






Subject: **Bylaw 1905 Draft Municipal Development Plan**  
 Meeting Date: Tuesday, September 17, 2024  
 Prepared By: Barb Hazelton, Manager of Planning & Development  
 Presented By: Barb Hazelton, Manager of Planning & Development

**STRATEGIC PLAN ALIGNMENT: (Check all that apply)**

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
High Quality Infrastructure		Economic Resilience		Quality of Life		Effective Leadership		Level of Service	

**RELEVANT LEGISLATION:**

**Provincial (cite)-** Alberta Land Stewardship Act, Municipal Government Act, Land Use Policies, Matters Related to Subdivision and Development Regulation

**Council Bylaw/Policy (cite)-** Strategic Plan, Bylaw 1829 Municipal Development Plan, Land Use Bylaw 1808

**BACKGROUND/PROPOSAL:**

Over the last year, Administration has facilitated a robust public engagement that would provide Council with ratepayer feedback specifically relating to the Municipal Development Plan. This draft document was prepared based on the feedback received from the working groups and presented to Council on September 10, 2024. Council requested that the draft be brought to the Committee of the Whole meeting for further discussion.

**DISCUSSION/OPTIONS/BENEFITS/DISADVANTAGES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:**

Some of the amendments to the existing Municipal Development Plan suggest a shift in philosophy and Administration needs to ensure that these changes reflect the views of Council as a group. Administration has provided a list of questions regarding these changes that will require Council feedback to move forward. Administration has also identified items that warrant further discussion.

1. Is Council satisfied that consideration will be given to the Land Suitability Ranking System (LSRS) when processing applications for non-agricultural use? (as opposed to the CLI ranking)
2. The working group chose to reduce the setback requirement for new confined feeding operations to 1-mile from an urban boundary or a hamlet. Is this Council consensus?
3. The working group chose to reduce the setback requirement for expansion of existing confined feeding operations to 1-mile from an urban boundary or a hamlet. Is this Council consensus?
4. Two working groups discussed options to reduce the impact to road infrastructure that is created by both industry and agriculture. Are there options Council would like to consider that should be included as a policy in the MDP? A policy in the MDP could be very general in nature with the details to be determined sometime in the future. This policy will impact other policies and departments within the municipality.
5. In the residential and hamlet working group there was a discussion regarding the potential to allow a carriage house as a second residence in a hamlet. There are several factors that would need to be considered if Council would like to pursue this as a policy option in the MDP. Details would become part of the Land Use Bylaw.
6. Regarding Country Residential developments and the surfacing of the access road. In the transportation working group there was discussion regarding the inconvenience to the operations



department when required to maintain a service road that does not have consistent surfacing with the road they come off. A policy was added that the access road surfacing must be consistent with the road they come off. Is this Council consensus? This policy will impact other policies and departments within the municipality.

7. In the economic development and growth management group there were discussions regarding the potential to run another water line off Aqua 7 specifically to service more commercial/ industrial uses. Does Council want to include policies that would suggest this?
8. Existing policy: "Any use not in keeping with the character and nature of the adjacent uses within a growth centre, shall not be permitted." This is very subjective and does not allow any flexibility or opportunity to address with conditions. Suggest removing or rewording to create more opportunities.
9. Existing policy: "New commercial and industrial parks will be encouraged to utilize alternative and renewable energy whenever possible." Is this still Council's opinion?
10. Included a policy that states the County may consider partnering with a developer to share in the costs of road upgrades and water service where the upgrades will potentially increase development opportunities for the area. Is this the consensus of Council?
11. Tax incentives may be considered where cost sharing has not been requested if developers are looking at LSRS lands classed 4-6. Is this the consensus of Council?
12. Review of the Growth Management map. Are there any changes Council would like to make?
13. Are there features of importance (relating to viewsapes) that should be noted and protected from development that could impact those viewsapes?

Administration is open to making any amendments Council wishes.

### FINANCIAL & STAFFING IMPLICATIONS:

The engagement has been facilitated by internal staff. Due to the time-consuming nature of the review and engagements, it has limited the ability to do a review of the Intermunicipal Development Plans. The total cost of the entire engagement process including the members-at-large was just shy of \$29,600. This includes catering, hall rentals, etc. This was taken out of Council's Strategic Initiatives budget line.

### ATTACHMENTS:

Bylaw 1905 Draft Municipal Development Plan

### RECOMMENDATION:

That the Committee of the Whole recommend to Administration to bring back the amended draft Municipal Development Plan to Council for first reading.

That the Committee of the Whole recommend to Administration to bring back the draft Municipal Development Plan to a future Committee of the Whole for further discussion.

### APPROVAL(S):

Mike Haugen, Chief Administrative Officer

Approved-

