

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
Land Use and Servicing Committee  
of the Calgary Metropolitan Region Board  
on Thursday April 1, 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  
Mayor Pat Fule – Town of Strathmore  
Councillor Bob Sobol – Town of Strathmore  
Reeve Amber Link – Wheatland County  
Deputy Reeve Scott Klassen – Wheatland County

**CMRB Administration:**

Greg Clark, Chair  
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** Reeve Henn, accepted by Chair.

**Motion:** That the Committee approve the agenda.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**3. Review Minutes**

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

**Motion:** That the Committee approve the Minutes of the February 4, 2021 meeting.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

#### 4. Phase 3 of Public Engagement

Anne Harding provided a presentation on current engagement statistics. She noted that there were multiple sign-ins from the same IP address and these respondents made up one quarter of total responses.. This could be attributed to multiple family members responding on the same computer, or people going back additional times to complete their answers. With the media attention from Foothills County, strong response from residents there is noted. In order to get a geographically balanced outcome, Anne encouraged members to ask residents from all member municipalities to respond. She noted that all verbatim comments would be included in the appendices of the upcoming What We Heard Report. Comments unrelated to the draft Growth Plan will be included, but not considered key findings. Some members felt the questions in the quick survey were leading. Anne reminded the Committee that those questions were created from input through the Communications and Engagement TAG (member municipality administrations). A member asked whether CMRB representatives or council members should be replying to the survey and it was noted that in order to get a clear unbiased picture, it may be best left to residents to respond, however there is no directive against it. Another member felt the media has negatively skewed the results of the public engagement, and that Board members should be acting in good faith.

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

#### 5. 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.

##### Issue #1: Growth Management Strategy that includes specific growth areas

- There was general agreement on this issue, however some members felt municipalities should have more flexibility to determine their own growth areas and that this prevents rural municipalities from updating ASPs that are outdated, resulting in less efficient use of land. Others identified their support for the recommendation and that the fundamental premise of the Growth Plan is to identify where smart growth should occur. Jonathan Schmidt offered that as long as an ASP update aligns with the Growth Plan they can be updated. Peter Calthorpe noted that by designating a hamlet growth area with a balance of mixed use, there is a path forward for infill that would comply with the Growth Plan.

##### Issue #2: Defining Regional Significance

- Members agreed the discussion should go back to TAG for refinement of criteria. The recommendation of the bar for employment and new dwelling units was discussed. Examples of exceptions where size threshold was

inappropriate (home-based business on an 80 acre parcel) was identified as an area for further discussion. A member suggested the threshold for employment areas be increased in rural communities to address the larger lot sizes in general. Other members offered their support for the recommended 8 lots or 20 acres of employment and 50 new dwelling units as being regionally significant.

Issue #3: Infill and Intensification

- There was general support for this recommendation in this item.

Issue #4: All Statutory Plans/Plan Amendments May Have Regional Significance

- No comments were provided.

Issue #5 Existing ASPs or ARPs

- There was disagreement amongst members whether this policy affects urban and rural municipalities equally. Liisa clarified that one of the policies in the plan indicates if there is infill and intensification proposed outside a preferred growth area, it shall not increase the overall population of those plans. The development form can change, but not the population. If a member wishes to create a growth area that increases population, they can apply for hamlet status, or for an exception under the Plan. Jonathan Schmidt noted there is an onus on urbans to have ARPs reviewed by the Board and to align with the plan by taking advantage of infill opportunities sufficiently and use resources or lands efficiently.

Issue #6 Joint Planning Areas

- No specific comments were provided with the exception of a member stating there is a difference of opinion on this item and that they feel the added JPA in the south is an added expense and additional red tape.

Prior to voting, Chair Clark clarified that voting in favour of the motion to provide feedback and receive for information does not indicate support for the item, and that all areas of concern will continue to be discussed.

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

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

**Motion carried unanimously.**

## 6. Regional Evaluation Framework

Liisa Tipman presented this item and reviewed the brief in the agenda package. There was overall agreement with the application review process and definition of regional significance. A comment was made that the appropriateness of the submission criteria that how appropriate will depend on the final policy in the Growth Plan which dictates when statutory plans must be used. Concerns with

the 20 acres size for employment areas was again highlighted. Jonathan Schmidt noted CMRB is looking to the Committee for comment on whether there could be nuance within the policy that speaks to multi lot employment areas vs single lot employment areas. Direction was given for TAG to put this on their agenda for discussion.

A member stated that clear criteria with no ambiguity is important, and suggested a principle of the Plan could direct the applicant municipality to:

- Seek guidance from CMRB when in doubt over identifying whether something is regionally significant.
- In the alternative, if there is doubt, simply to submit the REF to CMRB.
- Ensure public hearing submissions be included as part of REF submission requirements to ensure adjacent members' concerns are being heard.

The Committee discussed whether rural members are disadvantaged by the definition of preferred growth areas. Peter Calthorpe from HRDC stated that the proposed Growth Plan puts demands on both urban and rural municipalities and that all members are being asked to increase the quality of development in a proportional way.

A member expressed their frustration with the process to date.

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

**Motion:** That the Committee receive the CMRB Regional Evaluation Framework for information.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

## **7. Draft Servicing Plan**

Jaime Graves reviewed this item and asked members to focus their comments on whether the three (3) pillars are in alignment with the Committee expectations in terms of how we move forward and structure the Servicing Plan to reference the key services to each pillar. Several members agreed with the pillars as presented. Additional comments noted were:

### a) Servicing Priorities

- Does not consider existing development which could be problematic as it relates to transportation and provincial highways. Suggest existing development should be considered priority 2 preferred growth areas.
- Need emphasis on when it makes economic or fiscal sense, servicing priorities and sharing servicing
- Like to see role of working groups to focus on implementing Growth Plan
- Needs to be emphasis that focusses on when it makes economic or fiscal sense. Include a sentence referring to municipalities sharing servicing or allowing two other municipalities to share servicing.

b) Working Groups

- Don't see value to deal with things that might come up, but rather focus on things we need to. Smaller municipalities lack capacity for multiple working groups.
- Like clarity on role of working groups, and feel it should be limited to focus of implementing the Growth Plan.

c) Evidence Based Decision-Making.

- Acceptable as long as addressing actual problems. Value that data will provide should be weighted against the cost of generating it.
- Request to add something that refers to open and timely data sharing.

Members agreed the Servicing Plan is a plan to plan, a set of priorities for determining where and how to move forward which is unprecedented in the CMR. When the Growth Plan is approved, it will create a commitment to engage on how to service the lands. Once it is agreed where growth should occur, the conversation of when to invest public dollars will be developed.

Questions were answered about transportation corridors, equality of priority growth areas, and alignment with the Growth Plan, and how servicing matters will be discussed and managed going forward at a regional scale.

Jordon Copping confirmed that the Servicing Plan will likely be an iterative process, this draft would satisfy the Regulation, and that this draft is what the Minister of Municipal Affairs is expecting.

Jaime Graves gave an update on Recreation TAG. In some TAG conversations there were questions around whether there should continue to be a voluntary recreation working group process, a more mandated type of participation, or to strike the working group entirely. Through email, feedback was solicited from Recreation TAG and the respondents generally supported a voluntary working group (although there were preferences on all options). Accordingly, that is what is being proposed at this time from the feedback received and will be reflected going forward.

Finally, members started the discussion on the fundamental assumptions of the brief. Due to time constraints, Chair Clark noted that discussions on the draft Servicing Plan will continue at the April 15 meeting.

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

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

**Motion carried unanimously.**

8. Next Meeting: Thursday April 15 @ 1:00 PM.
9. Adjourned @ 12:30 PM.



---

**CMRB Chair, Greg Clark**