

Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan 2.0

Status of Sturgeon County Requests

As of Final Draft Plan, September 8, 2016

Sturgeon County Request Item	Status	Comments
<p>1. Preservation of Ag Lands vs. Ability for Rural Municipalities to Grow Responsibly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some concern around Ag Master Plan not being in place prior to vote on Growth Plan 2.0. CR Policy whereby under certain conditions (i.e. non-prime Ag lands, development of LESA tool) new CR development could occur. Consideration given to allow contiguous expansion of Major Employment Areas onto areas of lower quality soils, and clarification that being designated outside Metropolitan Policy Tier (in the Rural Tier) will have no impact. Relative to 1.2.6, what are 'eco-industrial principles,' as heavy industry is located in Ag areas? How will these principles be balanced with the need to locate heavy industry away from dense population centres? Prohibit fragmentation vs. discourage fragmentation. Agricultural Assessments on lands should be identified within Policy as additional study, as this information should supersede high level mapping determination of 'prime/non-prime' ag land. CR Policy (4.4.4) criteria should be amended to 85% of municipality's CR land supply has been absorbed. CR Policy should be limited to the Rural Policy Tier. Introduction of the commuter-shed at this stage of the process is inconsistent with process for Policy Tier development; more examination required. If the affected adjacent municipality provides consent to allow CR within a certain distance, it should be allowed. REF Process should only apply to CR developments of 3 quarter sections or more. 	Caution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informal task force of Counties, Edmonton and CRB have been providing input into some Principles that will guide the Master Plan. Malcolm plans on submitting draft 2 of Ag Master Plan Principles to the group when he returns from holidays, and solicit feedback from members. Policy 6.2 now reads 'discourage' fragmentation as opposed to 'prohibit.' Development of a Site Construction Tool to identify Priority Prime Agricultural Lands is now identified as a project to occur upon approval of GPU 2.0. After the August 18 Task Force Meeting, the Task Force is now recommending to the Board the approval of the revised Rural Growth Policy, which supports the infill and build-out of existing CR areas to a maximum density of 50 lots per quarter section, and allows for new CR areas/development under certain circumstances. The Board voted to adopt this Policy into the Growth Plan on September 8, 2016. It can be found on p. 60 of the Growth Plan.
<p>2. Sturgeon Valley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sturgeon Valley be identified in Table 5 with density targets TBD given its status as a Special Study Area. 	On-Track	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule 1 remains unchanged. The Valley is not identified on the Schedule—no rural areas are except for hamlets and

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sturgeon Valley Growth Plan Principles be included in Growth Plan 2.0, and Policy be included to ensure there is a sense of urgency from all parties involved to complete work in a timely manner. Schedule 1 be revised to reflect delineation more accurately of County assets and ability to transition from CR Community to urban development form. Policy 4.4.5 should remove 'country residential' and just say 'development.' 		<p>portions of Leduc County (part of Edmonton's Annexation Request).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most of this work remains ongoing. In draft 4 of the Plan, the Valley is recognized on p. 60 as section 4.4.5 and on p. 110 as part of the Implementation Plan.
<p>3. Growth Hamlets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define the difference between a Growth Hamlet and Non-growth Hamlet. There are significant differences in real growth potential, and there should be a range of density targets that are reasonable and achievable for all. Hamlets should have opportunity for Greenfield Growth, in keeping with the same criteria as Towns and Villages within the Rural Tier. Growth Hamlet Densities at 20 du/ha may present some concerns. 	<p>Caution</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Growth Hamlet densities approved by CRB on July 14th at 20 du/ha. Municipalities will be required to identify Growth Hamlets in Regional Context Statement submission within one year of approval of GPU; Context Statement translate to MDP.
<p>4. CRB Mandate Creep</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CRB Review of municipal Transportation and Infrastructure plans is unnecessary and costly. Interpretation of the overall Plan may be difficult, making it hard for municipal planners to implement at a local level and ensure compliance of other statutory documents. A clear criterion should be developed for municipal planners, Councils and developers to measure against. CRB Approval of future ASPs should not be required if all ASPs must comply with Growth Plan 2.0, unless MDPs have not been approved. 	<p>Caution</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We cautioned in December 2015 some of the Implementation Plan could be outside of the CRB's current mandate. As indicated at June 29 Task Force Meeting, the intent is now that only municipal Ag Master Plans and Transportation Plans would be received by CRB as information. However, p. 86 still speaks to the CRB providing comment on Transportation Master Plans and Agriculture Master Plans before the plan is considered for approval by the local Council.
<p>5. MDP Alignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although ASPs will be grandfathered, how do we ensure overall alignment of revised MDPs as new ASPs must comply with GPU 2.0? Suggest timeline to have MDP in alignment be adjusted to begin once Ag Master Plan is in place. 	<p>Caution</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timeline for MDP Alignment has been adjusted to 3-years after GPU approval, and the intent is to complete the Ag Master Plan within 2 years upon approval (giving 1-year to adjust MDP) (p. 110).
<p>6. Regional Context Statements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mandatory to have complete two years after the Plan's approval is unnecessary, given the requirement to align MDP one year later. 	<p>Unchanged</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Listed on p. 110 as expected to be completed within a year of GPU approval.

7. Resource Extraction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include Villeneuve-Calahoo as Resource Extraction Areas in Regional Structure Map • Oversight with Policy 2.5.1 that would prohibit any resource extraction—wording should be revised to allow extraction on prime agricultural lands. 	Complete	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule 3C (p. 39) identifies the area as having a Sand/Gravel deposit.
8. No Plans for Direct Community Consultations	Complete	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of reference to prime agricultural lands in relation to extraction activities.
9. Process Identified to Amend Policies on Regular Basis	Complete	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRB hosted regional roadshows in June and July. • Although it's debatable how successful they were, they were held after there was no apparent initial intent to do so.
10. Infill <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the definition related to existing CRAs allow for subdivision as one means of intensification. 	Complete	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CRB can consider amendments to the Growth Plan by adopting an enabling procedure through bylaws and within CRB Regulation. • Proposed amendments may be submitted by the Board or a member municipality. • A 5-year interim review and 10-year comprehensive review will occur otherwise. • Future CRB studies and initiatives (like the Ag Master Plan) may have outcomes that need to be incorporated into the Growth Plan, which will need to be approved by the CRB and GoA.
11. Cost-Sharing for Regionally Significant Infrastructure Projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be equitably distributed across the region. 	Complete	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition states, "Permit infill and build out of existing country residential areas in accordance with existing zoning and land use permissions and in new areas, subject to specific criteria" (p. 23).
12. Definition of Growth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes the consumption of rural lands for urban development; this should be removed. 	Complete	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarified that it applies to communities wishing to participate in collaborative and coordinated funding.
13. Rural Lifeline Transit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of this item needs to be clarified, as such statements may raise unrealistic and costly expectations for service-levels. • Amend the table 'Regional Levels of Service' by adding 'where feasible' or 'as appropriate' to the mention of rural lifeline transit. 	Complete	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appears to have been removed.
14. Only Incorporate 2014 MDP for Environmentally Sensitive Areas, Not 1996 MDP	Complete	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changed to read, "<i>potential</i> for lifeline transportation services"; still may raise unrealistic expectations (p. 23)
15. Environmental Master Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRB should look at Developing Regional Environmental Master Plan (similar to Ag) 	Unchanged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mapping error fixed within Schedule 6 v.5 May 24, 2016 • No apparent plan to look at a Regional Environmental Master Plan upon GPU Approval.

<p>in the future, given reference to mostly aspirations of complying with existing Federal/Provincial legislation in Nautral Living System Policy Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy 2.5.1 speaks to air quality, a Provincial jurisdiction and difficult to control within and across borders. 	Complete	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priorities appear to be Ag Master Plan, Regional Transportation Master Plan, Regional Infrastructure Master Plan and Regional Open Spaces Master Plan. Addition of Policy 2.3.3 and 2.3.4 appears to have resolved this concern (p. 46).
<p>16. Roles and Responsibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly identify roles within each Policy Tier, for example: do Counties have any role in the planning/development within the Metropolitan Area. If so, what? Ex. If a rural municipality has development opportunities identified within the Metropolitan Policy Tier, is it within their purview to develop those lands, or is it the role of an urban municipality? 	Unchanged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response; remains relatively unclear from Policy Tier descriptions (p. 22-27).
<p>17. Transportation Systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HWY 2 and transportation corridors associated with AIH identified as regionally significant. Policy 5.2.1 takes a very urban perspective with shift away from individual car-use. In rural context, this may mean park and ride. 	Complete	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway 2 is identified as a Regional Freeway in Schedule 10A (p. 71). Policy 5.2.2 recognizes park and ride dynamic for rural areas (p. 74).
<p>18. Local Employment Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Schedule 3B) Recommend removal of Area and Policies based on Land Use Districts, as not indicative of current statutory direction. 	Unchanged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response; local employment areas remain on map on p. 38.
<p>19. Policy Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That the language amongst policies be consistent (i.e. don't just have Ag policies sound regulatory with phrases like prohibit and limit). 	Complete	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Language within Ag Policy Area revised and toned down to be consistent.
<p>20. Identify CFB Edmonton as Federal Jurisdiction</p>	Unchanged	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No special federal indicator has been applied to CFB Edmonton as of yet in any of the Schedules (p. 38).