

Mountain View County
MDP/LUB Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, April 29, 2026 @ 8:30 AM
Council Chambers, 10 - 1408 Twp. Rd. 320, Didsbury, AB

PRESENT: Angela Aalbers - Reeve
Dwayne Fulton - Deputy Reeve
Greg Harris - Councillor
Angela Look - Councillor
Tiffany Nixon - Councillor
Peggy Johnson - Councillor
Jennifer Lutz - Councillor

ADMINISTRATION: Jeff Holmes - Chief Administrative Officer
Christofer Atchison - Director of Legislative Community & Agricultural Services
Margaretha Bloem - Director of Planning & Development Services
Ryan Morrison - Director of Operational Services
Jessica Ross - Assistant Director of Planning & Development Services
Peggy Grochmal - Development & Permitting Officer III
Becky Hutchings - Development Officer
Jaydan Reimer - Development Officer
Dolu Gonzalez - Planner II
Reanne Pohl - Planner I
Mariah Schnell - Planner I
Lynn Craven - Administrative Assistant
Denise Rice - Administrative Support

1. AGENDA

The Meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m.

By consensus, Reeve Aalbers was appointed the Chair.

Adoption of Agenda

MDP/LUBSC26-001

Councillor Nixon made a motion That the Steering Committee adopt the agenda as presented. **Carried.**

1.1 Introduction to the Municipal Development Plan & Land Use Bylaw Review

- Steering Committee members can make suggestions for topics.
- **Consensus** based approach is appropriate, not every topic requires a motion as long as the Steering Committee provides clear direction to Administration.
- There will be opportunity for the Steering Committee to engage the public on options for specific topics and feedback on all the proposed changes.
- Reeve will chair the Steering Committee meetings.

1.2 Floodway and Flood Fringe: MDP Policies and Land Use Bylaw Regulations

- Administration presented a timeline of historic flooding in the County.
- The Upper Red Deer River Flood Study was completed in September 2024.
- Three new study proposed - Little Red River (Westward Ho) and updated Rosebud River (Didsbury), and Channel Mitigation Pilot project in Sundre.

- HARP, Hazard Assistance and Resilience Program replaced the Disaster Recovery Program (DRP). Eligible funding for uninsurable losses is subject to rebuild to the 1:200 y flood (previously 1:100 y flood).
- **Consensus** to include HARP information, and comparison with DRP (if available from the province) so residents are informed on the provincial program changes.
- Administration presented the map of the Rosebud Creek and Westward Ho. The map in this Agenda is public information and can be shared with the Westward Ho Community.
- New studies include two new Fringe areas -High hazard Fringe and Protected Fringe.
- Administration shared the analysis of parcels completely within and parcels partly within the floodway of the Upper Red Deer River Flood Study. Noted that the mapping in the Garrington Bridge area will be updated to take into account flood protection berms and may change the floodway affecting an existing residential subdivision with no developed lots.
- Administration shared the proposed MDP policies that the previous Council considered in Section 6, and removing flood related policies in other sections of the MDP.
- The Steering Committee discussed the MDP policies:
- Reasons for 2 acres developable area size for residential compared to 1 acre to ensure sufficient area outside of the floodway;
- Reasons for a policy to restrict no aggregate extraction in the Floodway as a result of direction from previous Council for County pits, resident feedback and environmental concerns for equipment resulting in environmental hazard and environmentally sensitive areas in the Floodway;
- Qualified professionals are to prepare supporting maps as the use of GPS to determine site levels are not accurate;
- How new policies apply to existing parcels with concerns that existing parcels may not be able to develop, not enough information on parcels partially within the Floodway.
- **Consensus** that the public engagement should include interactive flood mapping so landowners can view / understand the proposed impacts on future zoning, subdivision or development and provide feedback.
- Administration shared the proposed Land Use Bylaw changes considered by the previous Council and due to liability issues, not to allow development in the Floodway to develop to the Flood Fringe standards; treat High Hazard and Protected Flood Fringe as Flood Fringe.
- The Steering Committee discussed the LUB regulations:
- Discussed the criteria for replacement of existing structures may be considered if damage is not due to flooding but will be replaced with similar size and structure.
- Discussed implications of grandfathering existing parcels in the Floodway to develop to the Flood Fringe not only in McDougal Flats, but the entire County. Insurance limitations and County liability issues.
- **Consensus** to change 9.12.1a (v) criteria C.to a “should” to provide flexibility to the Approving Authority to determine what is a similar footprint.
- **Consensus** to add a provision that MDP flood hazard policies and LUB regulations applies to all future approved and amended studies.

RECESS AND RECONVENE

Chair Aalbers recessed the meeting at 10:15 a.m. and reconvened at 10:25 a.m.

- Administration shared the difference between 1:100-year vs 1:200-year flood maps. HARP requires rebuilding to the 1:200 y flood when private property receives funding for uninsurable losses. The 1:200 year maps do not define

the Floodway and Flood Fringe and will affect more parcels than the 1:100 year flood.

- **Consensus** to stay with 1:100 year flood standard for MVC use.

1.3 Third Title in the Agricultural Preservation Area

- Administration presented an historic overview of MDPs from 2007, 2012 and 2020 concerning Agricultural Preservation Area; layers of the Agricultural Preservation Area; decisions made by Council on zoning applications for 3rd titles in the Agricultural Preservation Area from 2021 to 2025; and scenarios to illustrate Dwelling Density. Two tools identified to preserve the agricultural remainder if a third title is to be supported, a Restrictive Covenant; or new District could restrict a residence or non-agricultural uses on the remainder.
- Steering Committee discussed that the 3rd title should be restricted to an existing residence to address the problem of new agricultural landowners not wanting to be landlords of residences; or where “second farmsteads” exists. The residence has already taken the portion of land out of agricultural production. In lieu of the subdivision, the remainder of the quarter section should be restricted from future residential or non-agricultural use.
- Administration outlined the process of how a Restrictive Covenant would be implemented and further questions on appeal limitations. A legal review of the tools has not been done.
- **Consensus** to engage the public on possibility for a 3rd title in the Agricultural Preservation Area where a residence exists and consideration that the remainder of the parcel should be restricted from residential and non-agricultural uses. Options include Restrictive Covenant or a new District.

RECESS AND RECONVENE

Chair Aalbers recessed the meeting at 11:00 a.m. and reconvened at 11:15 a.m.

1.4 MDP Section 3 and 4 policies

- Administration gave an overview of the changes from previous MDP Reviews on parcel densities. Policies highlighted in blue represent Steering Committee member recommended changes, and those highlighted in yellow represent Administrative recommended changes.
- Steering Committee identified there are too many Shall statements in current document.
- **Consensus** that Administration review and reword Agricultural Preservation strongly discourage.... statement.
- **Consensus** to reword 3.3.3; 3.3.4; and 3.3.9 from shall to should.
- Discussion on 3.3.7 as smaller agricultural parcels are becoming more popular, trend since 2021 in MDP monitoring reports to approve more parcels smaller than 40 acres. Should retains flexibility, the use and landscape changes should reflect the proposed parcel. Assessment (outside of the MDP and LUB Review) is the tool to determine if a proposed agricultural parcel is ultimately uses for the agricultural purpose proposed in an application.
Consensus to reword 3.3.7 as provided by the previous Council's and no further changes.
- Discussion on 3.3.11 - Farmsteads need more flexibility, a maximum of nine acres may be too restrictive.
Consensus to engage the public on farmstead parcel size of 3.3.11; and the options to remove farmsteads from 4.3.3 d.; or to increase the total acres for all residential subdivisions (that includes farmsteads) from 9 acres to 15 acres.
- **Consensus** to reword 3.3.13 as presented.
- No changes to 3.21.
- **Consensus** to reword 4.2.2 – “...affordable housing options exist...” to

“...residential opportunities...”

RECESS AND RECONVENE

Chair Aalbers recessed the meeting at 12:05 p.m. and reconvened at 1:00 p.m.

- **Consensus** to reword 3.3.14, 4.3.16, 4.3.17 and 4.3.18 to be consistent and remove attached housing and seniors housing.
- **Consensus** to remove 4.3.3 a.
- **Consensus** to reword 4.3.3 e to match the change proposed to 3.3.13; and reword 4.3.3 d - from a shall to a should.
- Discussion on no definition of high quality forage lands, option to replace with cultivated forage lands, grazing vs crop land. 4.3.3 f. considers the preservation agricultural land with the siting of new lots.
Consensus to reword 4.3.3 g to remove high quality forage lands as agricultural preservation is covered in other sections.
- **Consensus** to reword 4.3.3 k to add the correct name of the County's access management policy.
- Discussion on consultation requirements of this policy, who defines the affected community. Administration shared the application process, examples of when pre-application consultation is required.
Consensus to reword 4.3.3.l - take out written confirmation requirement and should consult with neighbours for any residential subdivision.
- Discussion that historically the policy to discourage panhandles are to limit loss of agricultural land.
Consensus to reword 4.3.3.i that panhandles can be considered for other parcels, not only farmsteads.
- Discussion on the 14 criteria of 4.3.3 and that some has already changed as a result of direction provided today.
Consensus to bring to the next meeting 4.3.3 criteria for consideration.
- **Consensus** to amend the definition of unsubdivided quarter section.
- Discussion if existing ASPs use this policy, example Bearberry and Bergen ASPs.
Consensus to remove 4.3.23
- Confirmation that ASPs cannot propose subdivision densities higher than the MDP. ASPs can be more restrictive, but not less restrictive than the MDP.
Consensus to make no change to 4.3.5
- Discussion that there is no policy to guide applications when an equal split of unsubdivided quarter sections are proposed, when the quarters are smaller than 160 acres as the result of road widening or surveys of bed and shore. Due to road widening or surveys at least one parcel will be smaller (may only be slightly) than the minimum 80 acres, the minimum parcel size for Agricultural zoning.
Consensus to prepare a policy that redesignation is required.

RECESS AND RECONVENE

Chair Aalbers recessed the meeting at 2:00 p.m. and reconvened at 2:10 p.m.

Councillor Look did not return to the meeting.

1.5 Aerodrome Protection Overlay and S-AP District

- Administration provided an overview of the changes proposed to the Aerodrome Protection Overlay, the technical mapping and the S-AP Airport District in the LUB as a result of the Olds Didsbury Airport ASP Review and the Sundre Airport Concept Plan. Both Steering Committees reviewed the proposed changes except for the three changes highlighted in yellow in the

Agenda package.

- Discussion on the technical mapping that extends over part of the Town of Sundre, confirmation that the Town's bylaws apply to lands within the Town's jurisdiction and Spectator Sports Establishment as a Discretionary Use. Mayor Warnock was part of the Airport Sundre Concept Plan. Spelling error of Renewable in the District.

Consensus to bring forward the Aerodrome Protection Overlay and S-AP District for public engagement.

1.6 Emerging Trends: Data Centres

- Administration provided an overview of the research on Data Centre and options to consider in the LUB. Size varies from small footprints of 1 acre to large scale operations. Data Centres have 3 components, the fuel source, the power plant and the data centre that each component have different approval authorities involved. Options to include Data Centres in the LUB: Definition of Data Centre; appropriate in a Direct Control District with regulations to address specific requirements for the use. (Alternative options: Agricultural; Business Industrial Districts) Option to be considered for small facilities to operate on Agricultural lands if they fall under AUC exemptions with a separate definition with consideration of footprint size restriction, height, etc. Discussion on Direct Control District, existing Business Industrial District or a new District, Bitcoin operations and approval processes.
Consensus that Administration bring back more information and options for the Steering Committee.

2. NEXT STEPS

2.1 Meeting Summary

Reeve Aalbers summarized the changes directed by the Steering Committee:

- 1.2 - Include the DRP (Disaster Recovery Program) vs HARP (Hazard Assistance and Resilience Program) on the next agenda, more updates after the Emergency Management Team Meeting.
- Add provision in the Land Use Bylaw Floodway Maps updated apply without Public Hearing.
- 1.3 – Engage the public on a Third Title in Ag Preservation with an Existing Dwelling - Options for Restrictive Covenant or a new Agricultural District to restrict non-agricultural development from balance of property.
- 4.3.3 d – Engage the public to Exempt Residential Farmsteads nine acre maximum
- 3.3.13 - new wording
- 4.2.2 - Replace affordable housing with residential opportunities
- Section 4 - residential land, align LUB wording with 3.3.14, 4.3.16, 4.3.17 and 4.3.18
- 4.3.3 a - remove 5 year ownership
- 4.3.3 e - align wording 3.3.13
- 4.3.3 d - shall to should
- 4.3.3 g - remove high quality forage
- 4.3.3 k - update name of current policy reference
- 4.3.3 l - change throughout the MDP that consultation should precede any residential application
- 4.3.3 i - change wording on panhandles as needed to reflect Council Direction
- 4.3.3 - bring back to next workshop with amendments
- amend definition of unsubdivided quarter

- remove 4.3.23
- draft new policy to reflect the need for redesignation for 160+ acres.
- more information and options at next meeting concerning Data Centres and Bit Coin and a response from Minister Nate Glubish
- move forward the aerodrome policies
- email the list of the remaining topics to Steering Committee

2.2 Next Meeting Date

May 19, 2026

3. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Aalbers adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

Chair

I hereby certify these minutes are correct.