

Title: Road Requests Review & Assessment
Policy No: 3227
Approval: County Council
Effective Date: January 6, 2004
Revised Date: May 2, 2006
Supersedes Policy No: Nil



Policy Statement: The following policy outlines the general principle to be considered following the submission of any road request. The relative ranking of the various requests can then be compared based upon an empirical rather than subjective ranking.

1. When an individual requests the construction of an access road, administration and Council will review the request in light of the following criteria:

1.1 Relationship to future road network (25):

Is the roadway part of the larger “planned” road network for the area? Extensions or roadway additions which follow the County’s long range planning as outlined in the Rural Roads Study shall be given the highest ranking. Where the roadway has no relationship to the existing or proposed network, it shall be given a ranking of 1.

1.2 Probability of Extension (10):

What is the chance that the roadway will be extended to service future residences or lands in the future? 10 - High; 1 – low.

1.3 Number of properties serviced (10):

The more properties serviced by the roadway, the higher the ranking. Five or more different properties - 10, only one property – 1.

1.4 Number of residents serviced (10):

The number of residences immediately serviced by the proposed roadway today or in the future. How many residential dwelling units? Five or more - 10; only one - 1.

1.5 Alternative/Existing access to property (10):

Does the owner currently have access to the property via an access agreement, LOC or through other alternative means? Is the current access seasonal or year-round? None - 10; Verbal agreement - 5; Registered agreement - 1.

1.6 Legal Access/Physical Access (10):

Does the property have legal access? Was the property subdivided without access created at the time of subdivision? Roadways that are deadened due to physical barriers such as hills or creeks may need to receive special consideration. Both legal and physical access-10; only physical or legal access - 5; neither - 1

1.7 Terrain/Complexity of Construction (25):

The degree of difficulty associated with the construction of the requested roadway proposed. Construction on the right-of-way involving significant hills or sideslopes, creek crossings, marsh, etc. gentle terrain - 25; rolling - 20; creeks - 15; marsh - 10; otherwise poor terrain - 1

1.8 Cost (10):

Low costs <\$40,000 – 10; High costs > \$140,000 – 1

1.9 Value of Property Serviced by Roadway (10):

What is the value of the land in relation to the cost of construction? 5X - 10; 1X - 2

1.10 Future Potential for Growth of Area Population (10):

What is the economic benefit to the County in promoting the development of the area? What is the likelihood that the roadway will attract other residential growth utilizing the same infrastructure? Definite - 10; Likely - 5; Unlikely-1

1.11 Agricultural Significance of Area (10):

What is the current status of the agriculture immediately adjacent to the proposed roadway. Actively farmed - 10; Pasture Land - 5; Forested -1

1.12 Commitment (10):

What is the degree of commitment by the owner of the property requesting the access road? A demonstrated commitment by the owner for the servicing of the property with utilities, either by conventional or independent energy sources? Services in Place or Signed Agreements (10); None(1)

1.13 Waiting Time (10):

How long has the road request been outstanding? 1 year – (2); 2 years – (4); three years – (6); four years – (8); five or more – (10).

2. The relative ranking of the various road requests shall be reviewed in light of other access requests and the funding available.
3. Those access requests which demonstrate the highest ranking shall be considered for inclusion in the next year's Capital Budget deliberations.
4. Parcels to which access is available through the owner's other land shall not be considered for access construction.