

Handout:  
July 11, 2017  
Item 4.2 - Bylaws 2017-14  
Public Hearing

**Municipal Development Plan Bylaw 2017-14**  
**Written submissions received after June 30, 2017**

*The following written submissions were received on Bylaw 2017-14 after  
the June 30, 2017 commenting period closed.*

---



July 6, 2017

Martin Frigo  
Manager, Long Range Policy Planning  
53109A HWY 779  
Parkland County, AB T7Z 1R1

Delivered by e-mail [mfrigo@parklandcounty.com](mailto:mfrigo@parklandcounty.com)

RE: Bylaw 2017-14 Parkland County Municipal Development Plan

Martin:

Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to comment on Parkland County's draft Municipal Development Plan dated May 2017. Sturgeon County acknowledges the extensive amount of public engagement dating back to 2014 to inform the development of the Plan. Given Parkland County's extensive amount of pre-districted future country residential along our 24km long shared north border (see Figure 6 - Development Concept which includes over 400 quarter sections of country residential lands), Sturgeon County stresses the importance of continued growth management in the planning areas of Glory Hills (Bylaw 7-79), Atim Creek (Bylaw 26-2002) and Big Lake (Bylaw 17-91). It is noted that portions of these Area Structure Plans were previously linked with the Cluster Country Residential Area 'I' of the 2009 Capital Region Growth Plan.

Sturgeon County acknowledges that existing Area Structure Plans adopted prior to the 2016 Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan will remain in effect and be grandfathered as part of implementation of the Plan. With the removal of the Cluster Country Residential Area policy areas (with established density target of 2 units/gross ha) and the subsequent replacement with Rural Policy tier (with no identified country residential greenfield densities in Schedule 6); Sturgeon County notes that there no longer remains any regional policy connection point with the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan for these country residential areas identified for future growth. Furthermore, little density guidance exists at the local level, as there is vagueness and inconsistencies of density policies in the above mentioned statutory plans. For example;

- Atim Creek ASP does not identify a min/max density, nor does it provide a min/max lot size. Future residential multi-lot developments are required to submit an Outline Plan and are *'not to exceed the capability of the site'*.
- Glory Hills ASP identified min/max parcel sizes of 0.5-3ac and states that *'the density of any particular subdivision will not be arbitrarily controlled, but rather will be determined by the carrying capacity of the land'*.
- Big Lake ASP references CCRA 'I' and target density of 2 du/gross ha, with min/max lots sizes of 0.5-3ac and a limited amount of country residential at densities of 22 du/net ha.

Given the circumstances noted above, there is currently no way to evaluate the full local or regional impact of future country residential developments along Sturgeon County's shared boundary. Policies 7.2.1 and 7.2.2 in Section 7.2 'Country Residential Development Types' of the draft Parkland County MDP identifies the need to both undertake country residential inventories and to update Area Structure Plans.

*7.2.1 Country Residential Inventory & Analysis Study (a) The County may undertake a Country Residential inventory to identify and catalogue all types of Country Residential development in the County. The inventory will consider servicing availability, lot size, housing type, proximity to community and natural amenities, and proximity to natural amenities and features.*

*7.2.2 Country Residential Area Structure Plans (a) The County may update Area Structure Plans for Country Residential areas, including North (Glory Hills) and Southeast (Woodbend-Graminia/Devon Dunes). Area Structure Plan updates will incorporate technical and financial analysis to support the growth of complete communities.*

Sturgeon County strongly supports the above policy statements but recommends a change in the operative term of 'may' to 'shall' thereby ensuring that future work is completed to give greater understanding and certainty regarding Country Residential densities and their subsequent regional impact. It is also recommended that Atim Creek and Big Lake ASP be added to Policy 7.2.2. Associated amendments to these Area Structure Plans would ultimately require submission to the Capital Region Board through the Regional Evaluation Framework process, which would likely require additional due diligence to be articulated in policy statements within these in-force statutory plans. In summary, Sturgeon County supports the proposed draft Municipal Development Plan but recommends stronger wording be incorporated to support further planning at the Area Structure Plan level.

Sincerely,



Collin Steffes

Sturgeon County, Manager Community & Regional Planning

Cc:

Peter Tarnawsky, Sturgeon County, Chief Administrative Officer

Stephane Labonne, Sturgeon County, General Manager Integrated Growth

DATE; JULY 10, 2017

RE: PARKLAND COUNTY MDP PUBLIC INPUT

FROM [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

THIS IS NOT SUBMITTED BY JUNE 30<sup>TH</sup>, 2017. IF I NEED TO COME AND PRESENT VERBALLY PLEASE ADVISE BEFORE YOUR OFFICE CLOSES TODAY.

1. 32,000 RESIDENTS, 11,615 PRIVATE DWELLINGS. STONY PLAIN REPORTERS CIRCULATION IS ONLY 25,000 COPIES INCLUDING THE TOWN. HOW DOES THIS REMAIN OFFICIAL NOTIFICATION?
2. **HOW** DOES ANY OF THIS ADDRESS THE REDUCTION OF TAX DOLLARS AS THE COAL PHASE OUT? IS THE HIGHVALE END LAND USE STILL APPLICABLE?
3. 5.0.7  
DISCOURAGE NON COMPATIBLE USES ADJACENT TO NATURAL RESUORCE EXTRACTION.  
BECAUSE OF THIS IF A RESOURCE EXTRACTION IS APPROVED NEXT TO A LAND OWNER- EVEN A SINGLE LAND OWNER- YOU ARE STERILIZING THEIR LAND. YOU ARE REDUCING THE VALUE OF THE LAND AND TAKING AWAY FUTURE EARNING POTENTIALS.  
**HOW CAN YOU DESTROY ONE SINGLE LAND OWNERS INVESTMENT?**  
HAS PARKLAND NOT INCLUDED THE NSR AS A PART OF RECREATION AND SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT SO THEY CAN CONTINUE TO APPROVE STRIP MINES ON THE NSR?
4. **WHY** HAS PARKLAND COUNTY NOT PROVIDED A FLOOD PLAN? IT SHOULD BE PART OF THIS DOCUMENT.
5. HAMLET GROWTH- **WHY ARE WE SUPPORTING GROWTH IN ENTWHISTLE?** HOW MUCH MORE MONEY CAN PARKLAND SPEND FOR 500 PEOPLE? I WOULD LOVE GARBAGE PICK UP. THIS IS A DRAIN ON PARKLAND TAX DOLLARS- WHICH WE DO NOT HAVE.
6. 10.4.4  
FLOODWAYS ARE INCLUDED IN THE HEALTH OF WATERWAY FOR A SUBDIVISION BUT NOT SPECIFIC TO NATURAL RESOURCE. **WHY?**
7. 10.5.1  
RENEWABLE ENERGY – APPROVED FOR ALL AREAS? SOLAR FARMS, WIND FARMS, SHOULD NOT BE AUTOMATICALLY APPROVED IN ALL AREAS. THERE MUST BE CONSIDDERATION TO NEIGHBORS. SOLAR PANALS ON ONE RESIDENCE IS DIFFERENT THAN A FARM OF 40 ACRES +. FARMERS HAVE BEEN APPROACHED IN THE AREA NOW. **DO NOT GRANDFATHER THIS.**
8. CONSERVATION RESERVES AS PER THE MGA – VERY OPEN. I HAVE **MAJOR CONCERNS** WITH THIS.
9. ONE DAY ON THE NSR THIS PAST WEEKEND IN A VERY SMALL STRETCH- I COUNTED 7 GROUPS OF FLOATERS,CANOES, KAYAKS, CAMPING, 12 DIFFERENT MOTORIZED BOATS, GOLDPANNERS, SWIMMERS, FISHING. YOU HAVE MISSED THE POTENTIAL OF THE NSR- YOU HAVE FOCUSED ON LAKES AND NEED TO UPDATE THE NSR.

