

Subject: **Bylaw 1905 Draft Municipal Development Plan**
 Meeting Date: Tuesday, August 20, 2024
 Prepared By: Barb Hazelton, Manager of Planning & Development
 Presented By: Barb Hazelton

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

BACKGROUND/PROPOSAL:

The Municipal Development Plan is a long-term document that should reflect the values and priorities of the residents within the municipality it serves. A review of this document is an opportunity to review the current reality and identify emerging trends with a 20–30-year projected forecast. In February of 2023, Administration recommended to Council that a full review of the current Municipal Development Plan (MDP) take place. Administration also presented several public engagement options to Council.

Council approved a working group style where a maximum of 3 Councillors and 2 members at large would meet to discuss the 6 largest sections of the MDP. Administration would then take the working group information to the public engagement working suppers for additional feedback. This draft is the result of 18 working group sessions, and 4 separate public engagements held over a period of 11 months.

DISCUSSION/OPTIONS/BENEFITS/DISADVANTAGES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

The Municipal Development Plan was broken up into six major sections for review.

- Agriculture
- Residential & Hamlets
- Environment and Recreation
- Natural Resources & Renewable Energy
- Transportation & Utilities
- Economic Development & Growth Management

On June 18, 2024, Council was provided a binder of information noting all the feedback received from each working group as well as the feedback gathered at the public engagements for review prior to releasing the draft document. The results of the public engagement were also posted on the website.

The draft document has been done based on the input from the working groups and the changes and additions are highlighted to make it easier to review.



Administration will highlight the more significant changes and will also identify items that warrant further discussion. As we go through the presentation, the following questions will need to be answered:

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?

Each working group received drafts of their sections of the MDP and were given an opportunity to provide comments back to administration prior to it becoming part of the larger draft. Administration did receive comments from several members-at-large. As this is the first time Council has seen the entire draft, Administration will highlight the major changes in the document to ensure changes made by each working group has the consensus of all of Council. We are open to making any amendments Council's wishes. We will go through our presentation which highlights the major changes/amendments of each section.

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.



RECOMMENDED ENGAGEMENT:

Directive Decision (Information Sharing, One-Way Communication)

Tools:

Public Hearing

Other:

ATTACHMENTS:

Draft Bylaw 1905 Municipal Development Plan

COUNCIL OPTIONS:

1. That Council move first reading of proposed Bylaw 1905 as presented.
2. That Council move first reading of proposed Bylaw 1905 as amended.
3. That Council move to bring the proposed Bylaw 1905 to a Committee of the Whole for additional discussion.
4. That Council move to schedule the public hearing for October 22, 2024, at 10:00 a.m.
5. That Council move to schedule an alternate date and time for the public hearing.

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

That Council move first reading of proposed Bylaw 1905 Municipal Development Plan as presented.

FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS:

Administration will ensure that all our urban and rural municipal neighbours will receive a copy for review. It will also be posted on the website and copies will be available in the office for residents.

APPROVAL(S):

Mike Haugen, Chief Administrative Officer

Approved-

