

**Subdivision Authority****Agenda***Council Chambers, Leduc County Centre, Nisku, AB****Monday, March 15, 2021***

- 
- 1. Order – 1:30 p.m.**
  - 2. Adoption of agenda**
  - 3. Adoption of previous minutes**  
Subdivision Authority Minutes – Tuesday, February 16, 2021 ✓
  - 4. Subdivision Applications**
    1. SD20-031 – Donna Oliver on behalf of Leo & Jennifer Leblanc – SW-16-50-23-W4 ✓
    2. SD21-001 – Brian Caouette – NE-12-50-26-W4 ✓
    3. SD21-002 – Darcy Powlik on behalf of Bernard & Greg Geiger – NW-25-47-4-W5 ✓
    4. SD21-003 – Murray Brunken on behalf of M & H Brunken Farms Ltd. – NE-17-49-24-W4 ✓
    5. SD21-005 – Myron Ohlmann on behalf of Myron, Sherry, Travis & Chad Ohlmann – NW-33-48-24-W4 ✓
  - 5. Tuesday, July 20, 2021 Subdivision Authority Meeting – Reschedule to Thursday, July 15, 2021 @1:30 pm** ✓
  - 6. Adjournment**

**Delegated Authority Decisions: - February - 1**

✓ Attachment provided

*Leduc County is dedicated to serving its citizens and will create an enhanced quality of life through effective leadership, committed partnerships and open, transparent communication.*





## Subdivision Authority Minutes

*Council Chambers, Leduc County Centre, Nisku, AB  
Monday, March 15, 2021*

---

### Order and roll call

The meeting was called to order at 1:31 p.m. on Monday, March 15, 2021, by Tanni Doblanko as chair and committee members Kelly Vandenberghe, Glenn Belozar, Kelly-Lynn Lewis and Ray Scobie present.

### Other attendees

- Mr. Rick Thomas, Secretary of Subdivision Authority
- Mr. Dave Desimone, Senior Planner, Development Services
- Mrs. Rae-Lynne Spila, Senior Municipal Engineer
- Mrs. Adele Pysar, Recording Secretary

There was five other attendees present.

### Agenda adoption

**16-21** Committee Member Kelly-Lynn Lewis – that the agenda for the Monday, March 15, 2021 Subdivision Authority be accepted as presented.

Carried Unanimously

### Previous Minutes – Tuesday, February 16, 2021

**17-21** Committee Member Glenn Belozar – that the February 16, 2021 Subdivision Authority minutes be accepted as circulated.

Carried Unanimously

### Proposed Subdivision – Donna Oliver on behalf of Leo & Jennifer Leblanc – SW 16-50-23-W4 SD20-031

Mr. Dave Desimone, Senior Planner, Development Services presented a staff report with respect to the application by the applicant Donna Oliver on behalf of Leo & Jennifer Leblanc. Staff recommends refusal to subdivide a 1.05 ha (2.59 ac) residential parcel from a quarter section with a title area of 36.82 ha (90.99 ac).

### DISCUSSION

The subject property is a previously subdivided quarter section used for agricultural purposes located southwest of the intersection of Township Road 502 and Range Road 260. The proposed parcel is located off Range Road 260 and existing development consists of a dwelling, detached, a shop and several sheds.

According to the Municipal Development Plan the subject lands are located within the Agricultural Area B: North Central where policies are aimed at conserving large, contiguous tracts of prime agricultural land with minimal fragmentation primarily for intensive cropping operations. In accordance with 4.3.1.6 of the Municipal Development Plan, there shall be no more than one subdivision (two titled lots) per quarter section in Agricultural Area B: North Central. The proposed subdivision would result in the creation of a third lot in this quarter section, which Planning and Development regards as incremental and unplanned development that should be avoided.

The proposed subdivision is regarded as a farmstead subdivision which is defined as the subdivision of an existing farmstead from a quarter section. While a farmstead subdivision is an allowed type of subdivision in Agricultural Area B: North Central it must not be larger than 1 ha (2.47 acres), unless a larger lot is required to accommodate the location of existing buildings. At 4.34 ha (10.7 ac), the proposed parcel is more than 4 times larger than the maximum allowed size, and is significantly larger than is necessary to capture the existing buildings.

The proposed subdivision is in the Metropolitan Area of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan (EMRGP). Policy 6.1.3 of the EMRGP stipulates that in the metropolitan area, prime agricultural lands identified through the land evaluation and site assessment tool shall be conserved for agricultural purposes for as long as possible, recognizing that these lands will urbanize over time to accommodate growth.

There were no adjacent landowner comments submitted regarding the proposed subdivision.

Chair Tanni Doblanko asked if Committee Members had any comments or questions for administration.

Dave Desimone provided the following information:

- The Municipal Development Plan identifies a large section of area that is County Residential. The expectation is 50 lots per quarter section. Not all the land will be developed as this area needs an Area Structure Plan.
- Without an Area Structure Plan, subdivision should not happen. We want this area to develop in a Country Residential fashion.
- Confirmation made this is the sixth parcel out.
- The whole south half of this property is physically severed.
- Open discharge system shall not be installed, but could have a field system.
- Alberta Health Services responded that after a 5<sup>th</sup> parcel out, safety codes act comes into play. There is potential for contamination. It is recommended a hydrogeological report be completed. Concerned about soil suitability for septic systems as well as direction of surface and ground water flow. When we get into this type of density, it impacts so much.

Chair Tanni Doblanko called upon the applicant to speak to the subdivision. Donna Oliver approached and provided the following information:

- Lot being created is about 2.5 acres in size situated in the extreme northwest section of the parcel.
- The purpose of proposed subdivision is to allow the Leblanc's daughter to build a home there. She would be able to move out of the family home but remain close by.
- Understand there needs to be an Area Structure Plan completed, but not sure when that will happen.
- We are trying to comply the best we can with what the Area Structure Plan would require.
- In order to conform with future development, landowner is prepared to have some requirement in terms of location, so house is not facing the wrong direction.
- Location is a very high portion of land, so drainage goes down toward a low area and into the creek.
- We are willing to work together to comply with what the County wants and perceive this area to be.
- Keeping within the size of lot being encouraged.
- Make this interconnect with the neighborhood.
- Would have a cistern rather than a well.
- Storm water and drainage patterns are high.
- Natural areas – wildlife not affected.



- 
- The proposed subdivision is separated from the other five lots by a fair distance.

Chair Tanni Doblanko asked if Committee Members had any further comments or questions for the applicant and there were none.

Chair Tanni Doblanko asked if Committee Members had any further comments or questions for administration:

Dave Desimone provided the following information:

- There is no Area Structure Plan planned in the near future.
- Focus is to only have development where it connects to existing development.
- There is a lot of development to the east and north, which creates a lot of truck traffic.
- Appreciate the applicant's desire to have this subdivision approved, not knowing when the Area Structure Plan will be completed.

Rae-Lynne Spila advised it is not applicant's fault no Area Structure Plan is in force and perhaps having to wait 10 years to find out if there will be one.

**18-21** Chair Tanni Doblanko that the application to subdivide a 1.05 ha (2.59 ac) residential parcel from a quarter section with a title area of 36.82 ha (90.99 ac) be **refused** for the following reasons:

1. Pursuant to Section 654(1)(b) of the Municipal Government Act, the proposed subdivision does not conform to the following objectives and policies of the Municipal Development Plan (08-19):
  - a) Policy 4.2.0.1 which states in the Rural County, the Country Residential area, Local Employment areas, Growth Hamlet, and Lakeshore Communities shall be guided by Area Structure Plans;
  - b) Policy 4.5.1.2 which states one or more Area Structure Plans will be prepared to guide subdivision and development of the Country Residential area as identified in Map 4: Rural County Land Use Concept to promote interconnected neighbourhoods, transportation and storm water infrastructure, drainage patterns, natural areas, and wildlife habitats.

Pro: Chair Tanni Doblanko, Committee Members Kelly Vandenberghe, Kelly-Lynn Lewis

Con: Committee Members Glenn Belozor, Ray Scobie

Carried

The Subdivision Authority felt it was premature to go forward without an Area Structure Plan

Committee Member Kelly-Lynn Lewis exited at 1:54 pm *to view a tender opening.* *JD*

**Proposed Subdivision – SD21-001 – Brian Caouette – NE 12-50-26-W4**

**SD21-001**

Mr. Dave Desimone, Senior Planner, Development Services, presented a staff report with respect to an application by the applicant Brian Caouette. Staff recommends refusal to subdivide a 4.34 ha (10.7 ac) farmstead parcel from a previously subdivided quarter section with a title area of 32.36 ha (79.96ac).

## **DISCUSSION**

The subject property is a previously subdivided quarter section used for agricultural purposes located southwest of the intersection of Township Road 502 and Range Road 260. The proposed parcel is located off Range Road 260 and existing development consists of a dwelling, detached, a shop and several sheds.

*JD*

According to the Municipal Development Plan the subject lands are located within the Agricultural Area B: North Central where policies are aimed at conserving large, contiguous tracts of prime agricultural land with minimal fragmentation primarily for intensive cropping operations. In accordance with 4.3.1.6 of the Municipal Development Plan, there shall be no more than one subdivision (two titled lots) per quarter section in Agricultural Area B: North Central. The proposed subdivision would result in the creation of a third lot in this quarter section, which Planning and Development regards as incremental and unplanned development that should be avoided.

The proposed subdivision is regarded as a farmstead subdivision which is defined as the subdivision of an existing farmstead from a quarter section. While a farmstead subdivision is an allowed type of subdivision in Agricultural Area B: North Central it must not be larger than 1 ha (2.47 acres), unless a larger lot is required to accommodate the location of existing buildings. At 4.34 ha (10.7 ac), the proposed parcel is more than 4 times larger than the maximum allowed size, and is significantly larger than is necessary to capture the existing buildings.

The proposed subdivision is in the Metropolitan Area of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan (EMRGP). Policy 6.1.3 of the EMRGP stipulates that in the metropolitan area, prime agricultural lands identified through the land evaluation and site assessment tool shall be conserved for agricultural purposes for as long as possible, recognizing that these lands will urbanize over time to accommodate growth.

There were no adjacent landowner comments submitted regarding the proposed subdivision.

Chair Tanni Doblanko asked if Committee Members had any comments or questions for administration.

Dave Desimone provided the following information:

- There is only one residence on this property and only farmstead on the quarter section.
- The Town of Devon Area Structure Plan is some distance away.
- Over 30% of soils are class 2 and 3 suitability (primarily agricultural land) without wetland.

Chair Tanni Doblanko called upon the applicant to speak to the subdivision. Brian Caouette approached and provided the following information:

- Trees to the north are a shelterbelt.
- Fence in front of the yard.
- Extra two acres requested for pasture.
- It is wet in there in the spring – cannot get in until June or later.
- Own just the east side 80 acres of the quarter section and have lived there since 2003. Only resident of the quarter section.
- Drainage is to the southeast corner.
- Quite wet, there are some trees along north boundary.
- Have a mound for sewer system and a well.
- The reason it is so wet in there is because there is a big bowl in the land. Problem will still exist even with the subdivision.

Chair Tanni Doblanko asked if Committee Members had any further comments or questions for the applicant and there were none.



Chair Tanni Doblanko asked if Committee Members had any further comments or questions for administration and there were none.

**19-21** Committee Member Glenn Belozar that the application to subdivide a 4.34 ha (10.7 ac) farmstead parcel from a previously subdivided quarter section with a title area of 32.36 ha (79.96ac) be **approved** with the following conditions:

1. Pursuant to Section 654(1)(d) of the Municipal Government Act, the applicant/owner pay any outstanding property taxes to Leduc County or make satisfactory arrangements with the Council of Leduc County for the payment thereof;
2. Pursuant to Section 9(a) of the Subdivision and Development Regulation, access to the subdivision and balance of the quarter to be constructed to the standards of Public Works at the Owners/Developer's expense;
3. Pursuant to Section 7(g) of the Subdivision & Development Regulation, the applicant/owner confirm that any existing sewage disposal system(s) on the subject property is/are in compliance with the *Private Sewage Disposal Systems Regulation* in force at the time of application. Should the existing system(s) not be in compliance, modifications to the existing system(s) or installation of new system(s) shall be required;
4. Pursuant to Section 669(1) of the Municipal Government Act, Municipal Reserves in the amount of 3.236 ha (7.996 ac) be deferred against the title of the larger remnant parcel; and
5. The subdivision be registered pursuant to Alberta Land Titles requirements.

Pro: Chair Tanni Doblanko, Committee Members Kelly-Lynn Lewis, Glenn Belozar, Ray Scobie

Con: Committee Member Kelly Vandenberghe

Carried

The Subdivision Authority felt the existing yard site doesn't take any farm land out of production.

Kelly-Lynn Lewis back in at 2:09 pm

**Proposed Subdivision – Darcy Powlik on behalf of Bernard & Greg Geiger – NW 25-47-3-W5 SD21-002**

Mr. Dave Desimone, Senior Planner, Development Services presented a staff report with respect to the application by the applicant Darcy Powlik on behalf of Bernard & Greg Geiger. Staff recommends approval to subdivide a 5.51 ha (13.62 ac) farmstead parcel from an unsubdivided quarter section with a title area of 64.74 ha (159.97 ac).

**DISCUSSION**

The Agricultural Land Suitability Rating System indicates that the subject lands consists of Class 3 soils. Class 3 soils are considered Prime Agricultural. The applicant completed an agricultural impact assessment to determine if the proposed subdivision would adversely affect existing or future agricultural activities onsite and in the surrounding area. The applicant's assessment returned a score of 55 indicating that the proposed subdivision is aligned with planning policy.

20

According to the Municipal Development Plan the subject lands are located within the Agricultural Area A (West) where policies states there shall be no more than two subdivision (three titled lots) per quarter section in Agricultural Area A (West). The proposed farmstead subdivision would result in the creation of the first parcel out of the subject quarter section.

The Municipal Development Plan defines a Farmstead subdivision as the subdivision of an existing farmstead from a quarter section. The Farmstead subdivision shall not exceed 1 ha (2.47 ac) in size unless a larger lot is required to accommodate the location of existing buildings or shelterbelts associated with the residential use of the parcel. Administration has considered the size and shape of the proposed parcel and estimates that the 2.78 ha (6.87 ac) parcel depicted in Exhibit 2 is sufficient to capture the existing dwelling, access and driveway, while providing for sufficient space to meet the required side and rear yard setback distances. Administration is of the opinion that the requested 5.51 ha (13.62 ac) parcel is too large and may be the subject of further subdivision in the future if approved.

The proposed subdivision is in the Rural Area of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan (EMRGP). Policy 6.2.2 of the EMRGP stipulates that in the rural area, large contiguous agricultural areas will be protected and maintained to enable efficient agricultural production and to support the agricultural sector in the Region.

There were no landowner comments received regarding the proposed subdivision application.

Chair Tanni Doblanko asked if Committee Members had any comments or questions for administration and there were none.

Chair Tanni Doblanko called upon the applicant to speak to the subdivision. Darcy Powlik approached and provided the following information:

- Landowner purchased this quarter of land with the idea of adding additional farmland to his operations.
- This land is an unsubdivided quarter section.
- Shop and yard site exists. Buildings have been vacant for several years.
- The land is very low and drains west.
- Landowner does not need the yard site.
- Current driveway is only a trail – would renovate house and repair driveway. Landowners have a construction company to do the work. Property would be more attractive to be able to sell.
- No loss of agricultural land due to class 3 soil, considered poor land.
- Would be a good parcel for Country Residential land.
- Want to provide for a smaller agricultural holding. Property across the road – 23 acres – does provide for a smaller farming operation.
- Add more value to a potential client.

Chair Tanni Doblanko asked if Committee Members had any further comments or questions for the applicant:

- Darcy Powlik confirmed 13.62 acres is the desired parcel size.

Chair Tanni Doblanko asked if Committee Members had any further comments or questions for administration and there were none

**20-21** Committee Member Glenn Belozor that the application to subdivide a 5.51 ha (13.62 ac) farmstead parcel from an unsubdivided quarter section with a title area of 64.74 ha (159.97 ac) be **approved** with the following conditions:

20

1. Pursuant to Section 654(1)(d) of the Municipal Government Act, the applicant/owner pay any outstanding property taxes to Leduc County or make satisfactory arrangements with the Council of Leduc County for the payment thereof;
2. Pursuant to Section 9(a) of the Subdivision and Development Regulation, access to the subdivision and balance of the quarter to be constructed to the standards of Public Works at the Owners/Developer's expense;
3. Pursuant to Section 7(g) of the Subdivision & Development Regulation, the applicant/owner confirm that any existing sewage disposal system(s) on the subject property is/are in compliance with the *Private Sewage Disposal Systems Regulation* in force at the time of application. Should the existing system(s) not be in compliance, modifications to the existing system(s) or installation of new system(s) shall be required;
4. The subdivision be registered pursuant to Alberta Land Titles requirements.

Carried Unanimously

The Subdivision Authority feels no farmland is being taken out of production; and is supportive of pastureland and smaller agricultural holdings.

**Proposed Subdivision – Murray Brunken on behalf of M & H Brunken Farms Ltd. – NE 17-49-24-4 SD21-003**

Mr. Dave Desimone, Senior Planner, Development Services presented a staff report with respect to the application by the applicant Murray Brunken on behalf of M & H Brunken Farms Ltd. Staff recommends **refusal** to subdivide a 3.38 ha (8.36 ac) farmstead parcel from a previously subdivided quarter section with a title area of 63.54 ha (157.01 ac).

**DISCUSSION**

The subject lands are located off Range Road 244 and a half mile north of Township Road 492. A 1.21 ha (3 ac) parcel was subdivided from the southeast corner of the quarter section in 2007.

The Agricultural Land Suitability Rating indicates the subject land consists of Class 2 & 5 soil, with Class 2 considered Prime Agricultural Land. An Agricultural Impact Assessment was completed with the subdivision application to determine if the proposed subdivision would adversely affect existing or future agricultural activities onsite and in the surrounding area. The applicant's assessment returned a score of 117 which indicates that the proposed subdivision does not accord with planning policy.

According to the Municipal Development Plan the subject lands are located within the Agricultural Area C (South Central /East) where policies are aimed at conserving large tracts of prime agricultural land with minimal fragmentation primarily for intensive cropping operations and to protect existing and future confined feeding operations. In accordance with 4.3.1.8 of the Municipal Development Plan, there shall be no more than one subdivision (two titled lots) per quarter section in Agricultural Area C (South Central /East). The proposed subdivision would result in the creation of a third lot in this quarter section, which Planning and Development regards as incremental and unplanned development that should be avoided.

The subject lands are within Policy Area H – Reserve and Referral Area of the City of Leduc/Leduc County Intermunicipal Development Plan. The City of Leduc was referred this application and responded that they object to the subdivision stating it does not align with the policies of the Intermunicipal Development Plan,





Leduc County Municipal Development Plan and Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan. They request the application be refused.

Leduc County Agricultural Services responded to this referral stating a confined feeding operation was previously on this property. Administration confirmed with the owner that it is no longer in operation and this was further confirmed through site inspection.

The proposed subdivision is in the Rural Area of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan (EMRGP). Policy 6.2.2 of the EMRGP stipulates that in the rural area, large contiguous agricultural areas will be protected and maintained to enable efficient agricultural production and to support the agricultural sector in the Region.

There were no adjacent landowner comments submitted regarding the proposed subdivision.

Chair Tanni Doblanko asked if Committee Members had any comments or questions for administration:

Dave Desimone provided the following information:

- City of Leduc does not support this subdivision proposal, as it falls within Leduc County/City of Leduc Intermunicipal Development Plan area.
- Was an old Confined Feeding Operation, but does not exist now.

Chair Tanni Doblanko called upon the applicant to speak to the subdivision. Murray Brunken approached and provided the following information:

- Property was purchased to incorporate it into the farming operation.
- Yard site a liability – better to have an owner rather than renter.
- Renting is a concern - more trustworthy and responsible people if selling property.
- Established yard site with two residences, dairy barn, shop and out buildings for storage.
- Two silage pits and granaries not included in yard site. Would take concrete out and fill in pits.
- Does not believe any farmland is being taken out of production.
- Applicant owns lands to the north, south and east of subject property.
- Mixed farming operation – dairy and grain.

Chair Tanni Doblanko asked if Committee Members had any further comments or questions for the applicant and there were none.

Chair Tanni Doblanko asked if Committee Members had any further comments or questions for administration and there were none.

**21-21** Committee Member Ray Scobie that the application to subdivide a 3.38 ha (8.36 ac) farmstead parcel from a previously subdivided quarter section with a title area of 63.54 ha (157.01 ac) be **approved** for the following reasons and to amend to remove the municipal reserve dedication condition set out in the conditions of approval:

1. Pursuant to Section 654(1)(d) of the Municipal Government Act, the applicant/owner pay any outstanding property taxes to Leduc County or make satisfactory arrangements with the Council of Leduc County for the payment thereof;
2. Pursuant to Section 9(a) of the Subdivision and Development Regulation, access to the subdivision and balance of the quarter to be constructed to the standards of Public Works at the Owners/Developer's expense;



3. Pursuant to Section 7(g) of the Subdivision & Development Regulation, the applicant/owner confirm that any existing sewage disposal system(s) on the subject property is/are in compliance with the *Private Sewage Disposal Systems Regulation* in force at the time of application. Should the existing system(s) not be in compliance, modifications to the existing system(s) or installation of new system(s) shall be required;
4. The subdivision be registered pursuant to Alberta Land Titles requirements.

Pro: Council Members Kelly Vandenberghe, Glenn Belozar, Ray Scobie

Con: Chair Tanni Doblanko and Committee Member Kelly-Lynn Lewis

Carried

The Subdivision Authority felt the existing yard site doesn't take any farm land out of production.

**Proposed Subdivision – Myron Ohlmann on behalf of Myron, Sherry, Travis & Chad Ohlmann**

**NW 33-48-24-W4**

**SD21-005**

Mr. Dave Desimone, Senior Planner, Development Services presented a staff report with respect to the application by the applicant Myron Ohlmann on behalf of Myron, Sherry, Travis & Chad Ohlmann. Staff recommends **refusal** to subdivide a 3.95 ha (9.76 ac) residential parcel and a 3.60 ha (8.89 ac) residential parcel from a previously subdivided quarter section with a title area of 31.97 ha (79.01 ac).

#### **DISCUSSION**

The subject lands are located off of Township Road 490 and Range Road 260. The quarter section has been previously subdivided into two 80 acre parcels.

The Agricultural Land Suitability Rating indicates the subject land consists of Class 2 & Class 5 Soil. Class 2 is considered Prime Agricultural Lands. The areas of Class 5 denote the presence of water as being the largest constraint. An Agricultural Impact Assessment was completed and the proposed application received a score of 141. A score of 61 or higher indicates the proposed application requires further review or the proposed application does not align with policy. The score was given due to the subdivision not aligning with County policy and the location of 2 confined feeding operations within 800 meters of the subject lands.

There are currently two confined feeding operations directly adjacent to the subject lands at NE 32-48-24-W4 and SE 5-49-24-W4 with a third operation approximately 900 meters east. Policy 4.3.1.7 of the Municipal Development Plan stipulates in order to protect existing and future confined feeding operations in Agricultural Area C: South Central/East, subdivision shall be limited to no more than one subdivision (two titled areas) per quarter section. Part 6.12.1 of the Leduc County Land Use Bylaw states that within a land use district where an agricultural operation is listed as a permitted use, the County shall endeavor to protect such agricultural operations from any undue pressures that may arise due to nearby non-agricultural development. Leduc County Agricultural Services commented that there are 3 more confined feeding operations within 3.2 km of the subject lands. The policies of Agricultural Area C limit the amount of subdivision and residential development in this area in order to protect existing or proposed confined feeding operations. Administration is of the opinion that this application represents potential conflict with the current operation of confined feeding operations in the area and would impact the ability for future expansion.



Regulation 6.12.4 of the Leduc County Land Use Bylaw states in all land use districts, residential development shall be discretionary if it is within the minimum distance separation for a Confined Feeding Operation allowed under the Agricultural Operation Practices Act. In discussion with a representative of the Natural Resources Conservation Board, it was estimated the current Minimum Distance Separation from the existing confined feeding operations is approximately 350 meters. However, a determination would be made at the time of a development permit application. The expansion or alteration of the confined feeding operations in close proximity of the proposed lots may render the lands undevelopable and not suitable for the intended uses outlined in the Agricultural Land Use District.

The proposed subdivision is in the Rural Area of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan (EMRGP). Policy 6.2.2 of the EMRGP stipulates that in the rural area, large contiguous agricultural areas will be protected and maintained to enable efficient agricultural production and to support the agricultural sector in the Region.

One adjacent landowner submitted comments objecting to the proposed subdivision citing:

- Loss of privacy
- Increased traffic
- Loss of property value
- Land disturbance and loss of trees

The full comments are attached to this report.

Chair Tanni Doblanko asked if Committee Members had any comments or questions for administration.

Dave Desimone provided the following information:

- This property is adjacent to a Confined Feed Operation.
- If this subdivision were approved today, the Natural Resources Conservation Board (NRCB) could restrict the building of houses in accordance with Leduc County policies.
- Any development within minimum setback of a confined feeding operation may not be able to build a residence. Would refer out to adjacent landowners and a decision made if it would be suitable.
- This is a dairy farm operation.
- Do not have answer on why is there a property with a dwelling across Township Road 490.
- Administration is saying there is unknown information going forward.

Chair Tanni Doblanko called upon the applicant to speak to the subdivision. Myron Ohlmann approached and provided the following information:

- Main reason for subdivision request is trying to do some land transactions amongst my wife and two sons.
- If anything should happen to us, children would get their lawful allowances. After something happens, makes it harder for things to run smoothly.
- Land was grandfather's land.
- There are no utilities on land – have had some horses grazing on it.
- Are still farming the adjacent land.
- Close to Glen Park Road – because land is not being occupied, have had some issues with trespassing on the land. Ended up locking the gate and closing it off.
- No agriculture land taken out of production.
- Land is low with some poplar trees on it. Proposed Lot B is better land and drainage.
- Approach was to be discontinued on Glen Park Road and replaced on west side of parcel A.

- 
- Drainage is an issue. County cleaned out ditch which was causing water damage to the road. Also causing problems with farming operations.

Chair Tanni Doblanko asked if Committee Members had any further comments or questions for the applicant:

- There was an old homestead there at some time.
- There were two approaches off that road at one time and Leduc County replaced them when Glen Park Road was rebuilt.
- Soil is fairly low on west side (parcel A) with a couple of natural swales. Some poplar trees. Parcel "B" higher land and better drainage . No trees.
- Sons are currently involved in the farming operations and expected to do so in the future.
- Understand the possibility of restriction to build houses.

Chair Tanni Doblanko asked if Committee Members had any further comments or questions for administration:

Dave Desimone provided the following information:

- Natural Resources Conservation Board (NRCB) have nothing to with the subdivision - more of a municipal concern.
- Municipality bound by Natural Resources Conservation Board regulations
- No clear answers from Natural Resources Conservation Board.

**22-21** Committee Member Kelly Vandenberghe that the application to subdivide a 3.60 ha (8.89 ac) residential parcel from a previously subdivided quarter section with a title area of 31.97 ha (79.01 ac) be **deferred** to the April 20, 2021 subdivision authority meeting.

Carried Unanimously

**23-21** Committee Member Glenn Belozer that the Tuesday, July 20, 2021 Subdivision Authority meeting be rescheduled to Thursday, July 15, 2021 @1:30 pm.

Carried Unanimously


### **Adjournment**

**24-21** Committee Member Ray Scobie that the Subdivision Authority meeting be adjourned.

Carried Unanimously

The Subdivision Authority meeting was adjourned at 3:02 p.m.

  
Chairman

  
Secretary