

**From:** [Heather LaRose](#)  
**To:** [Alanna Hnatiw](#); [Dan Derouin](#); [Kristin Toms](#); [Wayne Bokenfohr](#); [Neal Comeau](#); [Patrick D. Tighe](#); [Karen Shaw](#); [Natasha De Sandi](#); [Lisa Schovaneck](#)  
**Subject:** Sturgeon County and Town of Bon Accord IDP Bylaw 1477/20  
**Date:** June 15, 2020 10:21:55 PM  
**Attachments:** [Sturgeon County Bon Accord IDP June2020.pdf](#)

---

Dear Mayor, Councillors, Natasha and Lisa:

Re: Sturgeon County and Town of Bon Accord IDP  
Bylaw 1477/20

Unfortunately I was unable to transcribe what I prepared for the May 12, 2020 Bon Accord Sturgeon IDP Public Hearing within the timelines you provided. Attached is a typed draft of what I prepared for that Public Hearing. Your five minute presentation time limit did not allow me to present all the material I had prepared. Since then, I have been unable to complete my review much past page 6 of the Bylaw.

**Summary and Recommendations:**

1. Don't enact this Bylaw.
2. Don't enact this Bylaw.
3. Please see #1 and #2 above.
4. If you choose to ignore recommendations 1, 2 and 3 above, please, at a minimum, delete sub clause #10 on page 6 which does not permit Confined Feeding Operations.
5. If you choose to ignore recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 4 please know you are passing a Bylaw that:
  - A) Will be costly to the landowners in the Plan Area as well as ratepayers of Sturgeon County while, at the same time, failing to secure Bon Accord's sustainability let alone growth and development as envisaged and anticipated by this Bylaw;
  - B) Though the primary, whole and noble purpose of this Bylaw may be (is) to establish a sustainable, diversified assessment and tax base to enable Bon Accord to deliver affordable services to its residents, this document does not accomplish that. It cannot accomplish that. It cannot be amended to accomplish that - even by including Bon Accord in the Plan Area;
  - C) This Bylaw is poorly worded, sloppily and carelessly drafted, often contradictory and misleading (or less than clear and direct), contains error in fact, confusing, difficult to understand and contains confusing, various, wording

descriptions and definitions. In short it is a poorly prepared putrid plethora of planners pallid planning platitudes; and D) Should be printed on toilet paper to ensure it provides some utility if not value to the residents of Bon Accord and Sturgeon.

6. If in the end you decide to proceed in order to placate the Province/MGA despite the full knowledge this will not benefit Bon Accord, for God's sake at least secure a lose win for Sturgeon rather than this lose lose for both. If this were a poker game and Sturgeon was the dealer/house you gave all our chips to Bon Accord, dealt us four 2's, Bon Accord a Royal Flush and then said "Play Cards." This Bylaw of course would then be the equivalent benefit to Bon Accord as Bon Accord then asking for three or five new cards!

Respectfully

Donald Rigney and Heather LaRose.

--

Heather M LaRose



**Sturgeon Bon Accord IDP**  
**Bylaw 1477/20**  
**Sturgeon County and Town of Bon Accord Intermunicipal Development Plan**  
**Bylaw**

My Short Title: "A Poorly Prepared Putrid Plethora of Planners Pallid Planning Platitudes."

Or

Dilbert's – Plan the Plan's Planny Plan

## 778 Results for Plan For Making Plans

View 1 - 10 results for Plan For Making Plans comic strips. Discover the best "Plan For Making Plans" comics from Dilbert.com.

Sort by: Relevance ▾

Tuesday October 28, 2008

★★★★☆



### Tags

[#need plan](#), [#plant plan](#), [#employee of the month](#), [#cop](#), [#wanted list](#), [#net](#), [#crazy person](#)

[View Transcript](#)

Sturgeon Bon Accord IDP

Bylaw 1477/20

Sturgeon County and Town of Bon Accord Intermunicipal Development Plan Bylaw

(My Short Title: "A Poorly Prepared Putrid Plethora of Planners Pallid Planning Platitudes.")

Madam Chairman, Councillors.

Heather LaRose and I own the NE 1/4 23-56-24 W4. This land is located in the very furthest Northwest corner of the Plan Area described by Map 3 of the IDP. We also own immediately adjoining lands which, by this Bylaw become fragmented from the NE 23. This has significant negative consequences and adverse effect on us. It will devalue all our land by \$375,000 to \$600,000 and restrict the use of our land and our ability to earn a livelihood from it. Accordingly this Bylaw is abhorrent to us as landowners and residents of Sturgeon County. It will cost us and all agricultural producers in Sturgeon County dearly while obscenely, carelessly, recklessly and inadvertently failing to secure Bon Accords sustainability let alone the intended growth and development envisaged and anticipated by this Bylaw. What is clearly not needed is a change to Sturgeons land use policies or this Bylaw as is envisaged here but a change to Bon Accord's. This Bylaw fails to do that. Whether by design or error Bon Accord is not part of the well defined "Plan Area" or poorly defined "referral area" or undefined "Referral Area." This despite having over 700 acres of undeveloped land within its boundaries which at recent rates of absorption (2001-2018) ensures 31,500 years of supply! How much land do they covet? Perhaps Sturgeon should send a copy of Tolstoy's short story about a man, who in his lust for land forfeits everything. It is not a change to the current land use policies of Sturgeon County or this IDP that is needed but a significant change to Bon Accord's practices and policies. Until that happens this Bylaw will only hamstring us, freeze and limit the use and development of our land and devalue our land and that of many other landowners for some imagined benefit of Bon Accord that will never materialize. The land use in Sturgeon around Bon Accord is not "governing" either Bon Accords sustainability or growth. Their own "governing" is. Their own internal policies are. Until that is addressed this Bylaw, though costly to the people you purport to represent, will be as beneficial as rearranging the deck chairs on a sinking ship before first plugging the leak. You might as well strike up the band and play "Nearer My God to Thee" as was apocryphally or actually performed as the last song on the Titanic but actually sung by the doomed crew and passengers of the Valencia as it sank off Vancouver Island's southwest coast.

Accordingly, we wish to record some of the reasons for our opposition to the enactment of this Bylaw both on principal and on content. We say "some" because the five minutes allotted to us is entirely insufficient to communicate all that is wrong with this Bylaw in

principal let alone in content (error).

I will start at the beginning and except for jumping at some point to clause "H 10" see how far I get. Is it possible to be advised at 4 minutes so I can do that?

Firstly, I would like to state how inappropriate it is to proceed with this Bylaw at this time. Your timing couldn't be worse. Many affected landowners are busy with spring work and unable to participate. Secondly, the Covid 19/CCP Virus pandemic necessitating your implementing this new, untested and unfamiliar virtual "Public Hearing" is an unfamiliar way for affected landowners to get together to provide meaningful input. We understand the necessity of this process to deal with an emergency such as flood, fire, pandemic or serious service interruption but this is none of those. This is an entirely unnecessary distraction at this time. Thirdly, there is no growth or development happening given current economic conditions and health issues. Regardless, based on the population growth in Bon Accord between 2001 (1532) and 2018 (1539), the longest and largest period of economic and population growth in Alberta and the Regions history, and assuming 3.5 persons per home and 5 homes per acre, Bon Accord currently has enough land within its current boundaries to meet its needs for 31,500 years!!!! Fourthly, the five minutes allowed is entirely insufficient time for anyone to address the damage (See Footnote #1 below) inherent in this Bylaw let alone the errors. Fifthly, the Province has extended the deadline for completing these IDP's/ICF's until April 1, 2021. There is always a chance that by then they will have not just partially but entirely eliminated any requirement for these IDP'S/ICF'S. Why eliminate that possibility by prematurely passing this Bylaw?

Heather and I attended the Open House for this IDP held in Bon Accord on February 24, 2020. No Sturgeon Councillors were in attendance. Sturgeon staff, Bon Accord staff, Bon Accord Mayor and Councillors and the hired Planning Consultant (Planner) (Austrom) were in attendance. I expressed my concerns and opposition to this Bylaw to our staff and the Planner. I noted bullet 8 from the top on the whiteboard titled "Intermunicipal Development Plan" stated: "- Procedures to amend and repeal the plan." I asked if this meant either municipality could unilaterally repeal the Bylaw? I was assured it meant either municipality could alone, unilaterally repeal the Bylaw. Oxford defines repeal as "revoke or annul (a law)." (This is repeated in Clause D. LEGISLATIVE REQUIRMENTS 1) d) page 4 which encouragingly also states "Procedures to amend or repeal the plan; and"). The Bylaw however does not support these. I challenge you to read Clause O.2)c) on page 12 and tell me I'm wrong. It begins with this ruse. Subclause iv) states: "iv) Once notice is given (to repeal?), the Town and County shall (Clause C1)j) on page 3 defines shall as "j) **Shall** means obligatory direction.") initiate the development of a subsequent Intermunicipal Development Plan in accordance with the Municipal Government Act." Follows with this

deception. Clause v) states: "The subsequent Intermunicipal Development Plan shall (obligatory) be adopted at the same time as the original Intermunicipal Development Plan is repealed." And concludes with this bit of treachery. Clause vi) states "vi) Once one municipality has passed a bylaw to adopt the subsequent Intermunicipal Development Plan and repeal the original Intermunicipal Development Plan the other municipality shall (again obligatory wording by definition) also proceed to pass the bylaws." Machiavelli would be proud! Of course if Sturgeon balks at this I assume the matter would end up before the Municipal Government Board as per clause Q8 on page 13. Conclusion? If you pass this Bylaw you have sold us out. What little control we have over our land use or little ability we have to influence change in our land use you will have ceded to Bon Accord and the MGB. We will pay dearly for this and get nothing in return.

Other wording from the whiteboards at the Open House stated:

#### "Intermunicipal Development Plan

What is an IDP?

- Future land use.
- Proposals for future development.
- Transportation systems.
- Intermunicipal Infrastructure.

#### Intermunicipal Development Plan Purpose

- Ensure orderly development.
- Establish a framework for attracting economic opportunities.
- Improve opportunities to secure a long-term economic base for the region.
- To identify areas for potential future growth in both municipalities along the shared boundary.

#### Intermunicipal Development Plan Goals

- Development of land use policies to protect prime agricultural lands from premature redesignation, subdivision and non-farm development." (I could write a book on how exploitive, unfair and underhanded this statement is but at this time I'll only say that for the Bylaw to be "equitable and fair to the residents of both municipalities" as stated at the Open House would require

this to apply to Bon Accord in the Bylaw. It does not. If we're going to protect farmland in Sturgeon it should be protected in Bon Accord too.)

- Effective coordination of transportation systems.
- Ensure resource development does not inhibit or restrict future development of the region. (This in itself is absurd. How is this possible when the authority for this resides with the Province?)
- Identification and protection of physical features and environmentally sensitive areas. (Protection from what? For whom? Why? Who pays? Protection or preservation? Why just in Sturgeon? Why not Bon Accord too? What are physical features?)
- Effective referral mechanisms and dispute resolution mechanisms between the municipalities.
- Effective plan administration and implementation."

Except for "protect(ing) prime agricultural lands" it all sounds pretty innocuous right? However, as Bon Accord is not included in the "Plan Area," "referral area" or Referral Area" as per the Bylaw how are any of the foregoing possible, attainable, feasible, workable, implementable, viable, or realistic let alone equitable and fair as stated in the following bullets from the whiteboards at the Open House?

- "-Ensure that the municipalities are developed in a manner that is equitable and fair to the residents of the municipalities.
- Development of land use policies to ensure future development is equitable and fair to the residents of both municipalities." (These last two quotes are not just deceptive and misleading they are possibly fraudulently mendacious. They are clearly not supported by the Bylaw. In fact, the Bylaw blatantly contradicts these two statements.

If there is one thing this Bylaw is, it is that it is not equitable and fair. As both a landowner and resident of Sturgeon County it makes me very angry when I am lied to or deceived and treated like this whether by my own local government or that of Bon Accord. When I attend an Open House where I am told I am overreacting and that the IDP Bylaw will have no impact on the use of my land for farming and agricultural purposes, I reasonably expected that to be reflected in the Bylaw. **It most definitely is not.** You only have to go to pages 2 & 3 to find Clause "C. DEFINITIONS 1) d)" which

reads "d) Environmentally Significant Lands means all lands in Sturgeon County that are: (a) a swamp; (b) a gully, ravine or coulee; (c) an escarpment; (d) a natural drainage course; (e) riparian lands adjacent to the beds and shores of rivers, streams, creeks, watercourses and natural drainage courses; (f) wetlands; (g) lands subject to flooding, including Flood Risk Areas, floodways, and flood fringes; (h) unstable lands; (i) natural areas including forests, woodlands, meadows, and prairies; or (j) contaminated lands." Then go to clause F. GOALS 1) g) which states "Identification and protection of physical features and environmentally sensitive areas." What are undefined "environmentally sensitive areas?" Are they the same as defined "Environmentally Significant Lands?" What are "physical features?" What do you mean by "protection?" Preservation? Protect from what? Who? Why? Who pays? Who bears the cost? If this is in the public good or public interest why should or how is it fair that I, the affected landowner, pays for this public benefit and not the benefitting public or Bon Accord or Sturgeon who propose to impose this on landowners in the Plan Area? I have forests, woodlands, meadows and prairies on my property. No impact on the use of my land for farming and agricultural purposes? Bullshit! How about clause H. LAND USE POLICIES 1) b) 10) on page 6 which states: "No new or expanding Confined Feeding Operations within the Plan Area.....shall be permitted.....!!!" Again, no impact on the use of my land for farming and agricultural purposes? Horseshit! Talk about déjà vu. A repeat of the 2016-2017 LUB Open House when we were told we were wrong. We were told that permits would not be required for new farm buildings when in fact the LUB required permits for all, even minor, farm buildings or improvements.

After attending the Open House and reading the Bylaw I am hard pressed to see that the two are related. I am hard pressed to see the Open House as other than for the purpose of deceiving, misleading and manipulating us affected landowners into a false sense of complacency to then enable passage of a very onerous and one sided Bylaw entirely contradictory to what was presented in the Open House both in tenure and fact.

So, on to the Bylaw.

The Bylaw opens with this statement:

#### "A. INTRODUCTION

1) The Town of Bon Accord (Town) and Sturgeon County (County) have agreed to undertake the process for preparing and adopting an Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP). "

I have learned, and it was confirmed at the open house held February 24, 2020 in Bon Accord, that this statement is misleading at best and not truthful at worst. This in no



way can be characterized as an "agreement to agree" or as negotiations being entered into by "mutual consent." My understanding is that the previous NDP government mandated these "shotgun weddings". As a result, Sturgeon was faced with the daunting task of being forced into over 20-25 of these ludicrous "planny plans" (please see the attached Dilbert cartoon) in an impossibly short period of time. The current PC government then amended this legislation in an attempt to reduce the crippling burden of red tape that was hamstringing us. Their efforts were admirable but didn't go far enough. They left the door open for any adjoining neighbor to force Sturgeon into one of these "shotgun weddings." Four of our so called "neighbors" have chosen to do just that.

A more truthful opening statement would read:

## "A. INTRODUCTION

1) The Town of Bon Accord (Town) is compelling Sturgeon County (County) to undertake the process for preparing and adopting an Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP)."

In other words, the Province failed to unload the shotgun, the Town of Bon Accord (Town) pointed it at Sturgeon County (County) and in the resulting crossfire everyone was collateral damage. This mandated process to prepare and adopt an Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP) is neither Intermunicipal (the Town is not even part of the Plan Area or referral area or Referral Area) nor Development(al) (the long history of Bon Accord failing to develop and grow will continue) and hence not a viable Plan. This is a forced, unequal, exploitive, shotgun marriage that is controlling at best and abusive at worst and from which there is little chance of escape or betterment. We are relegated to second class citizen status in our own community."

The very next or second clause reads:

"2) The Town and the County recognize that all municipalities are equals and have the right to growth and development."

Equals?

This statement is also misleading at best or a lie at worst and you don't have to read very far to find this out. Has anyone read this? How did this get past first reading? Within a mere two lines is the wording "...while protecting the area surrounding the Town for future expansion." There it is! We and Sturgeon County are merely a land bank for the Towns benefit. Mandate the rurals keep the adjoining land vacant and undeveloped (at the landowners' expense) for the benefit of the urbans by keeping it undeveloped enabling the urbans to sprawl across it cheaply and at there whim and convenience. If this is in the town or the publics interest or benefit the town or

the public should pay for it. Not us or the residents of Sturgeon.

Equals?

Then you only have to go to page 2 to find Clause "C. DEFINITIONS d)" which reads "d) Environmentally Significant Lands means all lands in Sturgeon County that are: (a) a swamp; (b) a gully, ravine or coulee; (c) an escarpment; (d) a natural drainage course; (e) riparian lands adjacent to the beds and shores of rivers, streams, creeks, watercourses and natural drainage courses; (f) wetlands; (g) lands subject to flooding, including Flood Risk Areas, floodways, and flood fringes; (h) unstable lands; (i) natural areas including forests, woodlands, meadows, and prairies; or (j) contaminated lands."

Again misleading or a lie. This clause only applies to Sturgeon. All other clauses in this section "Definitions" appear to apply to both municipalities except even that is questionable as Bon Accord is not included in the Plan Area, referral area or Referral Area. Furthermore, "F. GOALS g)" on page 5 states "g) Identification and protection of physical features and environmentally sensitive areas." These combined are confusing, misleading, disturbing and ominous. Confusing because Environmentally Significant Lands are defined (albeit poorly) but not environmentally sensitive lands. Misleading because clearly we are not "equals" as set out in Clause 2 as this "confiscation" only applies to Sturgeon. Disturbing because amongst other things it defines "Environmentally Significant Lands" as "(i) natural areas including forests, woodlands, meadows and prairies;". Again I ask, have you read this? Do you know what meadow means? Meadows are defined as "a piece of grassland, especially one used for hay". Prairie is the French word for meadow. My land is currently used for hay. The stated "Goal" therefore appears to be to identify and protect this land. From who. Me? For who? The Town? I have said many times for many years we and Sturgeon are not a zoo for our urban neighbors benefit and enjoyment. If you disagree and pass this Bylaw at least please require the Town provide for our care, feeding and upkeep.

Who writes this tripe? Is there a planner out there with any knowledge of history or economics let alone sense of reality? Seeing the future is easy if you know the past. We can't develop wetlands? A large part of Sturgeon and even Bon Accord were wetlands. After the London plague of 1665 Thomas Grosvenor paid Mary Davises mother (her father had died of the plague) £5,000.00 for her hand in marriage and 300 acres of wetlands. This is now Belgravia in the heart of London, some of the most valuable, desirable and productive land on earth.

A number of years back, while attending FCM in Quebec City Heather and I visited the farm of an elderly farm lady on ile d'Orleans. She was endeavoring to improve her lot in life and that of those around her (A rising tide lifts all ships) by growing grapes and producing ice wine instead of working for the variable cost of production inherent in growing the islands primary commodities of leeks and sugar maple. She stated that while producing ice wine was challenging and risky those were minimal compared to the difficulties visited upon her by the Provincial planning authorities. She was prohibited

from making any changes or improvements without their approval including paint color or roof finish. It was impossible for her son to build a second home on the property in order to help her. She lamented that while residents of Quebec City could change and progress and prosper according to ever evolving new realities, and amend their land use to accommodate these, her and her neighbors were condemned in perpetuity to provide them with vichyssoise and maple syrup and be on display as representatives of Quebec's historic past. A human zoo for the enjoyment and benefit of her urban neighbors! She so accurately pointed out that while this grew the tourism industry, those who worked in that industry were primarily part time, unskilled, seasonal, transient, minimum wage earners as opposed to those visiting from a short distance away across the bridge in Quebec City. This IDP if passed is the first step in consigning us in the Plan Area to a similar fate.

The very next or third clause reads:

"The purpose of the IDP is to accomplish the following within the Plan Area:"  
(Why is Bon Accord excluded from this? Surely, these should apply within Bon Accord first!)

"a) Ensure orderly development, while protecting the area surrounding the Town for future expansion;"

(How can Sturgeon ensure orderly development or even the purpose of the IDP when the Town is not included in the Plan Area? They currently have 700-750 acres of undeveloped land. Why would we protect the area surrounding the Town for future expansion when, during one of if not the longest and strongest periods of economic and population growth in the Provinces and regions history the Town has failed to develop and grow at all? In 2001 the population was 1,532. In 2018 it was 1,539. The population has essentially remained static for the past 20 years. It has taken 130 years to grow to 1500+! The Town should use the land they have before coveting their neighbors. Currently they have enough land to meet their needs for far longer than any very, very long term "planning period" that is customary in Alberta.

"b) Establish a framework for attracting economic opportunities;"

"c) Improve opportunities to secure a long-term economic base for the region;"

"d) Ensure the municipalities are development-ready and future oriented in their effort to attract economic activity;"

(Bon Accord has been development ready for years. They have far more than an ample supply of land. (This Bylaw even got that wrong. Materially incorrect!! Egregiously misleading! Clause B states: "The Town covers an area of approximately 211 hectares

(521.4 acres),..." when it in fact covers almost twice that area!) Only about 1/5 of this is developed yet they now want to plan on freeze, devalue and sterilize (Planners euphemistically refer to this as "preserving and protecting good farmland!") an additional area approximately six times bigger?! They have full urban services including city water provided largely through Provincial funding. (Of note they charge their residents \$3.21/m<sup>3</sup> for water while we and other Sturgeon residents have to pay \$5.75/ m<sup>3</sup> for the same water). The Province widened Highway 28 to four lanes through much of Bon Accord ensuring safe and easy access and egress. Sturgeon County paved RR 240/Sunnyside Road/50th Street to the City limits. Bon Accord escaped from the stifling embrace of the CRB/EMRB/Capital Region Intermunicipal Plan (it took a while before they recognized the acronym was the very appropriate CRIMP.)

Despite all these and despite being located in an area of Alberta that has experienced unprecedented growth in the last 20 years Bon Accord has failed to grow. It is not Sturgeons fault. It is despite or in spite of Sturgeons best efforts to the contrary. There were no impediments to Bon Accord's growth other than those that were self imposed by Bon Accord. These are still in place. Address those first. They don't need an IDP or an ICF or more collaboration with Sturgeon they need a change in policy. Until that is done this IDP is no more than an expensive and costly exercise in futility.) No amount of legislatively mandated IDP'S, ICF'S, Conservation Reserves (664.2 MGA), intermunicipal cooperation, planny-plans, mutual planning, cooperation and collaboration, service cost reduction, describing services, sharing of services, delineating who provides and who pays for those services, dispute resolution mechanisms, good governance or other similar claptrap will change that.

Clause "H LAND USE POLICIES 10) states " No new or expanding Confined Feeding Operations within the Plan Area ....shall be permitted...."

(In the definitions "Shall" means obligatory direction. No discretion here.) This is absolutely unacceptable. We always talk about "value added." Well it applies to agriculture as well. So how about walking the walk? This Bylaw condemns us in perpetuity to being hewers of wood and drawers of water. Large acreage producers of cereals and oilseeds for export. Animal agriculture is second only to steel in terms of being an economic multiplier. The act binds NRCB approval officers to the land use provisions set out in local municipal development plans. If an application is not consistent with local land use provisions, the approval officer must deny the application. This subverts due process. It denies me the right to an affordable, timely, fair hearing and approval. Even if any deleterious effects of the proposed use can be fully mitigated and eliminated the approving officer must deny the application. Even if the MDS required for Large Scale Residential, Rural, Hamlet, Village, Town or City falls short of Bon Accord's recently annexed outer boundary let alone the much further nearest residence, the approval officer must deny the application. For example, an application for 500 cows on the NE of 23 requires an MDS of 2584 feet from the nearest residence

in Bon Accord. The closest corner of this land is 3733' from the closest corner of the recently annexed, expanded boundary of Bon Accord and over 7,500' from the nearest house in Bon Accord. This is very close to 3x's the separation distance required by AOPA/NRCB but the approval officer must deny my application. This is onerous, heavy handed, unfair and unreasonable. In every instance my only hope is to pursue the much more expensive, uncertain and time-consuming process of appealing to the Board of the NRCB for a review. In my humble opinion the Council needs to evaluate this ban on the bases of its cumulative and chilling impact on Sturgeon as a whole. If passed you are sterilizing close to 26,000 acres of farmland that could be used for value added animal agriculture and the associated local employment, jobs, prosperity and well being.

Bon Accord enjoys a sewage lagoon in the County but their delicate sensibilities preclude any dust, noise, or odour from Sturgeon County?

Based on the most recent actual evidence available, if passed, this clause alone will have a monetary cost to us of about \$375,000. to \$600,000. A recent number of years back a close neighbor sold his land to a CFO for \$125,000 to \$200,000/quarter section over market value. I was personally involved and privy to the discussions, negotiations and terms. Both parties recognized the sale price was \$125,000 to \$200,000 per quarter over market but an assembly of 4 quarter sections was needed for the CFO to remain in Sturgeon County and get NRCB approval. Under current laws, unfortunately, you have the authority to devalue an owner's land without compensating the affected owner. That doesn't mean you should do it especially if you have another choice. In this case you do. Remove this clause or don't pass this Bylaw.

Clause F GOALS 1) a) states: "Identification of the Future Land Uses in the referral area. This is the IDP Plan Area in the County, within approximately one mile of the Town, where the County will refer proposed subdivisions, land use bylaw redesignations, and statutory documents to the Town for review and comment." Clause N. COMMUNICATION AND REFERRAL PROCESS 1) states in part: "All Municipal Development Plan amendments, subdivision applications, Land Use Bylaw redesignations, Area Structure Plans and development permit applications for discretionary uses within the Referral Area will be referred to the other municipality for comment. All ...." This is poorly/sloppily worded and defined. The NE of 23 is within the Plan Area. However all of or a good portion of the N ½ of the NE23 which is under a separate title is not in the referral area/Referral Area.

Clause G. FUTURE GROWTH & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT 2) and 3) state respectively: "The Town and County shall continue to encourage agricultural activity in the local area." and "The Town and County will work together to promote the establishment of a diversified and sustainable assessment base within the Plan Area." Where does one even begin to address this calamity? Firstly, sub-clause 3. **Bon**

**Accords biggest deficiency and challenge is they have neither a diversified nor sustainable assessment base.** If I have not already, indirectly or directly, stated this by now I think I have adequately inferred it by pointing out how this Bylaw will fail to secure neither Bon Accord's sustainability nor development. In fact it has far less than a snowball's chance in hell of doing so. It is the crux of this whole diatribe. The whole and noble purpose of this document is to establish a diversified and sustainable assessment and tax base to enable Bon Accord to deliver affordable services to its residents. This document does not do that. It does not even provide a mechanism to do that. It is a complete and utter bust. It is a farage (urban dictionary). **Bon Accord is not in the Plan Area.** Secondly, how do you square the foregoing subclause 2 "...to encourage agricultural activity in the local area." by not permitting CFO'S? Does local area mean within Bon Accord? Are we now encouraging agriculture in Bon Accord but discouraging it in Sturgeon?

I am now only up to page 6 and arguably the rest of the Bylaw is no better.

Footnote #1

**CRB Housing Comments August 9, 2012.**

**Mr. Chairman, fellow board members, today I will spare you from my usual: "If this (Board) were a marriage it would be judged as controlling at best and abusive at worst." comments and speak to you about the effect this Board is having and will have on housing in this region. A significant part of this Boards mandate from the Premier was to develop a housing plan for the region.**

**"Housing"**

**The capital region growth management plan creates an artificial housing shortage that imposes significant burdens on low-income families and first time home buyers while rewarding the wealthy homeowner with a significant, windfall, tax free gain. If this were tax policy it would be the same as supporting a highly regressive tax policy of taxing the poor to give to the rich. That is what all supporters of this Board and the Capital Region Growth Plan are in essence doing.**

**Additionally it is making our municipality's unsustainable. As our "planning" inexorably restricts supply and drives up housing prices and associated mortgage costs the homeowner is concurrently less able to afford our municipal taxes. Our cities will go from economic engines of growth and prosperity to perpetually subsidized urban housing co-ops.**

**The evidence is incontrovertible. Comparing the results with the dates that cities or metropolitan areas begin doing growth management planning by the public authority reveals a remarkably similar pattern and outcome. In regions where no growth management planning is done by the public authority, long term inflation adjusted housing prices grow at only about 1-3 per cent per year. In regions with centralized growth management planning by the public authority it is 4-14 per cent per year.**

**In the past 10 years Houston has grown by 1.2m people. This equates to the entire population of the Capital region. It is the fastest growing major city in the US and recently passed Chicago as #3. All this and no inflation in home prices. Still about \$100-\$150 psf or one half to one third that in Edmonton. Low house prices allow taxes as a per cent of home value to be much higher than in this region. Those same low house prices however ensure a homeowner's total principal, interest, taxes and insurance payments are much lower than in this region. Homebuilders have proven that they can meet the demand for housing. When demand goes up the supply rises--not the prices. Houston has no zoning or planning by the public authority. Developers could do the same here if we'd just get out of their way. Several years ago at his State of the City address Mayor Crouse scolded the development community for only building 130 odd new units. Yet it is he and his Council that is the problem--not the developers. Homebuyers should be able to buy the size and type of home they want at a price they can afford and not one that is a size and type dictated by some central planning authority at some vastly supply restricted premium.**

**Regional growth management planning cannot be justified by the need to limit the costs of sprawl. The most widely recognized and credible study done shows that if growth is not regulated/planned by the central authority, the resultant "sprawl" adds \$11,095 to the cost of each new home whereas a smart growth management plan like we are supporting adds \$25,000 - \$850,000 to the cost of every home with the average being \$135,000 per home over 110 cities. This played a significant contributing role, along with the US tax laws allowing the deduction of mortgage interest against personal income, in our present worldwide financial crisis that began in 2007-2008.**

**We should lobby the province to amend the MGA and repeal this Capital Region Growth Plan. They currently only serve to put barriers in the way of home builders meeting the demand for affordable housing by our citizens--the type of housing they want at a price they can afford. Failure to do this risks tossing one of mankind's greatest achievements--the city--onto history's ash heap of tragically failed experiments in central planning by the public authority along with--feudalism, mercantilism, communism and fascism. Only twelve years after the end of the century have we forgotten all of that centuries lessons? Apparently not. The impulse and urge to centralize power and impose plans by the public authority/secular clergy apparently remains amazingly persistent in Alberta today. It only goes away when we can no longer afford the cost as happened in the 1980s and 1990s. The results however are still just as anathema to humanity's well being today as they were then."**

**Just a few short years ago the Capital Region enjoyed the most competitive housing and industrial markets in Canada and North America. We now have the most expensive and least competitive residential and industrial markets in Canada--and getting worse--and the unintended consequence or obscene outcome is that the CRB is a major contributor to this and will continue to be a major contributor to this in the future! While this**



**initiative was well intentioned the unintended consequence is that it has variously restricted supply, restricted competition and choice, restricted growth, escalated costs, weakened our competitiveness, driven industry out of the region and province, ensured we don't get the maximum monetized value for our resources and limited diversification around our natural, competitive and comparative advantages. The outcome is less revenue, wild fluctuations in that revenue and government deficits leading to reduced levels of service and funding to municipalities. This has created considerable stress at this CRBoard as members find themselves fighting to secure an ever larger share of a static or shrinking provincial pie. Instead of generating more jobs and wealth (and assessment and taxes) in the region the CRB is causing these to be exported elsewhere. Four years ago, shortly after the founding of this board I warned that we go down this road at our peril. Shortly thereafter when this Board seriously considered a motion to not approve any development in the region until their perfect regional plan was completed I warned: "Edmonton's competition is Houston. (Alberta's is Texas). While this CRB will make it almost impossible for Edmonton to win this competition, if we begin with a moratorium on development now we might just as well throw in the white towel today!!! " While we didn't start off with a development moratorium, unfortunately, despite my continued efforts, we have continued down this road to serfdom. Ladies and Gentlemen, I am asking you again, please let's abandon this folly, let's scrap this plan before it is too late. If nothing else, let us at least first do no harm. This is tyranny. Let's choose liberty.**

**Thank you.**

**While we have had success, we have also faced challenges and will continue to face significant challenges, risks and threats both from markets and government. I reference access to markets (we are essentially being embargoed by BC, the US and some First Nations and it is becoming ever more apparent that rail may play a much bigger role in all our futures than**

any of us imagined only a few years ago), the rapidly changing supply picture for oil and gas (It was only a few short years ago when I was first elected as a Councillor, Agrium, our largest industry, faced a difficult future and potential closure because of low agriculture prices and high natural gas prices. In fact this potential loss of one of our oldest and largest County businesses is what prompted my pursuit of new industry. Off-gases from an up-grader are a potential natural gas feedstock substitute for a fertilizer plant. Of course, contrary to conventional wisdom, only a few years later what happens? High agriculture prices and low gas prices and Agrium reports record profits. My first and foremost commitment has and always will be to our existing residents and businesses but we must see the future and be proactive rather than just reactive.) the Electric Statutes Amendment act and Power lines, erosion of land owner rights, the Land Use Framework, REDA (Responsible Energy Development Act) the Capital Region Board are but a few. While many of these government initiatives are well intentioned the unintended consequence is that they have variously restricted supply, restricted competition and choice, restricted growth, escalated costs, weakened our competitiveness, driven industry out of the region and province, ensured we don't get the maximum monetized value for our resources and limited diversification around our natural competitive and comparative advantages. The outcome is less revenue, wild fluctuations in that revenue and government deficits leading to reduced levels of service. On many of these issues I believe I have taken well researched, well thought out, defensible, principled positions or stands on behalf of the citizens of Sturgeon. It has not been easy. It has not been without personal cost. I have not always won. But my motto has never been: "There goes the mob, I must follow them for I am their leader." My motto is more in line with Emerson's quote which I first saw at Soldier's Field, Harvard, while researching urban economics at the Kennedy School of Government with Ed Glaeser : "Though love repine and reason chafe, There came a voice without reply, Tis man's perdition to be safe, When for the truth he ought to die."