

MINUTES

EAGLE VALLEY AREA STRUCTURE PLAN REVIEW MEETING  
MOUNTAIN VIEW COUNTY

Meeting held on Thursday, April 27, 2017  
in the Council Chambers, 1408 Twp Rd 320 Didsbury, AB

PRESENT: Jim Smith, Chair  
David Bach, Vice Chair  
Peggy Johnson  
Rosalie Jorgensen  
Councillor A. Aalbers  
Councillor K. Heck  
Councillor P. McKean

ABSENT: Nil

IN ATTENDANCE: Matthew Pawlow, Manager, Planning Services  
Geneva Chaudhary, Planner  
Lee-Ann Gaudette, Administrative Assistant, Recording Secretary

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

2. AGENDA: 2.1 *Adoption of Agenda*

Moved by: K. Heck  
That the Agenda of April 27, 2017 be adopted as presented.

Carried

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES: 3.1 *Adoption of Minutes*

Moved by: A. Aalbers  
That the Minutes of March 30, 2017 be adopted as amended.

Carried

4. DELEGATIONS: Nil

5. OLD BUSINESS: 5.1 *Potential ASP Boundary Adjustment Information*

- Administration reviewed the potential boundary adjustments within the ASP area.
- Land Use considerations were reviewed when taking into account potential boundary adjustments.
- MDP Potential Multi-Lot residential development area was reviewed.
- Discussion took place about the road system being used as a potential boundary.
- Mapping was presented to show access for potential adjustments.

- Leave boundaries as is Option 1; Option 2: include areas west of Eagle Creek and majority of multi-lot development areas, would result in cutting parcels in half based where creek lies.
- Option 2b: Like Option 2 with Eagle Creek as the basis for the boundary but include the entire associated quarter sections.
- Discussed including 2 more parcels to the east that are within the potential multi-lot development area.
- Discussion took place as to what to do with the boundaries and what options to take to another Open House; Option 1 and 2b were favored.
- When taking these options back to an Open House, Committee needs to define the main reason for defining the boundaries is to incorporate Eagle Creek as per the Open House discussion.

Moved by: A. Aalbers

To take Option 1, which is no change to the boundaries, and Option 2b, without those two (2) quarters, to the next Open House for discussion.

Carried

## 5.2 *Land Use Area Policy Options*

- Administration explained that the Land Use Policy Areas are for the Committee's consideration. Administration takes the information provided from the Committee as to what they want to see in the ASP and then brings forward that suggested Policy for the Committee to consider. These Policies are suggestions and if the Committee wants to make changes or suggest other areas that need to be added then the Committee can indicate that.
- Mapping suggestions were presented for Land Use Policy Area Options outlining the three (3) following areas: Red Deer River Corridor Area; "Conditional" Low Density Area and Low Density Area. Additional restrictions may be put in place for development depending on which of these areas they developed in.
- Land Use Policy Area terms were reviewed and discussed as to how they are used throughout the ASP when preparing the Plan.
- Discussion took place as to whether the Plan needs a "goals" section in each policy section. Goals have already been discussed and the Committee would like to use those main goals already discussed at the Open House as the overall goals instead of an individual goal for each policy.
- Administration reviewed Section 5 Land Use Policy Areas of the current ASP and the following amendments were recommended by the Committee:

5.1.2 remove goals section under each policy.

5.1.3 j) discussion took place on removing this paragraph but also making it clear somewhere in the document that fragmented parcels would not be supported as a form of subdivision or only in the instance where it is the first parcel out of the quarter and can provide possible means.....we need clarity as to whether Committee supports fragmented parcels or do you not support a first parcel out plus a fragmented parcel.

**Action Item:** Administration was requested to bring back some examples in this area of the fragmented parcels so committee can see what they are going to look like. It might change the way the policy is identified.

5.1.3 k) looking for feedback on how to deal with Confined Feeding Operations.

**Action Item:** Request was made to have Administration bring back some information on Confined Feeding Operation to next meeting....A. Aalbers will send info to G. Chaudhary to circulate to members

5.1.3 l) Commercial or industrial land uses.....take out the word "should" and replace with "shall" not be permitted in the Low Density Areas. Remove rest of paragraph.

5.1.3 m) remove Notwithstanding section 5.1.3. l).....start at Industries related....

**Action Item:** Administration was asked to bring back 5.1.3 n) to re-word this clause and provide two options. One option for new recreational uses not being permitted and one option for existing uses to continue to be permitted.

- Need to go to public with a couple different options and see what they want to see in the Plan with respect to policy 5.1.3 n) and ultimately, it will be Council's decision as to what is possible and what is not for the final ASP.
- Comments were made to amend 5.1.3 n) to not allow any new recreational uses.

**Action Item:** Request that Administration brings back some additional wording for 5.2.1 purpose to add to protect wildlife, fauna and flora.

5.2.2 remove goals section.

Recessed at 3:18  
Reconvene at 3:26

5.2.3 o) keep first sentence only and remove the rest of the paragraph.

5.2.3 p) remove notwithstanding section 5.2.3 n) and end paragraph after....Low Density Area. Remove remainder of paragraph.

5.2.3 q) change "should" to "may" and remove New or, start sentence at Expanding.... end sentence at landowners. Remove remaining paragraph. Add.... New recreational uses shall not be permitted.

Paragraph 5.2.3 q) to be brought back for future consideration.

5.2.3 r) remove paragraph.

Discussion as to not having any development at all due to the ESA areas and taking into account the Summit Report. Anything that is built and existing you cannot change. Wording for flexibility around existing dwellings, such as adding a deck etc.

**Action Item:** Bring back info on no more development and what can be done with existing homes already there vs new development in the area.

5.3.2 remove goals.

Discussion took place on having no development in the Red Deer Corridor Area.

*Ran short on time so following items tabled until next meeting:*

5.2 Land Use Area Policy Options Section 5.3 Red Deer River Corridor

5.3 Updated February 27 Open House Survey Information

**6. NEW BUSINESS**

6.1 Table of Contents/Draft ASP

6.2 Environmentally Significant vs. Sensitive Areas

6.3 Prioritizing Goals – Peggy Johnson

6.4 Next meeting: Thursday, May 18, 2017 at 1:30 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Moved by: D. Bach

That the Eagle Valley ASP meeting be adjourned at: 4:00 pm.


Carried

Signed: May 18, 2017

Chair



I hereby certify these Minutes are correct.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Manager, Planning Services