a lot of direct contact with the landowner base inside the Plan. This is a manageable group of people. There should be an open invitation for them to contact Greg Hofmann and he will contact them as often as necessary so they understand what is happening around them, as an Area Structure Plan involves them directly. The difficulty is that it doesn't lend itself easily to a process, budget, and timeline. Greg Hofmann indicated he would prefer to see it work or progress as quickly as things will unfold. What will end up happening is over the course of a few months, it should continuously unfold and come to conclusion before Alberta municipal elections next year, hopefully, being done by the end of next spring (before June/07). City has municipal elections this year, but the vast majority of the affected land is in the County, so this shouldn't be an big issue. With regard to Budget, once Greg Hofmann has come up with the list and the proposed timelines, we can more accurately prepare the Budget.

G. HOFMANN

**Proposed Cost Sharing** – This can also be finalized once the Budget is proposed. The IDP Budget was mainly for the City's use, so the majority of this cost would be theirs, but with the Area Structure Plan, it mostly affects the County lands. It was suggested it could be pro-rated out by the areas as we go. As each area is developed, the plan is to pass this cost onto the Development. Eventually, the Developer will pay these costs, but the initial cash flow needs to be handled. The 10% solution is what is being proposed, and this will cost the Developer far less than doing all the drainage and roadway plans himself, as you can't only plan for the quarter the development is on, but to plan responsibly, you have to look at all the quarters surrounding the area as well. We need to apply for cost sharing from the Province. As soon as Greg Hofmann forwards the Budget numbers, each municipality can take it back to their respective

**CITY OF LLOYDMINSTER/COUNTY OF VERMILION RIVER NO. 24  
INTERMUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**ACTION BY**

Councils for resolution, and then it can be submitted to the Province as a joint project. The next Council Meetings are July 17<sup>th</sup> for the City and July 18<sup>th</sup> for the County. Greg Hofmann will tie the cost sharing into the proposal he brings back on the Budget.

G. HOFMANN

LETTER TO  
ALBERTA ON  
FUNDING

As discussed above, we should have the numbers and get this process approved at the next Council Meetings, and then we have have both the Mayor and the Reeve sign a letter to submit with the package to the Province. This should be ready to go by the next meeting on July 20, 2006.

INFORMATION

CITY  
DEVELOPMENT IN  
IDP AREA

Information on a proposed hangar at the Airport was distributed. This is not in the IDP area, but the City just wanted to keep the County updated on what is developing. Brentwood was already covered.

INFORMATION

COUNTY  
DEVELOPMENT IN  
IDP AREA

The County is mailing regular notification to the City as they come up. Haven't changed the zoning yet from noted in the IDP document. but they will notify the City on this as well. Most changes are acreages being bought up and converted to storage facilities that are oil-related. The County is going to work on an Area Structure Plan for a larger land use area, further south, and where the rezoning is taking place. Their plan to have it done by the end of June next year. The smaller ASP's will be supplement to this larger one. The Committee indicated they would like to see this happen sooner than next June so it all can be tied in with the new Zoning Bylaw and any Plan Lloydminster updates at the same time. The County will get the Bylaws going to rezone the lands noted in the IDP document (Page 66).

COUNTY  
ADMINISTRATION

ANY OTHER  
MATTERS

None.

NEXT MEETING  
AGENDA ITEMS

Next Meeting is July 20, 2006, at 9:00 a.m. @ the County Office.

Some Agenda Items:

- Elkow Meeting Discussion
- Wist Storm Water Drainage
- Submission to Alberta on Funding

Future dates were noted at the bottom of the Agenda. The alternate date of September 7 was chosen rather than August 24 as Alan and Greg are both away in August, so it was agreed that August 24 will be cancelled and September 7 will go ahead. August 10 – Glenda Thomas is away, and September 21, Alan Cayford is away, but those dates will remain as is for now. If we don't foresee a need as we go, we can always cancel them then.

COMMITTEE  
MEMBERS

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by that the meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m. CARRIED.