TOWN OF ONOWAY PUBLIC HEARING

HEARING WITH RESPECT TO BYLAW 790-21 LAND USE BYLAW AMENDMENT

ADDITIONS A G E N D A

DATE: Tuesday, October 5th, 2021

TIME: 7:00 p.m.

PLACE: Onoway Heritage Centre and virtual via zoom

1. Call to Order and Opening Remarks

- 2. Adoption of Agenda
- 3. Introductions
- 4. Public Hearing

Hearing with respect to the adoption of Bylaw 790-21 which proposes to amend Land Use Bylaw 712-13

Pg 1-3. 1. Assessment/taxation information prepared by Town Administration

- 5. Review of written submissions, for and against proposed Bylaw 790-21, received by the Municipality by Tuesday, September 28th, 2021
- Review of written submissions, for and against proposed Bylaw 790-21, received by the Municipality after the deadline of Tuesday, September 28th, 2021 and before 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 5th, 2021 (to be distributed at meeting time)

Pq 5 1. Ronald and Audrey Craddock

6 2. Susan Dales

7-8 3. Terry & Yvonne Slemko (x 2)

- 7. Oral presentations in favour of the proposed Bylaw 790-21 (the below individuals requested an opportunity to make an oral presentation prior to the public hearing, all those attending the public hearing (whether in person or virtually) will be given an opportunity to speak during the public hearing).
 - 1. Garth Hatch
 - 2. Jim Kyle
 - 3. Jane Holman
 - 4. Terry Slemko
- 8. Oral Presentations opposed to the proposed Bylaw 790-21 (all those attending the public hearing (whether in person or virtually) will be given an opportunity to speak during the public hearing).

9. Adjourn the Public Hearing

TOWN OF ONOWAY PUBLIC HEARING Redistricting Bylaw #790-21 October 5th, 2021

Administrative Background and Supplemental Information:

Exempt Assessment in the Town of Onoway:

Attached is the 2020 Assessment Roll Summary page. Recall that the 2020 (prior year) assessment values are used to calculate the 2021 (current year) tax rates, so this information is the most recent assessment information available for discussion.

Town of Onoway Assessment Breakdown:

Total Taxable Assessment:	100,916,780	~70.8% of total assessment
Total Exempt Assessment:	37,871,770 ¹	~26.6% of total assessment
Total Linear Assessment:	3,727,510	~ 2.6% of total assessment
Total Assessment	142,516,060	

¹Specific Breakdown of Exempt Assessment:

Code 802 School	25,936,800	~68.5% of exempt assessment
Code 803 Provincial	2,782,100	~ 7.3% of exempt assessment
Code 804 Religious ²	925,970	~ 2.5% of exempt assessment
Code 809 Misc. ³	8,104,700	~21.4% of exempt assessment
Code 820 Municipal⁴	122,200	~ 0.3% of exempt assessment
Total Exempt Assessment	37.871.770	•

²804 Religious has been adjusted from the base report. The Assessment Roll (attached) reports 804 Religious as 1,107,670 total assessment, however included in this is 181,700 in assessment of the Golden Club. The Golden Club used to have a religious use, but has since been reclassified; for the accuracy of this report we have moved 181,700 in assessment out of 804 and into 809 (which is where the Golden Club will now be coded – along with other like institutions).

³809 Misc. includes: town office, public works shop, water treatment plant, all parks areas, all municipal reserve areas, public utility areas, and the Community Hall. Also includes: all AHS properties, Legion, Heritage Centre/Guild, Arena, Curling Rink, and the Golden Club (as noted above).

⁴820 Municipal includes those vacant Town owned properties which could be sold and become taxable. Note that this assessment is not inclusive of all municipally owned properties; many municipally owned "corporate and utility" properties are coded in 809.

Impact of Proposed Development:

Noting that the exempt assessment makes up 26.6% of the total assessment base of the Town of Onoway currently, if the proposal being discussed was to go ahead and the property developed as proposed (at an estimated assessment of \$3,000,000) we would expect that – at most – the total exempt assessment would increase to 28.1% of the total assessment (increase of 1.5%). This is the result of the adjusted new exempt assessment (37,871,770 + 3,000,000 = 40,871,770) divided by the adjusted new total assessment (142,516,060 + 3,000,000 = 145,516,060).

⁵This estimate is an upper limit estimate. The estimated assessment for the church development is 3,000,000, which is a high estimate. However, this DOES NOT include the corresponding new assessment in residential properties, in particular the 13 new lots. While it is not possible to say exactly what value these new assessments are going to carry, or when they shift from vacant to improved parcels (i.e. when a house is built), we can say that these new lots bring a new assessment and this offsets the exempt assessment calculation above. For example, if we factor the 13 lots in at average vacant lot value of \$50,000 (\$650,000 total), the calculation yields 40,871,770/146,166,060 = 28.0% exempt (slightly lower than the 28.1% above). Further, if the 13 lots – once fully developed – yield a comparable average assessment of \$300,000 each (total of 3,900,000) the calculation yields 40,871,770/149,416,060 = 27.4% (again, lower than the 28.1% above).

Particular property comparison:

Roll 258 – current assessment is \$134,800, and total municipal taxation includes:

\$ 50.00 recreation

\$ 120.00 road service tax

\$4,080.25 vacant residential

\$4,250.25/year Total municipal taxation (not including Seniors or School Foundation)

Estimated municipal taxation should this parcel be subdivided as proposed:

Residential lots while vacant:

13 x \$50.00 \$ 650.00 13 x \$120.00 \$ 1,560.00

13 x \$1,000.00 <u>\$13,000.00</u> (current municipal minimum amount payable)

\$15,210.00/year

Residential Lots when improved:

13 x \$ 50.00 \$ 650.00 13 x \$120.00 \$ 1,560.00

13 x \$2,250.00 <u>\$29,250.00</u> (estimate of average municipal taxes)

\$31,460.00/year

⁶As per section 362(1) of the Municipal Government Act a Church property is exempt, however our assessor advises if the property is vacant it is taxable. So, for a short window (maybe 1 year) there would be some additional residual tax collection on this proposed Church property.



Assessment Roll Assessment Year: 2020

			Tax Year: 2021
Code Description	Status	Records	Total
101 Country Residential (Farm land @ Market)	T	3	376,470
102 Residential Imp/Site	т	346	
103 Vacant Residential	т	10	70,179,570
110 Multi Family	T	4	622,300
151 Farmland	7	11	1,060,610
202 Commercial Imp/Site	Ť	42	78,170
203 Industrial Imp/Site	, T	29	9,046,850
252 Vacant Commercial	<u>'</u>		18,283,000
253 Vacant Industrial	<u>'</u>	15	781,100
402 Machinery & Equip	1	6	480,400
	- I	1	8,310
802 School EX	Taxable Total:	467	100,916,780
803 Provincial EX	E	2	25,936,800
	E	3	2,782,100
	all the second section in Engineering	9	1,107,670
_	Ε	64	7,923,000
820 Municipal EX	E	42	122,200
404 000 11 000 11	Exempt Total:	120	37,871,770
404 DIP - Non Residential	т	2	643,930
405 DIP - Machinery and Equipment	т	2	916,700
502 Linear - Electric Power Systems	Т	2	•
503 Linear - Telecommunication Systems	т	4	570,750
505 Linear - Gas Distribution Systems	т	1	496,680
507 Railway	T	1	218,750
508 Linear - Pipeline	Ť	2	41,880
	Taxable Total:	14	838,820
	Totals:	601	3,727,510
	rotas:	001	142,516,060

Printed on 01/28/2021 01:27:30 PM by JOLENE Town of Onoway

Page 56



Written Submission For – received after Sept. 28, 2021, but prior to 2:00 p.m. Oct. 5, 2021:

- 1. Ronald and Audrey Craddock
- 2. Susan Dales
- 3. Terry & Yvonne Slemko (x 2)

Written Submission Against – received after Sept. 28, 2021, but prior to 2:00 p.m. Oct. 5, 2021: n/a



penny@onoway.ca

From:

Ron Craddock < ronc@interbaun.com>

Sent:

September 29, 2021 4:14 PM

To:

info@onoway.ca

Subject:

Bylaw which Proposes Redistricting of Lands from Residential to Urban Services District

Dear Town Administrator and Town Council, We, Audrey and Ronald Craddock, are property owners in the Town of Onoway, and wish to respond to the request for our thoughts on the proposal to possible changes to the Bylaw 790-21, which would result in redistricting of residential lots to Urban Services District.

We are NOT in favour of these proposed changes at this time for the following reasons:

- 1) due to the tight time frames for property owners to respond, it appears that the decisions have already been made and that the change is being imposed without adequate consideration. The timing of this whole process is suspect, being so close to the municipal election. A change of this importance should not be made without property owners taking a vote.
- 2) although it is indicated that there is no cost to the town or tax payers, long term this would not realistically be the case. Once this change is made and a structure has been built, the town, and thereby taxpayers, would be on the hook for the cost of any future DAMAGE or MAINTENANCE to infrastructure. (roads, sidewalks, gas, water, sewer, power etc).
- 3)we do not need another non-taxable entity in this town, with an estimate of 30% of properties in Onoway already being non-taxable. It would further weaken our already low tax base. Reducing the number of taxable properties in this area to 13 would not be good for the town of Onoway, nor those of us who are property owners.

We trust that our concerns, as well as those of other property owners, will be given serious consideration, and not just "swept under the rug" and ignored.

Ronald Craddock Audrey Craddock

Box 378, Onoway Alberta, TOE 1V0

Service address: Route 11 Sequence 3290

4723-46 Street, Onoway AB Legal Description: Lot 11, Block 2, Plan 7722760

Sent from my iPad



Susan Dales

Box 376 Onoway, Alberta TOE 1VO

September 30, 2021

This letter is in support of Bylaw 790-21.

Growing up in this community we had service groups such as Elks, Royal Purple, Women's Institute, Lions and Masons. When our community needed money for playgrounds, uniforms, seniors homes, sponsor a group to travel or just about anything else they would go to these service groups.

These service groups would cater, raffle cars, planned and expedited rodeos, or whatever they could think of to raise money for community.

These service groups have gone by the wayside, and now our community goes to the churches. For example the church I belong to supplies snacks, lunch and school supplies for the Elementary School.

When we bring in congregations into our town they may notice stores in the town that they never knew were here and support them.

We want to grow this community not stunt it.

Respectfully,

Susan Dales

penny@onoway.ca

From:

Yvonne Slemko <yslemko@xplornet.ca>

Sent:

October 4, 2021 9:41 PM

To:

info@onoway.ca

Subject:

Bylaw 790-21 - Redistricting Application - Land Use Bylaw Amendment

To Wendy Wildman - CAO, Town of Onoway

My comments pertain to the redistricting of the lands legally known as Plan 4114 TR, Block A from Residential Single Family Narrow Lot District (RIN) to Urban Services District (US). This would accommodate the LDS proposal for one lot for a place of worship, 13 lots as residential parcels and one lot dedicated to the Town.

The most recent LDS proposal addresses some of the concerns expressed at the Open House on May 15, 2021. Most importantly the Town will not be involved as a developer nor bear any of the associated costs for the development. The development of the lands will remove an eyesore and provide the Town with must needed residential lots.

The proposal is a win-win for the Town. My wife and I support the endeavor.

Terry and Yvonne Slemko Box 293 Onoway AB TOE 1V0 4712 Miller Drive Plan 8020999 Block 4 Lot 61A

Your truly

tes & myk



penny@onoway.ca

From:

Yvonne Slemko <yslemko@xplornet.ca>

Sent:

October 5, 2021 8:20 AM

To:

info@onoway.ca

Subject:

FW: File 221 SUB 02-24 Plan 4114 TR, Block A, 4602 - 47 Avenue - Town of Onoway

Thought you should see what I sent to Tony.

From: Yvonne Slemko

Sent: October 4, 2021 9:43 PM

To: 'pcm1@telusplanet.net' <pcm1@telusplanet.net>

Subject: File 221 SUB 02-24 Plan 4114 TR, Block A, 4602 – 47 Avenue – Town of Onoway

To: Tony Sonnleitner - Development Officer, Town of Onoway

We support the redistricting of a portion of the lands as described above. This would include

- 1. One parcel districted US for construction of a place of worship
- 2. 13 parcels districted RIN for construction of single family dwellings
- 3. One parcel dedicated to the Town as municipal reserve.

The redistricting shows foresight, will facilitate the development of a property which currently is an eyesore, and is an example of thinking outside the box. It is a win-win for the Town of Onoway.

tes & myk
Terry and Yvonne Slemko

