

## **500 Parkins Avenue Questions and Answers**

*Revised: February 25, 2025*

### **1. What are the current taxes being paid on 500 Parkins Avenue to the Village by the current owner?**

*A: The taxes that are currently paid on 500 Parkins Avenue comprise of School Taxes, Village Taxes, and other specialized taxes. The impact on remaining residents once we remove the Village taxes from our collection will be approximately **\$6.40 per remaining lot year per year (based on 2024 taxes collected)***

### **2. If the village was to purchase this property, what would they do with it? What would be the costs to develop this property? What would be the time line for the development of this property?**

*A: The village will work collaboratively with the residents and the Ross Haven Community League to determine the potential uses and timeline. It is not our intent to develop the property into additional lots, public campground, or public RV lots. The village's priority was to first secure this land, to prevent developers from acquiring it. We did not buy it with the intent of having a financial return on investment for the village, but to ensure that we could control and determine how this gets developed. We have started to compile a list of potential uses as provided by residents.*

### **3. What are the projected additional costs to maintain this property as is? How do these costs compare to the Tax Revenue Currently being paid by the current land owner?**

*A: The village is anticipating additional costs of the property to maintain in an "as is" scenario will be less than \$4,500, or **\$26.40 per lot per year**. Breakdown:*

- Insurance: Allowed for \$1,500 per year. \$6.67 per lot per year.*
- Bush Mower: \$3,000 per year. \$13.33 per lot per year.*
- Loss of Tax Revenue form existing owner (based on 2024 taxes): \$6.40 per lot per year*

### **4. What are the liability implications to the village and its residences? For example is the village liable if someone starts a fire on the property? What happens if someone decides to camp or squat on the property? What happens if a tree falls and damages property or injures someone? What are the implications to the village is someone gets injured while using the property?**

*A: The liability that the village has pertaining to this is no different than the liability we currently have with respect to the parkways, playground, and other common areas in the village – other than we have a larger area. We did not feel this should prevent the village from moving forward with this, and we will deal with items as appropriate.*

### **5. What are the costs to secure the property to prevent unauthorized access or use?**

*A: We don't expect to change anything in 2025.*

## **6: How Do Residents Get More Information and Answers to these Questions?**

*A: Continue to ask questions. Send to [CAO@rosshaven.ca](mailto:CAO@rosshaven.ca). We will post the Q&A on our website. Although we are monitoring RHCL, the better avenue is to email our CAO.*

**7: Yes we agree that we would prefer not to have a trailer park built on the property however what are the realistic odds of that actually happening? Developing the Golf Course into a trailer park would take years to do and would be a very expensive undertaking. Any development would require approvals from the Village and Province. It would require some type of access to the waterfront and lake? The developer to need to meet environmental requirements and new provincial standards for rural development as a result of the Jasper fires. The development would require costly infrastructure to provide electricity, sewer/sanitation to the property. In short it would take 5-15 years to develop and be very costly. If the purchase of the 500 Property is solely to ensure than a trailer park is not developed that is very expensive purchase, especially when you consider ongoing maintenance cost and the huge expense to develop the property.**

*A: Do you want to take that chance? If a developer comes along, you won't have as much say as you think. The RV Campground being built beside Yellowstone is a perfect example. A practicing lawyer in this area has offered the following insight to us:*

*There are some protections against "undesirable" development of the lands. Specially, development would require a change in the land use bylaw ("LUB"), subdivision approval (potentially), and approval of discretionary use(s) (if applicable under the amended LUB). However, these protections are not absolute. If the lands are acquired now or in the future by a developer with the financial means to pursue its right to develop the lands through the courts (eg. seeking judicial review of any refusal to amend the LUB; appeal to the ISDAB of any refusal to approve subdivision, the conditions of subdivision approval, or of any refusal to approve a discretionary use; seeking judicial review of an ISDAB decision), Ross Haven could find itself in the difficult position of either having to approve an undesirable use or pay to defend costly litigation.*

*The Three Sisters development in Canmore is a recent example of a municipality that was forced to approve a development that it didn't want after years of litigation. While there are some nuances between the development at issue in Canmore and development of the golf course lands, my point is that Ross Haven should not rely on its control over development under the LUB as an absolute protection against undesirable development of the former golf course lands. If a developer chooses to pursue the matter through the courts, the cost of litigation will likely force the hand of Ross Haven, a small municipality with limited funds. By way of example, our firm is currently acting for a developer client of mine on a judicial review of an SDAB decision and the legal fees for the preliminary part of this (application for judicial review) were over \$45k.*

**8: What is the long term vision or plan for this property and how will the decision be made?**

*A: As mentioned previously, Council will consider the feedback and decide. That is what you have elected us to do.*

**9: The biggest concern we have as residents of the village is the Lake level and water quality. If there is anything council can do to help work with the other municipalities around the lake and the Province and Federal government to improve the water level and quality of the lake this is our number one concern and where we would like council to focus additional tax dollars and resources.**

*A: Ray Hutscal has joined LILSA, and has ensured that one of their objectives is to try and improve the water levels of Lac Ste Anne and Lake Isle. He is leading that objective. LILSA also has a Water Quality Objective, and they are also working towards improving that. This will not happen overnight.*

**10: Did the village declare what the purchase price was?**

*A: No, the Village did not. The village negotiated a price with the seller based on assessment of other comparable in the area, their original purchase price, and the perceived value of this property. As this is a conditional offer, we did not disclose the exact amount, but this can be estimated by multiplying the per lot cost by the number of lots (225).*

**11: The votes are not secret – could this lead to backlash?**

*A: The village needed to track responses by lot to ensure one vote per lot. The responses will not be shared publicly, only Council and the CAO will have access to this information.*

**12: Has a locked gate fallen off the wayside?**

*A: No, just limited time, and dealing with other priorities. We hope to proceed with this.*

**13: Will other payment options other than 25 years or 1 year?**

*A: Yes, if we proceed you could pay out at any time, with an option to do that once per year. Payout at each year was provided in the letter (back side).*

**14: What would happen to any revenue, if any approved development occurs on those lands?**

*A: This would be determined at the time that a development plan is agreed upon. Ultimately, it is returned to the village, and could be used to reduce taxes, provide a payback to each resident, or ?? TBD.*

**15: Will this be an endless call for money on residents?**

*A: The intent is no. Pending on how we choose to use the lands will also determine how we fund it. Original intent is to partner with the RHCL and use the grant money capabilities, along with our ability to garner grants, to fund these uses.*

**16: Will taxes be raised to pay for the purchase?**

*A: Yes, as provided in the letter.*

**17: Should an independent appraisal be completed?**

A: Council has approved an independent appraiser to appraise this land.

**18. Why is there an urgency to purchase the land now?**

A: Council decided to proceed with a conditional offer in January. We believe it is better for the village to secure the land, versus having the risk of a developer purchase.