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Growth Plan Update
Capital Region Board

Task Force Meeting | Policy Development
December 11, 2015
AGENDA

Agenda Item #5: CAO Consultation Review
Agenda Item #6: CRB Committee Consultation
Agenda Item #7: Carry over Items from October 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2015 TF Meeting
Agenda Item #8: Supporting Analysis
Agenda Item #9: Coffee Break
Agenda Item #10: Metropolitan Structure
Agenda Item #11: Lunch
Agenda Item #12: Policy Areas: Objectives and Initial Policy Directions
Agenda Item #13: Next Steps
Agenda Item No. 5
CAO Consultation Review

See Pre-Read Package: CAO Consultation Review
18 CAOs and 20 other participant observers

Session included:

- Presentation on the Planning Tiers and Metropolitan Structure, Initial Residential Land Need Assessment and 3 Policy Areas: Objectives & Initial Directions (Land Use & Infrastructure, Communities & Housing Choice & Agriculture)
- Break-out group facilitated discussion on Objectives and Initial Policy Directions on Policy Areas

Key Feedback

- Overall support for initial policy directions and objectives
- Refinements to metropolitan structure mapping: add energy corridors, make natural living systems more pronounced, clarification on regional employment areas
- Need to use consistent and positive tone – permissive rather than restrictive
- Think about link to implementation
Item 5: CAO Consultation

**Recommended Motion:**
That the Growth Plan Update Task Force accepts the CAO Consultation input as information to further inform the Growth Plan update 2.0.
Agenda Item No. 6
CRB Committee Consultation

See Pre-Read Package: CRB Committee Consultation
Item 6: CRB Committee Consultation

**Recommended Motion:**
That the Growth Plan Update Task Force accepts the CRB Committee Consultation input as information to further inform the Growth Plan update 2.0.
Agenda Item No. 7
Carry-Over Items from October 2nd TF Meeting
Consultant recommendation that the Policy Area be changed to “Transportation Choice”

- Term refers to the full transportation system and all transportation modes, and includes the movement of people and goods
- “Choice” indicates there are multi-modal choices in the transportation system including transit and active transportation options
- As a result, recommend rename to “Transportation Choices”.
- To avoid overuse of the word ‘choice’, we also recommend removing ‘choice’ from the Communities & Housing policy area.
Carry-Over Items from October 2\textsuperscript{nd} Task Force Meeting

Naming of Transportation and Transit Policy Area

7 Policy Areas

• Integration of Land Use & Infrastructure
• Economic Competitiveness & Employment
• Agriculture
• Natural Living Systems
• Communities & Housing
• Transportation Choice

+ Implementation
Item 7: Policy Area Name Changes

**Recommended Motion:**
That the Growth Plan Update Task Force accepts the Consultants recommendation to change the names of the Transportation Policy area to *Transportation Choices* and to remove the word ‘choices’ from the Communities & Housing policy area to avoid over use of the word ‘choice’.
Agenda Item #8
Supporting Analysis: Regional Employment 2014 & Land Supply Analysis*

*Material to be provided at Task Force meeting
Item 9: COFFEE Break 15 Minutes
Regional Planning Approach

1. Tiered Planning Framework
Framework to reflect, respond and plan for diversity and rural contexts in the region. Mechanism to introduce tailored polices to respond to different urban and rural contexts.

- Rural Area
- Metropolitan Area
- Metropolitan Core

2. Regional Structure
Detailed illustration depicting how land uses, transit and transportation networks, infrastructure, natural living systems are structured as a regional framework to manage growth.

- Centres
- Employment Areas
- Infrastructure Corridors
- Natural Living Systems
Refinements to Tiers

- **Metro Core** - Refined area to reflect City of Edmonton’s Mature Neighbourhood overlay
- **Metro Area** - Refined tier area to follow Fort Saskatchewan’s municipal boundary in NE
- **Employment Areas** – adjusted to includes all regional major designated employment areas
- **Natural Living Systems** – Updates to reflect Parkland County mapping, further refinements forthcoming based on municipal input
- **Energy corridors** – additional layer on map
- **Hamlets** – added all hamlets on map
Intermunicipal Study Areas

Proposed Interface Study Areas

- Sturgeon Valley
- Morinville Area
- Villeneuve Area
Morinville Area Intermunicipal Study Area

Key considerations:
- Planning for growth in Morinville, Cardiff and in between
- Role of Morinville as a sub-regional centre/level of service
- Relationship to accommodating County growth generally
- Consideration of existing ISA assets such as Cardiff park/golf course, regional land fill, regional wastewater lagoons, and proposed Morinville recreation facilities and County campus, etc.
- Corridors along Highways 2 & 642
- Optimizing infrastructure capacity

Partners:
- Morinville
- Legal
- St. Albert
- Sturgeon County
- CRB
Villeneuve Intermunicipal Study Area

Key considerations:
- Extent and nature of employment area
- Future of Villeneuve Airport over 30 years
- Villeneuve as an identified growth hamlet; impact of airport constraints
- Appropriate density/size of parcels/housing type
- Status of planning and development intentions
- Corridors along Highways 44 & 633
- Servicing and infrastructure

Partners:
- Sturgeon County
- St. Albert
- Morinville
- Spruce Grove
- Edmonton Airports
- Sand and gravel industry
- CRB
Sturgeon Valley Intermunicipal Study Area

Key considerations:
- Country residential – ability to accommodate growth through infill and intensification
- Limits of urbanization - density/size of parcels/housing type
- Sturgeon River and environmentally sensitive areas (incl. River Lot 56)
- CFB Edmonton
- Proximity to NW industrial
- 127 Street corridor
- Infrastructure capacity
- Servicing strategy
- Cumulative impacts

Partners:
- Sturgeon County
- Edmonton
- St. Albert
- Morinville
- CFB Edmonton (DND)
- CRB
- U of A
Metropolitan Structure Components

In addition to the 3 Tiers, the Metropolitan Structure identifies:

**Centres** – Areas where significant levels of growth and intensification should be focused to optimize infrastructure, cluster services and amenities and create place. [Rural Centres, Urban Centres, Sub-Regional Centres, Downtown Edmonton, TOD Centres]

**Employment Areas** – Lands and related infrastructure to accommodate industry, businesses, resource extraction and employment growth in a variety of jobs sectors. [Major Employment Areas]

**Corridors** – Corridors along major arterial roads or transit for moving people and goods and energy corridors [Transportation & Transit Corridors, Major Pipeline Corridors]

**Natural Living Systems** – Natural features, areas and linkages

Note: The Metropolitan Structure and its components will be presented as part of the Agenda Item #12 and the motion to approve this will be deferred to Agenda Item #12.
Note: The Metropolitan Structure and its components will be presented as part of the Agenda Item #12 and the motion to approve this will be deferred to Agenda Item #12.
Item 11: LUNCH BREAK 45 Minutes
Agenda Item #12
Policy Areas:
Objectives and Policy Directions

See Pre-Read Package: Policy Areas Briefing and following supporting slides
Policy Areas

- **Draft policy objectives** and **initial policy directions** for 4 Policy Areas, not Draft Policies but initial ‘rolled-up’ directions
- Material has been presented to CAOs and Core Project Team and refined and updated based on their input (see redlines in Briefing)
- Material **sets the foundation for drafting detailed policies**
- Remaining Policy Areas will be presented in February 2015, and Draft Policies will be presented in April 2015

Your Role Today

- Provide initial feedback – flag concerns and gaps and input on discussion questions
CRB Growth Plan Update Key Outcomes and Timing

**Growth Plan Update Outline**

1. **Introduction**
2. **Framework for Growth**
3. **Policy Areas**
4. **Implementation**

**Key Outcomes**

- Opportunity
- Contextual Analysis
- Imperative
- Vision
- Principles
- Planning Approach
- Integration
- 6 POLICY AREAS
  - Key Issues
  - What are we trying to achieve
  - Policies
- Implementation Implications
- Issues
- Mechanisms + Trigger
- Measurements and Monitoring
- Tools
- Governance
- Partnerships

**Timeframe**

- **Jan - June 2015**
- **May - Sept 2015**
- **Oct 2015**
- **July - Oct 2015**
- **Oct 2015 - Sept 2016**
- **Dec 2015**
- **Dec 2015 - Sept 2016**

**Complete Draft Growth Plan**

- **Draft 1** April 2016 - TF
- **Draft 2** June 2016 - TF
- **Draft 3** August 2016 - TF

---

"Road Show"

Sept 2016 - Board
Today’s focus is on the objectives and initial directions for four policy areas.

The other policy areas will be presented at the February Task Force meeting.
Integration of Land Use & Infrastructure
Policy Areas Discussion

Questions

1. Do you agree with the proposed *Policy Objectives* and initial *Policy Directions*?

2. What concerns do you have or areas for clarification?
The Capital Region has doubled its population but tripled its urban land area over last 50 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Urban Land Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>22,650 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8% of total land area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>880,000</td>
<td>43,325 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5% of total land area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,234,000</td>
<td>69,930 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6% of total land area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Challenge

Since approving the 2010 Growth Plan, planned densities in the region have gone up…

… but new communities are still developed with predominately low-density single family housing and do not optimize proximity to infrastructure and transportation corridors.
Within existing urban communities, there is opportunity for infill and redevelopment... that can increase the vitality of downtowns, create more complete communities and utilize existing infrastructure to accommodate growth.
Some municipalities are starting to build mixed-use, higher density centres in the heart of their communities…. but there is a lack of integration of higher order transit to provide greater transportation choice.
Policy Objectives

1. Establish a compact and contiguous development pattern to accommodate population and employment growth to 2044

2. Promote growth within existing built up areas to optimize existing infrastructure and minimize the development footprint

3. Plan and develop future greenfield areas in an orderly and phased manner that contributes to the creation of complete communities and transit-supportive development patterns

4. Identify mixed-use and higher density centres as areas to concentrate people and jobs

5. Accommodate rural growth in appropriate locations and with a sustainable level of servicing

6. Prioritize investment and funding of regional infrastructure to support planned growth
Policy concepts to consider:

Intensification
Density Targets
Built Up Area versus Greenfield
Live/Work or People+Jobs
Policy Objective #1: Establish a compact and contiguous development pattern to accommodate population and employment growth to 2044

Defining a regional development pattern

Distinguishing what growth means specific in each tier

Accommodating population and employment growth across the region by:
• intensifying existing urban built-up areas including infill and redevelopment in central areas of existing communities, transit-serviced areas, brownfield sites and existing employment areas;
• building compact and contiguous developments in greenfield areas; and
• permitting the growth of country residential development through infill and intensification of existing country residential areas/CCRAs.
Existing Growth Plan | Refining the Density Targets

**FIGURE 1:** PRIORITY GROWTH AREAS AND CLUSTER COUNTRY RESIDENTIAL AREAS

### Table 13—PGA Density Range Midpoints & CCRA Density Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Growth Area</th>
<th>Density Range Midpoints (du/NRha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGA A</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA B</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA Cw</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA Ce</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA E</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA F</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA G</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Country Residential Area</th>
<th>Density Target (du/GRha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCRA I</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRA O</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRA Q</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRA S</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rural communities and County hamlets and residential areas identified in MDPs for growth.*
Ways to Accommodate Growth

In every community, growth may be accommodated through both **intensification** of the existing built up area and **new compact development** in future greenfield areas.
Ways to Accommodate Growth | Potential Metrics & Targets

How much growth will be in the existing built up urban area?

How many people and jobs will be in identified centres?

How many units will be developed per hectare in new residential areas?

Intensification Targets
Percent of Development Required in Urban Built Up Area (Residential)

People + Job Targets
Downtown Edmonton Urban Centres TOD Centres

Greenfield Density Targets
Targets for new residential urban areas
Policy Objective #2: Promote growth within existing built up areas to optimize existing infrastructure and minimize the development footprint with intensification and density targets ranging for each tier.

Introduce an **intensification target** that requires a percentage of growth to be accommodated in the Built-Up Urban Area.
Intensification

Development within the existing built-up area at a higher density than currently exists through:

Redevelopment, the development of vacant and/or underutilized lots, infill development, or the expansion or conversion of existing buildings.
Potential Intensification Targets

**Growth in Urban Built-Up Area**

- Rural Area: 5-10%
- Metropolitan Area: 20-25%
- Metropolitan Core: 100%

*Targets to be tested and explored*

Markham, Ontario

% of residential growth to be accommodated within defined urban built up boundary area.
Policy Objective #3: Plan and develop future greenfield areas in an orderly and phased manner that contributes to the creation of complete communities and transit-supportive development patterns

Designate, plan and develop future greenfield areas in a phased and orderly manner.

Designate future greenfield areas in locations that meet criteria
Future Greenfield Areas

Area for future urban growth located outside of existing built-up or previously planned areas with higher intensity uses than currently exist
Potential greenfield targets to encourage compact growth

**Min. Greenfield Density Targets**

- **Rural Area**: 20-30 u/nrha
- **Metropolitan Area**: 30-40 u/nrha
- **Metropolitan Core**: n/a

*Targets to be tested and explored*

- Garrison Woods Calgary, 40 du/nrha
- McKenzie Towne, Calgary 36 du/nrha
- Sherwood Park, 29 du/nrha
Integration of Land Use & Infrastructure

Policy Objective #4: Identify mixed-use and higher density centres as areas to concentrate people and jobs with density ranges for each tier

Centres in each Tier

Identify and plan for a range of centres including:
- **Rural Centres** in the Rural Area
- **Urban Centres** in the Metropolitan Area
- **Edmonton Downtown Centre** in the Metropolitan Cores

Centres are locations to concentrate mixed-use and higher density development, focus investment in transit, infrastructure and public services, and encourage a range of amenities and employment opportunities

Introduce density targets ranging for each tier for TOD Centres and Urban Centres
Rural Centres - Provide localized services with some employment, services, business and entertainment uses. Opportunity for intensification with some low/medium scale development and mixed uses.
Urban Centres in the Metropolitan Area & Downtown Edmonton in the Metropolitan Core

Downtown Edmonton
Primary node for business, employment, cultural and entertainment for the region. Planned for highest residential densities and mixed-use development. Multiple rapid transit connections.

Urban Centres
Centres for local government services, institutional, community and entertainment uses. Planned for medium/higher residential densities and mixed-use intensification. Locations for regional and local transit connections.

*Extent of Metropolitan Area to be determined based on Strathcona County’s decision on future growth node (Bremner vs. Colchester)*
Transit-Oriented Development Centres and Corridors in the Metropolitan Core & Area

Transit Centres
Locations identified for regional/rapid transit station. Focus for medium/high density housing and mixed-use growth concentrated at transit station.

Transit Corridors
LRT Corridors - Locations identified for regional/rapid transit in Metro Core with connections to Metro Area

Bus Transit Corridors
Locations identified for regional bus transit in Metro Core and Metro Area and connections to urban communities in Rural Area
Potential Targets for Centres to Concentrate People + Jobs

Focus areas to encourage mixed-use growth and create complete communities:

Urban Centres/TOD Centre  70-80; 90-100 du/nrha
Edmonton Downtown    150-200 du/nrha

*Targets to be tested. Jobs targets pending employment analysis.

Burlington, 178 du/nrha
Vaughan, 89 du/nrha
Mississauga, 41 du/nrha
Infrastructure Corridors

- Arterial Roads/Highway
- Major Pipeline Corridors
- Planned/Future Roads

Legend:
- Major Pipeline Corridors
- Arterial Roads/Highway
- Planned/Future Roads
Employment Areas & Resource Extraction Areas

- Major Employment Areas in the Capital Region
- Resource Extraction Areas
Components:
Employment Areas
A hierarchy of Centres
- Rural Centres
- Urban Centres
- Downtown Edmonton
- TOD Centres
Infrastructure Corridors
Natural Living Systems

* Exports of Metro Area in Strathcona County by 2044 is contingent upon decision by County Council on the location of its next urban growth node (Brammer or Edchester).
Discussion Questions

1. Do you agree with the proposed *Policy Objectives* and initial *Policy Directions*?
2. What concerns do you have or areas for clarification?
Communities & Housing
Policy Areas Discussion

Questions

1. Do you agree with the proposed *Policy Objectives* and initial *Policy Directions*?

2. What concerns do you have or areas for clarification?
The Challenge: Lack of housing diversity & Housing supply mismatch

60% of housing in Edmonton is low-density

Statistics Canada, 2011 Census

88% of housing in balance of Capital Region is low-density

Statistics Canada, 2011 Census

Over 90% low density housing in 15 member municipalities

Statistics Canada, 2011 Census

86% of housing stock is owned

Statistics Canada, 2011 Household Survey and 2006 Census

Mismatch between the units that are available and what people can afford, based on Core Housing Need

CRB, Leduc and Strathcona-Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Region Housing Needs Assessment Reports
The Challenge: Bedroom Communities

- New communities are largely residential, lacking the services, amenities, and access to transit and employment provided by “complete” communities
- Residents often have no choice but to leave their communities (by car) to carry out their daily activities
The Challenge: 
Country Residential Housing

• Supply is great and demand is waning for country residential lots

• Total approx. 6,200 registered country residential lots in Parkland County alone (1975-2012)

• 61% of country residential land unabsorbed (2009)
Traditional Country Residential Lot Registration Case Study:

- 6,186 lots registered
- 4,299 (69%) registered in first eight years (1975–1982)
- 1,887 (31%) registered in following 30 years (1983–2012)
- Analysis excludes lots registered before 1975

Source: Parkland County Community Scan & Analysis, 2015
## Status of Country Residential Land Supply by County, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2009 Country Residential Land Supply (ha)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Ratio (ha Unabsorbed per ha Absorbed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absorbed</td>
<td>Unabsorbed</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>16,181</td>
<td>18,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>14,340</td>
<td>25,309</td>
<td>39,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>8,858</td>
<td>3,435</td>
<td>12,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>3,014</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28,596</td>
<td>45,001</td>
<td>73,597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Capital Region Board, 2009 Regional Land Supply Analysis (previously unpublished)

- 1.57 ha of unabsorbed to 1 ha absorbed in 2009
- Little to no unabsorbed lands in Sturgeon and Lamont, suggesting criteria-based approach to CR approvals
- High amounts of unabsorbed lands in Leduc and Parkland, suggesting pre-designation approach to CR approvals
- Strathcona County is nearing full build-out of its pre-designated lands
- **Conclusion**: amount of supply far exceeds recent demands at regional level, though not universal to all counties (Lamont, Sturgeon)
1. Accommodate new growth in existing communities to foster and strengthen complete communities

2. Provide a range of housing options throughout the region

3. Provide affordable housing to address core housing need across the region
Policy concepts to consider:

Complete Communities
Housing Mix
Complete Communities

Meet people’s needs for daily living at all ages and provide convenient access to a mix of jobs, local services, a full range of housing, community infrastructure and multi-modal transportation choices, appropriate to the size and scale of the community.
Housing Mix

Encourage diversity in:
Housing type/form
Unit size (singles to family)
Income (affordability)
Policy Objective #1: Accommodate new growth in existing communities to foster and strengthen complete communities

Focus Growth Within Centres with an Appropriate Level of Service –
Develop centres within each tier to provide a level of service appropriate to their role.

Complete Greenfield Communities – Develop future greenfield areas as complete communities that:
• Are accessible and age-friendly;
• Are compact, mixed-use;
• Support transit, cycling and walking;
• Provide a diversity of housing options in terms of density and built form;
• Incorporate an interconnected street network and urban form to support active transportation and transit viability;
• Provide high quality parks, trails and open spaces; and
• Integrate local services and amenities with residential development, within buildings/and or within a five minute walk.
Discussion Questions

1. Do you agree with the proposed *Policy Objectives* and initial *Policy Directions*?

2. What concerns do you have or areas for clarification?
Agriculture
Policy Areas Discussion Questions

1. Do you agree with the proposed *Policy Objectives* and initial *Policy Directions*?
2. What concerns do you have or areas for clarification?
Agriculture

Lands Designated for Agriculture in MDPs by CLI Soil Class

Lands designated for Agriculture: 69% are Prime Agricultural Lands
Agriculture

Lands Designated for Agriculture in MDPs by CLI Soil Class with Plans in Effect
Agriculture

Natural Living Systems and Prime Agricultural Lands

*Environmental Sensitive Area (ESA) includes: (1) provincial ESAs; (2) ESAs from Parkland County’s 2014 Environmental Conservation Master Plan; (3) Edmonton Zoning Bylaw’s River Valley and Ravine Overlay; (4) Struan County’s MOP Neighbourhood F Overlay; (5) North Saskatchewan and Struan river valley lands within urban municipalities and counties; and (6) other valley/creeks associated with the Regionally Significant Rivers/Creeks identified in the Capital Region Growth Plan December 2009 Addendum.
The Challenge

Capital Region has policy gaps specific to the preservation of agricultural land.

1. Lack of leadership and direction from the Province.
2. No differentiation with respect to which agricultural lands are more suitable for preservation or development. Currently all agricultural lands are treated as equal.
3. Lack of a robust analytical framework to assist in the assessment and prioritization of specific agricultural areas (or properties) relative to the development pressures.
4. Differing approaches to zoning and subdivision processes by Capital Region municipalities which in turn leads to differing rates of land conversion (agriculture to other uses), fragmentation and impacts to the agricultural industry at large.
The Challenge

Development pressures to convert prime agricultural lands for non-agricultural uses and fragmentation of agricultural lands are priority issues that need to be addressed now.

- Prime agricultural land has unique value and must receive special consideration
- The time for action is now. A clear pattern of increased areas in the Edmonton CMA have been converted from agriculture and three specific areas have been identified where the greatest rate of fragmentation is taking place – north east Sturgeon County, east Parkland County; and the centre of Leduc County

- Major concerns with the conversion of agricultural land include:
  - increase in the non-agricultural population in the Rural Area - more residential parcels leads to land use conflicts and nuisance complaints
  - safety concerns for the movement of farm equipment due to increased traffic
  - vandalism of property and crops

Note 1: Source: Alberta Land Institute Study, 2015
The Challenge

Maintaining and growing a thriving agricultural sector requires a multi-dimensional approach and implementation of policies including:

- Preserving a supply of prime agricultural lands in the region
- Establishment of clear growth boundaries
- An analytical framework to assess development potential and priorities and the transfer of development credits
- Long term agricultural zoning
  - Limiting conversion and fragmentation of prime agricultural lands for non-agricultural uses for the purposes of urban growth only as a last resort
- Lot creation on prime agricultural land in Rural Areas where subdivided and retained lots are intended for agricultural uses and provided the minimum lot size is 160 acres\(^{(1)}\).

The objective of having a thriving agricultural sector in the region will not be achieved without this.

Note 1: Historically, in Alberta, a quarter section (160 acres, and in some cases, 80 acres) is viewed as a typical agricultural land unit size. In reality, extensive agricultural operations are either larger (several thousand acres) or are smaller more intensive operations.
The Challenge

Capital Region is losing agricultural land at much faster rate than the Calgary Region

While Edmonton and Calgary had similar population growth rates (12.1% vs. 12.6% from 2006 to 2011) farmland conversion was much higher in the Edmonton CMA than in the Calgary CMA. The loss of farmland in the Capital Region is:

- Approximately 3 to 4 times as much as in the Calgary region.

In total **38,250 hectares** or 94,515 acres has been converted within the Capital Region (between 2002 – 2012). Over 61% of these converted lands were prime agricultural lands (Class 1 & 2).

Note 1: CMA = Census Metropolitan Area
Note 2: The Alberta Land Institute is continuing to analyze these changes and will be providing more precise information in the near future

Source: Alberta Land Institute
Crop producers - growing rapidly in size - require contiguous farmland, large fields, road access, ability to move equipment, minimum of nuisances

Livestock producers (dairy in particular) require ability to expand - more land for forage production; spreading of manure; able to expand facilities without encroaching minimum distance requirements

Specialized producers require stability & predictability to make long term investments in facilities, equipment, operations and marketing
The Challenge

There is a need for a more robust land evaluation approach beyond C.L.I. Soil Class

Introducing LESA

• Initially developed by the USDA in the 1970’s in response to development pressures
• LESA now functions as a tool to assist local officials in identifying farmland for protection and development
• Comprised of four factors:
  1. LE: Land Evaluation based on C.L.I. soil quality (land class)
  2. SA -1: Site Assessment based on size of parcel; other agricultural factors
  3. SA -2: Site Assessment based on development pressures; proximity of development; access to services
  4. SA - 3: Site Assessment based on historic, scenic or environmental considerations.
Agriculture

Policy Objectives

1. Ensure a supply of prime agricultural lands is identified and preserved in the region to support a diverse range of economic and social activities over time as the region grows, and to provide a local source of food security for future generations.

2. Plan and coordinate the use of agricultural supportive land use planning tools and agricultural land conservation tools.

3. Minimize the fragmentation and conversion of prime agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses.

4. Promote efficient agricultural production and plan infrastructure to support the agricultural sector.

5. Diversity and grow the agri-economy.
Discussion Questions

1. Do you agree with the proposed Policy Objectives and initial Policy Directions?

2. What concerns do you have or areas for clarification?
Transportation Choice
Policy Areas Discussion Questions

1. Do you agree with the proposed Policy Objectives and Policy Directions?

2. What concerns do you have or areas for clarification?
The Challenge:
Traffic, congestion and lack of mobility options

Edmonton ranked 30/63 on cities on TomTom Traffic Index

2nd fastest growth in congestion in Western Hemisphere cities

CEOs identify congestion as key economic constraint - Choose to Lead, 2014
Regional traffic flow patterns reflect the economic activities within the region and to a lesser extent the outside world, but Edmonton remains the focal point for these flows and related connections.

Transit systems in the Capital Region are successful when focused on high density residential and employment environments and corridors, but suffer in low density residential areas and industrial/commercial areas.

Roadway and transit accessibility to jobs and employment areas is a key component of the region’s economic competitiveness.
Transportation Choice

What are we trying to achieve?

• An efficient, cost-effective and integrated regional transportation network to support growth and connect the region

• Coordination of land use and transportation networks to support the efficient movement of people, goods and services through the region and beyond

• A mode shift towards transit, active transportation and shared auto use at levels that recognize the urban and rural contexts within the region
Discussion Questions

1. Do you agree with the proposed Policy Objectives and initial Policy Directions?

2. What concerns do you have or areas for clarification?
Today’s focus is on the objectives and initial directions for four policy areas.

The other policy areas will be presented at the February Task Force meeting.
Item 12a: Policy Objectives & Policy Directions

**Recommended Motion:**
That the Growth Plan Update Task Force supports the initial draft Policy Objectives and Policy Directions for the policy areas *Integration of Land Use & Infrastructure, Communities & Housing, Agriculture and Transportation Choices*, as the basis for developing policies for the Growth Plan update 2.0.
Item 12b: Metropolitan Structure

**Recommended Motion:**
That the Growth Plan Update Task Force supports the refined *Metropolitan Structure approach* as the basis for developing policies for the Growth Plan update 2.0.
Agenda Item #13
Next Steps
Agenda Item #13
Meeting Adjournment

Happy Holidays!