

**MEETING NOTES FOR
TRI-AREA INTERMUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #30**



**Held Thursday July 16, 2009
at Cypress County Offices**

In attendance: Darcy Geigle, Brad Betcker, George Russill, Jeff Dowling, Norm Boucher, John Hughes, Frank Liszczak, Shanon Simon, Dwight Brown, Dwight Nagel, Kim Swanson

Absent: Ron Webb, Don Nunweiler, Lutz Perschon, Julie Friesen, Ty Schneider, Rob Hazelaar, John Komanchuk

The meeting began at 9:30am. The following agenda items were dealt with:

a) Unadopted public hearing minutes and submissions (attachment 1)

The unadopted minutes were discussed and several minor changes were made to them as points of clarification. The revised public hearing minutes as attached will accompany the Council report requesting consideration of second and third reading. A copy of these meeting notes was requested by Ms. Theresa Renke. A copy will be sent to her as requested.

b) Request of Connie Kappler to defeat the IDP

It was decided to retain IDP policy as is. The policy is a reasonable compromise between development expectations and continuity of agricultural operations. Allow the regularly scheduled policy reviews to be the milestone at which the municipalities re-examine the foundations of the IDP.

c) Request of Raymond and Theresa Renke and Mr. Stephen Elsley to amend IDP boundary

Alberta Transportation has defined the highway re-alignment and the IDP is simply reflecting this reality. In terms of Mr. Elsley's query respecting a future service centre at the Tempo station on Highway 1, a future Dunmore ASP will specify how and where land uses will be located. It was decided that there would be no change in the IDP boundary.

d) **Request of Mr. Nesyoly to review IDP one year after elections**

It was decided that the 6 year review period be retained as a reasonable time period for a mandated review with the knowledge that specific issues can be reviewed at any time through recommendation of the ILC.

e) **Request of Mr. Nesyoly to clarify mechanism of public input**

It was decided to revise section 3.8.2 (a) IDP Review and Amendment Policies as follows in **bold underlined** text;

Review timing	<i>a) The IDP is intended to be reviewed by resolution of the three Councils no later than 6 years after adoption and every 6 years thereafter. The Plan review period shall be agreed to by Council resolution of the three municipalities on the understanding that the timing of the review shall not be earlier than one year after municipal elections. <u>The terms of reference of the IDP review shall include a public consultation program to be determined by agreement of the Councils .</u></i>
----------------------	---

f) **Request of Mr. Nesyoly to delete Appendix C**

It was decided to add a disclaimer that the drawings are only for descriptive purposes. In addition, minor wording changes are made to clarify the explanation of the 10% policy application.

g) **Alberta Transportation comments and requests**

It was decided to approve changes that relate to the Alberta Transportation letter bullets 1 and 3. As for bullets 2, 4, 5, 6, the steering committee felt that the changes requested by Alberta Transportation concerning Highway 41 re-alignment should be revised to couch it as a "potential" Highway 41 alignment and that the municipalities should continue to lobby the Province to move forward with the improvement of Highway 41 as an alternative north-south through-route in Alberta. Changes to the IDP text are reflected in the second reading document.

h) **Map A and deleting the "undevelopable land designation"**

Map changes were accepted as proposed to include the undevelopable land category as 'Urban Reserve Redcliff' and the change is reflected in the IDP second reading documents.

i) **Map A and Map B consistency**

Minor map changes were accepted as proposed to clarify the relationship between Maps A and B.

j) **Next Steps** - The members deferred discussion of the second reading process to a technical staff discussion as to how best to coordinate the municipal Councils.

**Unadopted Minutes
June 25, 2009
Public Hearings
including
Written Submissions**

Revised July 16, 09



Medicine Hat
The Gas City

Cypress County

**MINUTES OF THE CYPRESS COUNTY, TOWN OF REDCLIFF AND CITY OF
MEDICINE HAT TRI-AREA INTERMUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (IDP)
AND
MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN BYLAW AMENDMENTS FOR CYPRESS
COUNTY AND CITY OF MEDICINE HAT
AND
CYPRESS COUNTY LAND USE BYLAW AMENDMENTS**

**HELD ON THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 2009 AT 6:30 P.M.
AT THE MEDICINE HAT LODGE IN SAAMIS ROOM C AND D
(TRANS CANADA HIGHWAY AND DUNMORE ROAD)**

PRESENT:

**CITY OF
MEDICINE HAT:** Mayor N. Boucher, Ald. T. Clugston, Ald. R. C. Dumanowski, Ald. J. C. Friesen, Ald. G. J. Kelly, Ald. T. D. Schneider, and Ald. J. O. Thompson

ALSO PRESENT: A. Bizio, Commissioner of Corporate Services
J. Komanchuk, Special Projects, Development & Infrastructure
D. Brown, General Manager, Planning, Building & Development
J. A. Hughes, City Solicitor, L. P. Godin, City Clerk
and C. Mazurek, Assistant City Clerk

**CYPRESS
COUNTY:** Reeve G. Russill, Councillors: B. Betcker, J. Clark, D. Geigle,
F. Haas, P. Konosky, G. Lentz, L. Pahl, and H. Scott

ALSO PRESENT: L. Perschon, County Manager, D. Henderson, Assistant County Manager, and J. Dowling, Planner, Penny Suddaby, Recording Secretary

**TOWN OF
REDCLIFF:** Mayor R. Hazelaar, Councillors: D. Kilpatrick, D. Nagel, E. Solberg,
and J. Steinke

ALSO PRESENT: K. Swanson, Municipal Manager, and S. Simon, Municipal Secretary

A moment of silence was held to remember former Cypress County Reeve and Councillor J. VanOoyen who recently passed away.

1. **APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN**

Mayor Boucher nominated George Russill, Reeve, Cypress County as Chairman of the meeting. There were no further nominations.

2. **OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED INTERMUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Mr. Frank Liszczak, Matrix Planning provided a presentation which included an overview of the proposed Tri-Area Intermunicipal Development Plan. A copy of the presentation is on file with the City Clerk Department, City of Medicine Hat. The IDP bylaws of the three municipalities are as follows;

- CYPRESS COUNTY BYLAW #2009/15 - being the adoption of the Tri-Area Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP)
- CITY OF MEDICINE HAT BYLAW #3938 - being the adoption of the Tri-Area Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP)
- TOWN OF REDCLIFF BYLAW #1616/2009 - being the adoption of the Tri-Area Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP)

3. **QUESTIONS BY ELECTED OFFICIALS**

Each of the three municipalities present were asked if they had any questions with regard to the Tri-Area Intermunicipal Development Plan. There were none.

4. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF SUBMISSIONS**

Mr. Larry Godin, the City Clerk of the City of Medicine Hat acted in the capacity of the secretary to the three Councils with respect to the Joint Public Hearing. Mr. Godin acknowledged the following submissions that were received including two late submissions:

City of Medicine Hat

None

Town of Redcliff

- (a) Prairie Rose School Division #8

Cypress County

- (a) Prairie School Division #8

- (b) Raymond and Theresa Renke
- (c) Ms. Conny Kappler
- (d) Alberta Transportation
- (e) Mr. Stephen Elsley

Copies of the submissions are on file with the City of Medicine Hat, City Clerk Department, Cypress County and The Town of Redcliff.

5. **SPEAKERS**

The following speakers presented their questions/comments.

Conny Kappler spoke against the proposed Tri-Area Intermunicipal Development Plan. Ms. Kappler was concerned with the band of irrigated lands to the south and west of the City of Medicine Hat being changed from “Agriculture” to “Potential Growth Area”. She indicated the highly productive land would be taken away by development and it would not make sense when other surrounding land does not have developed infrastructure for irrigation. As well, if agriculture is removed from the area, farmers would end up paying more costs for land, fuel and hauling.

Ms. Kappler also confirmed that according to the IDP her family will never be able to operate another dairy farm.

A copy of Ms. Kappler’s submission is on file with the Town and County offices as well as the City of Medicine Hat Clerk Department.

John Peters asked where the highway bypass will begin.

The highway bypass will begin at Highway 44.

Murray Nesdoly referred to Section 3.8.2 (a), IDP Review and Amendment Policies (Review Timing), and indicated the review should take place in one to three years, for modifications, rather than the specified six years after adoption. As well, review by the three municipalities should take place within one year of municipal elections rather than no earlier than one year after municipal elections as specified.

Mr. **Nesdoly** also indicated that Appendix C of the IDP should be removed entirely as the intent may be lost over a period of time.

Don McLennan mentioned the soil in the area is classed as 1 & 2 because it has been irrigated. He said the water rights should be kept with the land because if they need to be used for municipal purposes, they could be transferred. If water rights are not kept with the land, then it would encourage landowners to sell off their rights.

Robert Nevis wanted to confirm that the IDP is allowing any development on less than forty (40) acres.

It was confirmed that any approved development can take place on less than forty (40) acres.

Reeve George Russill asked what type of development can take place on the area south of Highway 41.

The County will be preparing an Area Structure Plan and at that time the residents will be have the opportunity to provide their input.

This concluded the IDP Public Hearing.

ADJOURNMENT

The meetings adjourned at approximately 7:30 p.m.

Adopted by the municipal Council of _____,

on _____.

Chief Elected Officer

Designated Officer

1. **PUBLIC HEARING - MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN BYLAW AMENDMENT BY CITY OF MEDICINE HAT (AT 7:30 P.M.)**

- (a) City of Medicine Hat Bylaw #3939, being an amendment to the City of Medicine Hat Municipal Development Plan Bylaw #3565.

D. Brown, General Manager, Planning, Building & Development Services gave an overview.

Mayor Boucher opened the Public Hearing and inquired three times if anyone wished to speak. There was no one.

Mayor Boucher closed the Public Hearing.

The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

2. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meetings adjourned at approximately 7:45 p.m.

Adopted by City Council on _____.

Chief Elected Officer

Designated Officer

MINUTES OF THE CYPRESS COUNTY PUBLIC HEARING HELD JUNE 25TH, 2009

PRESENT: George Russill, Reeve
Darcy Geigle, Deputy Reeve
Floyd Haas
LeRay Pahl
Garry Lentz
Herb Scott
Jerry Clark
Peter Konosky
Brad Betcker
Jeffrey Dowling, Planning Advisor
Penny Suddaby, Recording Secretary

ABSENT: None.

CALL TO ORDER: 7:45 P.M.

PURPOSE: To discuss and receive public comment on Municipal Development Plan Amendment Bylaw 2009/16 and Land Use Bylaw Amendment Bylaw 2009/17.

**INTRODUCTION:
Bylaw 2009/16 –
Municipal
Development Plan
Amendment**

Jeffrey Dowling explained that this is a bylaw to amend the Municipal Development Plan Bylaw 1994/13 (MDP) to comply with the proposed Tri-Area Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP). As a result of the Tri-Area IDP that is currently being proposed between Cypress County, the Town of Redcliff and the City of Medicine Hat, Cypress County is required to make amendments to the Municipal Development Plan to ensure that the MDP is consistent with the Tri-Area IDP and its policies. The 1992 Rural Urban Fringe Plan will be repealed once the proposed Tri-Area IDP is adopted, and the Cypress County/City of Medicine Hat Southwest Potable Water Gate Agreement is approved by the Alberta Utilities Commission.

The Planner recommends that Council approve these amendments on the basis that it is a requirement of the Municipal Government Act that all statutory plans must be consistent with each other.

SPEAKERS FOR THE APPLICATION: None.

SUPPORT OF THE APPLICATION:

None.

OPPOSITION TO THE APPLICATION:

None.

COMMENTS/ QUESTIONS:

Gerald Weiss, Landowner, asked for an explanation of the intensive livestock changes.

Jeffrey Dowling explained the existing operations are still intact. Any new applications or expansions will be discouraged. Applications go through Natural Resources Conservation Board (NRCB) and are referred to Cypress County for comments. As per the policies of the Tri-Area IDP, the Town of Redcliff and City of Medicine Hat will also be included for comments.

Larry Slack, Landowner, inquired about the overall plans of the agricultural land.

George Russill explained that if the Tri-Area IDP and MDP are adopted and passed, and a landowner has more than 40 acres then they will still be able to develop their land. The remainder of the land will be left agriculture. Approval from Town of Redcliff and City of Medicine Hat will be required.

Norm Noviski, Landowner, inquired about compensation for landowners whose land will have the proposed Highway 1 cut through it.

George Russill explained if Highway 1 re-alignment is passed the landowners will need to speak with Alberta Transportation regarding compensation.

Norm Noviski inquired about the access roads to and from Highway 1.

George Russill stated any questions regarding Highway 1 will need to be addressed with Alberta Transportation.

Warren Drefs, Landowner, asked for an explanation regarding subdivision approvals and land-use classifications around Township Road 120.

Jeffrey Dowling explained that within the Tri-area IDP the land will not automatically be re-classified to commercial and industrial. Subdivisions regarding residential parcels would not be suitable for this area. The Tri-area IDP document states that this area is for commercial and industrial re-classification. Existing farmsteads will be able to be subdivided. The potential commercial industrial area will go through an area structure plan.

Shirley Lapp, Landowner, inquired about the airport overlay protection area.

Frank Liszczak, Planning Advisor, Matrix Planning, explained the Federal Government already has regulations in place for the current airport. These regulations include no large water bodies in area, electronic regulations as well as height restrictions. The Tri-Area IDP recognizes those regulations.

Brian Ashwick, Landowner, inquired about compensation regarding landowners whose land is in the airport overlay protection area.

Frank Liszczak explained this plan recognizes the current situation. Highway 3 would have to be de-listed and an airport study will be done.

Dwight Brown, Director of Planning at the City of Medicine Hat, explained the airport expansion may not happen until 20 years from now. Many issues will need to be addressed with Highway 3 before this happens.

Norm Boucher, Mayor of Medicine Hat, stated he has spoken with the Chairman of committee for Highway 3, and MLA Len Mitzel. They have explained that the airport expansion will not be looked at until they have plans to twin Highway 3.

Gary Franz, Landowner, inquired about the zoning A-1 and A-2 explanations. Will this affect agricultural operations?

Jeffrey Dowling explained the area outside the Tri-Area IDP will be classified as A-2 - Agriculture. Inside the Tri-Area IDP the areas will be classified as A-1 – Urban Fringe Agriculture. Agricultural purposes in these areas will not be affected by the land use changes.

Conny Kappler, landowner, inquired whether her farm can have a dairy operation again.

Jeffrey Dowling explained the Natural Resources Conservation Board is the approval authority. Cypress County will be asked for comments.

Conny Kappler asked if the NRCB approved the application would Cypress County recommend refusal.

Jeffrey Dowling stated Cypress County would recommend refusal because it goes against the Tri-Area IDP policies.

Dale Mckenzie, Landowner, inquired about the restrictions with the zoning A-1 Agriculture, and overwintering operations.

Jeffrey Dowling stated there would not be any changes if you are involved with an overwintering operation.

George Russill explained the only change would be to the subdivision restrictions.

Bylaw 2009/17 – Land Use Bylaw Amendment

Jeffrey Dowling explained that this is a bylaw to amend the Land Use Bylaw 2006/13 to comply with the proposed Tri-Area Intermunicipal Development Plan. As a result of the Tri-Area Intermunicipal Development Plan that is currently being proposed between Cypress County, the Town of Redcliff, and the City of Medicine Hat, Cypress County is required to make amendments to the Land Use Bylaw to ensure that the Bylaw is consistent with the Tri-Area IDP and its policies. The proposed Bylaw amendments would come into effect once the Tri-Area IDP is adopted, and once the Cypress County/City of Medicine Hat Southwest Potable Water Gate Agreement is approved by the Alberta Utilities Commission.

The Planner recommends that Council approve this application on the basis that it is necessary for the Land Use Bylaw to comply with the policies and provisions of the Tri-area IDP.

SPEAKERS FOR THE APPLICATION:

None.

SUPPORT OF THE APPLICATION:

None.

OPPOSITION TO THE APPLICATION:

None.

COMMENTS/ QUESTIONS:

Cody Girling, Landowner, inquired about the service area for Dunmore regarding the sewer system.

George Russill stated that nothing is planned for the sewer system in Dunmore at this time.

Gerald Weiss inquired about the Land Use Bylaw Amendments to Implement the IDP diagram. What is the proposed zoning of the portion outside of the Tri-Area IDP boundary?

George Russill stated this portion will be zoned as A-2 Agriculture.

ADJOURN:

8:45 P.M.

REEVE

DESIGNATED OFFICER

➤ **Written Submissions to the IDP**



"Everyone Learning Together"

918 - 2nd Avenue • Dunmore, AB T1B 0K3
Ph: (403) 527-5516 • Fax: (403) 528-2264

June 16, 2009

Jeffrey Dowling
Municipal Planner
Cypress County
816 - 2nd Avenue
Dunmore, Alberta
T1B 0K3

CYPRESS COUNTY

JUN 16 2009

RECEIVED

Re: Tri-Area Intermunicipal Development Plan

Dear Mr. Dowling;

The Prairie Rose School Division Board of Trustees and Administration have had the opportunity to review the proposed Tri-Area Intermunicipal Development Plan for the Town of Redcliff, Cypress County and the City of Medicine Hat.

After reviewing the document, the Division has no objections to the proposed 50-year plan and commends the three municipalities for the joint efforts in developing the plan.

We appreciate you for keeping us informed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Marian Peers".

Marian Peers
Board Chair
Prairie Rose School Division

P.O. Box 601 LCD 1
Medicine Hat, Alberta
T1A 7G5

June 17, 2009

Cypress County
816 – 2nd Ave.
Dunmore, Alberta
T1B 0K3

City of Medicine Hat
City Hall
580 First Street SE
Medicine Hat, Alberta
T1A 8E6

Town of Redcliff
1 – 3rd Street NE
Mail Box 40
Redcliff, Alberta
T0J 2P0

Dear Councils:

Re: Proposed Tri-Area Intermunicipal Plan

I attended the information meeting on June 9 at the Medicine Hat Stampede Grounds regarding the Proposed Intermunicipal Development Plan.

This plan shows the band of irrigated lands to the south and west of the city as changed from Agriculture to Potential Growth Area.

These are the highly productive lands in terms of food production in the county. When the population of a center grows, it makes no sense to take away this highly productive land and cover it with development when other surrounding lands do not have the infrastructure for irrigation already developed. Medicine Hat has the most growing degree days and frost free days in Alberta. We have and can continue to have a healthy and viable agriculture industry if these lands are forever left for farming. Farmers will be able to continue making a decent living. Pushing agriculture out away from this area means higher costs to the farmer, he or she will need more land, more fuel, and haul farther distances.

The Kappler Farm has 320 acres of class one land in this Potential Growth Area where for several years we had a 100 plus dairy operation. Irrigated hay along with grain was fed to Holsteins and turned into milk. We did not have to truck hay in from other places and did not need to use roads or other infrastructure for moving hay. The consultant presenting the proposed plan commented that more efficient methods of irrigation like drip irrigation should be looked at. He also commented that he thinks we should not be using irrigation for hayland. Our operation turned irrigated hayland into feed for dairy cows which in turn produced milk. I am not sure how drip irrigating half a section of alfalfa would prove to be financial viable. That's a lot of drip pipe to move for three cuts of hay. We have also had over 300 acres of potatoes and beans grown on this farm as our

loam, clay loam and sandy clay loam soils are excellent for these crops. We practice crop rotation on our farm. Much of the land under irrigation does spend some time in alfalfa production, which is a nitrogen fixer. Drip irrigation is excellent for smaller acres of specialty crops, many of those which are grown in greenhouses or crops like strawberries that do not get rotated every year. Crop rotation is important for disease control, weed control, soil fertility, and soil tilth. Taking away established irrigated lands from production to give to a growing city makes no sense, when there are other available lands.

Claims are made that this will not happen unless absolutely necessary and that the city has lands for another 50 years. Designating these lands as potential growth area targets this area to greedy investors and leads to these lands being taken out of production earlier. We already have acreages developed all around us. These landowners as I have seen at the last Cypress County ratepayers meeting were only interested in dust control and not the overall food production and a viable agriculture industry for the county. The 40 acre parcel next to our land has been up for subdivision review 3 times by a developer and the current asking price for this property is now over a million dollars.

Please vote against this proposed intermunicipal development plan. It does not consider the interests of agriculture. It will eventually force agriculture into poorer lands that are harder and more costly to farm. Fuel prices will continue to rise and more land will be needed for a farmer to be able to make a living. At the same time land prices are going up. No young person will be able to enter the farming industry when we will be needing them most for growing cities. I do believe we should be growing local food for the local population.

A vote against this proposed IDP is a vote to keep excellent agricultural land for farmers and put development on poorer class of soils and where irrigation infrastructure is not already in place. It is a vote to keep food prices down as we can keep the cost of food production down. It is a vote to help families afford their weekly groceries and a vote to have local crops available to the local urban population.

Please for the sake of the viability of the agriculture industry that feeds a growing urban population, please vote against this proposed plan. Don't let good agricultural topsoil pile up as waste as it does around Edmonton. There are other ways, development can occur and agricultural land can be preserved. Please do not accept this plan as proposed. At this point it is only on paper and easier to change than when development starts.

Sincerely,

Conny Kappler P.Ag.

Cc: Alberta Agricultural Service Board
Honourable George Groeneveld
Premier Ed Stelmach

June 15, 2009

To Whom It May Concern:

I am in opposition to the potential Hwy 41 re-alignment.

The proposed Hwy #41 south of Hwy #1 would run directly between my home and barn. This would be a total destruction of our farming and ranching operation. We have lived here for 15 years and are finally getting things to run in a somewhat efficient manner. It would be impossible to run our operation with a division between our house and out buildings.

This is how the yard was set up when we purchased this family farm. We then decided to build a home on the site of the existing house. Municipal District of Cypress planners assured us that the division would never become an issue because the precedence was set by the continual rental of the road allowance lease.

We again approached council when a small portion of road allowance was turned over to the adjacent landowner in the process of making the road perpendicular to the stop sign at the intersection of the Josephberg Trail and TWP 114. Council were certain that both the Josephberg Trail and Eagle Butte Road were historically significant and should be incorporated into any future highway expansions. They also said that they are not in the business of turning over road allowance, but would review if we found problems with the rental arrangement. My problem is that now it has become a *potential highway*.

I would also have to question the fact that the Eagle Butte Road is less than 1 mile to the west and the Josephberg Trail is ½ mile to the east. Would it not make sense to use the existing road right of way in an expansion?

We, as a family, are counting on your support and consideration in this matter.

Raymond & Theresa Renke



Mr SP & KL Elsley
1042 Eagle Ridge Drive
Dunmore
Alberta
T1B 0J7
Canada

22 Jun 09

Tel: 001 403 488 7324
Email: spelsley@hotmail.com

Mr J Dowling
Municipal Planner
Cypress County
816-2nd Ave
Dunmore
Alberta
T1B 0K3

Dear Mr Dowling,

Reference: **Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP)**

Thank you for the information concerning the above subject and notification of the forthcoming public hearing. We are unable to attend due to other commitments, you will be pleased to note, that we have no objections to the proposal but we do have some concerns.

After reviewing the maps you sent and using the internet for clarification, we have the following questions: To set the scenario, our property backs onto Hwy 120, we knew this before we purchased and built our property.

1. The maps you published indicate that the proposed re-alignment of Hwy 1, route approximately half a mile south of Hwy 120. What is the likelihood of this 'potential' route moving further north and the 120 being used?
2. If Hwy 1 were to use the existing 120, would large barriers be constructed to minimise the noise, and would owners of property which back onto the 120 be compensated for loss of value to their property?
3. Dunmore currently has 'Tempo' as a service station. With Hwy 1 moving, their revenue will be reduced. With the re-alignment of Hwy 41 and Hwy 1, has consideration been given to this junction being developed as a future service area?

With the current plans in situ we do not have any major objections. If the routing of Hwy 1 were to change against our favour, this then may have major implications. Development of the area is the key to its future success. After reading extensively the IDP proposals, I feel that the predictions and plans for the next 42 years are somewhat ambitious and lack depth of vision.

I would like to thank you in advance for an interesting reply and I look forward to reading the minutes of the public meeting this Thu 25th Jun 09.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S P Elsley', written in a cursive style.

Mr Stephen P Elsley

Mr. Nездoly IDP presentation of June 25, 09

Good evening. The IDP steering committee should be commended for their time and efforts in producing the IDP document. One can appreciate the fact that creating a plan that all stakeholders are satisfied with would be next to impossible; the IDP as it presently reads has come a long way in attempting to address the concerns of several diverse groups. There are, however, two areas which need to be addressed that are very important to create the IDP in its final form.

The first area of concern comes under section 3.8.2 of the document, where it states that the document will be reviewed every 6 years. If one assumes that a significant change to the plan would be required, it may take 6 years for the change to be identified, plus 1 to 3 (or more) years for the necessary modification to the document. This extensive time frame may impose undue hardship on affected individuals through missed opportunities, as they wait for the IDP to be modified. It is suggested that a review of the IDP be held within 1 year following municipal elections, so that significant issues may be dealt with without undue delay. Furthermore, section 3.8.2 does not identify how the review will be conducted. It is very important that public input be included in the IDP reviews, in a forum such as we are in tonight, attended by our elected officials. This document is too important to simply be given an in-house review, and the IDP document should stipulate this condition.

The second area of concern with the IDP as it presently stands is identified in the document as "Appendix C", which shows a variety of subdivision models. Conditions for development in the "Potential Growth Area" and the "Urban Reserve (Redcliff)" policy areas is clearly stated within the document as it presently stands. It is understood presently that Appendix C merely provides examples of how subdivision may occur, but this intent may be lost over time. Decades from now, future bureaucrats may misinterpret the Appendix as a required model for development - a sort of template for subdivision - that was not the original intent. By removing Appendix C completely, as well as the reference to it in section 2.6.2(e), potential future misunderstanding could be avoided. It is important that Appendix C be removed entirely, and not merely labeled as an example, as it is felt that this could still lead to future misinterpretation.

Thank you for listening to this presentation. Please give the concerns mentioned the full consideration that they merit.