

Topic: Application to amend the Bylaw 2016-12 Highvale End Land Use Area Structure Plan and Bylaw 2025-12 Land Use Bylaw to support data centre uses.

Item 1: Bylaw 2025-22 Amendments to Bylaw 2016-12 Highvale End Land Use Area Structure Plan

Item 2: Bylaw 2025-23 Amendment to Land Use Bylaw 2025-12 for the proposed Data Processing and Infrastructure Direct Control District (DC Area 7) and Amendments to Section 5.80 Data Processing Facility

Item 3: Bylaw 2025-24 Data Processing and Infrastructure Direct Control District (DC Area 7) Area of Application Amendments (Keephills Area)

Item 4: Bylaw 2025-25 Data Processing and Infrastructure Direct Control District (DC Area 7) Area of Application Amendments (Sundance Area)

Item 5: Bylaw 2025-26 Keephills Direct Control District (DC Area 4) Data Processing Facility Amendments

Administration Recommendation

1. That Bylaw 2025-22 receive first reading
2. That Bylaw 2025-22 receive second reading
3. That Bylaw 2025-22 be presented at this meeting for third reading
4. That Bylaw 2025-22 receive third reading

5. That Bylaw 2025-23 receive first reading
6. That Bylaw 2025-23 receive second reading
7. That Bylaw 2025-23 be presented at this meeting for third reading
8. That Bylaw 2025-23 receive third reading

9. That Bylaw 2025-24 receive first reading
10. That Bylaw 2025-24 receive second reading
11. That Bylaw 2025-24 be presented at this meeting for third reading
12. That Bylaw 2025-24 receive third reading

13. That Bylaw 2025-25 receive first reading
14. That Bylaw 2025-25 receive second reading
15. That Bylaw 2025-25 be presented at this meeting for third reading
16. That Bylaw 2025-25 receive third reading

17. That Bylaw 2025-26 receive first reading
18. That Bylaw 2025-26 receive second reading
19. That Bylaw 2025-26 be presented at this meeting for third reading
20. That Bylaw 2025-26 receive third reading

Introduction

Administration has received an application to amend Bylaw 2016-12 Highvale End Land Use Area Structure Plan (ASP) and Land Use Bylaw 2025-12 which includes updating existing Direct Control District (DC) Regulations for DC Area 4, a map update for DC Area 2, and a proposed new Direct Control District- Data Processing and Infrastructure Direct Control District (DC Area 7). The application includes five separate bylaws to amend the Area Structure Plan and Land Use Bylaw. The overarching goal is to update the land use regulations to allow for data processing and associated uses on lands adjacent to the Keephills and Sundance plant sites, leveraging the existing power plant infrastructure.

Facts (Background Information)

The lands being proposed in this application were previously brought forward by administration in Q1 of 2025 through a proposed Land Use Bylaw amendment. The intent of the proposed amendment focused on supporting the County's efforts to align development regulations with the Province of Alberta's strategy for catalyzing data centre developments and positioning the County to harness associated economic opportunities. The application was defeated by Council on March 27, 2025.

To provide the applicant an opportunity to submit an application on the same lands, administration brought forward a waiver which removed the one-year period under Section 19.6.1 of the former Land Use Bylaw 2017-18. Council passed a motion to waive the one-year period, which provided an opportunity for the applicant to submit a formal application if desired.

Item 1: Area Structure Plan Amendment (Bylaw 2025-22)

Proposed Bylaw 2025-22 is an Area Structure Plan amendment for the Highvale End Land Use Area Structure Plan – Bylaw 2016-12 (ASP). The amendments propose both text and map updates to support data processing and their associated uses on lands adjacent to the existing Keephills and Sundance plant sites. The application proposes text changes to more accurately reflect the current state of the Highvale area and removes outdated references to past regional and provincial bodies. Map amendments for the application identify lands south of the Keephills Plant site and southwest of the Sundance Plant site to be Business and Industrial to support data centre processing on the lands. The application was submitted with the intent to utilize the existing power plants infrastructure to support Alberta's shift to data centre developments.

A full summary of the proposed amendments can be found in **Attachment 1- Highvale ASP Redline**.

Item 2: Land Use Bylaw Amendment (Bylaw 2025-23)

Proposed Bylaw 2025-23 is an amendment to Land Use Bylaw 2025-12 (LUB) to introduce a new Direct Control District (DCD) for data processing and identified associated uses (Data Processing and Infrastructure Direct Control District - DC Area 7). In addition to the proposed new DCD, additional amendments to Section 5.80 of Bylaw 2025-12 were also included to support the application's intent.

The proposed DCD is intended to provide specific regulations for data processing and associated uses development in the County, a type of development previously unaddressed in the existing LUB. The DCD was developed to fill a regulatory gap, ensuring a clear and structured approach to support the application's intent.

A full summary of the proposed new DCD and amendments to Section 5.80 of the LUB can be found in **Attachment 2 – DC Area 7 and 5.80 Redline**.

Item 3: Land Use Bylaw Amendment (Bylaw 2025-24)

Proposed Bylaw 2025-24 is an amendment to Land Use Bylaw 2025-12 to include lands located south of the existing Keephills Power Generation Site into the new DCD - Data Processing and Infrastructure Direct Control District - DC Area 7. The specific quarter sections proposed in this amendment can be referenced in **Attachment 3 – Bylaw 2025-24 LUB Schedule P**.

Item 4: Land Use Bylaw Amendment (Bylaw 2025-25)

Proposed Bylaw 2025-25 is an amendment to Land Use Bylaw 2025-12 to include lands located west of the existing Sundance Power Generation Site into the new DCD - Data Processing and Infrastructure Direct Control District - DC Area 7. The specific quarter sections proposed in this amendment can be referenced in **Attachment 4 – Bylaw 2025-25 LUB Schedule Q**.

Item 5: Land Use Bylaw Amendment (Bylaw 2025-26)

Proposed Bylaw 2025-26 is an amendment to Land Use Bylaw 2025-12 for the inclusion of a portion of the existing Keephills Power Generation Site to be included within the Keephills Direct Control District (DC Area 4) to allow for data processing facilities. As the intent of the application is to allow for data processing within the specific areas identified in Map 7- Future Land Use of the Highvale End Land Use ASP, a portion of the existing site was noted to not be within the existing Keephills DCD (DC Area 4) and would be required to be included to support potential future development of data processing and their associated uses.

The proposed amendments for this bylaw can be found in **Attachment 5 – DC Area 4 Redline and Attachment 6 – LUB Schedule C Amended**.

Analysis

Administration reviewed the proposed amendments, the submitted technical studies and What We Heard Report associated with the application, the Province of Alberta's 'Alberta's Artificial Intelligence (AI) Data Centres Strategy', the County's Strategic Plan (2022-2025), and the Municipal Development Plan (Bylaw 2024-22) to inform the County's recommendation for Council approval.

Jurisdiction over Power Generation Facilities

Based on legal advice, administration provides the following key takeaways relating to jurisdiction and the municipal planning framework

Development of data processing facilities typically includes three distinct land uses and activities. Each of which is subject to either provincial or municipal regulations, and in some cases, regulations from both levels of government. These three components include the fuel source, the power generation facility, and the data processing facility. Below is a summary of jurisdiction over these three activities in Alberta.

Jurisdictional Item 1: Fuel Source

Topic	Notes
Pipelines, Oil and Gas	- Provincially regulated, and the exclusive jurisdiction of the Alberta Energy Regulator (AER) - Under the Municipal Government Act (MGA) s 618 (1)(b) and (c) oil wells and pipelines are exempt from the municipal planning framework - Part 17 of the MGA does not apply
Coal	Coal extraction is not exempt from Part 17 of the MGA

	Conflicts between AER approvals and the municipal planning authority are addressed through MGA s 619
--	--

Jurisdictional Item 2: Power Generation Facilities

Topic	Notes
Dual Jurisdiction and Approvals	- Proponents must apply to both the provincial and municipal governments to receive approval to develop a power generation facility - The Alberta Utilities Commission (AUC) is the provincial tribunal with regulatory authority to approve the construction, operation, and reclamation of power generation facilities - Municipalities regulate land use considerations for a power generation facility through Council decision-making (i.e. adoption of a planning bylaw) and development permit approval (through the Development Authority)
Paramountcy	- Under MGA s 619, a municipal government's regulation cannot conflict with the provincial government's regulation of a power generation facility - If the AUC has approved a power generation facility, the municipality must also approve an application, provided it is consistent with the AUC approval - There is no provincial requirement that the AUC approval must be in place first before commencing the municipal development permit application process
AUC Deferral	In some cases, the AUC will determine that certain aspects of a power generation facility are to be deferred to be addressed by the municipality

Jurisdictional Item 3: Data Processing Facility

Topic	Notes
Jurisdiction	This type of development is completely municipally regulated. A municipality has sole jurisdiction over a development permit application for a data processing facility
Incidental provincial approvals	Incidental regulatory approvals may be required for the proponent to obtain from the province (i.e. a water licence), however, the incidental approvals do not give permission for the license holder to operate a data processing facility

Municipal Planning Framework

There are four relevant layers of the municipal planning framework that are applicable to this application: the Area Structure Plan (ASP), Land Use Bylaw (LUB), Master Site Development Plan (MSDP), and development permit approval.

Topic	Notes
ASP	- The ASP is proposed to be amended as the prior vision established within the ASP no longer aligns with the applicant's intent for the area - The ASP is proposed to be amended to update the policy for the area to align with the new vision (i.e. power generation facilities and data processing facilities)
LUB	The LUB is proposed to be updated to create a new direct control district that will provide detailed direction for how power generation facilities and data processing facilities would be developed at these specific locations

MSDP	• The MSDP addresses the overall configuration and key components of a large development site • The MSDP would require technical analysis and reporting to be submitted by the applicant and include documents such as a traffic impact analysis (TIA), agricultural impact assessment (AIA), biophysical assessment, or others based on the configuration of the site and potential impact to surrounding parcels
Development Permits	• A Direct Control (DC) development permit is issued by Council • Only minor matters, except those specifically identified, may be delegated to the Development Authority • Under this application, Council will have another opportunity to consider whether to grant a development permit, and if so, its requirements and conditions

Jurisdictional Issues and the Planning Framework

Neither the MGA or the Alberta Coal Conservation Act exempts lands on which coal extraction takes place from the standard operation of the municipal planning framework:

- Respecting the lands on which coal extraction had previously occurred or had been previously contemplated:
 - The County's planning/development authority will apply to all developments unrelated to coal extraction.
 - There are restrictions placed upon the County from proceeding with the normal long-range or current planning processes on those same lands
- There is no obligation for TransAlta to obtain final reclamation certificates respecting its coal extraction, prior to the County exercising its planning/development authority for other developments on those same lands, including changes to the municipal planning framework
- Where MGA s 619 applies to provide a provincial tribunal paramouncy over municipal approval, the provincial tribunal does not have other regulatory approval over the lands

Analysis of the Application to the Municipal Development Plan

An analysis of the proposed amendments to the policies within the County's Municipal Development Plan Bylaw 2024-22 is found in **Attachment 7 – MDP Policy Evaluation Framework**.

Summary of the Bylaw Amendments

The following summary identifies the intent of each of the proposed bylaw amendments. A summary analysis of each proposed Bylaw Amendment, the intent of the regulations, and the alignment of the proposed changes to the County's Municipal Development Plan can be found in **Attachment 8-Admin Report Analysis Chart**.

Item 1: Area Structure Plan Amendment (Bylaw 2025-22)

Text Amendments

To facilitate the proposed data processing use within the Area Structure Plan (ASP), administration required amendments to be included in the application beyond the initial submission. Administration provided the applicant with recommendations, which directed them to revise and update specific sections of the ASP that were found to be inaccurate or outdated. The applicant reviewed these recommendations and submitted an amended application. These proposed changes were categorized to ensure greater transparency and were added to the existing application to better address public concerns, improve accuracy, and align with current policy.

The categories identified through Administration's analysis included:

1. General updates to support updates to titles, sections, references and grammatical issues.
2. Proposed amendments to support the data processing use and expansion of Business and Medium Industrial development in the ASP through land use considerations.
3. Proposed amendments to support agricultural operations and mitigation of impacts from development onto agriculture and environmentally sensitive areas.
4. Proposed amendments to support compatible land use development surrounding the proposed application areas.

Map Amendments

The proposed map amendments to the ASP redesignate four sections of land from AG- Agriculture to BI-Business Industrial and MI Medium Industrial. To better reflect the existing power plant and its associated infrastructure/uses, an addition to the legend for Heavy Industrial has been included. The proposed amendment to include the Heavy Industrial use class is not a redistricting of the parcel but rather identifying what already exists in the area for future consideration. This change is reflected in Map 7 – Land Use Concept in the proposed redline (**Attachment 1 – Highvale ASP Redline**)

Item 2: Land Use Bylaw Amendment (Bylaw 2025-23)

Text and Map Amendments

The proposed new Direct Control District (DC Area 7) provides specific regulations which incorporate guardrails for potential future development of data processing facilities and associated uses in the County. The intent of the regulations for the proposed DC Area 7 District aim to mitigate community and environmental concerns. Specifically, the DCD includes provisions to address potential negative impacts for noise and visual disturbances, while also protecting agricultural land use and other environmental concerns. Furthermore, the DCD establishes setback requirements to ensure appropriate distancing from neighbouring properties.

Additional amendments are proposed to Section 5.80 of the Land Use Bylaw. Amendments to Section 5.80 provide additional guidance for development proposals, outlining requirements for mitigation measures, aesthetic standards for buildings, noise monitoring, and acoustic barriers.

Working together, the proposed DC Area 7 and the amendments to Section 5.80 provide specific details for development proposals, including requirements for site design and building layout, and specific use requirements for data processing facilities.

Item 3: Land Use Bylaw Amendment (Bylaw 2025-24)

Text and Map Amendments

The proposed text and map amendments to DC Area 7 identify an area of application for 12 quarter sections of land located south of the existing Keephills Power Plant. This amendment proposes to redistrict six quarter sections of land from Direct Control Area 2 to Direct Control Area 7, and six quarter sections of land from RI – Resource Industry District to Direct Control Area 7. The area of application is reflected in the proposed Schedule P (**Attachment 3 – Bylaw 2024-25 LUB Schedule P**).

Item 4: Land Use Bylaw Amendment (Bylaw 2025-25)

Text and Map Amendments

The proposed text and map amendment DC Area 7 identify an area of application for four quarter sections of lands located west of the existing Sundance Power Plant. This amendment proposes to redistrict four quarter sections of

land from AG – Agriculture General District to Direct Control Area 7. The area of application is reflected in Schedule Q (Attachment 4 – Bylaw 2025-25 LUB Schedule Q).

Item 5: Land Use Bylaw Amendment (Bylaw 2025-26)

Text Amendments

This bylaw proposes to amend the current Keephills Direct Control District (DC Area 4) to provide specific uses and regulations to guide future development proposals for data processing facilities and accessory buildings on the site of the existing Keephills Power Plant. The proposed regulations intend to identify allowable uses, delegate decision authority between Council and Administration, address potential community and environmental impacts and concerns, and describe the areas of the Keephills Power Plant that are suitable for development of a data centre.

Map Amendments

The map amendments associated with this Bylaw identify specific areas of land within DC Area 4 where data processing facilities and associated uses are limited. The amendments to the Land Use Map also propose redistricting a small portion of land west of the Keephills Power Plant from Direct Control Area 2 to Direct Control Area 4.

Internal Administrative Circulation

Administration conducted an internal review of the proposed amendments and technical report submissions. Below is a summary of responses received by internal departments

Department	Comments/concerns
Fire Services	ASP Amendment: No comments LUB Amendments: No comments Technical Reports: No comments
Engineering Services	ASP Amendment: The Map 8: Transportation Network Map identifies roads in alignment with Parkland County's TMP (2021) in regard to RR 43 (Arterial Classification) and RR 35 (Collector Classification). Local road connections are identified and should be managed through the 2003/2008 MOA. The local roads should be established and amended according to future mining (i.e. reclamation and buildout) sequencing/phasing and future project recommendations based on proposed developments accepted within the classified land use district. <i>Advisement:</i> - Any proposed future road closure will require going through the road closure process. - A Transportation Impact Assessment and Construction Traffic Management Plan will be required at the development stage. LUB Amendments: No comments Technical Reports: No comments
Agriculture and Environment Services	ASP Amendment: <i>Agriculture:</i> - Consider removing language updates to the ASP that allow for non-agricultural uses within the Agricultural area of the ASP land use concept so that impacts to existing agricultural operations and the agricultural community are lessened. - Consider amending the ASP to direct non-agricultural uses to lower capability lands where possible, minimize the amount of agricultural land taken out of production, reclaim soils to their original or higher state, and only allow non-

agricultural uses in areas designated for agricultural use if other lands in the ASP area are not feasible for the proposed development.

Environment

1. None

LUB Amendments: None

Technical Reports:

Agricultural Impact Assessment:

The following advisements to the applicant were provided:

1. Address information gaps throughout the development process to allow for clearer understanding of the level of agricultural impact the proposed amendments may have, including but not limited to:
 - a. Land fragmentation, agricultural density, and viability of surrounding farm operations;
 - b. Surface and / or groundwater usage;
 - c. Construction and operating nuisances;
 - d. Timeframe for data processing facility lifespan and possible return to agricultural production;
 - e. Site selection justification;
 - f. Transportation networks and farm operations accesses; and
 - g. Management of farming operations within the future development footprint.
2. All proposed mitigation measures outlined in the Agricultural Impact Assessment should be considered during site planning and development including but not limited to consideration of co-locating agriculture within the development area, avoidance of agricultural land where possible, a weed control plan, a soil erosion and control plan, and a reclamation plan that includes agricultural as an end land use for the project site.

Biophysical Impact Assessment

The submitted Biophysical Impact Assessment was reviewed and determined to require additional detail to meet development requirements at the Master Site Development Plan stage. These details include but are not limited to:

1. Site plan specific assessment of potential impacts to the existing environment;
2. Completion of site specific desktop studies, detailed field surveys, and other technical studies;
3. Identification of key issues or environmental sensitivities; and
4. Identification of proposed Best Management Practices and mitigation and/or offsetting measures.

Planning and Development Services Response:

Addressing these gaps in information will help ensure the potential agricultural and environmental impacts are understood and that mitigation measures are appropriately considered and incorporated to the site. Administration has provided amending motions under the Alternatives section of this report that allow for updated assessments to be required at the Master Site Development Plan stage. Greater amendments to the ASP

	have been identified by administration to be implemented into the greater Area Structure Plan project being completed.
Planning and Development Services	ASP Amendment: No comments LUB Amendments: Recommended motions for amending the proposed Bylaws have been provided in the 'Alternatives' section of this report. Technical Reports: No comments

While the identified gaps in the Agricultural Impact Assessment and Biophysical Assessment should be addressed to ensure a complete understanding of the impacts, Council may consider approval of the application, subject to the submission of an updated assessments to the satisfaction of Administration prior to the approval of any Master Site Development Plan (MSDP) or issuance of any development permit. This approach would allow the application to proceed while ensuring agricultural and environmental considerations are fully addressed at the detailed site design and development stage.

Public Consultation

As per Council Policy C-AD51, public engagement was required to support the proposed ASP amendment, LUB amendment, and Conceptual Scheme applications. A What We Heard Report (WWHR) completed by the applicant for all engagement conducted is available for review as **Attachment 9- WWHR**.

Developer – Led Engagement (Open House #1/2)

Pre-application open houses were hosted by the applicant on June 17th and 19th within the County. The Open Houses were hosted in the Summer Village of Seba Beach and the Keephills Community Hall, which was attended by approximately 60 public representatives wanting to provide feedback on the application and ask questions of the applicant. Main concerns identified during these open houses were:

- **Planning and Regulatory Alignment:** Concerns were raised regarding the proposed bylaw amendments based on outdated planning documents and their alignment with the original agreement for the Keephills area.
- **Infrastructure and Road Impacts:** Concerns were expressed about the adequacy of existing roads and access routes, with a specific focus on Township Roads 524, 522, 512, and 514. Concerns for road upgrades, improved winter maintenance, and identified emergency access points were highlighted.
- **Environmental and Community Quality of Life:** Potential impacts on the community's quality of life were a key concern. This included worries about construction-related dust, light pollution, and noise from the data center's operations, particularly from generators and cooling systems. The effects on property values and visual impacts were also noted.
- **Power and Energy Use:** Numerous questions were raised about the data center's power supply. The source of the required 400 MW, the long-term impact on the power grid, and whether the facility would be self-sufficient were all brought up. A preference for the use of clean energy sources was also expressed.
- **Communication and Engagement:** The level of communication and engagement was perceived as insufficient. Requests were made for weekend open houses, earlier notifications, and one-on-one meetings. The desire for more detailed project materials, including environmental reports, was also noted.

Developer – Led Engagement (Open House #3/4)

A second round of Open Houses was completed by the applicant to allow residents to provide comments on the proposed redlines to the ASP and LUB. Open houses were conducted on July 29th and 30th at the Seba Beach Heritage Society and Keephills Community Hall, which brought approximately 30 public representatives wanting to engage on the application. Main concerns identified during the second round of open houses were:

- **Environmental and Community Impact:** Community members raised questions regarding the environmental impact of the proposed data center, particularly regarding water usage and its effect on nearby lakes, as well as the noise from cooling systems and generators. Additional concerns were raised regarding the project's impact on local infrastructure, such as roads and fire services, and skepticism about the claimed economic benefits.
- **Bylaw Specifics and Project Details:** A large portion of the feedback focused on the specifics of the proposed Area Structure Plan (ASP) and Land Use Bylaw (LUB) amendments. Residents asked for clarification on what these amendments regulate, the differences between the new zoning areas, and whether certain technical studies would be mandatory or optional. There was also a desire for more concrete details about the data center, such as its exact location, access roads, and the timeline for its development.
- **Communication and Public Engagement:** The feedback highlighted dissatisfaction with the communication process. People questioned the timing of the open houses, public notifications, and whether there would be future opportunities for public input, especially regarding environmental assessments. There was a clear demand for more transparent communication and publicly available answers to all the questions raised.
- **Uncertainty Regarding Project Ownership, Power, and Future Land Use:** The public expressed curiosity and concern about the project's long-term aspects. Questions were raised about who would own and operate the data center (with concerns about a non-Canadian owner), the source of its power (including the potential use of hydraulic fracking and a preference for renewables), and TransAlta's plans for land reclamation and future development beyond the data center.

County Led Engagement

Administration conducted a series of Chat with a Planner sessions to support County residents through the application process. Administration conducted these sessions weekly, which allowed residents to sign up and meet with the administrative team reviewing the application (in-person or virtual options available). Questions which were not related to the process brought forward by the residents were not discussed. Administration advised all questions outside the scope of process must be submitted to the Legislative Services team for discussion during the public hearing.

To support residents an FAQ resource was developed for questions identified through public avenues and can be viewed as **Attachment 10- FAQ**.

Notification with residents

Administration provided notification to residents regarding the application and subsequent approval timelines through the following avenues:

1. Notification of application received sent on July 18, 2025 via mailout. Landowners within a 2000m radius were sent a letter notifying them an application has been received for lands in proximity to their parcel.
2. An Application website was developed for information sharing with the public regarding the application, timelines, opportunities to connect with administration, notification of engagement events and public hearing dates.
3. Notification of the Public Hearing was advertised in the Stony Plain Reporter, Pembina Post, and the Community Voice for a minimum of 2 consecutive weeks, with the first notice of Public Hearing available to the public on August 15, 2025.
4. Mail notices for notification of the Public Hearing were sent to residents within a 2000 metre radius on August 18th, 2025. Notice of Public Hearing to the applicable agencies was also completed on this date.
5. Administration provided the administrative report and information attachments, including all bylaws, to the public during the week of August 18th to provide the public opportunity to review all information being presented to Council on September 3rd, 2025, during the public hearing.

Legislative Circulation Period Conducted by Administration

In compliance with the requirements of the Municipal Government Act, Administration circulated the proposed amendments to internal stakeholders, relevant agencies, and adjacent municipalities. The formal comment period was between July 24th to August 14th, 2025.

The referral included language which stated that no response would equate to no concern. Administration moved forward with this understanding.

Below is a list of received responses

Agency/Adjacent Municipality	Response Received	Comments/Concerns
Alberta Health Services, Environmental Health	Yes	No concerns
Lac Ste. Anne County	Yes	No concerns or comments
Wabamun Watershed Management Council	Yes	General - Request for language to be included in both the ASP and LUB requiring an independent expert panel to review future development permits submitted by TransAlta LUB - Text revisions/additions requested for DC Area 4, DC Area 7, and Section 5.80, as shown in Attachment 11- External Circulation Comments Received ASP - Text revisions/additions requested throughout ASP, as shown in Attachment 11- Circulation Comments Received

Policy Framework Review

The policy frameworks relevant to the consideration of the proposed Highvale End Land Use ASP amendment are as follows:

1. The proposed amendments have been reviewed against Parkland County's Municipal Development Plan (Bylaw 2024-22). A comprehensive review is available through **Attachment 7 – MDP Policy Evaluation Framework**. The review has shown alignment of the proposed amendments to Bylaw 2024-22 Parkland County Municipal Development Plan with the exception of information gaps in the Biophysical Impact Assessment and Agricultural Impact Assessment provided by the applicant. To meet the intent of MDP policies 3.3.1.b and 3.4.2c, administration has provided alternative amending motions that clarify that additional technical reporting will be required at the Master Site Development Plan and / or Development Permit stages to ensure that environmental and agricultural impacts are addressed at the detailed site design and development stage.
2. Parkland County Strategic Plan 2022-2025: The following policy statements within the current Parkland County Strategic Plan support the proposed amendment:
 - a) *To explore strategies that encourage new businesses to locate in Parkland County, with strategic emphasis on Acheson and the Wabamun area (B1)*

- i. Proposed amendments enable new and innovative businesses opportunities in the Wabamun area that are compatible with existing contexts.
 - b) *To ensure that County Council is supported by a robust and current framework of bylaws, policies, and plans (D1).*
 - ii. Proposed amendments ensures that current bylaws and policies are competitive and accommodating of industry trends, enabling clear and consistent decision making.
 - c) *PILLAR A Complete Communities to ensure that County infrastructure meets the needs of residents, businesses, and industry.*
 - iii. Proposed amendments direct development to locations that have existing supportive infrastructure that will not impact the needs of existing residents, businesses, and industry.
3. Wabamun Area Vision (WAV)
- a) The application has been found to meet the intent of the Wabamun Area Vision as it is utilizing the existing energy nodes of the Keephills and Sundance power sites while addressing mitigation measures for impacts on existing agricultural operations and avoiding impacts to environmentally sensitive areas.
4. Wabamun Lake Sub-Watershed Land Use Plan
- a) The application has been found to meet the intent of the Wabamun Lake Sub-Watershed Land Use Plan as the proposed application provides mitigative measures and identifies intended technical requirements to be completed prior to the issuance of a development permit.

Alternatives

Proposed Motions for First Reading of Bylaws- Administration Recommendation

Administration recommends the following amending motions be accepted as part of First Reading of Bylaw 2025-23:

- 1. That Bylaw 2025-23 be amended as follows
 - d) That 4(1)(d)(ii) be revised as follows:
 - 1. 4.2 Council may require any technical studies or information as outlined by this Bylaw, and amendments hereto, that it deems necessary to decide on an application.
 - e) Remove Section 4(1)(h)(i)
 - f) Renumber 4(1)(h)(ii) '8.2' to '8.1'
 - g) That 4(5)(b) be revised as follows:
 - 1. 1.5 Mechanical Equipment must be screened on all sides by an Acoustic barrier or other screening measures, if deemed necessary by a noise impact assessment.
 - h) Revised 4(5)(h)(1) to remove "unless screened"
 - i) Revised 4(5)(h)(ii) to remove "or screening"

Administration recommends the following amending motions be accepted as part of First Reading of Bylaw 2025-26

- 2. That Bylaw 2025-26 be amended as follows:
 - a) That 4(3)(a)(ii) be revised as follows:
 - 1. 4.2 Council may require any technical studies or information as outlined by this Bylaw, and amendments hereto, that it deems necessary to decide on an application.
 - b) Remove Section 4(3)(e)(i).
 - c) Renumber 4(3)(e)(ii) '8.2' to '8.1'

Conclusion/Summary

Administration finds the proposed amendment to be in alignment with the Municipal Development Plan and Council Strategic Plan and therefore supports the proposed bylaw amendments and recommends that Council support Bylaws 2025-22, 2025-23, 2025-24, 2025-25 and 2025-26 for first, second and third reading as amended.

AUTHORS: Natasha De Sandi

Department: Planning and Development

Date written: August 20th, 2025