

ID #	Part	Section	Comment Details	Decision	Rationale for decision
1 1		9.1	Within Part 3 there is reference to Development - and I was enquiring as to where the Horse Club falls within this. We are in the urban service district - on leased land - and have been traditionally exempt from Development Plans though we are required to have Building Permits in accordance with Provincial Legislation - except for 3 sided horse shelters. It is noticed that Part 3 (o) specifically identifies" Trappers Cabin" so wondering about the horse club	No change proposed	The Horse club may best be captured under the proposed Recreation facility, Outdoor. However the future development may fit in other uses based on what is proposed. The trappers cabin is specific use, not captured under other definitions under the Land Use Bylaw.
2 1		9.1	few of the definitions are out of alphabetical order... for example Dwelling units per hectare; plant nursery; auto vehicle sales or rental	Change made	These typological corrections have been made.
3 1		9.1	Card lock facility: there's no definition although the term is used twice in the service station definition	Change made	Change card Lock facility to cardlock fueling station to add clarity to the term. Cardlock fueling stations are unmanned fuel stations that typically do not have convenience stores and aren't open to the general public. An example would be the Petro Canada at Taiganova eco-industrial park. Where a term is not defined, it means the 'general meaning' of the word. We define terms when we want to limit the meaning of that term or specify a particular meaning the term has. In this case, to help specify the term, we have re-worded to mean 'cardlock fueling station'.
4 1		9.1	Agriculture: personal use is used in the Small Holdings Permitted and Discretionary uses but there is no definition of what that is.	Change made	A definition for Agriculture, Personal Use has been added.
5 1		9.1	Farmers/Flea market has been removed but the urban markets (also not defined) are still happening, needs a definition	No change proposed	The farmers/ flea market is contemplated under the single-use "Market" and not defined separately
6 1		9.1	Carnival: has been removed but there is no definition for a fair either	No change proposed	Carnival is captured under another land use, and would fall under the definition "Recreation Facility, Outdoor". Depending on the time frame (See Part 5, Section 41.6) it may be captured under "Special Event."
7 1		9.1	Aquacultural facility: no definition but is used in the definition for agriculture small scale	No change proposed	Within the Land Use Bylaw, we define terms when we want to limit that term's meaning or state a particular meaning the term has. Aquaculture is the water equivalent of agriculture; the context here being propagation of water species (i.e. fish farm)
8 1		9.1 Abattoir	Abattoir: honestly should probably just use Slaughterhouse since that's what it is. This just sounds like a nice word for something that I think a lot of residents would be up in arms about if in their community.	No change proposed	Slaughter house is a specific use. However, the Abattoir definition allows for a wider range of uses such as sale, treating etc. in districts such as the Rural District
9 1		9.1 Abattoir	Abattoir: honestly should probably just use Slaughterhouse since that's what it is. This just sounds like a nice word for something that I think a lot of residents would be up in arms about if in their community.	Change made	Internal comment which resulted in the application of notice posting to this use

10	1	9.1 Airport	Airport - section b has been removed which covers the Department of National Defense Airport reserve has been deleted but I'm not sure if this is now covered in industrial uses	Change made	Airport - Added "and ancillary buildings or structures associated with such use" to the Airport definition. The Land Use Bylaw relates more to the use of a parcel than its ownership.  Airport Reserve-we would use a land use district to reserve lands, such as Environmental Preservation or Urban Expansion. It would have the same effect and removing the "Airport Reserve" helps simplify and reduce redundancies in the proposed Land Use Bylaw.
11	1	9.1 Campground	Campground - And finally the definition of Campground reads funny weird.....A campground this use...I think the word this needs to be removed	Change made	The edit has been made to provide clarity.
12	1	9.1 Lot Line, Zero	Zero lot line: definition has been removed although I'm pretty sure we still have properties with zero lot lines	No change proposed	The definition of the term is still in the Bylaw. The defined term is "Lot Line, Zero" to better facilitate sorting the "Lot Line" definitions.
13	1	9.1 Mobile Home	Mobile home - Definitions/ clarifications of manufactured home, ready to move home, modular home are needed to go with the mobile home definition	No change proposed	The 'manufactured home' in the 99/059 Land Use Bylaw is now captured under the term 'mobile home'. There was confusion about whether the term 'manufactured' referred to all types of pre-manufactured building types. The term 'mobile home' better captures one of the most distinguishing factors between this type of housing and other housing; the presence of a chassis. Ready to move or modular homes are captured under the "Single Detached Dwelling" land use. This is the same as the current Land Use Bylaw.
14	1	9.1 Oil Sands Operations	Update definition of oil sands mining, extraction and upgrading to include some acknowledgement of in-situ. She's asking if we can update the definition to reflect the fact that SAGD is now a significant method.	Change made	We have kept the inclusion of 'extraction' in the first portion of the definition to capture any other types of technology that could emerge over time. To ensure the definitions of the Land Use Bylaw are relevant with current industrial practices, the comment was incorporated.
15	1	9.1 Storage Facility, Outdoor	Typo found in the definition of Storage Facility Outdoor....designed is spelled incorrectly	Change made	The typographical correction has been made.
16	1	9.1 Swimming Pool	Swimming pool: I noticed the size requirement has been removed and was wondering how hot tubs and kids pools fit into the scheme of things now	Changes made	This reflects our current practice. However, changes have been made to Part 3 Section 2 to clarify regulations regarding swimming pools

17	1	9	Not in favor of cluster housing	No change proposed	The proposed Land Use Bylaw does not include 'Cluster Housing' as a use in any land use district. A new land use, called 'multi-residential development' allows more two or more types of residential developments to be constructed on the same lot, as long as those types of development are already allowed in the land use district. This use is included in the HR2 - Hamlet Residential 2 District and the HCC- Hamlet Community Core District as these are envisioned to be higher density land use districts, and is in line with the approved ASPs. The HCC and HR2 districts are not applied to very many properties in the Hamlets compared to HR1-Hamlet Residential 1 District which is much more common, so the application of this land use is very limited.
18	1	9	I don't agree with cluster housing.	No change proposed	The proposed Land Use Bylaw does not include 'Cluster Housing' as a use in any land use district. A new land use, called 'multi-residential development' allows more two or more types of residential developments to be constructed on the same lot, as long as those types of development are already allowed in the land use district. This use is included in the HR2 - Hamlet Residential 2 District and the HCC- Hamlet Community Core District as these are envisioned to be higher density land use districts, and is in line with the approved ASPs. The HCC and HR2 districts are not applied to very many properties in the Hamlets compared to HR1-Hamlet Residential 1 District which is much more common, so the application of this land use is very limited.
19	1	9.1	Alphabetically out of order. Like as in, removed the word "Greenhouse/" but forgot to move it to the P's We call this a garden centre and it was determined to be a retail activity. The drafter of this document took Garden out of C4 and Business Industrial districts and put it into 3 country residential districts. Who drafted this? This looks really bad.	Changes made	Noted the alphabetical order mismatch. This correction has been made. Plant nursery replaced Greenhouse/ Plant Nursery, and this use is included in C4, C5 Districts. Plant nursery is now removed from the Agriculture Small Scale definition. Garden Centre is not a use in the proposed or exiting LUB.
20	1	9.1 BnB	Bed and Breakfast- Defection highlighted in Yellow due to the inclusion of this use in the SH District	No change proposed	Bed and Breakfast is a compatible use in a Residential District. Additionally, it was supported in the Draper ASP survey by 48% . Therefore, it remains unchanged as per the current LUB (where it is discretionary MPC) and is included as a 'Notice Posting' use for additional advertising.
21	1	9.1 HBMA	Home Business, Major- what part of this definition distinguishes it from a Business? This deregulated the LUB in relation to districts	No change proposed	A Home Business, Major is an accessory use to a residential use. In typical commercial uses, the 'business' or commercial aspect is the principal use.

22	1	9.1 Agriculture Small Scale	<p>Why higher than 5 acres as per small holdings standards? This should be limited to the growing of crops, as it is now. No consultation was performed on this point Flooding and livestock, E-Coli? RMWB liability? Walkerton?</p> <p>As this relates to the Small Holdings district in that it authorizes or permits the nuisance and interference with a residential character and is therefore a breach of the MDP/ASP. Also, horse holding area in a floodplain is a very bad and dangerous. Who in a residential area wants a kennel, as that is an industrial use in most municipalities. Why an aquaculture facility or dog holding area? Where did this come from, and undefined? Someone copied another jurisdictions bylaws.</p>	Change made	<p>The four uses: Plant nursery, market garden, intensive livestock operation and livestock manure unit are removed from Agriculture Small Scale definition. Additionally, Agriculture, Small Scale is a Discretionary use in the district. These uses do not fit the intent of the ASP and the SH District. The definition of Small Scale agriculture has been changed to remove the uses that are not compatible with Residential Areas.</p> <p>Research has indicated that there are minimal risks associated with E-Colli transfer in moderate intensity of agriculture.</p> <p>There is a limitation on livestock in both the Agriculture Small Scale as well as Agriculture Personal Use (Part 5 Section 4.6 and 4.7 respectively)</p> <p>We define terms when we want to limit the meaning of that term or specify a particular meaning the term has. Aquaculture is the water equivalent of agriculture; so the propagation of water species (i.e. fish farm)</p>
23	1	9.1 D	DevelopmentShould Stockpile be referenced as temporary as this is not an allowable use in and of itself?	No change proposed	Stockpiling, or the storage of material, is an activity that is contemplated by other land uses (i.e. Contractor, General). The definition of Development comes directly from the Municipal Government Act.
24	1	9.1 FF	Flood Fringe and Floodway- Draper is not included on the Maps	No change proposed	In the package shared for public engagement, Appendix A Map1 and Map 18 includes Draper
25	1	9.1 FHA	Flood Hazard Area- Draper is not included on the Maps	No change proposed	In the package shared for public engagement, Page 44 of 45 - Appendix E includes Draper
26	1	9.1 GSa	Garage Sale- I suggest limiting this to so many days a year to prevent a junk yard business from popping up	No change proposed	<p>Being part of a Special Event, a Garage Sale would fall under the same number of days restricted. This is covered in the general regulations of the Land Use Bylaw instead of the definition which allows for for the following to apply:</p> <p>1.1.The duration of a special event shall:</p> <p>not exceed:</p> <p>i.fifteen (15) consecutive days, or,</p> <p>ii.a maximum of eighteen (18) days total in one (1) calendar year;</p> <p>Also, Garage sale is listed under special event in the exemption section 2.2 of part 3</p>
27	1	9.1 HaR	Habitable Room- Review definition	Change made	This definition was reviewed and changed. Cooking facilities were deleted. It now reads: means a room in a dwelling designed or occupied for sleeping, or living or purposes.
28	1	9.1 HBMI	Home Business, Minor- Avoiding walk-in business is preferred	No change proposed	In the context of Home Business, Minor, no customers are permitted to attend the residence. There would be no walk-in portion allowed.
29	1	9.1 ILO	Intensive Livestock Operation- Good idea	Change made	Appreciative comment. No change proposed.

30	1	9.1 Liv	Livestock *Highlighted in yellow*	Change made	Livestock is included in the Agriculture Small since some component of keeping animals is applicable in this use. Also, this use is included in Agriculture, personal Use. Therefore, a definition is required.
31	1	9.1 LM	Livestock Manure Unit *Highlighted in yellow*	No change proposed	Livestock Manure Unit is included under Intensive Livestock Operation. Therefore, a definition is required.
32	1	9.1 Market	Market *Highlighted in yellow*	No change proposed	No context is provided for highlighting the Market definition
33	1	9.1 MH	Mobile Home*Highlighted in yellow*	No change proposed	No context is provided for highlighting the Mobile definition
34	1	9.1 Re,G	Retail, General *Highlighted in yellow*	No change proposed	No context is provided for highlighting the Retail, General definition
35	1	9.1 Recreational Vehicle	<p>2.Please add "Park Model" to the definition of Recreational Vehicle. (For the purpose of this Bylaw this includes such vehicles as motor homes, campers not mounted on a truck, holiday trailers, tent trailers, park models, and fifth wheel units)</p> <p>Rationale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>oTo be consistent with the Building Codes regulation as Safety Codes can not approve a 'Park Model' as per their Standata as a Mobile Home;</li> <li>oTo define that the type of 'Park Model' is restricted in the new Bylaw to ensure that it does not receive approval from a Development Officer as a Mobile Home;</li> <li>oThe manufacturers description outline the Park Model as a Recreational Vehicle.</li> </ul>	Change made	Added Park Model to the examples under the definition of Recreational Vehicle as it is appropriate only three seasons (not year around) and qualifies for an RV
36	1	9.1 SecS	Propose restriction on Secondary suites. Areas of Edmonton ruined due to the Secondary suite issue.	No change proposed	Secondary Suites are restricted based on certain sizes as per section 36 of Part 5
37	1	9.1 SecyS	Security Suite- Suggest more specific restrictions or wording to avoid abuse	No change proposed	There is a section on the Security Suite restrictions (Part 5 Section 37). Security suites are restricted to 70sqm
38	1	9.1 SiDD	Single Detached Dwelling *Highlighted in yellow*	No change proposed	No context is provided for highlighting the Single Detached Dwelling definition
39	1	9.1 Similar Use	This creates uncertainty	Change made	The definition was changed to state: "a use that is comparable in character, intensity and purpose to another use as determined by the Development Authority." to provide clarity and be more concise.

40	1	9.1 SpIE	What type of Special Events to you see happening and who is hosting them? Should stipulate that it does not include activities primarily designed to promote a Business	No change proposed	In planning practice, the application is to consider the "use" rather than the "user". A development permit approval runs with the land and is not portable with the applicant. In a discretionary application, such as a Special Event, the approval is for the site and how the site will accommodate the use. Business type signage or advertising would be subject to Land Use Bylaw requirements, but may be considered ancillary to the Special Event particularly if the event is of short duration.
41	2	1.3	Is the intent for the delegate to not sub-delegate ever? If so, the word "may" needs to be changed to "shall". If not, then the whole sentence should probably be removed as it is now redundant.	Change made	The wording 'shall' is more consistent with the language of the draft Land Use Bylaw and is stronger language.
42	2	2.7	Why would this be discretionary?	No change proposed	The Development Authority (DA) imposes conditions based on the Development proposal. It is very common in every Development Permit to impose conditions on several aspects, but the DA is to decide in each instance which conditions are applicable
43	2	4	What are you doing for older buildings in the city? Your departments like to make changes and then people can't sell their houses. They have to go through hoops. This changes and then people can't sell their houses. They have to go through hoops. This is ridiculous for those that have owned their house for 30 or more years. It was up to p ar then. It should be grandfathered in	Changes made	There are a set of rules in place to protect the existing buildings or uses that no longer comply with the LUB, also know as non-conforming buildings or uses, which is addressed in Part 2 Section 4. Section 4.9 has been added 'for parcels created prior to the adoption of this Bylaw in urban residential districts'
44	2	4.4	Shouldn't the word may be changed to shall? If a development permit was issued in error, wouldn't it be the right thing to do and have it corrected before the developer proceeds further. Covers the extra expense for the developer and the possible ramifications of having the wrong type of development in an area.	No change proposed	We use the word "may" to be consistent with section 643(4) of the MGA, which uses the same language. While the more directory word "shall" could be used, it suggests some action or enforceability where this is about grandfathering.
45	2	5.1	directly contradicts 4.2. Messaging should be consistent	No change proposed	These two sections are not related. Section 4.2 refers to non-confirming use, while Section 5.1 details development permit application requirements.
46	2	5.3	...may accept ...without all the required information... This statement needs to be clarified a lot. If the development authority can accept applications without all the required info, what is stopping a major error or an illegal development to be built in the wrong zones/ flood plains etc. This should be removed, just to cover the behinds of the staff working in that department. This section is how mistakes are made.	Change made	The section has been removed as the discretion is already provided to the Development Authority in section 2.3. Staff use their discretion professionally to ensure they have received all the necessary information to make an informed decision on an application.

47	2	2.2 (p)	project accommodations...why wouldn't a project accommodations for up to 20 people for 28 days not need a development permit? Is this for the urban service area or for the rural areas? I would be choked if I lived in town and a 20 person camp went up on the green spaces in town. If its just for the project accommodations that are put up for drilling rigs in the middle of nowhere, then that needs to be specified.	No change proposed	Although these project accommodations do not require a development permit, they still need to follow the Land Use Bylaw requirements. In this case, they would only be allowed in districts where they included as a land use. The green spaces in the Urban Service Area typically fall under the Land Use District "Parks and Recreation" or "Environmental Preservation". Project accommodation is not a use in these districts, so they would not be allowed. Project Accommodation is only a use in the Rural District, so these are the areas something like this could occur.
48	2	2.4 (a)	The rationale behind this comment is the perceived abuse of this provision	Change made	We have replaced the word "analogous" with "comparable" to add clarity and to be consistent with the defined term. The similar use provision provides limited discretion to the Development Authority and it is reasonable to do so since it is almost impossible for the Council to predict every type of application that may be made.
49	2	5.2 (d)(e)	The requirements for flood protection measures and ENG slope stability should be mandatory in the floodway and flood plain	Change made	Section 18.1 applies to land with sloped development. The title of the section was modified to add clarity.. Also, additional flood provisions will come to the Land Use Bylaw in a later amendment through the flood recovery work.
50	2	2.4	Permit process is lengthy	No change proposed	The development review process usually requires several review stages. Additionally, the processing times are in line with the Municipal Government Act
51	2	2.3.1(b)	The rationale behind this comment is in regards Section 2.3.2 and the merits of the propose development. The sentence is vague and is open to interpretation	Change made	The section has been modified to remove vague parts of the section.
52	2	2.3.2 (a)(b)(c)(d)(e )	what does merits mean in this context?	Change made	We have added the word "planning" before merits. The term "planning merits" further describes the application of discretion by the Development Authority.
53	3	1	for question 2 you we have been told for more than a year that a change of use permit would not be required. The requirments for a development permit is worse in my opinion. I thought that the system was going to be simplified, I am confused.	No change proposed	The number of uses in the land use bylaw have been reduced, so the likelihood of requiring a change of use permit has decreased. This is especially true in the Business Industrial areas where typically the most change of use permits are issued.
54	3	2.1. (c)	Good idea	No change proposed	Appreciative comment on the Participate Wood Buffalo page. No change proposed.
55	3	2.2. (h)(i)	Too many opportunities for misinterpretation and how would a Development Officer determine this?	No change proposed	General regulations have specific provisions regarding the restriction of stockpiling in residential areas Part 5 Section 31.1
56	3	2.2. (p)	Project Accommodation - "Anywhere? "	No change proposed	Although the development in this section does not require a development permit, it is still required to comply with the standards of the Land Use Bylaw. For instance, a Project Accommodation would only be allowed in districts that have this included as a use (Rural District)

57	3	2.2.(x) iii	Should Garage Sale be its own category?	Change made	Added to the Garage sale definition
58	3	2.2.(x) v.	What kind of Special Event would not be inherent in the development Permit of a church and already allowable?	Change made	This item was review internally and it was deleted from the list
59	3	3.2.	Should this not be mandatory and include all affected parties so that the Officer has more to consider before making a decision?	No change proposed	Making a referral mandatory for all discretionary use development permit applications will be too onerous for the Department to undertake. There is no capacity or funds available for such an extensive review for all applications. Hence it is suggested that "the Development Authority <u>may</u> send a written notice"...
60	3	4.4.	Why is this discretionary?	No change proposed	The circumstances of cancellation are diverse, depending on the case and the provisions cannot be changed to say "shall" instead of "may"
61	3	6.3.	This creates a problem in the case of issue estoppel if the same use is being applied for.	Change made	Section 6.2 comes from the MGA, however provision 6.3 was deleted.
62	3	7.1 (b)	All discretionary uses should require notice posting. I don't want to leave it up to a kid fresh out of school Cziban? With current circumstances without notice being made directly to affected parties, there will be no effective notice	No change proposed	No change was proposed for the circulation of all discretionary uses. The notification provision are clear for discretionary uses and notice posting uses. Not every use needs a written notification.
63	3	7.4.	Not a realistic notice option	No change proposed	No change was proposed for the circulation of all discretionary uses. The notification provision are clear for discretionary uses and notice posting uses. Not every use needs a written notification.
64	3	7.2	Also directly contradicts 2.9 in section 2. Both parts deal with how refusal of permits are handled. 2.9 says no written notice required and 7.2 says written notice shall...It's one or the other...	Change made	These two sections are addressing two different things. Part 2 section 2.9 refers to the discretion of the Development Authority to provide reasons for a refusal, whereas Part 3 Section 7.2 requires the Development Authority to notify an Applicant of the refusal decision. We have included language from Part 2 section 2.9 to Part 3 section 7.2 to add clarity.
65	4	4.1	What is considered reasonable notice? 20 hours or 20 days? Depending on the situation both could be considered reasonable...probably could be defined	No change proposed	"Reasonable notice" is a phrase that is very common among Land Use Bylaw's in other communities. This terminology allows for flexibility and the ability to adapt to a specific context and enables the Development Authority to to be sensitive to the time frame notice required. For example, requesting an inspection on a Saturday within 24 hours of a commercial establishment where they may be closed on the weekend would not be reasonable. However, if an inspection were requested on a Tuesday within 24 hours that would be more reasonable.
66	4	4.3	Section 543 of the ACT is a "court ordered inspection" shouldn't the wording be ..."shall" proceed pursuant to section 543.... Only because I thought that if it was court ordered, the option to proceed was removed and the compliance officer has no choice but to inspect	No change proposed	The intent of the term "may", allows staff to continue to apply discretion. If entry is denied or otherwise interfered with, we have the discretion on how best to carry out enforcement. The final determination on any enforcement matter should rest with the responsible staff and not be subject to a third party or citizen compulsion.



67	4	3.2.	Rationale for this comment is that the Appendix D was not available	No change proposed	Appendix D was available at Page 43 of 55 in the Appendices package uploaded to the webpage <a href="https://participate.rmwb.ca/lub">https://participate.rmwb.ca/lub</a> page during the public engagement
68	5	1	Accessory Buildings – what's the possibility in other zones not listed? Is it not allowed in specific areas ex. Residential What about sea cans?	No change proposed	The only districts that sea cans are contemplated in are those listed in Part 5 Section 1.9
69	5	1	I'm in support of allowing sea cans as accessory buildings. As long as they are blended into the landscape and fits with the colors of the house. I think accessory buildings sizes should be increased as long as they meet with the look of the rest of the buildings and are not larger than the house foot print. Proposed changes could be increased by another 50 to 75 square meters on a 2 acre lot.	No change proposed	The proposed Land Use Bylaw has increased accessory building lot coverage in rural areas to 15% of the lot area to a maximum of: i. 250sqm for parcels under 2.0ha; or ii. 350sqm for parcels 2.0ha and larger. That is an increase from the current Land Use Bylaw of 110sqm for lots under 2ha.
70	5	2	What does pedestrian-friendly development and active storefronts even mean, can we use normal words and concepts please. Does this mean no street or cars?? If it then no we don't need pedestrian-friendly development and active storefronts. If it means that there is ample parking and good bylaw to allow for patios and plants and flower boxes on the sidewalks then yes.	No change proposed	Pedestrian-friendly development refers to how development supports the presence of people living, shopping, visiting or spending time in an area. For instance, an area without any sidewalks would not be considered pedestrian-friendly. Active frontages refer to building faces, or walls, where the design encourages activity at the street level. For example, promoting windows, entrances to buildings, or even patios at the ground floor of a building can play a role in encouraging activity at the street level.
71	5	4	Should not include Small Holdings as this is in the floodplain	Change made	Agriculture Personal Use definition has been added to provide clarity on intent within the SH District. For Agriculture, Personal Use, the number of animals that can be kept has been reduced to limit the intensity of animals. Additional provisions have also been added to require effective management of manure, and animal lodgings to be located above 250m in both Agriculture Small Scale as well as Personal Use. Agriculture, Small Scale is a Discretionary Use in the district.
72	5	4.3	4.3 - No livestock shall be permitted in any residential district in the Urban Service Area - Max 3 horses. I know that past Area Structure Plans defined the horse club on their maps but wanted to ensure there was no confusion	No change proposed	This parcel is within the Urban Expansion(UE) District. Horse stable and activities related to horses have been approved under various permits since 1970's. In future, if a need arises, the proposal will be assessed for review under the uses proposed in this district (For example Recreation facility Outdoor or Agriculture, extensive)
73	5	4.4	personal agriculture in Sprae Janvier Conklin Draper and Anzac Some of these communities are in a flood plain so maybe having the flood plain limits in this section for horses, llamas etc. Could be worded as no farm animals below 250m or the 1:100 flood	Changes made	For Agriculture, Personal Use, the number of animals that can be kept has been reduced to limit the intensity of animals. Additional provisions have also been added to require effective management of manure and animal lodgings to be located above 250m. These provisions have been applied to Agriculture, Personal Use and Agriculture, Small Scale.

74	5	4.4	Some of these communities are in a flood plain so maybe having the flood plain limits in this section for horses, llamas etc. Could be worded as no farm animals below 250m or the 1:100 flood	Change made	For Agriculture, Personal Use, the number of animals that can be kept has been reduced to limit the intensity of animals. Additional provisions have also been added to require effective management of manure and animal lodgings to be located above 250m. These provisions have been applied to Agriculture, Personal Use and Agriculture, Small Scale.
75	5	4.4	The part where Saprae is mentioned in 4.4 doesn't say residential. That may need a clarification if the intent was residential. Do we need to state residential for to be specific?	Change made	Clarified that this only applies in Hamlet Residential Districts in these communities. Saprae Creek is a hamlet.
76	5	7	What does 2 additional sleeping units mean?	No change proposed	There is a definition of sleeping unit in the proposed LUB. It "means a habitable room, not equipped with a kitchen, consisting of a lockable entry and providing accommodations for not more than two persons."
77	5	10	Campground - Doesn't specify which zoning district they can be developed. So can I put a campground in Timberlea? Or downtown Anzac?	No change proposed	Campground is a discretionary use in Parks and Recreation District(PR) and Rural District(RD). In the Parks and Recreation District, it must be located outside of the Urban Service Area therefore would not be located in areas such as Timberlea and Downtown. Being a discretionary use in PR and RD, if a request for campground was received in hamlets such as Anzac, the development authority would take into consideration factors such as compatibility with surrounding uses while reviewing the application to ensure non compatible uses are not granted approval. Additionally, Discretionary uses are advertised to the public which allows public to appeal the decision if the residents believe the it would affect the enjoyment and amenity of a neighbourhood.
78	5	10	What is Recreational Vehicle Parks?	Change made	Since the definition of campground was simplified, removed recreational vehicle park to refer to campgrounds with year round recreational vehicle accommodation.
79	5	10.6	Instead of bicycle parking requirements can we have parking for quad. Is that possible?	Changes made	Bicycle stall parking requirements have been removed from the Rural Service Area. Additionally, the Land Use Bylaw does not regulate off-highway vehicle parking.
80	5	15.2	Is the wording correct for this? The way I read it, it is saying to place parking in the visibility triangle however it would impede visibility?	Change made	This provision has been deleted. It was a comment during circulation and not an actual provision.
81	5	15.7	Maybe write out the words for the districts in brackets...I looked and couldn't find CBD1 in the old version. Did you change the names of the zoning? The others mentioned in this section are: BOR1, SCL1, SCL2. When I read these acronyms I immediately went to CBD ( cannabis) BOR ( borealis park) SCL (Syn crude Canada Ltd)	Change made	The names of zoning in Downtown have been continued for ease of reading by existing users.

82	5	16	<p>About development permit application. I live in FMM- if build deck/shed/fence is built in Fort Mckay, say minor things, someone may take offense, if they are asked to apply. This may create friction for minor works. Will metis members be required to apply for such applications, although it does not make sense.</p> <p>Make a community permitting process</p>	Change made	Decks and Accessory Buildings up to 20.0sq m in the Rural Service Area no longer require a Development Permit, provided they comply with the provisions of the Land Use Bylaw.
83	5	16.2	uses the terms zero lot line which has no definition in the definition section	No change proposed	The definition is included in Part 1, Section 9. Lot line, Zero (Zero Lot Line) means a residential development approach in which buildings are permitted to be located with no yard between the building and the property line on one or more property lines.
84	5	22	Why is that the town can have a chain link fence but out here in Saprae creek we can't. That's a ridiculous bylaw. I don't believe we should have different rules from the rest of the city with regards to fences.	No change proposed	The Fencing and Screening section does not specify the type of material that is used.
85	5	22.2	Provisions for chain link fences in Saprae Creek	No change proposed	The Fencing and Screening section does not specify the type of material that is used.
86	5	25	What is Major business? What about residential having constructive vehicles? Commercial vehicles, site vehicles, Gravel trucks	No change proposed	Part 5 Section 25.5. provides clarity on the nature of commercial vehicles that may be associated with a Home Business, Major. Many of the stated vehicles would not fall within the scope of a Major Home Business. Should these vehicles be associated with a business operating from a residence, enforcement would be the next course of action.
87	5	25.4	This is not a proper sentence	Change made	The sentence was changed to clarify intent of the provision
88	5	25.5	What denotes a Rural Residential District?	No change proposed	There is no definition for Rural Residential District however the rural residential districts are indicated in Part 1 Section 7.4
89	5	25.5	How could this be regulated?	No change proposed	This will be regulated through the permit process and the condition on the approved development permit.
90	5	25.5	Does this include customers and how do you regulate it? How could number of employees be regulated?	No change proposed	Home Business, Major allows for customers and employees which would be regulated through the permit process and condition on the approved development permit. Planning and Development work off a complaint based system to enforce the regulations.
91	5	25.5	Why are we changing the existing definition and rules related to this activity? What is wrong with what we have now?	No change proposed	The proposed Sections are consistent with the changes that were made under Bylaw 2018.004. The proposed LUB will require both Home Business, Minor (previously Home Occupation) and Home Business, Major to obtain a development permit.

92	5	25.5	Does this mean that we can have retail in Draper? What type of business are you promoting? Trucking? Hvac? Is this another attempt to deregulate a nuisance?	No change proposed	Home Business, Major and Home Business, Minor are both discretionary uses within the SH- Small Holdings District. As per section 25.6 if in the opinion of the Development Authority, the business is more appropriately located in a non-residential district, the permit would not be approved.
93	5	25.5	What shall not be permitted?	No change proposed	Section 25.6 lists the business that are not permitted as a Home Business, Major or Minor. In addition to the list, the Development Authority may determine the business should be located in a non-residential district, in which case, the permit would not be approved.
94	5	25.5	How noisy is this?	No change proposed	Section 25.4 says "No noise, vibration, smoke, dust, odours, heat, glare, combustibles, electrical or radio disturbance detectable beyond the parcel boundary. The Development Authority will determine if the business would create a nuisance to the neighbourhood. Planning and Development work off a complaint based system to enforce the regulations.
95	5	25.5	Can we rotate such font 180 degree so that its readable in print book form?	Change made	The text has been rotated to assist in legibility
96	5	25.5	Can we make dot bigger please?	Change made	Font size for dots were increased to improve readability.
97	5	25.6	Should this not also include a reference to the Character of the district?	No change proposed	There are many districts where home businesses are permitted. Therefore we would not be able to add every districts' character.
98	5	25.6	How come mobile mechanics can't have a home based business?? Not like they are opening a shop in their driveway	No change proposed	A mobile mechanic qualifies under the use of "automotive and equipment services". When creating the LUB, Planning and Development considered the different uses and their impacts. In this case it's important to consider the possible impacts of this use like noise, emissions, and disposal of hazardous substances into existing residential areas.
99	5	26.12	Shouldn't fire smart apply to multi unit residential and multi residential dwelling?	Change made	The revision has been made
100	5	26.6	I think the words fire smart trees should be in here as well as in the fire smart section.	No change proposed	Section 26.6 applies to all developments within the RMWB. However, "Fire Smart" Landscaping Regulations are addressed in Part 5 Section 26.12
101	5	29	Part 5 Section 29 Live-Work Unit This one feels wrong in general but I don't know why. It feels like the definition and the description of a live-work unit aren't quite in line.	No change proposed	The project team does not understand the concern regarding the definition and the description. Hence no change is proposed
102	5	31.7	Section 31.7 has a typo....starts with a comma	Change made	The typological correction has been made.

103	5	36	Should each lot have BS? If trying to accommodate the 4 parking stall requirement on all R1 lots. Because people cant afford to buy them	Change made	Additional provisions have been added to the Land Use Bylaw that restrict the types of lots that are able to apply for a secondary suite. Additionally, the minimum four car parking requirement has been removed.
104	5	36	Can multiple homes be built on one piece of land?; doesn't need to be subdivided; must have dual residents for subdivided	No change proposed	<p>Yes, there can be additional dwellings on a lot subject to applicable provisions of the LUB. The majority of the lots in Gregoire Lake Estates are in the Country Residential District and most lots in Anzac are within the Hamlet Residential district. Under the current LUB, an additional dwelling unit may be allowed on lots greater than 1.0ha in size.</p> <p>The proposed LUB allows an additional dwelling unit to be allowed on a lot if:</p> <p>a)The lot is greater than 2.0ha in size; and,</p> <p>b)The lot is within a rural residential district (which includes Hamlet Residential 1, Hamlet Residential 2, Country Residential, Small Holdings, and Suburban Estate Districts).</p> <p>The proposed Land Use Bylaw intends to increase the minimum lot area from 1.0ha to 2.0ha in order for an additional dwelling unit to be provided. This provides adequate space should a property owner decide to subdivide. During the Development Permit application process for an additional dwelling unit, the developer would be advised of how the location of the additional dwelling unit would impact their ability to subdivide at a later date.</p>
105	5	36	Suite above the garage as an in-law suite; senior brought a trailer onto the property so she could look after her	No change proposed	<p>The proposed LUB allows for various types of secondary suites across the Municipality like basement suite, loft suite, garden suite, and detached garage suite.</p> <p>However, a development permit application must be made to see if the proposal would be compliant with applicable sections of the LUB including, but not limited to, the lot area, proposed size and area, parking stall requirement, to name a few.</p>
106	5	36	Are basement or loft suits being added for Saprae Creek?	Change made	Secondary Suites were included as a Discretionary Use in the SE Suburban Estate District. This would allow development of other types of suites where possible (for example detached garage suite)
107	5	36	I do not support the addition of suites in any developed area. If this proposal is for new development, fine. If not the rmwb should focus on managing the suites it has. Area s not designed with suites do not have sufficient parking as it is.	No change proposed	<p>Secondary suites are discretionary uses within the residential districts. Discretionary uses are advertised to the residents which allows them to appeal the decision if they believe the suite would affect the enjoyment and amenity of the neighbourhood. In addition, the proposed LUB has added provisions to reduce 'driveway creep', maintain on-street parking options, and higher requirements and standards for when a Secondary Suite will be allowed.</p>

108	5	36	Sea cans should be allowed as accessory buildings. I am supportive of other types of secondary suites as long as there is adequate parking to accommodate additional vehicles.	No change proposed	Sea cans are discretionary use in Rural/Hamlet Districts. Secondary suites are discretionary uses within the residential districts. The proposed LUB has added provisions to reduce 'driveway creep', maintain on-street parking options, and higher requirements and standards for when a Secondary Suite will be allowed.
109	5	36	Q2 I Only support having either a basement suite or a loft suite because so many already exist and provide cheaper accommodations needed in this town. Adding more types of suites will probably tax views, utilities and increase parking issues. Having double height garages here and there would make it feel too cramped and make neighbourhoods look confused.	No change proposed	Secondary suites are discretionary uses within the residential districts. Discretionary uses are advertised to the public which allows them to appeal the decision if they believe the suite would affect the enjoyment and amenity of the neighbourhood. In addition, there are added provisions that require minimum lot sizes for secondary suites. Additional suite types, like garden suites or garage suites, would not be allowed on small lots.
110	5	36	I think that considering that vacancy is becoming a problem in most neighbourhoods, that the focus on land use should be on how the municipality will deal with vacant & grant properties & less about future development as this is likely going to be the issue at hand for the next 5 to 10 years.	No change proposed	The Land Use Bylaw provides provisions and regulations for development and does not distinguish between future or current vacant lots. The regulations would remain the same as long as the bylaw is in place.
111	5	36	1. Yes to larger green areas 2. No, I think there is no need for 3 storey homes, it blocks the sun and makes the community feel more tight and, I will generalize, also leads to congested street parking because a good percentage of our population rents their extra rooms.	No change proposed	Residents can only rent a maximum of two rooms in a home otherwise it would constitute to another use like a boarding house (3 or more sleeping units). If boarding house is approved on a lot, it would require a higher level of parking requirements. We currently have a maximum 12.0m building height in Parsons Creek and we are unaware of any issues.
112	5	36	I support sea cans in rural areas as long as they are not unsightly. I also support basement suites as they are many in the rural area already and should be grandfathered in and allowed for new developments	No change proposed	Part 5 Section 1.9.e proposes "Sea-cans shall not be unsightly and shall be finished to the satisfaction of the Development Authority." Basement suites remain a use in many residential districts including districts within the rural areas. They have been renamed to Secondary Suite which allows for various types of suites like basement suite, loft suite, garden suite and detached garage suite.
113	5	36	basement suites should definitely be allowed with them being grandfathered in allowing stoves for cooking etc.. Given the loss of employment and income due to the current oil prices and covid and lay off people need that additional income in order to survive.	No change proposed	Basement suites remain a use within many residential districts of the Land Use Bylaw. They have been renamed to Secondary Suite which includes basement suite, loft suite, garden suite and detached garage suite.

114	5	36	<p>Front footage/width is imp- we are concerned how it relates to Parsons. Rationale is based on parking. Has there been any thought process for the adjustment for affordability? 25% loss of the number of units as we originally planned for development in Parsons. Providing 4 cars is achievable but there are other methods or tools which must be explored for Basement Suites- limit spacing these units on corner or near a park space or limit the type of product within an area.</p> <p>Price is purely based on width of lot and house- based on how lumber is cut and costed. Not on based on sec suite . As a planner I value it but for density and affordability- size of lot, lane, etc. is a challenge. Lets say 50% homes have SS at present, But this bylaw proposes every single lot.</p> <p>Pricing- 4000 for extra frontage. So 40-50k extra for additional footage due to 4 stalls, which is substantial. The consumer may not understand how the lot size impacts housing cost ex. Prices go up for larger lot.</p> <p>Missing gap how land is sold really based on front footage</p> <p>The challenge is how do we create proper housing around \$400,000 and make it more attractive. The proposal does not work for parsons</p>	Change made	<p>The Team carefully considered this valuable feedback and reviewed the proposed R1 and R2 districts. Revisions to the lot width(minimum), lot area(minimum) and other provisions are recommended for the low-rise medium density residential district(R2) to balance these concerns and ensure adequate options are available for various typologies in future.</p>
115	5	36.4	<p>Do we need upper limit for rooms in detached garage suite for rural?</p> <p>Does this have potential for boarding house query</p>	Change made	<p>Revised to indicate the maximum of two sleeping units applies to all secondary suites, not only basement suites.</p>
116	5	36.7	<p>What is rear yard amenity area. Havent we eliminated all reference to amenity areas in residential?</p>	Change made	<p>Change in language made to better refer to defined terms and add clarity.</p>
117	5	36.8	<p>The main heading says BS and Loft Suite but no reg for Loft suite.</p> <p>Recommend removal of loft suite if not applicable</p>	Change made	<p>Deleted heading and clarified that the provision applied to both a basement suite and a loft suite.</p>
118	5	41	<p>Special events – no buildings for special events, down the road may have community facility. Doesn't want special parking limits to diminish the participation for the event. Every time we have a Christmas Party in Janvier to we need to have a parking demand study? Explain detailed process for Special event parking ex. When its needed</p>	No change proposed	<p>Buildings for special events can range from portable washrooms to sun tents. Permanent structures would likely fall under another use requiring development permit approval. The requirement for a parking study has been altered to require a parking plan to address how parking will be provided.</p>
119	5	41.1	<p>What does "in all other cases" mean, it can be less than 100m discretionally or it can occur anywhere?</p>	Change made	<p>This sentence was changed for clarity.</p>
120	5	41.6	<p>This should be limited to 2 days at a time, and only a few times a years.</p>	No change proposed	<p>The proposed 15 days is lower than other communities in the Province. No change was proposed</p>

121	5	1.1. (b)	Rationale for this comment is the confusion that the 99/059 has created	No change proposed	Secondary suite and security suites are defined under the land use bylaw. It was not clear what concern the comment raised.
122	5	1.2.	What is a residential district by definition?	No change proposed	There is no definition for Residential District however the residential districts are indicated in Part 1 Section 7.4 Each district has a purpose statement that defines the character of the district itself.
123	5	1.8(d)	Part 5 General regulations 1.8 (d) just clarification since country residential and suburban estates isn't included in the definition	No change proposed	Country Residential District and Suburban Estate District are included in Rural Residential Districts as per Part 1 Section 7.4 (e) of the proposed Land Use Bylaw.
124	5	1.8.	In reference to Sea cans- "What about Draper? "	No change proposed	Part 5 Section 1.9.c. states that Sea-cans are discretionary is the rural residential districts which would include the SH and CR Districts in Draper
125	5	10.2(ii)	What is the definition of a Recreational Campground?	Change made	Since the definition of campground was simplified, removed recreational campground to refer to campgrounds without year round recreational vehicle accommodation.
126	5	16.1 (b)	What is considered the main floor? Will this cause issues for walkouts? Balcony uses "first storey". Should we be consistent?	Change made	Replace all reference of 'main floor' and 'first floor' with "ground floor" to be consistent with the terms used in the Bylaw and reduce repetition.
127	5	17.3.(b)	Probably too vague if we are trying to protect future home owners. 1:100 should be defined in metres	No change proposed	The provision allows the Development Authority to request and respond to context specific elements in an application. Information required for an application may be different based on the proposal, for example, between a Single Detached Dwelling and a multi-storey commercial building.
128	5	19.1.	Or where erosion is reasonably determined to be the result. This comment was discuss with BM (Director) it is proposed to require a Geo tech within 30 m of top of the back or when slope is above certain percentage	No change proposed	This section of the Land Use Bylaw is consistent with the Engineering Servicing Standards. The ESS also includes a maximum slope percentage of 33.3% towards a property boundary, so 20% requiring a development permit is reasonable.
129	5	20.1. (c)	The concern for this comment is the availability so Secondary suites on residential districts and the fact that these cannot be sold separately	No change proposed	Secondary Suite is an "accessory use" to and located on the same parcel as the principal dwelling.
130	5	22.2.	What is the definition of a residential land use district? What about Gate posts?	No change proposed	The residential districts are indicated in Part 1 Section 7.4. The posts are considered to be a part of the fence.
131	5	25.1-5	Related to which, major, minor or both?	No change proposed	Section 25.2 and 25.4 would apply to both. The other Sections would apply as indicated in the LUB
132	5	25.5.e	Why are businesses hours so generous?	Change made	This was reviewed and a revision is proposed to Section 25.5.e.i. It is proposed that the "All commercial vehicle trips related to the business shall be restricted to Monday to Saturday between the hours of 7:00am and 7:00pm"



133	5	25.6.	<p>Should any form of retail store be added?</p> <p>I agree that these uses are generally inappropriate, but with other provisions, does the Development Officer understand that they can say "no".</p> <p>My experience says this provision is ignored when it should be primary consideration</p>	No change proposed	The development authority will use their discretion when determining if a use is appropriate to be run as a home business. This list includes these uses however is not limited to those uses.
134	5	26.12 (b)	Should also include residential to follow Fire Smart Guidelines	No change proposed	To require residential lots to comply with this section would mean we would need to require applicants to submit landscaping plans to demonstrate they comply. Currently, no such requirement exists. Making this a requirement could be too onerous and costly for applicants.
135	5	29.9.	<p>This can lead to all kinds of problems in that it opens the door to unlimited interpretation. A sounder, more specific definition would help, or removal of this all together.</p>	No change proposed	Definition of Live-work unit: means a development designed or used for the purpose of an integrated commercial and residential use in a contiguous space. This includes, but is not limited to; artist studio, office, general retail and the making, processing, and assembly of products on a small scale.
136	5	31.1.	wondering why this is here. I have a neighbour who had left junk like this for 15 years, without anyone from the RMWB requiring its removal.	No change proposed	Planning and Development work off a complaint based system to enforce the regulations.
137	5	31.3 31.4	<p>Without prejudice, to whom it may concern. I am writing this to let you know that the 1 RV and 1 Trailer is not for Sapræ Creek Estates residents. We have ample room to accommodate our toys. I recently moved from the Timberlea location to Sapræ Creek Estates just for this reason that I will be able to buy whatever I need and not have to worry about any neighborly or unsightly concerns. That being said, these laws should stay out of Sapræ Creek Estates. Thank you for listening.</p>	Change made	On lots larger than or equal to 8094 sqm (2 acre), three recreational vehicles shall be permitted. Change has been made

138	5	31.3 31.4	<p>bestchoicephw@outlook.com</p> <p>the section on the LUB that is on page 59 (item 31.4) about RVs and Trailers should be changed for rural areas or places that have larger parcels of land. I can understand in the urban service area not allowing RVs that block views, but I live where I have parking and space on my property for my things.</p> <p>I moved to Saprae so I could park my stuff and have recreational vehicles. I have one RV and one motorhome and both are used for different reasons. I have a flat deck trailer for my toys and I have 2 covered trailers for things that can't be left in the elements while driving.</p> <p>I suggest that a person in rural has the ability to have 2-3 RVs and 2-3 trailers. As I drove around Saprae today this seems to be the norm out here. Maybe someone can take a drive out and see what people have and then make a suggestion.</p>	Change made	On lots larger than or equal to 8094 sqm (2 acre), three recreational vehicles shall be permitted. Change has been made
139	5	32.3.	Is there a specific area where this is identified as permissible?	No change proposed	Project Accommodations are only contemplated in districts where they are listed as a use (for example, the Rural District)
140	5	36.1.	What is the purpose of this, other than doubling the density of each affected area? This creates all kinds of problems later when the property is up for sale and it promotes rentals in the middle of each affected district. This seems to be 15 years out of date. Just look at the Westwood subdivision in Edmonton. It ruined the neighbourhood and became a parking nightmare and promotes a slum.	No change proposed	Secondary suites are discretionary uses within the residential districts. Discretionary uses are advertised to the residents nearby which allows the public to appeal the decision if they believe the suite would affect the enjoyment and amenity of their neighbourhood.
141	5	4.2.	If intended in Small Holdings district, it should not as this is in the floodplain	Change made	Agriculture Personal Use definition has been added to provide clarity on intent within the SH District. For Agriculture, Personal Use, the number of animals that can be kept has been reduced to limit the intensity of animals. Additional provisions have also been added to require effective management of manure, and animal lodgings to be located above 250m in both Agriculture Small Scale as well as Personal Use. Agriculture, Small Scale is a Discretionary Use in the district.
142	5	4.2. (b) (c)	This (c) should form part of (b) to make sense	Change made	The was a mistake in the numeration of the provision. Correction has been made

143	5	4.4. (a)	This should not be allowed in the floodplain	Change made	Agriculture Personal Use definition has been added to provide clarity. For Agriculture, Personal Use, the number of animals that can be kept has been reduced to limit the intensity of animals. Additional provisions have also been added to require effective management of manure, and animal lodgings to be located above 250m in both Agriculture Small Scale as well as Personal Use. Agriculture, Small Scale is a Discretionary Use (for example in SE2,CR and SH Districts)
144	5	41.1.	what about a situation where you share a road?	Change made	We have modified the provision to be specific to separation distance between the parcel and residential districts themselves. Have also made Special Events discretionary to allow the Development Authority to take traffic congestion matters into account in a decision.
145	5	41.2.	what about traffic? I witnessed a Municipality that allowed 3km of cars to sit for hours on a road for an "event" that was nothing more than a promotional campaign for an illegal business being held in a completely illegal unsafe building and site. How does this prevent the cowardness of the development officer making this decision	No change proposed	Section 41.8 indicates that the Development Authority may have as conditions of a development permit for a special event any or all the following: (e ) mitigating potential nuisance factors, including but not limited to pollution, noise, dust, traffic congestion, garbage disposal, and recycling;.
146	5	41.5.	Should parking not be a requirement that you have sufficient parking?	No change proposed	Yes, in order for you to obtain a special event permit you must meet the required parking as per section 41.5 (b) and (c)
147	5	41.5.b	The parking demand study under special events seem onerous financially. Also, it is generally tailored on a large set of assumptions	Change made	Modified language to indicate parking plan, requiring the applicant to provide a plan for how parking will be accommodated during a special event, in place of a parking demand study
148	5	50.7 (a)(b)(c)	Based on the received feedback, we will remove the Hamlet Residential 2 District from the existing residential homes in Anzac and replace with Hamlet Residential 1. This will preserve the existing large lot residential development.	Change made	Map changes were made to better align with the Anzac Area Structure Plan and community feedback.
149	5		Yes I look after my wife with Dementure in one built in 2000.Don't come in and change the rules now and destroy the only piece of sanity, Peace and quiet and isolation we have left to live in Wood Buffalo under the current virus conditions. We have lived with Wilson noise for 3 yrs now.	No change proposed	In the case of a Garden Suite, the minimum lot size requirement 500sq m. This will remove many lots in the RMWB from being eligible for such a suite. The large lot sizes also minimizes the impact from a suite to an adjacent property. Being a discretionary use, there are always appeal rights for affected parties should residents feel there are additional concerns not addressed by the proposed development.
150	5		I am supportive of allowing sea cans in rural areas as long as they are not unsightly from the main roads.	No change proposed	Part 5 Section 1.9.e proposes "Sea-cans shall not be unsightly and shall be finished to the satisfaction of the Development Authority."
151	5	1	Accessory Buildings; we should make sure there is a provision where detached garages on a corner lot where their vehicle door faces the road, should not have less than 6.0m to prevent vehicles parking on the boulevard	Change made	Section 1.4 is added to ensure the detached garage is atleast 6 m from the property line

152	5	1.3	We will need to add a provision requiring a minimum 6.0m setback for a detached garage where the vehicle door is facing a road/street when on an corner lot	Change made	Section 1.4 is added to ensure the detached garage is atleast 6 m from the property line
153	5	1.3.d	While architectural testing, another thing crossed my mind. So for detached accessory on lot with rear lane, should we reconsider to impose Part 5 Section 1.3.d which forces them the garage to be 6m. Now with only 2 stall requirement in R2, we could propose a smaller area if we do away with this section and add 1 m clause like before.... Thoughts?	Change made	The Section 1.3.d is intended for accessory buildings in general. Section 1.4 is added to ensure the detached garage is atleast 6 m from the property line as a standard parking stall is 5.8m long. It was concluded that the 1m from lane is not acceptable to the team, given the challenges in our experience, for future lots. However, there is no limitation on variance between accessory building and principal dwelling in the proposed bylaw. Hence the existing lots should be able to compy.
154	6	1	R1S is missing. Don't understand the R1 residential is different than the R2 discretionary – they seem the exact same Significant impact on affordability. Industry isn't going for wider lots.	Changes made	Several changes have been made to the R2 District to better differentiate between the R1 District. Lot sizes have been reduced and reflect a formerly R1S lot typology.
155	6	1	Parking is Normally not an issue in R1. Challenge in R1S. R1S homes will be extremely difficult – if a detached garage is included they will not meet the parking guidelines, their garage will have to be right up against the house. Existing lots. They struggle with the parking requirements now. The lots must be smaller.	No change proposed	The four stall parking requirement has been removed from the proposal based on public feedback. The Part 2 Section 4 on 'Non conforming uses and buildings' has been revised to assist future developments in existing neighborhoods. Residential districts
156	6	1	will the subdivision of an R1 lot to 2 lots require 8 Stalls? As the established neighborhoods wouldn't allow this. So , they will not able to change the fabric. If you could clarify the intent	Change made	The Team received feedback that four stalls requirement for all residential lots throughout the urban service area seems excessive. Considering that the LUB must provide variousdevelopment options in our region, the team revisited this requirement and removed this requirement from Part 7
157	6	1.2	Semi-detached dwellings to be a Discretionary use in the proposed Land Use Bylaw (LUB) Based on Stantec comment discussion with Core gp	Change made	R1 district is seen primarily as a Single Family District. The team proposed that semi-detached dwelling be changed from Permitted to Discretionary use within R1 District
158	6	1.4	I agree that three story homes are unnecessary	No change proposed	We currently have a maximum 12.0m building height in Parsons Creek and we are unaware of any issues.

159	6	2	If it smells, is noisy, unsightly, garish, encroaches on your neighbor, obstructs sight lines, views, sunlight to existing dwellings, is a fire or safety hazard, restricts emergency access or access to ones property, then it shouldn't be allowed. Other than that reasonable concessions and exceptions should always be possible. A yard/lot can still be beautiful without grass or bushes in place of trees; as can a small house on a big lot. Creative solutions to parking, bump outs, decks privacy screens, fences and so on should be open to consideration. Land use policies that are too restrictive can be as detrimental as the derelict property that no one can do anything about. An example would	No change proposed	The Land Use Bylaw Team feels that the proposed provisions provide flexibility and various typology options to respond to changing market demands. These provisions are specific to the typology, rather than one set of rules that would apply indiscriminately to everything. There are always appeal rights in the cases of discretionary uses where impact to adjacent properties can be responded to and mitigated.
160	6	3.3	Secondary Suite isn't a use in R2 (What about before passing of this bylaw?)	Change made	Secondary Suite was added as a Discretionary Use to the R2 District.
161	6	3.3	Do we want SDD to be discretionary. What if now all ND = R2	Change made	Single Detached Dwelling moved to Permitted Use. Smaller lot sizes in this district are consistent with the R2 District purpose statement.
162	6	5	I am against cluster housing.	No change proposed	The proposed Land Use Bylaw does not include 'Cluster Housing' as a use in any land use district. A new land use, called 'multi-residential development' allows more two or more types of residential developments to be constructed on the same lot, as long as those types of development are already allowed in the land use district. This use is included in the HR2 - Hamlet Residential 2 District and the HCC- Hamlet Community Core District as these are envisioned to be higher density land use districts, and is in line with the approved ASPs. The HCC and HR2 districts are not applied to very many properties in the Hamlets compared to HR1-Hamlet Residential 1 District which is much more common, so the application of this land use is very limited.
163	6	7	Do C2 regulations encourage transition towards more of a C1 "Main Street" built form over time? Or are established C2 districts locked into that form? C2 is key, as an energised node. If there is an opportunity to turn them into hubs, that would be great. From the MDP perspective, it would be a success if C2 is more active and inviting.	No change proposed	In order for re-districting and the revitalization of existing commercial areas to occur, there would need to be policy direction in place to support that change, in the form of an Area Structure Plan or Area Redevelopment Plan.
164	6	8.4	I agree; 2 stories encourage more rental and less parking; I don't want to live in a shady parking lot.	No change proposed	We currently have a maximum 12.0m building height in Parsons Creek and we are unaware of any issues.
165	6	10	Grocery store had living house attached – is that still allowed?	No change proposed	The proposed Land Use Bylaw allows for Live-Work Units which allow the integration of commercial and residential uses in the same space. This use is included as a Discretionary Use in the Hamlet Community Core District. Part 5 Section 29 of the proposed Land Use Bylaw includes several additional rules for live-work units.

166	6	12	Public service zone area have people living in those lots – identified where WBH owns the lot	No change proposed	The districting is consistent with the Area Structure Plan. If changes are required, the ASP will need to be amended to inform a future LUB map amendment.
167	6	14	What is the availability for residential development in two of parks zoning areas in Janvier? Map that Justin has seen isn't the same – discuss with parks and recreation why its zoned for park development – Members of the community would like to build houses there Another parks and recreation area – not being used – what's future – can it be rezoned?	No change proposed	As per the Janvier Area Structure Plan's (ASP) Land Use Concept, the two lots that are zoned as Park in the proposed Land Use Bylaw are contemplated as "Open Space". The ASP has identified these areas for low-impact uses and development such as walking trailers, etc. The reason why the ASP and the proposed Land Use Bylaw have contemplated this for these two lots as they are part of the Municipal Reserve, which the Municipality is required to maintain as park/natural areas. Therefore, these lots would not be available for residential development.
168	6	17	Any changes to MacDonald Island Park land (future home of McMurray Métis Pavilion)? Any change for land on McMurray Métis office and acreage location in Gregoire	No change proposed	The information was sent to the stakeholder and confirmed there is no change to the proposed districting.
169	6	21	May want larger out buildings due to heavy equipment businesses	No change proposed	The Land Use Bylaw has proposed a significant increase in maximum Accessory Building lot coverage in the Rural Service Area in comparison to what currently exists.
170	6	22	HR1 be eligible for district 2 for medium density if needed?	No change proposed	The Uses that are available in the HR2 District can only be used within lots that are zoned as such. However, if the property owner of a lot zoned HR1 would like to have a Use that is only available in HR2, they may submit an application for a Map Amendment. This would Change the district of that lot from HR1 to HR2, which would allow for the property owner to develop the lot using the medium density Uses allowed in HR2. All Map Amendments are approved by Council.
171	6	23	What I need to understand are all hamlets within the municipality having HR2? It is my understanding that one hamlet asked for this change which then resulted in open consultation and meetings with the residents and the municipality. It then moved for are as the specific hamlet residents were in favour of the HR 2 district. Did other ham lets request HR 2 and the municipality have open consultation and meetings with the residents, similar to the one hamlet that requested it?	No change proposed	The new LUB is proposing two hamlet residential districts. The HR2 District will allow for uses like multi-unit dwelling developments, which will allow for more flexibility in the type of housing that is developed in the hamlets. This change aligns with the area structure plans (ASPs) that have been created for and approved by our rural communities. Each ASP went through an extensive public consultation process in its respective hamlet. The new LUB will implement the ASPs once adopted by the Municipality.
172	6	24.2	Is there a specific building that may be built in HCC. Like xyz projects are ok and not. I ask as there is possible building or a potential site for future head office for our nation in HCC	No change proposed	variousland uses are contemplated in the HCC District. So long as a proposed development falls within those contemplated uses, an application could be entertained.

173	6	24.2	Question for home business, major in HCC-Wil there only be minor and not major? I recommend a mix of both.	Change made	The intention of the Hamlet Community Core District is to have various uses including residential and commercial. The team agrees with this observation and Home business, major has been included in this District as a discretionary use.
174	6	24.2	[1:25 PM] Jasmine Kaur I am logging this one, Apartment is both permitted and discretionary in HCC	Change made	Proposed it to be Discretionary, as discretionary uses provide opportunity to review a proposal in more detail as per context
175	6	27	Ownership of small parcels is up for question	No change proposed	All land within the jurisdiction of the RMWB will require a district from the Land Use Bylaw.
176	6	27	Not liking Secondary Suite anywhere as it does nothing positive for the area but create a complication when it is later sold. Promotes rentals when we do not have a demand. Suggest removed completely	No change proposed	There was 84% approval rate for secondary suites in CR and 74% approval in SH during the public engagement. The team inferred that the public is interested in other housing options. It is a Discretionary use and it is subject to appeal.
177	6	27.4	2.02?	Change made	Changed District Lot Area (min) to be precise (Now Part 6 Section 28.4)
178	6	27.5	Wow - will it include the definition of what limited development below 250m actually means. The motion passed without the definition .... By design??	No change proposed	The flood provisions are coming as a Land Use Bylaw amendment as part of the flood mitigation work. These provisions will better capture most recent direction from Council.
179	6	28	Could you please confirm me that section 104.5 (c) (i) for Suburban Estate in the current Bylaw has been removed in the new Bylaw? If it has been removed does it mean people can bring the mobile home as a Discretionary Use in the West of Spruce Valley Drive once the new Bylaw will be in place? Oct 27 I was thinking I should be elaborate on my previous inquiry by mentioning a specific application that I have a concern and dealing with for a long time. I am working on an application for a Single Detached Dwelling at 201 Weiss Drive since May 2020. The property is on the west side of Spruce Valley Drive in the Suburban Estate District. As per section 104.5 (c) (i), it can not be a Manufactured Home. In the last five months, the applicant is continuously submitting a Mobile Home instead of a Single Detached Dwelling and that is being rejected every time by Tracey and myself not to follow section 104.5 (c) (i). As we are in the conjunction with the current and new Bylaw, we need your advice on dealing with this application.	Change made	Two separate districts have been created to address this concern. The SE2 – Suburban Estate Residential 2 District proposes Mobile Homes to be a discretionary use (Refer Map- SE2 would be east of Spruce Valley Drive) while Mobile Home is not a use in the SE1 District. This approach adds clarity for residents and the Development Authority.

180	6	28	????	Change made	The district names have been revised and the word 'residential' has been added. For example SE1 now reads Suburban Estate Residential 1 District (Part 6 Section 29)
181	6	28.3	Please add Secondary Suite to Discretionary Use in Suburban Estate Rationale A Secondary Suite Use would be consistent with other large Rural Residential zonings. Engagement with residents indicates a desire for this Use.	Change made	A Secondary Suite Use would be consistent with other large Rural Residential zonings. Engagement with residents indicates a desire for this Use. These have been added as discretionary uses to SE1 and SE2
182	6	28.3	4.Please remove Market Garden form Suburban Estate (SE) District Rationale o There are no existing Market Gardens in the Suburban Estate District o In reviewing the Sapræ Creek Area Structure Plan and the Highway 69/Clearwater River Valley Area Structure Plan there is no support for Market Gardens in Sapræ Creek.	Change made	There are no existing Market Gardens in the Suburban Estate District. In reviewing the Sapræ Creek Area Structure Plan and the Highway 69/Clearwater River Valley Area Structure Plan there is no support for Market Gardens in Sapræ Creek.
183	6	28.4	Are 3 story buildings allowed in Sapræ Creek	No change proposed	The draft LUB proposes the maximum height to be 12.0 meters. The proposed draft LUB does not provide any regulations on the number of storeys in Sapræ Creek.
184	6	28.5	1.Please add to Section 28.5 “Mobile homes are a discretionary use only in accordance with the following: development permits may be issued for manufactured homes east of Spruce Valley Drive” Rationale o to be consistent with the existing practice that is followed by Development Officers; o to maintain the character of the neighborhood by not allowing a Mobile Home in the west side of Spruce Valley Drive.	Change made	Two separate districts have been created to address this concern. The SE2 – Suburban Estate Residential 2 District proposes Mobile Homes to be a discretionary use (Refer Map- SE2 would be east of Spruce Valley Drive) while Mobile Home is not a use in the SE1 District
185	6	29	Streets should absolutely be wider AND lots should allow for both a garage and some back yard. I do not support the change for height maximum in developed areas. It could ack yard. I do not support the change for height maximum in developed areas. It could allow for some odd building additions. I only support it in new developments.	No change proposed	Road width is addressed by the Engineering Servicing Standards and not determined by the Land Use Bylaw. In regards to three storey buildings we have this currently in Parsons Creek and are unaware of any issues
186	6	29	I support backyard chicken coops. Please include this in land use bylaw.	No change proposed	The Land Use Bylaw Team has received a lot of feedback from residents in support of urban hens. A Bylaw for an Urban Hen Pilot Project has been drafted and is intended on being brought to Council at a later date. This Bylaw will address the required amendments to the Land Use Bylaw and Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw to allow for a pilot project to take place



187	6	29	<p>Is it the same process development in the urban areas than it is in rural areas?</p> <p>Does a site visit needed to be done for approval? RMWB should be a little more lenient as the lots have been vacant for 30 years.</p>	No change proposed	<p>The Development Permit application process is the same in the rural and urban service areas.</p> <p>Site inspection requirements are very rare in the case of Development Permits and are typically more associated with Building Permits. The Land Use Bylaw also does not regulate lots that are vacant; only insofar as development does or does not occur on the lot.</p>
188	6	29	<p>agreed, as long as the property is large enough to sustain such operations. some yards and neighbourhoods are too small/congested that it could be a nuisance. I believe some of the older neighbourhoods could sustain minimal operations without causing too much hardship on neighbours that are not ok with such enterprise.</p> <p>As well, I don't see why beehives should need to be contained to ones yards, with permission, on public greenspace and precautions, why couldn't residence maintain hives?</p>	No change proposed	<p>This comment was received as a response under the 'Residential' forum on Participate Wood Buffalo. The context is small scale poultry/beekeeping on public greens within the RMWB.</p> <p>A Bylaw will be coming to Council for an Urban Hen Pilot project, applicable to the Urban Service Area. Administration investigated the suitability of urban bees and found that given the RMWB's desire to become a Bear Smart Community, such a provision would not be compatible.</p>
189	6	29	<p>This is a lovely change. Thank you. I hope that going forward the houses in parsons and rotary could be replanned to allow for a more loveable space. The current lots are e the size of downtown Calgary or Edmonton lots except they are in suburbs. It's terrible for quality of life and for our town. All of our lots are painfully small and people are shoved on top of each other like sardines. It affects quality of life for everyone. More then this though we need access to agricultural land and small farms. People want local food, lots they can have a small hobby farm on. We live in the middle of nowhere but we are crammed into big city living despite being surrounded by land.</p>	No change proposed	<p>The proposed LUB provides opportunity for various lot widths to be developed within the various residential districts like R1E, R1 and R2, based on a typology. It is typical for a LUB to propose minimum lot widths. However, a developer may choose lot widths applicable to an area at the ASP/Outline Plan stage, which may be larger than the minimums proposed in the LUB.</p> <p>Agricultural land in the RMWB has limited availability. This has been carefully reviewed and uses have been considered accordingly in the proposal.</p>
190	6	29	<p>Q1: I think at least some of the new areas need to have larger yards and the ability to have double car garages. The biggest thing though is that the STREETS in these areas need to be much wider. It is ridiculous to not be able to pass another truck on the street if people are parked on both sides of the Road. Get rid of the little grassy strips between the road and sidewalk and make the streets wider so two trucks can pass each other. This is Fort McMurray... we have a LOT of trucks up here. Q2: I have no problem with question two allowing for a third story.</p>	No change proposed	<p>The proposed LUB provides opportunity for various lot widths to be developed within the various residential districts like R1E, R1 and R2, based on a typology.</p> <p>Street widths are beyond the scope of the Land Use Bylaw.</p>

191	6	29	Hi, not sure who will read this. I don't see where residential and commercial construction sites are addressed. We've had a lot of development over the past 4 years and generally all of the construction sites are left with exposed soils, massive piles of rock and dirt in the streets, untidied building materials and even some contractors blocking the road due for days using it as a laydown yard. I'd like to see homebuilders and contractors responsible for their worksites by requiring temporary erosion and sediment controls (to manage dirt running off their worksites) and general respect for making neighbourhoods feel like communities rather than a worksite. These features can be built into the list of conditions in building permits and inspected by bylaw officers. The sediment issue into the streets and using city streets as staging areas and laydowns is already in the bylaws under the Sewer Use Bylaw (1985) and can be enforced by Bylaw already. I just think the LUB is not done yet, but did fix a few issues. Keep up the good work, but maybe a bit more engagement is needed.	No change proposed	These issues are able to be captured across multiple Bylaws. Development Permits typically include a standard condition referring to maintenance of construction debris. The Community Standards Bylaw may also play a role in addressing some of these issues. No additional amendments would be required to the Land Use Bylaw to allow the Development Authority to address some of these concerns.
192	6	29	We have businesses building on residential land in the rural. They have their workers living in these buildings. At the present time it is against the bylaw. Does cluster house living in these buildings. At the present time it is against the bylaw. Does cluster house ng open the door for this now to be legal?	No change proposed	The Team understands that this query is about a boarding house in an additional dwelling or multiple dwellings on a lot in the Rural Service Area. Whether boarding house or more than one dwelling on a lot, the regulations continue to be similar to 99/059 Bylaw. Furthermore, we have proposed additional regulations to limit such an activity in the proposed LUB. Part 5 , Section 8 provides guidance on Boarding Houses while Section 20 addresses multiple dwellings on a lot
193	6	29	Small scale poultry operations will keep tons of waste from the landfill, promote local food, and accelerate composting. Win, win, win...!	No change proposed	The Land Use Bylaw Team has received a lot of feedback from residents in support of urban hens. A Bylaw for an Urban Hen Pilot Project has been drafted and is intended on being brought to Council at a later date. This Bylaw will address the required amendments to the Land Use Bylaw and Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw to allow for a pilot project to take place
194	6	29	Frustration of length of LUB and no separation of rural district	No change proposed	The LUB has been substantially consolidated to be almost half the number of pages from the existing 99/059 and attempt has been made to create a concise document which provides clear direction for various developments. The rural districts are identified under the interpretation provision under Part 1 Section 7.4

195	6	29	This district used to be on the other side of the Clearwater river Why agriculture and abattoir?	No change proposed	Abattoir continues to be a use, in line with the current 99/059 LUB, with the the Rural District. The land use on the south of Clearwater River continues to be Urban Expansion as show in the maps in Appendix A
196	6	29.4	Min lot size for Agriculture extensive	Change made	This provision is not necessary in the SE provisiosn and has been eliminated. It is reflected in the definition of Agriculture, Extensive and is consistent with other practices in the province.
197	6	1.7.a 3.10.a	With respect to new homes - there is now an inclusion that the width of any attached garage shall not exceed 70% of the width of the principle building. If you take a 40 ft wide lot - (and most are of less width) and take into account the 1.2 m setback on each side you have a building pocket of 32 ft. This would then leave 22.5 ft for the garage (and driveway) and 9.5 ft for the entry. It is recognized that having a larger entry is more esthetically pleasing - however we have a parking issue as we are largely an industrial town - with many trucks. If you look to most homes (and duplexes) of the past 10 years - you will see that they have larger garages and smaller entry ways - so that they have parking and storage for recreational vehicles so they would not conform to the 70/30% defined. We already have a parking problem within the RMWB and with the current sizes of lots this proposed change will make driveways smaller and add to the parking issue. If you have a lot with	Change made	The garage to principal dwelling ratio is now applicable to single detached homes in the low rise low density district (R1) only, based on a review of the existing subdivisions as it is commonly present and deemed easily achievable. This requirement has been removed from the low rise medium density district (R2) to facilitate larger garages on lots with smaller width.
198	6	14.3 (b) , 29.3 (d)	Camp grounds in Saprae Creek	No change proposed	The proposed draft LUB does not provide regulations regarding campgrounds specific to Saprae Creek. Campgrounds regulations are for the entire Municipality where applicable. Section 10 of the draft LUB provides detailed regulations on campgrounds.
199	6	21.2 (g)	Part 6 Land use districts IH- Heavy industrial District : permitted uses (g) Heavy equipment and manufactured home dealership—no definition of manufactured home	Change made	The correction from 'manufactured' to 'mobile' has been made.
200	6	22,23	Old part of Anzac - maintain single family dwelling new subdivision affordable living duplexes and apartments –what the community wants	Change made	The change is consistent with the Area Structure Plan for Anzac.
201	6	22. & 23	Clarify HR1 and HR2	No change proposed	It is unclear what this comment means.
202	6	26.3.	This is new, putting a Garden Centre in the Country residential district, without consultation. Not very appropriate	Change made	The definition of Agriculture small scale changed and Market Garden is not included

203	6	26.6.(b)	Residential is currently is the dominant use in the district, but that is now changing without demand for the use, which makes no sense. Both Agriculture, small scale and Home business, major create conflict without need	Change made	The Purpose statement of the District includes the intent for residential and agriculture pursuits. The definition for agriculture , small scale has been revised to limit the intensity or possible commercial aspect. Home Business major is an accessory use to a residential use and fulfils the intent as such.
204	6	27.1 (b)	Small holdings -permitted uses (b) agriculture small scale Why would we have a commercial agricultural operations in a flood plain when the definition includes "intensive livestock operations, horse holding area, etc.? These large animals are poop factories and wouldn't there be a concern regarding feces contamination in the potable water systems and the rivers during a flood incident? Bylaw 04/012 says that intensive agriculture must go through the planning commission.	Changes made	Agriculture, Small Scale is a Discretionary Use in the district. Definition for Agriculture, Personal Use and Agriculture, Small Scale have been revised to limit the commercial aspect of such pursuits.
205	6	27.2 - 27.3	Moved from Discretionary to Permitted Use without consultation while adding a lot of unwanted.	Change made	Upon review, Agriculture, small scale is placed under discretionary use while Agriculture, personal use is introduced as a permitted use to align with the proposals agreed to during the ASP engagement
206	6	27.2 - 27.3	Home business Minor does not require a Dev. Permit as per 2.2	No change proposed	Yes, it is proposed that this be a permitted use as it is anticipated to have minimum or no impact in a neighborhood. Additionally, it had a 95% approval rate in SH during the public engagement when presented in concurrence with the ASP
207	6	27.2 - 27.3	Both in contravention of MDP and ASP and planning process	No change proposed	It is unclear which two uses are being referred to in the comment.
208	6	27.2 - 27.3	What is the purpose of doubling our density without further consultation after the community already said a resounding "no"	No change proposed	There was 84% approval rate for secondary suites in CR and 74% approval in SH during the public engagement. The team inferred that the public is interested in other housing options. It is a Discretionary use and it is subject to appeal.
209	6	27.2 - 27.3	Why is a "PARK" IN Draper, who would do that? Public washrooms? These are private lands. Used to promote what?	No change proposed	Park is a Discretionary or Permitted use in all Districts
210	6	27.2 - 27.3	*NP Notice Posting	No change proposed	Notice posting is required for bed and breakfast as it was Discretionary Use–Planning Commission under the 99/059 Land Use Bylaw
211	6	27.5 (a)(ii)	What happened to the Subdivision requirement that you had to build up the land to 250M? What happened to the Subdivision rules?	No change proposed	Subdivision design provisions were removed from the proposed LUB since these are cover under the Provincial Regulation. Provisions about development under 250 are captured under Part 5 Section 17
212	6	27.5 (a)(ii)	What does "site-specific technical studies" mean?	Change made	We have deleted this section and added more specific language to section 27.5 (b) to better articulate what is meant by a site specific study.

213	6	27.5 (e) (iv)	Suggest saying "Statutory Plans" instead of just ASP	Change made	This is a logical change and is more comprehensive of other statutory plans that may be in place, rather than limiting to Area Structure Plans. (Now Part 6 Section 28.5.e.iv)
214	6	27.5 (f)	This is nuisance requirement is impractical as a paper requirement does not police an issue created by a questionable Development Permit. This should say that the use can only be approved if it does not impact the other owners, as it currently does.	No change proposed	There is a section that allows the Development Authority to consider multiple factors when assessing an application in the general section of the Bylaw as opposed to the district specifically.
215	6	27.5 (h) (i)	"Agricultural, personal use" is not a designated use in the Small Holdings district as per 27.1. Also, why are we looking to add a new use to the permitted uses that is not safe and with no demand in our area of the Province?	Change made	A definition for Agriculture, Personal Use has been added in line with the draft ASP This provision has been moved to Part 5 Section 4- Agriculture uses based on relevance to all agricultural uses.
216	6	27.5 (h) (i)	Agricultural, Personal Use is not defined	Change made	A definition has been added.
217	6	28.3.	Where is the consultation on these changes???	No change proposed	Previous comments regarding the definition of Agriculture, small scale have been integrated, which affect the discretionary uses in the SE District. For example, the removal of market garden from the definition.
218	6	28.3.	This includes a Garden Centre	Change made	Market Garden to be removed as a Discretionary Use in the SE District. There are no existing Market Gardens in the Suburban Estate District and in reviewing the Sapræ Creek Area Structure Plan and the Highway 69/Clearwater River Valley Area Structure Plan there is no support for Market Gardens in Sapræ Creek.
219	6	28.4 (c)	Are sea cans allowed in front of houses in Sapræ Creek	No change proposed	Sea-cans are discretionary in the rural districts. It is possible to have an Accessory Building in the front yard. However various provisions such as screening from any public roads to the Development Authority's satisfaction and its appearance shall apply.
220	6	28.5.	Is commercial agriculture realistic in this area?	Changes made	Previous comments regarding the definition of Agriculture, small scale have been integrated, which affect the discretionary uses in the SE Districts. For example, the removal of market garden from the definition.
221	6	3.2.b	Duplex to be a Discretionary use in the proposed LUB Based on Stantec comment discussion with Core gp	Change made	The change has been made.
222	6	3.6.a	Edit proposal to state "Interior dwelling unit :180 sq.m. per dwelling unit. End dwelling unit: 216 sq.m. Based on Stantec comment discussion with Core gp	Change made	Sapræ Creek has Parks and Recreation District (PR) lands. This district aims to provide for the development of land for parks and recreational facilities intended for the public's use and enjoyment at large. In PR district, campground is a Discretionary Use,
223	6	4.7.a	Edit proposal to state "Interior dwelling unit :180 sq.m. per dwelling unit. End dwelling unit : 216 sq.m. Based on Stantec comment discussion with Core gp	Change made	Based on architectural test results, the proposed numbers are accurate. The revision has been made

224	6	multiple residential	1 Remain the same 2 no	Change made	Based on feedback from multiple stakeholders, revisions to lot area have been recommended for the low-rise medium density residential district. For the increased height, we currently have a maximum 12.0m building height in Parsons Creek and we are unaware of any issues.
225	6		<p>My recollection is that basement suites were allowed everywhere to alleviate the housing crunch and to make investing in housing affordable. This is no longer the case and hence our LUB needs to be more flexible and able to adapt to current conditions.</p> <p>Our community tends to want to “design our way out of problems” as opposed to enforcing existing bylaws to control parking.</p> <p>I think that there will be pressure (currently there is lots of pressure in larger communities) to densify current communities and some of the alternative housing types would allow for this as well as make it more affordable (Vancouver is a good example). Do we need to provide for this event on 100% of the lots – I tend to agree Carmelo where specific lots can handle the increased density but not force every lot to conform.</p> <p>My thoughts</p>	Change made	<p>We received this feedback from various stakeholders and thoroughly reviewed the proposal to ensure the land use bylaw supports a wide variety of developments for residential uses. It was noted that the four stall requirement reflected on high lot widths and sizes and, therefore, affordability of lots in general. Revisions to the lot width(minimum), lot area(minimum) and other provisions are recommended for the low-rise medium density residential district to balance these concerns.</p>
226	6		<p>It seems to me that we do not have provision for a zoning which allows single family homes, I think it would be beneficial to have a zoning with no legal suites permitted, this would be a true R1 zoning at the moment an R1 zoning is really an R2 and an R2 is really an R3</p> <p>I feel that there is a cross section of people that would love to live in an area with no legal suites, where people park in their driveways or garages and not on the streets.</p> <p>In the early subdivision legal suites were allowed and designated to corner lots where parking would not be a problem and they were limited. The other factor that comes into effect as well is that, it creates vacancies in existing apartments and curbs the building of new apartment blocks. The RMWB should be pushing to reduce or eliminate the legal suites altogether. There would additional tax revenue generated by building new apartments especially when the tax ratios have taken such a hit.</p>	Change made	<p>When reviewing the R1 provisions, the team concluded that there is little scope to revise the low rise low density residential district.</p> <p>However, the provisions of low rise medium density district were reviewed and changed to suit the needs of the region. This would allow for single family homes without suites to be possible as there is a limitation on minimum lot area for secondary suites applicable under Part 5 Section 36.</p>

227	6	<p>permitted as well. As a resident in Eagle Ridge for the last 10 years I can say that I am quite tired of all the basement suites and congested streets. In my past life I was involved in the original design of Eagle Ridge and the single family lots and traffic infrastructure was not designed to accommodate the density that basement suites brings.</p> <p>As a family we moved to that area because of the lifestyle that was expected. If I could do it all over again we would have selected an area where there are less, or no basement suites around. Basement suites introduce a whole flurry of issues that we never considered until we lived around it all. Such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Constant transient renters.</li> </ul> <p>oWhen you are bringing up a young family it can be a concern.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The renters in the basements don't really care for the neighborhood like owners, they don't have anything invested.</li> <li>•Typically the single family units are required to have one parking stall for a basement suite.</li> </ul> <p>oIn most instances we note that each basement suite tends to bring in 2 more vehicles per household.</p> <p>That adds to the reason the streets are so congested, and less safe for small children to run and play.</p> <p>Andrew mentioned that houses in McMurray have become more affordable over the last few years relative to income. I agree and the need for basement suites is less important, and is more catering to people that just want the added disposable income but don't necessarily need them to pay for their homes. Personally I think that the excessive permitting of basement suites has made many of our single family neighborhoods become quite ugly. If there is a demographic of folks (like myself) that would like to live in a neighborhood that was designed for</p>	Change made	<p>The Team received feedback on issues related to basement suite. Provisions have been added to include minimum lot sizes that could support a certain type of secondary suite, including basement suites.(Part 5 Section 36). Additionally, parking requirements based on number of bedrooms continue to be in place under Part 7.</p> <p>Depending on its size, a lot may now be unable to meet the minimum area required for a secondary suite in an existing neighborhood.</p>
-----	---	---	-------------	---

228	6		<p>Agrees with Carmelo Daprocida - I can agree with this. Maybe there are some pockets in subdivisions where suites are not allowed, but not sure how the logistics of that look.</p> <p>Just to clarify, the LUB requires 1 more stall (additional to the base 2 that are already required) for a one bedroom suite, and 2 additional stalls for a two bedroom suite, and to a maximum of two additional stalls if there were more than two bedrooms in the suite (not that the RMWB approves those anyways). I think another problem is the mass amount of "illegal" suites, but that would require different attention from development compliance.</p> <p>Further to this, people in WoodBuffalo quite often have their garages full of storage and toys, so the 2 stalls that would be accounted for in the garage are not being used as such. There was a day where people could not get mortgage approval without adding a basement suite for review, but those days have long since passed.</p> <p>I agree with Dan fully</p>	No change proposed	<p>Provisions have been added to include minimum lot sizes that could support a certain type of secondary suite, including basement suites.(Part 5 Section 36). Additionally, parking requirements based on number of bedrooms continue to be in place under Part 7.</p> <p>Going forward, lots would be limited by the minimum area requirements for a secondary suite, in their ability to have a suite. Hence, there may be pockets where secondary suites may or may not be possible, subject to lot size.</p> <p>Non compliance to conditions of a development permit may be brought to the attention of our compliance officers for enforcement.</p>
229	6		350-500 empty lots – are there are requirement parking for the ones that exist ex. Burnt lots in Abasand	Change made	There is no change proposed to existing lots. The Part 2 Section 4 related to non-conforming uses and buildings has been strengthened to support rebuilding in existing neighborhoods. Additionally, changes have been made to the minimum parking requirement that would be applicable to small lots, reducing the minimum from 4 stalls to 2 stalls.
230	6	1.7	Should "The width of an attached garage for a single detached dwelling shall not exceed seventy percent (70%) of the width of the principal building"apply only to new subdivisions	No change proposed	The Variance provision will facilitate development in existing neighborhoods
231	6	3.4	Need to check R1P lot block plan # and send to Jennica for inclusion in R2 for 50% lot coverage provision	Change made	In order to capture the essence of existing R1P and R1M districts, where both Mobile Homes and Single Detached Dwellings exist, it was decided to retain the R1M district with modifications as necessary.
232	6	6	Which SDD regs will we apply now to the SDD in RMH District, the R2 ,or keeping the 99/059	Change made	Single family home has been added as a discretionary use to RMH to be consistent with existing provisions and allow for such development
233	6	6.3	add SDD as a discretionary use in RMH considering areas like beacon hill for example.	Change made	Single family home has been added as a discretionary use to RMH to be consistent with existing provisions and allow for such development



234	6	28	<p>Suburban estates</p> <p>When did the established section of Sapræ change from Country Residential to Suburban Estates? According to the original appendix in the 99/059 LUB, SE is supposed to be only the “new” section that was developed on Sommer Way and Janke Lane areas. The main parts of Sapræ Creek, Freestone, Community, Weiss, Sol Park, Sapræ Cres are the established areas and have always been classed as country residential . This could explain why there have been issues with some of the rebuilds.</p>	Change made	<p>Based on our records, it appears as though the change occurred when the 99/059 Land Use Bylaw was passed. The SE Suburban Estate District, however, includes the same provisions as the CR Country Residential District, with some additions to capture specific provisions applicable to Sapræ Creek.</p> <p>The project team has established two districts for Sapræ Creek Estates to differentiate between older and newer portions.</p>
235	6	28.3	<p>3.Please add Secondary Suite to Discretionary Use in Suburban Estate Rationale</p> <p>oA Secondary Suite Use would be consistent with other large Rural Residential zonings.</p> <p>oEngagement with residents indicates a desire for this Use.</p>	Change made	<p>A Secondary Suite Use would be consistent with other large Rural Residential zoning. Engagement with residents indicates a desire for this Use. These have been added as discretionary uses to SE1 and SE2</p>
236	6		<p>Cluster housing: I thought this was a discretionary use in Conklin; needs to be re-instated</p>	No change proposed	<p>The use cluster housing is not included in the proposed LUB as such, but similar development may be possible within the Multi-residential dwelling use.</p> <p>Multi-residential dwelling is a discretionary use in the Hamlet Community Core District.</p>
237	6	31.3	<p>Should we add Bulk Oil, Fuel and Chemical Storage to RD - Rural District?</p>	Change made	<p>Bulk Oil, Fuel and Chemical Storage was added as a Discretionary Use to the RD Rural District.</p>
238	7	1	<p>Respectfully, I haven't read the whole of the document, but there are some suggestions that I disagree with - 4 parking stalls for every house? That is ok for high end peeps but what about a modest person who doesn't want to run a business at home. I am also thinking about my friends who have duplexes. They told me they will have problems in future. I hope you have an option for the common man - Its difficult to understand what I may or may not build to in future. It would be easier if you said your neighborhood is changing from this color to this and this is what has changed. So for Abasand, I hear some changes are going to happen. Can you tell us, residents, what that is? I hope I can build similar to before cos I know we have more buildable area allowed here and build closer to the street - Where is all that talk about being able to lease some land or remove random structures from green land at the back of houses. Last time I was told there is going to be a policy, but there is no mention in this bylaw?</p>	Changes made	<p>The four stall parking requirement has been removed from the proposal based on public feedback.</p> <p>The Sections on 'Non conforming uses and buildings' has been revised to assist future developments in existing neighborhoods.</p> <p>Residential districts have been simplified to avoid confusion and increase clarity. The R1P and R1S lots in Abasand would now be zoned R1M and R2 respectively, as reflected in the LUB Map as a part of this simplification. Please note, that this results in little change to existing site provisions. Therefore, a resident may likely be able to build to similar to what is possible under the current LUB in terms of setbacks and lot coverage, with a few exceptions.</p> <p>Many other changes applicable to neighborhoods in urban service area (includes Abasand) are highlighted in the 'summary of changes-Urban' document.</p> <p>The LUB is limited to regulate developments within a parcel or property.</p>

239	7	1	yes but parking is an issue... maybe look at some central green space parking close to bus routes..	No change proposed	Parking lots are a permitted use in several districts. The LUB does not direct specific uses of a parcel, rather enables a future development on a parcel.
240	7	1	The proposal is restrictive towards options given today's market. This doesn't allow market to take lead. We don't know another Municipality in Canada has increased the parking requirement. This might counter MDP policies, to create higher densities, create more massing. It appears to sterilize land from infill development.	Change made	Changes have been made to the minimum parking requirement, reducing the minimum from 4 stalls to 2 stalls. Additionally, the provisions of low rise medium density district were reviewed and changed to suit the needs of the region and allow for denser development.
241	7	1	I think that homes with back alley access should also have a front drive way small enough for 1 truck. This would eliminate a lot of on street parking.	No change proposed	The intent of lane access lots is to have vehicular access only from laneway. Allowing access from both sides of the lot would result in inefficient use of Municipal Infrastructure and is not recommended as a good planning practice
242	7	1	<p>Can't keep increasing cost of subdivision. -Lot width is 12 metres, not enough space for additional parking stalls. May not support market conditions – maybe 12 meters is too big; maybe 10.8 – should be flexible to respond to market conditions and economic environment</p> <p>If people want more parking stalls but are told it will cost a certain percentage more for their lot – what do you think the answer will be?</p> <p>LUB needs more flexibility in the housing forms.</p> <p>Because of requirement for stalls- width of lots needs to be more. Therefore it would be more expensive to buy the lots and maintain/provide additional engineering standards. There may be higher cost of development. Engineering servicing standards-driveways, gutters on all streets, depressed driveways for each house to prevent paving of front yard. For rear access lots, this would result in increase cost of building the lane.</p> <p>If traffic congestion/parking concerns, another approach is to use bylaw enforcement.</p> <p>With this, the new subdivision would be difficult to enter the market. There isn't a market for Saline Creek. If prices are so high, this will become difficult to sell. Therefore, we need a document and look at ways to make document more flexible. We are in a slump, need to address that we want to be open and encourage expenditure in our community. This may include different ways, perhaps may be re purposing the not built subdivisions to meet current price points. Or let's say if we are relocating people impacted by the floods, we have to look where do we do that? We must check, do we have flexibility in our system? The current answer is no. Another thing is we must put sustainability at the forefront and make a sustainable community. Who knows what will change in the next 20 years, our LUB must have flexibility to do that. In some cases we have achieved that, but in some cases we haven't.</p>	Change made	The Team carefully considered this valuable feedback and reviewed the proposed R1 and R2 districts. Revisions to the lot width(minimum), lot area(minimum) and other provisions are recommended for the low-rise medium density residential district(R2) to balance these concerns and ensure adequate options are available for various typologies in future.

243	7	1.4	Any type of commercial area needs a lot more parking available than there has been allotted in so many areas of FM. Parking spots need to be longer and wider and the area where you have to back out need to be bigger to accommodate trucks. Not just small cars. We need to encourage many more stores that are found in the larger cities to come here. This may help with people always heading south to Edmonton to spend their money.	No change proposed	The small car stall was removed from proposed LUB provisions. The standard stall is 2.8x5.8 meter and this size was not increased. The LUB enables several uses in different Districts and if proposed businesses can be located in the Urban Service Area
244	7	2	Q1: This would be great but the streets themselves need to be much wider. I'm not seeing any questions about home based businesses...Q2: Yes	No change proposed	The LUB does not determine road widths.
245	7	2	Regarding the increase to minimum parking requirements, the proposed measure would help reduce street congestion in neighbourhoods from which people leave for the day's work and return in the evening to park wherever they can. In neighbourhoods to which people arrive to park their cars for the day's work, however, the congestion may well become worse than it is now (Consider Fitzgerald Avenue in Birchgrove where hospital workers and visitors park from Hospital Street to May Crescent, throughout Berry Crescent and Bell Crescent too). If the minimum requirement increases, then many residential driveways will expand sideways, thereby reducing street parking.NB:	Change made	The four stall parking requirement has been removed for single and semi-detached homes. Parking enforcement is something that needs to be followed up with Bylaw Services
246	7	2	1. I think instead of increasing parking on a property the neighbourhoods should be designed to have street parking not on the road (wider roadways so that road doesn't feel tight while driving. I agree with the earlier comment that more than 2 stalls would mean less green space and the lot sizes are already so small. 2. I think this should depend on the type of business. Larger parking lots like Grocery stores and department stores, sure, but as a mom with 3 small kids if I have to go into a store that only has a 4-5 parking stalls available I don't want to have to walk a block to go there because all the stalls are designated.	Change made	The Team received feedback that four stalls requirement for all residential lots throughout the urban service area seems excessive. Considering that the LUB must provide various development options in our region, the team revisited this requirement and removed this requirement from Part 7. The green area on a lot is ensured by the landscaping requirement condition on the approved development permit. The LUB does not determine road widths. The designated parking stalls in larger developments are a percentage of the total number of stalls required.

247	7	2.5	Absolutely there needs to be some changes regarding residential parking. When you have a home owner that is also a business owner and by times he has as many as four business vehicles plus his 3 personal vehicles. It should definitely be increased and there should be some form of bylaw about business vehicles!!!!It is absolutely ridiculous when you have two way streets that only one vehicle can get through	Change made	The Team received feedback that four stalls requirement for all residential lots throughout the urban service area seems excessive. Considering that the LUB must provide variousdevelopment options in our region, the team revisited this requirement and removed this requirement from Part 7
248	7	2.7	Q1. 4 stalls seems excessive. 2 should be adequate. Is this even being enforced? Q2. No. Who will be asking for age Id? If a senior requires special parking they should apply for an accessible parking permit. These parking spots will end up empty. It is not wor th the effort.	Changes made	Based on feedback received during the public engagement, the four stall requirement for all residential lots has been removed. The requirements of Senior parking are not in addition to the required parking for a use. Accessible parking permits are not available for anyone under 65, and are reserve for people with disabilities that have challenges in walking more than 50m. The requirement of Senior parking makes our community more inclusive and reserves parking closer to the street for these users
249	7	2.7	I also seek clarification on Section 2.7 - regarding parking - which states for Residential semi-detached and single detached homes - there is a requirement for 4 parking stalls plus residential visitor parking. With smaller parking (as noted above) - I'm not sure how you get 4 stalls per dwelling unit plus residential visitor which implies one additional stall. The RMWB is a unique community that doesn't offer some of the amenities of other areas given our land availability (and cost) issues and our remote location. Parking and storage are an issue - and the proposed changes seem to exacerbate the issues.	Change made	Based on feedback received during the public engagement, the four stall requirement for all residential lots has been removed. The residential visitors requirement was revised to provide clarity that it is not required for single semi-detached homes.
250	7	2.7	I support the parking change for house as there are now an average of 3 vehicles in one household and rental units.	No change proposed	Comment supporting four stall requirement. However, due to overwhelming response against it, this requirement has been removed
251	7	2.7	More RV's and trailers could be allowed to parking on rural property. Our lots are bigger than urban lots.	Change made	Provisions were modified to allow for more RV and trailers to be parked on residential lots in the Rural Service Area.
252	7	2.7	Regarding question 1. Am I correct in reading that every new single family dwelling M UST have parking for 4 vehicles? By mandating a minimum 4 vehicle driveway, home UST have parking for 4 vehicles? By mandating a minimum 4 vehicle driveway, home s will no longer have any lawn. Why not require visitor parking in neighbourhoods, en courage wider lots and streets (like Hillcrest area) and implement sidewalks on both si des of the street?	Change made	The Team received feedback that four stalls requirement for all residential lots throughout the urban service area seems excessive. Considering that the LUB must provide variousdevelopment options in our region, the team revisited this requirement and removed this requirement from Part 7 The lawn area on a lot is ensured by the landscaping requirement condition on the approved development permit. Visitor parking requireents are applicable to apartment, multi-unit and multi-residential developments.

253	7	2.7	Many homes have more than two vehicles with teenagers having cars and parents having cars so 4 parking stalls remove road congestion. I agree with more parking.	Change made	The Team received feedback that four stalls requirement for all residential lots throughout the urban service area seems excessive. Considering that the LUB must provide various development options in our region, the team revisited this requirement and removed this requirement from Part 7.
254	7	2.7	This is utter nonsense, why are you increasing minimum parking to 4? Do you have a ny idea that this will now mean that the single detached houses will NOT have any ba ckyards? Are you all high when you proposed these "suggestions". God I hope the Council has some sense.	Change made	The Team received feedback that four stalls requirement for all residential lots throughout the urban service area seems excessive. Considering that the LUB must provide various development options in our region, the team revisited this requirement and removed this requirement from Part 7.
255	7	2.7	Four stalls does make sense for busy streets. What not lift the by laws so people can i ncrease their driveways ncrease their driveways	No change proposed	It is possible to increase driveway width for a property by applying for a boulevard crossing permit with our Engineering Department. However, such permits are reviewed for compliance to the landscaping requirement under the development permit approval for a lot.
256	7	2.7	4 stall parking; difficult for new lots, difficult for parking. Enforcing maybe aln alternative	No change proposed	Based on feedback received during the public engagement, the four stall requirement for all residential lots has been removed. Yes, opportunities for LUB enforcement are in place for our Municipality.
257	7	2.7	I like the idea of increasing parking stalls to reduce on street parking or single detached housing. More than 2 should be required. At the very least there should be 3 detached housing.	Change made	The Team received feedback that four stalls requirement for all residential lots throughout the urban service area seems excessive. Considering that the LUB must provide various development options in our region, the team revisited this requirement and removed this requirement from Part 7.
258	7	2.7	4 mandatory stalls per single residence is craziness. The entire grass area of suburban neighbourhoods would have to be covered in concrete. This is a terrible suburban neighbourhoods would have to be covered in concrete. This is a terrible idea eliminating yet more green space from neighbourhoods.	Change made	The Team received feedback that four stalls requirement for all residential lots throughout the urban service area seems excessive. Considering that the LUB must provide various development options in our region, the team revisited this requirement and removed this requirement from Part 7.
259	7	2.7	4 parking stalls mandatory may solve some of the street parking problems we face. But how is this to be implemented and at who's expense? Is this only for new builds.? Should there only be parking on one side of the street.? At least then two cars can fit in the winter. Q2 I agree with the senior pass instead of designated parking.	Change made	The Team received feedback that four stalls requirement for all residential lots throughout the urban service area seems excessive. Considering that the LUB must provide various development options in our region, the team revisited this requirement and removed this requirement from Part 7. The requirements of Senior parking are not in addition to the required parking for a use. Accessible parking permits are not available for anyone under 65 are reserve for people with disabilities that have challenges in walking more the 50m. The requirement of Senior parking makes our community more inclusive and reserves parking closer to the street for these users

260	7	2.7	Minimum 4 stalls will make streets look awful. Some development is not even wide enough for 2. This requirement will remove all vegetation from streets. Maybe you need to look at the size of development in the future and build in bigger lots. Surely houses in timberlea will not be able to comply.	Change made	The Team received feedback that four stalls requirement for all residential lots throughout the urban service area seems excessive. Considering that the LUB must provide various development options in our region, the team revisited this requirement and removed this requirement from Part 7. Existing lots which do not comply to proposed provisions will be assisted by the Sections on Non conforming use and buildings
261	7	2.7	Increase the parking to 4 stall minimum, however keep the current soft scape ratio. Parking will increase and builders will be forced to make larger lots. Parking is always reduced to increase the density not make more greenspace. When lots were selling for 350K does anyone really think that was reflective of the true cost? No that is what speculation and the market would bear. PS - I am not high	Change made	The Team received feedback that four stalls requirement for all residential lots throughout the urban service area seems excessive. Considering that the LUB must provide various development options in our region, the team revisited this requirement and removed this requirement from Part 7. The landscape requirements continue to be the same for most residential districts.
262	7	2.7	4 parking stalls per house? Were you high when you wrote this? The congestion is due to illegal renters, maybe deal with the real issue instead of making nonsense rules. Sure change it so people have the option to turn their lawns into parking, but don't force that on every new build! We only have one vehicle and a two car driveway, as does our good friend not everyone needs to be able to park 4 cars. Also I don't know where to post this so.... please allow back yard chickens!	Change made	The Team received feedback that four stalls requirement for all residential lots throughout the urban service area seems excessive. Considering that the LUB must provide various development options in our region, the team revisited this requirement and removed this requirement from Part 7. We also received a lot of feedback from residents in support of urban hens. A Bylaw for an Urban Hen Pilot Project has been drafted and is intended on being brought to Council at a later date. This Bylaw will address the required amendments to the Land Use Bylaw and Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw to allow for a pilot project to take place
263	7	6.1	What is the difference between "drive-in" and "Drive-through" queuing? Why is que needed in drive in instead of parking?	Change made	The Drive-in parking requirement have been refined to clarify applicability
264	7	6.5	Section 6 Vehicle Queuing Drive through shall not have access directly from an arterial road. This one might need an exemption/grandfather clause because the Tim Hortons on Thickwood Blvd actually contradicts this one. Remember back when the RCMP had to enforce the no stopping of vehicles on Thickwood Blvd during the boom times....	No change proposed	This provision is applicable for new development or if a development adds GFA to existing development. Existing development will be considered non-conforming, and in that case, the non-conforming clauses with the Land Use Bylaw will apply
265	7	7	Senior citizen parking also in rural? Change it to Elder	Change made	Provision was added that Senior citizen parking is not required in the Rural Service Area
266	7	8	Senior and bicycle parking -rec centre can keep senior parking however not need else where in the community	Change made	Provision was added that Senior citizen parking is not required in the Rural Service Area

267	7	8	Bicycle parking for instance. When Taiga Nova was built, it had to address building typologies and amongst other things bicycle parking. Our community, doesn't happen to use bicycles to the extent as in Edmonton and Calgary. So, now we have stalls that dont fit purpose or no one uses them. They are not unsightly, but not necessarily a need. Such a requirement would depend on location and the type of business. If its a warehouse, why would you need bicycle stalls. The same applies to some of the signage regulations.	Change made	Bicycle Section was thoroughly reviewed and requirements were revised to reflect the applicability to our region (Part 7 Section 8) The requirements have been reduced from previous proposal and the need for stalls in industrial areas has been eliminated.
268	7	8	Bike parking is irrelevant in the community	Change made	Bicycle parking has been eliminated for the rural service area, except for educational facilities
269	7	11	Once a Development Permit is granted, the lawn and street will be full of cars. Very Naïve ideas. Need more common sense.	No change proposed	Every development must abide by the conditions of its approval under the development permit, including but not limited to minimum landscaping and location of uses within a property. In case of the Urban Service Area there is a setback requirement for driveways to ensure sufficient on street parking is available. Should a parking concern arise, after approval of a secondary suite development permit, it may be reported for enforcement action.
270	7	11.2 The	In order to have a secondary suite you would need 5 stalls for the single detached dwelling plus 1 per sleeping unit in the secondary suite? Potentially 7 stalls?	Change made	The Section was reworded for clarity that parking for suites is in addition to the two stalls needed for the principal dwelling
271	7	12, 13	Section 12 Boarding house Section 13 Bed and Breakfast For both of these, it's the number of stalls required. It says that 1 required for each unit that gets rented out and that the single detached unit requirements is reduced to 1 for the homeowner. Why would a home that has no revenue need 4 stalls minimum and the homes that have revenue only need 1 stall for the homeowner and 1 stall for the bedrooms rented out? This makes very little sense in the scheme of things	Change made	Provision was deleted as parking would apply based on sleeping units
272	7	2.1 (h)	Access Aisle Width (metres) "on side" Is this a typo?	Change made	The missing dimension was added to this provision to rectify typological error
273	7	2.7 (a)	New Single/Semi-Detached Dwellings need 5 stalls? 4 stalls + 0.2 stalls per dwelling units (rounded up to 1) =5?	Change made	The Section was reworded for clarity that parking for suites is in addition to the two stalls needed for the principal dwelling
274	7	2.7 (a)	Section 2.7 stalls residential In (a) semi-detached and single detached required 4 stalls minimum? Is this a misprint? LUB 99/059 doesn't say that and this seems a little extreme.	Change made	Based on feedback received during public engagement, the four stalls requirement has been removed from the proposal.

275	7	2.7 (l)	Should it not be 1 stall per sleeping unit instead of per dwelling unit?	Change made	This change makes sense and it appears this has been a typological error
276	7	4.2 (e)	Off site parking permanent agreement....Is this legally binding? And my example will be: the owners of the mall and the casino have a signed shared parking agreement but the way I read this is if the owner of the casino sells the casino, the signed agreement between the original owners will still be binding even if one of them no longer has a financial/ vested interest in the development. How can this be binding? What if one of the owners died, you can't enforce on a person who doesn't own the property or is no longer of this world. This just seems to be another of these weird/wrong feeling bylaws	No change proposed	A development permit approval runs with the land and is not portable with applicant. Parking agreement is a part of the development, and it is registered on the certificate of title, and not tied to the ownership.
277	7		LUB needs to be flexible with current economy and are adjusting of what use to be, Bylaws need to be flexible, is it easier to enforce parking through bylaw	No change proposed	Attempts have been made to provide for development of various uses and developments under the proposed LUB, based on what we heard from various stakeholders. Yes, opportunities for LUB enforcement are in place for our Municipality.
278	7		If the municipality is committed to building an age friendly city, as identified in the strategic plan, it is imperative there be designated senior parking stalls. It is best practice under age friendly designations.	No change proposed	Senior parking is included as a requirement for Commercial, Industrial and Institutional uses in the proposed LUB
279	7		Do away with parking requirement table in rural areas based on type of use alone. Propose to base it on parking study. We cannot establish how high/how low or a number on variance as we have no reference. We did research, there is no reference for uses in diff locations.	Changes made	Additional variance authority has been provided for the Rural Service Area



280	7		Hi Isela, After the meeting with the WLCA on Friday, Darryl (President) called me to clarify a couple things. His main concern is wanting to make sure the LUB is clear, especially for rural. He said that if certain things are not explicitly stated, there is a tendency to differ to the urban bylaws, which don't necessarily work in rural. The example he gave at the meeting was in regards to the number of parking stalls required at the Anzac Grocery Store parking lot. He said when this area was being constructed, there were not clear bylaws about it for rural, so the urban bylaw was used and there was initially an expectation to have a large amount of parking stalls- which did not make sense for such a small community. He said that he worries if things are left up to interpretation, the way a resident interprets it may be different than the way the RMWB interprets it. I just wanted to share that as I'm not sure if that point was made clear in the meeting.	Changes made	The project team has reviewed provisions and several revisions have been made to cater to the needs of residents in the Rural communities. This includes significant revisions to the parking provisions like eliminating bicycle parking and allow reducing parking requirements where deemed necessary. The senior parking requirements in rural service area have been eliminated
281	7	2.9	Sports Club is not defined but referred to in parking section	Change made	Sports Club was removed from this section. It now reads "Health Spa"
282	7	10	Should 4.5m distance from driveway to property line apply only to new subdivisions	No change proposed	This section may be varied as necessary by a development officer as we are not limited in our variance authority with respect to this provision
283	8	1	Why did the font change from how the rest of the draft is presented? Just finding it to be very distracting.	Change made	Updated Heading 3 style to be more consistent with the document.
284	8	1	Unsightly	No change proposed	Specific regulations for the appearance of signs are proposed in the LUB
285	8	4	No. These signs are a source of distraction and are too bright in the winter. The one on Carman (Centerfire) is way too bright in the winter. The RMWB was supposed to request the white be turned down. It never did from what I see. Residents should be asked in different areas. None are to go on Clearwater Drive. And they should keep them off of 63 too.	No change proposed	The proposed bylaw includes many rules to control how a sign is lit. For example, there are proposed provisions to limit the brightness level based on existing natural levels. These provisions can be found in Part 8, Section 5.4.
286	8	5	Ok as long as they can be secured so they may not be blown into street or other properties and have identification as to ownership and follow rules for visibility for drivers I think 1 year is too long	No change proposed	The one year approval is a maximum limit. This provides opportunity to Commercial owners for applying only one sign permit a year if it is proposed for long term. Part 8, section 5.2.1 addresses maintenance as well as visibility.

287	8	5	Digital signage has the potential to increase light pollution. See signage at Reidel Street, and Gordon ave, Gregoire drive, and Thickwood blvd at Centre Fire Arena. Obviously bright, and a possible distraction to drivers. Street lights are required to cast a minimum levels of upward lighting. Do we have regulations to the same effect regarding signage/billboards?	No change proposed	The proposed bylaw includes many rules to control how a sign is lit. For example, there are proposed provisions to limit the brightness level based on existing natural levels. These provisions can be found in Part 8, Section 5.4.
288	8	5.4	No to digital signs. Too large, create distractions and cause light pollution!	No change proposed	As part of our day to day practice the Planning and Development Department understands there is a need to regulate Digital Signs. The proposed bylaw includes many rules to control how a sign is lit. For example, there are proposed provisions to limit the brightness level based on existing natural levels. These provisions can be found in Part 8, Section 5.4.
289	8	5.4	No to digital signs they cause increase light pollution we do not need.	No change proposed	As part of our day to day practice the Planning and Development Department understands there is a need to regulate Digital Signs. The proposed bylaw includes many rules to control how a sign is lit. For example, there are proposed provisions to limit the brightness level based on existing natural levels. These provisions can be found in Part 8, Section 5.4.
290	8	5.4	Digital signage needs to be made so the lighting in them isn't so blinding to the eyes of drivers going by, or to the people who own homes in the area as the lights are very bright and annoying inside their homes. Digital sign wording should also be large enough than you can actually read it at a glance and not have to really concentrate (distracted driving) on the sign to try to figure out what it is saying. More time on each advertisement would make it better, too. Q: isn't one sign per property going to make for distracted driving trying to read them all?	No change proposed	The proposed bylaw includes many rules to control how a sign is lit. For example, there are proposed provisions to limit the brightness level based on existing natural levels. These provisions can be found in Part 8, Section 5.4.
291	8	5.4	There should be a limit on brightness as this would not only affect drivers but residents in the area. Also the time between ads should be increased to avoid constant distractions for drivers, as well as no animations add these could also create a distraction for drivers. There should be a limit to the amount of these in a neighborhood to avoid driver distraction and light pollution.	No change proposed	The proposed bylaw includes many rules to control how a sign is lit. For example, there are proposed provisions to limit the brightness level based on existing natural levels. These provisions can be found in Part 8, Section 5.4.

292	8	6.12	The portable signs are nothing more than visual pollution and show a community more interested in making money than presenting an appealing atmosphere. We should be interested in making money than presenting an appealing atmosphere. We should have higher expectations and not just consider the fees from the signs. They should be replaced with proper signage and not clutter the green space outside business zones.	No change proposed	Enforcement is based on complaints in the RMWB therefore every size of a sign will not be checked. We will enforce rather signs that are out of the norm if required.
293	8	8.3	Chart of permitted and discretionary uses   Awning & Canopy in districts R3,R4, DC-R4, there's a letter "P" instead of a dot	Change made	Change has been made to be consistent with the remainder of the tables.
294	8	8.5	Industrial districts chart   Fascia...also has "P" instead of the dot	Change made	Change has been made to be consistent with the remainder of the tables.
295	8	5.2.6	I would support Question 1. Sea cans should be screened or part of landscaping and blend in with the common theme of the lot. Existing sea cans should be grandfathered into the LUB providing they are not unsightly.	No change proposed	General provisions require the screening of sea cans. Existing sea cans, where a development permit has been granted, will be able to remain.
296	8	5.4 (a)	Regulate and ENFORCE the brightness of signage!!!! It's like driving into the sun around the casmen and gregoire dr (crystal glass)	No change proposed	The proposed bylaw includes many rules to control how a sign is lit. For example, there are proposed provisions to limit the brightness level based on existing natural levels. These provisions can be found in Part 8, Section 5.4.
297	8	6.10 (d)	How does the mural on Father Turcotte school fit into this provision? I'm not sure which district the school is in because there are only three districts listed; commercial, institutional, and industrial	Change made	Father Turcotte school would be considered a part of an institutional district. Section 7.4.c was added to clarify that PS is an Institutional District.
298	8	6.12 (d)	..may not use red, green, or amber.... Is this because these colours are usually associated with traffic lights or emergency response? If emergency response, maybe blue should also be included...	No change proposed	This Section is related to Traffic Light only since Portable signs are visible from the street and traffic
299	8		Sign Face -When calculating sign face for example would it be 23sqm a total for both sides or one side only?	Change made	Wherever the "sign face" is referred to in the Bylaw it has now been changed to "sign face per side".
300	9	9.4	Snyeside Clearwater Residential Area - I think that the flood mitigation should be mentioned here as something that needs to be incorporated. It doesn't say and if I was looking at building in this area and not being from the area, I wouldn't know to look for flood mitigation. Just think it should be mentioned or at least have building restrictions for under 250m	No change proposed	The flood provisions would be a part of a separate Land Use Bylaw amendment as part of the flood mitigation work. These provisions will better capture most recent direction from Council.

301	9	5.2 (c) (d)	I must be missing something in this section as it isn't making any sense at all. One sentence says the Development Authority shall not allow a variance...but the next sentence says that the Development authority may allow a variance....This definitely needs to be clarified	No change proposed	The general format of these sections is designed to mean "no variance is allowed in situation X unless...." The vast majority of Part 9 remains the same for the existing Land Use Bylaw. Once the work on the Area Redevelopment Plan for the Downtown is complete, a Land Use Bylaw amendment will be introduced to align with the new policy direction and will work to simplify the language further.
302	10	1	This whole section is confusing as it feels like it contradicts everything in the land use bylaw.	No change proposed	The intent of the Overlay Bylaw following the 2016 wildfire was to preserve owners' ability to rebuild exactly what they legally had prior to the wildfire. Because the Land Use Bylaw had changed since many of these areas were constructed, many of these properties would not be able to rebuild what they had because the development would not comply with the Bylaw that was in place. This Part is in place to allow this to occur.
303	10	10.1	Voluntary waiver of claims- What? Does this mean that if I was rebuilding and the notice is posted, I could start building before the notice expires? Isn't this setting people up for failure and extra costs?	No change proposed	At the time the Bylaw was passed, the residents wanted to rebuild and begin construction as soon as possible. This provision would allow construction to occur to meet key deadlines. It was a risk to begin construction before the appeal period was over, but this provision often assisted in property owners' meeting key construction timelines.
304	2 and 9	3.1 , 4.4.a.i.	I have a question about not conforming uses or buildings and the parking min standard of 4 stalls. If the min parking for residential is 4 the rest of the lot that don't comply will be non conforming which means that they cannot be added or altered. Perhaps is best to add a parking requirement for existing single and semidetached so that the non-conforming matters are left to lot size and use	Change made	Based on feedback received, the four stall parking has been removed from the LUB. The Sections on 'Non conforming uses and buildings' has been revised to assist future developments in existing neighborhoods
305	5 and 6	4 , 27.5 (g)(h) , 29.2 (c)	I would like to advocate for the city to ensure there remain areas where horses can be kept and rode. They are a huge part of owners lives, as well as bring enjoyment to many community members. We want families to remain in the area, horses enhance quality of life.	No change proposed	The Rural Communities and Hamlets are within the Boundary of the Regional Municipality of Wood Buffalo and, therefore, under the jurisdiction of the RMWB Municipal Council that can adopt a Land Use Bylaw.
306	7 , 3 , 5 , 7	2.3 (e) , 2.2 (x) , 41.8 (b) , 2.3 (e)	Part 7 Parking and Loading Section 2.3 required number of on-site parking stalls (e) when requiring a development permit...parking stall requirements for a special event shall be based on a parking demand study.....this seems to contradict what the other sections say. Part 3 (2.2) (x) says no development permit required and Part 5 says that the development authority may have as conditions...(b) parking and location but in Part 7 it says that the special event needs a parking demand study....just wondering how that works	Changes made	It is modified to indicate "Parking Plan" as opposed to a "Parking Demand Study". A Parking demand study is a technical document and can be time-consuming and cost-prohibitive for an applicant to provide.

307	N/A	N/A	<p>INDIVIDUAL bYLAWS - Based on the Indigenous and rural engagement to date on the LUB there appears to be a main theme emerging, which is the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Requests to have individual by-laws that are specific to rural communities. The rationale being that the current single bylaw approach appears to be difficult for communities to understand how the LUB impacts their rural community and some of the zoning may able to one rural community but not another (e.g. Cluster housing not wanted in Anzac)</li> <li>•Requests for individual by-laws have been requested by ACFN, WLCA and FMMN; and would likely be supported by other rural and Indigenous communities if the option was presented.</li> </ul> <p>If community specific LUB's are not an option then we will need to explain to the communities as to why its not a viable option that can be pursued. An alternative could be through supporting communication material that is specific to each rural community that explains how the LUB applies to each individual rural community. My concern with that approach is that I do not feel that communities currently have a clear understanding on the current changes and how they will impact each rural community. So if this communication approach is taken I would assume that it would be after Council considers the LUB and rural communities may not full understand the changes until after the LUB is approved.</p>	No change proposed	In Alberta, the MGA applies to all Municipalities and Improvement Districts and establishes the Purposes, Powers and Capacity of Municipalities. The MGA in section 639 states: Every municipality must pass a land use bylaw. The MGA also specifies further details on what the LUB regulates and how in section 640. This content was included in the presentation to all stakeholders.
308	N/A	N/A	Send rural summary	No change proposed	The Land Use bylaw is implemented the adopted ASP's to date.
309	N/A	N/A	<p>While I am happy to hear this, for those of us who have been waiting for at least 2 years for the request to be addressed, it can not come soon enough. I am 100% in favor for the request to be addressed, it can not come soon enough. I am 100% in favor of this project for Fort McMurray. If they can do it successfully in other cities, I am sure we can do it here as well.</p>	No change proposed	The Land Use Bylaw Team has received a lot of feedback from residents in support of urban hens. A Bylaw for an Urban Hen Pilot Project has been drafted and is intended on being brought to Council at a later date. This Bylaw will address the required amendments to the Land Use Bylaw and Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw to allow for a pilot project to take place
310	N/A	N/A	If there is scope for red tape to be removed, then that's a must. We must maintain ability to attract people and keep them	No change proposed	Efforts are being made to reduce the same. Some permit types, for example, Home Business, Minor no longer require development permits so long they comply with the requirements of the Land Use Bylaw.
311	N/A	N/A	Dear RMWB, In all the new Land Use Bylaw Engagements sessions online there has been no further mention or polls created to show how many residences support the keeping of Backyard Chickens or Bees! In a region of diversity, northern designation, & seeking a stronger and more sustainable community this topic should still be included in our regional affairs. Since this was in past discussions a half the people request this be re-included?	No change proposed	The Land Use Bylaw Team has received a lot of feedback from residents in support of urban hens. A Bylaw for an Urban Hen Pilot Project has been drafted and is intended on being brought to Council at a later date. This Bylaw will address the required amendments to the Land Use Bylaw and Responsible Pet Ownership Bylaw to allow for a pilot project to take place
312	N/A	N/A	Is this still a problem consider the drop in prices over the last 5 years?	No change proposed	Comment during a stakeholder meeting. No change proposed.

313	N/A	N/A	Hi Isela- there is an action item from the last Advisory Committee on Aging meeting that says you are going to provide additional clarity on the current requirements for universal design for developments. Are you able to include this information in your email about the parking?	No change proposed	Typically Universal Design is not enforced by a bylaw, but Municipalities create guidelines for the same. These guidelines will then be promoted to be included in new development/facilities. The current requirement for barrier-free design is as per the building code, and the Land Use Bylaw does not overlap with the building code but in the accessible stalls requirements. Some Policy documents are being created and may consider including a policy on Universal Design in the MDP and the ARP.
314	N/A	N/A	Love all your points! I agree with this too. Fort McMurray is my home now, and I missed the "boom", so how about we focus on making this municipality as great of a place as any hometown we came from? No disrespect to the people born and raised here, you already treat this place as your home, while the rest of us (mostly) are trying to do the same.	No change proposed	Appreciative comment on the Participate Wood Buffalo page. No change proposed.
315	N/A	N/A	Has residential parking congestion been any different since COVID?	No change proposed	This has not been observed by the project team.
316	N/A	N/A	Has the RMWB internally considered if engagement is necessary for government policy? To understand the RMWB has all relative information, if it does Mikisew would be interested in participating	No change proposed	The RMWB does not currently use a spectrum of consultation to determine the level of engagement/consultation on RMWB projects and initiatives. Through our conversations on the Municipal Indigenous Consultation Policy (MICP) we heard clearly from Indigenous communities that they did not want to pursue a similar model to the Government of Alberta's Consultation Policy on Land and Natural Resource Development and associated guidelines that uses a spectrum approach to determine levels of consultation. With this in mind, Indigenous communities were sent letters to engage on the Land Use Bylaw (LUB) using a preferred method approach. As per the recent alternative MICP meeting, our joint recommendation to move forward is through a protocol agreement that would identify engagement/consultation processes collaboratively with MCFN. IRR will be seeking approval from RMWB Council in Q1 2021 to move forward with the negotiation of protocol agreements with Indigenous communities. As an interim measure, prior to completion of a protocol agreement, is to engage with MCFN using their preferred approach and extent of engagement directly with MCFN.
317	N/A	N/A	Reference to Indigenous rights in the ASP – how the current LUB initiative respects that? How its incorporated into the LUB	No change proposed	The uses and provisions of the Bylaw are open and there is opportunity to facilitate a wide variety of cultural, recreational, and residential uses that respond to the needs of the indigenous communities.

318	N/A		Will the LUB create more red-tape for permit process?	No change proposed	Efforts are being made to reduce the same. Some permit types, for example, Home Business, Minor no longer require development permits so long they comply with the requirements of the Land Use Bylaw.
319	N/A	N/A	Are you changing the structure of the LUB?	No change proposed	Yes, the LUB has been substantially consolidated and improvised, as explained in the summary of changes documents.
320	N/A	N/A	"....ACFN would like to know if the LUB can have a separate section geared to their location specifically. I know we've been having consistent requests on this item....."	No change proposed	The Area Structure Plan is a policy document specific to each community within our region while Land Use Bylaw helps fulfil that intent. The LUB is an implementation tool with Sections that apply to most of our region. Certain sections apply to Fort Chipewyan, for example, Accessory Buildings, Hamlet Residential and Secondary Suites, to name a few.
321	N/A	N/A	FMMN to develop a concept for the Special Use & Cultural and communicate these concepts with the LUB team for consideration and discussion.	No change proposed	The proposed Special Use and Cultural area in the ASP does not have specific uses. The detailed proposals for the "Special use and Cultural" as proposed in the ASP need to be more specific to propose a Land Use zone in that area. Additionally, that area is wet. Therefore the development proposal will need to demonstrate the feasibility of the development to be proposed.
322	N/A	N/A	FMMN to provide detailed development plans for Lot 4	No change proposed	No proposal was shared with the project team. Administration can take a look at the proposal once it is received and determine how any concerns can be addressed
323	N/A	N/A	Live work versus live-work , text edit as not searchable	Change made	The change has been made for consistency throughout the document
324	N/A	N/A	I am a veterinarian in town and the owner of Northern Veterinary Services in Gregoire. The clinic is currently approved for both major and minor animal services. I have been made aware that the land use definitions are under review at this time and it is my hope to have the ability to house and rehabilitate wildlife included under the major and minor animal service definition going forward. I am starting the process to establish a small wildlife rehabilitation center in the community. Northern Veterinary Services would be the veterinary care facility but the rehabilitation center would be a separate entity. It would however be on the same property if approval is met by both the RMWB and AEP. Please let me know if there is any further information or clarification required at this point? As well, if I have directed this email to the wrong person, please let me know who best to follow up with!	No change proposed	Intended activities are consistent with the uses listed in the existing and proposed land use bylaw.