



REQUEST FOR DECISION

SUBJECT:	Policy 4002 Access Roads and Cul-de-sacs		
SUBMISSION TO:	POLICY REVIEW COMMITTEE	REVIEWED AND APPROVED FOR SUBMISSION	
MEETING DATE:	June 2, 2025	CAO:	MANAGER: LT
DEPARTMENT:	CONSTRUCTION & ENGINEERING	DIR:	PRESENTER: LT
STRATEGIC PLAN:	Governance	LEG:	

RELEVANT LEGISLATION:

Provincial (cite) – N/A

Council Bylaw/Policy (cite) – Policy 4001 and Policy 4002

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

MOTION: That the Policy Review Committee recommends Council approve the Policy 4002 “Access Roads” as presented.

BACKGROUND/PROPOSAL:

During the December 10, 2024, regular Council meeting, Administration brought forward 2 separate requests for the extension of rights-of-way to encompass an engineered cu-de-sac to be added. At that time, Council determined that it was not required for these locations. Council did, however, request Administration to review the existing Policy 4002 Access Roads and bring forward for review.

Motion 24.12.625 Moved: Councillor Ryan Ratzlaff

That Council accept Administration’s report on increasing ratepayer requests to upgrade sections of dead-end-roads with the construction of proper cul-de-sacs, for information. CARRIED

Motion 24.12.626 Moved: Councillor Ryan Ratzlaff

That Council direct Administration to develop a new/revised policy that will assist in addressing all construction requests for existing roadways, and bring the same to the Policy Review Committee for review and discussion. CARRIED

Upon review of applicable existing policies, Administration has combined Policy 4001 Security Deposits for Residential Road Construction to Proposed Residential Developments and Policy 4002 Access Roads, to simplify and clarify the application process and the requirements for *any* road construction request within Greenview. The existing Policy 4001 relates to the road construction requests that are submitted for residential use. However, there are stipulations that apply to residential applications vs other construction applications.

Active Policy 4001:

- Purpose: To establish a process whereby security deposits are required from applicants for the construction of residential roads.
- The security deposit will be returned or refunded to the applicant, without interest, if permanent residency is established within three years of the date of approval of the residential road construction.
 - Administration fee of \$2,500
 - Security deposit required of \$2,500 once application approved
 - Must live within the location within 6 months the security gets returned
 - 30m right-of-way

Active Policy 4002:

- Purpose: To provide physical access to land(s) within Greenview that has no accessibility.
- Greenview may construct access roads to give access to any cultivated lands, which ~~have no~~ are not accessible through a developed/undeveloped road allowance and/or any applicant owned adjoined lands.
 - No security deposit required
 - No living requirement
 - 30m right-of-way

Administration is asking Policy Review Committee to support the combination of both policies to ensure that each request is evaluated and considered in a consistent manner. Each request has the same engineered requirements for the road construction itself, therefore, should not be any different than the other. Construction of a road has high costs that could benefit one landowner in some instances vs multiple in some cases. Residents that do not have financial stake in the construction aren't invested. Those that have financial stake have more investment to either move to the land or use the land accordingly.

Administration notes that the fees associated with Policy 4001 are currently only reflected within the policy itself and are not included in the current Schedules of Fees bylaw.

However, with the combination of the policies Council can determine the cost that should be associated with both types of applications. The policy would put a timeframe on the deadline for applications for Council to review and approve for the following construction season.

BENEFITS OF THE RECOMMENDED ACTION:

1. The benefit of Policy Review Committee accepting the recommended motion is the Policy would provide consistent requirements for road construction, regardless of the use of the roadway.
2. The applicants would have financial stake and Greenview would recover some of the costs for the construction of roadways.

DISADVANTAGES OF THE RECOMMENDED ACTION:

1. The disadvantage to the recommended motion is there would be costs to the applicant for the construction of the roadway.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Alternative #1: Policy Review Committee has the alternative to make revisions to the draft combined policy and direct Administration to bring back to PRC for a follow-up review.

MOTION: That Policy Review Committee direct Administration to bring back the draft policy combining Policies 4001 and 4002, to a future Policy Review Committee meeting for further review and discussion, with the following changes: [list revisions].

FINANCIAL IMPLICATION:

There are no financial implications to the recommended motion.

STAFFING IMPLICATION:

There are no staffing implications to the recommended motion.

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT LEVEL:

Greenview has adopted the IAP2 Framework for public consultation.

INCREASING LEVEL OF PUBLIC IMPACT

Inform

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION GOAL

Inform - To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.

PROMISE TO THE PUBLIC

Inform - We will keep you informed.

FOLLOW UP ACTIONS:

Administration will apply any revisions and bring the combined policy to Council for approval.

ATTACHMENT(S):

- DRAFT - Policy 4002 Access Roads and Cul-De-Sacs
- ACTIVE - Policy 4001 Security Deposits for Residential Road Construction...
- ACTIVE - Policy 4002 Access Roads