

MINUTES

EAGLE VALLEY AREA STRUCTURE PLAN REVIEW MEETING

MOUNTAIN VIEW COUNTY

Meeting held on Friday, August 11, 2017  
in the Council Chambers, 1408 Twp Rd 320 Didsbury, AB

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

ABSENT:

IN ATTENDANCE: Matthew Pawlow, Manager, Planning Services  
Kylie Lashmar, Administrative Support, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER: Meeting commenced at 9:06 a.m.

2. AGENDA: 2.1 Adoption of Agenda

Moved by: R. Jorgensen  
That the Agenda of August 11, 2017 be adopted as presented.

Carried

3. ADOPTION OF MINUTES: 3.1 Adoption of Minutes

Moved by: D. Bach  
That the Minutes of May 18, 2017 be adopted as presented.

Carried

4. DELEGATIONS: Nil.

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES:

- Peggy had concerns with the motion relating to section 4.3.2 regarding pathways as there seemed to be no information within the May 18 minutes relating to this motion before it was made.
- Peggy also had concerns with the third and fourth bullet points on the second page of the May 18 minutes relating to developing within an ESA area, as these points could be interpreted as community members

and landowners having no input as administration would bring forward any required additional information on application reviews and Council could direct that updated reports be prepared.

- The chair suggested the best option to mitigate these concerns is to adopt the May 18 minutes as presented and reflect the concerns under a section within the present meeting minutes (August 11).
- Discussion regarding the concern of new recreational development and no new aggregate extraction as neither of these points of discussion were recorded in the May 18 minutes, as Peggy's motion does not make sense without these discussion points.
- Discussion between committee members regarding recreational development (i.e. pathways).
- Administration clarified that there are certain areas within the Eagle Valley area that already have existing Parks and Recreation land use zoning, therefore within the ASP, these areas cannot be limited to having no new recreational uses as they already have the land use zoning, and development permits can be applied for, if the Land Use Bylaw regulations are being met.
- Administration clarified the outcome of the discussion at the last steering committee meeting as Policy b) under section 4.3.2 (noted in next bullet point).
- Section 4.3.2 Policies b) Recreational uses that complement the agricultural history and character of the area, such as equestrian centers/facilities, are supported in appropriate locations in the plan area.
- Concern with Policy d) "Recreational development should have consideration for pathway systems that provide network linkages where appropriate", as this policy is open ended and it is unclear where the pathways and pedestrian connections would be located, as it had been previously mentioned to be placed on environmental reserve land, or public/provincial land, but not to be placed on private land.
- Discussion on the issues associated with trespassing, and that this may be mitigated if there were designated pathways for public use.
- Discussion on ensuring that it is clearly stated within the ASP document that pathways will not be developed on private land, as this is something that may not be supported by the public and is not supported by the steering committee.
- Administration clarified it was determined at the last meeting, that there would be no dictation one way or the other if pathways are going to be established, as development proposals should take into consideration some form of linkage to the rest of the community to avoid having an isolated parcel that does not have proper access and that there should be an overall scheme of connectivity.
- Administration clarified that there is no authority to impose pathways on private land.
- Discussion on aggregate extraction section 4.5.2 policy a) New applications for extraction or processing of natural resources, particularly sand and gravel deposits, are not supported within the plan area, while another policy (b) states that all future gravel extraction will require the appropriate approvals.

- Administration clarified that applicants will still be given the opportunity to apply for aggregate extraction processing however applicants will be made aware that within the ASP, aggregate extraction is not supported, however Council will be responsible for making the ultimate decision.
- Further discussion on 4.5.2 Policy b) to be had at a future meeting.

## 6. NEW BUSINESS

### 6.1 ESA Level 1 Aerial Maps

- Administration presented zoomed in mapping information, as requested from the last ASP meeting.
- Administration explained that the boundaries follow the tree line, sloping in towards the river which has been designated as the ESA Level 1 area.
- Administration clarified that tributaries flowing into the river are also captured within the ESA area.
- Discussion on establishing the west boundary of the ASP regarding the river, administration clarified that it can be amended to include the river and the ESA area, following the same boundary that Land Titles has making it the most current and legal information that the Province has.
- Discussion on differentiating private vs. public land when people are walking along the river, administration clarified that physically differentiating the two would be a challenge, unless the land has been surveyed and fenced or marked, however a detailed GPS system that has been linked to Land Titles would be the most precise way.
- Discussion on gathering information from the provincial website on high water marks and bringing the information back to a future meeting.
- Administration clarified that it is their intent and it would be best to follow legal surveyed areas from Land Titles when dealing with private and public land along the river.
- Discussion on water marks consistently changing and the best the committee and administration could do to address this, is utilize the most current information available and incorporate it within the ASP document.

### 6.2 Alberta's Strategy for the Management of Species at Risk

- Peggy handed out correspondence regarding this agenda item for discussion.
- Discussion on a recovery plan for endangered and threatened species being part of the ASP document.
- Administration clarified that during the development process, if proposed developments have these species located on the property, it is the applicant's responsibility to have an environmental plan outlining how the species can be protected, as well as part of the development referral process, the information provided by the applicant would be sent to the provincial government for review to indicate that it satisfies provincial criteria. Administration clarified that it is a provincial regulation (Wildlife Act).
- During a site-specific review, if species have been identified, it is the responsibility of the Province to inform the County.

- As a municipality, MVC must follow provincial acts (i.e. Wildlife Act).
- Discussion on including an appendix within the ASP document of these species, however it would be too difficult to maintain this list.
- Administration suggested a few options to mitigate concerns related to species at risk including, a list of species although not being able to provide a location for each species, or, a community identified map related to species at risk, to be considered when a development proposal comes forward.
- Administration clarified that any identified species within a proposed development area could instigate further reports or studies, and possibly even changes to proposed site plans dependent on the feedback from the province.
- This could be a discussion point at a future public open house.
- The committee requested that Administration work with the working group to come up with a list and mapping related to species at risk within the plan area.

### 6.3 Mountain View Region Parks, Recreation and Culture Master Plan

- Administration clarified that this document was developed by the Mountain View Region Municipalities (the Towns) as well as the County in 2009, however there is no record on the County website, as it is not an actively utilized document.
- Administration cautioned the committee to utilize this document for references as it has not been actively utilized nor has it been accepted by Council.

### 6.4 Draft ASP

- Peggy & Rosalie have made some proposed additions to the introduction of the ASP, with the intent being that this is a new document and some time will be needed to make any decisions related to these changes.
- Policy Content; Administration explained that this content reflects how this plan relates to the MGA, MDP and other studies and is similar throughout previous presentations.
- 2.2 Land Use Framework – end the paragraph with, “Once the regional plan has been adopted, this Plan will be reviewed to ensure compliance with the Red Deer Regional Plan”.
- 2.4 MDP – discussion on the second sentence in the first paragraph relating to concentrated development within a Growth Centre as Eagle Valley does not have a growth center, administration clarified that this is a general overview and the MDP governs Growth Centers and the policies that affect them.
- Administration clarified that a Plan would not be developed that is not consistent with the MDP, and that an ASP is more detailed than the MDP, meaning a geographic area has been defined and policies are being put into place.
- Figure 3 map discussion and a request by Peggy to have a clearer map inserted, administration clarified that this map is for location purposes only. Clarification was given that if a larger map and more information is needed, the MDP will provide that information as the ASP provides a

very small overview of the MDP. This map has been taken directly out of the MDP for location purposes only.

- 2.6 to be reviewed at next meeting with more information brought forward by the working group and Administration.
- **Break @ 10:30 a.m. Reconvened @ 10:45 a.m.**
- Administration presented the updated draft land use policy area map, this map was created with information directly from the Province, and now follows the parcel boundary, and not the ESA boundary.
- Following the low density area, is the conditional low density area, and the furthest west is the Red Deer River corridor area.
- Discussion on the separation of the different land uses and what determined the boundaries of the land uses. Administration clarified that the land uses were separated according to the 1-100+ year flood level.
- Discussion on the difference between the low density and the conditional low density areas, administration clarified that within the conditional low density area there may be requirements for additional studies, reports, conditions etc. during the application stage (subdivision or development).
- Administration clarified that the requirements for reports, studies or conditions are based on provincial data or information from other County departments or sources, giving administration more support to request these requirements of the applicant.
- 4.1.2 Policy i) CFO discussion, administration clarified that the NRCB has the final say for CFOs, however this ASP does not support CFOs.
- Edit to Policy k) "Business related to agriculture and large scale agricultural operations not requiring Confined Feeding Operations approval may be allowed in the Low Density Area. The approving authority will consider traffic, noise, and impacts on adjacent properties".
- Further discussion to be had regarding Policy l) in regard to consultation at the next meeting.
- 4.2.2 Policy e), discussion on replacing "may" with "should", however not knowing what additional studies there are that may be needed. Administration clarified that using "may" indicates that there may be a requirement and at the appropriate time it can be determined what the requirement is. This policy to be discussed at the next meeting.
- Policy f), clarification asked on the 100m riparian buffer setback, and the definition of watercourses, administration to bring back more clarification to next meeting.
- 4.4.1 Recreational Development Purpose: also include "negatively impact agricultural operations".
- Administration clarified that there are existing parcels of land zoned Recreational District within the plan area, applicants can submit subdivision or development permit applications, as they already have the appropriate land use zoning. At the last meeting, it was determined that bare land condominium subdivisions for seasonal RV sites were not favored by the steering committee. Areas zoned for recreational use cannot be subdivided into bare land condominium sites.

- Further discussion on pathways, administration clarified that potential reserves along the river could potentially focus people away from trespassing on private property if there are defined pathways through designated recreational areas to access the river.
- Suggestion from the EVWG to the committee and administration for possible consideration of the Castle Mountain Master Plan for references related to mitigation of trespassing issues and ATV use issues.
- Discussion on removing any references to pathways within the ASP document, and trespassing issues will have to be solved through other options. Administration clarified that Council makes the ultimate decision on the ASP content, and should council wish to discuss pathway content, administration as well as the steering committee can address trespassing concerns to Council.
- Deletion of policy f) viii. under Recreational Development, as the Mountain View Region Parks, Recreation and Culture Master Plan is not a document that is in use nor has it been accepted by Council.
- 4.5 Natural Resource Extraction section to be discussed later after further public input.
- 5. Environment section, re-discuss later, after more information is brought forward by administration and the EVWG regarding Species at Risk.
- Administration clarified that there are no Growth Centers within the Eagle Valley and that the cluster residential development of 3 lots around paved roads within the Eagle Valley area was a previous practice by different administration and Council that has been moved away from and there is no longer a policy referenced to this type of development.
- Administration clarified that there is no intent of these cluster developments happening within the Eagle Valley area and that in the past they were created with the intent of having municipal services provided in conjunction with the paved roads.
- Wastewater section 6, discussion on 6.2.2 Policy a), administration clarified that the fire suppression would be intended for non-residential developments (i.e. recreational development) rather than residential development.
- Discussion on communal water system and the uses this would sustain (i.e. potential RV lease sites without separate titles), administration clarified that there cannot be an elimination of the ability for applicants to apply for a prescribed use within the Land Use Bylaw.
- Discussion on the consolidation of Policies b) & d), as both policies are describing the same ideas. Administration made this change.
- Administration clarified that if a drilled well is deemed non-sufficient for usage, the applicant's development permit would not be supported for approval.

#### **6.5 Possible Open House Dates**

- **Next agenda**

6.6 Open House Materials

- Next agenda

6.7 Next Meeting

- September 22<sup>th</sup> @ 9 a.m.

Moved by: D. Bach  
Adjourn meeting at 12:00 pm

Carried

Signed: Sept 22, 2017

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

I hereby certify these Minutes are correct.

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