

MINUTES

MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Mountain View County

Minutes of the **Municipal Planning Commission** held on **October 21, 2021**, in the Council Chambers, 1408 Twp Rd. 320, Didsbury, AB. and the opportunity to join Via Zoom Cloud

PRESENT:

G. Ingeveld; Member-At-Large/Chair  
 G. Schalin; Member-At-Large  
 C. Keleman; Member-At-Large  
 G. Krebs; Member-At-Large

A. Aalbers; Councillor  
 G. Harris; Councillor  
 P. Johnson; Councillor via Zoom Cloud

IN ATTENDANCE:

M. Bloem; Director, Planning & Development/Secretary, Municipal Planning Commission  
 J. Ross; Manager of Development & Permitting Services  
 R. Pohl; Planning Technician  
 L. Craven; Recording Secretary

CALL TO ORDER: G. Ingeveld called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

AGENDA

MPC 21-192 Moved by C. Keleman  
 That the Municipal Planning Commission adopt the agenda of the Municipal Planning Commission meeting of October 21, 2021 as presented.

Carried.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

MPC 21-193 Moved by G. Schalin  
 That the Municipal Planning Commission adopt the minutes of the Municipal Planning Commission meeting of October 07, 2021 as presented.

Carried.

PLRDSD20210161  
 SE 29-29-3-5

Planning and Development Services presented an overview of a proposed subdivision located at SE 29-29-3-5, and provided information as introduced in the agenda package, such as the location map, aerial photos and site photos. Planning and Development Services provided specific information to the application as follows:

- To create one (1) forty-six point eight one ((+/-) 46.81) acres within SE 29-29-3-5.
- Applicant / Landowner - REID, John Boulter & Sandra Lee

- Redesignation was refused by Council on September 29, 2021 by Bylaw No. LU 37/21
- Proposed parcel is within the Agricultural Preservation Area and contains Environmentally Significant Area - Level 2.
- Dogpound Creek has the potential for flooding.

Municipal Planning Commission discussed the following:

- Administration clarified that the application was for an Agricultural (2) parcel and that the parcel does not have correct zoning as it was refused by Council.
- Administration stated that in order to appeal the decision the subdivision application has to be refused.
- It was stated that to build on the land east of the Creek, technical studies would be required before putting a residence due to flood risk.

Applicants, John & Sandra Reid were present, in person.

Moved by A. Aalbers  
MPC 21-194 That the Municipal Planning Commission (MPC) refuse the proposed subdivision to subdivide one (1) forty-six point eight one ((+/-) 46.81) acres within SE 29-29-3-5, submitted by REID, John Boulter & Sandra Lee, file no. PLRDSD20210161, for the following reasons:

Reasons:

1. The proposal does not comply with the Municipal Government Act, Section 654(1)(b) as it does not conform to the provisions of the Municipal Development Plan (MDP) Bylaw No. 20/20 and the Land Use Bylaw (LUB) No. 16/18.
2. The proposal does not meet the requirements of the MDP:
  - i. The application for redesignation of the subject lands to Agricultural (2) District (A(2)) was refused by Council through Bylaw No. LU 37/21 on September 29, 2021 and does not comply with the redesignation requirement and compliance with other MDP policies. (Policy 3.3.5 (a) and Policy 3.3.7).
  - ii. The proposal meets the definition for a fragmented parcel but does not meet the requirements to be considered for subdivision, according to Policy 3.3.20. Developability of the proposed parcel appears severely limited due to risk for flooding and no Flood Risk Assessment has been provided. As no suitable building site has been identified within the subject lands, the proposal does not meet the criteria for fragmented parcels (Policy 3.3.20 (i)).
3. The proposal does not meet the requirements for Agricultural District (A) parcels or the requirements of Section 9.11 Hazard Lands, according to the LUB:
  - i. The application for redesignation of the subject lands to Agricultural (2) District (A(2)) was refused by Council through Bylaw No. LU 37/21 on September 29, 2021. The

Adopted

lands have therefore remained zoned Agricultural District (A). The proposal for a smaller agricultural parcel does not have the correct land use designation for its intended use (Section 11.1);

- ii. The proposal does not meet the minimum parcel size requirement for Agricultural District (A) parcels, its current designation (minimum 80 acres) (Section 11.1);
  - iii. Subdivisions are prohibited on parcels that are completely within a floodway and the subject lands appear prone to flooding (Section 9.11.8).
4. The proposal does not meet the requirements of the Subdivision and Development Regulation:
- i. The Subdivision Approving Authority must consider any potential for flooding, subsidence or erosion of the land and the subject lands appear prone to flooding (Section 7 (d)).

Carried.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

Information Items

MPC 21-195

Moved by G. Harris

That the Municipal Planning Commission receive the following items as information:

- 1) Permitted Development Permits Approved
- 2) ASDAA August SD Decisions

Carried.

**ADJOURNMENT**

MPC 21-196

Moved by A. Aalbers

That the Municipal Planning Commission of October 21, 2021 be adjourned at 9:35 a.m.

Carried.

Adopted November 18, 2021



Chair

I hereby certify these minutes are correct.



Secretary, Municipal Planning Commission