



Recommendation to County Council

REPORT NAME

Intermunicipal Development Plans (IDP) with Wetaskwin and Camrose Counties

RECOMMENDATION

That Leduc County Council give first reading to Bylaws XX-18 and XX-18, being the bylaws to adopt the Intermunicipal Development Plans with the Counties of Camrose and Wetaskwin respectively.

IMPLICATIONS

Reason: To support neighboring municipalities in aligning with provincial requirements for intermunicipal planning and collaboration as outlined in the Modernized Municipal Government Act.

Authority (MGA/Bylaw/Policy):

- Bill 21- Modernized Municipal Government Act, requires that municipalities enter into Intermunicipal Collaboration Frameworks regarding shared service delivery with all adjacent municipalities. Such Frameworks to include an Intermunicipal Development Plan
- Section 631(1) of the Municipal Government Act allows for two municipalities to, by bylaw, adopt an Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP).

Funding Required: N/A – Project funded and led by Wetaskiwin County

Funding Source: Provincial grant

BACKGROUND

Bill 21: The Modernized Municipal Government Act has been adopted by the Province and it updates the Municipal Government Act (MGA). As a part of this update, the Province has included requirements for the creation of Intermunicipal Collaboration Frameworks (ICF) to cover shared service provision opportunities between adjacent municipalities. These ICFs, in turn, require that the municipalities involved develop an Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP) as outlined in the MGA under section 631.

While the provisions of Bill 21 with regards to ICFs do not come into force until April of 2018, the sheer scope of this requirement means that many municipalities, combined with the already known deadline of April 2020, mean that many Albertan municipalities are already undertaking some or all of the work required to get these frameworks into place. As a part of this undertaking, Wetaskiwin County has received a provincial grant to develop a template for ICFs and IDPs for smaller municipalities.

In early 2017, Wetaskiwin County then hired Vicinia Planning and Engagement to develop these templates and, over the course of 2017, Leduc County has provided assistance to Wetaskiwin

Submitted by: Benjamin Ansaldo, Planner, Long Range Planning

Reviewed by: Jordan Evans, Manager, Long Range Planning

Date: February 6, 2018



Recommendation to County Council

County and their consultants through document reviews and detailed feedback and comment with regards to the ICF and IDP between our municipalities as well as regarding the ICF and IDP with Camrose County. Additionally, Leduc County attended a public open house in July of 2017, and the document has been revised to include feedback received from the open house.

DISCUSSION

The proposed IDPs are consistent with the requirements laid out in Section 631(2)(b) of the MGA which states that an IDP must include: a conflict resolution procedure between the involved municipalities (Section Q of the IDPs); a procedure to amend or repeal the plan (Section O); and provisions related to the administration of the plan (also Section O).

Additionally, the proposed IDPs do provide for the manner and proposed planning for future developments in the plan area as is optional under Sections 631(2)(a)(ii) and 631(2)(a)(iii) of the MGA through policy and direction contained in Sections G, H, and I.

However, while it would appear that the IDPs also contemplate the optional requirement of Section 631(a)(i) of the MGA, being "the future land use within the area" through the inclusion of a concept map and Policy H(2) of the IDPs, neither the concept map nor Policy H(2) reflect the future development plans outlined in Leduc County's approved area structure plans for Pigeon Lake and Wizard Lake.

Leduc County administration have expressed concerns to the consultant regarding the inclusion of this concept map, and the wording of the aforementioned policy, but it has been made clear that the inclusion of the map and the policy as written is in keeping with the template they have used with other municipalities. Ultimately the combination of the IDP defining the land uses shown on the concept map as being "consistent with the **current** land use designations." (policy H2 – emphasis mine) with Policy H2(c) and H3 (which exempt the concept map from needing to be updated should the respective land use bylaws be amended in the plan area and direct that development in Leduc County by the lakes be guided by an area structure plan respectively) would seem to clearly indicate that the intention behind the inclusion of the concept map is to show existing land uses and is not intended to be a depiction of the future land uses. While this is not how Leduc County has traditionally utilized concept maps in our statutory documents, it is consistent with how Wetaskiwin County has approached their already adopted IDPs with Ponoka County and Camrose County.

NEXT STEPS

Should County Council give the attached bylaws first reading, the proposed IDPs would then be submitted to the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Growth Board in accordance with the requirements of the Regional Evaluation Framework. Once approval has been received from the EMRGP, then a public hearing would be scheduled in advance of second and third readings.

Submitted by: Benjamin Ansaldo, Planner, Long Range Planning

Reviewed by: Jordan Evans, Manager, Long Range Planning

Date: February 6, 2018



Recommendation to County Council

Attachments:

- Bylaw XX -18 to adopt the draft Wetaskiwin County and Lacombe County IDP
- Bylaw XX-18 to adopt the draft Camrose County and Lacombe County IDP