






## SUMMARY REPORT – PLAN 2

1. Response Rate: 89.6 %
2. 16 / 43 Votes
3. Overall Rank: 1
4. Compliance with Guiding Principles

	Strong Agreement –	14.3 %
	Agreement –	40.0 %
	Neutral –	40.0 %
	Disagreement –	5.7 %
	Strong Disagreement –	0.0 %

5. Design Review Comments

- a. **What did you like about Plan 2?**

- Agricultural strong
- Higher density @ core, lower as you radiate out
- Hamlet feel
- Lower density
- No industrial area
- 2, 10, 8, 1, 7
- 8 golf course low density zone good idea
- No HD
- MD < 50
- Industrial restricted to Hwy 22
- Like idea of stepping up #s from center out (residential density)
- No gravel through 4 way + buffer zone for pits
- Hamlet feel
- Good to get commercial towards Cremona hwy. BUT this would pull people from WV business.
- Goal of low density; more of a hamlet feeling
- Use of crown land as rec land

- Med density to take advantage of golf course
- Not much need for camping as there is plenty west of here
- North/south commercial from 4 way stop
- Very similar concepts to Plan 1
- Stepping idea
- Buffer zone for commercial
- North/south development
- Defining reclamation guidelines clearly
- Redefine H density max to 80
- I agree with the hamlet idea and no High at this time
- Hamlet concept! Vs clustered community
- Like reclamation
- Agree MDP doesn't fit with stepping concept
- Like no High density
- Like hauling routes not going through 579
- Environmental corridors
- Don't want high density. Max at 50 units / quarter
- Industrial along 22
- North/South dev. From 4 way stop
- Hamlet ideal
- Medium density lower than maximum levels possible
- No high density
- Med density around golf course
- Changing haul routes
- Recreation around golf course good idea as well
- I like the bulls eye idea of density increasing to town hub
- Agree no high density
- No high density
- Industrial along Hwy 22
- Lower density as per Plan # 1
- The idea of medium density 50 max at hub. Then max 10 further out to leave rural feel in area
- Hamlet idea
- Reclamation suggestions
- Recreation
- No high density
- Reclamation
- 'Hamlet' concept
- Phased Development
- The plan should recognize that the area east of WV should be designated agricultural only
- Density – 50

- Low to med. Good to keep med density to 40 to 50.
- Gravel extraction allowed in ESA (its all located in the area) and then reclamation to be for recreation
- No high density
- Medium =50
- Agriculture to east
- More recreation = equestrian/hiking/biking trails
- Leverage golf course
- Reclamation
- Recognition of riparian areas
- Leave corner 22 + 597 undeveloped
- Commercial in WV – North south rather than east west
- Industrial along Highway 22 north of 579
- No high density in hup; step + phase density towards Hub
- Gravel hauling does not go through 4 way stop
- Larger medium density growth
- Did not agree with this plan did not allow for enough growth
- No high density
- Liked that the lots should not be clustered together. Keep to a hamlet feel

**b. What did you dislike about Plan 2?**

- Med. Density
- More recreational
- Development area to (sic) large
- Relocating highway trucking routes away from 4 way stop + other roads would have to be built up to handle weights + there is quite a few drivers that stop at the commercial businesses in Water Valley
- Don't like commercial development on Highway 22 because we need to draw people into W.V. area to support commercial businesses within
- Including industrial
- Size of their area (development)
- Don't like north-south orientation of commercial are + density
- Not enough recreation designation. Some conversation but not enough designated.
- North south development has potential to cut off wildlife corridors
- Size of expansion west – this area is environmentally sensitive – full of wildlife corridors
- No high density
- No medium density around golf course! Low density OK
- The commercial along highway 22
- Not allowing gravel trucks on 579
- Not enough recreation

- Lack of density
- No provision for more campgrounds
- Too many limitation to only day use recreation. Don't provide income source for development.
- Commercial tied to 21
- Gravel pit restoration
- No high density in Town
- Most of it
- 50 -60 lots per quarter would like less

**c. What changes would you recommend to Plan 2?**

- Med Density to 80
- Hwy 579 is provincial. You may have trouble changing it
- 10 move high density up to 80
- move focused rec areas
- Change MVC (sic) – refine density
- More protected area around Winchell + West of W. Valley
- Make development area smaller
- Some commercial development opportunity east of fire hall
- Lower level of density in housing
- Lesser development into western riparian zone
- Commercial area
- More recreation around golf course
- Winchell Lake is suitable for recreational development properties
- Preservation of Winchell Lake area
- A little further west for boundary for medium density growth

**6. Table Comments**

- All but one member were landowners in the area with property locations and sizes of parcels varied – a good sample group.
- Consensus and full agreement on the agriculture areas east of the town see map – pretty similar to all groups.

**Density discussion:**

- Consensus was focused on more of a “Hamlet” style development vs. High density “town” residential”
- Carry on format of some of the current style of subdivides
- Absolutely no support from anyone in the group for the high density concept at the upper limits.

- Target Medium density with a max of 50 to 60 lots per quarter
- Key shape for growth area – more of a north south development
- More medium density over larger area could get to the same growth numbers as high density approach but would still protect the feel and many of the key attributes of the area that the group valued.
- We liked the concept of stepped up density as you approached the core – (the 4 way stop). ie outer quarters in the targeted area start at 30 then 40 then 50 per quarter as you moved into the center of town – the group felt this would give a nice feel to the area as it grows. At the same time we believe people are looking to the area for some “ space” ie 5, 10 or 20 acre parcels.
- However this idea for the ASP in itself led to our biggest challenge:
  - We understand the current MDP constricts the ability to do this ie 4, 5 or 10 acre parcels do not seem to be possible in any medium density development plan – this was the idea behind the “stepped” approach
- We did not conclude on how to facilitate the look of the stepped density under the current parameters of the MDP. But it was clear the group felt very strong about this concept and wanted to push the committee to address what we can do to achieve an ASP that incorporated some of these thoughts.
- Everyone liked the heritage / western theme and would like to see some guidelines to make sure all development is consistent with this as the commercial plan was developed.

#### Commercial

- group very much supports this – more restaurants retail etc – support private small bus owner vs. franchise etc – look to north south expansion – pushing south first – see map – good consideration for traffic flow etc. East west could support larger commercial ie Motel ?
- Everyone wanted more recreational areas – we highlighted some county and gov’t lease pieces
- Suggest we look to some form of bonus criteria that would provide for some corridors ( trails etc) to link these areas as other adjoining parcels are developed. A network of trails ( equestrian) would be a great goal to achieve as the area is developed and some felt necessary to maintain – ie a network of trails that connected recreational areas and the commercial – great achievement.
- Defined an opportunity to leverage the golf course for some medium density development surrounding it – some were ok with higher density in this area and it may be a good spot for this type of development.

#### Resource development areas to have 3 criteria:

1. Reclamation requirements to final state as recreational area – good thought to get more recreational property in the targeted area



**MOUNTAIN VIEW COUNTY  
WATER VALLEY / WINCHELL LAKE AREA STRUCTURE PLAN  
DESIGN CHARRETTE  
APRIL 10<sup>TH</sup>(10 am- 4pm)  
WATER VALLEY, ALBERTA**

2. Address hauling routes so no more heavy traffic through the town – very strong opinions on this – particularly to facilitate more growth in town.
  3. All resource extraction sites to have acceptable buffer areas – trees – berms etc.
- Timber to continue with a sustainable manner and protecting environmental areas
  - Camping areas currently should not be restricted and we could look for ways to expand existing camps – however the group felt new camping areas need to happen outside the targeted area and further west – like family camping concept and saw a need.
  - Review and define environmental protected areas – seemed to be a feeling that some of this was inconsistent in its designation criteria.
  - Thought the Industrial growth could be a strip on highway 22 – protect the main intersection at highway 579 and 22 with a ½ mile each way – as this was the entrance to the community.

