

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Submitted to</b>	<b>Board</b>
<b>Purpose</b>	<b>For Discussion</b>
<b>Subject</b>	<b>Growth Management and the Efficient Use of Land</b>
<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>January 15, 2021</b>
<i>That the Board provide feedback on and receive for information the Growth Management and Efficient Use of Land section of the Growth and Servicing Plans</i>	
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth Management and the Efficient Use of Land is a section of the Growth Plan that includes policies related to the type, scale and location of growth in the Calgary Metropolitan Region.</li> <li>• Preliminary growth management direction and policies were reviewed at the December 10, 2020 policy workshop, and with Land Use TAG (LU TAG) on December 21, 2020. The policies were updated based on all feedback and presented at the January 8, 2021 workshop. At the workshop, the growth management policies were discussed in detail.</li> <li>• There are several areas where HDR Calthorpe requires further direction from the Board to finalize the growth management policies. The purpose of the attached memo is to daylight areas where further direction is required from the Board to finalize the policy.</li> <li>• HDR Calthorpe will update the Growth Management and Efficient Use of Land Section of the Growth and Servicing Plans in consideration of the feedback received from the Board and from LU TAG. A comment tracking log will be circulated, including comments provided to HDR Calthorpe following the January 8<sup>th</sup> workshop.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Attachments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth Management and the Efficient Use of Land section of the Growth and Servicing Plans, HDR Calthorpe</li> <li>• Potential Final Scenario Map, HDR Calthorpe</li> </ul>	

## Background

HDR|Calthorpe is in the process of building draft Growth and Servicing Plan documents. As part of this process, individual policies are being compiled together into document

sections. Draft table of contents for both documents have been provided as part of Agenda Item 6 of this agenda package.

The Growth Management and Efficient Use of Land section of the Growth and Servicing Plans brings together policies that will guide the type, scale, and location of growth in the Calgary Metropolitan Region. These concepts have been discussed and refined through feedback provided at workshops and LU TAG meetings. A comment tracking log was circulated to Committee and LU TAG members as part of the materials provided via email for the January 8<sup>th</sup> workshop. A second comment tracking log will be circulated prior to the January 15, 2020 Board meeting.

## **Board Discussion**

As the focus of the January 8<sup>th</sup> workshop, HDR|Calthorpe provided an overview of the proposed approach to growth management and the associated policies. The group discussion highlighted areas where there is a general agreement on certain aspects of the proposed policy and other areas where there is a general lack of agreement.

HDR|Calthorpe has prepared a memo that follows-up on the January 8<sup>th</sup> workshop by bringing forward key questions for further discussion. The purpose of the memo is to daylight areas where further direction is required from the Board to finalize the policy. This memo has been included as an attachment to this agenda item along with the potential final scenario map.

## **Next Steps**

The draft Growth and Servicing Plan documents will be reviewed by TAGs, Committee and the Board once compiled. The full Growth Plan and Servicing Plan documents must be ready for circulation to individual municipal councils by February 5<sup>th</sup>, 2021 to give each municipality 2 weeks to review the document prior to Board review on February 19, 2021.

## **Recommendation**

That the Board provide feedback on and receive for information the Growth Management and Efficient Use of Land section of the Growth and Servicing Plans

# Memo

Date: Tuesday, January 12, 2021

Project: CMRB Growth and Servicing Plan

To: Jordon Copping

From: Peter Calthorpe

Subject: Growth Management and Efficient Use of Land – Board Meeting

## Recap:

At the TAG/Elected Workshop on Friday, January 8, 2021 the discussion was focused on the Growth Management and Efficient Use of Land policies.

There was general consensus on moving forward with the current policy wording for the following components and sections:

- Preamble
- Goals, Objectives, and Strategies
  - *Note: requested clarity on the wording for objective (e) under goal #2 pertaining to country cluster residential.*
- (Section 1) Definitions of Preferred Placetypes
  - *Note: some discussion on the density minimums for JPAs/Rural Municipalities including for rural/country cluster.*
- (Section 2) Placetype Targets for Population Growth
  - *Note: suggestion to increase percentage for JPAs to 75%*
- (Section 3) Locational Criteria for Placetypes
- (Section 5) Approved Statutory Plans
  - *Note: suggestion to clarify “substantive” in 5.2*
- (Section 6) Joint Planning Areas
  - *Note: requested clarification on criteria for new JPAs*
- (Section 7) Municipal Development Plan Updates
- (Section 8) Periodic Reviews and Reporting

(Section 4) – Rural Area Development did not garner consensus from the members participating. In response, the below topics of discussion focus on key questions that are intended to narrow the focus of the conversation and hopefully assist with moving towards consensus on these and other unresolved matters pertaining to Growth Management and Efficient Use of Land.

## **DISCUSSION TOPICS FOR THE BOARD**

The following topics of discussion focus on policy areas that are yet unresolved.

### **1. Criteria for New Joint Planning Areas**

At the TAG/Elected workshop on Friday, January 8<sup>th</sup>, HDR|C was requested to propose criteria for establishment of new Joint Planning Areas. Section 1.5 Joint Planning Areas of the current draft policy indicates that JPAs have the following common features:

- a. Existing or planned intermunicipal utility servicing
- b. Need for shared service agreements
- c. Primary transportation networks planned or in place
- d. Significant growth pressure
- e. Approved Areas Structure Plans and land uses in place
- f. Non-residential growth potential

From these common features, we recommend the following criteria for new JPAs, which would be added to Policy 6.2:

*6.2 The Board may adopt additional Joint Planning Areas, repeal them, or modify their boundaries. The area encompassed by any new Joint Planning Area shall be added to the Growth Structure Map. Municipal Development Plans must reflect such amendments upon their next Periodic Review. When evaluating the merits of creating a new Joint Planning Area the Board must consider how the proposed JPA meet the following criteria:*

- (i) Is proposed by two or more municipalities;*
- (ii) Is contiguous to existing urban areas;*
- (iii) Has an existing regionally-significant transportation corridor;*
- (iv) May have potential for or includes a transit corridor;*
- (v) Has potential for urban-style development of the preferred placetypes and employment areas at a scale that is regionally significant;*
- (vi) Is mostly land without major environmental constraints such as environmentally significant areas, flood prone areas, steep slopes, etc.;*

- (vii) *Has existing, planned or potential for intermunicipal services of water, wastewater and/or stormwater servicing and the potential for full municipal servicing; and*
- (viii) *Shared service agreements are likely a cost-effective means to support development in the proposed Joint Planning Area.*

It should be noted that HDR|C had previously recommended a northern extension of JPA3 that was intended to take advantage of the potential development opportunities offered by ~~the~~ Highway 2, a proposed water line and some of Foothills' Central District growth areas. As a result of discussion with the three southern municipalities, it was recommended that the northern portion of this JPA be removed with a further recommendation that ~~that~~ Foothills and Okotoks may identify a new JPA that will take advantage of the opportunities generated by the proposed water line and reflect Foothills' Central District growth areas. This new JPA would provide the additional time requested to determine appropriate boundaries without delaying the Growth Plan completion.

<b>Key Discussion Question</b>
<b>Are these the correct criteria for the creation of a new JPA?</b>

## 2. Rural Development Opportunities (per Policy 4.1):

The current policies present opportunities for rural growth and development, but also place some limitations on growth within rural areas to ensure the Plan achieves its goals and objectives of efficient use of land.

Section 4.1 of the draft policy indicates that rural municipalities (Counties) have multiple growth and development opportunities, including:

- (i) Growth within an existing **Joint Planning Area** with *preferred placetypes* and Employment Areas. *Analysis by HDR |Calthorpe suggests there is enough growth potential within these areas to accommodate the forecasted growth projections for the rural municipalities;*
- (ii) Growth within a proposed new **Joint Planning Area**;
- (iii) Growth planned for development under **approved ASPs**. *Similarly, analysis by HDR |Calthorpe suggests capacity for growth exists within approved ASPs. Although these approved ASPs are mostly in Rocky View County some existing approved, but undeveloped, ASPs exist in Foothills County and Wheatland County.*

- (iv) Growth within identified **Hamlet Growth Areas**, if the proposed growth aligns with the *Preferred Placetypes*, Employment Areas, and associated minimum densities;
  - i. Balzac
  - ii. Bragg Creek
  - iii. Conrich
  - iv. Langdon
  - v. Heritage Pointe
  - vi. DeWinton
  - vii. Aldersyde
  - viii. Cheadle
  
- (v) Growth in all rural areas that complies with the Rural/Country Cluster *placetype*.
  
- (vi) *Employment areas* that serve rural areas, including resource extraction and agriculture-related business including processors, producers and other agri-business, which have no location criteria.

<b>Key Discussion Questions</b>
---------------------------------

<b>Are there other existing settlement areas that should be added to this list of Hamlet Growth Areas?</b>
--

<b>Are these the appropriate opportunities and constraints for rural development?</b>
---

### 3. Define Country Cluster / Placetypes

A suggestion was made at the TAG/Elected workshop on Friday for the rural / country cluster placetype to clarify that it is “residential density of 3 gross du/ac”. We seek board direction on this minor modification. More important is the potential for the cluster to grow into large subdivisions randomly located across the rural landscape, which could undermine the goals and objectives of the Plan by increasing the land and resources consumed from development and making it difficult to service residential areas efficiently.

<b>Key Discussion Question</b>
--------------------------------

<b>Should there be a cap on the maximum size of a rural / country cluster (e.g. 40 residential units)?</b>
--



ROCKY VIEW COUNTY

AIRDRIE

COCHRANE

CALGARY

STRATHMORE

CHESTERMERE

WHEATLAND COUNTY  
(Portion within CMRB)

OKOTOKS

FOOTHILLS COUNTY

HIGH RIVER

Legend

- Joint Planning Area (JPA)
- Area Structure Plan (ASP)
- Infill and Redevelopment
- Hamlet Growth Area

Transit

- Light Rail (CT Red / Blue Line)
- Proposed Light Rail
- Proposed Transitway
- Proposed BRT
- Proposed Rapid Transit (HOV or Other)

Note:  
Transit routes source Calgary Transit's RouteAhead

PRELIMINARY DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES

Potential Final Scenario |

Calgary Metropolitan Region, CMRB

1: 400,000

