

PUBLIC HEARING INPUT AND DIRECTIONAL REPORT

PROPOSED LAND USE BYLAW 1385/17

Attachment #1

2.1 Uses in AG – hybrid

Input received:	Certain uses (e.g. veterinary clinic, agri-business) in AG-Major could be better accommodated on smaller parcels (AG-Residential).
Section(s):	Section 11.1
Submitted by:	Gordon Putnam (verbal)
Staff analysis:	<p>The “certain uses” referred to could be better accommodated in the AG-Residential district. Staff have come to the conclusion that the differences between the uses listed in the three size-based AG categories are marginal and they could be combined into a single list of permitted and discretionary uses.</p> <p>However, it is proposed to keep the three size-based AG-Agriculture categories for distinguishing between applicable development and subdivision regulations.</p> <p>Having a single list of uses would have the following implications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) <i>Secondary dwelling needs to be singled out as only allowed on AG major parcels of 80 acres or more.</i> b) <i>A dugout will become a permitted use in the AG-Residential category.</i> c) <i>HBB level 2 will become a permitted use in the AG-Minor and AG-Residential category.</i> d) <i>An auctioneering establishment, temporary asphalt plant and temporary concrete batch plant need to be singled out as only allowed on AG-Major parcels.</i> e) <i>A community garden, guest ranch, topsoil screening and veterinary clinic will become discretionary uses in the AG-Residential category.</i> f) <i>An equestrian facility needs to be singled out as only allowed on AG-Major and AG-Minor parcels.</i>
Recommendation:	That the three lists of uses in the AG-Agriculture district be combined to one.
Motion 2.1:	That Section 11.1, Schedule A of proposed Land Use Bylaw 1385/17, be replaced with Attachment 3 – Revised Agricultural District.

2.2 Uses in AG (2)

Input received:	<p>More flexibility should be added to some of the uses in AG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Permitted Uses – there are fewer Permitted Uses in the proposed LUB and they should be expanded; b) Discretionary Uses – some of these should be included in Permitted Uses (i.e. Home Based Business Level 2 and 3) with additional uses added as discretionary items (i.e. Secondary Dwelling); c) Other uses we should consider including as Permitted or Discretionary include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Agricultural support services; ii. Contractor services; iii. Daycare; iv. Extensive agriculture and livestock; v. Secondary dwelling (should be considered on parcels 9.8 acres and over); vi. Secondary suite (so many families need to care for elderly parents at home, employ a nanny, etc.); vii. Renewable energy facility; viii. Solar collector;
------------------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ix. Sod farm; x. Temporary dwelling; and xi. Wind energy system.
Section(s):	Section 11.1
Submitted by:	David Benjestorf
Staff analysis:	
<p>a) This was done intentionally to protect the integrity of agricultural lands and the industry of agriculture. The existing Agricultural district has many permitted and discretionary land uses that are not agriculture related which have been moved to more appropriate land use districts. A landowner has the option to apply to redistrict their land if they wish to apply to develop a land use that is not within the proposed AG-Agriculture district.</p> <p>b) Home-based business Level 2 has been added as a permitted use in the AG-Agriculture district (on all parcel sizes) and home-based business Level 3 is discretionary. Other uses mentioned have been moved to discretionary to ensure the integrity of the agricultural landscape be maintained.</p> <p>c) A response has been provided for each listed land use above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Agriculture support services – <i>is listed as a permitted use in I1-Rural Industry Support district.</i> ii. Contractor services – <i>not an agricultural land use, but on a small scale could be accommodated under a home-based business 2 or 3.</i> iii. Daycare – <i>this is an institutional land use not agricultural.</i> iv. Extensive agriculture and livestock – <i>these are both permitted without a development permit on parcels districted as AG-Agriculture (see Section 2.3(i) and (j))</i> v. Secondary dwelling (should be considered on parcels 9.8 acres and over) – <i>this will be considered by Council in response to Motion 139/17.</i> vi. Secondary suite (many families need to care for elderly parents at home, employ a nanny, etc.) - <i>this will be considered by Council in response to Motion 139/17.</i> vii. Renewable energy facility – <i>not an agricultural land use and provincial approvals may be required to support this use. Is listed as a use in I5-Heavy Industrial district.</i> viii. Solar collector – <i>as per Section 5.29 these will be as an accessory use.</i> ix. Sod farm – <i>considered Intensive agriculture and is a permitted use in the Agricultural district.</i> x. Temporary dwelling – <i>this will be considered by Council in response to Motion 139/17.</i> xi. Wind energy systems – <i>per Section 5.37 these will be as an accessory use/building and can be installed on an AG-Agriculture parcel with development permit approval.</i> 	
Recommendation:	
No action recommended.	

2.6 RV Storage in Recreational district

Input received:	Consider adding Recreational Vehicle Storage as a permitted use in the Recreational land use district.
Section(s):	Subsection 15.7.2
Submitted by:	Norman C.R. Suvan
Staff analysis:	
This was an option that was considered by Administration. This use can be considered complimentary to the REC-Recreational land use district. Having said that, listing them as a permitted use may be a stretch considering that Storage Facilities are primarily a commercial use as opposed to a recreational use.	
Recommendation:	
Add Recreational Vehicle Storage Facility as a discretionary use in the REC-Recreational District.	
Motion 2.6:	
That <i>Recreational vehicle storage facility</i> be added as a discretionary use in Subsection 15.7.2, Schedule A of Bylaw 1385/17.	

3.2 AG - Change to subdivision policies

Input received:	Subdivision policies and regulations should be refined to allow for more flexible configurations such as a) 3 acreages out of one quarter and b) 2 acreages on 80 acres in unique situations.
Section(s):	Section 11.1
Submitted by:	a) Rob Tappauf b) Gord Putnam (verbal)
Staff analysis:	<p>The clustering non-agricultural development (residential) on poor agricultural land does have merit, however, current Municipal Development Plan Policy is not entirely supportive of transferring development rights from one parcel to another. This discussion and potential solution toward policy change and ultimately Land Use Bylaw regulations may be better served within the creation of an Agricultural Master Plan. Ideally this work would recommend the best way to implement this type of subdivision policy.</p> <p>Part 638 of the <i>Municipal Government Act</i> states “<i>all statutory plans adopted by a municipality must be consistent with each other.</i>” Within the ‘higher-tier’ Municipal Development Plan, Policy 2.3.17 states that Sturgeon County “<i>shall ensure that the maximum allowable agricultural subdivision layout for a 64 hectares/160 acre land unit contains two (2) Agricultural Parcels and two (2) Acreage Lots, as further defined within the Land Use Bylaw.</i>” Therefore, to be consistent with the Municipal Development Plan, the proposed Land Use Bylaw must be worded in a manner which provides for a maximum of 2 ‘agricultural parcels’ (generally ±80 acres each) and 2 ‘acreage lots’ (generally ±2.47 acres each).</p>
Recommendation:	No action recommended.

3.5 Fragmented parcels

Input received:	By only allowing 4 parcels on a quarter, the proposed Land Use Bylaw prevents the additional subdivision of fragmented parcels and additional income for a farmer.
Section(s):	Policy 2.3.20 of the Municipal Development Plan
Submitted by:	Gail Murray (verbal), Member representing SUREAL
Staff analysis:	<p>It is not the role of Municipal Government to estate plan or provide income opportunities for private landowners. The role of Municipal Government is to plan for sustainable, responsible growth and land development. Other County residents have provided feedback suggesting that agricultural subdivision policies are too high. Policy 6.1.2 of the Province of Alberta’s Land Use Policies states: “<i>Municipalities are encouraged to limit the fragmentation of agricultural lands and their premature conversion to other uses</i>”. Similarly, Policy 6.1.3 states “Where possible, municipalities are encouraged to direct non-agricultural development to areas where such development will not constrain agricultural activities”. In this regard, the 4 per quarter policy found in the Municipal Development Plan is one of the most liberal agricultural subdivision policies in the Province. Preservation of prime agricultural land is an important policy initiative of the Province and Sturgeon County. Fragmentation of agricultural land should be limited, as should population density in un-serviced rural areas (i.e. Municipal Development Plan policy states that fragmented parcels “should” count towards the maximum density of four parcels per quarter-section). Accordingly, the proposed Land Use Bylaw wording has been updated to align with the Municipal Development Plan.</p>
Recommendation:	No action recommended.

3.7 Subdivision of a second parcel

Input received:	Why is the subdivision of a second parcel, in certain circumstances, a prohibited event?
Section(s):	Paragraph 11.1.5(b)
Submitted by:	Martin Kaup, Gord Putnam (verbal)
Staff analysis:	<p>Although the suggestion has merit in clustering non-agricultural development(residential) on poor agricultural land, current Municipal Development Plan Policy does not support the transferring of development rights from one parcel to another. This discussion and potential solution toward policy change and ultimately Land Use Bylaw regulations may be better served within the creation of an Agricultural Master Plan or other such visioning document. Ideally this work would recommend the best way to implement this type of subdivision policy. The Subdivision regulations that have been added to Section 11.1 are to clarify existing Municipal Development Plan policy that exists today. Nothing has been changed - the proposed Land Use Bylaw simply documents existing subdivision policy for more clarity at the application stage.</p>
Recommendation:	No action recommended.

3.8 Policy 2.2.2 of the Municipal Development Plan

Input received:	Policy 2.2.2 of the Municipal Development Plan does not deal with preventing two subdivisions from an 80 acre parcel but rather is a generic and confusing statement relating to future development potential or development restrictions.
Section(s):	Policy 2.2.2 of the Municipal Development Plan
Submitted by:	Martin Kaup
Staff analysis:	<p>The intent of the noted Policy statement is to restrict one landowner from subdividing their land in a manner that removes the ability for another landowner to do the same. This discussion and potential solution toward policy change and ultimately Land Use Bylaw regulations may be better served within the creation of an Agricultural Master Plan or other such visioning document.</p>
Recommendation:	No action recommended.

3.9 Infill of subdivisions

Input received:	Infill of subdivisions were previously allowed for in certain circumstances, but are now prohibited. Why?
Section(s):	Subsections 12.1.3, 12.2.3, 12.3.3 and 12.4.3
Submitted by:	Martin Kaup
Staff analysis:	<p>They are not prohibited today nor will the proposed Land Use Bylaw prohibit infill subdivision, they are subject to recommendations of an approved local planning document consistent with the County's Municipal Development Plan.</p> <p>The infill of existing residential subdivisions(development)should only be supported with a local planning document that includes engagement with all existing residents in the neighbourhood and the appropriate level of analysis to understand the impacts to the character of said neighbourhood, servicing and off-site infrastructure. Having said that, subdivision could be supported without a local planning document in cases where existing parcels are large enough to be subdivided and still meet the minimum lot size of the land use district. Administration does see merit in adding a clause to the proposed Land Use Bylaw that would support this form of subdivision.</p>
Recommendation:	Administration recommends the addition of a regulation to allow the opportunity for infill subdivisions that meet the minimum parcel size and parcel density of the district.
Motion 3.9:	<p>That the wording of Subsections 12.1.3, 12.2.3, 12.3.3, 12.4.3, Schedule A of Bylaw 1385/17 under <i>Infill subdivision</i> be changed to read as follows:</p> <p>Further <i>subdivision</i> of existing <i>parcels</i> where the proposed parcels do not meet the minimum parcel area and/or the prescribed parcel density, shall be subject to the recommendations of an approved <i>local planning document</i>.</p>

6.3 Resource Extraction - Measuring setbacks

Input received:	A developer should have to use a neighboring landowner's <i>property line</i> to create their 400m setback to the operations area, not a neighboring landowner's <i>dwelling</i> . This allows a landowner protection of one's entire property without having the possibility of unwanted activities that affect a homeowner's quality of life.
Section(s):	Paragraphs 11.2.4(c)(i) and (ii)
Submitted by:	Emily Comartin
Staff analysis:	<p>While this is a valid concern, it is important to note that there are many sizes of parcels and without a dwelling which would increase the sterilization of deposits in an area. Ultimately given this proposal, a full quarter section of undivided land could sterilize an amount equal to two entire sections of land.</p> <p>The proposed setbacks are consistent with those found in the Calahoo Villeneuve Sand & Gravel Area Structure Plan.</p>
Recommendation:	No action recommended.

6.4 Resource Extraction - policy

Input received:	These 400 metre setbacks have become prohibitive for some landowners who wish to sell their gravel but are landlocked by various acreage owners who are demanding exorbitant amounts of cash to allow the digging of the gravel. For other natural resources such as oil, gas or electricity this would never happen. It is time that the bylaws be updated with the setbacks changed to allow land owners who wish to sell their gravel the ability to do so without being held hostage by some acreages or adjacent land owners with old setback by-laws. With the County growing there will always be opposition as there is with any change but these gravel pits also pay taxes to Sturgeon County and like the Heartland project which has brought much controversy to many residences will continue to pay their way and help Sturgeon grow
Section(s):	Paragraph 11.2.4(c)
Submitted by:	Phil Soetaert
Staff analysis:	This again is a valid concern for both industry and residents and falls within the cadre of inputs #7.1 and 7.3 above. Policy 4.4 of the Province of Alberta's "Land Use Policies" states: " <i>municipalities are encouraged to establish land use patterns which accommodate natural resource extraction or harvesting and processing, manufacturing and other industrial development while, at the same time, minimizing potential conflict within nearby land uses and any negative environmental impact</i> ". Similarly, Policy 6.2.3 states " <i>municipalities are encouraged to direct subdivision and development activity so as not to constrain or conflict with non-renewable resource development</i> ".
Recommendation:	No action recommended.

6.9 Resource Extraction - Variances

Input received:	The draft Land Use Bylaw does not include any provision for the Development Authority to issue a variance for Resource Extraction district in accordance with Table 2.1 and some discretion should be given in this regard.
Section(s):	Subsection 2.8.6 Table 2.1
Submitted by:	Calahoo Villeneuve Sand and Gravel Advisory Committee
Staff analysis:	The Land Use Bylaw is in alignment with the setbacks stipulated in the Calahoo Villeneuve Sand and Gravel Area Structure Plan. The only variances apply to these setbacks as repeated in Section 11.2.4(c) and which ultimately allows the County to grant a variance with written consent from the affected landowner. This is consistent with the regulations of the existing Land Use Bylaw. As such, no variance powers for the Resource Extraction district were added to Table 2.1.
Recommendation:	No action recommended.

6.10 Resource Extraction - Clarity re. community benefits plan & community and neighbourhood consultation

Input received:	<p>a) Clarity is required around what a community benefits plan is in relation to the Community Aggregate Payment Levy Bylaw 1078/06.</p> <p>b) Conditions re. community and neighbourhood consultation should be consistent with the public engagement policy.</p>
Section(s):	Paragraphs 2.9.4(g) and (h)
Submitted by:	Calahoo Villeneuve Sand and Gravel Advisory Committee
Staff analysis:	<p>a) The Municipal Development Plan references a community benefits plan to allocate funds generated by the CAP Levy. In the absence of this community benefits plan the Sand and Gravel Committee advises Council on allocation as per the CAP Levy Bylaw.</p> <p>b) The Land Use Bylaw provides regulation for initiatives that are proposed by developers and where community consultation is required to support applications for proposed developments. It is Administration's opinion that the Public Engagement Policy is meant to guide Sturgeon County driven initiatives and not those of private developers, although they would stand to gain if they followed our framework.</p> <p>Administration recognizes subsection 2.9.4 states a list of conditions that may be imposed on an approval for primary and secondary processing. This list should not be directed at only this specific industry but rather to any development permit approval if so required.</p>
Recommendation:	Administration recommends that Subsection 2.9.4 be amended to apply to all development permit applications where applicable.
Motion 6.10:	<p>That the wording of Subsection 2.9.4, Schedule A of Bylaw 1385/17 be changed to read as follows:</p> <p>.4 While not limiting the generality of the <i>Development Authority's</i> discretion as outlined herein, in making a decision regarding <i>development permit applications</i> the <i>Development Authority</i> may require the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) adherence to additional information as may be required under Subsection 2.4.3; (b) adherence to a groundwater monitoring and groundwater protection program; (c) adherence to a community benefits plan; (d) adherence to community and neighbourhood consultation; (e) adherence to provincial and federal regulatory compliance; (f) adherence to specified hours, days, months or years of operation; (g) limiting the time that a development permit may continue in effect; (h) compliance with applicable <i>statutory plans</i>; and (i) any such other conditions as may be reasonably required.

6.14 Resource Extraction – stripping and reclamation

Input received:	<p>a) Municipal requirements should compliment the provincial regulations. Specific requirements for operational items to be identified in the reclamation plan may be irrelevant.</p> <p>b) Can there be an opportunity to propose alternative end uses at the end of the life of a pit?</p>
Section(s):	Paragraph 11.2.10(a)
Submitted by:	Calahoo Villeneuve Sand and Gravel Advisory Committee
	a) Administration acknowledges that this Paragraph should be revised to Application Requirements and will change the list so as not to repeat those required under the Code of Practice for Pits Application Requirements.

b) A change to the original end land use requires a change to the operations as per Section 11.2.6(b). This will require a new development permit application and plans for approval by both the municipality and the province.

Recommendation:

Upon further review and testing Administration agrees that these regulations are not conducive to reclamation given any reclamation plan requires Provincial approval and the Province will not grant approval without Municipal approval which in this case is a Development Permit. Therefore; the detailed list can be deleted from this paragraph and it can simply refer to the requirement for a development permit and the addition of a new subsection addressing application requirements.

Motion 6.14.1:

That Subparagraph (b) be deleted from Paragraph 11.2.10, Schedule A of proposed Land Use Bylaw 1385/17, and

Motion 6.14.2

That the following Subsection 11.2.14 be added to Section 11.2, Schedule A of proposed Land Use Bylaw 1385/17

.14 Application Requirements

A development permit application for natural resource extraction and secondary processing shall include, but is not limited to the following:

- (j) a copy of the application for registration under the Code of Practice for Pits.
- (b) copy of any application for approvals under the Water Act.
- (c) Supplemental information addressing those stated under Subparagraph 11.2.4 to 11.2.12 of this Bylaw.

6.16 Resource Extraction Overlay

Input Received:	The wording contained within Section 17.3 of the proposed Land Use Bylaw requires revision to allow for more flexibility with regards to development within lands that fall within the proposed Resource Extraction Overlay as shown in Schedule 4 and described in Section 17.3.
Section(s):	Section 17.3
Submitted by:	Simon Patrick
Staff analysis:	Administration agrees with this input. Through testing the Overlay (against applications received) a number of technical changes have been made to ensure the overlay meets the intent thereof, specifically to serve notice to existing and future landowners of the potential for resource extraction in the area. Note that Section 17.3 was reworded accordingly as part of the technical changes to be consider by Council on May 9 th , 2017.
Recommendation:	No action recommended.

7.2 Development Constraint Overlay - Inconsistencies

Input received:	The proposed 'overlay' is applied inconsistently to different sides of the Sturgeon River in the vicinity of the Alberta Resource Recovery Centre.
Section(s):	Section 17.1 and Schedule 2 – Development Constraint Overlay Map
Submitted by:	Alberta Resource Recovery Centre Ltd.
Staff analysis:	The Development Constraint Overlay was created to reflect the existing line-work found in Neighbourhood F of the County's Municipal Development Plan in addition to data received from the Province with respect to historical landfills, coal mines and hydrocarbon sites. This was done to support existing policy direction with respect to hazardous and environmental sensitive lands as well as Council Strategic focus area to "Respect the Natural Environment". As identified in the Municipal Development Plan and the Overlay itself, landowners can complete the necessary studies to demonstrate developability of lands within the overlay.
Recommendation:	No action recommended.

8.1 Delay the approval of the Land Use Bylaw

Input received:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Council should delay approving the Land Use Bylaw for 12 months to allow for review and input from the County's residents and further open and transparent discussions. Reasons being to make the Land Use Bylaw more succinct and efficient and reduce the need for future amendments. b) The proposed Land Use Bylaw should wait till the new updated Growth Plan (and the amendment of the Municipal Development Plan), the Province's Land Use Framework and the new Municipal Government Act has been finalised.
Section(s):	N/A
Submitted by:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Mike Kinsella, David Benjestorf, Ron, Debbie, Cory & Chris Cherdarchuk, Don Levers (verbal), Robert Lemm (verbal), Lucy Dowhaniuk (verbal), Dwayne Benfield (verbal), Evan Cameron (verbal), John Wasmuth- Members representing SUREAL b) Gail Murray (verbal)
Staff analysis:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) In terms of delaying approval, Administration recommends Council set a future 'effective date' upon adoption along with an implementation plan, as a more suitable option. b) Administration would not recommend delaying this project until adoption of the Capital Region Metropolitan Growth Plan by the Province given the County's existing Municipal Development Plan aligns very well with the proposed Growth Plan. The Land Use Bylaw has been developed to align with the County's Municipal Development Plan. This is not to say that future Land Use Bylaw amendments may be in order as these plans are implemented, but overall, the proposed Land Use Bylaw meets the intent of both the County and regional planning documents. <p>The other important consideration for Council is that Administration, through application inquiries, has ongoing dialogued with numerous residents and landowners who are waiting for the proposed Land Use Bylaw to be adopted by Council before they make application to improve their lands. The proposed Land Use Bylaw provides efficiencies in processes and opportunities that do not exist in the current so delaying the approval could have an impact on these landowners who see value in what is being proposed.</p> <p>Administration sees the Council directed Implementation Plan can help with some of the concerns with transitioning for the current Land Use Bylaw to the new.</p>
Recommendation:	No action recommended.

8.2 More background needed

Input received:	<p>Formal presentations are needed over the next 6 months to the ratepayers informing them of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the basis of the proposed Land Use Bylaw's origination; • deficiencies in the existing Land Use Bylaw that need correcting; • the mission, opening goals and objectives of the proposed Land Use Bylaw; • the depth the Land Use Bylaw had to be adhere to and how was it defined (how specific did it need to be?); • the major changes introduced in the proposed Land Use Bylaw and what they accomplish, and • the qualitative and quantitative changes this proposed Land Use Bylaw brings to the ratepayers (e.g. property taxes, development, etc.).
Section(s):	N/A
Submitted by:	Evan Cameron (verbal)
Staff analysis:	<p>Throughout the Land Use Bylaw re-write project the purpose and objectives have been made public through presentations at numerous public Council meetings. Council, through exercising responsible governance, approved the re-write of the Land Use Bylaw based on the same. The Land Use Bylaw has been drafted to align with the Municipal Development Plan, provide more efficiencies in delivering development permit services to applicants, reduce land use conflicts that result in expensive enforcement action and find balance in promoting responsible development of lands. The process has been followed by Administration and Council and the best course of action at this point is to adopt and administer the Land Use Bylaw for a year and collect feedback from applicants towards a 1-year review and potential amendments.</p> <p>Also, Administration have been engaging with landowners since October of 2016 on a daily basis through application request and inquires. This is part of the on-going testing of the proposed Land Use Bylaw resulting in the suggested clerical and technical amendments.</p>
Recommendation:	No action recommended.

8.6 Not engaging the public

Input received:	<p>How is it possible that the proposed Land Use Bylaw has been in the making for 2 years and the P&D department did not consult with the public, i.e. the people that are affected most by the proposed Land Use Bylaw, in the process? Why were there not more meetings with representatives/entities that make up the community? The County belongs to the residents and they should determine the use of the land.</p> <p>The perceived hostility towards the proposed Land Use Bylaw could have been averted if more engagement with the public took place and more reasoning was provided for the proposed changes the proposed Land Use Bylaw brings forward.</p>
Section(s):	N/A
Submitted by:	Neil McDougall (verbal), Don Levers (verbal), Robert Lemm (verbal)
Staff analysis:	<p>Over the 2-year length of the project (Feb. 2015 to Dec. 2016) Council and the public were engaged numerous times through public open houses, on-line surveys and; County events and Community Hall meetings as detailed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ April 2015 - Stakeholder and resident online surveys. ✓ Spring 2015 – Public Open Houses (4). ✓ February 2016 – Presentation, Q&A with Economic Development Advisory Board. ✓ April 2016 – Information booth/table at County Centre Community Meeting. ✓ August 2016 – Information booth/table at Culinary Cook Out.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ October 2016 - Information booth/table at Calahoo Hall Community Meeting. ✓ November 2016 - Information booth/table at Namao Hall Community Meeting. ✓ November 2016 – Stakeholder and Public Information Sessions. ✓ January 2017 – Municipal Planner Information Session. ✓ Other ways we got the word out to the public: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Webpage • Start in Sturgeon webpage • County Twitter (tweets started in November 2016) • Start in Sturgeon Twitter and Facebook • Newspaper ads (in both the Morinville Gibbons Free Press and the St. Albert Gazette) • Utility bill mailouts (June & October 2016) • Mayor’s Golf Tournament • Road Signs in 3 high-traffic locations • Signs and handouts at County Centre and other public County buildings
<p>Recommendation: No action recommended.</p>

8.10 How public Inputs are shared and considered in drafting regulations

Input received:	It was hard to find on the Internet the inputs that the public provided at the Open House held at Gibbons. Irrespective, how much importance is put on to what the residents are saying (compared to professional staff are saying)?
Section(s):	
Submitted by:	Tom Strawson (verbal)
<p>Staff analysis: All inputs are important and considered in drafting regulation. The project team considered the inputs from best practice research completed by ISL; review of existing Land Use Bylaws in the Capital Region and in rural municipalities around Calgary; input from residents, landowners and stakeholders collected during the public engagement sessions and surveys; perspectives and inputs from Council during numerous public meetings and workshops and finally from the experiences of staff processing applications against the existing Land Use Bylaw. All perspectives and facts are then weighed and validated against Councils Strategic Directions and Municipal Development Plan Policy to come up with a balance of land use regulations that will work towards responsible growth in the County. In addition, the Research and Recommendation Report was completed by ISL following the 2015 engagement sessions and was reviewed and adopted by Council which provided the Project Team with direction to advance with the draft Land Use Bylaw considering the document inputs and recommendations.</p>	
<p>Recommendation: No action recommended.</p>	

11.6 The public hearing itself

Input received:	<p>a) You have meetings which are open to the public, yet they are held in rooms that may only hold 50 people, so that everyone else has to stand in the hallways and try to find out what is being said with a game of "pass it on". Administration was ill prepared.</p> <p>b) You have people speak for no longer than 5 minutes, and if they take too long you hold up a red folder. To me this is a slap in the face of the residents in Sturgeon County.</p> <p>c) Then when the meeting is taking longer than you expected you call a 2-minute break because you know this will give the people a chance to leave because they feel like they aren't being heard and are giving up on something that will probably be passed along anyway.</p> <p>d) Why do you have a meeting in the afternoon when you know most people will be at work or away at spring break?</p> <p>e) It is very disturbing that a Council would come to such tactics to pass a law that will affect so many lives, except for maybe the people who have moved to rural areas and want to live their way instead of adapting to the agricultural way of life, and denying the farmers the right to live the way their fore fathers had intended them to. If they don't like the way we do things out here maybe they should go back to the city where the dust, animals, tractors, combines and smells won't bother them quite so much.</p>
Section(s):	
Submitted by:	L Kerckhof (Concerned citizens of Sturgeon County), Neil McDougall (verbal), Don Levers (verbal)
Staff analysis:	The process defined and regulated by the <i>Municipal Government Act</i> was followed for the proposed Land Use Bylaw. In this case, the requirements were exceeded by Council by leaving the Public Hearing open for a month and offering an evening and an afternoon option for the public to attend. Also, it is important to note that written submissions hold the same weight as a verbal presentation and Administration received over 300 inputs (both written and verbal) for Council to consider in making a final decision on the proposed Land Use Bylaw.
Recommendation:	No action recommended.

12.3 Potential typo with respect to minimum parcel size in the R1 district

Input received:	Minimum lot size in R1 a typo – should be maximum.
Section(s):	12.1.3
Submitted by:	Frank Klassen
Staff analysis:	Administration does not view this as a typo. The minimum lot sizes are to ensure the consistent character of a residential subdivision while allowing adequate room for private servicing.
Recommendation:	No action recommended.

12.8 Non-conforming issues

Input received:	There is a deficiency in the proposed Land Use Bylaw in that it does not state that if you previously did not need a permit for something (e.g. shipping containers) that after the passage of the proposed Land Use Bylaw such as shipping containers will be considered non-conforming.
Section(s):	Section 1.6
Submitted by:	Martin Kaup
Staff analysis:	If a previous Land Use Bylaw did not require a development permit for a building or use it would be considered the same as non-conforming.
Recommendation:	No action recommended.

12.10 Common amenity areas

Input received:	As part of the Multi-family district, common amenity areas are required. Why can't this be required within the other residential districts?
Section(s):	Section 12.5.9
Submitted by:	Community Services Advisory Board
Staff analysis:	A multi-family district accommodates for higher density and typically does not provide for private outdoor yard space for each unit. The best example of this is an apartment building. The common amenity area is a provision to provide for recreational both passive and active spaces to these residents on-site. The reason these provisions are not included in other residential districts is because they are on parcels sizes that include yard space on site for the private enjoyment of the landowner.
Recommendation:	No action recommended.

12.14 Definitions

Input received:	The definitions are in a variety of different places and is confusing.
Section(s):	1.5 Terminology, Part 7, Signs, Part 18 Definitions for uses
Submitted by:	Don Levers (verbal), Member representing SUREAL
Staff analysis:	Previous drafts of the proposed Land Use Bylaw had the definition sections together and feedback received suggested they be separated due to confusion.
Recommendation:	No action recommended.