

CITY OF CASTLEGAR
SUPPLEMENT TO
DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGE BYLAW 695

December, 1994

CITY OF CASTLEGAR

SUPPLEMENT TO BYLAW 695

REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGES

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document has been prepared to provide background information to developers levied with Development Cost Charges (DCC).

DCCs are imposed to finance future capital costs of construction or improving the highways, water mains, sewer mains and drainage systems necessary to accommodate growth in the City. The DCC levy is carefully designed to provide a fair and reasonable allocation of these infrastructure costs between those works and services required for new developments and the works necessary to meet the needs of the existing population.

DCCs are used to finance works of general benefit to the City rather than works which benefits only limited properties. The charges do not duplicate the costs of other requirements for works and services required under the Subdivision and Development Bylaw. The projects included in the DCC Bylaw do not exceed the prevailing standards of services required by the Subdivision and Development Bylaw and the Official Community Plan (OCP).

DCCs are payable when a developer obtains a subdivision approval or a building permit. Some properties, such as religious buildings that are exempt from taxation, are also exempt from the DCCs. No DCC is payable for construction of three or fewer dwelling units or where the building construction cost is less than \$50,000.

The old DCC Bylaw No. 281 was adopted in 1980. When the City prepared the Comprehensive Development Plan in 1991 and subsequently adopted a new Official Community Plan (OCP) in 1993, a need to upgrade the old DCC Bylaw was obvious because:

1. the new OCP, adopted in 1993, contains different policies and strategies for the growth of the community and identifies different projects and benefitting areas;
2. projects identified in recent utility studies based on current and anticipated short term growth are not included in the old list of DCC projects;
3. the projects associated with the old DCC bylaw are not all included in the current 5-Year Capital Plan;
4. the rate schedule is out-dated.

In order to explain how the new Development Cost Charge Bylaw 695 was established, this report is divided into the following components:

Section 2.0	Population Projection
Section 3.0	Projected Demand for Development
Section 4.0	DCC Projects to Accommodate the Growth
Section 5.0	Allocation of Development Cost Charges

2.0 POPULATION PROJECTION

Castlegar has been a slow growing community during the last three decades. Since 1961 until 1991, the City's average population increase has been 1.4% per year. By the 1991 Census Year, the population had reached 6,580, accounting for a 3% change from 1986, or less than 1% per year over that period. (See Table 2.1)

TABLE 2.1
HISTORIC POPULATION TRENDS - CENSUS DATA

YEAR	POPULATION	AVERAGE GROWTH PERSONS/YEAR	ANNUAL GROWTH RATES
1961	4,376	-	-
1966	6,309	387	8.8%
1971	5,918	-78	-1.3%
1976	6,255	67	1.1%
1981	6,902	129	2.0%
1986	6,385	-103	-1.5%
1991	6,580	195	0.6%

Over the past 3 - 4 years, Castlegar has experienced significant in-migration, partly due to the Pulp Mill expansion project. Yet, the main factors for current population growth are the migration from the Coast and Okanagan due to their population pressure and the migration from the Prairies.

The outlook for Castlegar's growth is very positive, suggesting that future annual growth rates will be between 2% and 4%. Table 2.2 provides an indication of growth scenarios for the next 5, 10, 15 and 20 years.

TABLE 2.2
POPULATION PROJECTION

	2.0%	Projected increase	3.0%	Projected increase	4.0%	Projected increase
1991*	6,580	-	6,580	-	6,580	-
1996	7,265	676	7,628	1,048	8,006	1,426
2001	8,021	756	8,843	1,215	9,740	1,734
2006	8,856	835	10,251	1,408	11,850	2,110
2011	9,778	922	11,884	1,633	14,418	2,568

3.0 PROJECTED DEMAND FOR DEVELOPMENT

The projected population can be translated into a projected demand for residential units. The projected demand for the next 5, 10, 15 and 20 years was calculated using a factor of 2.6 persons per unit. This is considered a realistic assumption as the City's population ages and household demographics continue to change.

TABLE 3.1
PROJECTED DEMAND FOR RESIDENTIAL UNITS
(Based on Population Projections and 2.6 Persons Per Household)

	2.0%	Projected housing demand	3.0%	Projected housing demand	4.0%	Projected housing demand
1991*	2,530	-	2,530	-	2,530	-
1996	2,793	263	2,933	403	3,073	548
2001	3,084	291	3,400	467	3,745	667
2005	3,405	321	3,942	542	4,556	811
2011	3,759	354	4,569	627	5,544	988
20 yr total		1,229		2,039		3,014

1991 Census, Statistics Canada *

Table 3.1 sets out the projected demand for residential units using the factor of 2.6 persons per household. According to a statistic provided by B.C. Tel there was a 3.14% annual average increase of residential phone lines in Castlegar between 1990 and March, 1994. Based on the above various factors, it is assumed that the estimated population growth rate for the City will be 3% per year and the projected housing demand will be approximately 2,000 dwelling units by the year 2001.

Proportioning the level of usage of each service for each standardized unit of development based on a standard single family dwelling unit yields an Equivalence Factor for the type of development. Table 3.2 shows the various equivalent factors as developed for the District of Langley's DCC Bylaw.

TABLE 3.2
EQUIVALENT FACTOR FOR VARIOUS USES

Type of Development	per	Equivalence Factors			
		Highway	Drainage	Sewer	Water
One Family Residential	lot	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000	1.00000

Two Family Residential	lot dwell	1.60000	1.33333	1.56256	1.56250
------------------------	-----------	---------	---------	---------	---------

Med Density Residential	unit	0.80000	0.40909	0.78128	0.78125
Commercial	ha	28.40000	25.50000	17.10000	20.40000
Industrial	ha	8.10000	25.50000	17.10000	20.40000
Institutional	ha	6.60000	24.00000	18.40000	18.80000
Rural	ha	12.70000	12.00000	12.50000	12.50000

The mixture of single detached dwellings and the other types of housing (apartments, townhouses, mobile homes) is presumed to change from the current ratio of 3:1 to a ratio of 2:1 for the new developments during next 20 years. The City's Comprehensive Development Plan (1991) predicts that 3 to 8 ha (7.5 to 20 acres) of land will be required for commercial development and 4 to 12 ha (10 to 30 acres) of industrial development will occur within next 20 years.

Based on an assumption that 8 ha of commercial lands and 12 ha of industrial lands are to be developed by the year 2011, Table 3.3 projects that developments equivalent to approximately 2200 single family dwelling units will take place. The percentages of each category of the projects are based on the construction costs which are explained in Section

4.0.

TABLE 3.3
PROJECTED DEVELOPMENTS EQUIVALENT TO SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS

		High-ways	Drain-age	Sewer	Water	Total	No of units	Equip S.F. D.U.
	% based on cost of projects	63.59%	10.77%	17.95%	7.68%	100.0%		
Single Family Dwelling	SFD Equiv Factor	1	1	1	1			
	Compound Factor	0.63590	0.10770	0.17950	0.07680	1.00	1400 units	1400
Medium Density Dwelling	SFD Equiv Factor	0.80000	0.40909	0.78128	0.78125			
	Compound Factor	0.50872	0.04406	0.14024	0.06000	0.753	600 units	452
Commercial	SFD Equiv Factor	28.4000	25.5000	17.1000	20.4000			
	Compound Factor	18.0596	2.74635	3.06945	1.56672	25.442	8ha	204

Page 5

Industrial	SFD Equiv Factor	8.1000	25.5000	17.1000	10.9000			
	Compound	5.15079	2.74635	3.06945	0.83712	11.804	12 ha	142

	Factor							
Total Units Equivalent to Single Family Detached House								2198

4.0 DCC PROJECTS TO ACCOMMODATE THE GROWTH

In 1991, the City commissioned the Comprehensive Development Planning (CDP) study to assess the pending impacts of increased economic activity and growth. The CDP examined the land use, servicing and financial implication of the forecast development. Based on general land use strategy, servicing options and deficiencies in the present infrastructure to support new developments were assessed and selected on the basis that each project shall benefit the entire community.

4.1 Highway Projects

4.1.1 Arrow Lakes Drive Upgrade

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Upgrade Arrow Lakes Drive from the west approach of the Castlegar/Robson bridge to the Pope & Talbot access (length = 5.0 km)
OBJECTIVES	This roadway is the sole access route to our major industries (Pulp Mill and Saw Mill). Priority due to age deterioration upgrading is required. Widening is required to reflect current safety standards. This upgrade will also promote the development of adjacent vacant rural, light industrial & residential lands.
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	1995 - 1998
COST ESTIMATE	\$3,500,000
FUNDING	DCC & general taxation
REFERENCE DOCUMENTS	McElhenney Engineering (pre-design)

4.1.2 Columbia Avenue South Upgrade

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Four lane Columbia Avenue (Highway 22) from the interchange (18 th Street) south past 37 th Street.
---------------------	---

OBJECTIVES	The existing traffic volumes on the two lane roadway currently produces numerous safety problems. The rate of redevelopment along this corridor is therefore depressed (controlled access). Four laning would relieve this condition
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	1999 – 2001
COST ESTIMATE	\$3,000,000
FUNDING	DCC, general taxation & Provincial Gov't
REFERENCE DOCUMENTS	Ministry of Transportation & Highways

4.1.3 Columbia Avenue, North Upgrade

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Upgrade Columbia Avenue from Downtown to the Interchange.
OBJECTIVES	The deteriorated pavement and curb on the existing 3 lane roadway will be rebuilt. New sidewalk will be installed on both sides of this commercial road. Overhead wires will be buried underground and proper street lights will be installed.
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	2004 – 2007
COST ESTIMATE	\$4,800,000
FUNDING	DCC & general taxation
REFERENCE DOCUMENTS	

4.1.4 14th Avenue South

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	A by-pass collector connecting Highway #3 at upper bench and Highway #22 near Industrial Park.
OBJECTIVES	Opening this road will alleviate the one-road-city problem of the southern portion of Castlegar
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	2011 – 2014
COST ESTIMATE	\$4,600,000
FUNDING	DCC, general taxation and contribution from frontage beneficiaries

4.1.5 Woodland Drive

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	A by-pass collector road connecting 17 th Street and Arrow Lakes Drive through Oglow Subdivision.
OBJECTIVES	Opening this road will alleviate the one-road-city problem of the northern portion of Castlegar.

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	2008 - 2009
COST ESTIMATE	\$1,800,000
FUNDING	DCC, general taxation and contribution from frontage beneficiaries

4.2 Storm Drainage

4.2.1 Merry Creek Storm Drainage System

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Upgrade the existing storm drains from Merrycreek Road to 17 th Street.
OBJECTIVES	Provide capacity to convey the after development peak rate of run-off from the vacant developable lands above the existing inlet structure.
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	1997 – 1998
COST ESTIMATE	\$590,000
FUNDING	DCC & general taxation
REFERENCE DOCUMENTS	Kerr Wood Leidal (Drainage Study)

4.2.2 Bloomer Creek Storm Drainage System

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Upgrade the existing storm drainage system within the Bloomer Creek water shed.
OBJECTIVES	Provide capacity to convey the after development peak rate of run-off from the vacant developable lands above the existing inlet structure.
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	2002 – 2003
COST ESTIMATE	\$720,000
FUNDING	DCC & general taxation
REFERENCE DOCUMENTS	Kerr Wood Leidal (Drainage Study)

4.2.3 Killough Creek Drainage System

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Upgrade the existing storm drainage system within the Killough Creek water shed.
OBJECTIVES	Provide capacity to convey the storm drainage after development peak rate of run-off from the vacant developable lands above the existing inlet structure.
PROPOSED	

CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	2007 - 2008
COST ESTIMATE	\$260,000
FUNDING	DCC & general taxation
REFERENCE DOCUMENTS	Kerr Wood Leidal (Drainage Study)

4.2.4 No Name Creek Drainage System

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Storm drainage system within the tributary area of No Name Creek which covers the proposed 14 th Avenue South.
OBJECTIVES	Provide capacity to convey the storm water from 14 th Avenue and from the vacant developable lands after development peak rate of run-off.
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	2009 – 2010
COST ESTIMATE	\$1,260,000
FUNDING	DCC, general taxation and contribution from frontage beneficiaries.

4.3 Sanitary Sewer

4.3.1 Columbia Avenue Trunk Main

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Upgrade of a hydraulically overloaded section of sanitary trunk main (parallels Columbia Avenue between 9 th Avenue and CP bridge crossing).
OBJECTIVES	To upgrade the capacity of the trunk sewer (currently overloaded) to convey flows from existing and vacant lands within the north collection system.
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	2002 - 2007
COST ESTIMATE	\$1,500,000
FUNDING	DCC & general taxation
REFERENCE DOCUMENTS	Kerr Wood Leidal (Sanitary Sewer System Evaluation)

4.3.2. Lift Stations Upgrade

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Upgrade of existing lift stations within the north and south collection system.
OBJECTIVES	To upgrade and/or replace existing stations to support anticipated infill and new land development.
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	1996 – 2005

COST ESTIMATE	\$450,000
FUNDING	DCC & general taxation
REFERENCE DOCUMENTS	Kerr Wood Leidal

4.3.3 Lagoon Upgrade

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	North sewer lagoon upgrade
OBJECTIVES	Upgrade works on an existing sewer treatment facility. Works primarily consist of: ? berm upgrade ? de-sludging ? air system upgrade ? power supply
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	1997 – 1999
COST ESTIMATE	\$520,000
FUNDING	DCC's & general taxation
REFERENCE DOCUMENTS	Kerr Wood Leidal

4.3.4 Treatment Plant Upgrade

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	South treatment plant upgrade.
OBJECTIVES	Upgrade or twin the existing treatment facility to accommodate buildout development.
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	2007 - 2008
COST ESTIMATE	\$2,200,000
FUNDING	DCC & general taxation
REFERENCE DOCUMENTS	Kerr Wood Leidal/Urban Systems Ltd.

4.4 Waterworks

4.4.1 Purcell Reservoir

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Purcel Reservoir replacement/upgrade
OBJECTIVES	Increase required storage capacity and allow development to occur in adjacent vacant land.

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	2001 - 2002
COST ESTIMATE	\$570,000
FUNDING	DCC & general taxation
REFERENCE DOCUMENTS	Kerr Wood Leidal

4.4.2 Trunk Mains

PROJECT DESCRIPTION	Up-size the carrying capacity of various mains within the community
OBJECTIVES	To meet Fire Underwriters requirements and allow development.
PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE	2003 - 2012
COST ESTIMATE	\$1,450,000
FUNDING	DCC & general taxation
REFERENCE DOCUMENTS	Kerr Wood Leidal

4.5 Open Spaces

The Municipal Act authorizes the Municipalities to impose DCCs to assist the municipalities to pay the capital cost of acquiring park land. The City's current inventory of open space totals 135 acres including Twin Rivers Park site. As the City will need only 120 acres of open space by the year 2011, when the population is projected to increase to 12,000 (1 acre per 1000 persons, Open Space Study, 1992 PERC), no further park land is needed.

4.6 Summary of Costs

Table 4.1 summarizes the costs at 1994 value for the projects associated with the DCC.

TABLE 4.1
COST SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECTS
REQUIRED TO ACCOMODATE NEW DEVELOPMENTS

Category	Projects	Cost	DCC Reserve	Cost After Grant & Reserve
----------	----------	------	-------------	----------------------------

Highways	Arrow Lakes Dr	\$3,500,000		
	Columbia Ave. S	\$3,000,000		
	Columbia Ave. N	\$4,800,000		
	14 th Ave. S	\$4,600,000		
	Woodland Dr	\$1,800,000		
	Total	\$17,700,000	\$1,230,000	\$16,470,000
Storm Drainage	Merry Creek	\$590,000		
	Bloomer Creek	\$720,000		
	Killough Creek	\$260,000		
	No Name Creek	\$1,260,000		
	Total	\$2,830,000	\$40,000	\$2,790,000
Sewer	Trunk Mains	\$1,500,000		
	Lift Stations	\$450,000		
	Lagoon Upgrade	\$520,000		
	Treatment Plant Upgrade	\$2,200,000		
	Total	\$4,670,000	\$20,000	\$4,650,000
Water	Purcell Reservoir	\$570,000		
	Trunk Mains	\$1,450,000		
	Total	\$2,020,000	\$30,000	\$1,990,000
Total		\$27,220,000	\$1,320,000	\$25,900,000

5.0 ALLOCATION OF DCC

Allocation of costs for the works and services included in the DCC bylaw is determined by the “cost split” factor and the “assist” factor.

In order to determine the “split factor”, the costs for capital projects were divided into two revenue sources: general property taxes and DCC funds, which were linked to the current population of 7000 and the next 20 years projected increase of 5000.

The proposed projects will equally benefit the existing residents and the occupants of future developments.

General Tax : DCC = 7000 : 5000 = 58.3% : 41.7%

Page 12

The “assist” factor represents that portion of the project costs which will benefit new developments that has been determined to be paid by the general tax payer. The assist factor is determined as 2%. This is kept as a very low percentage since the main contribution of the split factor also is from the general taxpayer.

The apportionment of the costs is shown on Table 5.1.

TABLE 5.1
ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

Projects	Cost after Reserve from	Assist Factor 2%	Tax Revenue 98% x 58.3% =	DCC 98% x 41.7% =
----------	-------------------------	------------------	------------------------------	----------------------

	Table 4.1		57.2%	40.8%
Highway	\$16,470,000	\$329,400	\$9,420,840	\$6,719,760
Drainage	\$2,790,000	\$55,800	\$1,595,880	\$1,138,320
Sewer	\$4,650,000	\$93,000	\$2,659,800	\$1,987,200
Water	\$1,990,000	\$39,800	\$1,138,280	\$811,920
Total	\$25,900,000	\$518,000	\$14,814,800	\$10,567,200

The amount of \$10,567,200 financed by DCCs was divided by 2,200 units (equivalent to single family residential lots - Table 3.3) to come up with a nominal rate of \$4,803 for each single residential lot created. Table 5.2 shows the proposed DCC charges based on this nominal rate and the Equivalent Factor (Table 3.2).

TABLE 5.2
DEVELOPMENT COST CHARGE

Zone/type of Building		Development Cost Charge					Per Unit	Charged For
		Highway	Drainage	Sewer	Water	Total		
One Family Residential	Equiv. Factor	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	\$4,803	lot	subdivision
	DCC	\$3,055	\$517	\$862	\$369			
Two Family Residential	Equiv. Factor	2.0000	2.0000	2.0000	2.0000	\$9,606	lot	subdivision
	DCC	\$6,110	\$1,034	\$1,724	\$738			
Medium Density Residential	Equiv. Factor	0.80000	0.40909	0.78128	0.78125	\$3,618	dwelling unit	building permit
	DCC	\$2,444	\$212	\$674	\$288			
Commercial	Equiv. Factor	0.00284	0.00255	0.00171	0.00204	\$12,21	area in m ²	building permit
	DCC	\$8.67	\$1.32	\$1.47	\$0.75			

Page 13

Industrial	Equiv. Factor	0.00081	0.00255	0.00171	0.00109	\$5.66	area in m ²	building permit
	DCC	\$2.47	\$1.32	\$1.47	\$0.40			
Institutional	Equiv. Factor	0.00066	0.00240	0.00184	0.00188	\$5.54	area in m ²	building permit
	DCC	\$2.02	\$1.24	\$1.59	\$0.69			

The area for calculating DCCs for non-residential development will be determined by measuring the floor area of the building and the required set-back area. This is described in detail in Schedule "A" of the Bylaw.

(Addendum to the Supplement to Bylaw 695)

6.0 DCC RATE UPDATE (March, 1999)

6.1 DCC for Duplex Zone and Single Mobile Home Zone

The new Zoning Bylaw 800, which replaces the current Zoning Bylaw # 553 allows a secondary suite to most single residential lots. This means a single residential lot in R-1 or R-1B zone may accommodate up to two dwelling units. No secondary suite is allowed on a lot designated as R-1C (Single Manufactured Home) zone as its minimum lot width is too narrow (12.0 m) to have two dwelling units.

The provision of R-2 (Single and Duplex Residential) zone, which also allows up to two dwelling units per lot, has not been changed with the new bylaw. As a result the maximum allowable dwelling units per lot became equal between R-2 zone and R-1/R-1B zone. To make the DCC charges equitable, the previous rate of R-2 zone (\$9,606) is reduced to be same as R-1 or R-1B.

The rate for R-1C zone, in the mean time, should become less than R-1, R-1B or R-2 as each lot can contain only one dwelling unit. It is considered appropriate to charge equal rate as a dwelling unit of a multiple residential building (\$3,618 , approx. 3/4 of others).

Table 6.1 shows the proposed amendment:

**TABLE 6.1
CHANGE OF DCC RATES FOR RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION**

Old Zoning Designation under Bylaw 553		Maximum No. of Dwelling Units per Lot	Old DCC Rate per Lot	New Zoning Designation under Bylaw 800		Maximum No. of Dwelling Units per Lot	New DCC Rate per Lot	Remarks
R1	Single Family Residential	1	\$4,803	R-1	Single Residential	2	\$4,803	unchanged
R1B	Single Family Residential-B	1	no provision	R-1B	Single Residential -B	2	\$4,803	DCC rate introduced
R1-	Single Family	1	\$4,803	R-1C	Single	1	\$3,618	reduced to

MH	Mobile Home				Manufactured Home			be equitable to multiple residential
R2	Single and Two-family Residential	2	\$9,606	R-2	Single and Duplex Residential Zone	2	\$4,803	reduced to be equitable to single residential

While no immediate impact on the over-all DCC revenue amount by this change is expected, the residential rate structure will be further studied and adjusted to reflect the higher density of residential developments in the in-fill areas when the current DCC rate system is updated.

6.2 DCC for Senior Citizens Home

A senior citizens home is defined as:

A multiple residential building occupied exclusively by people over the age of 55:

- (a) which is supported in whole or in part by financial assistance from the Municipal, Provincial, or Federal Governments or agencies; or
- (b) where the residents are regularly served with meals, housekeeping and alert services for emergent medical needs and the building contains adequate facilities to provide such services along with other amenities.

Since the previous DCC rate does not separately categorize this type of facilities, multiple residential building rate (\$3,618 per dwelling unit) is applied currently. It is, however, less likely for an occupant of a congregate care or other senior care facilities to own a vehicle than ordinary apartment or condo dwellers.

Although no consistent statistics for vehicle-trip-generation, water consumption, sewer discharge, etc. are available, it would be reasonable to assume that their low persons-per-family density and relatively immobile lifestyle warrant approximately 2/3 of the DCCs for other types of multiple residential buildings or 2 of a single residential lot (\$2,400 per suite).

6.3 Airport Area

The airport site contains large vacant developable lands that are not directly used for the aerodrome operation. The City envisions that these vacant lands will accommodate private commercial and light industrial developments in order to recover the costs related to the airport operation and the airport infrastructure improvements. In determining whether a DCC should be charged for this area, the following elements are considered.

- \$ The area to be developed is currently not facilitated with necessary works and services such as access road, water or sewer. The City anticipates that the developer(s) of the lands are expected to bear the cost of servicing. This includes the cost of installing a new access to the provincial Highway #3.
- \$ Since the Airport Area and the main area of Castlegar are separated by the Columbia River, it is not feasible for the City's main water system and sewer system and other utility networks to accommodate the Airport Area.
- \$ Therefore the developments within in the Airport area will neither gain any benefit from nor add any burden to the main area of Castlegar's works and services.

The current DCC requirement that is applicable to subdivisions and developments with the main

area= of Castlegar should be exempted for the Airport Area.

- End of Document -