

Minutes of the Meeting of the
Land Use and Servicing Committee
of the Calgary Metropolitan Region Board
on Thursday April 15, 2021 by Go-To Meeting

Delegates in Attendance:

Mayor Peter Brown – City of Airdrie
Councillor Gian-Carlo Carra – City of Calgary
Mayor Marshall Chalmers – City of Chestermere
Mayor Jeff Genung – Town of Cochrane
Reeve Suzanne Oel – Foothills County (Vice Chair)
Councillor Delilah Miller – Foothills County
Mayor Craig Snodgrass – Town of High River
Mayor Bill Robertson – Town of Okotoks (Vice Chair)
Reeve Dan Henn – Rocky View County
Councillor Bob Sobol – Town of Strathmore
Deputy Reeve Scott Klassen – Wheatland County

CMRB Administration:

Greg Clark, Chair
Jordon Copping, Chief Officer
Liisa Tipman, Project Manager–Land Use
Jaime Graves, Project Manager-Intermunicipal Servicing
JP Leclair, GIS Analyst
Shelley Armeneau, Office Manager

1. Call to Order

Chair Greg Clark called the meeting to order at 9:30 AM.

2. Approval of Agenda

Moved by Mayor Brown, **Seconded by** Mayor Genung, accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Committee approve the agenda.

Motion carried unanimously.

3. Review Minutes

Moved by Councillor Carra, **Seconded by** Mayor Robertson, accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Committee approve the Minutes of the April 1, 2021 meeting.

Motion carried unanimously.

4. Phase 3 of Public Engagement

Anne Harding provided a presentation on current engagement statistics and answered questions about the results. Of note, and what is different from the previous engagement phases, is the results did not represent geographic

distribution across the region. Themes (more than 15 responses) fell into 3 main categories relating to the governance of the Board. Further, Anne noted her disappointment there was a media campaign that gave messages to citizens relating to the Plan, and that came out in the open-ended responses where the exact same wording was used multiple times. This may indicate that people did not take the time register their own thoughts and words but were responding to what they had been asked to do. From her perspective, that skewed the results. One of the members felt this was not necessarily an assumption to be made and that their comments should be considered meaningful. Anne noted that the What We Heard Report would be coming to the May 6 Board meeting.

Moved by Mayor Genung, **Seconded by** Councillor Sobol, accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Committee receive for information an update on Phase 3 of public Engagement for the Draft Growth Plan.

Motion carried unanimously.

Mayor Chalmers arrived at 1:30 PM.

5. Draft Servicing Plan

Jaime Graves introduced this agenda item and noted that discussion would resume from where they left off at the April 1 Committee meeting. The following comments were made:

3. Three Pillars

- A suggestion was made to add to (b) Working Groups to read “Working Groups have a mandate to find cost-effective and collaborative ways to advance servicing matters...” and (c) Evidence Based Decision-Making includes defining problems, collective data, monitoring/reporting and developing cost effective strategies and collaborative...”

4a Preferred Growth Areas Relationship to Servicing

- One member felt this creates a disadvantage to the rural communities because all of the preferred growth areas are in the urban areas. Jaime noted that Foothills has a number of hamlet growth areas and those would be supported in the Servicing Plan.
- Another member noted that while servicing should focus on the preferred growth areas, priority should also be given to approved and existing ASPs. Jaime advised this was discussed at TAG and there was general support for consideration of those plans in place. Further, that additional language to say these may be of interest will be added to the growth plan.
- Like to see more emphasis on Transportation and utilities corridors, and identifying those corridors as key. Steve Power advised this would be a conversation for TAG.

4b Agreed Level of Commitment

- Starting with a group approach makes sense, then evaluating throughout the process to determine who needs to be at the decision-making table.
- Consider an “expression of interest” to evaluate further, and the Board would decide which is the best approach.
- Should be voluntary.
- While criteria makes sense, consider capacity and impact on ability to undertake own projects.
- Agree if an opportunity for shared servicing is cost effective and minimizes environmental impacts it should be considered. Members should be obligated to come to the table for good faith discussions on potential shared servicing and shared information, but ultimately the decision to proceed should be in hands of service provider. If there is reluctance to share servicing, the reasons need to be clearly identified and supported by data.
- In an ideal setting, as many members as possible should be at the table, but need to be realistic about capacity. Where it’s not possible to participate, the member would have to be confident in their regional partners to look at what’s best for the region as a whole.
- If agreement, then anyone potentially able to provide servicing to achieve the growth should be at the table to determine the best way to do that.
- General support for 4b was demonstrated.

4c Equal in Priority.

- Recommend joint planning areas take an investment-based approach.
- Important to respect municipal autonomy. Focus on market demand. Context studies should inform growth but not dictate it.
- Jaime clarified that when a need comes up in a joint planning area, the Board looks to all of the needs and not just one in a joint planning area or hamlet growth area, but understand needs as they arise and as the market demands.
- A member asked “how would this be determined, who decides, and would efficiency be considered?”. Jaime responded that the iteration and plan to plan shows we need to get together with experts to identify what priorities are and foresee the demands that will come with time. The purpose of the Servicing Plan is to anticipate and gather the right people to make decisions about when the Board takes action on investigating the next servicing need that arises.

Next steps from Jaime - the Servicing Plan is out for commentary by TAG. Updates to the document will be made following feedback today and in days ahead. It is anticipated the next version will be released for the next Board meeting agenda package circulation on April 29.

Two additional comments were provided in relation to capacity:

- i. Recreation: note that municipal members have differing capacity levels and that working groups should be mindful of that; and

- ii. Data Collection: capacity and cost benefit should be top of mind and that data collection should have a demonstrated purpose.

Moved by Mayor Robertson, **Seconded by** Councillor Klassen, accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Committee provide feedback on and receive for information the draft Servicing Plan.

Motion carried unanimously.

Councillor Sobol left the meeting at 2:25 PM.

6. Growth Plan – Areas for Further Consideration

Liisa Tipman presented this item and collected feedback on the areas for further consideration table set out in the brief. She noted that TAG will be discussing #7 hamlet growth areas on April 16, to clarify the wording around the 3 growth areas for Foothills County.

Issue #7: New/Additional Hamlet Growth Areas

- There was general agreement that there should be Board approval of new Hamlet Growth Areas.
- Some members felt a size restriction (640 acres) is not necessary.
- Liisa indicated the purpose for having a specific number is to show that there is demand for a development and that it will build out in a timely way. The number itself will be discussed at the next TAG meeting. Peter Calthorpe agreed with Liisa and noted that 640 acres would translate to approximately 7000 population. He further noted that the size restriction is essentially an effort to make the early phases of a Hamlet compact and efficient, but not to limit the ultimate growth. A member requested that wording around expansion of a hamlet growth area should be identified in the Plan.

Issue #8 Hamlet Growth Areas - Densities

- Most members supported Administration's recommendations on this item.
- A preference was noted to continue conversations on achieving densities over time.

Issue #9: Rural and Country Cluster

- No clear locational criteria for this placetype. Not clear why would restrict the benefits of modest density increases in existing country residential areas but encourage density in more remote locations outside these areas. These densities create more unsustainable cluster developments.
- Above a certain density country residential should become a hamlet.

Issue #10 Employment Areas

- Restriction of development is unfair to rural municipalities. Definitions need refinement so do not create unforeseen difficulties.
- Limiting employment in viable areas is not wise in a time when economic development is critically important.
- Developments in rural areas count on urbans to support by providing infrastructure, workplaces, shopping.

Mayor Brown left the meeting at 3:10 PM.

Issue #11 Expand the Harmony Hamlet Growth Area in RVC

- There was general discussion about expanding this growth area. Further discussion will be had at the TAG meeting.

Issue #12 Local Employment Areas

- Feedback has been received that the 20 acres for local employment areas is too small. Liisa noted this item would be discussed at TAG on April 16, and specifically:
 - Proposing to remove requirement for statutory plans for these areas;
 - Discuss what might be a better metric for defining local employment areas;
 - Discussion on how employment areas relate to each other and the lines between them.

Moved by Reeve Henn, **Seconded by** Councillor Klassen, accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Committee provide feedback on and receive for information the Growth Plan Areas for Further Consideration.

Motion carried unanimously.

7. Next Meeting: Thursday June 3 @ 9:00 AM.

8. Adjourned @ 12:30 PM.



CMRB Chair, Greg Clark