






SUMMARY REPORT – PLAN 4

1. **Response Rate: 89.6%**
2. **7 / 43 Votes**
3. **Overall Rank: 3**
4. **Compliance with Guiding Principles**

| | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------|
|  | Strong Agreement – | 5.7 % |
|  | Agreement – | 45.7 % |
|  | Neutral – | 37.1 % |
|  | Disagreement – | 8.6 % |
|  | Strong Disagreement – | 2.9 % |

5. **Design Review Comments**

- a. **What did you like about Plan 4?**

- Protection of environmental area
- Agriculture Designation
- Residential growing west
- Resource extraction accompanied by reclamation
- No industrial → Smokestacks?
- Restrict no. of lots
- 10, gas stations
- HD ≤ 80
- No industrial
- No industrial
- Keep gas bars etc to main highways
- Specify reclamation
- Crown land for W. Valley recreation land
- Lower density rating
- Compensation of commercial interests impacting community + individuals
- Like there (sic) # for density area on all
- Ag land to east



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

- No industrial
- Waterway protection and mandated protected areas
- Commercial on main drag
- Not to overstate environmentally sensitive areas.
- Trying to be environmentally conscious
- Restrictions to watersheds should be government restricted
- Point made about environmentally sensitive. Up to County not landowner.
- Compensation
- County being responsible to prove its decision re: ESA
- Companies using roads need to be responsible for upgrading road (ex. logging trucks)
- No Industrial
- Not map keep to 80 lots maz
- Density #s
- ESA comment re county proving it is ESA
- Environmental sensitive areas need to be proven by County, not by owner; only assigned to extremely sensitive (high impact areas)
- Recreation being conscientious – look for neighbor consent
- Environment sensitive – should be proven by County not owner
- Keep commercial together
- No industrial
- Neighbor consultation
- Country has to justify ESA designation
- Good agenda
- No industrial
- Agree with most of everything
- Main corridor for commercial development
- “Case by Case’ density development / Common Sense
- *Property owner should not be impeded by ESA*
- *County should compensate for MR/ER*
- Ag farmland
- No high density
- Waterway protection environmentally conscious
- Low impact commercial
- No industrial
- Extraction select basis only
- Participation of company users to upgrade road
- No high density
- Larger med density area
- Their plan seemed to fairly good like 1
- Should be County to prove why area deemed conservation or not

What did you dislike about Plan 4?

- Residential being shown to the west
- Medium Density should be at 80 extended west
- Push development to west
- Emphasizing development to W
- Requiring County to prove ESA
- Is little concerned with attitudes re land values
- Don't like commercial at 579 + 22; again we need to draw people into W.V. to support businesses within
- Agricultural land S/W larger + crossover to west land (acreages)
- Hoopla about ESA, only a problem for developers; would rather error on side of environment!
- Pushing housing west
- Size of limit on medium density should be lower
- Commercial development on highway section
- Onus on environmental status is on the County not on the owner to prove
- Commercial @ 579 + Hwy 22
- Max 80 -160 density
- Ultra light industrial
- Golf course road as an optional gravel road
- Not allowing industrial. This need to be allowed in order to create tax base
- Too much for med density
- Not in favor of medium growth going west
- Expansion should be west
- Like industrial on 22 but not at intersection of 579
- Med density
- Not clear enough on some issues
- Did not like commercial around transfer station

What changes would you recommend to Plan 4?

- Extend med. Density further west of town (sic)
- High density up to 180
- Generated from land sale return to community
- More conservation land
- Lower density
- Don't like development north of river on AG land
- Keeping onus on owner on developability (sic) of environmental area
- Lower levels on development levels west
- Move industrial north of 579 on Hwy 22; keep intersection of 22 + 579 clear

6. Table Comments

Agriculture

- When land was purchased as “agriculture” LEAVE AS IS. Do not change to conservation
- Leave east border and move west border of growth center to the County boundary

Residential

- No high density – where will the water come from?
- Medium density – max 40
- Have flexibility
- Up to 80 around Water Valley
- Less subdividing in forestry
- Seniors Housing

Commercial/ Industrial

- Low impact “commercial” in the Water Valley hub along roadway
- Flexibility
- Commercial kept together

Recreation

- Application bases only!
- Environmentally conscious
- Posted for neighbours consent

Environment

- Protect waterways
- Grandfather clause – “when land is sold the owner has the say if he/ she wants it labeled “conservation”!
- ESA – Should be proved by the County as to why it is an “ESA” as opposed to the resident to prove that it is not
- Environment sensitive designation has a huge impact on ability of landowner to sell
- If designated environmentally sensitive the County should compensate appropriately

Resource Extraction

- Resource removal only on selective basis – no clear cut on Crown
- Reclamation by resource company
- Private ownership to decide future purpose on application
- Public ownership – Recreation/ Community use
- Businesses to help repair roads used – main roadways

