MINUTES
EAGLE VALLEY AREA STRUCTURE PLAN REVIEW MEETING
Mountain View County

Minutes of the Eagle Valley Area Structure Plan Review Meeting held on Thursday, November 3, 2016, in the Council Chamber, 1408 Twp Rd. 320, Didsbury, AB

PRESENT:	Jim Smith David Bach Peggy Johnson Rosalie Jorgensen Councillor K. Heck Councillor P. McKean
ABSENT:	Councillor A. Aalbers
IN ATTENDANCE:	Matthew Pawlow, Manager, Planning Services Geneva Chaudhary, Planner Dolu Gonzalez, Planner Lee-Ann Gaudette, Administrative Assistant, Recording Secretary
CALL TO ORDER:	Meeting commenced at 12:42 p.m.

AGENDA

Agenda was adopted as amended to add:
Under New Business – Possibility to meet with the Advisory Group sometime in early December.

Moved by: D. Bach
That the Agenda be accepted as amended.

Carried

ADDITIONS:

7.6 Meet with Advisory Group in early December

INTRODUCTION:

Dolu Gonzalez, Planner will be attending the meetings to provide some technical assistance with the Steering Committee. It is good to have two Planners to assist in the process.

MINUTES

Amendments to the Minutes:
- Remove the wording, "We can start here and then add and remove information as needed" and insert, "We can start with the original Eagle Valley Area Structure Plan (ASP) and then add and remove information from there"
- Remove the wording "Eagle Valley has shrunk and not grown.... Re-word to say, "Development Permit applications in the Bergen & Bearberry ASP areas have increased where the Development Permit applications in the Eagle Valley ASP area have decreased".

Moved by: P. McKean
That the Minutes of October 4, 2016 be approved as amended.

Carried

BUSINESS ARISING
OUT OF PREVIOUS
MINUTES

4.1 Redesignation, Subdivision and Development Statistics 2011-2016

- Administration reviewed the Subdivision and Development Statistics Handout for 2011-2016; there were three (3) approved Redesignation and Subdivision files; ten (10) approved Development Permits; and seven (7) approved Building Permits. Compared to the rest of the County this is not very many applications.
- Reviewed current land use zoning that is within the ASP area; 98% is Agricultural District; 0.2% Country Residential District; 1.5% Parks & Conservation District; 0.1% Institutional Educational District.
- Administration also noted that 17% is Environmental Significant Areas; with 2% of that being Moderately Environmental Significant Areas.
- Comment made that the Summit Report did not include the Eagle Creek in the Report. Should the absence of the Eagle Creek in the Report be noted and updated?
- Administration answered that if it is appropriate to include this information in the ASP then we can certainly note that. Updating the Summit Report would be something that Council would have to take into consideration.
- Question on what changes are anticipated in the Municipal Government Act (MGA) Review and how they are going to impact this ASP process.
- Administration responded that it is unlikely the MGA amendments will have an impact on the ASP process. If anything is going to change, then it will be County wide and will affect every ASP. MGA amendments will probably be more at the Municipal Development Plan (MDP) level than the ASP level. If anything changes, will make sure all of our ASPs conform to the changes of the MDP, if any. MGA amendments may change the Provincial flood regulations or with our relations and collaborations with the municipalities that surround us (urban/rural) and the planning that overlaps the two.
- In the Bearberry & Bergen ASPs there is a perception and an assumption of growth, what factors are driving the perception of growth?
- Administration responded that this is based on the MDP guidelines and what can and cannot be developed;
- Administration advised that if there is anything that the Steering Committee members want added to the Agenda either before the Agenda is sent out or after, Steering Committee Members can let us know and it can be added.

ACTION ITEM: Requested a map of which parcels are County owned, Provincially owned or privately owned

4.2 Review of Land Use Districts

- Administration reviewed the different Land Use Districts that are listed in the Land Use Bylaw.
- Current Land Use Districts in the Eagle Valley area are limited to Agricultural, Country Residential, some Parks and Recreation and Parks & Conservation Districts. Members may want to think about what Districts would be suitable within the ASP area as we go through the process.
- Administration advised the Committee to review their Land Use Bylaw to see what uses are exempt, permitted or discretionary on agricultural

lands. Some uses in an Agricultural District are exempt if they are being used for agricultural purposes.

ACTION ITEM: Within the next Agenda, add a list of each district that affects the land uses in the Eagle Valley Area.

4.3 Review existing Eagle Valley ASP – verbal
- Administration suggested going through the existing ASP section by section and either use the existing information or remove items that are no longer relevant.
- Suggested that we work on the Vision Statement and go from there.

DELEGATIONS: Nil.

OLD BUSINESS: Nil.

NEW BUSINESS:

7.1 Eagle Valley ASP Vision Statement:
- Administration explained the "Creating a Vision Statement" handout that was provided to the Steering Committee.
- Vision Statement helps to guide and formulate long term planning goals and objectives for the area.
- Discussion took place among Steering Committee Members to start creating a Vision Statement for the Eagle Valley Area. The Committee came up with four potential Vision Statements as follows:

1) To have diversified, moderate and sustainable growth in all areas of development while maintaining a rich agricultural presence and history, while respecting Environmentally Significant Areas.

2) The Eagle Valley community understands that in order to thrive, it is important to have diversified, moderate and sustainable growth in all areas of development. We believe in the balance of the needs of population growth while maintaining a rich agricultural history. We believe in maintaining the area with minimal impact to Environmentally Significant Areas while looking at opportunities where appropriate, based on such items as soils, grades and topography. Development and farming should respect minimally invasive procedures and apply modern practices.

3) To protect and sustain the rural quality of life, the historically and Environmentally Significant Areas and the agricultural land within the Eagle Valley Area Structure Plan boundaries and that agriculture will remain the primary land use.

4) Eagle Valley is a community that fosters agriculture while allowing growth which compliments a rural lifestyle, protects Environmentally Significant Areas and maintains our historical values.

- The Steering Committee Members were unable to come to a consensus and were provided printed copies of the four possible vision statements noted above to then review and finalize at the next meeting.

Review of Current Objectives:
- The Steering Committee Members' discussion moved to reviewing the Objectives that are noted in the existing ASP. The Objectives were amended to the following:

November 3, 2016

a) To ensure that agriculture remains as the dominant land use in the Plan area and that alternative land uses may be considered if they are compatible and supportive of the agricultural community;

- Discussed the level of farming that currently exists in the area

b) To ensure that environmentally sensitive areas are adequately protected from the negative impacts of new development;

- Discussed adding 'historically significant areas' and it was decided to add another objective below to address 200 years of documentation about the community to ensure these areas are protected and recognized.

c) To ensure that historically significant areas are considered and protected from the negative impacts of new development;

- Discussed what 'historically significant areas' might be and how they could be integrated into an ASP.
- The Eagle Valley Community Association Working Group has identified a number of areas that could be identified as historical
- The County currently has mapping of 'historical resources' from the Province of Alberta and it includes archeological/paleontological & historical sites. There do not appear to be any Provincial recognized historical resources in the Eagle Valley area. The Water Features and Historical Resources map under the "Maps tab" in binders show historical resources.
- 'Historically significant areas' can be documented and included if they are not part of the existing literature.

d) To ensure that future development is adequately protected from natural or man made hazards;

- Discussion on how Planning currently ensures development is not built on a slope or flood plain for example.

e) To ensure that new development take place in a manner which minimizes impacts on the area's transportation network;

- Discussion of current road system and how increased development can put more pressure on road systems.

f) To ensure that the area's road system is developed in a safe and efficient manner;

- Discussed possibly merging objectives e) and f)
- Asking if there is a need to improve the existing road systems or create new roads.
- Administration responded that if a road needs improvement, Operational Services can review that. If the Steering Committee thinks a new road or road network should be developed as part of this ASP, Planning Services can provide further information on that.
- Discussion of two (2) speed corner areas, some of the neighbours don't feel it is safe but the County feels it is safe, so there has been an impasse and no changes made.

g) To maintain a rural lifestyle and ensure that higher capability agricultural land is protected for agriculture.

- Discussion of what the County considers "less productive" land to mean versus what farmers and ranchers might consider "less productive". Restricting development to "less

November 3, 2016

productive" land may be too subjective and Steering Committee might want to consider some kind of percentage of productivity.

h) Any future developments be suitable to the soil type/productivity of the lands.

- Added this point regarding future developments being suitable to the type of soil and if subdivision should be allowed in areas considered to have poor soil. Potential for development and focus on non-predominant Agricultural lands.

General Discussion of Objectives:
- Discussed the potential of presenting these objectives to the public at an Open House. When we come back after an Open House then that would be a good time to revisit this and get to a point to finalize these. We could say: here is where our ideas are that are not set in stone and we're looking for your input. If too restrictive in objectives and goals it takes a bit of discretion out of what Council has to consider as part of applications coming in. There should be some discretion left for Council to consider.
- Administration noted that an Open House Meeting would be scheduled for 2 hours.
- Early on or halfway through the meeting there would be a formal presentation to give an overall presentation of what we are doing and present the Vision Statement, provide justification as to why we are presenting these objectives and goals.
- Through this the boards will be on display with our Administration present to communicate with the public and answering any questions they may have.
- Public provides good feedback through these Open Houses and through surveys that are handed out.
- We will have at least one more, maybe two Steering Committee meetings prior to an Open House.

7.2 SWOT Analysis:
- Discussion of SWOT analysis approach versus a critical thinking model approach.
- A $65,000 figure was brought up as the cost of reviewing the Eagle Valley ASP.
- Administration clarified that the actual budget for this ASP is $10,000.

Moved by: P. Johnson
Use the Critical Thinking Model in conjunction with the SWOT analysis.

Carried

- Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats boards were written on with each Steering Committee member giving their thoughts under each of these categories.

Strengths: good roads; Red Deer River in the area; strong family histories not a transient area; strong community, a lot of involvement in the community; community residents know and support each other; community residents value rural quality of life; community of independent and innovative problem solvers; rich documented history; very good place to raise a family, strong family ties & values; good place to do business in the

November 3, 2016

farming community, not as many acreages to deal with people with dogs & people unhappy with performing agricultural operations, easier to farm in community; very scenic area, clean air, clean water

Weaknesses: few services in the area; no school, no stores, gas lines all over the place; area hasn't grown; it is critical just to maintain what is in the area; NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard), has to be a way to look at how to make things grow together instead of no development at all; difficulty of enforcement, right at the corner of Red Deer County, Clearwater County and MVC and left out there to our own devices if we need any kind of enforcement

Opportunities; big river in the area, could have public walkways & roadways along the river to have better access to the river for fishing etc.; underutilized land based, not being used for anything, lots of development opportunities, housing, acreages etc.; Economic & Tourism Study in the area, diversify RV parks in the area; opportunity to define and evaluate the rural quality of life;

Threats: shrinking population, don't build don't grown then costs/taxes will go up; big disconnect between the way the public sees agriculture and the way agriculture people see agriculture, the whole idea of land not being used is a perception problem; people without a vested interest in the community still want to enjoy the benefits of the natural landscape the community has to offer although nothing invested in it; exploiting current development opportunities for profit trumps responsible stewardship for future development

General discussion:
- Discussion of the picturesque community and if tourism should be promoted in the area or kept to be enjoyed by inhabitants, their friends and family;
- Administration suggested that the Steering Committee keep in mind for the Open Houses how you would like to promote this area whether it is family based or public recreation based because that distinction will affect applications for campgrounds or other tourist type of attractions.

7.3 Review of Current ASP Boundaries:
- bring up boundary adjustment at Open House to see what the public would like to see.

7.4 Possible Open House Dates – for discussion
- Eagle Valley Community Association Advisory group would like to get together with the Steering Committee to present information they have gathered and share in meeting before December 15, 2016.

7.5 Next meeting discussions:
- Dec. 9, 2016 1:00-4:00p next meeting

7.6 Advisory Group from Eagle Valley Community Association:
- The group would like to get together with SC to present info they have gathered and share.
- Outside groups usually would appear at a future Steering Committee meeting as a delegation on the Agenda.
- Can add the Advisory Group to item 5 on our Agenda, as a delegation and they can do a presentation

CORRESPONDENCE: Nil.

CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS: Nil.

ADJOURNMENT: **Moved by: D. Bach**
Motion to adjourn the meeting at 4:14 pm

Carried

Signed: _December 9_, 2016

_____
Chair

I hereby certify these minutes are correct.

_____
Manager, Planning Services

November 3, 2016