WHAT WE HEARD REPORT TO COUNCIL

Summer Village of Val Quentin Land Use Bylaw | 7 September 2025

BACKGROUND

On August 6 and 28, 2025, the Summer Village of Val Quentin and Municipal Planning Services (MPS) hosted in-person open house to present the draft Summer Village of Val Quentin Land Use Bylaw (LUB) to residents. The open houses were attended by approximately 30 residents (not including MPS staff, Summer Village Administration, and members of Council).

The Summer Village provided residents with 3 weeks following the second open house to submit comments and questions for Council's consideration. As of October 7, 2025, the Summer Village and MPS have received 9 email and phone call submissions (in addition to the questions and comments received during the open houses). All emails provided are included as Schedule A – Feedback.

The following is a summary of the feedback received by MPS, along with responses/recommendations for consideration in the draft Land Use Bylaw.

TOPIC	LOCATION	FEEDBACK	RESPONSE/RECOMMENDATION
Minor spelling, duplication, and grammar errors	Throughout	Community members and MPS noted a few minor spelling, grammar, and duplication errors. Also noted referencing to National Building Code (Alberta Edition) content for improved readability.	Some suggested typographical, formatting, and process changes are included in Schedule A – Feedback. **MPS has made minor corrections** to the draft Land Use Bylaw as noted, and has reviewed the document for other minor spelling, grammar, duplication and formatting changes.
Adjacent properties owned by same person(s)	Throughout	Adjacent properties owned by the same person(s) should be treated as one area, which would allow more flexibility for landowners without having the develop another dwelling.	**No changes recommended to the draft Land Use Bylaw.**
Red Tape Reduction	Throughout	The regulations in the draft Land Use Bylaw appear to be adding more red tape for residents, and the proposed regulations appear more appropriate for a city, not a rural Summer Village.	The draft Land Use Bylaw has aimed to reduce red tape by identifying (where possible) all possible development permit application requirements so that residents/development proponents can see what may be required to support a development permit application. Development may be within a rural setting, however the Summer Village's proximity to the lake and high property values requires the Summer Village to ensure that proper regulations are in place to ensure that future development is safe, efficient, and orderly. **No changes recommended to the draft Land Use Bylaw.**
Commercial Use	Throughout	Question about why commercial use is defined in the Land Use Bylaw. The Summer Village should allow commercial uses to enable residents to earn a living.	Section 3.2 of the Land Use Bylaw defines uses that may be allowed to be developed in the Summer Village, as well as uses that may not be developed. 'Commercial Use' is defined to differentiate this type of use from 'Home Occupations'; commercial uses are not permitted in the draft Land Use Bylaw.

			No changes recommended to the draft Land Use Bylaw.
References to 'Orders'	Throughout	The draft Land Use Bylaw references both 'orders' and 'stop orders'. There should be definitions for stop orders, and where orders are referenced (meaning stop order) they should be identified as stop orders.	**MPS recommends that all references to orders (that are intended to reflect stop orders) be revised to read 'stop order'.** **MPS recommends that the following (shown in italics) be inserted in Section 3.2 – Definitions:** *Stop Order means a written notice pursuant to section 645 of the Act issued by the development authority of the municipality, which may order the stoppage of all works or activities on the lands and/or require compliance with actions required by the notice to ensure the use of structures on the lands in question are in accordance with the requirements of the Act, the Land Use Bylaw, a development permit approval, or a subdivision approval.*
Personal Information Protection Act	Throughout	References to FOIPP Act should be changed to the Personal Information Protection Act, where required.	**MPS has made the corresponding changes throughout the document.**
References to Districts	Throughout	The draft Land Use Bylaw should be reviewed to standardize references to the districts (e.g. R – Residential District).	**MPS has reviewed the draft Land Use Bylaw and made minor revisions** throughout the document to ensure all references to the Land Use Districts are standardize. This should assist with the readability/interpretation of the document.
Development Authority Discretionary Powers	Throughout	Resident asked how the Development Authority makes decisions that requires their discretion.	The Development Authority is required to use their discretion to determine things such as what application requirements may be required to support a development permit application, when a discretionary use may be approved or refused, etc. Discretionary powers are available to the Development Authority because not all development scenarios can be anticipated in the Land Use Bylaw. All Land Use Bylaws in Alberta provide the Development Authority with some discretionary powers. Both the current Land Use Bylaw and the draft Land Use Bylaw includes limitations on the power of the Development Authority to grant variances for development proposals that do not conform to all regulations in the Land Use Bylaw, to ensure the proposed development is in keeping with the surrounding community. **No changes recommended to the draft Land Use Bylaw.**
Carport Definition	3.2 Definitions	The current definition does not allow the storage of 3 cars, and screening requirements appear to be insufficient for keeping snow out.	MPS has reviewed the current definition (from the current Land Use Bylaw) and recommends that the following new definition (shown in italics) be inserted: *Carport means a roofed structure either free standing or attached to a building, which is not enclosed on the front and at least one side, to shelter parked vehicles.*

Deck Definition	3.2 Definitions	Questioning why a deck cannot have a roof.	A portion of a dwelling with a deck covered by a roof is considered part of the dwelling; a deck (for the purposes of this bylaw) is an uncovered structure. **No changes recommended to the draft Land Use Bylaw.**
Double Fronting Lots	3.2 Definitions	Questioned if the residential lots along east end of 50th Avenue should be considered double fronting because of the undeveloped road right of way (pathway) behind the lots.	MPS has reviewed the lots in question with Administration; the lots fronting 50th Avenue should not be considered double fronting as there is not a developed (or planned to be developed) road on the opposite side of the lots. **MPS and Administration to discuss the interpretation of the double-fronting provisions in the Land Use Bylaw with the Summer Village's Development Officer.**
Lot Grading and Drainage Plan	3.2 Definitions	Add definition for 'Lot Grading and Drainage Plan.'	MPS recommends that the following (shown in italics) be added in the list of definitions in Section 3.2 – Definitions: *Lot Grading and Drainage means a plan that specifies design elevations, surface gradients, swale locations,* *and other drainage information required for lot grading.*
Referral of Development Permit Applications to Agencies	4.1 Application to Amend Bylaw	Resident noted that there are no recreation facilities and schools in the Summer Village that would be impacted by proposed developments.	**MPS recommends that Section 4.1.6 be revised to read (change shown as italic strikethrough):** *4.1.6 - Upon receipt of an application to amend this Land Use Bylaw, Summer Village Administration may refer the application to the Summer Village's planning and engineering service providers, who shall analyze the potential impacts on local land use, development, infrastructure, and servicing that would result from the proposed amendment. This analysis must consider the full development potential for the proposed amendment and shall, among other things, consider the following impact criteria:* *d. Relationship to, or impacts on, water, wastewater, and other public utilities and facilities ~~such as recreation facilities and schools;~~*
Accessory Buildings	5.2 Development Not Requiring a Permit and 9.1 Accessory Buildings	Several residents questioned the restriction on the number of accessory buildings and suggested that there be no restrictions (or restricts on size of buildings only). Larger lots should be able to have more accessory buildings. Requested that the regulations be revised to allow 2 garages and 1 shed on a lot.	MPS acknowledges a forming error in the draft Land Use Bylaw that identified 5.2.1.aa as proposed to be deleted. **MPS recommends that this item (a portable accessory building) be shown as a proposed addition to the Land Use Bylaw.** **MPS to discuss the accessory buildings regulations (maximum number that may be developed on residential lots, and size) with Council and Administration.**

		Item aa (portable accessory building) should not be deleted from the list of developments not requiring a permit	
		Sea cans should be allowed as accessory buildings.	
		New boat houses should not be prohibited.	
Derelict Properties and Demolition	5.5 Applications for Demolition or Removal of Buildings	Questioned why a development permit is required for the demolition of a derelict dwelling.	Development permits should be required for the demolition or removal of a structure that would have required a development permit to be constructed to ensure: • Hazardous materials are disposed of properly; • Impacts on adjacent property owners are minimized; and • Impacts on the lake and environmentally sensitive areas are properly managed. **No changes recommended to the draft Land Use Bylaw.**
Development Permit Notices	5.7 Development Permit Notices	Noted by Administration that the regulations in this section should be separated into two sections (move Validity of Permits into its own section)	**MPS recommends that content in Section 5.7 (5.7.5 to 5.7.13) be removed and added to a new subsection titled Section 5.8 – Validity of Permits.**
Wildfire Management	9.5 Building Orientation, Design, and Wildfire Management	Objections to including the design requirements to mitigate the spread of wildfire. Asked that the wildfire design regulations be added as a recommendation, not a requirement.	**MPS to discuss wildfire management regulations with Council and Administration.**
Site Triangles at Corner Lots	9.6 Corner Sites	Resident questions what the purpose of site line triangles on corner lots was, and how they are implemented	MPS provided an explanation of how development on corner lots needs to protect site line triangles at the intersection of roads to ensure proper visibility for vehicles and pedestrians. Development on corner lots and site line triangles are currently addressed in the current Land Use Bylaw as well as in the draft Land Use Bylaw. **No changes recommended to the draft Land Use Bylaw.**
Flood Susceptibility	9.7 Environmentally Sensitive Lands and 9.10 Flood Susceptible Lands and High Water Tables	All lands in the Summer Village are flood susceptible, would make it hard for future development to happen	**MPS to discuss flood susceptibility with Council and Administration.**

Noises from Home Occupations and other Accessory Uses	9.12 Home Occupations	Questions raised about the purpose of including restrictions on noise generation by equipment associated with home occupations.	Limitations on noise generation by home occupations is proposed in the Land Use Bylaw to ensure that the use and enjoyment of adjacent residential properties is not negatively impacted by external noises generated by home occupations. The proposed regulations in the draft Land Use Bylaw are similar in intent to the regulations in the current Land Use Bylaw that regulate noise by home occupations. **MPS to discuss noises associated with home occupations/normal accessory building uses with Council and Administration.**
Animal Infestation	9.13 Keeping of Animals	Community members noted the presence of properties with wild animal infestations (e.g. wild foxes, etc.)	The issue has been noted for Administration's attention and consideration for enforcement via the Summer Village's new animal control bylaw. MPS to review the new animal control bylaw and ensure consistence with the draft Land Use Bylaw **No changes recommended to the draft Land Use Bylaw.**
Landscaping	9.14 Landscaping	Questioned why the draft Land Use Bylaw includes regulations for minimum vegetation.	Minimum vegetation requirements are included in the Land Use Bylaw to preserve a sufficient vegetative cover to ensure that surface water is properly filtered before entering the lake. These regulations are developed from watershed management planning best practices. **No changes recommended to the draft Land Use Bylaw.**
Modular Dwellings and Manufactured (Mobile) Homes	9.15 Manufactured Home Dwellings	Residents had questions regarding the difference between modularly constructed dwellings and manufactured homes.	MPS explained to attendees the differences between modularly construction dwellings (single detached dwellings that are constructed offsite and assembled on the lot) and manufactured homes (dwellings manufactured with a specific CSA rating and exhibiting distinctive building designs (e.g. length to width ratio, chassis construction, roof pitch, etc.). The Summer Village's current Land Use Bylaw does not enable the development of manufactured homes on lots (not listed as a permitted or discretionary use). The draft Land Use Bylaw does not enable their development on residential lots. **MPS to discuss whether to allow newer manufactured homes (as discretionary uses) on residential lots with Council and Administration.**
		Resident suggested that some newer manufactured homes are of a high quality construction.	
		Resident suggested that manufactured homes be included as a discretionary use in the R - Residential District.	
		Manufactured homes cannot be properly rebuilt in the event of a natural disaster/storm damage.	
		Consider enabling lots with existing manufactured homes to continue to allow new manufactured homes in the future.	
		Some manufactured homes are nicer in appearance than old cabins.	

Maximum Vehicle Size/ Weight on a Lot	9.18 Objects Prohibited or Restricted in Yards	Resident noted that tandem trucks are being parked on residential lots.	The current Land Use Bylaw restricts the placement of vehicles with a weight greater than 5 tonnes on a residential lot. **MPS to discuss maximum vehicle weight/length restrictions, as well as other vehicle/equipment restrictions on a lot with Council and Administration.** **MPS to work with Administration to ensure consistency with the Summer Village's proposed Traffic Bylaw.**
		Residents noted that the maximum person vehicle size identified is not sufficient given the weight of modern vehicles.	
		Resident noted that Section 9.18 should also identify other equipment/vehicles that are not permitted to be stored on a residential lot.	
		The Land Use Bylaw should not restrict the keeping of work vehicles on a residential lot.	
Tented Structures	9.18 Objects Prohibited or Restricted in Yards	Tented structures enable residents to keep chattel secure and safe.	**The current draft Land Use Bylaw does not allow the use of tented structures in the Summer Village. Tented structures does not include gazebos.** **MPS to discuss the use of tented structures with Council and Administration.**
		Residents should be allowed up to two tented structures on a lot.	
		Should not include gazebos.	
Parking on Boulevards	9.19 Onsite Parking	Community members noted that some residents are parking their vehicles on municipal property (within the boulevards)	This issue has been noted for Administration's attention. Parking of vehicles on municipal property is best addressed through a Traffic/Road Use Bylaw, not the Land Use Bylaw.
Keeping of Vehicles on Soft Landscaped Areas	9.20 Pollution Control	Objection to restricting the storage of vehicles to roads and hard landscaped areas.	Provision included in the draft Land Use Bylaw to limit potential soil/vegetation contamination of landscaped areas which may potentially impact drainage into the lake. **No changes recommended to the draft Land Use Bylaw.**
Recreational Vehicles	9.22 Recreational Vehicles	A maximum of 1 recreational vehicle should be allowed on a lot.	The current Land Use Bylaw enables the placement of 1 RV on a developed lot for guest accommodation and indicates that it shall not be used as a permanent or seasonal dwelling. The regulations in the draft Land Use Bylaw are in keeping with the current approach (maximum of 1 on a developed lot, 0 on undeveloped lots, and shall not be used as a permanent or seasonal dwelling. **MPS to discuss recreational vehicle regulations with Council and Administration.**
		The Summer Village should not require a dwelling to be on a lot first before allowing a recreational vehicle to be placed on a lot.	
		As a seasonal community, lot owners should be able to place a recreational vehicle on a lot without building a dwelling first (summer months only).	
		The placing a recreational vehicle on a lot during construction of a dwelling	

		should be allowed, with an established timeline for completion/removal (up to 1 year).	
		Objection noted to allowing recreational vehicles on undeveloped lots, even if a development permit has been issued for a dwelling.	
		A second recreational vehicle should be allowed on a lot (perhaps up to 2 weeks) without a permit.	
		Recreational vehicles should be allowed within the front yard of a lakefront lot.	
		Additional recreational vehicles should bee allowed on a lot on a short term basis.	
Tourist Homes	9.29 Tourist Homes	Resident indicated that tourist homes should not require a development permit.	The current Land Use Bylaw does not enable the development of tourist homes in the Summer Village. As per Council's direct, the draft Land Use Bylaw enables their development with an approved development permit. **MPS to discuss tourist homes and potential development permit process with Council and Administration.**
		The maximum number of occupants should be increased to include 2 additional occupants (in addition to 2x the number of bedrooms that is allowed in the draft regulations).	
		Tourist homes should not be allowed (or should be restricted) as this is the approach many other municipalities are taking on this subject.	
		Adjacent residences should be consultant and have a say in whether tourist homes can be developed on a lot.	
		Resident suggested that tourist home operators should be required to reside onsite when a portion of a home/suite is being rented.	
		Concern noted that requiring operators to be onsite while renting a dwelling/portion of a dwelling as a tourist home	

		would be onerous and impractical. Requiring that a tourist home comply with all other provisions in the Land Use Bylaw would be difficult for non-conforming properties.	
Vacant Lots and Servicing	9.31 Water Services, Sanitary Services, and Other Improvements	Question asked if vacant lots are required to connect to Village services.	MPS confirmed for the resident that vacant, undeveloped lots are not required to connect to municipal services; this occurs when the lot is developed for residential use.
R – Residential District	11 R-Residential District	Rear yard setback for detached garages is too large, likely intended to reflect lane access.	The rear yard setback for garages (6.1 m (20.0 ft)) appears to be based on an urban standard that assumes a garage will be accessed via a lane. **MPS recommends that 11.5.6 – Minimum Rear Yard Setback be revised to read (change shown in italics):** 11.5.6 Minimum Rear Yard Setback b. Detached Garages *(with vehicle doors facing a road or lane)*: 6.1 m (20.0 ft)
Storage of boat hoists	Land Use District Map	Resident asked why boat hoists are not able to be stored on municipal properties adjacent to the shoreline	MPS to share this comment with Administration for consideration with the Summer Village's Municipal Reserve Use for Storage of Boats, Life, and Pier Sections Policy. **No changes recommended to the draft Land Use Bylaw.**

Received August 14, 2025
Submitted by: SJ

First, I'd like to say that I am responding here as a concerned resident of Val Quentin.

Since 2019, the Government of Alberta has been working hard to reduce red-tape for residents of Alberta, to reduce costs, speed up approvals, remove duplicate processes and unnecessary rules, and to make life easier for Albertans. This includes reducing red tape in development and building permits. The expectation is that municipalities in Alberta are expected to reduce red tape as well, however, with these newly introduced bylaws, it seems the Summer Village of Val Quentin is trying to do the opposite, introducing new and highly unwarranted rules. Implementing these highly restrictive rules in a rural summer village seems completely unnecessary and you are setting the village and people up for failure. We are not a city, so why are you trying to make rules like a city would. One of the wonderful things about Val Quentin was always the relaxed rules.

I feel like a wealthy city lawyer that has never lived in Val Quentin, or in a rural summer village re-drafted these bylaws. We are a summer lake community in the country full of all sorts of folks from different social and economic levels, and these bylaws need to be created with all of its residents in mind. Please ensure the rules you introduce reflect this, and I hope that council members truly understand that they are here to represent the people of Val Quentin.

While the draft bylaw clearly indicates that the yellow highlighted text is content for community engagement, I am commenting and asking questions on other changes made throughout the whole document.

3.2.33 – Why can't a deck have a roof? Lots of folks want covered decks, so I'm unsure what the reasoning is behind this.

5.2.1 aa – I'm confused here. Is a shed allowed without approval or are you recommending portable buildings are no longer allowed? If this means a shed would need an approval, or that portable buildings are no longer allowed, this is not acceptable.

5.3.4 –I'm confused here. Does this mean that one can't build a garage or additional building because they have a LEGAL non-conforming building? I could take a guess that over 50% of residents here have a non-conforming building on their property, so to take away the ability to build is astounding. I myself bought my property knowing that I had a LEGAL non-conforming building on it. And because of the bylaws, I knew I could always build a garage in the future. Now the council is wanting to take this right away? Completely unacceptable.

5.3.8 –Non-conforming buildings are legal and grand fathered in no matter where they were built so I assume you wouldn't be allowed to have them removed.

9.1.3(c) – Why is this still remaining? Why can't garage doors face or be close to the road?

9.1.10 – Why do you want to prohibit it? This is a lakefront community.

9.5.4 – Absolutely remove. 1. We do not live in an area prone to wildfires. 2. This should be up to an owner. 3. Not everyone has the money to build using those suggested materials. 4. We are a summer village where folks want things built of wood. It doesn't make sense that you will allow a wood storage building, but not a wood deck or wood siding. We do not live in a big city, so these highly prescriptive rules seem extremely unacceptable.

9.5.4(d) and (e) – What does this mean? No wood decks?

9.7.1 – Every lakefront property around this lake is susceptible to flooding. Does this mean you are against those owners building anything? Is this because all members of the board already have lots that are fully developed?

9.10.5 – Does this mean all lakefront properties? Does residential development include building a garage?

9.14.4 (a) and (b) – Can you please explain what these mean and why you are wanting to introduce these rules?

9.15.1 – Why? Val Quentin is not a posh, gated community full of wealthy residents. We are a rural summer village. Please keep that in mind. And manufactured homes these days are very nice….nicer than a lot of cabins out here.
9.17.1 – Why? I have a house plus an accessory building and a shed. Does this mean I could never have a garage? If a shed is also defined as an accessory building, then this is unacceptable. Not everyone has the same sized lots, open land, house or garage. How can you possibly say that someone can't have a home, a garage and two sheds?
9.18.1– I'm not sure why we would include most of these. 1. We are a summer village. 2. We are in the country. 3. Some folks can't afford garages or storage for their equipment. 4. Many lots already have these including homes made of sea cans and large vehicles on their property. What a new burden to put on existing folks. Way to restrictive.
9.20.5 – I hope this only refers to public land, not private. Owners should be able to have any motorized vehicle on their private property that they want.
9.22.1 – I don't understand what this means. Residents can't have a quad and a holiday trailer on their lot?
9.29.1 – Does this just refer to building a tourist home? Or does it mean using your home as a vacation rental requires a permit?
9.29.2 –What does 'reside onsite' mean? If you mean that if I, as the owner of my home and lot, decide to rent my home out occasionally, that I have to be there at the same time as a renter, then that is highly unacceptable and should be removed. Again, we are a lake community, and some folks, including myself, require renting our properties out occasionally in order to afford life.
11.5.6 – Why is the rear yard setback 20 ft? What a complete waste of property. So I can't build on the front 26 ft or the back 20 ft. My lot is 100ft, so I only have 48 feet to build a house and a garage? This should be changed to 5 feet. The majority of garages in Val Quentin are built close to the rear property line, so already all of those owners now have a non-conforming building. I just don't understand this rule and would like to know the reason for it.

Received August 21, 2025
Submitted by: BD

I am emailing to ask you to amend the "RV on vacant lot bylaw(9.22.2)" to allow 1 (one) RV on a vacant lot. We keep our lot clean, un-cluttered, and grass cut. The current bylaw allows one RV on a lot with a cabin on it. There is properties that meet this requirement but are cluttered and run down in some cases, but the bylaw allows for one RV in this case. As stated our property is clean and un-cluttered. The bylaw needs to be amended to allow one RV on a vacant lot. Some may argue that there is a "nuisance issue"
and those "trailer owners" are noisy, or that Val Quentin collects less tax on vacant lots. Both are not true. There is no evidence to show that people staying in a trailer make more noise or are a nuisance compared to people in a cabin. We have NEVER had any complaints in this regard. Regarding taxes, I pay less than $200 per year taxes compared to a lot with an older cabin on it (less than 10%) Our family (the Dawson's) have owned property and paid taxes in Val Quentin since the 1950's, before Val Quentin was even officially established, for almost 75 years and 4 generations (4 lots, 2 have cabins on them). We have always been good citizens. We have enjoyed many amazing years at the lake growing up with our family and friends and have countless memories. The "Summer Village" of Val Quentin is just that: a great "summer village" - where families can get out of town and spend quality time at the lake. My wife and our 2 children enjoy many weekends on our lot, just as many others in Val Quentin do on their property. We very much want this to continue. We keep our trailer clean, property clean and un- cluttered, and grass cut. I want to remind you that we never took ANY legal action against the Summer Village of Val Quentin in the summer of 2019 when ALL the mature trees on OUR property were cut down by the Village of Val Quentin. We were left with a barren lot, we were in tears. Again we took NO legal action against the "Village", the mayor, the deputy mayor, or any councillor. As very upset as we were, we were "reasonable" and good citizens and quietly just let it go. Some trees were re-planted, but they won't be like the ones that were cut down for likely 30 years. Now, I ask you all to be "reasonable", as we were, and please allow

our family to enjoy all that Val Quentin has to offer, and continue to have fun at the lake. I ask that you amend bylaw 9.22.2 to allow one RV on a vacant lot. Thanks.

Received August 22, 2025
Submitted by: BD

I have a major concern with Bylaw: 9.22.2. I have a lot in Val Quentin with a RV on it. The lot always kept trimmed, neat and uncluttered, the trailer is maintained and clean. Taxes always paid in full and on time. I have been attending meetings and emailing Val Quentin Mayor and councilors to get this bylaw amended to: "RV on undeveloped lot bylaw(9.22.2)" to allow 1 (one) RV on a vacant lot. As I said we keep our lot clean, un-cluttered, and grass cut. The current bylaw allows one RV on a lot with a cabin on it. There is properties that meet this requirement but are cluttered and run down in some cases, but the bylaw allows for one RV in this case. The bylaw needs to be amended to allow one RV on an undeveloped lot. Some (on council) may argue that there is a "nuisance issue"
and those "trailer owners" are noisy, or a nuisance. I feel this opinion and way of thinking is discriminatory and unjustified. Some (on council) may argue that Val Quentin collects less tax on vacant lots. Both are not true. There is no evidence to show that people staying in a trailer make more noise or are a nuisance compared to people in a cabin. We have NEVER had any complaints in this regard. Regarding taxes, I pay a minimal difference of less than $200 per year taxes compared to a lot with an older cabin on it (less than 10%) I believe this bylaw, the way it is currently written, is unreasonable and unwarranted. It appears the bylaw is being "pushed through" with no regard for the interests of the property owners in general - as no one has ever complained, or has any issue with a property owner having one RV on an undeveloped lot. Our family (the Dawson's) have owned property and paid taxes in Val Quentin since the 1950's, before Val Quentin was even officially established, for almost 75 years and 4 generations (4 lots, 2 have cabins on them). We have always been good citizens. We have enjoyed many amazing years at the lake growing up with our family and friends and have countless memories. The "Summer Village" of Val Quentin is just that: a great "summer village" - where families can get out of town and spend quality time at the lake. My wife and our 2 children enjoy many weekends on our lot, just as many others in Val Quentin do on their property. We very much want this to continue. This bylaw, the way it is currently written, would END our time at the lake completely. Now, I ask for your support on this matter and allow our family to enjoy all that Val Quentin has to offer, and continue to have fun at the lake. I ask that you amend bylaw 9.22.2 to allow one RV on a undeveloped lot. Thanks.

Received August 28, 2025
Submitted by: BT

Regarding the clauses preventing RVs from being on undeveloped lots. The purpose of those clauses should be to prevent owners from using an RV as a primary residence. I can store pretty much anything else on my vacant lot except for an RV. Thus I am forced to pay for storage in a storage facility. Seems ridiculous.

I would like to see a clause that allows for storage of RVs not being used as a dwelling on undeveloped lots. Perhaps require a development permit that allows for RV storage and has to be renewed annually. It will still give council control over the RV being present on an undeveloped lot.

Just my thoughts. Reach out if you want to discuss further.

Received September 2, 2025
Submitted by CPP

1. Para 2 Authorities
2.1.2,
Editorial
"...permit applications within a Direct Control Districts..."
It has a singular article and a plural noun.
2. Para 2 Authorities
2.2.2
Editorial

"... shall be filled by a person (or persons) appointed by the resolution of Council."
"...appointed by a resolution of Council"
3. Para 2 Development Authority
2.2.6
Editorial
"... Development Officer shall perform such duties that are specified in..."
"...Development Officer shall perform such duties as specified in..."
4. Para 3.1 Development Authority
3.1.1
Editorial
"Whenever dimensions are present or calculations are required the metric measurement shall take precedence for the ..."
"...Whenever dimensions are present or calculations are required the metric measurements shall take precedence for the ..."
5. Para 3.2 Definitions
3.2.24
Technical
"3.2.24 "CARPORT" - means a roofed structure used for storing or parking of not more than two private vehicles which has not less than 40% of its total perimeter open and unobstructed"
This provision is a problem on two counts:
1. It is common for people to build three car garages these days. It is reasonable to permit 3 vehicle carports, not limit the capacity to two.
2. A one or two bay carport will not be able to meet the 40% requirement if it has three walls, which are reasonably needed to prevent the accumulation of blowing snow on and around the vehicles.
6. Para 3.2 Definitions
3.2.61
Technical
"FLOOR AREA - means the total of the main floor area calculation and passageways contained in a building, but does not include the floor areas of basements, attached garages, carports, sheds, open porches or breezeways"
This should be divided into two definitions: FLOOR AREA and FOOTPRINT. The definition addresses neither properly. The floor area should refer to living area on all floors above ground, excluding a basement unless it contains legal bedrooms, in which case only the occupied area should be included.
The footprint is only the land area upon which the building sits, exclusive of overhangs such as cantilevered floor areas. This is distinct from LOT COVERAGE which is the sum of several structures.
7. Para 3.2 Definitions
3.2.160
Technical
"...whether it has been modified so as to no longer be mobile or capable of being mobile,..."
"...even if it has been modified so as to no longer be mobile or capable of being mobile,..."
8. Para 3.2 Definitions
3.2.185
Technical
"SHOULD..."
This word should not be used in a Code or Standard. All 19 occurrences must be replaced by the word SHALL.
9. Sea cans should be permitted on site if they cannot be seen from the street. They are secure and durable.
10. Sheds and accessory buildings should be limited by a % of the area of the plot, not a fixed

number suited to the minimum plot sized of 7500 sq ft. Our single fenced area is 34,000 sq ft. A 1500 sq ft greenhouse and two hired helpers would fit easily.
11. Adjacent plots with the same owner should be treated as one even if legally distinct. This will permit the construction of income generating buildings, additional sheds and conveniences without forcing the owner to build a "primary residence" on that plot. Several of the rules unreasonably ban the development of a set of plots (2 or 3) as a group. There are multiple cases of double plots in VQ. They are taxed as a pair, but are not permitted to be developed as a pair. This is unreasonable.
12. As a group, these new sections and rules make it even more difficult for residents to earn a living in Val Quentin. There is no restaurant, no convenience store, no commercial space, and from the zoning map, no plan to have any. We are developing backwards.

Received September 3, 2025
Submitted by: BD

I am emailing about bylaw 9.22.2. If you are proceeding with this bylaw, I should get equal status to properties that do not meet current dwelling square footages (old existing cabins on a lot) but are still acceptable ("grandfathered in"). We have had properties there (4 lots) some going back to the 1950s and my trailer has been on my lot for many years. I should also get the privilege of being "grandfathered in" as well as these properties with less than 1000 square feet that exist and ARE allowed.

Received September 3, 2025
Submitted by: TB

Questions:

Pertaining to 9.1 Accessory Buildings

- Question: Why can we no longer develop boat houses on lakefront lots?
    - With appropriate stewardship of building materials, why is this no longer allowed? As lake front owners, I would like to understand further why this would be against a bylaw.
    - Proposed solution – need more information on why this is not allowed.

Pertaining to 9.18 Recreational Vehicles

Question: Why can't we revisit this bylaw to enable ONE RV per lot, until there is a noise or nuisance complaint?

Based on information from the August 20th Council meeting, I understand that the reason for not allowing RV on lots without a primary dwelling include:

Noise/nuisance complaints from neighbors
Unsightly concerns regarding a RV rather than a primary dwelling
Tax considerations (less taxes paid by RV compared to primary dwellings.

Proposed solution – I would ask Council to consider this bylaw for a number of reasons:

1. RV's are not in and of themselves less appealing visually than cabins (this would be subjective)
2. RV's are within the spirit of a 'Summer Village' (which is what we are at this point in time).
3. Actions around the above concerns could be incorporated into the new bylaw (only one RV per property, surcharge for RV's without a dwelling to even out the tax base)
4. Noise/nuisance complaints are a function of the people, not the dwelling
5. People who own properties at the lake may ultimately build a dwelling but may want to assess the utility of the property prior to building (may be longer than 6 months).

Question: Why are RV's not able to be parked lakefront yard in a lakefront lot?

Historically we did not have the same regulations for location of primary dwelling. If the RV can be placed within the property boundaries of the lakefront property, why is this not going to be allowed?

Proposed solution – consider removing this requirement for lakefront owners and refer to following requirement as stated within the proposed land use bylaw ('RVs shall adhere to the front , rear and side yard setback requirement).

Pertaining to 9.29 Tourist Homes

Question: Why are we opening up this door when other municipalities are trying to control tourist homes (ie. BC).

Tourist homes can be problematic for neighbors due to lack of accountability of renters (ie. Excessive noise, litter etc).

Tourist homes built for such a purpose negates community

Many municipalities are putting rules around tourist homes to alleviate the above.

Proposed solution – Enable tourist homes within specific parameters with a caveat that neighbors have an ability to present arguments against such a development. Ensure noise and environmental stewardship rules are established and abided by or removal of tourist home permit.

Understand this is a tough one to control and there are some positives from responsible tourist accommodations. I personally, the potential negative outcomes could result in more complaints and issues brought to Council unless this is fully defined with appropriate controls.

Received September 11, 2025
Submitted by: KD

I just wanted to send you a couple of points that we discussed at the open house that you said you would forward to council:
- 9.22 Recreational vehicles
- 9.22.1 only one trailer on lot w/building, we think more than one trailer should be allowed for maximum of two(2) weeks without a permit (guests bringing a rv)
- 9.22.2 no trailer's on undeveloped lot, we think that you should be able to park your trailer on your property as a taxpayer-seasonally (summer months)
- 11.5 Development regulations
- 11.5.6 Maximum rear yard setback under (b) detached garages 6.1 m (20 ft) should be same as accessory building 0.9 m (3.0 ft)

Received September 19, 2025
Submitted by: GS

I have attached my comments for consideration in preparation for the preliminary draft of proposed Bylaw modifications and update. Should you have any question about my submission comments you can reach me at the number below.

I offer my services to proof read and review your preliminary draft. You have a daunting task ahead to write a bylaw that the general public can understand and also provides the necessary guidance to counsel members. I spent 11 years of my spare time writing the integrated testing standard for Canada which is now adopted in the NBC. Writing Bylaws is challenging to have a system that is transparent to administrate and can be used to safeguard all parties; counsel and residents.

One aspect of the document that I found missing was the guidance to counsel in accepting building construction without permits. This place the Counsel and the general public at considerable risk. When a counsel applies to a subdivision appeal board to accept accepting construction the counsel now accepts the risk for construction management of the project. This I believe is outside the "ACT" as the Counsel does not have the expertise to manage construction problems. This places a burden on municipality taxpayers that is unnecessary.

One last item is about trees. Guidance to counsel on how to deal with trees that share a boundary line between two properties and secondly how to deal with trees that are 30 plus years old, showing decay present. One party wants them down due to the risk of collapse, and the other party wants to keep them for privacy. My perspective is always from a fire risk perspective. Most small municipalities have fire response times exceeding 10 minutes. Risk of collapse is the guiding precedent. Perhaps an impartial review sheet (check list type) may be a consideration with a waiver of liability to counsel could be constructed.

Over the past 53 years I have spent 11 years of dedicating pro bono time towards publishing the Integrated Testing safety standard. The lesson learned from this experience is the general public interpret code rulings differently. My comments contained in this review reflect on standardizing the Development process and procedures for the office of the Development Authority.
I. The Development permit process has to be streamlined to provide:
a. Equality to all residents
b. Safeguard the appeal process of adjacent neighbors' rights to a Subdivision Appeal Board Hearing.
II. Restrict the Development Authority office from the perception of providing referential treatment.
a. Upon receipt of notice (email, written or verbal) to the development officer, the Chief Administration officer or any member of SVVQ council of the Unauthorized construction (No development permit issued, or no development permit in effect, or no building permit issued, or no building permit in effect) the SVVQ counsel shall issue an immediate stop work order. This will safeguard the SVVQ from liability.

b. Any Development Permit requiring a variance must be signed off by SVVQ council. The Development officer is required to provide a written submission to the Chief Administration officer for presentation to Council to review detailing the variance request.
c. The SVVQ council shall consider the hardship aspect and unique situation of individual resident owners. The emergency response time of first responders (in excess of 10 minutes) for fire emergency situations shall be considered when situating a building on a property. Access by fire responders requiring access through adjacent properties must be considered by SVVQ council. This is a point of liability to council.
III. The existing bylaw 300-25 was the first step by the mayor towards a process of transparency. The Development officer receives his authority from Council, that needs to be made very clear. The mayor is heading in the right direction towards a tighter control on the Land Use Bylaws. The structure as I understand it is:
a. The Chief Administration officer is responsible for the hiring of the Development officer. This is a good practice to have a second review of documents prior to sending to council.
b. The Chief Administration Officer shall be copied on all emails of the Development officer. This includes emails to the building permit authority and residents of the development permit applicant.
c. It needs to be made clear to the development permit issuing service (aka development officer) the practice of engineering is not within the scope of the services provided. This matter needs to be enforced to limit liability to the SVVQ council.
d. The Chief Administration officer shall issue a call for proposal to provide permit issuing services. The term of the contract shall be one year with an option to extend this contract for one additional year.
e. The contracted company providing services for development permit issuing (aka Development officer) shall maintain a limited liability insurance policy in the value of $ 100,000.00 for the terms of the contract. The policy shall be specified (assigned solely) to the SVVQ council. This will safeguard the SVVQ council from the permit issuing services.
f. A point in question: Can the SVVQ council appoint a company to the board? When I review the development permit application it references a company called “Design Services”. A higher level of transparency is needed to safeguard public interests; are issuing development permits being issued by a company “design services” or and employee of design services or an individual with a self-appointed title of development officer. The entire matter is misleading. Section 2.2.4 indicates it is a “person” and not a company.
I. The posting of information to the permit website needs to be updated in an expedient manor. There are permit rejections that are from 6 months ago and remain hidden from public scrutiny. The residents of the SVVQ deserve to be kept current.
There is one further matter to be examined before providing a review. There is an impact of the Alberta Building Code (Alberta Edition) which went into effect in May of 2024. I bring this matter to the attention of the SVVQ council as it is grey area. Three points are brought to SVVQ council attention:
1) National Building Code Section1.5
1.5.1.2 Conflicting Requirements
1) In case of conflicts between the provisions of this code and those of a referenced document, the provisions of this code shall govern.
The NBC(AE) supersedes Bylaws in conflicts applying to building construction. This will be a point of contention within Municipalities that provide the development officer with the authority to alter building codes requirements. The Development officer places the Municipality at risk of litigation if the Municipality does not advise the safety codes permit issuing authority.
2) 2.2.10. Permits 2.2.10.1. General
1) A permit is required for any work to which this Code applies in accordance with the Safety Codes Act and its Regulations. (See Article 1.1.1.1. of Division A.)
This point places the Municipality at risk for failing to issue a stop work order. Streamline the process and reference the NBC (AE) edition.
3) 2.2.12. Prohibitions (NBC AE 2023 May 1 2024)
2.2.12.1. Prohibited Actions
1) No person shall
c) undertake work on, over or under public property, or erect or place any construction or store any material thereon, without permission from the appropriate authority,

d) allow the property boundaries or grading of a building lot to be changed so as to place a building in contravention of this Code,
e) knowingly submit false or misleading information,
f) change the scope of a project for which a permit has been issued or for which permission to construct has been given, without obtaining permission from the authority having jurisdiction, or…
The opening sentence “no person shall” applies to all people, including the SVVQ council, the Chief administration officer and the development officer equally. The reality is the “act” and the “code” overlap. There are two Authorities Having Jurisdiction; the “act” gives the Municipality the rights to decide land use, the “code” tells you how to construct.
There are two points to be raised here; allowing the property lines to be altered by a development officer will result in litigation. If construction was unauthorized by the SVVQ council, negotiations would normally proceed before construction begins to resolve such boundary line infringements. In the event the building was constructed without permits the structure needs to be removed.
The second matter is a change in scope get owner shall give written notice to the authority having jurisdiction of any change during the course of the project to the entities
5.4.1 – suggest adding elevation of proposed top of slab elevation for accessory building and garages. The minimum requirement should match the elevation of the existing primary structure and be above the flood plain level. Matching existing structures allows proper drainage planning. The requirements for flood plain have changed over the years. I do note 5,4,7 references a drainage plan, but no grading plan is required.
5.9.X – suggest adding point “II.a” identified in the opening remarks of this document. State the issuing of a stop work order will be issued. Streamline the process. Any building constructed without permitting shall be demolished. Make it clear and avoid litigation.
5.10.3 – Modification is required. Insert the word “NO”. NO variance to allow an accessory building (or garage) within the front yard of a back lot may be considered. This will now align with section 9.5.4
Poor planning by building a relocatable shed for example is no excuse to allow the fire loading on both the primary residence owners structure and adjacent property owners structure to be significantly increased. The point of having a garage structure away from the primary residence is survivability of the primary structure in a fire event. It further provides access to first responders to suppress the fire event. The insurance industry would examine the existing structure and hold the SVVQ responsible for liability for disregarding public safety due to flame loading. I would anticipate the garage owner would have considerable difficulties in collecting on his insurance and litigation
would be placed by the adjacent landowner for any damages. The SVVQ council would be named in the suit as this is common practice to name all parties. I do have experience on this subject matter.
I would like to offer my experience to review the next draft and offer comments.