

RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF ABERDEEN NO. 373
Public Meeting
Held on June 12th, 2025 at the Municipal Office, located at
101 Industrial Drive, in the Town of Aberdeen



The Reeve Martin Bettker called the public hearing to order at 1:30 pm.

Present: Reeve Martin Bettker, Councilors Graham White, Mark Schaffel, Kevin Kirk, Real Hamoline, Paul Martens, Jim Korpan, C.A.O. Bridgette Shwytky

Public Present: Jason Chilliak, Rob Farkas, Jim Greenshields, Deb Campbell, Les Wailing, Harvey Callin, Sara Pruden, Melanie Kahovec, Ryan Kolb, Wanda Babich, Ken Babich.

The purpose of the public hearing was to hear concerns/objections/representations regarding the Proposed Special Tax Bylaw for the Application of SB90 in the Country Residential Development of Valley View Heights.

Reeve Martin Bettker chaired the hearing, introduced council and staff and then instructed those attending of the procedure that the hearing would follow.

Summary of Concerns/Comments from the Written Submissions

Summary of responses from opposed:
Costs too high, household cannot afford
Not bothered by dust, they moved here knowing roads were gravelled
More speeding in the development if SB90 is applied
Concerns over road maintenance costs once SB90's lifespan is exceeded
SB90 will bring in crime/outside traffic
Not a fair way of dividing the costs as everyone's property has different frontage
Not enough information provided to resident/lack of transparency
Satisfied with services already provided, no need for change
If the RM wants to make these improvements, the RM should pay for it
SB90 surface is icier in the winter than gravelled roads
Over 50% of taxes already go towards road maintenance
Public roads had SB90 applied at no cost to ratepayers, why are interior roads treated differently?
Product lifetime does not justify environmental impact of SB90 application
Summary of responses in favor:
Would be very happy to see it applied
Will prolong the life of vehicles and reduce dust in houses
Will improve the value of property
Will give the neighbourhood a great appeal
Glad they can split the payments up throughout the year the same as taxes

Verbal Presentations:

In lieu of formal presentations, the council permitted an informal discussion to take place to provide the ratepayers present the opportunity to ask questions. Discussions took place regarding the ability to split the costs to ratepayers over multiple years instead of charging it over 1 year and the accuracy of the costs estimates. A ratepayer also suggested looking into alternative products, that an engineer

MB

would be willing to provide a lifetime so that it may be done as a local improvement project over multiple years.

The RM explain that estimates for pavement had been explored at the request of ratepayers prior to receiving the petition from the residents requesting the application of SB90. The costs associated with paving the development would significantly exceed the RM's debt limit. The RM would not be able to fund the application of pavement. The RM also explained that no other products were explored as the petition received specified the application of SB90 and no other requests had been received regarding other products.

The RM explained that, in order for the costs to be split over multiple years, the legislation requires the involvement of an engineer to determine the lifetime of the project and that the yearly payment installments could not exceed the lifetime determined by the engineer. As the engineering firms contacted by the RM were not willing to provide a lifetime of the application, the RM is not capable, per the legislation, to charge it over multiple years.

The RM explained that the decision to charge the costs over 1 year as a special tax was not related to the ability to finance the project, but rather the limited mechanisms within the provincial legislation to permit the RM to add amounts to taxes. A special tax does not require the involvement of an engineer to proceed but must be fully added to taxes in the year the work is performed. A Local Improvement Levy is the only legislated mechanism that allows project costs to be applied to property taxes over multiple years. However, in accordance with provincial legislation, the RM is required to obtain an engineer's assessment to establish the expected lifespan of the project. Without this engineering determination, the RM cannot legally proceed with implementing a Local Improvement Levy.

As the initial gravel cost estimates were based on 2024 pricing, the RM agreed to obtain updated quotes from gravel suppliers to ensure the cost estimates reflect current market rates and provide a more accurate projection. A new notice will be sent out to all Valley View Heights residents with the updated costs once current pricing has been obtained.

Reeve Martin Bettker thanked those in attendance for their written submissions and participation in the discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:44 pm.


Reeve


C.A.O.

MB