



County of St. Paul – Red Tape Reduction Project

Engagement Summary

June 2021

1. Introduction

ISL Engineering and Land Services was retained by the County of St. Paul (the County) to undertake a review of its Municipal Development Plan (MDP), Land Use Bylaw (LUB), General Municipal Servicing Standards (GMSS) and Reserve Lands Management Policy (RLMP) to identify and minimize “red tape” inefficiencies in accordance with provincial guidelines. In summary, red tape is broadly defined by the Alberta Government as “relieving the regulatory burden on business and promoting economic growth, improving government service delivery through digital transformation, and reducing costs and saving time for Albertans”. Through this review, the County expects to have more streamlined planning and development policies and regulations, resulting in more efficient and effective services to landowners and businesses.

The purpose of this Engagement Summary document is to describe the engagement activities, record the feedback received, and begin the policy and regulation update phase of the Red Tape Reduction Project.

2. Engagement Process

A key component of this project is engagement with a wide range of interests, namely County Council, Administration, key stakeholders, and the public, to obtain a diverse spectrum of thoughts about the barrier’s stakeholders have experienced when using the County’s planning documents.

The engagement activities and stakeholders included:

1. A workshop with County Administration,
2. A workshop with County Council,
3. Stakeholder interviews, and
4. A public survey.

The feedback collected from these activities is summarized in this report and will be used to identify solutions to update the County’s MDP, LUB, GMSS, and RLMP.

3. County Administration Workshop

On February 17, 2021 County Administration met with ISL to flag their MDP, LUB, and RLMP “red tape” concerns. The concerns primarily focused on MDP and LUB items that prohibited or hindered subdivision and development and/or the decision making process. Proposed solutions included new definitions for multi-lot development, visual representation of multi-lot development scenarios, clarity of on-site access locations, reducing requirements for accessory buildings, and reducing the duplication created by the RLMP. The concerns and proposed solutions are described in **Appendix A**.



4. County Council Workshop

On February 25, 2021 County Council met with County Administration and ISL to flag their MDP, LUB, and RLMP “red tape” concerns. The concerns primarily focused on the number of parcels subdivided from a quarter section, and their lot area and method of sanitary sewage. Discussion also focused on accessory buildings, encroachments, secondary suites, and stormwater management on private property and reserve lands. Proposed solutions included: 5 lots allowed on a quarter section (including the balance); the preservation of agricultural land; 20 acre farmsteads; three sheds/parcel; property surveys; sharing water and sewer services; and, movable structures on reserve lands. The concerns and proposed solutions are described in in **Appendix B**.

5. County Administration Workshop

On March 18, 2021 County Administration met with ISL to flag their GMSS “red tape” concerns. The concerns primarily focused on development standards, pavement structures, ditch grades, culvert sizes, ASP requirements, variances to standards, the need for development agreements, and road slopes and specifications. The concerns and proposed solutions are described in in **Appendix C**.

6. Stakeholder Interviews

County Administration requested interviews with stakeholders who frequently or recently participated in the County’s planning and development processes. The County and ISL developed nine interview questions designed to gather feedback to identify red tape barriers and solutions to address those barriers. Eight stakeholders were identified and invited to discuss their experiences. Seven agreed to participate in the interviews, while one stakeholder did not return calls to participate. An alternate stakeholder was invited to participate and declined. ISL conducted the interviews via Teams and Zoom between March 24 and April 9, 2021.

The interviews were scheduled for 30 minutes and consisted of a semi-structured conversation guided by the interview questions. The questions asked of each stakeholder is provided in **Appendix D**.

Table 1 provides a list of the number of interviews, when they occurred, the participant, and the interviewer.

Table 1 Interview Schedule

| Interview # | Date/Time | Stakeholder/ Occupation/Organization | Interviewer |
|-------------|----------------------------|--|------------------|
| 1 | March 24, 2021 10:00 AM | Connie Petersen/Project Manager/Explore Surveys | Nathalia Schwind |
| 2 | March 26, 2021 1:30 PM | Lisa Gordon/Development and Planning Technologist/Alberta Transportation | Mitch Braun |
| 3 | March 29, 2021 11:00 AM | Leo Demoissac/Private Developer | Nathalia Schwind |
| 4 | March 30, 2021 11:00 AM | Linda Sallstrom/Economic Development Officer/St. Paul – Elk Point Economic Development Alliance | Mitch Braun |
| 5 | March 31, 2021 10:00 AM | Tyler Poirier/Broker/Century 21 | Nathalia Schwind |



| | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|-------------|
| 6 | April 1, 2021 10:00 AM | Rob Hippisley/Broker/Coldwell Banker Cartier Realty | Mitch Braun |
| 7 | April 9, 2021 9:30 AM | Tony Noel/Private Developer | Mitch Braun |

7. Summary of Stakeholder Interview Feedback

The following is a summary of the feedback received from the stakeholder interviews. This summary identifies common themes that emerged throughout the interview process, which may inform revisions to the County's MDP, LUB, GMSS, and RLMP.

1. Understanding of regulations and approval processes

- Clear submission requirements are needed to ensure transparency and that the requirements are not perceived as arbitrary. More upfront communication and professional guidance from the County is required.
- The need to hire specialized professionals (i.e. lawyers, surveyors, or planners) to interpret regulations and handle applications for subdivisions and developments where the process should be straightforward.
- Area Structure Plans and other studies are perceived to create an unfair financial burden.
- Receiving conflicting or inconsistent advice from the County. These sorts of encounters create an antithetical impression with respect to the County's "open for business" aspirations.

2. Prioritization of subdivision and development applications

- Lack of differentiation and prioritization of development by type or scale ("one-size fits all" approach).
- Certain uses are regulated too strictly for the impacts they create on and off site.
- Excessive requirements and/or timelines for "minor" developments is a cause for frustration and often results in applicants deciding not to develop or develop elsewhere.
- More efficiency in the approval process is desired, especially in the context of post-pandemic economic recovery.

3. Document legibility

- Illustrations and diagrams can be used to help clarify concepts and interpret regulations.
- Add hyperlinks throughout the document for easy of navigation.
- The County's online GIS services are underutilized and could be used illustrate policies and regulations.

4. Proactive measures to support development and economic recovery (see Interview #4 below)

- Anticipating the types of development that the County is most likely to encounter in the future can tailor policy and development requirements to mitigate "red tape" barriers and facilitate open for business goals. For example: agricultural lands near airport nodes, urban areas, and



highway corridors will be “vectors” for future development based on current economic trends; rural industrial uses, such as processing facilities, are being encouraged as a strategy to diversify and enhance the agricultural sector; the aircraft industry is drawing expansion interest, leading to clustering around airports; and, the region has seen an influx of properties purchased for the development of uses that support tourism. These lands are primarily located around lakes and natural areas. The County might see an increase on development permit applications for uses such as bed and breakfast establishments and recreational uses.

5. Other

- a. Perceived lack of transparency in recognizing compliance certificates.
- b. Having to engage legal counsel or incur in additional construction costs to rectify contraventions that were previously signed-off on by the County.
- c. Having to look for legal alternatives to bypass LUB requirements that are perceived as useless and unfair, which has the potential to create even bigger issues down the road.
- d. Lack of clarity and usability of transitional regulations, regulations for non-conforming uses, and variances.

8. Online Survey

In addition to the stakeholder interviews, a survey was developed to engage all County ratepayers. The survey was extensively promoted by the County, including a media release issued the day the survey went live to alert residents of the opportunity to provide feedback. Supplemental advertisements were placed in the County-wide newsletter and communicated via radio spots. The County dedicated a space on their website to promote the survey throughout its accessible window and reflected this information on its Facebook page. **Appendix E** illustrates the examples of survey promotion.

The survey, placed on the County's website, went live on April 30, 2021 and ran through to May 30, 2021. A printed copy of the survey was made available upon request.

Despite the high level of promotion, two respondents took part in the survey. The survey questions and responses are provided in **Appendix F**.

9. Public Engagement Key Findings

Both the Stakeholder Interview and Online Survey questions were tailored to obtain precise feedback on the topic of red tape inefficiencies in the County's MDP, LUB, GMSS and RLMP. The following key themes were found:

1. Participants did not raise issue with the language, format, organization, or availability of these documents. For example, the organization of the LUB was seen as positive. This included its inclusion of illustrative figures that supplement written requirements (i.e. setback distances, building heights and floor-area-ratios). However, additional drawings and hyperlinks between the MDP, LUB and online GIS information system was recommended.
2. Participants cited “unknown” subdivision and development permit submission requirements as a barrier to development and a key red tape reduction item. Several participants expressed a feeling of



being “blindsided” by requirements they did not anticipate and felt assistance from the County in making them aware of these requirements was lacking. In these scenarios timelines and costs were extended beyond initial expectations. It was advised that these issues can be addressed or mitigated through a required pre-application meeting, a review and edit of the list of requirements in the MDP and LUB, and/or a reduction in the number of application submission requirements, or some combination of the above. The County’s online information regarding its planning and development processes was found to be a great resource that applicants should be directed to in order to assist in understanding requirements, timelines and costs and with general expectation setting.

3. Some participants questioned how the County sets priorities on the development applications it receives and believed there should be higher priority given to larger scale proposals representing higher market and pay rate values. However, the County is beholden to legislated timelines and setting a priority on development based on size or monetary value is counter to an equitable process. In some instances, municipalities have designated “liaisons” to guide large/complex projects through the development process. This approach is outside the regulations of a LUB but may be considered within a MDP policy framework. The risk... inequity and fairness.
4. Restrictive requirements in the MDP and LUB, i.e. the requirement for ASPs, motivated applicants to engage legal counsel and find ways to bypass those requirements. It was noted this has the potential to create even bigger issues in the future. Participants recommend removal of these policies or regulations, or at least some discretion in their implementation.

10. Next Steps

1. Administration to review feedback.
2. Administration and ISL to discuss policy, regulation and process priorities pertaining to the project.
3. ISL to provide recommendations for MDP, LUB, GMSS and RLMP updates.



APPENDIX
Administration Meeting Records

A



4015 7 Street SE, Calgary AB T2G 2Y9, T: 403.254.0544 F: 403.254.9186

Meeting: **St. Paul Administration Workshop on Red Tape Reduction** Meeting Time: **10:00 pm**
Client: **County of St. Paul** Meeting Date: **February 17, 2021**
Location: **Teams** Meeting No.: **01**
In Attendance: Sheila Kitz, Chelsey Cartron, Tammy Goddu, Jane Dauphinee, Gary Buchanan, David Schoor, Mitch Braun Prepared By: **Mitch Braun**
Distribution: **All Attendees**

The subjects discussed and decisions reached are summarized in the following record. Please notify the author of any errors or omissions. If no comments are received within 7 days this record is considered correct.

| Item | Description | Action By |
|------------|--|-----------|
| 1.0 | Welcome | |
| | <p>Introductions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introductions were made<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Sheila explained that Gary will be assist the County <p>Overview of Workshop Purpose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In line with Minister's recent directive, the County is looking to achieve red tape reductions with respect to planning and development process.• "Red Tape Reduction" as broadly defined by the Alberta Government: <i>Relieving the regulatory burden on business and promoting economic growth, improving government service delivery through digital transformation, and reducing costs and saving time for Albertans.</i> <p>Overview of Workshop Agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Agenda was reviewed, and attendees asked if any other subject(s) should be added for discussion:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The primary additional subject brought up was the General Municipal Services Standards (GMSS) and that ASP processes are nested here and in other locations (MDP)○ This information will be removed form the GMSS and live in the MDP alone | |
| 2.0 | MDP Red Tape Reduction | |
| | Specific MDP sections (per agenda) were discussed with primary focus during this discussion relating to: | |

| | | |
|------------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of parcels on agriculturally zoned lands. If the policy states a maximum of 4 parcels subdivided (before triggering a land use amendment) does this total include / consider the remnant e.g. 5 titles? Language like this could lead to disputes regarding requirements, approvals, etc. Solutions that are clear and equitable are sought with respect to development/density on agricultural lands. Solution: make it clear that 5 lots (titles) maximum is allowed (this should be a Council discussion item). ○ Definition of Multi-lot development needs to be reviewed. ○ Visual representations of multi-lot development scenarios could aid in decision making. ○ Agricultural land values can be difficult to determine and a methodology that is transparent with consistently applied metrics is required. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council feels it unreasonable to limit the number of parcels-out in areas where agricultural land is not realistically as valuable as other agriculturally zoned areas. Feel their hands are tied by policy when a goal is to encourage multi-lot development. ▪ Options for land value determination include Canada Land Inventory, the County's assessment data, MuniSight (which shows a percentage value for agricultural lands which could be reflected in policy). ▪ Other requirements/considerations (e.g. pump-outs) • Roundtable / Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Requiring Development Agreements (2.2.2) can lead to DA's that are meaningless but require processing resources ○ County's claim to 30 meter road widening needs be made clear and taken in accordance with bylaw to reduce dispute ○ Clearer definitions (e.g. Collector Roads) ○ Environmental Policy and wetland setbacks: more clarity on nature of reserves and flexibility in policy to consider context of specific developments ○ Clarity on IDP and ASP locations within the County, GIS mapping tool. ○ The County's Subdivision Authority is not in favor of easements for access and will seek demonstrative physical and legal access. | |
| 3.0 | LUB Red Tape Reduction | |
| | <p>Specific LUB sections (per agenda) were discussed with primary focus during this discussion suggesting red tape issues with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parcel Sizes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Presently difficult for proper assessments or enforcement ○ Landowners aren't sure of exact property lines ○ Lack of clarity on what to include in parcel area (wetland area, shelter belt) • Clarity on Authorities • Clearer reflection of MGA information for decision making • Overlap and/or inconsistency between MDP and LUB (e.g. density / first parcel out). • Accessory Buildings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Too many hoops to go through for small "accessory" sheds, etc. | |

| | | |
|------------|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Make it a permitted use or no permit required if under 100 square feet not permit required ○ Time, cost and safety code issue for Administration ● Roundtable / Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Give Council an opportunity on February 25, 2021 to discuss their concerns. ○ Administration and MPS will provide LUB “red tape” lists to ISL ○ Agreement with the red tape reductions in LUB policy as presented by ISL ○ Of these the most time was spent discussing Section 7.17 – what are tolerance thresholds with respect to GFA. Further discussion with Council required. | |
| 4.0 | Reserve Lands Red Tape Reduction | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reserve policy lives in three places: standalone Municipal and Reserve Lands Regulation Bylaw (Bylaw 2017-11), MDP and LUB ● This speaks to the importance the County places on this matter, however nesting this policy in three places may be overkill and there are contradictions in content. ● For instance, a common issue relates to access to water through MR (for lake lots). This is addressed in some reserve policy but not all, so rules become unclear. ● Bylaw 2017-11 DS covers a lot of territory (e.g. policies and regulations with respect to license agreements) content that may be better suited to go into LUB. ● Keeping in mind the goal of reducing red tape some options for streamlining the reserve process may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bylaw 2017-11 policy rescinded; remnants ported to MDP with the LUB ○ Bylaw 2017-11 edited, MDP addresses policy items, LUB regulations/implementation. ○ approval for reserve lands could be developed into a separate, streamlined process. <p>Present Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ISL will review the existing policy and determine whether it makes sense to move part or all of Bylaw 2017-11 to the MDP and/or LUB. | |
| 5.0 | Next Steps | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● County Administration, Jane and Gary will provide lists of opportunities they have identified in policy for reducing red tape inefficiencies. ● Council Session February 25 to discuss the “Red Tape” project ● ISL to interview identified stakeholders re: MDP, LUB and Reserve Lands issues. | <p>County, MPS and Gary</p> <p>Red Tape Team</p> <p>County to identify stakeholders</p> |



APPENDIX
Council Meeting Records

B



4015 7 Street SE, Calgary AB T2G 2Y9, T: 403.254.0544 F: 403.254.9186

Meeting: **St. Paul Council Workshop on Red Tape Reduction** Meeting Time: **1:00 pm**
 Client: **County of St. Paul** Meeting Date: **February 25, 2021**
 Location: **Virtual - Zoom** Meeting No.: **02**
 In Attendance: **County:** Sheila Kitz, Gary Buchanan, Cliff Martin, Darrell Younghans, Maxine Fodness, Chelsey Cartron, Kevin Wirsta, Laurent Amyotte, Steve Upham, Arlene Shwetz, Betty Richard, Daniel Reid, Phyllis Corbiere, Tammy Goddu and Tim Mahdiuk; **ISL:** David Schoor and Nathalia Schwind. Prepared By: **Nathalia Schwind**
 Distribution: **All Attendees**

The subjects discussed and decisions reached are summarized in the following record. Please notify the author of any errors or omissions. If no comments are received within 7 days this record is considered correct.

| Item | Description | Action By |
|------------|---|-----------|
| 1.0 | Welcome | |
| | <p>Introductions</p> <p>Overview of Project Scope and Definition of Red Tape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In line with Minister's recent directive, the County is looking to update the GMSS, MDP, LUB and Reserve Lands policies to reduce red tape. Reduction of red tape means easing the regulatory burden for individuals and business to advance economic goals while keeping healthy regulations that protect the public interest. This project will be implemented in three phases. Phase 1 connecting with Administration, Council, and stakeholders to identify where red tape or bottle neck regulations and policies might be, and explore ideas to resolve these issues. Phase 2 reviews the input collected in Phase 1, and develops recommendations to the County's GMSS, MDP, LUB and Reserve Lands policies. Phase 3 provides recommendations to Administration and Council with the proposed changes to ensure alignment with the intentions and directives of the County, and approve these changes through the appropriate processes. The timeline of this project is four to five months. Based on the input provided by Sheila Kitz and her administrative team in a previous meeting, a few issues were identified for discussion with Council. The agenda, which was distributed to participants prior to the meeting, contains a list of proposed changes. Participants were encouraged to review these items on their own and provide any comments or concerns they might have. | |
| 2.0 | MDP Red Tape Reduction | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> David and Sheila opened the discussion on MDP policies by explaining that there are conflicting regulations regarding the number and size of parcels allowed to be subdivided from a quarter section zoned for agricultural uses. Sheila asked Council to provide direction. Council comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The County's policy has always been to allow for 4 parcels out plus the balance of the quarter section, for a total of 5 titles in one agricultural quarter section. | |

| | | |
|------------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There should be an exception made for fragmented lands (e.g. fragmented by water courses, roads, etc.) since some are largely unsuitable for agricultural operations. ○ The bottom line is to preserve agricultural land, the main objective of the County should be to preserve most of the quarter section for agriculture. ○ Diagrams or illustrations could be added to clarify the maximum total number of parcels within a quarter section – whether it be 4 parcels out plus the balance (for a total of 5 parcels), or 3 parcels out plus the balance (for a total of 4 parcels). ○ The maximum size for a farmstead subdivision should be 20 ac. ○ The size of the subdivisions will determine the type of servicing infrastructure provided. For instance, the location of a pumpout requires a little over 10 ac of land, provided the parcel is square. Less than 10 ac would call for a field or holding tank. ○ The County should provide some flexibility in the maximum size of farmstead subdivisions. A maximum size of 22 ac would accommodate 2 pumpouts. ○ Council is supposed to act as environmental stewards of the land. Providing for minimum parcel sizes that can easily accommodate pumpouts will encourage this type of servicing structure. Council needs to create more environmentally focused regulations without necessarily adding more red tape. ○ If people want to subdivide under different standards (e.g. more lots out of a quarter section or different lot sizes) they would need to go through the process of rezoning to Country Residential. The County won't hinder this, but will make sure that agricultural land is protected. ● David and Sheila wrapped up the discussion, concluding that the MDP will be amended to provide clarity on number of subdivisions and total number of titled parcels that can exist within an agricultural quarter section. Diagrams and illustrations may be needed to aid on this, | |
| 3.0 | LUB Red Tape Reduction | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● David opened the discussion on LUB regulations by explaining that one of the main issues that Administration has identified with this document is the need of a development permit to build a shed. He asked Council for their opinion about the inclusion of sheds in the list of development not requiring a development permit, as long as the minimum yards and other LUB regulations are met. ● Sheila and Chelsey added that sheds are currently discretionary uses in some districts and there are LUB regulations limiting their size. This creates a big financial burden for people, not to mention a long wait. Some landowners even skip the permitting process and build their sheds without a permit. ● Council comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The LUB should make it easier to build a shed, as long as the maximum number of sheds remains at 3. ○ Sheds should be a permitted use; it doesn't make sense that the permit costs more than building the shed. ○ Another issue to consider is the distinction between sheds and other structures, like garages. The size and foundation should determine whether a structure is considered a shed. If it is located on a permanent foundation, like a cement pad, it would be considered a garage, but if it is placed on skids it should be allowed without the need for a permit (Chelsey clarified that any structure over 107 ft² requires a permit regardless of what it is). | |

| | | |
|------------|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There needs to be clarity as to where sea cans fall. They cannot be considered sheds as there are aesthetic and other considerations needed to regulate them. The LUB should have a definition for sea cans and regulate them separately. • Sheila commented that a property survey may be needed to avoid encroachments into municipal lands and neighbouring property. This would add some upfront cost to development but would save time and effort down the road when the owners want to sell and are required to get a compliance certificate. No additional discussion followed. • Sheila added that an important item to discuss with Council was whether the County would like to allow a second residence on a parcel. • Council comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This has been allowed in the past in the form of mobile homes installed on a parcel where there is already a residence to make accommodations for family members. ○ Secondary suites are also provided for in the LUB. ○ What is the minimum parcel size for a second residence (Chelsey advised that its currently 9.9 ac). ○ Would the County require separate water and septic systems for the two residences? It could be shared if the land is under a single title. If the parcel is only 5 ac, for instance, both houses would have to share servicing. ○ Some people will use this as an opportunity to accommodate family members, others will try to profit from it. The County needs to regulate this. • Council discussed road standards and development permit applications on land adjacent to roads that are not built to municipal standards. David to consult with Sean Novak and get back to Council with a recommendation. In the meantime, David mentioned that the upgrade and/or maintenance of the road could be worked out as part of the conditions of approval or through a development agreement. | |
| 4.0 | Reserve Lands Red Tape Reduction | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David introduced the discussion on Reserve Lands by explaining that reserve policies are currently addressed in three different places: the MDP, the LUB and the Reserve Land Bylaw. This adds confusion, which could result in problems with implementation. He asked Council if they have experienced issues with this and how they think these can be corrected. • Sheila added that Administration has had issues with bylaw enforcement. She asked what the main objective for reserve lands is and how far does Council want to go in terms of enforcing this objective. • Council comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The County needs a streamlined and fair process to deal with encroachments whenever assessors and surveyors identify these issues. ○ It is important to have a consistent approach. For instance, is the encroaching structure movable and how long it has been on reserve lands. Council needs to retain some discretion to make decisions on a case-by-case basis while having a framework for consistency in decision-making. ○ It is important to ensure that all the documents addressing reserve lands are in alignment and clear about the regulations and enforcement process. The reasons for enforcement need to be laid out as well as the tools and processes to carry it out. ○ There should also be some flexibility so the County doesn't waste time and resources on smaller cases that have no real adverse impacts. | |

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is there any way the County's rules can be compared to minimum provincial statutory requirements? (In response: yes). It is important to make a distinction between what constitutes provincial jurisdiction and what is the responsibility of the County. ○ The County cannot fix every single issue that is there currently, but it needs to prevent future issues. • Council raised an additional concern regarding the practice of diverting water from private property into municipal infrastructure. Sheila indicated that this is a stormwater management issue. David proposed that the LUB could partially address this by stating that landowners must deal with drainage on their own properties, without affecting municipal infrastructure or neighbouring properties. | |
| 5.0 | <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The next steps: prepare meeting notes, share them with participants, gather additional comments, and conduct stakeholder interviews. • Sheila asked Council if they can think of anyone that would be a good candidate for the stakeholder interviews. • Council responded that real estate agents might be a good choice. The County did not receive any rezoning applications in 2020, most likely due to the requirement to adopt an ASP. The high cost of preparing an ASP creates a deterrent for new development. • Sheila commented that if the County does not require rezoning to be done through an ASP process there could be potential issues at the development permit stage, when developers are required to provide geotechnical studies which may show that the proposed development is not a good fit for the land. • Council comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the use of the land does not change considerably there should be no requirement for an ASP as this can cause businesses to locate in other municipalities. ○ The County could adopt an ASP tiering system to reduce the cost for developers while ensuring that the development is appropriate for the land. The more complex the development, the more studies are required from the developer. • David and Sheila thanked all participants for their attendance. The meeting was adjourned. | |



APPENDIX
GMSS Update Meeting

C

Meeting Topics – Meeting comments are in red

1. Any more standard details? Only road cross section in the current standards – **Sounds like low priority due to lack of private development.**
2. Geotechnical Testing requirements? Specifics
3. 3.3 - Two services within the same trench – Pipe separation should be included in the ROW width
4. PDF page 33 – Road Class 1-5 - Confirm surface type – **Updates have been previously discussed. Linda to confirm if a draft document has been created and will send to Sean.**
5. Minimum Pavement Structures – Review - **Updates have been previously discussed. Linda to confirm if a draft document has been created and will send to Sean.**
6. 4.3.5 – Sidewalks – Still want sidewalk on both side of roadway? – **No comments**
7. Ditch Grade – Issues with 0.5% ditch grade? – **Open to variance when 0.5% is unachievable.**
8. Minimum Culvert Size? – **Approach agreements states that a 400mm is the minimum culvert size.**
9. 5.6.2.1 – PDF page 39 – Runoff Coefficient - Review
10. 5.7.1 - PDF Page 43 – Lot Grading – 4% away from building – Should it be 2m @ 10%? – **Construction Manager thinks 4% is very flat. No other comments.**
11. General Lot slope at 1% - Should it be 2%? – **No comments**
12. PDF page 45 – Have they had any odour issues? – **No issues currently**
13. PDF page 50 – Auguring service connections – Why cant they be open trenched with uniform backfill? – **They currently allow open trenching depending on the situation. GMSS will need to be updated to reflect this.**
14. PDF page 57 – Delete manhole table? Every manhole should be sized a case by case basis
15. PDF page 57 - Safety Grates still required? – **No comments**
16. PDF page 58 - 2% slope on services?

Notes from the meeting**ASP**

- Example – West of town there is an existing building on a parcel – Someone wants to put a smaller building up for a small business – Needed an ASP to rezone from agricultural to commercial and the developer walked away.
- Rezoning and multi lot – require ASP
- Unclear in the standards when an ASP is required. Looking for some flexibility depending on what kind of development is happening.
- Have to follow the MGA at minimum
- ASP can get expensive depending on what the municipality requires for reports, modeling, etc.

Subdivisions

- Example - existing 800m roadway – Subdivision request at the end of the roadway – The county is wondering if it's typically to force the developer to build the entire 800m roadway that is required for access to the subdivisions up to the standards in the GMSS – Wondering if a variance from the standards for an offsite road due to proposed development being on the end of an existing gravel road. The road will be maintained by the county.
- Flexibility? Variance? – Slippery slope if its given for one developer and not another
- Boat Launch – Standard boat launch? – County completed an engineered boat launch at Stony Lake – Governed by Alberta Environment
- Development agreement is overwhelming for single acreage development when all they need is an approach and/or road widening. A MISA type agreement would be better for this application
- Requirements if a paved or gravel road is required for a subdivision is in the development agreement

Signage

- Looking to create a standard for Election Signage – land use bylaw

Sewer

- One hamlet has infrastructure at the end of its lifespan that they're having issues
- Private servicing should meet or exceed the Alberta Private Sewer Code

Drainage

- Drainage courses – rising water levels – Private landowners are creating ditches etc. to drain their land.
- Andy would like something in the standards from the Water Act stating the County can correct or unblock a drainage course at the cost of the land owner. Should be at least included in the bylaws

Roads

- Don't use any standard for new roads constructed by the County
- 8m top 3:1 slope to 3m wide ditch to 3:1 daylight – 60% of County currently not built to this standard– last 15 years built to this standard
- Spec of gravel roadway?
- Spec for subgrade?
- Specify between old asphalt mix design vs superpave?

General

- The document lacks construction standards
- High level update is all they're looking for due to lack of development in the County
- Open to incorporating another municipalities standards
- 2014 is the latest document
- Looking for ISL to create Summary chart with suggested changes



APPENDIX
Stakeholder Interview Script Template

D



Introduction and Project Overview

As you may know, our team is assisting the County of St. Paul with a review of its Municipal Development Plan, Land Use Bylaw, General Municipal Servicing Standards and Reserve Lands Policy. This review is in response to the Government of Alberta's directive to reduce red tape inefficiencies – such as duplicate processes and rules that do not add protections – and save time, money, and resources while still protecting the environment, keeping Albertans safe and healthy, and upholding fiscal accountability.

The County's goal, like the Province's, is to make it easier for people to get the government services they need and reduce the regulatory burden on job creators to encourage investment, boost Alberta's competitiveness, and get more Albertans back to work.

Accordingly, we feel that you are an ideal candidate to weigh in on this topic and assist us in identifying instances of red tape inefficiencies and developing strategies that will reduce these.

If you are comfortable proceeding, we may begin the interview:

1. What is your level of familiarity with the MDP, LUB and Municipal Reserve Policy? (i.e. low, high)?

2. Are these documents critical to your day-to-day professional activities?

3. Are there certain sections you use exclusively? (i.e. land use districts, future development plan, application requirements, etc.)?

4. Given your level of familiarity (document use) can you speak to any barriers or "red tape" inefficiencies you have encountered?

5. For instance, have you dealt with any development applications or been a part of any approval processes with the County that seemed inefficient or unclear?

- Have you ever applied for, or assisted with a subdivision or development application or been part of a land use amendment process? Did these processes go smoothly or were there barriers to progress?
- From your perspective, were these barriers associated with cost burdens, restrictive regulations, lack of clear policy, unnecessary requirements or another inefficiency you can point to?



6. What specifically do you feel led to these barriers? Were they compounded by other challenges?

7. Given the examples of challenges and inefficiencies you have highlighted, can you think of how they could be addressed to reduce the “red tape” they represent?

8. Is there a “nearest neighbour” municipality you know of that has a process the County should emulate because it is exemplary? (i.e. Development Permit application)

9. Do you have any other questions or comments on any of what we have discussed or is there anything we may have overlooked that you would like to add?




APPENDIX

Online Survey Promotion

E

Screenshot of County Website(s)



COUNTY OF
ST. PAUL


For Residents ▾

For Visitors ▾

For Business ▾

Governance ▾

Contact Your County



News

Home » News


Country Living in the County | News & Blog

We believe that country living in the County of St. Paul is a rewarding lifestyle choice. We regularly post information on this news page about council happenings, county news, lifestyle blogs and more. Check back here regularly for updated information.

All

News

Public Notice




Land Use Bylaws under Review – Your input is wanted

Category: [Public Notice](#) | April 30, 2021

The County has engaged ISL Engineering and Land Services to review its Municipal Development Plan (MDP), Land Use Bylaw (LUB), General Municipal Servicing Standards (GMSS), and Reserve Land Management Policy to identify and minimize inefficiencies. Through this review, the County will have more streamlined planning and development policies and regulations and will be able to...

[Read More...](#)




Road Work: TWP 582 and 57 street from May 3 to September 30, 2021 Local Traffic Only

Category: [Public Notice](#) | April 29, 2021

The Town St. Paul and the County of St. Paul have collaborated to rebuild and pave both TWP 582 and Range Road 95/57 street. Map of area The County of St. Paul, Town of St. Paul and our awarded contractors will require access for construction on TWP 582 and 57th Street from May 3 to...

[Read More...](#)




County Operational Updates – January to March 2021

Category: [Public Notice](#) | April 27, 2021

Council approved the Operational Updates at the April 27 Public Works meeting. The Operational Updates reflect progress on the priorities set in the 2021 Strategic Plan. The Operation Update can be found at this link. or under Governance/Strategic Plans/2021

[Read More...](#)

TEXT



COUNTY OF
ST. PAUL


For Residents ▾

For Visitors ▾

For Business ▾

Governance ▾

Contact Your County



Planning & Development

Home » Planning & Development

County of St. Paul Planning & Development

The County of St. Paul Planning & Development department provides information for those looking to develop or improve property. Please [contact us](#) with any questions.

Land Use Bylaws under Review – Your input is wanted

The County has engaged ISL Engineering and Land Services to review its [Municipal Development Plan \(MDP\)](#), [Land Use Bylaw \(LUB\)](#), [General Municipal Servicing Standards \(GMSS\)](#), and [Reserve Land Management Policy](#) to identify and minimize inefficiencies. Through this review, the County will have more streamlined planning and development policies and regulations and will be able to provide a more efficient and effective service to landowners and businesses. The documents can also be found below under 'Policies & Bylaws'.

How to get involved?

We want to hear from you about your thoughts, experiences, and ideas regarding Red Tape reduction in the County's planning and development documents. Your feedback will be used to identify your main concerns and ideas for how planning and development processes could be improved in the County.

Have Your Say – Complete a Survey!


A survey is available until May 30, 2021 for stakeholders, businesses and residents to share their feedback on potential concerns they have with the County's planning and development process.

Complete an online survey [here](#) or contact Arlene at the County to request a printed copy.

Email: ashwetz@county.stpaul.ab.ca

Phone: 780-645-3301 ext. 1219 (please leave a message)

Screenshot of County Facebook Page




County of St. Paul No. 19

Published by Arlene Shwetz · April 30 at 11:26 AM ·

Land Use Bylaw Red Tape Review - Your input is wanted!
The survey is available until May 30, 2021.

The County is reviewing its planning and development documents to minimize red tape to ensure the County continues to be a welcoming community for business and residents.

Let us know your thoughts by completing a survey. See the County's website for more information, and a link to the survey. <https://www.county.stpaul.ab.ca/.../land-use-bylaws.../>



COUNTY.STPAUL.AB.CA

Land Use Bylaws under Review – Your input is wanted | County of St. Paul

The County has engaged ISL Engineering and Land Services to review its Municipal Developme...

186

People Reached

10

Engagements

Boost Post

COUNTY OF ST. PAUL

5015 – 49 Avenue, St. Paul, Alberta, T0A 3A4
phone: 780-645-3301
www.county.stpaul.ab.ca



Our Mission - To create desirable rural experiences



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Date: April 30, 2021

MEDIA RELEASE

County is seeking your input on Planning documents Review

St. Paul, AB – The County of St. Paul is in the process of reviewing key planning documents to reduce red tape and is seeking public input.

Through this red tape reduction review, the County will have more streamlined planning and development policies and regulations, resulting in more efficient and effective services to landowners and businesses.

ISL Engineering and Land Services has been retained by the County to undertake a review of its Municipal Development Plan, Land Use Bylaw, General Municipal Servicing Standards and Reserve Lands Management Policy to identify and minimize inefficiencies in accordance with provincial guidelines.

The County is now in the process of collecting public input through a survey. Your feedback will be used to identify main concerns and put forward ideas for how planning and development processes could be improved.

The survey is available until May 30 on the following link:

<https://www.surveymonkey.ca/r/stpaulredtape>

A printed copy of the survey is available upon request by contacting Arlene at ashwetz@county.stpaul.ab.ca or leave a message at 780-645-3301 ext. 1219.

Backgrounder

The Government of Alberta has directed municipalities to reduce red tape inefficiencies – such as duplicate processes and rules– to save time, money, and resources while still protecting the environment, keeping Albertans safe and healthy, and upholding fiscal accountability.

Much like the Province, the County wants to make it easier for people to get the government services they need and reduce the regulatory burden on job creators to encourage investment, boost the local economy, and get more people back to work.

The County has engaged ISL Engineering and Land Services to review its Municipal Development Plan (MDP), Land Use Bylaw (LUB), General Municipal Servicing Standards (GMSS), and Reserve Land Management Policy to identify and minimize inefficiencies. Through this review, the County will have more streamlined planning and development policies and regulations, and will be able to provide a more efficient and effective service to landowners and businesses.

Project Process

This review process involves one-on-one interviews with key stakeholder groups, engagement with local businesses, residents and landowners, and a technical analysis of existing County policies and regulations. Engaging with the community is a key part of the project, which is why we have designed this survey to collect your input.

The anticipated completion date of this review is August 2021.

Complete a Survey

A survey is available until May 30, 2021 for stakeholders, businesses and residents to share their feedback on potential concerns they have with the County's planning and development process.

County Planning documents survey – Draft

Radio 30” x 2 per day

Air first week of May whenever they can start 2xday on start date for 4 days

2 x day May 17, 19, 21, May 25, 26. 27

The County of St. Paul is seeking public input during the review of key planning documents.

The goal of the red tape review is for more streamlined planning and development policies and regulations, resulting in more efficient services to landowners and businesses.

The County of St. Paul is collecting public input through a survey.

The survey is available until May 30 on SurveyMonkey at ‘St Paul Red Tape’.

A printed copy of the survey is available upon request by contacting Arlene at the County of St. Paul office at 780-634 3301 extension 1219.



APPENDIX
Online Survey

F

Summary of Online Survey Feedback

1. Which of the following documents are you familiar with? Check all that apply.

- a) **Municipal Development Plan (MDP)**, which states the County's long-term goals and policies relating to future growth, sustainability, economic and physical growth, and social and environment responsibility.
- b) **Land Use Bylaw (LUB)**, which contains regulations about the land uses permitted in each Land Use District, development standards, and the process to apply for a subdivision or development permit.
- c) **General Municipal Servicing Standards (GMSS)**, which establishes the servicing standards and guidelines for development in the County.
- d) **Reserve Land Management Policy** which establishes an approach for the dedication of reserve lands in the County.
- e) **All of the above.**
- f) **I am not that familiar with any of the above.**

Respondent 1 selected f) **I am not that familiar with any of the above.**

Respondent 2 selected f) **I am not that familiar with any of the above.**

2. On a scale of 1 to 5, what is your level of use and familiarity with these documents?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Very Low | Low | Moderate | High | Very High |
| I know these documents exist. | I know these documents exist and their purpose. | I have used one or more of these documents at least once in the past. | I have used one or more of these documents a few times in the past. | I often reference one or more of these documents. |

Respondent 1 selected 3 - **Moderate. I have used one or more of these documents at least once in the past.**

Respondent 2 selected 1 - **Very Low. I know these documents exist.**

3. From your experience with these documents, are there any policies or regulations that you would consider excessive and/or unnecessary, which may hinder or discourage development in the County?

- a) **Yes** (Please specify below)
- b) **No**

Respondent 1 selected a) **Yes** and added:

Back lot owners on Lac Sante can put their boating equipment on the beach in front of lake front homes.

Respondent 2 selected b) No

4. For the statements below, please rank your level of agreement using a scale of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).

| | 1 Strongly Disagree | 2 Disagree | 3 Neutral | 4 Agree | 5 Strongly Agree |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Policies and regulations in the MDP, LUB, General Municipal Servicing Standards and/or Reserve Land Management Policy are clear and easy to navigate. | | | R1 R2 | | |
| The County's requirements to submit an application for a subdivision and/or development permit are reasonable. | | | R2 | R1 | |
| The County's timelines to process subdivisions and/or development permits are often shorter than the maximum timeframes established at the provincial level (20 days to review application completion, 60 days to review complete development permit applications, and 40 days to review complete subdivision applications). | | | R1 R2 | | |
| The County has an efficient system to process subdivision and/or development applications. | | | R1 R2 | | |
| The costs associated with submitting and getting approval for a subdivision and/or development permit are reasonable. | | | R1 R2 | | |

5. If you have personally applied for an application, i.e. a subdivision and/or development permit, at the County, what issues have you encountered? Check all that apply.

- a)** I found conflicting or inconsistent regulations in the County's MDP, LUB, General Municipal Servicing Standards and/or Reserve Land Management Policy.
- b)** I found the requirements (i.e. additional information/studies), to be excessive for the type of subdivision or development I was applying for.

- c) I found the regulations too difficult to interpret and had to hire a specialized professional to handle the application on my behalf.
- d) I have had issues with variances.
- e) I have had issues with compliance certificates.
- f) I have not experienced any issues (*Please continue to **Question 7***).
- g) I have not personally applied for a subdivision and/or development permit at the County (*Please continue to **Question 7***).
- h) Other. Please specify in the text box below.

Respondent 1 selected **a) I found conflicting or inconsistent regulations in the County's MDP, LUB, General Municipal Servicing Standards and/or Reserve Land Management Policy.**

Respondent 2 - No Response

6. What do you think the County could do to improve the issues you have encountered?

Respondent 1 stated:

Change the rules in that the back lot lake owners do not have the right to have their boats, lifts, on the lakefront face. Why are those with homes that are deemed lake front paying more taxes than a back lot owner even though they have the same benefits.

Respondent 2 - No Response

7. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions for the County to reduce red tape and project a more “open for business” image?

Neither respondent provided comment.