Meeting Agenda  
April 10, 2014 – 9:00 a.m. – Noon 
Fairmont Hotel Macdonald, Empire Ballroom  
10065 100 St, Edmonton

1. Call to Order

2. Chair’s Opening Remarks

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Approval of Minutes of March 13, 2014

5. REF Applications
   a. Sturgeon County Motion – Sturgeon Municipal Development Plan Revisions

   **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approves the proposed revisions to REF 2014-001, as described in Attachment B, which provide clarity and reinforce Sturgeon County's proposed MDP's consistency with the Growth Plan; And, That this approval be given conditionally upon Sturgeon County incorporating the proposed revisions into Bylaw 1313/13 prior to Third Reading

   b. REF 2014-001, Sturgeon County Proposed Municipal Development Plan

   **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the proposed Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan in accordance with the Regional Evaluation Framework.


7. Other Business
   a. North Saskatchewan Regional Plan – Regional Advisory Council Nominations
b. St. Albert Motion – Revise CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework

**Motion:** That, **effective beginning July 1, 2014**, the CRB CEO revise the May 9, 2013 “CRB Administrative Procedure for the Regional Evaluation Framework”, (and any other related policies, procedures and terms of reference) by including clarification in the following 5 areas:

1. Prior to Step # 1 “Receipt of Application by CRB”, the CRB staff may be consulted by an Applicant for advice relative to submission of a REF application.
2. The best professional advice shall be provided to the Applicant by staff in writing. At this stage there shall be no consultant yet engaged by the CRB.
3. Once Step # 3 “Application Deemed Complete” is achieved, there shall be no further advice given by CRB staff, CRB consultants and no changes made to the application whatsoever.
4. By sending the “Deemed Complete” email, that email verifies the final document to be evaluated. Clarification may be sought but no changes whatsoever (other than typos, grammar, immaterial errors etc.) may be made to the documents from this point forward until a decision is made by the CRB. If the Third Party Consultant requires clarification regarding an Application, then a supplemental report may be submitted by the Applicant for clarity, but there shall be no alteration made to the original Application.
5. The appeal period be changed from 14 calendar days to 21 calendar days.

8. Administrative Items

a. CEO’s update
   i. Information Requests
   ii. 2015-2016 Board Meeting Schedule

b. REF Approval Process Update

Administration Recommended Motions:

1. That the Capital Region Board receive the update on the REF approval process as information.
2. That the Capital Region Board amend the REF Administrative Policies and Procedures by increasing the REF Appeal period from 14 calendar days to 21 calendar days.

9. Committee/Task Force Minutes

a. Transit Task Force *(Draft Minutes)*

b. Growth Plan Update Task Force *(Draft Minutes)*

10. Representations from the Public

a. AESO Presentation

11. Adjournment
Minutes of the meeting of
the Capital Region Board
held at Grand Ballroom, Chateau Louis Conference Centre
on Thursday, March 13, 2014

Delegates in Attendance:
Mayor Nolan Crouse – St. Albert/Chair
Councillor Kathy Barnhart – Beaumont
Mayor Bill Skinner – Town of Lamont
Mayor Roxanne Carr – Strathcona County
Mayor Don Iveson – Edmonton
Mayor Gale Katchur – Fort Saskatchewan
Mayor Lisa Holmes – Morinville
Councillor Art Erickson – Wabamun
Mayor John Whaley – Leduc County
Mayor Mel Smith – Redwater
Mayor William Choy – Stony Plain
Mayor Ralph van Assen – Warburg
Mayor Randy Boyd – Bon Accord
Mayor Stephen Lindop – Devon
Mayor Stuart Houston – Spruce Grove
Mayor Barry Rasch – Thorsby
Mayor Karl Hauch – Bruderheim
Mayor Rodney Shaigec – Parkland County
Mayor Ken Baril – Legal
Mayor Tom Flynn – Sturgeon County
Mayor Greg Krischke – City of Leduc
Mayor Don Faulkner - Calmar
Reeve Wayne Woldanski – Lamont County

Absent:
Mayor Doug Horner – Gibbons
Ivan Moore – Government of Alberta

CRB Administration:
Doug Lagore, Chief Executive Officer
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
Stephanie Chai, Planning Intern
Courtney Andrews, Executive Assistant
Allyson Jacques, Administrative Assistant
Amanda Borman, Administrative Assistant
1. **Call to Order**
   Called to order 9:00 a.m.

2. **Chair’s Opening Remarks**
   Chair Crouse informed members that the CRB will be hosting a Capital Region Caucus dinner at the Edmonton Petroleum Club on April 10, 2014 at 5:30 p.m.

3. **Approval of Agenda**
   Chair Crouse advised that the CRB received a letter from Sturgeon County requesting that agenda Item 5a regarding REF 2014-001, Sturgeon County MDP be removed from the March 13 agenda and be deferred to the April 10, 2014 Board meeting.

   **Moved by** Mayor Flynn.

   **Motion:** To approve the agenda of March 13, 2014 as amended with the removal of item 5a of the original agenda.

   **Motion carried unanimously.**

   Members requested clarification regarding the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) withdrawal process. Chair Crouse noted that CRB Administration will review the REF withdrawal process, in consultation with CRB legal counsel, and follow-up with the Board in the near future.

4. **Approval of Minutes of February 13, 2014**
   **Moved by** Mayor Katchur.

   **Motion:** To approve the minutes of February 13, 2014.

   **Motion carried unanimously.**

5. **REF Applications**
   a. REF 2014-001, Sturgeon County, Proposed Municipal Development Plan
      This item was removed from the agenda; to be addressed at the April 10, 2014 Board meeting.

6. **CRB 2013 Audited Financial Statements**
   A handout of 2013 Audited Financial Statements was provided to members. Mr. Michael Epp, partner from Hawkings Epp Dumont LLP, presented the CRB’s 2013 Audited Financial Statements.

   **Moved by** Mayor Skinner.

   **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the 2013 calendar year Audited Financial Statements as presented by the CRB auditor.

   **Motion carried unanimously.**
7. Regional Services Committee
   a. Letter Regarding Study of High-Speed Rail
      Mayor Smith introduced the item. Mayor Whaley requested that the letter be amended to read “capital region infrastructure” versus “regional infrastructure”.

      Moved by Mayor Smith.

      **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board forward the attached letter of response to the Standing Committee on Alberta’s Economic Future regarding the Study of High-Speed Rail in the Province of Alberta, as amended.

      **Motion carried unanimously.**

8. Other Business
   a. Fort Saskatchewan Motion – Performance Monitoring Committee Terms of Reference Amendment
      A handout of the amended Performance Monitoring Committee Terms of Reference was provided to members. Mayor Katchur introduced the item. It was noted that the Terms of Reference should be reviewed and updated further to indicate that each municipality can only be represented once in the Committee membership.

      Moved by Mayor Katchur.

      **Motion:** That the Terms of Reference for the Performance Monitoring Committee be amended to increase the membership by one (1) member to provide the City of Edmonton with membership on the Performance Monitoring Committee, thereby increasing the membership to six (6) members.

      23 in favour, 1 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Motion carried.**

   b. CEO Administers Selection of Member at Large for the Performance Monitoring Committee – CEO declares successful candidate
      Mr. Doug Lagore introduced the item noting the four candidates nominated for the Member at Large for the Performance Monitoring Committee: Mayor Carr, Strathcona County; Mayor Lindop, Devon; Mayor Krischke, Leduc and Mayor Horner, Gibbons.

      Members voted and Mayor Krischke was declared the Member at Large for the Performance Monitoring Committee.

      Moved by Mayor Lindop.

      **Motion:** To destroy the ballots for the vote of the Member at Large for the Performance Monitoring Committee.

      **Motion carried unanimously.**
c. Spruce Grove Motion – Economic Development Committee
Mayor Houston introduced the item.

**Moved by** Mayor Houston.

**Motion:** That the Board direct the CEO to prepare a Terms of Reference, complete with budget, for the establishment of an Economic Development Committee taking into consideration the “Capitalize – The Economic Roadmap for Alberta’s Capital Region” report and report back to the Board within 90 days.

Mayor Katchur put forward a friendly amendment to add the word “proposed” to the motion with reference to the budget for the Committee. The friendly amendment was accepted.

Mayor Lindop put forward an amendment.

**Amendment:** To remove “taking into consideration the ‘Capitalize – The Economic Roadmap for Alberta’s Capital Region’ report”.

**Amendment carried unanimously.**

**Moved by** Mayor Houston.

**Amended Motion:** That the Board direct the CEO to prepare a Terms of Reference, complete with a proposed budget, for the establishment of an Economic Development Committee and report back to the Board within 90 days.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

d. St. Albert Motion – Revise CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework
Chair Crouse relinquished the Chair position to Mayor Shaigec, Parkland County. Mayor Crouse introduced the item.

**Moved by** Mayor Crouse.

**Motion:** That the CRB CEO revises the May 9, 2013 “CRB Administrative Procedure for the Regional Evaluation Framework”, (and any other related policies, procedures and terms of reference) by including clarification in the following five areas:

1. Prior to Step # 1 “Receipt of Application by CRB”, the CRB staff may be consulted by an Applicant for advice relative to submission of a REF application.

2. The best professional advice shall be provided to the Applicant by staff in writing. At this stage there shall be no consultant yet engaged by the CRB.

3. Once Step # 3 “Application Deemed Complete” is achieved, there shall be no further advice given by CRB staff, CRB consultants and no changes made to the application whatsoever.

4. Sending the “Deemed Complete” email verifies the final document to be evaluated. Clarification may be sought but no changes whatsoever may be made to the documents from this point forward until a decision is made by the CRB. If the Third Party Consultant
requires clarification regarding an Application, then a supplemental report may be submitted by the Applicant for clarity, but there shall be no alteration made to the original Application.

5. The appeal period be changed from 14 calendar days to 21 calendar days.

Members put forward some points of clarification regarding the motion. In order to address the considerations put forward by the membership, it was agreed that Mayor Crouse bring back a revised motion to the April Board meeting.

Motion withdrawn.

10:49 a.m. Mayor Lindop, representative for the Town of Devon, left the table.

9. Administrative Items
   a. CEO’s update
      i. Per Diem Summary provided
      ii. Update on Electronic Voting
          Administration is exploring the introduction of electronic voting, however, implementation costs may be too great for the Board at this time.
      iii. Communications Update
          Ms. Loreen Lennon provided an overview the new CRB Newsletter reCAP that will be sent to CRB representatives in the future, and advised that the CRB Chair and CEO will be travelling to member municipalities in the upcoming months to make a presentation to their councils.

10. Committee/Task Force Minutes
    Mr. Doug Lagore noted that going forward all Committee and Task Force minutes, once approved, will be posted to the CRB website.
    a. Land Use & Planning Committee (draft minutes provided)
    b. Regional Services Committee (draft minutes provided)
    c. Energy Corridors Task Force (draft minutes provided)

11. Adjournment

    Moved by Mayor Carr.

    Motion: To adjourn the meeting.

    Motion carried unanimously.

    The meeting was adjourned at 10:56 a.m.
March 31 2014

Capital Region Board  
#1405 Bell Tower  
10104 103 Avenue  
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H8

Attention: Mr. Neal Sarnecki  
Regional Projects

RE: REF 2014-001 - Summary of Clarifications

Following notification of the Capital Region Board (CRB) Administration to approve REF 2014-001 on January 29 2014 and the subsequent Notice of Appeal received on February 7 2014, the following has transpired.

- Sturgeon County subsequently entered into discussion with the City of Edmonton (COE) with the intent of providing the necessary clarity required for the COE to deem the Sturgeon County MDP compliant, and therefore withdraw their appeal.
- Subsequent intermunicipal dialogue with Sturgeon County has resulted in clarifications being proposed for incorporation into the Sturgeon County MDP prior to Third Reading.
- At the CRB Board meeting on March 13 2014, the matter to vote on the appeal regarding REF 2014-001 was deferred, citing progress between the COE and Sturgeon County towards coming to an agreement on terms to withdraw the appeal.

In preparation for the upcoming CRB Board meeting on April 10 2014, a summary of the proposed clarifications is attached with this summary letter (see attachment A and B).

- Attachment A provides a table summary of clarifications; outlining the difference between what was submitted as part of REF 2014-001 versus the proposed clarifications.
- Attachment B provides a version of the proposed clarifications as incorporated within the proposed MDP.

*While Attachments A and B may seem extensive, it should be noted that requested clarifications required identical textual changes on multiple pages to ensure consistency across the entire document. As such, Sturgeon County has provided every single page that has been altered to ensure that all member municipalities have access to all updated information related to REF 2014-001.*

Below is an overview of key clarifications incorporated into the Sturgeon County MDP as submitted to the CRB under REF 2014-001.

**Neighbourhood E**

- Clarified the role of Villeneuve as a rural centre and as a complete community in a rural context.
**Neighbourhood G**
- Provided visual clarification and additional explanation text regarding PGA sub-policy areas.
- Clarified requirements for statutory planning documents within PGA lands and when the need for an Area Structure Plan is triggered.

**Neighbourhood I**
- Provided visual clarification to context maps.
- Clarified the role of Sturgeon Industrial Park within Neighbourhood I.
- Clarified what triggers an MDP amendment in reference to any expansion to Sturgeon Industrial Park.

If any additional information is required, or clarification on any of the above provided information, please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mayor Tom Flynn

Cc: Sturgeon County Council  
   Peter Tarnawsky  
   Collin Steffes

See Attachments A & B
ATTACHMENT A

Summary of Clarifications - Overview
March 31 2014
### 1. Residential Character - Updated Text References to PGA Developing Growth (see page 34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification</th>
<th>Source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC 2.3.1 Shall accommodate residential development (Type 1) by establishing statutory Regional Planning Documents for lands known as PGA Developing Growth and the Sturgeon Valley (CCRA-O) as a way to identify, prioritize, densify and phase subsequent residential growth in the listed locations. (See Figure 4 – Regional Concept Map p.25 and Map 12A p.114.)</td>
<td>RC 2.3.1 Shall accommodate residential development (Type 1) by establishing statutory Regional Planning Documents for lands known as PGA Developing Growth (Future Growth 1) and the Sturgeon Valley (CCRA-O) as a way to identify, prioritize, densify and phase subsequent residential growth in the listed locations. (See Figure 4 – Regional Concept Map p.25 and Map 12A p.114.)</td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested that PGA Developing Growth be changed to PGA Future Growth 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC 2.3.2 Shall accept new residential development (Type 1) applications for Local Planning Documents within the boundaries of PGA Developing Growth and the Sturgeon Valley (CCRA-O) upon adoption of a statutory Regional Planning Document. (See Map 12A p.114.)</td>
<td>RC 2.3.2 Shall accept new residential development (Type 1) applications for Local Planning Documents within the boundaries of PGA Developing Growth (Future Growth 1) and the Sturgeon Valley (CCRA-O) upon adoption of a statutory Regional Planning Document. (See Map 12A p.114.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC 2.3.3 Shall apply Sturgeon County’s Municipal Development Plan Residential Type 1 policies to PGA Developing Growth and CCRA-O in compliance with the Capital Region Growth Plan. (See Map 12A p.114.)</td>
<td>RC 2.3.3 Shall apply Sturgeon County’s Municipal Development Plan Residential Type 1 policies to PGA Developing Growth (Future Growth 1) and CCRA-O in compliance with the Capital Region Growth Plan. (See Map 12A p.114.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Neighbourhood Growth and Population Forecasts - Added Clarification Text** (see pages 58, 66, 74, 84, 92, 108, 122, 130 and 138)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neigh (Current)</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification (Neigh)</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>**Estimated Change in Pop. **(\uparrow 535)</td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested that clarification text be added to emphasize that estimated change in population applies across the Neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>**Estimated Change in Pop. **(\uparrow 430)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>**Estimated Change in Pop. **(\uparrow 1,735)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>**Estimated Change in Pop. **(\uparrow 370)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>**Estimated Change in Pop. **(\uparrow 919)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>**Estimated Change in Pop. **(\uparrow 8,609)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>**Estimated Change in Pop. **(\uparrow 61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>**Estimated Change in Pop. **(\uparrow 311)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>**Estimated Change in Pop. **(\narrow 111)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Neighbourhood E - Residential Character - Added Clarification Text (see pages 92 and 95)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.1 Supporting the growth of Villeneuve as an emerging rural centre inclusive of all phases and aspects of a complete community.</td>
<td>E.1 Supporting the growth of Villeneuve as an emerging rural centre inclusive of all phases and aspects of a complete community in a rural context.</td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested that clarification text be added to note difference in perspective of a ‘complete community’ from urban and rural perspectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neighbourhood E - Economic Health Outcomes - Added Clarification Text (see pages 92 and 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.4 Designating Villeneuve as a strategic logistic hub and a major employment centre for Sturgeon County.</td>
<td>E.4 Designating Villeneuve as a strategic logistic hub and a major employment centre for Sturgeon County.</td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested clarification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neighbourhood E - Context Map - Added Clarification Text (see page 94)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The historic Hamlet of Villeneuve has unique opportunities to build and sustain growth. Traditionally an agrarian community, economic growth within the Hamlet of Villeneuve and Neighbourhood E has grown to include natural resource extraction (gravel aggregate) and the Edmonton International Airport (EIA) Villeneuve Airport. In an effort to ensure continued growth of the agricultural industry (Class I and II soils) and the aggregate and aviation industry; while protecting the natural ecosystems around Big Lake and reducing rural sprawl, the Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan proposes to centralize Neighbourhood E growth to within the Hamlet of Villeneuve.</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested clarification text be added to describe Villeneuve as a community identified for growth within Sturgeon County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Text taken directly from Supplementary Report submitted as part of REF 2014-001 (see page 8 of Supplementary Report).*

### Neighbourhood E - Economic Health - Added Output Action (see page 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.4.I Recognizing the importance of the Villeneuve Airport as a regional asset by consulting with Capital Region Board member municipalities regarding its growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested addition of an output action to economic health section of Neigh E regarding Villeneuve Airport.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Population (2011 census): 5,609&lt;br&gt;Estimated Annual Growth Rate: 3%&lt;br&gt;Estimated Future Population (2042): 14,218&lt;br&gt;Estimated Change in Pop. Across Neigh G (▲8,609)</td>
<td>Current Population (2011 census): 5,609&lt;br&gt;Estimated Annual Growth Rate: 3% (Across Entire Neighbourhood)&lt;br&gt;Estimated Future Population (2042): 14,218&lt;br&gt;Estimated Change in Pop. Across Neigh G (▲8,609)&lt;br&gt;● An estimated annual growth rate of 3.5% across the CCRA policy area represents an increase of approximately 6,650 people of the total estimated change in population across Neigh G until 2042.&lt;br&gt;*Estimate Future Population includes populations within PGA and CCRA policy areas, CFB Edmonton and the UofA. Population forecasts are based upon historic trends and information available at the time. Forecasts are subject to change as a result of fluctuations in development conditions, new policies and updated data.</td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested additional clarification text be added regarding estimated increase in population within CCRA policy area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Neighbourhood G - Residential Character - Added New Policies (see page 113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed New Policy</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>G 1.1.6 Shall ensure that statutory Regional Planning Documents are required to minimize future land use conflicts and to ensure the logical extension of road networks and servicing between municipalities (such as, but not limited to, evaluation of servicing alternatives according to municipality’s needs, priorities, statutory plans and bylaws).</td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested that an additional policy be added.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Text taken directly from italicized introductory text originally found under PGA-B residential character outcome G1.1.*

9. Neighbourhood G - Residential Character - Added Clarification Text (see page 113)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed New Policy</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>G. 1.1.7 Shall ensure the planning objectives in PGA-B of both the Sturgeon County MDP and the Capital Region Growth Plan are met by requiring statutory Local Planning documents to adhere to an approved statutory Regional Planning document and to address the following:&lt;br&gt;● Timing and phasing of development.&lt;br&gt;● Future municipal infrastructure servicing.&lt;br&gt;● Municipal financial sustainability, and the&lt;br&gt;● Amount, location and phasing of residential growth.</td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested that an additional policy be added.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Text developed in partnership between City of Edmonton and Sturgeon County.*
10. **Neighbourhood G - PGA Developing Growth - Clarification Text (see pages 113, 114 and 115)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGA Developing Growth</td>
<td><strong>PGA Developing Growth Future Growth 1</strong></td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested that PGA Developing Growth be changed to PGA Future Growth 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **Neighbourhood G - PGA Future Growth - Clarification Text (see pages 114 and 115)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGA Future Growth</td>
<td><strong>PGA Future Growth Future Growth 2</strong></td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested that PGA Future Growth be changed to PGA Future Growth 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. **Neighbourhood G - Location Map - Changed Colours in Graphic (see page 114)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed Colours on Map</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested visual clarification of PGA sub-policy areas and their link with Neighbourhood G.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. **Neighbourhood G - Location Map - Added Clarification Text (see page 114)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PGA Future Growth 1:</strong> Contiguous development principles and local servicing needs provide the rationale for the identification of the PGA Future Growth 1 area. Imminent investigation and creation of statutory Regional Planning Documents for PGA Future Growth 1 are required to complement the existing communities (Sturgeon Valley, agricultural lands, and the City of St. Albert), while ensuring that infrastructure investments addresses the future needs for sustainable development of both Sturgeon County and the City of St. Albert.</td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested clarification text be added to generally describe the PGA sub-policy areas (PGA Future Growth 1 and PGA Future Growth 2). *Text taken from Supplementary Report submitted as part of REF 2014-001 (see pages 27, 33-39).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PGA Future Growth 2:</strong> These lands present limited future residential influence within Sturgeon County. Future residential development will require infrastructure upgrades and connection to existing servicing networks that are not easily accessed through Sturgeon County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Neighbourhood I - Residential Character Outcome - Clarification Text (see pages 130 and 133)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current I.1 Promoting a diverse range of employment opportunities that are supportive of the industrial activity within the Capital Region.</td>
<td>I.1 Promoting a diverse range of employment opportunities that are supportive of the industrial activity within the <strong>Capital Region - Sturgeon Industrial Park</strong>.</td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested clarification text be added to denote SIP as a local focus as opposed to regional.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neighbourhood I - Context Map - Changed Neigh I Colour (see page 132)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Changed colour on map.</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested visual clarification to provide clarity to lands zoned and designated under existing statutory/regulatory documents prior to CRGP adoption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neighbourhood I - Context Map - Added Clarification Text (see page 132)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Current None                                                           | The **Sturgeon Industrial Park** - The Sturgeon Industrial Park has been the cornerstone of light and medium industrial activity within Sturgeon County since the 1970's. The existing industrial park currently contains over 1,200 acres of designated and zoned industrial land. Features of the Sturgeon Industrial Park include regional water and sanitary servicing, fully paved roads, access to an extensive highway network and CN Rail access. Sturgeon County has supported local infrastructure improvements, to make Sturgeon Industrial Park a fundamental non-residential growth area within Sturgeon County. CRB Regulation - Part 5 Section 23 “For greater certainty, except as provided in Parts 3 and 4 of the Regulation and Section 17 of the MGA, all statutory plans of a participating municipality that were in effect on April 15, 2008 and have not been repealed before the coming into force of this Regulation remain in full force and effect.” The full area of Sturgeon Industrial Park is designated as per: ● Sturgeon County MDP (Bylaw 818/96) ● Sturgeon County LUB (Bylaw 819/96) ● South Sturgeon ASP (Bylaw 407/81) ● Sturgeon County Bylaw 160-72 ● Edmonton Regional Planning Commission General Plan adopted July 1972 (see ERPC file no 76-SC-198) | City of Edmonton requested clarification text be added to describe SIP as an industrial park identified for growth within Sturgeon County.  
*Text taken directly from Supplementary Report submitted as part of REF 2014-001 (see pages 44 and 45 of Supplementary Report)* |
17. **Neighbourhood I - Residential Character Outcome - Added Explanatory Text (see page 133)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development in the Neighbourhood is closely aligned with industrial</td>
<td>Development in the Neighbourhood is closely aligned with industrial sector growth in</td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested additional clarification of the emphasis of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sector growth in the Alberta Industrial Heartland (AIH). Industrial</td>
<td>the Alberta Industrial Heartland (AIH). Industrial growth will continue to provide</td>
<td>industrial development within the residential character outcome of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth will continue to provide Sturgeon County with an increasing and</td>
<td>Sturgeon County with an increasing and significant employment base. **As such, **</td>
<td>Neighbourhood I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant employment base. The desired intent of the Neighbourhood is</td>
<td><strong>residential development within Neighbourhood I should complement and not distract</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ensure the successful co-existence of existing residential and</td>
<td><strong>from the opportunities that the Sturgeon Industrial Park provides.</strong> The desired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposed Non-Residential development activities.</td>
<td>intent of the Neighbourhood is to ensure the successful co-existence of existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>residential and proposed Non-Residential development activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. **Neighbourhood I – Economic Health Outcome - Added Clarification Text (see page 136)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Clarification</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.4.C Locating proposed or expanding Non-Residential developments to</td>
<td>I.4.C Locating proposed or expanding Non-Residential developments to the Non-</td>
<td>City of Edmonton requested additional clarification for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Non-Residential Development Park (SIP). If there is a demonstrated</td>
<td>Residential Development Park (SIP). If there is a demonstrated need identified by</td>
<td>requirement for an MDP amendment for expanding SIP (non-residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need identified by Sturgeon County to create additional industrial</td>
<td>Sturgeon County to create additional industrial development opportunities in the</td>
<td>development park).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development opportunities in the Neighbourhood, priority will focus on</td>
<td>Neighbourhood, priority will focus on land contiguous to the existing Non-Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land contiguous to the existing Non-Residential Development Park or to</td>
<td>Development Park or to lands identified in the Regional Planning Document and will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lands identified in the Regional Planning Document.</td>
<td>necessitate an MDP amendment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residential Type 1

Residential Type 1 contains the majority and most varied of Sturgeon County’s future residential potential and is situated where development pressures are most imminent. This residential type contains a range of housing densities (from estate residential to high-density residential development). All Residential Type 1 development requires municipal infrastructure and service provision. Residential Type 1 is limited to the geographic areas identified as PGA Future Growth 1 in the Priority Growth Area B (PGA-B) and the Sturgeon Valley. For additional policies reflecting the unique needs of each geographic area/community, refer to Neighbourhood G.

2.3.1 Shall accommodate residential development (Type 1) by establishing statutory Regional Planning Documents for lands known as PGA Future Growth 1 and the Sturgeon Valley (CCRA-O) as a way to identify, prioritize, densify and phase subsequent residential growth in the listed locations. (See Map 12A p.114.)

2.3.2 Shall accept new residential development (Type 1) applications for Local Planning Documents within the boundaries of PGA Future Growth 1 and the Sturgeon Valley (CCRA-O) upon adoption of a statutory Regional Planning Document. (See Map 12A p.114.)

2.3.3 Shall apply Sturgeon County’s Municipal Development Plan Residential Type 1 policies to PGA Future Growth 1 and CCRA-O in compliance with the Capital Region Growth Plan. (See Map 12A p.114.)

2.3.4 Shall aim to achieve the established population projections identified in the Capital Region Growth Plan, and shall accommodate the associated densities through the planning process.

2.3.5 Shall discourage premature fragmentation of Primary Industry lands for non-Primary Industry development, as a way to ensure cohesive and contiguous future land development and municipal servicing.

2.3.6 Should advocate for compact residential types, mixed-use developments, secondary suite allowance, walkable communities and communal open space in accordance with the Capital Regional Growth Plan’s strategic principles.

2.3.7 May consider the implementation of a Residential Density Bonus when significant investment in Sturgeon County’s public realm and community amenities are agreed upon by Sturgeon County and enacted by the developer.

Residential Type 2

Residential Type 2 refers to development within Sturgeon County’s hamlets where additional residential growth is viable. This residential type is reflective of Sturgeon County’s traditional housing opportunities and is associated with residential densities found within Sturgeon County’s hamlets. Consideration and contemplation of growth within the identified hamlets requires supportive planning and infrastructure documents, rationalizing the proposal. Residential Type 2 will be limited to the Hamlets of Cardiff and Villeneuve. For additional policies reflecting the unique needs of each Hamlet, refer to individual Neighbourhoods.

2.3.8 Shall accommodate residential development (Type 2) by establishing a series of statutory Regional Planning Documents for the Hamlets of Cardiff and Villeneuve as a way to identify, prioritize, densify and phase subsequent growth in the listed locations. (See Figure 4 – Regional Concept Map p.25.)

2.3.9 Shall establish an administrative boundary for Sturgeon County Residential Type 2 hamlets and limit residential development outside the boundaries until Sturgeon County identifies a demonstrated need for expansion of the Hamlet. The administrative boundary will take into account mitigative measures including (but not limited to) land use conflicts, airport activities, aggregate and agricultural operations, right of ways and infrastructure setback.

2.3.10 Shall undertake an evaluation of municipal servicing needs prior to significant Hamlet development or expansion in order to identify and prioritize improvements for development.

2.3.11 Shall require proposed residential development to respect the existing scale, type and character of the community. Secondary suites or mixed-use developments may be contemplated where the applicant can successfully demonstrate to the approval authority that no significant impacts on municipal infrastructure or community amenities will occur.
Neighbourhood A

Distinctive Neighbourhood Role
To accommodate diverse rural lifestyle that enhance the existing communities and their landscape characteristics, and responds to development demands in a responsible manner.

Sturgeon County will support the distinctive Neighbourhood Role through the following Outcomes:

1. Encouraging a mixture of residential types throughout the Neighbourhood and centralizing service delivery out of Calahoo.
2. Assisting local community groups to identify and prioritize organizational strategies for facilitating recreation and cultural programs.
3. Supporting development that respects the natural landscape while not significantly altering the existing topography, water quality, native vegetation or wildlife habitats.
4. Encouraging small-scale enterprises to seamlessly integrate into the residential character of the Neighbourhood.
5. Ensuring subdivision and development activities do not exceed infrastructure capacities or result in an increased demand for expanded municipal infrastructure.

Neighbourhood Growth and Population Forecasts
Total of ±10,131ac (4,096ha) of land
Represents ±2% of SC land mass

Estimated Annual Growth Rate: 1.5%
Estimated Future Population (2042): 1,438
Estimated Change in Pop. Across Neigh A (▲535)

Key Regional Planning Documents
Statutory Plan: Calahoo-Villeneuve Sand and Gravel Extraction Area Structure Plan (Bylaw 922/01)
Neighbourhood B

Distinctive Neighbourhood Role
To foster an adaptive local economy that builds upon the resiliency of the community and is capable of responding to the shifting priorities of Primary Industry.

Sturgeon County will support the distinctive Neighbourhood Role through the following Outcomes:

1. Understanding the impacts of generational succession and estate planning throughout the Neighbourhood and centralizing service provision out of Riviere Qui Barre (RQB).
2. Acknowledging and respecting diverse cultural connections and historical experiences.
3. Understanding the ecological value of the land and its influence on economic productivity.
4. Supporting the diversification of agricultural operations in response to fluctuating economic forces.
5. Maintaining infrastructure service delivery that meets the needs of the rural community and that does not result in increased demands on municipal infrastructure.

Neighbourhood Growth and Population Forecasts
Total of ±92,967ac (37,623ha) of land
Represents ±17% of SC land mass

Estimated Annual Growth Rate: 0.5%
Estimated Future Population (2042): 2,990
Estimated Change in Pop. Across Neigh B (▲430)

Key Regional Planning Documents
Statutory Plan: Calahoo-Villeneuve Sand and Gravel Extraction Area Structure Plan (Bylaw 922/01)
Neighbourhood C

Distinctive Neighbourhood Role

To secure Sturgeon County’s position as an agricultural leader, and facilitate subsequent agricultural activity that sustains its provincial importance.

Sturgeon County will support the distinctive Neighbourhood Role through the following Outcomes:

1. Supporting the agricultural industry by acknowledging the unique features of the working landscape.
2. Building on the symbiotic relationships that exist between the agricultural community and neighbouring municipalities.
3. Supporting agricultural sustainability by promoting best management practices that contribute to healthy land, water and air.
4. Encouraging value-added initiatives that recognize and contribute to agricultural industries.
5. Ensuring infrastructure service delivery that meets the needs of the rural community and the residents of Cardiff.

Neighbourhood Growth and Population Forecasts

Total of ±206,399ac (83,527ha) of land
Represents ±38% of SC land mass

Estimated Annual Growth Rate:
2.0% for Cardiff and 0.5% for rural areas
Estimated Future Population (2042): 7,777
Estimated Change in Pop. Across Neigh C (▲1,735)

Key Regional Planning Documents

Statutory Plan: Legal Crossroads Area Structure Plan
Neighbourhood D

Distinctive Neighbourhood Role
To facilitate dialogue that empowers the local community, through an awareness of sensitive landscapes, in an effort to maintain a high quality of living.

Sturgeon County will support the distinctive Neighbourhood Role through the following Outcomes:

1. Maintaining the rural character of the Neighbourhood through responsible interaction with the landscape.
2. Building on the natural features of the Neighbourhood through an awareness of the unique natural environment.
3. Facilitating dialogue about best-management practices that respond to the dynamic nature of the landscape.
4. Supporting diverse agricultural operations that adequately address impact on the ecosystem.
5. Maintaining infrastructure service delivery that meets the needs of the rural community.

Neighbourhood Growth and Population Forecasts
Total of ±75,186ac (30,427ha) of land
Represents ±14% of SC land mass

Estimated Annual Growth Rate: 0.5%
Estimated Future Population (2042): 2,573
Estimated Change in Pop. Across Neigh D (▲370)

Key Regional Planning Documents
n/a
Neighbourhood E

Distinctive Neighbourhood Role
To shape and establish self-reliant, multi-faceted communities, by building on the inherent local conditions and recognizing the diverse range of opportunities.

Sturgeon County will support the distinctive Neighbourhood Role through the following Outcomes:

1. Supporting the growth of Villeneuve as an emerging rural centre inclusive of all phases and aspects of a complete community in a rural context.
2. Promoting venues that enable residents to participate in shaping and building their communities.
3. Fostering the viability of Primary Industry by locating incompatible development to strategic locations.
4. Designating Villeneuve as a strategic logistic hub and a employment centre for Sturgeon County.
5. Establishing service provision that ensures the economic viability of the diverse and future needs of the Neighbourhood.

Neighbourhood Growth and Population Forecasts
Total of ±25,333ac (10,252ha) of land
Represents ±5% of SC land mass

Estimated Annual Growth Rate: 2.0%
Estimated Future Population (2042): 1,990
Estimated Change in Pop. Across Neigh E (▲919)

Key Regional Planning Documents
Statutory Plan: Calahoo-Villeneuve Sand and Gravel Extraction Area Structure Plan (Bylaw 922/01)
The historic Hamlet of Villeneuve has unique opportunities to build and sustain growth. Traditionally an agrarian community, economic growth within the Hamlet of Villeneuve and Neighbourhood E has grown to include natural resource extraction (gravel aggregate) and the Edmonton International Airport (EIA) Villeneuve Airport. In an effort to ensure continued growth of the agricultural industry (Class I and II soils) and the aggregate and aviation industry, while protecting the natural ecosystems around Big Lake and reducing rural sprawl, the Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan proposes to centralize Neighbourhood E growth to within the Hamlet of Villeneuve.
Supporting the growth of Villeneuve as a rural centre inclusive of all phases and aspects of a complete community in a rural context.

Residential development pressures exist in Neighbourhood E, not only in the Hamlet of Villeneuve but also along Meadowview Drive and on lands used for Primary Industry purposes. While there is general consensus on the locational merits for residential development, infrastructure and land-use challenges exist. To ensure the continued evolution of the Hamlet of Villeneuve, to support the aims of the Integrated Regional Growth Strategy and to achieve Villeneuve’s vision, strategically located residential development in Neighbourhood E is essential. Sturgeon County has completed significant public consultation and stakeholder engagement with the Villeneuve community. While the existing community consists of approximately 275 residents, existing local infrastructure (with local upgrades) is capable of supporting an additional 1,000 residents (total approximate population of 1,300) over the MDP timeframe. The desired intent for the Neighbourhood is to support the growth of Villeneuve and to create a self-sustaining, complete rural community centre.

E.1 residential character output actions

- Strengthening the viability of the agricultural and resource extraction industries in the Neighbourhood and outside of the Hamlet of Villeneuve through the application of Residential Type 4 policies. Proposed developments that exceed Residential Type 4 and Non-Residential Type 4 policies will be located in the Hamlet of Villeneuve or in an appropriate location identified in an approved Planning Document.
- Reducing the sterilization of Natural Resources by limiting development in areas with known aggregate deposits, in which the proposed use is conflicting in nature, or until extraction is complete (consistent with the Calahoo-Villeneuve Sand and Gravel Extraction Area Structure Plan).
- Developing a Villeneuve Airport Approach Path overlay to ensure that the Federal government’s development restrictions are enforced and that proposed development does not negatively infringe Villeneuve Airport operations.
- Requiring that lands (outside of Villeneuve) originally identified with Class 1 or Class 2 soil designations (as identified by the Canadian Land Inventory: Land Capability for Agriculture) revert to agricultural function and zoning after resource extraction is complete.
- Discouraging the development or expansion of Confined Feeding Operations (as per the AOPA notification schedule detailed in Appendix A-2) from Sturgeon County communities with densities in exceedance of Residential Type 4, in an effort to minimize land-use conflicts between working landscapes and residential communities.
- Establishing an administrative boundary for the Hamlet of Villeneuve and implementing Residential Type 2 policies within the Hamlet of Villeneuve. Until an administrative boundary is identified, existing land-use zoning shall be used to identify where residential type policies are applicable.
- Recognizing Villeneuve as a Residential and Non-Residential centre for growth by developing and adopting a statutory Regional Planning Document for the Hamlet of Villeneuve. The document should identify sustainable types and scales of Residential and Non-Residential activity, as well as the associated infrastructure and community services levels required to support future development.
- Requiring proposed residential development in the Hamlet of Villeneuve to conform to the statutory Regional Planning Document, through the adoption of a series of Local Planning Documents.
- Giving regard to the existing residential character of the Hamlet of Villeneuve by requiring proposals for residential infill density to ensure that proposed lot location, size and servicing complement the existing community. Depending on the scale and impact of the proposed development, the approving authority may require additional Planning Documents to accurately assess the application.
- Encouraging a range of housing options (including both Market and Non-Market Affordable) and built forms in the Hamlet of Villeneuve, including single-detached, semi-detached, townhouses and multi-unit housing.
- Supporting the continued development and expansion of seniors’ facilities in the Hamlet of Villeneuve that provide affordable not-for-profit accommodation and assisted living.
- Collaborating with local school boards when selecting new school sites, and promoting the Hamlet of Villeneuve as a service centre for the west quadrant of Sturgeon County.
- Developing and adopting a Regional Planning Document along Meadowview Drive. The document should address the associated impacts caused by residential densities on the local transportation networks, infrastructure capacities, levy distribution, community services and any other input required by the approval authority.
- Limiting River Lot residential densities to Residential Type 4 levels along Meadowview Drive, until Sturgeon County identifies residential densities for the area, through the adoption of a Regional Planning Document.
- Limiting the infill of existing country residential subdivisions until the applicant provides a Needs Assessment (deemed complete to the satisfaction of the approving authority) that demonstrates a need for the additional residential development proposed.
Due to the high quality agricultural soil and the significant sand and gravel deposits in the Neighbourhood, economic development activity has traditionally focused on Primary Industry. With proposed future Provincial transportation improvements, established railway infrastructure and opportunities at the Villeneuve Airport, the Hamlet of Villeneuve has significant economic development opportunities in the logistics sector. The desired intent is to centralize residential activity in the Hamlet of Villeneuve and make efficient use of the logistics network to support economic activity.

**E.4 economic health output actions** Sturgeon County will support the long-term outcome of the Neighbourhood by:

1. **Ensuring** that proposed non-Primary Industry in the Neighbourhood (outside of the Hamlet of Villeneuve), will have limited adverse impacts on the Primary Industry operations, activities or industry.

2. **Recognizing** the importance of aggregate extraction as a significant economic contributor, by restricting proposed development until resource extraction is complete.

3. **Requiring** aggregate resource extraction operations to comply with an approved reclamation plan. Development permits for aggregate resource extraction will ensure that sites will be returned to their former agricultural capability, or other post-extractive use, as the County and the Province deem appropriate.

4. **Encouraging** Non-Residential Type 4 HBB (located outside of Villeneuve), that complement local agricultural activities (such as agri-tourism, value-added agricultural and agricultural support services) and that meet the HBB requirements found in the Land Use Bylaw.

5. **Requiring** proposed or expanding development that exceeds Non-Residential Type 4, to relocate to identified Non-Residential centres in the County (such as Villeneuve). HBBs, where the Non-Residential type and scale conflicts with residential uses, shall relocate to an existing Non-Residential Development Park or an appropriate location identified within an approved Planning Document.

6. **Applying** Non-Residential Type 2 and 3 levels to the Hamlet of Villeneuve when the Non-Residential type complements the residential nature of the community.

7. **Supporting** the ongoing expansion and development of the Villeneuve Airport by implementing the Edmonton Regional Airport Authority’s Villeneuve Airport Master Plan (see Map 10 on page 99).

8. **Requiring** planned developments, in close proximity to the Villeneuve Airport, to avoid or mitigate potential land uses that conflict with the viability of current and future airport operations. Compatibility Buffers for the Villeneuve Airport are to be applied as indicated in the Capital Region Growth Plan Regional Buffer areas map.

9. **Recognizing** the importance of the Villeneuve Airport as a regional asset by consulting with Capital Region Board member municipalities regarding its growth.
**Neighbourhood G**

**Distinctive Neighbourhood Role**

To support the regional vision of growth where positive intermunicipal dialogue is facilitated and sustainable communities are the result.

**Sturgeon County will support the distinctive Neighbourhood Role through the following Outcomes:**

1. Providing a transition from more intensive urban-built forms to lower density rural land-uses.
2. Promoting a community culture that is inclusive of a variety of voices and perspectives.
3. Maximizing development potentials of the Neighbourhood by applying a design approach and methodology that integrates unique landscape characteristics, valued community assets and existing development constraints.
4. Facilitating Sturgeon County’s emerging Non-Residential sectors, while leveraging diversification and opportunities with the University of Alberta, CFB Edmonton and agricultural producers.
5. Ensuring growth coincides with efficient municipal service provision and in a manner that does not preclude future infrastructure expansion and development.

**Neighbourhood Growth and Population Forecasts**

Total of ±25,560ac (10,344ha) of land

Represents ±5% of SC land mass


Estimated Annual Growth Rate: 3% (Across Entire Neighbourhood)

Estimated Future Population (2042): 14,218

Estimated Change in Pop. Across Neigh G (▲8,609)

- An estimated annual growth rate of 3.5% across the CCRA policy area represents an increase of approximately 6,650 people of the total estimated change in population across Neigh G until 2042.

**Key Regional Planning Documents**

Statutory Plan: Sturgeon Valley Area Structure Plan
Demonstrated Need for Planning in PGA-B?

Urban development within the City of St. Albert has reached Sturgeon County municipal boundaries to the east of the city. In addition, proposed area structure plans within the City of St. Albert reach Sturgeon County’s municipal boundaries. There has been development interest expressed in Sturgeon County adjacent to the City of St. Albert. Both communities recognize the need to integrate development along the shared boundary.

Reducing the amount of land consumed by residential development in the Capital Region through concentration of growth in the PGA-B area, in conformance with the Capital Region Growth Plan and in coordination with the cities of Edmonton and St. Albert.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs directed the Capital Region Board (CRB) to minimize the Capital Region’s development footprint. The Capital Region Land Use Plan, approved on March 31, 2009, supports the Minister’s direction by concentrating new growth in Priority Growth Areas (PGAs) and by planning for intensive forms of development that significantly exceed existing development patterns in these areas. The March 2009 Land Use Plan Policies state that most new growth shall occur in PGAs. Priority Growth Area B (PGA-B) is located within Sturgeon County municipal boundaries. As per the CRB Growth Plan, residential development will be of a urban nature, with minimum densities targets of 30 dwelling units/net residential hectare. The PGA-B identified lands contained within Neighbourhood G reflect the interpretations set out by the CRGP and the CRB Toolkit (as per Sturgeon County Council direction). It is recognized that a full urban build out of the PGA lands would exceed 2044 CRB population projections. As such, development of the PGA-B correlates to the two (2) different policy areas (PGA Future Growth 1 and PGA Future Growth 2) and is contingent upon a number of factors including the completion of required planning studies, joint planning endeavours with neighbouring municipalities, the approval of Alberta Transportation plans and approved servicing agreements.

G 1.1 Shall ensure Residential densification in PGA Future Growth 1 by requiring applications to adhere to the Residential density targets outlined in PGA-B of the CRB Growth Plan. (See Map 12A p.114.)

G 1.1.2 Shall encourage the incorporation of a wide range of housing options (both Market and Non-Market Affordable) and built forms (including single-detached, semi-detached, townhouses and multi-unit housing) in PGA Future Growth 1 that meet the PGA-B density targets. (See Map 12A p.114.)

G 1.1.3 Shall support an integrated regional public transportation system and increase public transportation options, by identifying and incorporating transit linkages in PGA-B, as outlined by the CRB Growth Plan.

G 1.1.4 Shall identify and prioritize development in the PGA-B based on infrastructure accessibility, land use and need.

G 1.1.5 Shall undertake consultation with the cities of Edmonton and St. Albert regarding Residential development in the PGA-B, in an effort to develop mutually beneficial statutory Regional Planning Documents, to provide certainty to impacted stakeholders and to provide opportunities for commentary and feedback.

G 1.1.6 Shall ensure that statutory Regional Planning Documents are required to minimize future land use conflicts and to ensure the logical extension of road networks and servicing between municipalities (such as, but not limited to, evaluation of service alternatives according to municipality’s needs, priorities, statutory plans and bylaws).

G 1.1.7 Shall ensure the planning objectives in PGA-B of both the Sturgeon County MDP and the Capital Region Growth Plan are met by requiring statutory Local Planning documents to adhere to an approved statutory Regional Planning document and to address the following:

- Timing and phasing of development,
- Future municipal infrastructure servicing,
- Municipal financial sustainability, and the
- Amount, location and phasing of residential growth.
PGA Future Growth 1 versus PGA Future Growth 2

**PGA Future Growth 1:** Contiguous development principles and local servicing needs provide the rationale for the identification of the PGA Future Growth 1 area. Imminent investigation and creation of statutory Regional Planning Documents for PGA Future Growth 1 are required to complement the existing communities (Sturgeon Valley, agricultural lands, and the City of St. Albert), while ensuring that infrastructure investments addresses the future needs for sustainable development of both Sturgeon County and the City of St. Albert.

**PGA Future Growth 2:** These lands present limited future residential influence within Sturgeon County. Future residential development will require infrastructure upgrades and connection to existing servicing networks that are not easily accessed through Sturgeon County.
Demonstrated Need for Development of Statutory Planning Documents?

The Sturgeon County MDP outlines the binding statutory policy documents required to be completed prior to the expansion of urban areas into PGA-B within Sturgeon County. (See RC 2.3 Residential Type 1 Policy RC 2.3.1 and RC 2.3.2 on page 34). Joint statutory Regional Planning documents provide transparency in decision-making to all impacted stakeholders and ensure that proper development and coordination with municipal neighbours occurs within the planning process. Agreement on the type and level of statutory Regional Planning Documents will be established through intermunicipal dialogue (for example - the Intermunicipal Affairs Committee sanctioned workplan developed between Sturgeon County and City of St. Albert). Examples of Joint Regional Planning Documents include (but not limited to): Intermunicipal Development Plans, Joint Area Structure Plans and Joint Servicing Agreements. For additional information see page 18 of the MDP.

PGA Future Growth 1

G 1.1.8 Shall require that new residential growth and development connect and enhance existing developments within both the Sturgeon Valley and the City of St. Albert through the application of Residential Type 1 policies.

**PGA residential character output actions** Sturgeon County will support the long-term outcome of the PGA Future Growth 1 by:

1. Requiring that proposed land uses, and resulting development, provide a compatible development transition between Sturgeon County’s Residential developments and St. Albert’s urban development patterns.

2. Supporting a variety of Non-Residential commercial types which contribute to complete communities.

3. Requiring Non-Primary Industry development to ensure the provision of municipal infrastructure servicing.

PGA Future Growth 2

G 1.1.9 Shall not prejudice the use of these lands for future regional urban growth. As interpreted through the CRGP, the lands identified for urban residential development within PGA Future Growth 2 are beyond the planning horizon of the CRGP. Interim development of these lands will focus on Primary Industry uses, consistent with the CRGP principles.

**PGA residential character output actions** Sturgeon County will support the long-term outcome of the PGA Future Growth 2 by:

1. Ensuring proposed development complements existing built environments in Sturgeon County and the City of St. Albert. Proposed development shall not preclude future non-Primary Industry development potential.

2. Limiting current residential development to Residential Type 4 levels until the CRGP identifies a development need, municipal infrastructure servicing is accommodated and associated statutory Regional Planning Documents are adopted. Interim development of these lands will focus on Primary Industry, consistent with the CRGP principles.
Neighbourhood H

Distinctive Neighbourhood Role
To recognize rural development opportunities, while respecting existing local constraints, in an effort to contour the agricultural interface.

Sturgeon County will support the distinctive Neighbourhood Role through the following Outcomes:

1. Providing regional stability and managing associated development expectations by applying practical and pragmatic design.

2. Recognizing Namao as a community gathering space for cultural activities and learning opportunities.

3. Identifying and addressing, in consultation with local landowners, the cumulative impacts of development on the local landscape.

4. Supporting Non-Residential development and associated service delivery out of Namao.

5. Ensuring the level of proposed development can be supported by the existing infrastructure or by proposed infrastructure improvements.

Neighbourhood Growth and Population Forecasts
Total of ±14,287ac (5,782ha) of land
Represents ±3% of SC land mass

Estimated Annual Growth Rate: 0.5%
Estimated Future Population (2042): 427
Estimated Change in Pop. Across Neigh H (▲61)

Key Regional Planning Documents
n/a
Neighbourhood I

Distinctive Neighbourhood Role
To strengthen the strategic industrial corridor, by targeting infrastructure investment that supports and links regional economic growth.

Sturgeon County will support the distinctive Neighbourhood Role through the following Outcomes:

1. Promoting a diverse range of employment opportunities that are supportive of the industrial activity within the Sturgeon Industrial Park.
2. Building on the cultural heritage of Lamoureux and recognizing the settlement’s historic regional importance.
3. Ensuring that industrial activity does not negatively impact the natural environment and that the health and safety of residents is maintained.
4. Encouraging a range of manufacturing, logistics and support industries that ensure a diverse economic base and that complement activity in the Alberta Industrial Heartland and the City of Edmonton Energy and Technology Park.
5. Providing infrastructure services that facilitate economic growth for industrial users.

Neighbourhood Growth and Population Forecasts
Total of ±10,912ac (4,416ha) of land
Represents ±2% of SC land mass

Estimated Annual Growth Rate: 1.5%
Estimated Future Population (2042): 836
Estimated Change in Pop. Across Neigh I (▲311)

Key Regional Planning Documents
Sturgeon Sturgeon Area Structure Plan (Bylaw 407/81)
The Sturgeon Industrial Park
The Sturgeon Industrial Park has been the cornerstone of light and medium industrial activity within Sturgeon County since the 1970s. The existing industrial park currently contains over 1,200 acres of designated and zoned industrial land. Features of the Sturgeon Industrial Park include regional water and sanitary servicing, fully paved roads, access to an extensive highway network and CN Rail access. Sturgeon County has supported local infrastructure improvements to make Sturgeon Industrial Park a fundamental non-residential growth area within Sturgeon County.

CRB Regulation - Part 5 Section 23
For greater certainty, except as provided in Parts 3 and 4 of the Regulation and Part 17 of the Act, all statutory plans of a participating municipality that were in effect on April 15, 2008 and have not been repealed before the coming into force of this Regulation remain in full force and effect.

The full area of Sturgeon Industrial Park is designated as per:
- Sturgeon County MDP (Bylaw 818/96)
- Sturgeon County LUB (Bylaw 819/96)
- South Sturgeon ASP (Bylaw 407/81)
- Sturgeon County Bylaw 160-72
- Edmonton Regional Planning Commission General Plan adopted July 1972 (see ERPC file no 76-SC-198)
Promoting a diverse range of employment opportunities that are supportive of the industrial activity within the Sturgeon Industrial Park.

Development in the Neighbourhood is closely aligned with industrial sector growth in the Alberta Industrial Heartland (AIH). Industrial growth will continue to provide Sturgeon County with an increasing and significant employment base. As such, residential development within Neighbourhood I should complement and not distract from the opportunities that the Sturgeon Industrial Park provides. The desired intent of the Neighbourhood is to ensure the successful co-existence of existing residential and proposed Non-Residential development activities.

I.1 Residential character output actions

Sturgeon County will support the long-term outcome of the Neighbourhood by:

1. Strengthening the viability of the agricultural operations, the regional industrial strategy and the Sturgeon Industrial Park (outside of the Hamlet of Lamoureux) through the application of Residential Type 4 policies in the Neighbourhood.

2. Promoting subdivision layouts of Agricultural Parcels and Acreage Lots that focus Acreage Lots to one general area of the former quarter section, as a way to assist in the viability of agricultural operations, reduce land-use conflicts and encourage the retention of large tracts of agricultural lands.

3. Discouraging the development or expansion of Confined Feeding Operations (as per the AOPA notification schedule detailed in Appendix A-2) from Sturgeon County communities with densities in exceedance of Residential Type 4, in an effort to minimize land-use conflicts between working landscapes and residential communities.

4. Requiring proposed developments to provide a compatible land-use transition between the City of Edmonton, residential development and existing Primary Industry.

5. Limiting the infill of existing country residential subdivisions and Hamlets until the applicant provides a Needs Assessment (deemed complete to the satisfaction of the approving authority) that demonstrates a need for the additional residential development.

6. Establishing an administrative boundary for the Hamlet of Lamoureux and implementing Residential Type 3 policies for residential development within that boundaries. Until an administrative boundary is identified through the Planning Document process, existing land-use zoning shall be used to identify where residential type policies are applicable.

7. Giving regard to the existing residential character of the Hamlet of Lamoureux by requiring proposals for residential infill density to ensure that proposed lot location, size and servicing complement the existing community. Depending on the scale and impact of the proposed development, the approving authority may require additional Planning Documents to accurately assess the application.

8. Requiring residential infill in the Hamlet of Lamoureux to be limited to on-site septic development and setback standards.
Encouraging a range of manufacturing, logistics and support industries that ensure a diverse economic base and complement activity in the Alberta Industrial Heartland (AIH) and the City of Edmonton Energy and Technology Park (ETP).

To ensure fiscal sustainability as outlined within the Integrated Regional Growth Strategy, the diversification of industrial activities within the Sturgeon Industrial Park (SIP) is required. Promoting economic diversification that attracts targeted sectors requires investment and continued development focus for SIP. The desired intention is to support initiatives that will transform the SIP into a competitive alternative for industrial development and growth within Sturgeon County.

**I.4 economic health output actions** Sturgeon County will support the long-term outcome of the Neighbourhood by:

1. Ensuring proposed developments for the Neighbourhood demonstrate limited adverse impact on the activities, growth or viability of the SIP.
2. Ensuring the continued viability and growth of SIP by promoting Non-Residential Type 2 developments in the SIP that support and build on development activity in the AIH and the ETP.
3. Locating proposed or expanding Non Residential developments to the Non-Residential Development Park (SIP). If there is a demonstrated need identified by Sturgeon County to create additional industrial development opportunities in the Neighbourhood, priority will focus on land contiguous to the existing Non-Residential Development Park and will necessitate an MDP amendment.
4. Developing and adopting an Area Redevelopment Plan for SIP in an effort to establish an industrial corridor linking the heavy industrial activity in the AIH to the eco-industrial activity proposed in the ETP.
5. Undertaking a Needs Assessment and adopting an Economic Development Strategy for SIP to ensure that the Non-Residential Development Park is a premier destination for value-added industrial activity and supportive industrial service for the AIH.

6. Investigating and establishing Floor Area Ratio targets for Non-Residential Development in the SIP, in an effort to balance municipal infrastructure development with tax revenue.
7. Supporting a variety of Non-Residential uses that complement development activity and serve the local employment sector of the SIP.
8. Promoting Non-Residential Commercial that provides support services to developments in SIP and the AIH. Non-Residential Commercial will be considered at key strategic locations to assist further diversification of the SIP and AIH industrial base.
9. Requiring Non-Residential proposals that result in amendments to Planning Documents to demonstrate (to the satisfaction of the approval agency) that the activity will not conflict with, nor affect the viability of developments in SIP and municipal infrastructure capacity.
10. Requiring Non-Residential proposals to undertake planning and consultation with landowners and stakeholders regarding long-term growth aspirations. Consultation shall address land use, servicing and access issues related to future development. Associated Planning Documents are to identify sustainable types and scales of Non-Residential activity, as well as the associated infrastructure and community services levels required to support future development.
Neighbourhood J

Distinctive Neighbourhood Role
To focus heavy industrial activity within Sturgeon County, while being an active contributing partner, in order to become an emergent industrial leader.

Sturgeon County will support the distinctive Neighbourhood Role through the following Outcomes:

1. Aiming to be a major industrial employment generator for the Capital Region.
2. Encouraging corporate industry to invest in Sturgeon County’s social, cultural and environmental initiatives.
3. Complying with Federal and Provincial regulations in an effort to maintain safe communities and natural environments.
4. Facilitating and accommodating the growth of Alberta’s energy sector, which contributes to the overall viability of Sturgeon County’s future.
5. Ensuring efficient infrastructure networks to accommodate a wide range of industrial needs.

Neighbourhood Growth and Population Forecasts
Total of ±35,986ac (14,563ha) of land
Represents ±7% of SC land mass

Estimated Annual Growth Rate: -1.5%
Estimated Future Population (2042): 188
Estimated Change in Pop. Across Neigh J (▼111)

Key Regional Planning Documents
Statutory Plan: Alberta Industrial Heartland Area Structure Plan
PURPOSE

To establish the Board meeting procedures for an appealed Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) application.

POLICY

The Capital Region Board (CRB) shall conduct the REF appeal efficiently with a standardized process to manage the appeal. In accordance with Ministerial Order L:270/10 Section 5, at the meeting at which the Board administration report and recommendation are presented, the Board must, by consensus, approve or reject the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment. In the event that consensus is not achieved, a formal vote of the Board must be conducted in accordance with the voting and notification provisions of the Capital Region Board Regulation and Policy G005 Board Meeting Procedures.

GUIDELINES

1. The Board Chair shall introduce the Agenda item.

2. The Board Chair shall acknowledge the member from the applicant municipality.

3. The member from the applicant municipality shall read the motion (the Board Chair does not accept the motion at this point) and present the REF application.

4. CRB administration shall present its recommendation.

5. The Board Chair shall advise that the CRB administration recommendation was appealed by a member municipality or municipalities. The appealing municipality or municipalities shall present the basis for the appeal(s).

6. The Board Chair shall begin an open period of questions and answers for clarification.

7. The member from the applicant municipality may withdraw the REF application or read the motion into the record.

8. Should the applicant wish to proceed, the motion shall be accepted by the Board Chair.
   a. The Board Chair shall open the floor for debate.
   b. Each party shall be given an opportunity to respond once, in accordance with Policy G005 Board Meeting Procedures. The Board Chair may only speak second last and only after relinquishing the Chair to the Vice-Chair.
   c. As mover, the member from the applicant municipality closes the debate.

9. The Board Chair calls the vote.
REF 2014-001, Sturgeon County
Proposed Municipal Development Plan

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approves the proposed Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan in accordance with the Regional Evaluation Framework.

Background

On January 2, 2014 the CRB received an application from Sturgeon County (the County) for approval of a proposed new Municipal Development Plan (MDP).

A CRB Administrative recommendation to approve the subject application (attached) and a Third Party Consultant evaluation (attached) indicating consistency with the Growth Plan were posted to the CRB website on January 29, 2014. In accordance with the REF Administration Procedures the CRB Administration recommendation was subject to a 14 day appeal period ending on February 12, 2014.

A Notice of Appeal of the subject REF Application was received on February 7, 2014 from the City of Edmonton (attached). No other appeals were received.

Pursuant to the REF Administration Procedures, when an appeal is received the application is presented at the next Board meeting for disposition.

At the March 13, 2014 Board meeting Sturgeon County Mayor Tom Flynn advised Board members that Sturgeon County and the City of Edmonton were having ongoing discussions to resolve the issues of the appeal and requested that the motion be deferred. The Board approved the deferral of the subject motion to the April 10, 2014 Board meeting.

Attachments:
1. REF 2014-001 CRB Administrative Recommendation
2. REF 2014-001 Stantec Evaluation
3. REF 2014-001 Notice of Appeal - City of Edmonton
REF 2014-001, Sturgeon County
Proposed Municipal Development Plan

Recommendation

CRB Administration recommends that REF application 2014-001 be approved.

Background

On January 2, 2014 the Capital Region Board (CRB) received a Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) application from Sturgeon County (the County) for approval of a proposed new Municipal Development Plan (MDP). The County submitted the application pursuant to the following submission criteria in the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF):

3.1 A Municipality must refer to the Board any proposed new Intermunicipal Development Plan, Municipal Development Plan and any proposed amendment to an Intermunicipal Development Plan or Municipal Development Plan.

CRB Administration deemed the application complete on January 6, 2014.

The Application

The proposed Municipal Development Plan replaces the 1996 Municipal Development Plan as the County’s primary policy document for long range planning, highlighting the community’s needs and directing future growth. The MDP describes the County’s preferred direction with respect to land use, residential and non-residential types, infrastructure investments, service provision and future development zones; guides policy creation and planning tools regarding land use, transportation and infrastructure investment decisions across the County; and, provides an overarching document to assist in the coordination of municipal bylaws, policies, programs and investments.

Evaluation

CRB Administration obtained the assistance of Stantec Consulting Ltd. to evaluate the application with respect to the REF requirements. The Stantec evaluation (attached) reviewed the proposed MDP in relation to the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan (the Growth Plan) in section 11 of the Regulation, the Principles and Policies of the Growth Plan, and the evaluation criteria in section 5.4 of the Regional Evaluation Framework. The Stantec evaluation recommends that the proposed MDP be supported by the CRB.

CRB Administration Comments

This application marks the first MDP to be submitted by a County under the Regional Evaluation Framework. Further, Sturgeon County is one of the few municipalities within the Region that must consider every principle and policy within the Growth Plan in their planning. Acknowledging and balancing the various principles in the Growth Plan such as preserving agricultural lands, protecting natural
resources and minimizing the regional footprint, is no simple task when an MDP is based on a “pro-growth development model” as in Sturgeon’s case.

The Integrated Regional Growth Strategy, the model on which MDP is based, is consistent with the integrated and strategic approach to planning contained in the Growth Plan. The MDP and Growth Plan both emphasize regional consultation and collaboration with neighbouring municipalities to coordinate decisions affecting the overall development pattern and future infrastructure investments of the Capital Region.

Further, the MDP is consistent with the six guiding principles of the Growth Plan:

Protect the Environment and Resources
The MDP acknowledges the importance of a healthy environment and includes a neighbourhood overlay that supports environmental stewardship. Sturgeon County has abundant natural and agricultural resources. Policies have been established to guide and develop the resources efficiently and with minimal impact on the environment and residential land uses.

Minimize the Regional Footprint
The MDP proposes to minimize the regional footprint by maximizing the development potential of Priority Growth Area “B” and Country Cluster Residential Area “O” through the application of Growth Plan density targets. Growth outside of the PGA is limited to the current capacity of existing regional infrastructure.

Strengthen Communities
Through Community Guiding Principles: Residential Character and Cultural Vitality, the MDP supports creating attractive and complete communities with access to a diverse array of quality community spaces, amenities and programming.

Increase Transportation Choice
The MDP supports the creation of a sustainable transportation system, aligning land use decisions with regional transportation goals. Despite Sturgeon County’s predominately rural nature, the MDP includes policies that support an integrated regional public transportation system and encourage increased public transportation options.

Ensure Efficient Provision of Services
The MDP includes policies supporting the coordination of regional infrastructure servicing with municipal neighbours and maximizing the use of existing infrastructure.

Support Regional Economic Development
The MDP has multiple policies supporting regional economic development including aligning strategies with the Capital Region Board development strategies that are mutually beneficial and collaborating with regional partners to identify opportunities.

Overall, CRB Administration considers the proposed MDP to be consistent with Section 11 of the CRB Regulation, the criteria in the Regional Evaluation Framework, and the Principles and Policies of the Growth Plan.
Administration Recommendation to the Capital Region Board

January 29, 2014

Recommendation

CRB Administration recommends that REF 2014-001 be approved.

Attachments

Evaluation Stantec Consulting Ltd.

REF Documents

REF Cover Letter - Sturgeon County MDP
Attachment A-Bylaw131313
Attachment B-Request for Decision
Attachment C01-bylaw131313-preliminary-draft-vII-2013-12-20
Attachment C02-Appendix A-4
Attachment D-Public Engagement Plan
Attachment E-Background Report
Attachment F-Preferred Action Plan
Attachment G-Supplementary Report
Attachment H-Municipal Development Plan 1996
Attachment I-Sturgeon County REF Application Letter May 2013
Attachment J-Sturgeon County REF Application Letter August 2013
Attachment K-Stantec REF 2013-010 Evaluation June 2013
Attachment L-Stantec REF 2013-016 Evaluation September 2013
Attachment M-CRB Administration REF 2013-010 Recommendation June 2013
Attachment N-CRB Administration REF-2013-016 Recommendation Sept 2013
January 23, 2014
File: 116100150-258

Attention: Mr. Nolan Crouse, Chair
Capital Region Board
Suite 1100, Bell Tower
10104 - 103 Ave
Edmonton, AB, T5J 0H8

Dear Mr. Crouse,

Reference: Referral REF# 2014-001 Sturgeon County - Proposed Municipal Development Plan

Attached is our third party evaluation of the above noted referral from Sturgeon County.

It is our opinion that REF# 2014-001 does generally comply with the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan as set out in Section 11 of the Capital Region Board Regulation and is consistent with Section 5.4 of the Schedule A to Ministerial Order No. L:270/10.

We recommend that the Capital Region Board support the proposed Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan (Bylaw 1313/13).

Regards,

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Bonnie McInnis RPP, MCIP, MDes
Senior Associate, Community Development
Phone: (780) 969-3374
Fax: (780) 917-7179
bonnie.mcinnis@stantec.com

Attachment: Sturgeon County, REF 2014-001 Evaluation
Regional Evaluation Framework: Third Party Evaluation

Sturgeon County
Municipal Development Plan
REF 2014–001
Proposed Municipal Bylaw 1313/13

1 Introduction
The Province has adopted the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) for the Capital Region Board (Board) to ensure consistency with the Capital Region Growth Plan and the Capital Region Board Regulation. Section 3.1 of the Regulation states a municipality must refer to the Board any proposed new intermunicipal development plan, municipal development plan and any proposed amendment to an intermunicipal development plan or municipal development plan. Sturgeon County (Sturgeon) has referred its proposed new municipal development plan (MDP) to the Board as it meets the requirement of REF for submission.

2 Background and Purpose

Status:
The Bylaw received 1st reading on November 12, 2013.
Public Hearings were held November 16, 2013, and December 10, 2013.
The Bylaw received 2nd reading on December 17, 2013.

Purpose:
To adopt a proposed new Municipal Development Plan. The current 1996 MDP does not align with the policies contained within the Capital Region Growth Plan or the Sturgeon County Strategic Plan and, based on new analysis and community consultation, the new plan provides a new long term strategy.

3 Evaluation Criteria

Section 5.4 of REF lists what the Board must consider in its evaluation. These considerations are listed below, with a discussion of each in the context of the MDP.

Section 5.4 a) compatibility of the development with the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan as set out in Section 11 of the Regulation. Section 11 of the Capital Region Board Regulation outlines the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan as being:

Section 11(a) to promote an integrated and strategic approach to planning for future growth in the Capital Region:

Commentary:
Based on clarifications and refinements to earlier versions of the Municipal Development Plan, the policies in the MDP are consistent with the strategic and integrated planning objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan.

The MDP provides a high-level planning framework and policy intended to describe and manage the future growth of Sturgeon consistent with the stated development strategy. The MDP divides Sturgeon into ten sub-areas that are referred to as ‘neighbourhoods’ (See Appendix 1). Policies within each
neighborhood provide an additional level of detail to respond to local conditions and opportunities. The general planning context is reflected in Appendix 2.

Consistency with the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan is demonstrated in the MDP’s Guiding Principles. The Community Guiding Principle, RG1.2 Establishing Effective and Collaborative Processes, states that Sturgeon (1.2.1) Shall promote intermunicipal dialogue at both the political and administrative levels to facilitate an approved and united vision for the region; (1.2.2) Should encourage the coordination of joint municipal processes and Planning Documents that provide agreement for land-use activity along shared municipal boundaries; (1.2.3) Should establish infrastructure servicing and joint-use partnership agreements with municipal neighbours and other government agencies that are mutually beneficial and provide for the coordinated distribution of municipal services; (1.2.4) Should work with regional and provincial stakeholders to identify and accommodate connectivity for roads of regional significance.

Section 11(b) to identify the overall development pattern and key future infrastructure investments that would:
(i) best complement existing infrastructure, services and land uses in the Capital Region, and
(ii) maximize benefits to the Capital Region:

**Commentary:** The MDP seeks to attain the density targets appropriate for Priority Growth Area PGA-B, and Cluster Country Residential Area CCRA-O within the context of regional objectives and local desires. The MDP supports and encourages the logical extension of existing local infrastructure and coordination of regional infrastructure and transportation with Capital Region partners. In numerous instances, the MDP calls for further analysis of infrastructure before future development. The MDP does provide some future infrastructure mapping that shows integration of the overall development pattern in the MDP that is generally consistent with key infrastructure identified in the Growth Plan.

Section 11(c) coordinate decisions in the Capital Region to sustain economic growth and ensure strong communities and a healthy environment.

**Commentary:** The plan provides a comprehensive strategy with policies addressing economic issues (diversification and growth, as well as identifies specific strategies and general locations for commercial and industrial development including Alberta’s Industrial Heartland, etc.), environmental issues (protecting environmentally significant and natural areas, and natural resource use, etc.), and social issues (establishing complete communities with open spaces, local services and employment opportunities, as well as health, wellness, culture, safety, etc.).

Section 5.4 b) whether the approval and full implementation of the plan would result in a level, type and pattern of development that is consistent with all of the following:
(i) The Land Use Principles and Policies of the Capital Region Growth Plan including provisions for:
   i. Buffer area as shown on the Regional Buffers Area Map in the Capital Region Growth Plan;
   ii. Priority Growth Areas as shown on the Priority Growth Areas and Cluster Country Residential Areas map in the Capital Region Growth Plan;
   iii. Cluster Country Residential Areas as shown on the Priority Growth Areas and Cluster Country Residential Areas map in the Capital Region Growth Plan;
   iv. Density targets as outlined in the Capital Region Growth Plan; and
   v. Outside Priority Growth Areas as outlined in the Capital Region Growth Plan.
Commentary:

i  The policies in the proposed MDP are consistent with the buffers identified in the Regional Buffer Areas map in the Capital Region Growth Plan. Specifically, it includes policies for the Edmonton Garrison Approach Path; Villeneuve Airport; the Conservation Buffer for Big Lake and the various creeks and rivers; and the Safety & Risk Management Buffer around the Alberta Heartland Industrial Area.

ii  The MDP Neighbourhood G includes those parts of PGA-B (a priority growth area) and CCRA-O (cluster country residential area) that are within Sturgeon County. The MDP designates approximately 80% of Sturgeon’s residential growth in Neighbourhood G. This includes urban forms of development (Residential Type 01: a range of housing densities from estate residential—not defined—to high-density residential development) are contemplated within the PGA area of Neighbourhood G. All Residential Type 01 development requires municipal infrastructure and services. Residential Type 01 is consistent with the intent of PGAs outlined in the Capital Region Growth Plan.

The MDP proposes that the urban development (Type 1) be concentrated in the CCRA-O and a transitional area in PGA-B between the City of St. Albert and Sturgeon’s country residential area to the east (See Appendix 3). The remainder of the PGA (all of Neighbourhood G west of Highway 2 and the City of St. Albert are noted as “being beyond the planning horizon of the CRGP” and interim use of these lands will focus on primary industry (agriculture, etc.).

iii The MDP Policy G 1.2.1 Shall conform to the total number of residential units in the CCRA-O through the application of the CRGP’s Country Cluster Residential policies; is consistent with the CRB requirements for Cluster Country Residential Areas.

iv With respect to the PGA, MDP policy G 1.1.1 states, Shall ensure Residential densification in PGA Developing Growth by requiring applications to adhere to the Residential density targets outlined in the PGA-B of the CRB Growth Plan. The MDP states that this area shall have a minimum density of 30 dwelling units/net residential hectare—which meets the minimum target from the CRB Growth Plan for this PGA. Further, policy G 1.1.2 states Sturgeon Shall encourage the incorporation of a wide range of housing options (both Market and Non-Market Affordable) and built forms (including single-detached, semi-detached, townhouses and multi-unit housing) in PGA Developing Growth that meet the PGA-B density targets. These two statements apply only to PGA – Developing Future Growth. The western area, noted as being beyond the time horizon of the plan, provides for Residential Type 04 (four residences to a quarter section).

With respect to the CCRA, MDP policy G 1.2.2 states that the County should identify, prioritize and establish density ranges in the CCRA-O, to ensure cohesive development patterns between the Cities of Edmonton and St. Albert and Primary Industry activities, in an effort to achieve viable options to support density allocations as outlined in the Capital Region Growth Plan. This may involve the creation of additional programs or policies that support varying densities from one location within the CCRA-O to strategic locations identified through Sturgeon County’s planning process. This is consistent with the general concept of clustering contemplated in the Capital Region Growth Plan.
v Land designations and policies outside of PGA-B and CCRA-O conform to the policies and provisions of the Capital Region Growth Plan, and are consistent with the CRB requirements for allowing growth only to the extent that existing servicing and infrastructure can support and that no expansion to regional infrastructure is contemplated that is not consistent with the Capital Region Growth Plan.

(ii) The regional population and employment forecasts in the Capital Region Growth Plan:

Commentary: The CRB’s most recent population forecast identifies a population range of 31,000 to 39,200 for Sturgeon by the year 2044. The MDP has population forecasts allocated for each neighbourhood which total 32,437 by the year 2042. This is near the lower end of the population range and is, therefore, consistent with CRB population forecasts.

The most recent employment forecast by the CRB showed a range of employment, by 2044, from a low of 7,900 to a high of 10,000 by 2044. The MDP was predicated on previous CRB forecasts, done in 2009, which allocated employment of 18,888 for Sturgeon. The recent CRB employment forecasts have reallocated regional employment growth, resulting in a forecast of up to 10,000 jobs by 2044. The MDP allocates percentages of total employment growth by sector as follows, noting that Sturgeon’s planning documents will need to comply with CRB projections:

The employment projections now contemplated by the CRB can be accommodated by the MDP.

(iii) The regional transportation network as shown in the Regional Transportation Infrastructure map in the Capital Region Growth Plan:

Commentary: The MDP is consistent with the Regional Transportation Infrastructure map. In Sturgeon, the regional transportation network is primarily the existing highway network (which accommodates some intermunicipal bus routes) and the rail network, all of which is accommodated by the MDP. A future east/west regional road/highway is shown in Sturgeon north of St. Albert as an extension of the West Bypass. Both of these proposed roads are accommodated by planning for Neighbourhood G.

(iv) The Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan of the Capital Region Growth Plan (Figures 8, 9 or 10 of the Capital Region Intermunicipal Network Transit Plan), and a Transportation Master plan as approved by the City of Edmonton:
**Commentary:** All long-term intermunicipal bus routes shown by Capital Region Intermunicipal Network Transit Plan are accommodated by the existing highway network.

(v) The regional infrastructure, recreation, transportation and utility corridors identified on the Regional Transportation Infrastructure, Regional Water and Wastewater Infrastructure, Regional Power infrastructure and Regional Corridors maps in the *Capital Region Growth Plan*:

**Commentary:** The proposed MDP is generally consistent with regional infrastructure, recreation, transportation and utility corridors identified in the *Capital Region Growth Plan*.

(vi) The boundaries and policies of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Area Structure Plans and the Edmonton International Airport Area Structure Plan:

**Commentary:** A portion of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Area Structure Plan lies within Sturgeon County’s boundaries. This area is consistent and corresponds with Neighbourhood J of the proposed MDP. The policies and objectives of the MDP for Neighbourhood J are consistent with Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Area Structure Plan policies.

Sturgeon County is not within or adjacent the Edmonton International Airport Area Structure Plan and therefore this MDP has no impact on it.

4 Opinion

It is recommended that the Capital Region Board support the proposed Municipal Development Plan.

Prepared by:

**Stantec Consulting Ltd.**
John Steil, RPP, FCIP and Bonnie McInnis, RPP, MCIP

Appendix 1: MDP Neighbourhoods
Appendix 2: MDP Growth Strategy Concept Map
Appendix 3: Neighbourhood G
Appendix 1: MDP Neighbourhoods
Appendix 2: Growth Strategy
Appendix 3: Neighbourhood G
**Regional Evaluation Framework**

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT OF APPEAL</th>
<th>CRB Applicant Municipality</th>
<th>Statutory Plan(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REF #</td>
<td>CRB Applicant Municipality</td>
<td>Municipal Development Plan Bylaw No. 1313/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-001</td>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB Administration Recommendation</td>
<td>Appeal Period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPELLANT INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRB Appellant Municipality</th>
<th>Council Resolution #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>Report CR_870, Attachment 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, state the reasons for appealing the subject REF application, including the specific provisions, sections and/or policies of the Capital Region Growth Plan or Capital Region Board Regulation which provide a basis for this appeal.

See attached document for basis of appeal.

---

A notice of appeal must be received by CRB Administration within fourteen (14) days of the CRB Administrative Recommendation being posted to the CRB Website: [www.capitalregionboard.ab.ca/framework](http://www.capitalregionboard.ab.ca/framework). The most convenient method to submit the appeal is by emailing the Notice of Appeal to info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verification of Receipt - CRB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Use Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Stamps - Appeal Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 07 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEIVED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Received By: [Signature]

Attachment 2
Report CR_870
### SUBJECT OF APPEAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #</th>
<th>CRB Applicant Municipality</th>
<th>Statutory Plan(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-001</td>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>Municipal Development Plan Bylaw No. 1313/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB Administration Recommendation</td>
<td>Appeal Period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPELLANT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRB Appellant Municipality</th>
<th>Council Resolution #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>Report CR_870, Attachment 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, state the reasons for appealing the subject REF application, including the specific provisions, sections and/or policies of the Capital Region Growth Plan or Capital Region Board Regulation which provide a basis for this appeal.

See attached document for basis of appeal.

---

A notice of appeal must be received by CRB Administration within fourteen (14) days of the CRB Administrative Recommendation being posted to the CRB Website: www.capitalregionboard.ab.ca/framework. The most convenient method to submit the appeal is by emailing the Notice of Appeal to info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca.
Summary of Reasons for Appeal to the Capital Region Board of the Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan, Regional Evaluation Framework 2014-001.

The decision to appeal the Capital Region Board Administration's approval of the Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan (2014-001) is based on the criteria of Section 5.4 of the Regional Evaluation Framework. The main arguments are outlined below:

1. Sturgeon County MDP does not meet the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan, as defined in Section 11 of the Capital Region Board Regulation (Section 11 (a) and (b) (i)).

These objectives include promoting an integrated and strategic approach to planning for future growth in the Capital Region and; identifying the development patterns and key future infrastructure investments that best complement existing infrastructure, services and land uses in the region.

The Sturgeon County MDP does not meet these objectives given the proposed planning and development described in Neighbourhood G for an urban area immediately north of St. Albert within PGA B, a PGA shared by both the City of St. Albert and the City of Edmonton. The area of PGA B to the East of Highway 2 is designated as PGA Developing Growth area. The plan states that development of this area will occur based on Residential Type 1 policies. This residential type contains a range of housing densities (ranging from estate residential to high-density residential development). These policies allow for an urban form of development requiring municipal infrastructure and services. To best complement existing patterns of development and related infrastructure, and to ensure orderly and economic extension of development and related services, development in PGA B should be contiguous with the existing urban area. Sturgeon County's development of the PGA could lead to parallel infrastructure provision, greenways and parks areas that are not connected and transportation linkages that do not take into account the long term development of PGA B in a strategic and integrated manner.

2. The Sturgeon County MDP is not consistent with the Capital Region Growth Plan principle of Minimizing Regional Footprint (Capital Region Land Use Plan, Section 2.2 il a., b., and c.).

Although the lands proposed for urban development in the Sturgeon County MDP are within a PGA, the Capital Region Growth Plan specifies that priority be given to growth in PGAs where three of four criteria are met. In the case of development of PGA B as described in the Sturgeon County MDP, only two of the criteria will be met - the lands are on a proposed multi-mode movement corridor and adjacent to an existing major employment area. The other two
criteria - intensification of an existing urban area and locations that utilize existing infrastructure or logically extend that infrastructure - are not met. Therefore, PGA Developing Growth area should not be given priority for development at this time. There is no commitment within the MDP that the PGA Developing Growth area will meet the density target of 30-45+ dwelling units per net residential hectare. It is noted that Type 1 residential policies allow for a range of housing densities, and therefore it is not clear that minimizing footprint will be achieved. On the other hand, development to densities expected in PGA B will, on its own, result in a population increase that will exceed Sturgeon County’s overall population forecast. This lack of commitment and clarity on how the PGA Developing Growth area is to be planned and developed strongly suggests that designation of these lands for development at this time is pre-mature.

The Plan also identifies the Hamlet of Villeneuve for future growth, with a projected population more than triple its current size, essentially creating a new town, which is in excess of what is appropriate for growth outside of a Priority Growth Area.

3. The Sturgeon County MDP is not consistent with the Capital Region Growth Plan principle to Ensure Efficient Provision of Services (Capital Region Land Use Plan, Section 2.2 V, a., and b.).

Development of PGA Developing Growth area will require the extension of services from St. Albert. There are existing undeveloped areas within the City of St. Albert that should be developed before extension of its infrastructure is considered. The Plan requires that within the PGA Developing Growth area, development applications must “ensure the provisions of municipal infrastructure servicing.” The Plan does not consider how this is to be accomplished in a strategic, integrated and efficient manner. It is noted that there is no agreement between Sturgeon County and the City of St. Albert to extend infrastructure services to PGA Developing Growth area.

The Plan contemplates the Sturgeon Industrial Park becoming a major employment area, an inconsistency with the Growth Plan which does not identify these lands as a major employment area. In order to develop the Park to this extent will require significant infrastructure investment that has not been rationalized in a regional context within the Capital Region Growth Plan.
**Actions to be Taken**

1. That the Mayor, on behalf of City Council, sign Council's written resolution outlined in Attachment 1 of the January 20, 2014, Sustainable Development report CR_870.

2. That, if the Capital Region Board Administration recommends approval of Regional Evaluation Framework application 2014-001, the Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan, Administration file, at the Capital Region Board, Council's signed written resolution appealing the recommendation on Regional Evaluation Framework application 2014-001, as set out in Attachment 1, and the Notice of Appeal, as set out in Attachment 2 to the January 20, 2014, Sustainable Development report CR_870.
CERTIFICATE

I certify that the attached document, comprised of three pages, is a true copy of January 20, 2014, Special City Council Minutes, Item 3.1, Inter-municipal Update - Capital Region Board, and the corresponding Resolution of Council.

SIGNED AND SEALED

February 6, 2014

Alayne Sinclair
City Clerk
Call to Order

Mayor D. Iveson called the meeting to order at 12:26 p.m.

1.2 Adoption of Agenda

Moved S. McKeen - M. Oshry:
That the January 20, 2014, Special City Council meeting agenda be adopted with the following changes:

**Addition:**

3.1 Inter-municipal Update - Capital Region Board
PRIVATE
(Sections 21, 24, 25 and 27 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act)

In Favour: Carried
D. Iveson, B. Anderson, B. Esslinger, E. Gibbons,
B. Henderson, A. Knack, D. Loken, S. McKeen, M. Nickel,
M. Oshry, A. Sohi, M. Walters

Absent:
T. Caterina

1.3 Protocol Items

There were no protocol items.

2. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND RELATED BUSINESS

2.1 Requests to Speak

There were no requests to speak.

2.2 Requests for Specific Time on Agenda

There were no requests for any items to be dealt with at a specific time.

3. PRIVATE REPORTS

3.1 Inter-municipal Update - Capital Region Board

Council met in private at 12:28 p.m., pursuant to sections 21, 24, 25 and 27 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

Council met in public at 3:39 p.m.
Moved E. Gibbons - M. Nickel:


In Favour:


3.2 Emerging Waste Management Issues - Verbal report

Council met in private at 12:28 p.m., pursuant to sections 21, 24, 25 and 27 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

Council met in public at 2:26 p.m.

Moved S. McKeen - B. Henderson:

That Notice of Renewal be dispensed with and that the following motion made at the December 17, 2013, Special City Council motion be renewed:

B. Henderson- D. Loken (made at the December 17, 2013, Special City Council meeting):

1. That the 2014 Waste Management Utility's operating revenues be increased by $500,000.

2. That the 2012 - 2014 Waste Management Capital Equipment Budget be increased by $2 million with funding from the following sources:

   a. a $1 million transfer from the 2013 City Operating Budget contingency to be repaid by the Waste Management Utility over 5 years

   b. $500,000 from the Waste Management Utility Operating Budget from increased operating revenue

   c. $500,000 from the Waste Management Utility's
Resolution of Council

City Council hereby authorizes Administration to take all necessary steps to file with the Capital Region Board, a signed and dated copy of this Resolution attaching the Capital Region Board Regional Evaluation Framework Notice of Appeal in Attachment 2 of the January 20, 2014, Sustainable Development report CR_870.

And Council hereby directs the Mayor to sign this Resolution on behalf of Council.

Mayor Don Iveson

Date

City Clerk

Date
February 7, 2014

Mr. Doug Lagore  
Chief Executive Officer  
Capital Region Board  
#1100 Bell Tower  
10104 – 103 Avenue  
Edmonton, AB T5J 0H8

Dear Mr. Lagore:

Please find attached, for service upon you, the Notice of Appeal and a Certified Copy of the Council Motion directing this appeal of the proposed Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan (MDP), Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) application 2014-001.

The City of Edmonton is filing this appeal on the basis that the above noted application is non-compliant with the approved Growth Plan in three key areas as described in the attached REF Notice of Appeal and companion documents.

Further, we believe that the limits of the CRB Administration’s discretion in recommending approval of REF applications needs to be reviewed.

This appeal ensures that the proposed Sturgeon County MDP will be considered by the CRB Board itself, where the authority to approve a non-compliant plan properly resides.

Yours truly,

S.C. Farbrother, MCIP, RPP, MA  
City Manager

SCF/tl

Enclosures: Notice of Appeal Form and Summary of Reasons For Appeal  
Certified Copy of the Council Minutes  
Singed Copy of the Council Motion
March 24, 2014

Nolan Crouse
Chair
Capital Region Board
1405 Bell Tower, 10104-103 Ave
Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 0H8

Subject: Expression of Interest – North Saskatchewan Regional Advisory Council

Dear Mr. Crouse:

The Government of Alberta is developing the North Saskatchewan Regional Plan under Alberta’s Land-use Framework. When completed, the regional plan will provide context and guidance for land and natural resource use in central Alberta to help achieve Alberta’s long-term social and economic goals based on a foundation of responsible environmental management.

To support this process, the Government of Alberta is establishing a Regional Advisory Council for the North Saskatchewan region to provide advice to the Government of Alberta in the development of the plan.

You are receiving this letter because our records indicate you or your organization previously expressed an interest in becoming a member of the Regional Advisory Council for this region. If you still wish to be considered for membership on the Council, please go to the Land-use Framework’s website at www.landuse.alberta.ca for further details on the Council and how to submit a notice of interest.

Thank you for your interest in this most important initiative.

Sincerely,

Bev Yee
Stewardship Commissioner
Frequently Asked Questions – Regional Advisory Council

Q: What is a Regional Advisory Council?
A: A Regional Advisory Council (RAC) is created for all regional plans. The RAC is composed of a cross-section of individuals who live, work, recreate and/or have an interest in the region, and are able to strategically consider what is best for the entire region at a holistic level.

Q: What is the role of the Regional Advisory Council?
A: The RAC provides strategic advice to Cabinet in the development of a regional plan based on a terms of reference for developing each regional plan.

Q: What is a terms of reference for developing a regional plan?
A: The terms of reference for developing a regional plan provides guidance on the economic, environmental, and social factors that are to be considered as the RAC prepares its advice to Cabinet and as the Government of Alberta prepares the regional plan. The Terms of Reference for Developing the North Saskatchewan Regional Plan will be released in May 2014.

Q: Who leads the Regional Advisory Council?
A: The RAC is led by a chair that represents the Government of Alberta.

Q: How are Regional Advisory Council members appointed?
A: The RAC is appointed by Cabinet through a public and transparent nomination process.

Q: How many individuals will sit on the Regional Advisory Council?
A: The RAC will consist of approximately 20 members.

Q: What are the requirements to be a member of the Regional Advisory Council?
A: RAC members are appointed based on the following criteria:

- An understanding of the complexity of land and natural resource use in central Alberta;
- Ability to provide a regional and provincial perspective;
- Demonstrated expertise (e.g., education, volunteer or work experience) in land use, stewardship and conservation, or resource management;
- Experience in a sector or community of interest affected by land use issues and experience in strategies to address these issues;
- Creative and innovative thinking;
- Have the interest and the time to commit to an intensive, but highly rewarding process; and
- Demonstrated ability to work collaboratively, in an advisory capacity and under tight timelines.
Q: I can’t fill out the application online, how do I submit it?
A: Print the roster application form, scan it and send it to the Land Use Secretariat by email. Alternatively, submit your application form, resume and biography by mail or fax.
Be part of building the
North Saskatchewan Regional Plan

The Government of Alberta is looking for individuals who live, work, play and have an interest in the North Saskatchewan region to become members of the Regional Advisory Council for the North Saskatchewan Regional Plan. Council members are appointed by Cabinet and will be led by a Chair who represents the Government of Alberta.

Council members will be required to strategically consider what is best for the entire region at a holistic level and provide advice to Cabinet in the development of the regional plan. The Regional Advisory Council will also provide advice based on input received through regional public, stakeholder and Aboriginal consultation, and background information provided by the Government of Alberta.

Successful candidates for the Regional Advisory Council will be notified directly. Expenses and honorariums will be provided to council members. Closing date for nominations is April 23, 2014. For further information about council requirements, duties and to submit your interest for participation, please visit the Land-use Framework website at: http://www.landuse.alberta.ca.
Revise CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework

Motion

That, effective beginning July 1, 2014, the CRB CEO revise the May 9, 2013 “CRB Administrative Procedure for the Regional Evaluation Framework”, (and any other related policies, procedures and terms of reference) by including clarification in the following 5 areas:

1. Prior to Step # 1 “Receipt of Application by CRB”, the CRB staff may be consulted by an Applicant for advice relative to submission of a REF application.
2. The best professional advice shall be provided to the Applicant by staff in writing. At this stage there shall be no consultant yet engaged by the CRB.
3. Once Step # 3 “Application Deemed Complete” is achieved, there shall be no further advice given by CRB staff, CRB consultants and no changes made to the application whatsoever.
4. By sending the “Deemed Complete” email, that email verifies the final document to be evaluated. Clarification may be sought but no changes whatsoever (other than typos, grammar, immaterial errors etc.) may be made to the documents from this point forward until a decision is made by the CRB. If the Third Party Consultant requires clarification regarding an Application, then a supplemental report may be submitted by the Applicant for clarity, but there shall be no alteration made to the original Application.
5. The appeal period be changed from 14 calendar days to 28 calendar days.

Background

- On April 8, 2010 the Board approved the Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).
- The REF Administrative Procedures were amended on January 13, 2011 and May 9, 2013.
- The subject motion was moved at the March 13, 2014 Board meeting and subsequently withdrawn prior to debate, in order to take into consideration the comments received from Board members.

Administration Recommendation

1. CRB Administration supports proposed amendments #1-4 to the REF Administrative Procedures, however, does not support the appeal period increasing to 28 calendar days as proposed in amendment #5.

- The first four proposed amendments to the Administrative Procedures provide additional clarification of the REF application process. However, the proposed 5th amendment is not a clarification, but a change to the actual REF process. The length of the appeal was considered as part of the six-month REF process review. The Planning Advisory Group and a majority of CAOs that responded to a review survey supported increasing the appeal period to 21 calendar days. (See Item 7b on the Agenda)

Attachments:
1. Existing REF Administrative Procedures
2. Amended REF Administrative Procedures
CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework

Purpose: To clarify the CRB’s Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receipt of Application by CRB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An application is received by the CRB. CRB Administration date stamps the documents. If the application is submitted in paper only, CRB Administration requests an electronic copy from the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Preliminary CRB Administration Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The application is reviewed by CRB Administration to determine if all required documents have been received in accordance with Section 3.5 of the REF. Applications do not proceed until an electronic copy of all required documents have been received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If all required documents have not been received, CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRB Administration reviews the Application to determine whether or not the Application relates to a statutory plan that must be referred to the CRB under Section 3 of the REF. If yes, then the Application is referred for Third Party review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the Application does not appear to relate to a condition under Section 3 of the REF, then CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Application Deemed Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When all required documents are received, and it is determined that the Application meets conditions required for referral to the Board for review under Section 3 of the REF, the Application is assigned a REF number (e.g. REF 2010-000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An email is sent to the Applicant Municipality noting the date the Application is deemed to be complete and the date by which a CRB Administration Recommendation must be issued (within 25 working days from date Application is deemed complete). This email is copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CRB Chief Officer and CAOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted to the CRB website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Referral for Third Party Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRB Administration sends an email to the Third Party reviewer asking for an Evaluation to be prepared within 14 working days. The email, which is copied to the CAOs, advises that the Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted and available on the CRB website. The Third Party Evaluation is prepared with reference to the criteria set out in Section 5.4 of the REF.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description of CRB Administrative Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>If a Third Party reviewer advises that they have a conflict of interest, CRB Administration actions the review with another Third Party reviewer with an Evaluation to be prepared within 14 working days. On receipt of a Third Party Evaluation, CRB Administration reviews the Evaluation for completeness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>CRB Administration Recommendation</strong>&lt;br&gt;CRB Administration reviews the Application and the Third Party Evaluation in accordance with the evaluation criteria in Section 5.4 of the REF and prepares a CRB Administration Recommendation on or before the 25 working days. The Third Party Evaluation and CRB Administration Recommendation are posted to the website as soon as available and the Applicant Municipality, CRB Members, and CAOs are notified.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Approve Recommendation:&lt;br&gt;A CRB Administration Recommendation to approve an Application will stand as the final decision on a REF Application after a 14 calendar days appeal period, unless a member municipality appeals the recommendation to the Board. If no appeal is received within the appeal period the application is Deemed Approved and CRB Administration will confirm in writing to the applicant municipality, Board members, and CAOs of the disposition of the REF within one week after the appeal period expires.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Reject Recommendation:&lt;br&gt;If a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve an Application, CRB Administration notifies the Applicant Municipality, Board members, CAOs and indicates that the Application will be brought to the next Board meeting for disposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Appeals</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. Any CRB member municipality may appeal the CRB Administration recommendation to approve a REF application.&lt;br&gt;2. An appeal may be commenced by submitting a notice of appeal within 14 calendar days after the CRB Administration recommendation is posted to the CRB website. Note that the date of the recommendation and posting of the recommendation may be different due to the logistics of posting the recommendation to the website.&lt;br&gt;3. The notice of appeal must be accompanied by a resolution of Council in support of the appeal.&lt;br&gt;4. The reasons for the appeal must be included in the resolution and shall reference the section(s) of the CRB Regulation and/or the Capital Region Growth Plan that the submitted statutory plan does not conform.&lt;br&gt;5. All appeals must be submitted by 4:30 pm at the CRB offices on or before the 14th day of the appeal period. If the 14th day falls on a weekend or statutory holiday, the appeal deadline is extended to the end of the next business day at 4:30 pm. A notice of appeal will be accepted by email at <a href="mailto:info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca">info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca</a> provided it includes a record of the Council resolution with the reasons for the appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>If a notice of appeal is received within the appeal period CRB administration shall send the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, by email to the applicant municipality, CRB members, and CAOs, within one business day of receipt the appeal. Further, the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, will be posted to the CRB website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>An appeal period does not end with the submission of a notice of appeal. Appeals will continue to be accepted until the final day of the appeal period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>If a REF application is appealed and the appeal period ends within 10 working days of an upcoming Board meeting, the REF will be added to the agenda of the following Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>CRB Administration will present the appeal(s) at the Board meeting the REF application is presented. The municipality(s) that submitted the appeal will be identified by CRB Administration, however, they are under no obligation to speak to the appeal at the Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 **Capital Region Board Review and Decision**

An Application is considered by the Board if a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve the Application or if a member municipality appeals the CRB Administration Recommendation to approve an Application.

At a Board meeting, the Applicant Municipality and CRB Administration are offered an opportunity to inform the Board (Section 5.3 REF). The Board must, by consensus, approve or reject the Application. If consensus is not reached, a formal vote of the Board must be conducted in accordance with the Capital Region Board Regulation (Section 5.2 REF).

If an Application is reviewed by the Board, following a decision, CRB Administration will issue a letter to the Applicant Municipality indicating approval or rejection of the Application (copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CAOs and the Third Party reviewer).

Decisions of the Board taken under Section 22 of the Capital Region Board Regulation (approval of statutory plans) are final and not subject to appeal.
CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework

**Purpose:** To clarify the CRB’s Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td><strong>Pre-Application Consultation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRB staff may be consulted by an Applicant for advice relative to submission of a REF application. The best professional advice shall be provided to the Applicant by staff in writing. At this stage there shall be no consultant yet engaged by the CRB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Receipt of Application by CRB</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An application is received by the CRB. CRB Administration date stamps the documents. If the application is submitted in paper only, CRB Administration requests an electronic copy from the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Preliminary CRB Administration Review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The application is reviewed by CRB Administration to determine if all required documents have been received in accordance with Section 3.5 of the REF. Applications do not proceed until an electronic copy of all required documents have been received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If all required documents have not been received, CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRB Administration reviews the Application to determine whether or not the Application relates to a statutory plan that must be referred to the CRB under Section 3 of the REF. If yes, then the Application is referred for Third Party review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the Application does not appear to relate to a condition under Section 3 of the REF, then CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Application Deemed Complete</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When all required documents are received, and it is determined that the Application meets conditions required for referral to the Board for review under Section 3 of the REF, the Application is assigned a REF number (e.g. REF 2010-000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An email is sent to the Applicant Municipality noting the date the Application is deemed to be complete and the date by which a CRB Administration Recommendation must be issued (within 25 working days from date Application is deemed complete). This email is copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CRB Chief Officer and CAOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted to the CRB website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After an application is deemed complete no further advice will be given by CRB staff and/or CRB consultants, and no changes may be made to the application whatsoever. By sending the “Deemed Complete” email, that email action clarifies what the final document is that is to be evaluated. Clarification may be sought but no changes are allowed whatsoever (other than typos, grammar, immaterial errors, etc.) to the documents from this point forward until a decision is made by the CRB. If the Third Party Consultant requires clarification regarding an Application, a supplemental report may be submitted by the Applicant for clarity, but there shall be no alteration made to the...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Step 4: Referral for Third Party Evaluation

CRB Administration sends an email to the Third Party reviewer asking for an Evaluation to be prepared within 14 working days. The email, which is copied to the CAOs, advises that the Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted and available on the CRB website. The Third Party Evaluation is prepared with reference to the criteria set out in Section 5.4 of the REF.

If a Third Party reviewer advises that they have a conflict of interest, CRB Administration actions the review with another Third Party reviewer with an Evaluation to be prepared within 14 working days. On receipt of a Third Party Evaluation, CRB Administration reviews the Evaluation for completeness.

### Step 5: CRB Administration Recommendation

CRB Administration reviews the Application and the Third Party Evaluation in accordance with the evaluation criteria in Section 5.4 of the REF and prepares a CRB Administration Recommendation on or before the 25 working days. The Third Party Evaluation and CRB Administration Recommendation are posted to the website as soon as available and the Applicant Municipality, CRB Members, and CAOs are notified.

**Approve Recommendation:**
A CRB Administration Recommendation to approve an Application will stand as the final decision on a REF Application after a 14 24 28 calendar days appeal period, unless a member municipality appeals the recommendation to the Board. If no appeal is received within the appeal period the application is Deemed Approved and CRB Administration will confirm in writing to the applicant municipality, Board members, and CAOs of the disposition of the REF within one week after the appeal period expires.

**Reject Recommendation:**
If a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve an Application, CRB Administration notifies the Applicant Municipality, Board members, CAOs and indicates that the Application will be brought to the next Board meeting for disposition.

### Step 6: Appeals

1. Any CRB member municipality may appeal the CRB Administration recommendation to approve a REF application.

2. An appeal may be commenced by submitting a notice of appeal within 14 24 28 calendar days after the CRB Administration recommendation is posted to the CRB website. Note that the date of the recommendation and posting of the recommendation may be different due to the logistics of posting the recommendation to the website.

3. The notice of appeal must be accompanied by a resolution of Council in support of the appeal.

4. The reasons for the appeal must be included in the resolution and shall reference the section(s) of the CRB Regulation and/or the Capital Region Growth Plan that the submitted...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>All appeals must be submitted by 4:30 pm at the CRB offices on or before the 14th or 21st or 28th day of the appeal period. If the 14th or 21st or 28th day falls on a weekend or statutory holiday, the appeal deadline is extended to the end of the next business day at 4:30 pm. A notice of appeal will be accepted by email at <a href="mailto:info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca">info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca</a> provided it includes a record of the Council resolution with the reasons for the appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>If a notice of appeal is received within the appeal period CRB administration shall send the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, by email to the applicant municipality, CRB members, and CAOs, within one business day of receipt appeal. Further, the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, will be posted to the CRB website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>An appeal period does not end with the submission of a notice of appeal. Appeals will continue to be accepted until the final day of the appeal period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>If a REF application is appealed and the appeal period ends within 10 working days of an upcoming Board meeting, the REF will be added to the agenda of the following Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>CRB Administration will present the appeal(s) at the Board meeting the REF application is presented. The municipality(s) that submitted the appeal will be identified by CRB Administration, however, they are under no obligation to speak to the appeal at the Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capital Region Board Review and Decision

An Application is considered by the Board if a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve the Application or if a member municipality appeals the CRB Administration Recommendation to approve an Application.

At a Board meeting, the Applicant Municipality and CRB Administration are offered an opportunity to inform the Board (Section 5.3 REF). The Board must, by consensus, approve or reject the Application. If consensus is not reached, a formal vote of the Board must be conducted in accordance with the Capital Region Board Regulation (Section 5.2 REF).

If an Application is reviewed by the Board, following a decision, CRB Administration will issue a letter to the Applicant Municipality indicating approval or rejection of the Application (copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CAOs and the Third Party reviewer).

Decisions of the Board taken under Section 22 of the Capital Region Board Regulation (approval of statutory plans) are final and not subject to appeal.
**Date** | **From** | **Request**
---|---|---
Feb 13, 2014 | Ft. Saskatchewan Capital Region Board | What will be the process for dispersing these line items in the 2014 Budget:
- $250,000 - Special Projects?
- $50,000 - Board Initiatives?

**Background**

See Item 5.b in Feb 13, 2104 CRB Meeting Agenda
- *CRB 2014 Revised Budget*

**Date** | **From** | **Response**
---|---|---
Feb 21, 2014 | Doug Lagore, CEO | These line items are available for unforeseen projects as they may arise at the Board or in any of the committees/task forces in 2014.

Each committee/task force will be informed of the budget at its first meeting with the expectation that new projects, once approved via the appropriate committee, will come to the Board for final approval.

Generally, any money that is not spent in a Budget cycle – including the Special Projects Budget - will be rolled over into the next fiscal year.
Clarification of REF withdrawal process: What are the parameters for making amendments and/or withdrawing a REF appeal once it’s been made?

Background

Mar 14, 2014

See Item 5.a in Mar 13, 2104 CRB Meeting Agenda

- Sturgeon County, Proposed Municipal Development Plan

Following its appeal of the Sturgeon County MDP, the City of Edmonton entered into discussions with the County to resolve the issues surrounding the appeal. In the meantime, the REF application was placed on the agenda for the March 13, 2014 Board meeting in accordance with REF policy and procedures. Both Edmonton and Sturgeon indicated that discussions have been positive, however, more time is required to resolve the issues. Shortly before the March 13 Board meeting, Sturgeon requested its application be deferred to the April 10, 2014 Board meeting with the expectation that the issues will be resolved and the appeal withdrawn. At the March 13, 2014 Board meeting the Board agreed to remove the REF application from the agenda and defer the item to April Board meeting. However, clarification was requested on the procedure and implications of an appeal withdrawal – Is the application automatically approved? Is the application presented to the Board for a decision regardless of the appeal withdrawal? If the Statutory Plan is amended to resolve the issues, does the application remain valid? Does the application require resubmission?

Response

Mar 20, 2014

Neal Sarnecki, Regional Projects Manager

CRB Administration requested a legal opinion from the Board’s solicitor.

For an appeal that is withdrawn, the opinion is that the application should be treated as if there never was an appeal and the underlying administrative recommendation of approval would stand. Therefore, if Edmonton withdraws its appeal, and since there were no other appeals, the MDP shall be deemed approved by the Board.

With regard to subsequent amendments to the statutory plan, the opinion is that a municipality would have the ability to make non-substantive amendments to the plan prior to third reading without resubmission to the CRB. As long as the plan amendments do not alter the substance of the plan content (ie. purpose and intent), nor result in the plan being in conflict with the Growth Plan, then such amendments are permissible.

The legal opinion is attached for information.

Attachment – March 19, 2014 Email – Sheila McNaughton Q.C., RMRF
From: Sheila McNaughtan, Q.C. <SMcNaughtan@rmrf.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2014 10:35 AM
To: Neal Sarnecki
Subject: FW: Regional Evaluation Framework Questions

HI Neal

We provide the following opinion on the two questions you pose:

1. If an appeal is withdrawn or abandoned, it would be treated as if there had never been an appeal. While your process does not articulate this, nor does the MGA when dealing with appeals filed to the SDAB or a municipality. The reason we are of this opinion is that the jurisdiction of the Board under your process to consider the matter of approval of a statutory plan that is required to go through the review process, or the SDAB under the Act, is triggered by an appeal. If the appeal is no longer extant because it is withdrawn or abandoned, the underlying administrative recommendation of approval would stand and the Board would not have jurisdiction to consider the particular statutory plan.

Your process makes clear that more than one appeal can be filed and as such, if only one is filed, and it is withdrawn prior to the Board dealing with the matter substantively, it is as if there was no appeal.

2. In our opinion a municipality which has a statutory plan approved by the CRB, would have the jurisdiction to make non-substantive amendments to that plan prior to third reading, without resubmitting the plan to the CRB under the review process. The reason we are of this opinion is based upon the purpose of the review process and the power granted to a municipality under s. 230 of the MGA. Legislation is interpreted in a purposive manner, to give effect to the underlying goal of the particular provisions. The review process the CRB utilizes to is provide a means of ensuring consistency between statutory plans and the Capital Region Growth Plan. This purpose would be achieved if a statutory plan, which has been approved as being consistent with the Growth Plan, is amended prior to third reading if the amendments made do not affect the substance of the plan, but are for the purposes of providing clarity.

Support for this opinion is found in s. 17 of the CRB Regulation. If the Board finds that a municipality has adopted a statutory plan which conflicts with the Capital Region Growth Plan, the Board may take certain action. But the threshold is that the plan in question conflicts with the Growth Plan. Minor amendments to provide clarity would be highly unlikely to result in a conflict between the statutory plan and the Growth Plan. There is a judgment element involved, but so long as the amendments do not alter the substance of the plan content, nor result in the plan being in conflict with the Growth Plan, we are of the opinion that such amendments are permissible.

Regards

Sheila

Sheila McNaughtan, Q.C. | Partner
Direct: 780.497.3362
This communication, including any attachments, is confidential and may be protected by solicitor/client privilege. This communication is intended only for the person or persons to whom it is addressed. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please contact the sender and delete the e-mail. E-mail communications are vulnerable to interception by unauthorized parties. If you are the intended recipient and you do not wish for the sender to communicate with you by e-mail, please notify the sender at your earliest convenience. In the absence of such notification, your consent is assumed.

From: Neal Sarnecki [mailto:nsarnecki@capitalregionboard.ab.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, March 18, 2014 3:47 PM
To: Sheila McNaughtan, Q.C.
Cc: Doug Lagore
Subject: Regional Evaluation Framework Questions

Hi Sheila,

The Board Chair, Nolan Crouse, has requested that CRB Administration get a legal opinion regarding a situation that has arisen from a new board approved REF process. As you may recall, last year the Board got rid of the CAO Subcommittee review of REF applications recommended for approval by administration in favour of an appeal process. Basically, if a REF application is recommended for approval by administration, the member municipalities are notified of the recommendation and given 14 days to appeal the recommendation to the board for a decision. If after the 14 days there is no appeal, the REF application is considered approved by the board.

We received our first appeal under the new process at the beginning of February – Edmonton appealed the CRB Administration approval recommendation of Sturgeon’s proposed MDP. Since the appeal, Edmonton and Sturgeon County have been working to resolve the issues of the appeal. Sturgeon is anticipating that Edmonton will ultimately withdraw its appeal rather than have the Board consider the application (the application has already been deferred once at a board meeting).

This has led to two questions:

1. If the appeal is withdrawn, is the application approved as if an appeal was never submitted?

2. The issues of the appeal may be resolved with minor amendments/clarifications to the MDP. Would these minor amendments/clarifications require resubmission of the REF application?

Our opinion is that if the amendment were substantive enough to require an applicant municipality to hold a new public hearing then a new REF submission would be warranted. Otherwise a new application would not be required for minor revisions and wording changes that bring more clarity to the statutory plan.
Please give me a call to discuss when you have a moment.

Thanks!

Neal Sarnecki RPP, MCIP
Manager, Regional Projects (Land Use)

#1100 Bell Tower, 10104 103 Avenue, Edmonton AB T5J 0H8
Main: 780-638-6000|Direct: 780-638-6003|Cell: 780-686-7301
nsarnecki@capitalregionboard.ab.ca / www.capitalregionboard.ab.ca
## BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 8, 2015</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 12, 2015</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 12, 2015</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 9, 2015</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 2015</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11, 2015</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 9, 2015</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 13, 2015</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 10, 2015</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8, 2015</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12, 2015</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis St. Michael Room</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 10, 2015</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 14, 2016</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 11, 2016</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10, 2016</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14, 2016</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12, 2016</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 9, 2016</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 14, 2016</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 11, 2016</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8, 2016</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 13, 2016</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10, 2016</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 8, 2016</td>
<td>9:00 a.m. - Noon</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Grand Ballroom</td>
<td>Tentative*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) Approval Process Update

Administration Recommended Motions

1. That the Capital Region Board receive the update on the REF approval process as information.

2. That the Capital Region Board amend the REF Administrative Policies and Procedures by increasing the REF Appeal period from 14 calendar days to 21 calendar days.

Background & Update

- Section 7(1) of the CRB Regulation provides the Board authority to delegate any of its powers, duties, or functions with the exception of those noted under Section 7(2).

- On May 9, 2013, the Board rescinded the REF CAO Subcommittee Delegation of Authority and approved the Alternative REF Process amendments to the REF Administrative Procedures with one minor amendment, reducing the proposed appeal period from 30 calendar days to 14 calendar days.

- CRB Administration committed to undertaking a 6 month review of the implementation of the new process and report back to the Board.

- CRB Administration reviewed the Alternative REF Process on two occasions with the Planning Advisory Group (PAG), November 2013 and February 2014, and surveyed member Chief Administration Officers (CAO) in March 2014 for feedback on the Process.

- The Planning Advisory Group expressed concerns regarding the length of the appeal period advising that 14 calendar days was not enough time to review CRB Administration recommendations to approve a REF application and engage their Councils to lodge an appeal. Options for extending the appeal period were discussed including the status quo, 21 calendar days, combined application/appeal period of 40 days, and 30 calendar days. Consensus was reached on the 21 calendar days option. There was a concern that extending the appeal period further would impact development timelines.

- Ten of twenty-four CAOs responded to the feedback survey on the alternative REF process. Overall the majority were satisfied with the new process. However, there was support for increasing the appeal period to 21 calendar days. The CAO comments are summarized in Attachment 3 – CAO Consultation Summary.

- The average cost of 3rd party evaluations has been reduced by 23% with the introduction of the new REF process. This works out to a saving of over $1300 per REF application on average. Further, staff time to schedule and prepare for Subcommittee meetings has been eliminated.

- With respect to timelines, Subcommittee approvals took an average of 33 calendar days whereas the new REF process average is 40 calendar days.
Administration Recommendation

- That the REF appeal period be extended from 14 calendar days to 21 calendar days.

Attachments:
1. Existing REF Administrative Procedures
2. Amended REF Administrative Procedures
3. CAO Consultation Summary
CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework

**Purpose:** To clarify the CRB’s Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Receipt of Application by CRB</strong>&lt;br&gt;An application is received by the CRB. CRB Administration date stamps the documents. If the application is submitted in paper only, CRB Administration requests an electronic copy from the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Preliminary CRB Administration Review</strong>&lt;br&gt;The application is reviewed by CRB Administration to determine if all required documents have been received in accordance with Section 3.5 of the REF. Applications do not proceed until an electronic copy of all required documents have been received.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;If all required documents have not been received, CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;CRB Administration reviews the Application to determine whether or not the Application relates to a statutory plan that must be referred to the CRB under Section 3 of the REF. If yes, then the Application is referred for Third Party review.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;If the Application does not appear to relate to a condition under Section 3 of the REF, then CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Application Deemed Complete</strong>&lt;br&gt;When all required documents are received, and it is determined that the Application meets conditions required for referral to the Board for review under Section 3 of the REF, the Application is assigned a REF number (e.g. REF 2010-000).&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;An email is sent to the Applicant Municipality noting the date the Application is deemed to be complete and the date by which a CRB Administration Recommendation must be issued (within 25 working days from date Application is deemed complete). This email is copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CRB Chief Officer and CAOs.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;The Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted to the CRB website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Referral for Third Party Evaluation</strong>&lt;br&gt;CRB Administration sends an email to the Third Party reviewer asking for an Evaluation to be prepared within 14 working days. The email, which is copied to the CAOs, advises that the Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted and available on the CRB website. The Third Party Evaluation is prepared with reference to the criteria set out in Section 5.4 of the REF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>CRB Administration Recommendation</strong>&lt;br&gt;CRB Administration reviews the Application and the Third Party Evaluation in accordance with the evaluation criteria in Section 5.4 of the REF and prepares a CRB Administration Recommendation on or before the 25 working days. The Third Party Evaluation and CRB Administration Recommendation are posted to the website as soon as available and the Applicant Municipality, CRB Members, and CAOs are notified.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Approve Recommendation:&lt;br&gt;A CRB Administration Recommendation to approve an Application will stand as the final decision on a REF Application after a 14 calendar days appeal period, unless a member municipality appeals the recommendation to the Board. If no appeal is received within the appeal period the application is Deemed Approved and CRB Administration will confirm in writing to the applicant municipality, Board members, and CAOs of the disposition of the REF within one week after the appeal period expires.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Reject Recommendation:&lt;br&gt;If a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve an Application, CRB Administration notifies the Applicant Municipality, Board members, CAOs and indicates that the Application will be brought to the next Board meeting for disposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Appeals</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;1. Any CRB member municipality may appeal the CRB Administration recommendation to approve a REF application.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;2. An appeal may be commenced by submitting a notice of appeal within 14 calendar days after the CRB Administration recommendation is posted to the CRB website. Note that the date of the recommendation and posting of the recommendation may be different due to the logistics of posting the recommendation to the website.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;3. The notice of appeal must be accompanied by a resolution of Council in support of the appeal.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;4. The reasons for the appeal must be included in the resolution and shall reference the section(s) of the CRB Regulation and/or the Capital Region Growth Plan that the submitted statutory plan does not conform.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;5. All appeals must be submitted by 4:30 pm at the CRB offices on or before the 14th day of the appeal period. If the 14th day falls on a weekend or statutory holiday, the appeal deadline is extended to the end of the next business day at 4:30 pm. A notice of appeal will be accepted by email at <a href="mailto:info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca">info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca</a> provided it includes a record of the Council resolution with the reasons for the appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>If a notice of appeal is received within the appeal period CRB administration shall send the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, by email to the applicant municipality, CRB members, and CAOs, within one business day of receipt the appeal. Further, the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, will be posted to the CRB website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>An appeal period does not end with the submission of a notice of appeal. Appeals will continue to be accepted until the final day of the appeal period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>If a REF application is appealed and the appeal period ends within 10 working days of an upcoming Board meeting, the REF will be added to the agenda of the following Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>CRB Administration will present the appeal(s) at the Board meeting the REF application is presented. The municipality(s) that submitted the appeal will be identified by CRB Administration, however, they are under no obligation to speak to the appeal at the Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7 Capital Region Board Review and Decision
An Application is considered by the Board if a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve the Application or if a member municipality appeals the CRB Administration Recommendation to approve an Application.

At a Board meeting, the Applicant Municipality and CRB Administration are offered an opportunity to inform the Board (Section 5.3 REF). The Board must, by consensus, approve or reject the Application. If consensus is not reached, a formal vote of the Board must be conducted in accordance with the Capital Region Board Regulation (Section 5.2 REF).

If an Application is reviewed by the Board, following a decision, CRB Administration will issue a letter to the Applicant Municipality indicating approval or rejection of the Application (copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CAOs and the Third Party reviewer).

Decisions of the Board taken under Section 22 of the Capital Region Board Regulation (approval of statutory plans) are final and not subject to appeal.
CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework

**Purpose:** To clarify the CRB’s Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Receipt of Application by CRB</strong>&lt;br&gt;An application is received by the CRB. CRB Administration date stamps the documents. If the application is submitted in paper only, CRB Administration requests an electronic copy from the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Preliminary CRB Administration Review</strong>&lt;br&gt;The application is reviewed by CRB Administration to determine if all required documents have been received in accordance with Section 3.5 of the REF. Applications do not proceed until an electronic copy of all required documents have been received.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;If all required documents have not been received, CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;CRB Administration reviews the Application to determine whether or not the Application relates to a statutory plan that must be referred to the CRB under Section 3 of the REF. If yes, then the Application is referred for Third Party review.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;If the Application does not appear to relate to a condition under Section 3 of the REF, then CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Application Deemed Complete</strong>&lt;br&gt;When all required documents are received, and it is determined that the Application meets conditions required for referral to the Board for review under Section 3 of the REF, the Application is assigned a REF number (e.g. REF 2010-000).&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;An email is sent to the Applicant Municipality noting the date the Application is deemed to be complete and the date by which a CRB Administration Recommendation must be issued (within 25 working days from date Application is deemed complete). This email is copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CRB Chief Officer and CAOs.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;The Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted to the CRB website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Referral for Third Party Evaluation</strong>&lt;br&gt;CRB Administration sends an email to the Third Party reviewer asking for an Evaluation to be prepared within 14 working days. The email, which is copied to the CAOs, advises that the Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted and available on the CRB website. The Third Party Evaluation is prepared with reference to the criteria set out in Section 5.4 of the REF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>CRB Administration Recommendation</strong>&lt;br&gt;CRB Administration reviews the Application and the Third Party Evaluation in accordance with the evaluation criteria in Section 5.4 of the REF and prepares a CRB Administration Recommendation on or before the 25 working days. The Third Party Evaluation and CRB Administration Recommendation are posted to the website as soon as available and the Applicant Municipality, CRB Members, and CAOs are notified.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Approve Recommendation:&lt;br&gt;A CRB Administration Recommendation to approve an Application will stand as the final decision on a REF Application after a 14 21 calendar days appeal period, unless a member municipality appeals the recommendation to the Board. If no appeal is received within the appeal period the application is Deemed Approved and CRB Administration will confirm in writing to the applicant municipality, Board members, and CAOs of the disposition of the REF within one week after the appeal period expires.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Reject Recommendation:&lt;br&gt;If a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve an Application, CRB Administration notifies the Applicant Municipality, Board members, CAOs and indicates that the Application will be brought to the next Board meeting for disposition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6    | **Appeals**<br><br>1. Any CRB member municipality may appeal the CRB Administration recommendation to approve a REF application.<br><br>2. An appeal may be commenced by submitting a notice of appeal within 14 21 calendar days after the CRB Administration recommendation is posted to the CRB website. Note that the date of the recommendation and posting of the recommendation may be different due to the logistics of posting the recommendation to the website.<br><br>3. The notice of appeal must be accompanied by a resolution of Council in support of the appeal.<br><br>4. The reasons for the appeal must be included in the resolution and shall reference the section(s) of the CRB Regulation and/or the Capital Region Growth Plan that the submitted statutory plan does not conform.<br><br>5. All appeals must be submitted by 4:30 pm at the CRB offices on or before the 14th 21st day of the appeal period. If the 14th 21st day falls on a weekend or statutory holiday, the appeal deadline is extended to the end of the next business day at 4:30 pm. A notice of appeal will be accepted by email at info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca provided it includes a record of the Council resolution with the reasons for the appeal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>If a notice of appeal is received within the appeal period CRB administration shall send the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, by email to the applicant municipality, CRB members, and CAOs, within one business day of receipt the appeal. Further, the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, will be posted to the CRB website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>An appeal period does not end with the submission of a notice of appeal. Appeals will continue to be accepted until the final day of the appeal period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>If a REF application is appealed and the appeal period ends within 10 working days of an upcoming Board meeting, the REF will be added to the agenda of the following Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>CRB Administration will present the appeal(s) at the Board meeting the REF application is presented. The municipality(s) that submitted the appeal will be identified by CRB Administration, however, they are under no obligation to speak to the appeal at the Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7 Capital Region Board Review and Decision**

An Application is considered by the Board if a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve the Application or if a member municipality appeals the CRB Administration Recommendation to approve an Application.

At a Board meeting, the Applicant Municipality and CRB Administration are offered an opportunity to inform the Board (Section 5.3 REF). The Board must, by consensus, approve or reject the Application. If consensus is not reached, a formal vote of the Board must be conducted in accordance with the Capital Region Board Regulation (Section 5.2 REF).

If an Application is reviewed by the Board, following a decision, CRB Administration will issue a letter to the Applicant Municipality indicating approval or rejection of the Application (copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CAOs and the Third Party reviewer).

Decisions of the Board taken under Section 22 of the Capital Region Board Regulation (approval of statutory plans) are final and not subject to appeal.
**REF Process 6 Month Review**

**CAO Consultation Summary**

**Introduction**

As part of the 6 month review member CAOs were surveyed for their feedback on the alternative REF process.

On March 3, 2014, all CRB CAOs were emailed the following with a request to respond by March 14, 2014:

CRB CAO’s,

As you are aware, the Capital Region Board approved an alternative REF process in May of 2013 (see attached REF Administrative Procedures) that essentially replaced the CAO Subcommittee review of REF applications with an appeal process. At the time the alternative REF process was approved, CRB Administration committed to reviewing the process and reporting back to the Board after 6 months. In this regard, we are requesting your feedback on the new REF process to inform the review.

To assist in providing your feedback we put together a few questions for your consideration:

1) Are the new CRB Administrative procedures for REF meeting your expectations?
2) Are you satisfied with the new REF procedures?
3) Do you have any suggestions to improve the new REF procedures?
4) Would you prefer to see a new REF procedure in place? Do you have any suggestions?
5) Does the appeal period meet the needs and requirements of your municipality? (Note: This has been discussed by the Planning Advisory Group (PAG) who are recommending that the appeal period be extended from 14 days to 21 days. Further, I have just been informed that St. Albert is revising their REF Procedures motion to include increasing the appeal period to 21 days, which will be considered at the March 13, 2014 Board meeting.)

We would appreciate receiving your feedback by March 14, 2014.

However, of the 24 CAOs only 4 had responded by March 14, 2014. Additional time for feedback was granted until March 21, 2014 with the proviso that if they did not respond, it would be assumed that they had no concerns with the new REF process. In this regard, an additional 6 responses were received for a total of 10 CAO’s providing feedback.

Based on the feedback received, and the assumption of no concerns from those that did not respond, there is significant support for the new REF process. The only concern that was mentioned more than once was the length of the Appeal Period/Timelines. While most were okay with the 14 day appeal period, there was support for consideration of a 21 day appeal period. A summary of the responses follows on the next page.
### Summary of CAO Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
<td>“The alternative REF process seems to work well”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>“I am good with the process and procedures”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>“The changes made to the process are quite positive”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>“No concerns with the new REF process”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stony Plain</td>
<td>“No significant concern with the REF process. I do believe that it is cleaner and would believe that much more friendly for CRB to administer while accomplishing the intended goals. I further believe it is an improvement from the previous process.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wabamun</td>
<td>“No issues with the process as proposed”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Appeal Period    | Sturgeon               | “No, the Appeal mechanism as described in Step 6 has not been effective as it, for all intents, also brings the matter back into the political arena (ie: requires a motion of the Council to appeal, meaning the municipal imperative vs. regional imperative is at play.)
- I note in the case of the Sturgeon County Appeal, the motion was taken PRIOR to the completion of the 3rd Party Review and the CRB staff recommendation.
- The need for a motion of Council to Appeal driving the decision of a CRB member is also inconsistent with the "duty to the corporation" described by Allan Farmer (RMRF) when describing the CRB Board member’s roles when deliberating.” |
<p>|                  | Stony Plain             | “no significant concern with the REF process. I do believe that it is cleaner and would believe that much more friendly for CRB to administer while accomplishing the intended goals. I further believe it is an improvement from the previous process.” |
| Appeal Period    | Strathcona              | “The current 14 days is working well for us, but we are sympathetic to the opinion expressed by other municipalities that 14 days can be challenging. We could support either leaving the status quo 14 days or increasing to 21 days. Suggest 1 year review” |
|                  | Bruderheim              | “14 or 21 days are both fine for appeal. As a small municipality we can work with 14” |
|                  | Fort Saskatchewan       | “The 14 day appeal period is difficult for larger applications... Agree that 21 days would allow more time.” |
|                  | Spruce Grove            | “We feel that the 21 day appeal period makes sense given that a resolution of Council is required. We believe this to be a positive amendment to the proposed changes.” |
|                  | Edmonton                | “There are several periods where it is not possible to schedule a Council meeting within a 14 day period, such as Christmas Break, Spring Break, AUMA convention, and during Summer Recess. 25 working day appeal period, combined with some way to request an extension to the appeals period.” |
|                  | Sturgeon                | “14 days is adequate.... I could possibly support “a 14 business days” period” |
| Appeal Process   | Sturgeon                | “Our experience in Step 6 is that following an Appeal, the REF should not simply proceed to the next Board meeting, but should come forward at the will of the applicant” |
| Third party Evaluation | Fort Saskatchewan | “Distribute Third Party Evaluation as soon as received by CRB” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timelines</td>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>“The current process requires a 25 working day review period for the CRB Admin recommendation and a 14 calendar day appeal period. This is confusing to everyone - Council, administration, applicants and the public. We understand some of the complexities of making this more consistent, but is there a simpler solution?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>“- uncertainty around when the CRB will release a decision and when the ‘appeal countdown begins’. This uncertainty provides difficulty in scheduling Council meetings to review REF applications as the CRB recommendation could come at any time during the 25 day review period. - REF Notifications to municipalities could be improved by providing a specific date for the completion of a REF Evaluation – a defined appeal period allows municipalities to plan with a level of certainty and removes complications in establishing Council meeting agendas to discuss a REF and related issues.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Process Suggestions</td>
<td>Sturgeon</td>
<td>“Better solution would be to keep the matter out of the municipal/political arena. - The motion to Appeal by a municipal Council would see the matter referred back through CRB Administration to a second 3rd Party Reviewer that determines whether the basis of the Appeal is founded. - If &quot;unfounded&quot; then &quot;Deemed Approval&quot; (ie: a &quot;black and white decision) - If the Appeal may have merit, the matter comes to the Board for decision (this becomes a &quot;shades of grey&quot; decision point for the Board) (It may be awkward to have one reviewer comment of another reviewers opinion, in which case the referral could be back to the same independent agency) In this regard, there may be benefit in articulating a process to adjust and resubmit REF’s that are initially recommended for refusal. For example, if it is determined that a REF initially recommended for refusal, could likely to be approved with some limited revisions (vs. an entirely new REF), this may trigger a shorter review period, assurance that the REF will be reviewed by the same 3rd party consultant in the interest of consistency and building upon the prior feedback, and perhaps even justification to ensure a reduced cost for 3rd party consultant review.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Comments</td>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
<td>“The depth of complexity of appeals that come to Board along with volumes of backup material documents (initial submissions, CRB review, Third party review, Appeal rationale etc.) can be challenging for a smaller municipality without backup of complement of team of municipal planning subject matter experts assisting with interpretation, understanding and preparing/briefing for our elected officials.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>“It should be clarified that Growth Projections were never intended to be used as a regulatory measure, but more so as an information tool.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>“Lack of clarify around what precisely needs to be addressed in an ASP and, the amount of detail required for it to be considered complete.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Quarterly Financial Report as at March 31, 2014

#### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2014 Annual Calendar Year Budget</th>
<th>31-Mar-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOA Regular Grant</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA RCP Regional Competitive Analysis</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA RCP Growth Plan update</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA RCP Housing</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Carryover from 2013</td>
<td>$236,662</td>
<td>$239,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue</td>
<td>$1,470,290</td>
<td>$1,470,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$2,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,956,952</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,712,711</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2014 Annual Calendar Year Budget</th>
<th>31-Mar-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board and Committees</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>$38,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$21,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$4,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$12,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$1,997,000</td>
<td>$433,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries/Benefits</td>
<td>$1,533,700</td>
<td>$319,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Lease/Utilities</td>
<td>$206,000</td>
<td>$58,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal &amp; Professional Fees</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$12,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>$32,800</td>
<td>$14,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$8,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$10,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$5,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$2,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Chgs and Interest</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Fees</td>
<td>$1,485,952</td>
<td>$106,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$23,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry over projects</td>
<td>$90,952</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Fees</td>
<td>$1,275,000</td>
<td>$83,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Projects</td>
<td>$1,104,000</td>
<td>$292,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Energy corridors</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Competitive Analysis</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$24,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Plan Update</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$200,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Regional Housing</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$6,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transit Governance Study</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
<td>$61,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Intern</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital</strong></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$11,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office Furniture/Equipment</strong></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$11,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,956,952</strong></td>
<td><strong>$882,479</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated Project Funds</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,830,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (Deficit)</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit Task Force

Thursday, March 27, 2014
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
Edmonton Petroleum Club, Rainbow Room
11110 – 108 Street, Edmonton

Members:
Wes Brodhead, City of St. Albert (Chair)
Michael Walters, City of Edmonton
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Glen Finstad, City of Leduc
Searle Turton, City of Spruce Grove
Brian Botterill, Strathcona County
Tom Flynn, Sturgeon County

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Amber Nicol, City of Spruce Grove
Bob McDonald, City of St. Albert
Colton Kirsop, City of Edmonton
Corey Levasseur, City of Spruce Grove
Kevin Wenzel, City of Leduc
Leslie Chivers, Sturgeon County
Matt Carpenter, Strathcona County
Terry Cashin, Sturgeon County

Regrets:

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Neal Sarnecki, Acting CEO
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager

Stephanie Chai, Planning Intern
Amanda Borman, Administrative Assistant
Hassan Shaheen, ISL Engineering & Land Services Ltd.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Acting CEO, Neal Sarnecki called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

2. Roundtable Introduction

3. Terms of Reference/Orientation

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Transit Task Force Terms of Reference be recommended to the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee for approval.
4. Selection of Chair

Following the nomination of Councillor Wes Brodhead and no additional nominations, Councillor Wes Brodhead was declared the Task Force Chair by acclamation.

5. Selection of Vice Chair

Following the nomination of Councillor Michael Walters and no additional nominations, Councillor Michael Walters was declared the Task Force Vice-Chair by acclamation.

6. 2014 Workplan

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Transit Task Force accept the 2014 Workplan as presented.

7. Project Updates

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Transit Task Force accept the Project Updates as presented.

8. Specialized Transit

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Transit Task Force accept the information as presented by Mayor Nolan Crouse, CRB Chair.

9. Meeting Schedule

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Transit Task Force’s next meeting will be held April 24, 2014 and that the Capital Region Board Administration suggest alternative dates for future meetings to the Transit Task Force Members.

10. Regulation from the Province

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Transit Task Force accept the information presented by Mayor Nolan Crouse, CRB Chair.
11. Review of the Terms of Reference

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Transit Task Force evaluate its Terms of Reference following its review of the Governance Study – Business Case Report final draft on April 24, 2014.

12. ADJOURNMENT

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Transit Task Force meeting be adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 11:18 a.m.

Task Force Chair, Wes Brodhead
Growth Plan Update Task Force

Thursday, March 27, 2014
1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Edmonton Petroleum Club, Rainbow Room
11110 – 108 Street, Edmonton

Members:
Roxanne Carr, Strathcona County (Chair)
Don Iveson, City of Edmonton
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Cathy Heron, City of St. Albert
John Schonewille, Leduc County
Lisa Holmes, Town of Morinville
Ralph van Assen, Village of Warburg

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Barry Huybens, iStrategic Advisors Inc.
Brian Botterill, Strathcona County
Clayton Kittlitz, Sturgeon County
Colton Kirsop, City of Edmonton
Corey Levasseur, City of Spruce Grove
David Hales, City of St. Albert
David Klippenstein, Klippenstein and Associates Ltd.
Ed Gibbons, City of Edmonton
Greg Hofmann, Town of Morinville
Janel Smith, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Jordan Evans, Leduc County
Leslie Chivers, Sturgeon County
Peter Ohm, City of Edmonton
Sarah Feldman, Strathcona County
Tom Flynn, Sturgeon County

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Neal Sarnecki, Acting CEO
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager

Stephanie Chai, Planning Intern
Amanda Borman, Administrative Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER

Acting CEO, Neal Sarnecki called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

2. Roundtable Introductions
3. Terms of Reference/Orientation

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Growth Plan Update Task Force Terms of Reference be recommended to the Capital Region Board for approval.

4. Selection of Chair

Following the nomination of Mayor Roxanne Carr and no additional nominations, Mayor Roxanne Carr was declared the Task Force Chair by acclamation.

5. Selection of Vice Chair

Councillor Cathy Heron and Mayor Lisa Holmes were nominated for Vice-Chair of the Task Force. Following a secret ballot vote by members, Mayor Lisa Holmes was declared the Task Force Vice-Chair.

Motion: That the administration destroy the ballots for the election of Vice-Chair of the Growth Plan Update Task Force.

Moved by: Councillor Cathy Heron, City of St. Albert

Decision: Carried

6. Growth Plan Update – Committee Discussion

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that discussion item 5d “What areas within the current plan are working well, and should be preserved?” be deferred to the next meeting of the Growth Plan Update Task Force.

7. Project Update Growth Plan Update Program

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Growth Plan Update Task Force accept the Project Update as presented.

8. 2014 Workplan

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Growth Plan Update Task Force accept 2014 Workplan as presented.
9. Meeting Schedule

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Growth Plan Update Task Force’s next meeting will be held May 5, 2014 and that the Capital Region Board Administration suggest alternative dates for future meetings to the Growth Plan Update Task Force members.

10. Review of the Terms of Reference

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Growth Plan Update Task Force review the Terms of Reference following the Project Team’s review of the updated timelines.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: That the Growth Plan Update Task Force adjourn the March 27 meeting.
Moved by: Mayor Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Decision: Carried

Meeting adjourned at 3:57 p.m.

Task Force Chair, Roxanne Carr