

**Mountain View County
Municipal Development Plan Update
June 29, 2007**

Summary of Workshop Exit Survey Results

Mountain View County held a series Workshops as part of the Municipal Development Plan review process. The Workshops were held on June 18, 19, 20, and 21, 2007 at various locations throughout the County. A total of 104 people registered their attendance at the workshops. Exit surveys were distributed at each workshop for participants to provide further comments and concerns. In total, 34 exit surveys were submitted to EBA Planning Services for compilation and analysis.

The results from the surveys received from each workshop are compiled below. Please note: the survey results were calculated based on the total number of exit surveys returned and not the total number of responses per question (e.g., if only 20 out of the 29 exit surveys received answered Question X, the total is still 29, with 9 “no response” answers).

1. Do you agree with the vision and mission statements of the County?

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	3	4	2	9	1	19	56
No	1	2	2	4		9	26
Undecided	1		2	2		5	15
No Response				1		1	3
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- Add agriculture.
- Not entirely... Need to mention primacy of agriculture.
- Should have some mention that County is agricultural in nature.
- The draft often mentions the importance of preserving agriculture yet there is no mention of that in either statement.
- I'd really like to see more emphasis on protecting the natural environment. It is too often omitted or relegated to the end of our concerns.

2. Do you agree with the new directions for growth and development for the County?

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	1	4	3	11		19	56
No	2	2	2	3	1	10	29
Undecided	1		1	1		3	9
No Response	1			1		2	6
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- Most of it (*the respondent does not select an answer*).
- Absolutely not

3. If you said no in Question 2, please explain which direction you do not agree with:

- Bring residences in the form of large subdivisions. This is a rural county not a city. Stop trying to urbanize the agricultural areas. Rural & urban don't mix.
- The entire development vision of the revised MDP relies on one premise: the use of private vehicles by individuals who work, shop, and play at a distance from their homes in the County. Eliminate individual freedom of movement, due to extreme weather, prohibitive fuel costs, forest fire, or any number of market-driven mishaps, and the result is scores of suburban residents with urban expectations of public service stranded in the bush.
- Expansion should be in a radius from existing centers – not pushed out in one direction.
- I don't think enough research has been done to adequately understand the market forces in the province and in particular this county which would allow for a successful development plan. The down side to that is that the market will decide what the future holds for Mountain View not the reverse, which we often foolishly think. Once a farming area, within commuting distance of a large urban centre, becomes desirable for rural residential (rr) inhabitants it doesn't take long until all the farmers are gone. Farmers cannot compete with the land values which rr's are prepared to pay so as they look for room to expand or as they reach retirement and the next generation of farmers takes over they must move further out to find land values conducive for agriculture sustainability, which for many is an oxymoron as nearly half of all farmers have to have of farm income to survive. Some might say the answer is to stop all subdivisions, unfortunately that only leads to rr folks buying up quarter sections to live on instead of acreages. I think we must study other areas which have experienced this phenomenon and learn from their successes and failures and develop a plan which will allow farmers to subsidize their farming operation by selling off small pieces of their land and satisfying the demand for rr lots at the same time. Caution must be used not to discriminate against any segment of the farming community and some leniency should be given to allow farmers to generate these subdivisions in a timely and cost effective manner, if the county gets too greedy or demanding no one wins.
- Do not agree with proposed County Residential subdivisions. Growth and development should be in high density rural developments or growth centers.
- Larger acreage should be allowed in the town instead agricultural areas to allow for a true "county" experience. Small acreages don't do it!
- My main objection is to rural residential development. In the very near future, clear agricultural land will be a rare commodity. People not involved in agricultural production should reside in the urban centers.

- I don't believe in hard core policies – rather guidelines. This is a huge County with many variables.
- The entire province is swept up in growth development – MVC seems bent on going the same way – the proposed plans for growth (& developing a new corporate “brand”) all point toward the urbanization of the rural parts of the County.
- All I see happening to date is unmitigated growth to the detriment of my lifestyle.

4. Do you agree that “first parcel out” should be generally supported by the County, but is not a right, subject to the provisions of the MDP?

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	3	3	3	10		19	56
No	1	3	3	6	1	14	41
Undecided						0	0
No Response	1					1	3
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- It should be a right (with guidelines from the County).
- As well “natural” subdivisions should be supported and consideration should be given to major pipelines as they create issues not unlike a river. As for “farmstead” subdivisions they should be allowed to include the entire building site, corrals and all. Otherwise the owner of the remaining package is forced to use facilities he may not want and to build adjacent to the farmstead which they both may not want. As well rezoning should not be mandatory for farmstead subdivisions.
- Should not be generally supported.
- I believe it should be our right.
- 1st parcel out should be any size – no designation on parcel over 10 acres.
- It is right but with guidelines.
- Too much – smaller – not so many lots – keep to only 1 or 2, not 4.

5. Do you agree that the total amount of land to be subdivided from a quarter section (outside a Growth Centre) should be limited to 10 acres in order to protect agricultural land and open space?

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	1	2	3	7		13	38
No	3	4	3	8	1	19	56
Undecided				1		1	3
No Response	1					1	3
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- Yes but! What about special situations that are acceptable in all considerations? This is where we need FLEXIBILITY.
- I think up to 40 ac. / quarter section
- Not all land is quarters are good agriculturally.
- Up to 6 up to 10 each pre-existing can subdivide 3 plus other own 3 ??? (*Not clear enough to read*).
- Not all County land can be farmed.
- Depending on your location – west would prefer larger acreage.
- 1- acre is too much – I'd much prefer 5 or 6.
- Both #5 and 7 are poorly worded – I do not agree with either.

6. Are home occupations appropriate in agricultural areas, provided that they do not negatively impact adjacent developments?

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	5	5	5	16	1	32	94
No		1				1	3
Undecided			1			1	3
No Response						0	0
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- Allow rental.
- Home occupations ought not to adversely affect adjacent landowners, not just development.

7. Do you agree that the County should consider low density residential applications throughout the County, if they meet the criteria?

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	2	4	4	11		21	62
No	2	2	2	4	1	11	32
Undecided				1		1	3
No Response	1					1	3
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- But I have issues with some of the criteria. Lot size should be large enough to support at least 2 horses. I think min. 5 ac. Clusters should not be mandatory, not all

quarters are conducive to clusters and not all customers want them. Paved roads are not necessary or required. Be careful not to discriminate against land owners.

- As long as criteria are Guidelines – each low density should be determined case by case. Pavement should not be one of the criteria.
- This is but the 1st step in urbanizing the County / rural lands – the rural voice is being increasingly eroded by County administrators and the planners. They here who seem for the most part to be urban people – who have little experience living in rural areas. We do not want to be little “cities”, we do not want to traffic, noise, people, crime etc.

8. If you said no in Question 7, please explain:

- Agriculture is an industry. You do not permit residential development in industrial areas. There will be conflict.
- High density should be built in fringe areas on hamlets.
- The low density rural residential subdivision model creates many cul-de-sacs, yet the residents presumably “move from town” to have space and quiet. Where will they go for a walk? Along the paved road? In the balance of the quarter section with or without permission? In addition, nearby agricultural activity may come under heavy criticism for noise, smell, and nuisance complaints. Though communal water and sewer on smaller lots is a good idea in principle, it does not address the long term problem which it is simply deferred.
- I assumed 4 – 40 per quarter is low density.
- Is not economic.
- Is not necessary unless part of an agricultural operation.
- Has no clear direction.
- Will become very wide spread over time becoming incompatible with agriculture.
- Prefer residential applications for growth centers and prefer greater numbers of growth centers.
- I feel you are putting us all in one basket in general when there are many or several at least different quarters of land with different situations.
- It will be like little hamlets and over crowd the County making it like a subdivision.

9. Do you agree with the following policies for low density residential development (throughout County) subject to redesignation and subdivision approval?

Policy: Up to 4 lots can be subdivided out of an existing ¼ section.

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes		3	3	7		13	38
No	4	3		3	1	11	32
Undecided			3	6		9	26
No Response	1					1	3
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- Too many!! Absolutely not.

Policy: Maximum total of 10 acres for all lots.

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	1	3	1	8		13	38
No	3	2	4	7	1	17	50
Undecided			1	1		2	6
No Response	1	1				2	6
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- Each up to 10 acres.
- Max 40 acres for all lots.
- 5 or 6 acres maximum.

Policy: Minimum 2 acres for each lot.

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	1	3	3	4	1	12	35
No	3	2	2	10		17	50
Undecided			1	2		3	9
No Response	1	1				2	6
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- Up to 10 acres.
- NO Min 5 acres / lot.
- 2 ½ or 3.

Policy: Clustered to allow farming on balance of ¼ section.

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	2	5	1	10	1	19	56
No	1	1	4	3		9	26
Undecided	1		1	1		3	9
No Response	1			2		3	9
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- Some natural subdivisions aren't clustered.
- Depends on topography.
- Clusters may not suit the land or the owner or the customer (who is always right).
- Depending on land quality and lay.
- Not necessarily.

Policy: Located on the periphery of the ¼ section.

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	3	4	2	9	1	19	56
No	1	2	3	3		9	26
Undecided			1	2		3	9
No Response	1			2		3	9
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- A "lot" may be better at the back or on a ridge in the ¼.
- Depends on topography, rivers, creeks, forest etc.
- Again it may not be possible or suitable.
- Not if existing residential are internal.

Additional Comments to Q 9:

- These points are topographically dependent, arrangement should be appropriate to the terrain, avoiding riparian and environmentally sensitive or hazardous areas. They should be specifically examined for each application.
- Strongly disagree. The implication has roads, school buses, neighbour conflicts, water, sewer, electricity, gas, noise, light pollution ext. are not thought out.
- This application may work on flat ¼ section without waterway etc, but not in riparian area.
- Confine growth to the nodes.

- Allow Max of 3 houses on quarter – 1 on the home place (balance of ¼) – 2 on the subdivided 1st piece parcel out.
- If you are having growth than keep it compact.

10. Do you agree with the following policies for higher density residential (in growth centers only)?

Policy: Density between 6 to 80 lots per ¼ section.

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	4	4	3	14		25	74
No		2			1	3	9
Undecided	1		2	2		5	15
No Response			1			1	3
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- 80 seems high.

Policy: Located within an identified growth centre.

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	4	4	4	12	1	25	74
No		2	1	3		6	18
Undecided	1		1			2	6
No Response				1		1	3
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- Or recreation area (*the respondent selected **no** for this question*).

Policy: Maximum lot size is 1 area.

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	2	5	1	10	1	19	56
No		1	3	1		5	15
Undecided	2		1	5		8	24
No Response	1		1			2	6
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- Variable.

Policy: Minimum lot size is ¼ acre.

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	4	4	5	9	1	23	68
No		2		2		4	12
Undecided			1	5		6	18
No Response	1					1	3
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- 1 acre.
- Keep lots smaller, clustered keep remainder as community green space.

Policy: Located on edge of ¼ section and adjacent to other developments.

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	2	4	2	9	1	18	53
No		2	1			3	9
Undecided	2		3	6		11	32
No Response	1			1		2	6
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- If land is appropriate.

Policy: Provide a landscaping plan to enhance natural surroundings.

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	5	4	4	16	1	30	88
No		2				2	6
Undecided			2			2	6
No Response						0	0
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Policy: Minimize impact on adjacent uses.

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	5	4	5	16	1	31	91
No		2				2	6
Undecided			1			1	3
No Response						0	0
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Policy: Density Bonusing – allowing greater density in exchange for various provisions.

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	3	3	3	13		22	65
No	1	3	1	1	1	7	21
Undecided	1		2	2		5	15
No Response						0	0
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- I worry about this – it seems to be a ploy securing higher densities with little added to the quality of life.

Additional Comments to Q 10:

- Pavement should be criteria for high density.
- Put growth in the nodes – not rural.

11. Is density bonusing an appropriate tool for gaining new infrastructure, amenities, open space, or more environmentally friendly developments?

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	3	3	3	15		24	71
No		3	2		1	6	18
Undecided	2		1	1		4	12
No Response						0	0
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- Only near growth nodes.
- Seems that they only ones who benefit are the developers (who get to crowd more people into smaller spaces and the county – that gets someone else to pay for the growth it is bent on bring in.)

12. Do you agree that secondary suites, seniors housing, and manufactured homes should be supported in the County?

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	5	4	5	15	1	30	88
No		2		1		3	9
Undecided			1			1	3
No Response						0	0
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- However seniors housing should be strategically located to have reasonable access to services typically required for this group.
- Yes, to secondary suites, which could offer housing for seniors or juniors! No, to manufactured homes.
- YES to secondary suites and seniors housing BUT I have concerns about manufactured homes, they must be on permanent foundations and be relatively new when installed.
- Secondary suites: yes; senior housing: yes; manufactured homes: no. (*the respondent selected **no** for this question*)
- But only in growth nodes.

13. By combining economic nodes with areas around urban municipalities and communities, a series of growth centers have been identified. Do you agree with the areas identified?

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	4	6	4	13	1	28	82
No			2	2		4	12
Undecided	1			1		2	6
No Response						0	0
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- I think the county will quickly be in the midst of disputes with the urban centers which they are surrounding for a multitude of reasons ie. Growth, services, water, sewage, emergency services, etc.

14. If you said no to Question 14, please explain:

- The growth nodes identified in the draft plan largely ignore existing loosely clustered habitation. Revive the hamlets that once existed conjunction with the historic school quarters. These were small centers, in current parlance “nodes”, which had a few cottage or mercantile businesses, postal centers (which exist again), and community halls. Dog Pound, Midway, Westcott, to name a few, were once “a wide place in the road”. That is where subdivision could be useful to group dwellings, consolidate services, provide more space for walking trails on lower speed roadway, encourage community childcare, carpools, public transit, and small businesses. It would (re-)create a community which is less predominantly vacant during the day, and a better serviced neighbourhood for residents unused to living in seclusion.
- Some growth nodes are too far from existing centers – increase cost to supply water, etc.
- Prefer greater numbers of growth centers as opposed to low density County residential.

- Not so far East – to Reed Ranch. Go west to Rdg Rd 23 – Red Lodge Road.
- Water Valley has no waste and sewer – is a problem.
- How likely is it that the County will change its mind in a few years and identify even more nodes – slow down the growth!
- We appear to be opening the flood gates.
- Quality of life is important – the more people, the less quality.

15. Do you agree that anyone proposing subdivision and/or development should pay all costs associated with the servicing of the development?

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	2	4	3	11	1	21	62
No	2	2	3			7	21
Undecided				4		4	12
No Response	1			1		2	6
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- But the criteria have to be agreed upon and I think the draft asks for too much; i.e. paved roads, as well the subdivision process should not be a CASH COW for the county.
- County roads should be a County cost. *(the rest of comment is not clear enough to read).*
- Including schools, roads, emergency services, power lines, etc. – do not load down existing residents – they have already paid for services which are adequate for our needs.

16. Do you agree with the County's direction to plan for long term municipal piped services for potable water and sanitary sewer collection?

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	4	5	4	10		23	68
No	1	1	2	3	1	8	24
Undecided				3		3	9
No Response						0	0
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

- As long is done right.
- In high density areas and commercial/industrial areas.
- Do not have enough information.
- If we keep rural lands rural, we do not need such services.

- But only to those identified growth nodes and on condition that those along the proposed routes are not forced to hook up or pay for it.

17. Do you agree that the County should take Municipal Reserve lands where appropriate and provide amenities such as trails and pathways, or large open spaces for parks, playgrounds, and sporting facilities?

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	2	5	3	14	1	25	74
No		1	2			3	9
Undecided	2		1	2		5	15
No Response	1					1	3
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- The County should have an overall plan to determine where municipal reserves, if taken as land, should be located to serve their local communities; the purpose of the reserve, and how that land will be maintained.
- This creates costs to the County, and attracts urban – non – County residents.
- In high density areas. p.s. Don't forget Fire Stations etc.
- Yes to trails + pathways, no to the rest (*the respondent selected "undecided"*).
- Who maintains these areas?
- Not ATV/quad trails.
- If the County takes MR, ensure they take the land – cash-in-lieu seems to disappear into general funds. Use the money to enhance green spaces / to promote more environmentally friendly operations etc – do not just fritter it away.

18. The County is proposing that development be allowed to develop based on meeting various conditions (i.e., paved roads, piped services). Do you agree with this form of development phasing?

	June 18	June 19	June 20	June 21	Web	Total	%
Yes	2	1	2	6		11	32
No	1	5	3	7		16	47
Undecided	1		1	3	1	6	18
No Response	1					1	3
Total	5	6	6	16	1	34	100

Additional comments:

- Not required by pavement.
- Possibly not.
- No paved roads, just dust control.

- Understanding that the County seeks to formulate a guideline for diverse applications with the MDP, it is unwise to consider all applications honourable, or all developments viable, or all councils savvy to the foibles of the market.
- In the end, developers should be required to explain to potential buyers the rudimentary level of rural services which will not change due to higher density development: fire protection, garbage pickup, ambulance service, leash laws, in short, the ethic of rural living: to be a considerate neighbor.
- In high density areas & commercial/industrial only.
- Not for the rural parts of County – Keep housing in the growth nodes – allow only one piece out of quarter.
- *The comment is not clear enough to read.*

General Comments:

- Thanks to staff and council for running and hosting the workshops. We noticed that not much attention was given to the development of privately developed recreational uses. Although there appears to be some informal views held about the advantages or disadvantages of privately-run recreational uses, little or none of it was discussed or outlined within the MDP document, and underlying principles around this concept are not clearly documented.
- We believe that attractive recreational developments, located near growth nodes and in proximity to areas that can capitalize on attractive topographical features, lend support and strength to what the County is trying to achieve by channeling and concentrating growth within nodes. We hope that this will be considered and supported in future drafts of the MDP.
- The majority of your questions cannot be answered with a yes or no, without an explanation. The people behind this 40 years plan had better take a step back and consider the long term effect on agriculture. It is quite obvious that none of the planners have had to work around and deal with urban people living in the county.
- A lot of existing subdivisions are for more than 10 acres. i.e. 20, 40, 80 acres. Therefore a 10 acre max is impossible.
- A lot of farmsteads are 10 acres or more.
- Here should be a limit of 4 or 5 parcels out of a quarter. The market will soon dictate the size required which other areas have found to be 2 acres or less.
- It is may hope that the final Development Plan will leave some flexibility for unique quarter sections... River land, forest etc.
- Thank-You for this opportunity.
- In my view, the vision statement is meaning less. It talks of “vision any planning”, “quality resources”, “ethical governance”, “exceptional services”, “diverse rural”. To obtain diverse rural communities, there should be no plan, all subdivisions should be allowed, and people should be allowed to pursue diverse objectives. However, I doubt that this is what people want. I prefer well planned and controlled rural

communities as approved to diverse rural communities. I also disagree with the proposed low density County residential development and do not believe this is a good thing for the County as agricultural or rural communities. I think the County is greatly under estimating the future demand for these types of developments and the future (is) appropriate for agriculture.

- I would like to comment that low density development should not be subject to paved roads. The county cannot afford it, and I feel this is a very unnecessary condition. Low density development can rather have the requirement of calcium on their road, something that is reasonable considering the other criteria are met for low density development.