

MINUTES

EAGLE VALLEY AREA STRUCTURE PLAN REVIEW MEETING

MOUNTAIN VIEW COUNTY

Meeting held on Monday, March 13, 2017  
in the Council Chambers, 1408 Twp Rd 320 Didsbury, AB

PRESENT: Jim Smith  
David Bach  
Peggy Johnson  
Rosalie Jorgensen  
Councillor A. Aalbers  
Councillor P. McKean

ABSENT: Councillor K. Heck  
Lee-Ann Gaudette, Administrative Assistant  
Dolu Gonzalez, Planner

IN ATTENDANCE: Matthew Pawlow, Manager, Planning Services  
Geneva Chaudhary, Planner  
Kylie Lashmar, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER: Meeting commenced at 1:35 p.m.

2. AGENDA: 2.1 Adoption of Agenda

Moved by: D. Bach  
That the Agenda of March 13, 2017 be adopted as presented.

Carried

3. ADOPTION OF  
MINUTES: 3.1 Adoption of Minutes

Moved by: A. Aalbers  
That the Minutes of January 16, 2017 be adopted as amended.

Carried

4. BUSINESS  
ARISING: 4.1 Nil.

5. DELEGATIONS: 5.1 Nil

6. OLD BUSINESS: 6.1 Nil.

7. NEW BUSINESS

### 7.1 The Big Picture

- P. Johnson presented a handout to each of the committee members and administration to show how large amounts of information and ideas could be structured starting with types of development the land and resources could support, ensuring new development meets policies, knowing what type of development already exists and what types of new development would be compatible followed by what types of development the community supports, with the ASP being the target at the end.
- Discussion had on regulatory process and how the petroleum industry fits in, administration explained that it is the landowner's responsibility to be aware of existing pipelines/wells, while Mountain View County can assist landowners as well as pipeline/well companies when a subdivision or development application is submitted. Administration explained that setbacks could be added into the ASP document, but any other concerns/information needs to be handled by the AER.
- A brief discussion was had on tax revenue and the loss due to the petroleum industry and the downturn of the economy.
- Peggy also presented a motion:  
The Eagle Valley Working Group and Mountain View Planning Department recognize that a co-operative effort can lead to the successful development of the Eagle Valley ASP. This can be accomplished by the Working Group contributing information on the quality of life and environmental planning components and the Planning Department contributing the Policy and regulatory planning process. Through this joint effort, community and resident input will form the foundation for the ASP. Both the Eagle Valley Working Group and the Planning Department see this as a model for ongoing collaboration.
- After a discussion on the responsibility of administration to present information submitted by either the working group or any members of the general public to the steering committee the motion was withdrawn.
- Invite the Eagle Valley Working Group (EVWG) to present at the next meeting.
- Frank from the EVWG explained that the working group has geological information, water well information, groundwater movement information, soil erosion information, land degradation information, geology deposit information (related to aggregate), and oil and gas information within the Eagle Valley areas. The working group also can provide information on forest and plant ecology and heritage resources.

### 7.2 Review of Feedback from February 27<sup>th</sup> Open House

- Administration reviewed the attendance of the Open House which was 47 people from the public, receiving 40 surveys.
- There were 26 surveys received from inside the ASP boundary area and 14 from outside the area.
- Administration reviewed each survey question one at a time with the steering committee:

- First question asked was “why do you live in the Eagle Valley area?” Some responses were: quiet, peaceful, rural lifestyle, agricultural community, low population density, minimal traffic, wildlife and recreation.
- Next question asked was “where do you work?” Some responses were 55% work from home or in the area, with 33% being retired or not working.
- Next question asked was “which vision statement do you prefer?”  
**Option #1: To have diversified, moderate and sustainable growth while maintaining a rich agricultural presence and history, while also respecting Environmentally Significant Areas.** Only 26% favored this option.  
**Option #2: To protect and sustain the rural quality of life, the historical community sites, Environmentally Significant Areas and the agricultural land within the Eagle Valley Area Structure Plan boundaries. Agriculture will remain as the primary land use.** 74% favored this option.
- The next question referred to ASP goals from 1997, and the majority of the public favored “**To ensure that environmentally sensitive areas are adequately protected from the negative impacts of new development**” followed by “**To ensure that agriculture remains as the dominant land use in the Plan area**” and “**To ensure that higher capability agricultural land is protected for agriculture**”.
- The revised working draft goals for 2017 that were favored by the public were “**To ensure that existing ground water resources are protected from any negative impacts**” followed by “**To ensure that environmentally sensitive areas are adequately protected from the negative impacts of new development**” and “**To ensure that historical community sites are considered and protected from the negative impacts of new development**”.
- The next survey question was related to types of development that the public sees as suitable for the area including; riding arenas, greenhouse/nursery, bed and breakfast, daycare services and animal clinics. The public deemed the following types of development as NOT suitable for the area; group home, wind energy systems, recreational resorts/campgrounds and mineral/aggregate extraction and processing.
- The public favored a first parcel out option when asked about subdivisions per quarter section.

Recess: 2:45 p.m.

Reconvene: 3:00 p.m.

- The next survey question was regarding the boundaries of the ASP area and the most favored option was to include the Eagle Creek and ESAs to the east, followed by keeping the boundaries the same.
- Administration is going to compile all of the written responses as well as all the workshop data to present to the steering committee for use during policy creation.

### 7.3 Next Steps

- Steering committee to further discuss open house results and draft policies needed to address the results brought forward by administration.
- Discussion on the vision statement and how the public input should influence the decision of the committee. More information requested on historical sites and their protection, the EVWG could be approached to expand on this if needed. Administration clarified that after a Vision Statement is chosen; the goals accompanying the statement should clarify the meaning of the Vision Statement.

**Moved by P. McKean**

**To accept Vision Statement Option #2 (To protect and sustain the rural quality of life, the historical community sites, Environmentally Significant Areas and the agricultural land within the Eagle Valley Area Structure Plan boundaries. Agriculture will remain as the primary land use) as presented.**

**Carried**

- Discussion had on using the input from the public to develop draft goals.
- Clarification was asked if the goals rated by the public could be placed in a priority list, administration clarified that they would not be placed in such a list, as it would be difficult to amend the list in later years.

**Moved by P. Johnson**

**To accept the 2017 draft goals prepared for the open house identified by the public as very important or important as presented.**

**Carried**

- Discussion on creating policy related to subdivisions per quarter section. The majority of public at open house voted 1 parcel out (2 titles) per quarter section.

**Moved by: A. Aalbers**

**Administration to create a draft policy allowing for one (1) Subdivision per quarter section within the ASP area.**

**Carried**

- Further discussion had on how having a one residential parcel and an agricultural parcel could protect agricultural land, protect the agricultural wants and needs of the community, while providing an opportunity for families to subdivide for future. Administration suggested having parcel sizes written into the policy should the committee want to decide upon parcel sizes.
- Discussion had related to adjusting the boundary of the ASP area, and not including multi lot (high density residential) or aggregate potential areas within the boundary area.

Moved by: A. Aalbers

Regarding boundary adjustments administration to further investigate the existing land uses within the expanded area and report back the steering committee and for Administration to collaborate with the working group on how technical information can be utilized if boundaries were to be adjusted.

Carried

7.4 Next Meeting

- March 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017 1:30 p.m. - 4 p.m.

Moved by: D. Bach

Adjourn meeting at 3:54 pm

Carried

Signed: Mar 30, 2017

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Chair

I hereby certify these Minutes are correct.

  
\_\_\_\_\_

Manager, Planning Services