

DRAPER AREA STRUCTURE PLAN

PURPOSE

An Area Structure Plan (ASP) guides future development of a community by implementing policies that regulate land use.

The proposed Draper ASP will supersede the development policies outlined for the study area in the Highway 69/Clear River Valley ASP (1999).

OBJECTIVES

1. To meet *Envision Wood Buffalo's* goals and objectives
2. To provide a long-term plan (ASP plans for 20 years, reviewed after five)
3. To address community issues arising from growth pressures
4. To take advantage of development opportunities due to the availability of land
5. To explore opportunities for new recreational facilities in the community
6. To ensure access to the waterfront area
7. To ensure the efficient use of natural resources and protection of the natural environment
8. Integrate land use with existing and future transportation, servicing, and other infrastructure.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Residents of the Draper area are key stakeholders in the Draper ASP development process.

Community engagement sessions will take place in Winter /Spring 2010 and residents are encouraged to attend.

Please check the *Draper News* for information on community engagement sessions or contact the Draper ASP Project Manager.

TIMELINE AND PROCESS

The Draper ASP will be completed by completing following process.



1. Background Research/Analysis
 2. Policy Development
 3. Develop ASP document
 4. Begin Council Process
- Community Engagement Session

CONTACT

Muhammad Mughal – Project Manager
Planning & Development Department
Muhammad.mughal@woodbuffalo.ab.ca
780.793.1046

Ron Pelletier

From: Muhammad Mughal
Sent: Monday, June 28, 2010 4:00 PM
To: Bill Duncan; Jennifer Johnson
Subject: Draper Open House.

Good afternoon Jennifer and Bill,

I would like to thank you for your all assistance in advertisement and preparation of panels regarding Draper Open House.

The session went well and we had very good turnout.

Indeed, your cooperation and assistance made the session productive and successful.

Thanks again

Best regards

Muhammad Shahid Mughal
Planner – Long Range Planning & Policy
Planning & Development Department
Regional Municipality of Wood buffalo



REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY
OF **WOOD BUFFALO**

P 780.793.1046

F 780.743.7874

Muhammad.Mughal@woodbuffalo.ab.ca

www.woodbuffalo.ab.ca

309 Powder Drive, Fort McMurray, AB T9K 0M3

**Draper Area Structure Plan
Public Open House Summary Report
June 24th, 2010**

The Draper's Area Structure Plan Open House was held on June 24, 2010 from 7: 00 to 9: 00 pm at Syncrude Sport and Wellness Centre, Keyano College. Approximately (40) forty people attended this session.

The Open House was advertised in advance in the Fort McMurray Today and direct invitations also sent to individuals by mail.

The Residents/ Stakeholder expressed the following comments, issues and wish list in the Open House.

Draper's Community Comments and Concerns

- Keep as acreage and stick to Residential;
- Don't want heavy equipment business within Draper community;
- The development blocking access to Water;
- Municipal services e.g. Water and Sewer should be priority;
- Limit trucking business in the Community;
- Dust on Road;
- Protect Heritage River on or near the River;
- No transient Campground;
- No place for Centre of activities;
- Don't need Sewer service, need Water delivery system;
- Stop Industrial and Commercial development except Home Business;
- Enhance River access, boat access, fishing/ swimming area, ATV trails and horse riding arena;
- Walking trail needed;
- Would like to have approximate time of each stage of development;
- City received 100, 000 from the province to build the park, timeline?
- Setback requirement along Clearwater River;
- walking trail used for ATV trail;
- Need water services; and,
- Maintenance of Road.

Community Wish List

- Community Centre
- Access to water
- Enforcement of ATV bylaw as in Saprae creek
- More business opportunities e.g. Storage facilities;

- Bed and Breakfast;
- Cold Storage;
- New haul dealership;
- Home Based Business;
- Horse Riding Arena;
- Golf Course;
- More Subdivision;
- Recreational facilities e.g. marina;
- Fishing;
- Swimming Areas;
- Trails and Park;
- Campground; and,
- Golf Course.

The Draper's Community strongly emphasized on Municipal commitment and action

Ron Pelletier

From: Muhammad Mughal
Sent: Friday, July 3, 2015 8:41 AM
To: Susan Frampton; Richard Giele; Brynja Bjarnason
Subject: FW: FW: Re: Draper Area Structure Plan (ASP) Outcomes of Public Meeting Held June 11, 2015

Hi Susan:

FYI - Forwarded below Andrew Thorne's response/comments regarding revised Draper ASP policies.

Regards,
Muhammad

From: ANDREW THORNE [mailto:andrewthorne@shaw.ca]
Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2015 8:32 PM
To: Muhammad Mughal
Cc: stephenchipchase@woodbuffalo.ab.ca
Subject: Re: FW: Re: Draper Area Structure Plan (ASP) Outcomes of Public Meeting Held June 11, 2015

Hello Muhammad,

In response to your email I would like to make two points:

1) When you say that the points in red are based on discussions at the previous meetings. Despite this, it seems that several new ideas have been included that were not discussed at the meetings, including what is listed as policy XXX, which would permit "where intensive agriculture is the approved use of the land, the following supporting uses may be allowed:

- (i) Related on-site services;
- (ii) Accessory buildings (vehicle garage and indoor storage building)
- (iii) Outdoor storage area for trucks, goods, materials and equipment; and
- (iv) Recreational Vehicles (RVs) to provide living accommodation for seasonal workers for a limited time period of time per year."

As well, you state in the new draft:

Policy V: Recreational uses may include:

- I. Passive park;
- II. walking trails;
- III. Interpretation boards and viewing platforms; and
- IV. Multi use community recreation area.

Policy XX -A development permit will be required for the outdoor storage of any commercial vehicle, goods, materials and equipment, unless the Development Authority is satisfied that it is integral to a home based business or intensive agriculture or another use that has been approved.

(a) Outdoor storage areas should be compatible with neighbouring lots and not be a source of inconvenience or nuisance. They must be maintained in an orderly and well maintained state. They may be required to be screened from view by means of fencing, shrubbery, trees or other landscaping

I understood that the last meeting was to clarify one issue. The question is: if we are going to introduce these new policies which have not been raised for discussion, and which I believe could have great effect on our community, is a survey sufficient when previous discussions were facilitated to discuss such matters with all members of the Draper community?

Who proposed such changes (along with the ones described below) and when were these changes proposed?

2)

Over the past several years, despite an SDAB ruling to the contrary, we have experienced a large landscaping company and a retail store in Draper using recreational vehicles (RV's) from April until November to further its illegal landscaping business that has prompted its employees to use our area at any time before 5am to after midnight, 7 days a week.

I am not aware of a great need to house temporary workers for agricultural purposes as there is very little agricultural activity in Draper. I would not want to create an opportunity for people operating illegally to obtain a permit under the agricultural guise and use it in the commercial activities that are not legally permitted, including a large landscaping company. Also, Draper does not have a long history of agriculture or farming. Several people created market gardens in the 1970's and which essentially died out as of the early 2000's. I only state this to put this use in context and so as to clarify that we are not trying to preserve long historical family farms in Draper as there have never been more than a few that attempted to make this a viable business, which it was not and which is why it is all but dead. Draper was never a farming community.

Also, when you use the words: "Multi use community recreation area" can we be more specific to remove any doubt that this does not include any commercial/marketing events for private commercial activities (agritainment, fair grounds, go carts, etc...) and that it is in reference to the Draper community residents and not an area for the other members of the RMWB which has in the past blocked out community for hours at a time.

And you state: **Policy X** – A maximum of three (3) commercial vehicles may be parked and maintained on a residential lot. The maximum weight (Gross Vehicle Weight – GVW) of a commercial vehicle that may be parked on the lot is 7,000 kg. I can see all kinds of abuse to this rule, including the storage of dump trucks that will be brought back at night and leave in the morning. I recognize one residents comments at the meeting and believe that this is why you included this, but again it is broad and could easily lead to abuse.

Also, why would you require a development permit for a non-permitted use when you state: "**Policy XX** -A development permit will be required for the outdoor storage of any commercial vehicle, goods, materials and equipment, unless the Development Authority is satisfied that it is integral to a home based business or intensive agriculture or another use that has been approved.

(a) Outdoor storage areas should be compatible with neighbouring lots and not be a source of inconvenience or nuisance. They must be maintained in an orderly and well maintained state. They may be required to be screened from view by means of fencing, shrubbery, trees or other landscaping"?

If a home based business or intensive agriculture activity exists, and these items are not part of those **uses**, there should be no opportunity for a development permit to be issued unless it falls under an existing permitted or discretionary use. This as is written, is too broad and may be interpreted to include all commercial activities.

You also stated: "**Policy XXX**: Where intensive agriculture is the approved use of the land, the following supporting uses may be allowed:
(i) Related on-site services;

- (ii) Accessory buildings (vehicle garage and indoor storage building)
- (iii) Outdoor storage area for trucks, goods, materials and equipment; and
- (iv) Recreational Vehicles (RVs) to provide living accommodation for seasonal workers for a limited time period of time per year."

My questions are: what is a related on-site service? What trucks would an agricultural pursuit require and are these supposed to be related to the intensive agriculture (it does not specifically state this)? If a proper agricultural pursuit was the activity, why would such stipulations as stated be necessary?

Accordingly, if you are going to bring these new matters forward at this final stage of the process, then I request another meeting of Draper residents to provide proper discussion and feedback as these could be very significant changes that appear to benefit one landowner at the expense of the rest of us.

----- Original Message -----

From: Muhammad Mughal <MUHAMMAD.Mughal@rmwb.ca>

Sent: Thu, 02 Jul 2015 11:46:43 -0600 (MDT)

Subject: FW: Re: Draper Area Structure Plan (ASP) Outcomes of Public Meeting Held June 11, 2015

Good morning:

Please find attached the information package regarding Draper ASP outcomes of Public meeting held on June 11, 2015 for your review and consideration.

The purpose of this information package is to:

- share with you what we heard from residents/stakeholders at our last public meeting on June 11, 2015;
- distribute our revised draft policy document (dated June 29, 2015) incorporating what we heard; and
- outline the 'next steps' in the ASP process.

The attached information package includes:

1. Intro letter (include outline the next steps in the ASP process),
2. A summary of what was discussed at the June 11, 2015 meeting ("What We Heard"), and
3. A revised draft policy document in response to the questions and concerns raised at the June 11, 2015 meeting (this is the document entitled "Draft Draper ASP Policies (for Discussion Purposes Only – July 2, 2015)").

Ron Pelletier

From: Muhammad Mughal
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2015 8:38 AM
To: Richard Giele
Cc: Susan Frampton
Subject: FW: Proposed Additions to Draft ASP

Good day Richard,

FYI – forwarded below an email from 17 (1) regarding new additional policies to the draft Draper ASP.

Regards,
Muhammad

From: 17 (1)
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2015 7:49 PM
To: Muhammad Mughal
Subject: Proposed Additions to Draft ASP

Dear Muhammad,

I am very concerned with several of the new additions to the draft Area Structure Plan that you have forwarded to the residents of Draper for comment and the manner in which some of these policies were added.

Although I have not attended all of the meetings due to health reasons, I have been kept up-to-date by my husband and the other Draper residents who were in attendance at the meetings which I did not attend.

At no time were the following issues raised by anyone at any of the meetings despite the statement that the additions in red had been made on the basis of the meetings held:

I. **Policy XXX** – which states in part:

“...where intensive agriculture is the approved use of the land,
the following supporting uses may be allowed:

(i) Related on-site services;

(ii) Accessory buildings (vehicle garage and indoor storage building)

(iii) Outdoor storage area for trucks, goods, materials and equipment; and

(iv) Recreational Vehicles (RVs) to provide living accommodation for seasonal workers for a limited time period of time per year."

At present, the only permits that have been granted for Intensive Agriculture to date, were granted to Dunvegan Gardens in relation to the sod and tree farm permits that they obtained for their own properties as well as the one they obtained for a landowner who owns land on the East side of Garden Lane. So the real questions is why are these provisions necessary and why were they added at the last minute without proper consultation with other Draper Residents and under the guise that these issues had been discussed at the last meeting when they were never discussed.

Our community has already made the following clear to the RMWB and Dunvegan Gardens:

1. That we do not want a temporary camp for workers as evidenced by the community's response to Dunvegan Gardens previous application for a permit for same. Please note that this permit was not granted. The RV's that are presently located in Draper allegedly for "seasonal workers" should be removed and not legalized by a change in the ASP. How many of the seasonal workers are actually employed or work in Dunvegan Gardens landscaping division and not in their market garden or tree or sod farm operations? As the tree and sod farm operations have not commenced, and the market garden is a small portion of Dunvegan Gardens operations, the answer should be obvious;
2. That we do not want the bylaws to be amended to allow a cold storage facility as evidenced by the community's response to Dunvegan Gardens amendments requesting same in relation to the U-haul business they were illegally conducting in Draper and in relation to their other subsequent requests to amend the bylaws to allow storage of large vehicles in Draper. Please note that these amendments were also not granted and the U-haul business was relocated out of Draper;
3. That we want to maintain the residential nature of our community;
4. That the increased traffic and commotion is a nuisance and a safety concern given the lack of infrastructure and the quiet residential nature of our community;
5. That stockpiling of materials is not acceptable or legal in our district;
6. That Dunvegan Gardens retail store and landscaping operations which continue to operate contrary to the existing bylaws need to be removed and not legalized by a change in the Area Structure Plan;
7. That we do not want agritainment in our community; and
8. That we want the existing bylaws to be enforced properly instead of being ignored or changed to allow Dunvegan Gardens to continue their improper activities to the detriment of our community.

Given these facts, I am greatly concerned by the last minute addition of Policy XXX:

What does related on-site services mean? Does this mean that you intend to allow a mechanic shop to fix the equipment and machinery and commercial vehicles owned by Dunvegan Gardens thus legalizing the mechanic shop that should not be allowed on the Dunvegan lands under the present bylaws? Does this mean that they will be allowed to have a commercial outlet or retail store? Why was this provision added? Who requested that it be added and who chose the wording for the policy?

What are the accessory buildings for? Why would you need trucks? This is not a large agricultural farm that ships wheat or corn by the dump truck load. What materials would be required? Why would you need indoor storage for items that are to be grown in the ground?

I am concerned that this type of wording will allow Dunvegan Gardens to continue to store their landscaping materials and supplies in Draper despite the SDAB Decision prohibiting them from doing so under the guise that they are storing these material and equipment there in relation to their intensive agriculture permits.

This failure to follow due process is unacceptable given the history and the circumstances outlined above and I hereby request that another meeting be held or that these provisions be removed in their entirety.

II. **Policy V-** which references a "Multi use community recreation area."

For clarity, I would ask that this use explicitly state that items such as agritainment, fairs and go-karts are not intended to be included under this category but that this is a recreation area for the community of Draper to gather.

III. **Policy XX** –which states in part: "A development permit will be required for the outdoor storage of any commercial vehicle, goods, materials and equipment, unless the Development Authority is satisfied that it is integral to a home based business or intensive agriculture or another use that has been approved."

It is unclear to me why this provision has been included as commercial items are not allowed to be stored in Draper in any event as this is not a commercial district. Under what other permitted or discretionary use would any of these items be allowed in any event?

- IV. **Policy X** – A maximum of three (3) commercial vehicles may be parked and maintained on a residential lot. The maximum weight (Gross Vehicle Weight – GVW) of a commercial vehicle that may be parked on the lot is 7,000 kg

I understand that this policy was likely included due to people's concerns about driving commercial vehicles home. I would suggest that the wording be changed to avoid further abuse by those storing commercial vehicles improperly on their property in Draper and that this matter be raised at another meeting so that all residents of Draper can have input:

Policy X – Any commercial vehicle over 7,000 kg is prohibited from being parked, stored or maintained on a lot in the Small Holdings District.

Any commercial vehicle under 7,000 kg is prohibited from being parked, maintained or stored on a lot in the Small Holdings District with the exception of the following:

- a) Each owner of the lot may park one commercial vehicle that is owned by their corporation on their lot overnight for the purpose of driving to and from their place of business; and
- b) A guest or relative living on the lot may park one commercial vehicle overnight on the lot where they are residing so long as the vehicle is being used to drive to and from their place of business.

Given all of the above issues, I am requesting that another meeting be held where these issues can be discussed further with input from the community which is being affected by these additions.

Yours truly,

17(1) 7 (1)

----- Original Message -----

From: Muhammad Mughal <MUHAMMAD.Mughal@rmwb.ca>

Sent: Thu, 02 Jul 2015 11:46:43 -0600 (MDT)

Subject: FW: Re: Draper Area Structure Plan (ASP) Outcomes of Public Meeting Held June 11, 2015

Good morning:

Ron Pelletier

From: Muhammad Mughal
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2015 10:15 AM
To: Richard Giele
Cc: Susan Frampton
Subject: FW: Draper ASP

Hi Richard,

FYI - forwarded below an email from 17 (1) regarding draft Draper ASP policies.
As suggested, I am preparing log sheet, so that all the comments/concerns can be putted in proper format and in a single document.

Regards,
Muhammad

Regards,
Muhammad

-----Original Message-----

From: 17 (1)
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2015 9:52 AM
To: Muhammad Mughal
Subject: Draper ASP

Hello Muhammad,

I find this rather disheartening that additional provisions have been added and are deemed topics that were previously discussed at meetings, when they were not. I have attended almost every meeting and have been updated on all topics and find this new agenda to be very supportive of only one resident, not the entire community of Draper.

I will not go into a long-winded dialogue about why I oppose certain provisions, as I am certain that other people will have done so already, but please note my opposition regarding the vaguely worded additional provisions. At this point, I would request that another meeting take place so that all residents can express their views regarding the additional provisions.

Kind regards,

17 (1)

Ron Pelletier

From: Muhammad Mughal
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2015 3:37 PM
To: Richard Giele
Cc: Susan Frampton; Brynja Bjarnason
Subject: FW: Draper Area Structure Plan Outcomes of Public Meeting Held June 11, 2015

Hi Richard,

FYI- forwarded below an email from [REDACTED] regarding new additional policies to the Draper ASP.

Regards,
Muhammad

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2015 1:36 PM
To: Muhammad Mughal
Subject: Re: Draper Area Structure Plan Outcomes of Public Meeting Held June 11, 2015

"Draper is a close-knit, quiet community characterized by residential acreages and the ever-changing Clearwater River. An abundance of green space offers many residents the chance for market gardening and home based businesses, and offers our children a wonderful environment in which to play. Indoor and outdoor recreational opportunities, including trails, are enjoyed by residents and people from all over the region. At the heart of Draper is a central facility where our residents can gather and enjoy social events and creative pursuits. Our community infrastructure, especially our roads, is well maintained." (Envision Wood Buffalo, 2010)

Good Day Muhammad

I apologize for not getting back to you sooner but I needed some time to digest the information that you gave me and then needed a few more days to calm myself down. To say that I am disappointed with the revisions made to the ASP (that was last presented as virtually complete I might add) is a gross understatement. I am once again asking myself the question of... why? Why is one resident given the freedom to impose his personal commercial pursuits on the rest of our community by allowing him to inject policy into the ASP at this late in the game? Why is it that the very things that we have made very clear every step of this process that we **do not** want in our neighbourhood (commercial activity) suddenly emerge in the policy as being permitted under the guise of allowable home based business or agriculture activity?

Let me start with the easy one, lot sizes. I know that we have a couple of residents that look to maximize the number of lots that they can subdivide off their current properties and they have requested that lot sizes be lowered to 1.5 acres from the current 2.5 acre minimum. I, for one, would be opposed to this change. I came down here knowing that acreages were limited and larger

lot sizes meant a quieter neighbourhood with increased privacy. Allowing a decrease in the size of lot could potentially double the population in our community. There definitely needs to be more discussion with regards to this change, as it would inflict all sorts of challenges from roads to emergency services. To make changes to the lot sizes now, after many of us have invested in the community for the sake of a disgruntled resident or two would not be fair for the rest of us.

Now for the more difficult ones. Policies X, XX, XXX and IV which I have included below....

Objective 2.2: Maintain the existing development pattern (continued)

Policy X – A maximum of three (3) commercial vehicles may be parked and maintained on a residential lot. The maximum weight (Gross Vehicle Weight – GVW) of a commercial vehicle that may be parked on the lot is 7,000 kg.

- (a) Accessory trailers, used in conjunction with a home-based business or intensive agriculture may be parked and maintained on site.

Policy XX -A development permit will be required for the outdoor storage of any commercial vehicle, goods, materials and equipment, unless the Development Authority is satisfied that it is integral to a home based business or intensive agriculture or another use that has been approved.

- (a) Outdoor storage areas should be compatible with neighbouring lots and not be a source of inconvenience or nuisance. They must be maintained in an orderly and well maintained state. They may be required to be screened from view by means of fencing, shrubbery, trees or other landscaping.

XYZ: Intensive agriculture may include:

- I. Market gardens and greenhouses;
- II. Bee keeping;
- III. Sod farms; and
- IV. Tree farms.

Policy XXX: Where intensive agriculture is the approved use of the land, the following supporting uses may be allowed:

- (i) Related on-site services;
- (ii) Accessory buildings (vehicle garage and indoor storage building)
- (iii) Outdoor storage area for trucks, goods, materials and equipment; and
- (iv) Recreational Vehicles (RVs) to provide living accommodation for seasonal workers for a limited time period of time per year.

Policy IV: A temporary or time limited development permit will be required for a Recreational Vehicle kept on a Small Holdings lot.

- (a) Recreational Vehicles (RVs) shall be located, developed and maintained in an orderly and well-maintained state. They should be compatible with neighbouring lots and not be a source of inconvenience or nuisance. They may be required to be screened from view by means of fencing, shrubbery, trees or other landscaping.

I know that we have a handful of residents that drive their company truck back and forth to work and have voiced concern over not being allowed to legally do that. I can appreciate implementing something that would permit one vehicle coming and going every day but three is overkill and would directly impact the rest of the neighbourhood. We have gone from not allowing anything to opening up Pandora's box with this provision.

Home-based businesses should not involve “commercial vehicles, accessory trailers or outdoor storage “ of any sort. This type of equipment is industrial/commercial in nature and should not be present in our community. We have worked long and hard to keep these exact activities out of our neighbourhood and this policy would only serve to undermine our efforts. The majority of our residents want only to enjoy the peace and quiet of a residential neighbourhood and not be subjected to someone else's commercial intentions. These four policies have been blatantly injected to aid Dunvegan Gardens in their pursuit of legalizing their commercial business in our community. I am once again trying to understand why the municipality feels it necessary to try and sneak this type of legislation past the residents who have fought, are fighting, and will continue to fight against the bully in the neighbourhood. Your intro letter states that policy highlighted in either red or blue indicates proposed new or revised policies resulting from discussions at either the February 12th or June 11th meetings. And yet, these items never came up in discussion at either of these meetings. (You would have had a riot on your hands if it had.) This is another attempt by Mr. Freisen to subvert the entire ASP process and impose his commercial pursuits on the rest of our community. I am aghast at the audacity of the municipality to insert these items into the ASP under the false pretence that they have been publicly discussed or evaluated amongst our community members. To inject policy that so clearly benefits only one community member, and to do so at the cost of the rest of the community residents who have fought to prevent just such things from happening is mystifying to me. Permits for “Related on-site vehicles, vehicle storage and outdoor storage for trucks, goods, materials and equipment and RV's” are all items that Mr. Friesen has applied for in the past and the community rallied and had them all revoked. We are still waiting to see enforcement on decisions that go back

several years and to now see these exact same items show up in our ASP at the tail end of the process is simply insulting. Not just to the residents of our community but to the entire municipal processes of permitting, appeals, and the Area Structure Plan. It undermines and ignores the conversations that have taken place over the last several years with regards to the future of our community.

I am at a loss as to where we go from here. I am angry that I am feeling shafted by the municipality once again.

I strongly oppose the proposed policy X, XX, XXX, and IV and suggest that these items be omitted from the ASP since they were never discussed with residents. I am also opposed to the changes made to the policies 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 with regards to lot sizes.

Sincerely frustrated,

17 (1)

On 2015-07-02, at 11:21 AM, Muhammad Mughal wrote:

Good day 17 (1)

Please find attached the information package regarding Draper ASP outcomes of Public meeting held on June 11, 2015 for your review and consideration.

The purpose of this information package is to share with you what we heard from residents/stakeholders at our last public meeting on June 11, 2015; to distribute our revised draft policy document (dated June 29, 2015) incorporating what we heard; and to outline the 'next steps' in the process.

The attached information package includes:

1. Intro letter,
2. A summary of what was discussed at the June 11, 2015 meeting ("What We Heard"), and
3. A revised draft policy document in response to the questions and concerns raised at the June 11, 2015 meeting (this is the document entitled "Draft Draper ASP Policies (for Discussion Purposes Only – July 2, 2015").

Ron Pelletier

From: Muhammad Mughal
Sent: Thursday, July 9, 2015 1:32 AM
To: Susan Frampton; Richard Giele
Subject: RE: Andrew Thorne Phone Call

Hi Susan,

I am seriously concerned about comments and questions raised by the Draper residents. I am afraid, supporting to new additional policies will open another window of never ending discussion and ASP will be delayed for uncertain period of time.

I believe, the new policies need omit from the ASP. The following are my comments for your consideration:

- I understand the Draper residents raised their concern about storage and number of vehicle etc. However, during our last public meeting we provided the facts that we need to focus on the ASP contents/ broad policies and such details will be included in the LUB, not in ASP;
- The new additional policies conflict to discussion and facts we presented in our last public meeting, held on June 11, 2015;
- I respectfully disagree to facts which have been provided to support the new additional policies, since the new additional policies are merely related to LUB, not ASP;
- The existing plan prepared in 2000. Today's 98% percent of the residents/stakeholders intend to see Draper community composed as primarily of residential units on large acreage lots. Additionally, they are happy with the provision of market gardening, instead emphasize on intensive / large scale agriculture, on which all energies have been used to emphasize and enforce.

The above facts are based on my observation and working experience with the Draper community. We will discuss further details in a meeting scheduled this morning.

Regards,

Muhammad

From: Susan Frampton
Sent: Wednesday, July 08, 2015 7:48 PM
To: Richard Giele; Muhammad Mughal
Subject: RE: Andrew Thorne Phone Call

Hi,

Please see the attached explanation behind the 'good neighbour' policies. This may help with our discussion at 9 am.

We need to also be able to respond to his comments on the multi-use community area too. Also check out what Mrs. Thornton's concerns are, as he may follow up with questions about those.

Cheers
Susan

Ron Pelletier

From: Muhammad Mughal
Sent: Thursday, July 9, 2015 8:43 AM
To: Richard Giele; Susan Frampton
Subject: FW: Draft Draper Area Structure plan

Hi Richard,

FYI-attached are comments/concerns raised by 17 (1) regarding additional policies to the Draper ASP.

Regards,
Muhammad

From: 17 (1)
Sent: Wednesday, July 8, 2015 7:07 PM
To: Muhammad Mughal
Subject: Draft Draper Area Structure plan

Dear Muhammad; I am concerned with a number of the last minute additions to the proposed Draper Area Structure plan and would like to have an opportunity to discuss them @ a meeting with my neighbors. It is obvious to me that some residents get preferential treatment, while others have to struggle to receive fair treatment. Some of these amendments seem to be leaning in the wrong direction. More time to hammer out an ASP that accomodate as many residents as possible is imperative.

Regards 17 (1)

Sent by [Outlook](#) for Android

Ron Pelletier

From: Muhammad Mughal
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2015 9:40 AM
To: Richard Giele; Susan Frampton
Subject: FW: Draper Area Structure Plan; Proposed Modifications

Hi Richard,

FYI- forwarded below an email from 17 (1) regarding draft Draper ASP policies.

Regards,
Muhammad

From: 17 (1)
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2015 9:33 AM
To: Muhammad Mughal
Subject: Draper Area Structure Plan; Proposed Modifications

Muhammad,

I am so disappointed having to write this response whilst on my vacation. It is not only my personal family time that is being used, but also has aggravated my mind over the past several days since I initially read the email. I am further disappointed that having to write these responses, appeals, etc. over the past 9-10 years has collectively utilized a significant amount of overall family and personal time, unnecessarily. I have had to change trips out of town, modified schedules, etc. so I can personally participate in repeated appeals from various citizens in the Draper area who want to sustain their quiet, country lifestyle.

When we moved down here (Draper), we undertook our due diligence and spoke with the Director, Manager, as well as the area planner from Planning and Development for Draper to ensure that this area would remain as a quiet residential neighbourhood. We moved from downtown Fort McMurray to accommodate this very thing in the urban area, which to this very day has still not been redeveloped. We were assured that any development would suit the character and nature of the residential acreage lifestyle, particularly due to the majority of land being in a flood plain as well as the fact that there was not requisite infrastructure and multiple modes of transportation to and from the community. There have been multiple endeavours over the past 10 years ranging from the *Future Forward* sessions, to multiple ASP sessions which have all sustained and supported the continuance of this quiet community lifestyle. I don't understand why there is this sudden shift in direction; I would like to know whom specifically this is coming from, whether it is from the community or from the Municipality. I cannot fathom why the municipality would think that we are not competent enough to see how the verbiage and the proposed changes would directly support varying levels of commercial and industrial activity in the area.

At present, the current bylaws are not being enforced, despite having various Subdivision Appeal Rulings and complaints from community citizens. I am not sure why this particular business (Dunvegan Gardens) is being provided with such leeways on their operations. Over the years they have made application for businesses

ranging from U-Haul sales/rentals to RV Sales and Repairs - they have no true intent of sustaining an intensive agricultural operation, it is merely a temporary means to an end. While I reside about 3 km's from this particular business, I do have a vested interest as it has the potential to impact each and every property in the area. I have a current neighbour who wants the changes so that he can run a full scale electrical business in the community; avoiding having to pay rental fees and commercial taxes in a Gregoire Shop. I 'tolerate' the current fleet of 2, plus those staff that come in from time to time, but pushing a ruling to 3, actually means they will operate a full fleet, and this would never be enforced - give an inch, they take a mile, due to no enforcement. I have countless comments regarding various aspects of suggested line item modifications you have made, but again, I am on vacation and don't need this to further fuel any further loss of time or frustration on my part as I am beyond disgusted at this point.

When I drive around the community, I see various derelict and vacant properties in the urban and industrial park communities that would be better suited for these types of activities - why not spend some efforts to deal with the multiple developments you already have in place instead of choosing to not have to do the hard work and enforce the bylaws in the areas that you have already developed.

The economy of these properties is not the business of the municipality to intervene with, it is up to the businesses to properly plan and operate in these approved areas within the means of the bylaws in place - it wasn't too long ago that Dunvegan was in Gregoire - greed has afforded them increased profits, not business logic. The vast majority of their business is retail and commercial/industrial landscaping, not intensive agriculture, a quick visit there will better inform you of this.

It appears that you should have another meeting with community members to discuss what is the intent behind the changes, truly. If this is really what the municipality will be imposing on the community, I ask that you consider my property to purchase, as it will be for sale. I will join the masses and start commuting to work and no longer to be one of those that is an investor or proponent of the community.

Apologies for the curtness, but the tact and manner in which you delivered your modifications was offensive.

Regards,

17(1) 7 (1)

Ron Pelletier

From: Muhammad Mughal
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 10:00 AM
To: Richard Giele; Susan Frampton
Subject: FW: Draper Area Structure Plan (ASP) Outcomes of Public Meeting Held June 11, 2015

Hi Richard,

FYI – forwarded below comments by [REDACTED] to draft Draper ASP policies.

Regards
Muhammad

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 9:42 AM
To: Muhammad Mughal
Subject: RE: Draper Area Structure Plan (ASP) Outcomes of Public Meeting Held June 11, 2015

Muhammad,

I've been a resident of Draper since 1999 and was a part of a [REDACTED] from the mid 80's up until 2005 on Garden Lane. The family was involved with the initial workshops that created the first Area Structure Plan (ASP) for the Draper area in 1999 and it involved many weeks of discussion and hard work to perfect. The concept was country living on large acreages with small pursuits in agriculture and home based business with no nuisance, noise or smells to interrupt the quality of living. I really liked the concept that was created for the area and I built my home on River Bend Close in 1999.

The majority of residents still support and approve this old ASP, we've built our homes here based on an ideal you no longer seem keen on protecting. Why are we re-evaluating an ASP that the majority of residents still support? It seems as though you're trying to fabricate details in the ASP to support commercial activity. Being a business owner and land developer myself, **I'm not in support of this at all.** Greed should not be the driving force of our area structure plan; **quality of living** should be.

Is commercial business what the municipality supports? Does the RMWB have a hidden agenda? If so, you should let the Draper residence know.

I do not like the wording in the new/revised ASP draft. I believe it leaves too many loop holes for people to misinterpret the plan and would promote more commercial activities in the area. A clear, well-defined ASP is needed so that no by-laws can be misinterpreted and taken advantage of.

Recreation in Draper area should be kept to a community hall/park for the residents of Draper, along with the existing ATV trail and the two river accesses mentioned on the map. Recreation should not be carnivals, exhibitions, fairs, Easter egg hunts, Halloween attractions etc. These types of things should be held where most of the city's population resides and in a location with proper road access and egress.

RV parks for seasonal workers and RV storage lots for the purpose of commercial activity should not be allowed. Only personal RV storage should be allowed. There are other accommodations around Fort McMurray in which seasonal workers can live.

I believe two commercial vehicles is more than sufficient for any small home business or agricultural pursuit, anything more than that suggests endeavours that are larger than should be permissible.

The lot sizes in the 2000 ASP should not be changed, it would over populate the area and take away the rural character.

It's getting pretty tiring as a resident and one of the forefathers of development in this area, when commercial companies are constantly trying to change the bylaws to suit their needs, when they were illegal and never had proper permission to do what they are doing in the first place.

The commercial activity like Dunvegan's landscaping, department store and aggregate supply company should be removed from this area.

Draper is not a large area and resides adjacent to a heritage river; it is your responsibility to protect it, and approve developments that maintains the rural character and quality of living. Looking forward to the completion and approval of this ASP.

17(4) 7(1)

From: MUHAMMAD.Mughal@rmwb.ca

Subject: FW: Re: Draper Area Structure Plan (ASP) Outcomes of Public Meeting Held June 11, 2015

Date: Thu, 2 Jul 2015 17:46:43 +0000

To:

Good morning:

Please find attached the information package regarding Draper ASP outcomes of Public meeting held on June 11, 2015 for your review and consideration.

The purpose of this information package is to:

- share with you what we heard from residents/stakeholders at our last public meeting on June 11, 2015;
- distribute our revised draft policy document (dated June 29, 2015) incorporating what we heard; and
- outline the 'next steps' in the ASP process.

The attached information package includes:

1. Intro letter (include outline the next steps in the ASP process),
2. A summary of what was discussed at the June 11, 2015 meeting ("What We Heard"), and
3. A revised draft policy document in response to the questions and concerns raised at the June 11, 2015 meeting (this is the document entitled "Draft Draper ASP Policies (for Discussion Purposes Only – July 2, 2015").

Please do not hesitate to contact me, should you have any questions or concerns.

Best regards,

Muhammad Shahid Mughal, MCIP, RPP
Planner – Comprehensive Planning
Planning & Development Department
Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo

Ron Pelletier

From: Muhammad Mughal
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 3:49 PM
To: Richard Giele; Susan Frampton
Subject: FW: Draper Area Strucure Plan(ASP)

Hi Richard,

FYI - forwarded below an email by [REDACTED] regarding new additional to the draft Draper ASP.

Regards,
Muhammad

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 2:13 PM
To: Muhammad Mughal
Subject: Draper Area Strucure Plan(ASP)

Hello Muhammad,

After reading the revised Draft policy document that has been provided to the residents/stakeholders of Draper Road. We are very concerned with the proposed new policies/revised policy wording. (Red text) In all the revisions and throughout the Draft Draper ASP policies there needs to be more clarity in the terminology; the use of "may" is too broad a term and opens up the risk of politics and self-interest interpretations. Policies X, XX, XXX and IV are of great concern because a lot of these ideas have not been discussed with residents and seem to have been included to serve the commercial pursuits of one resident Of Draper Road. Knowing that we are not the only residents that are opposed with the new draft revision, we strongly request that another meeting be held to address the new policies which have been inserted into the ASP.

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

Ron Pelletier

From: Muhammad Mughal
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2015 8:38 AM
To: Richard Giele
Cc: Susan Frampton
Subject: FW: Draper Area Structure Plan (ASP) Outcomes of Public Meeting Held June 11, 2015

Hi Richard,

FYI – forwarded below an email from [17(1)] regarding draft Draper ASP policies, circulated on July 2, 2015.

Regards,
Muhammad

From: [17(1)]
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 9:44 PM
To: Muhammad Mughal
Subject: RE: Draper Area Structure Plan (ASP) Outcomes of Public Meeting Held June 11, 2015

Good evening Muhammad. The email that you received from this email address yesterday was from my husband [17(1)]. Please see his name at the bottom it. I have many of my own concerns regarding this information package as many of the proposed changes were not discussed at either of the ASP meetings that I attended. I do not consider it a waste of my time to attend and participate in the public meetings to develop the Draper ASP. I do feel that I have totally wasted my time attending the February and June meetings as there are many points included in this package that were never discussed by the group in attendance at either meeting. The group made it perfectly clear that commercial/industrial activity that was not allowed in our previous ASP, was not to be included in the new ASP. Better wording was requested in the new ASP to ensure that it was perfectly clear what activity was allowed and what was not. I also agree wholeheartedly with all points made by [17(1)] in the previous email.

Concerned and frustrated,

[17(1)]

From: MUHAMMAD.Mughal@rmwb.ca
Subject: FW: Re: Draper Area Structure Plan (ASP) Outcomes of Public Meeting Held June 11, 2015
Date: Thu, 2 Jul 2015 17:46:43 +0000
To:

Good morning:

Please find attached the information package regarding Draper ASP outcomes of Public meeting held on June 11, 2015 for your review and consideration.