

A meeting of the City of Lacombe Council was called to order by Mayor Christie at 7:00 p.m. on May 16, 2017 in the Council Chamber of the Lacombe County Administration Office.

A meeting of the Lacombe County Council was called to order by Reeve Law at 7:00 p.m. on May 16, 2017 in the Council Chamber of the Lacombe County Administration Office.

City of Lacombe: Mayor, S. Christie, Deputy Mayor, G. Harder, Councillors, P. Bouwsema, W. Armishaw, R. Konnik; CAO, D. Pollard, Director of Operations & Planning Services, M. Goudy, Planner, J. Kirchner and the public at large as attached and forming part of these minutes.

Lacombe County: Reeve, P. Law, Deputy Reeve, B. Knight, Councillors, D. Kreil, R. McDermid, B. Shepherd and K. Wigmore, County Commissioner, T. Hager, Senior Planner, A. O'Driscoll, Planner/Development Officer, C. Paradis and Executive Assistant, L. Turnbull.

Stantec Consulting: Bonnie McInnis, Brad Vander Haden

Moved by Mr. Bouwsema that the City of Lacombe Council meeting recess in order to conduct a public hearing for the Lacombe Intermunicipal Development Plan.

Time: 7:05 p.m.

Carried Unanimously.

Moved by Mrs. Knight that the Lacombe County Council meeting recess in order to conduct a public hearing for Lacombe Intermunicipal Development Plan.

Time: 7:05 p.m.

Carried Unanimously.

Reeve Law called the public hearing to order.

Reeve Law advised on the purpose and process of the public hearing.

Bylaw No. 441 is a bylaw of the City of Lacombe to adopt the proposed Lacombe Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP).

Bylaw No. 1239-17 is a bylaw of Lacombe County to adopt the proposed Lacombe Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP).

Stantec Engineering provided an overview of the Lacombe Intermunicipal Development Plan providing a detailed summary of the following components of the Plan.

- Project Process
- Public Open House February 28, 2017
- Revisions – Resulting from Public Open House
- What is an IDP
- Why IDP is Being Updated
- IDP Report
- General Policies
 - Agriculture
 - Residential
 - Environmental & Open Space
 - Servicing
 - Roads & Transportation
- Area Specific Policies
 - Agricultural Research Lands
 - Burman University
 - Lacombe Airport
 - Joint Economic Areas
 - Future Growth Areas
- Forecasted Land Requirements – 2056
- Future Growth Areas
- Rosedale Valley
- Public Utility Lot (PUL #2)
- Annexation Process

Reeve Law inquired if there were questions from Councillors.

Mr. Armishaw commented that the Plan boundary was stated to be 2 miles or 1.6 kms (which is 1 mile). Mr. Armishaw inquired as to the correct boundary. Ms. McInnis advised that the boundary is 2 miles.

Mr. McDermand inquired with regard to regulations for new CFO's or expanded CFO's. Ms. McInnis commented that if a new or expanded CFO was within the southeast growth area it would not be allowed to move forward.

Mr. McDermand inquired if the existing County policy is encumbered by the NRCB. Ms. McInnis advised that the NRCB are the approval granting authority for CFO's but municipalities can make recommendations if they do not think the development is appropriate. Ms. McInnis commented that general if a CFO is close to city limits NRCB will not approve the application.

Ms. Shepherd inquired if a landowner within Lacombe County in the southeast growth area would be allowed to sell to a developer for a residential development that would be annexed in the future. Ms. McInnis advised that such a development would not be allowed.

Mr. McDermand inquired if the experimental research station lands and Burman University lands would be treated the same. Ms. McInnis commented that the intent is to recognize that both entities are important to the region and there should be no impact on future expansion plans for either property.

Mr. Armishaw inquired if Ms. McInnis could illustrate the criteria for expansion. Ms. McInnis commented that it is difficult to determine the exact developable area as there are various physical constraints. When 10% of 92 hectares (9.2) hectares of the developable land requires servicing annexation would be initiated when one half of that 10% is subdivided.

Mr. Harder commented that he has concerns if the 10% requirement is high enough. A developer could develop 10 hectares and trigger annexation of the entire area. Ms. McInnis there has to be a number determined and there has been extensive discussion regarding that number. It was felt that 10% is an efficient enough commitment to initiate annexation.

Mrs. Knight questioned if 9 to 10 hectares would be residential development and how many lots that would result in. Mr. Goudy advised that there are 15 units allowed per hectare so there would be approximately 150 lots. Mrs. Knight inquired if there would be standard municipal services. Mr. Goudy responded those services would be required.

Reeve Law inquired if there were any verbal submissions from government agencies.

There were no verbal submissions from government agencies.

Reeve Law inquired if there were any verbal submissions from municipal agencies.

There were no verbal submissions from municipal agencies.

Reeve Law inquired if there were any verbal submissions from the public at large.

Donald Parker

- Impressed with the layout of the two options for the City
- An expensive lift station and water services will be required
- Development will interfere with the natural drainage systems
- Committing the City to developing the Barnett Lake area will be very expensive
- City folks would like to keep their taxes down
- Wonder if the 10% requirement is large enough
- The amount of money to be spent on this area shows that requirement should be higher
- There will be water problems, problems with wildlife and the land contour

Bill Marquardt

- Totally against the use of good farm land for a house or concrete streets
- There will be less farmland for food to grow that we need
- Develop land that is clay and sand
- The soil west and east of Lacombe has been good farmland for many years
- The more good cropland the more people can be fed
- There will not enough food in the next 200 to 300 years
- There are many places that cannot grow food
- We have that land, why are we covering it up with houses, streets and sidewalks
- Why not look at a different place
- Don't need to cover up 150 to 200 hectares for 2 or 3 people to live in one house
- Land with sandy soil produces 30 to 40 bushels per acre, good land produces 60 to 80 bushels per year
- How many meals have you eaten since you were 5 years old, how long until you could starve to death?

Rick Hindley

- Own land adjacent to Rosedale Valley
- Concerned with percentage of threshold to trigger annexation, seems low
- An actual value would be better than a percentage, a little higher threshold required
- If someone voluntarily approaches City and allows annexation would that affect the process

Reeve Law inquired if there were any written submissions from government agencies.

Ms. O’Driscoll advised that one written submission was received from Alberta Transportation who had no objections in principle. Ms. O’Driscoll read the February 27, 2017 letter from Alberta Transportation.

Reeve Law inquired if there were any written submissions from the public at large.

There were no written submissions from the public at large.

Ms. McInnis provided the following concluding remarks:

Ms. McInnis referred to the question if volunteer Annexation would this affect the annexation criteria. This would be a decision of the City and if they supported such an annexation it would reduce the developable area so it would reduce the amount of land left and affect the annexation criteria. Ms. McInnis again commented that incremental absorption would be City decision.

Mr. McDermand commented on the 10% annexation threshold and inquired if 300 acres were developed how many houses this mean. Ms. McInnis advised there are 90 developable hectares and at 15 units per hectare this would be 1300 to 1400 homes. Mr. Goudy commented that the 10% factor is approximately 145.

Reeve Law thanked the public for their attendance and comments.

Reeve Law advised that if the Councils are satisfied that everyone has had an opportunity to make a presentation, and that if further information is not required, it would be appropriate to have resolutions from each municipality to close their public hearing.

Moved by Mr. Wigmore that the public hearing of Lacombe County be adjourned.

Time: 8:05 p.m.

Carried Unanimously.

Moved by Mr. Harder that the public hearing of the City of Lacombe be adjourned.

Time: 8:05 p.m.

Carried Unanimously.

Moved by Mr. Armishaw that the Council meeting of the City of Lacombe be adjourned.

Time: 8:06 p.m.

Carried Unanimously.

Moved Ms. Shepherd that the Council meeting of Lacombe County be adjourned.

Time: 8:06 p.m.

Carried Unanimously.

Mayor

CAO