

Interim Regional Evaluation Framework (IREF) CMRB Administration Recommendation	
Member Municipality	Rocky View County
Application Name	Rocky View County and Kneehill County Intermunicipal Development Plan
IREF Application Number	2020-02
Type of Application	Intermunicipal Development Plan
Municipality Bylaw #	Bylaw C-7943-2019
Date of Complete Application	January 16, 2020
Date Application Circulated	January 21, 2020
Date of CMRB Administration Recommendation	January 27, 2020
CMRB Recommendation	
That the Board APPROVE IREF Application 2020-02, the Kneehill County and Rocky View County Intermunicipal Development Plan	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IREF Application 2020-02 is a proposed new Intermunicipal Development Plan (“IDP”). • The plan encompasses the lands located adjacent to the municipal boundary between Kneehill County and Rocky View County. Kneehill County is not a member of the CMRB; therefore, the IREF review only applies to those lands within the boundary of the Calgary Metropolitan Region. • The IDP does not propose regionally significant development. Regionally significant development, as defined in Section 4.0 of the IREF, includes employment areas and/or 50 or more new dwelling units. • The third-party consultant review, completed by Stantec, found the application to be consistent with the Interim Growth Plan (IGP) and the IREF. • CMRB Administration finds IREF Application 2020-02 to be consistent with the principles and policies of the IGP and Section 6.0 of the IREF and recommends the application for approval. 	
Attachment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Third-Party Consultant Review, Stantec 	

1.0 Background

On January 16, 2020, Rocky View County submitted Interim Regional Evaluation Framework (IREF) Application 2020-02, the Rocky View County and Kneehill County Intermunicipal Development Plan, proposed Bylaw C-7943-2019.

The IDP was submitted to the CMRB through IREF under Section 4.1(a) which requires municipalities to refer “all new Municipal Development Plans (MDPs) and Intermunicipal Development Plans (IDPs).” As this IDP is between Rocky View County and Kneehill County, a non-member, the IREF review focuses only on that portion of the IDP plan area located within the boundaries of the Calgary Metropolitan Region.

The IDP does not propose regionally significant development. Regionally significant development, as defined in Section 4.0 of the IREF, includes employment areas and/or 50 or more new dwelling units. The plan area is predominantly agriculture and grazing, and the IDP reaffirms this as the intended land use.

CMRB Administration notified CMRB members of IREF Application 2020-02 on January 21, 2020.

2.0 Third Party Evaluation

CMRB Administration obtained the assistance of Stantec to evaluate the application with respect to the IREF requirements. The Stantec evaluation (attached) reviewed the proposed IDP in relation to the objectives of the Interim Growth Plan (IGP) and the evaluation criteria of the IREF. Stantec found IREF Application 2020-02 to be generally consistent with the objectives of the IGP and IREF.

3.0 CMRB Administration Comments

CMRB Administration finds IREF Application 2020-02 to be generally consistent with the objectives of the IGP and IREF.

3.1 IGP Section 2, Principle 1: Promote the Integration and Efficient Use of Regional Infrastructure

The IDP considers the integration of land use and infrastructure and is consistent with IGP Section 2, Principle 1. The IDP contains policies around agriculture, transportation infrastructure, environment and open space, existing and potential land use, resource extraction and renewable energy development. There is no development proposed in the IDP.

- As noted in IDP Section V *Intermunicipal Land Use Policies*, Policy 4, “both municipalities agree to jointly discuss ways to cooperate with provincial and federal agencies and utility providers to help facilitate the efficient delivery of infrastructure and services that are of a mutual benefit.”
- IDP Section *Environmental and Open Space Policies*, Policy 6, notes that “the municipalities support the alignment and connection of open space pathways in the defined plan area.”
- IDP Section *Transportation*, Policy 1, notes that “each municipality shall be notified of any subdivision or development proposal in the other municipality that will result in access being required from a road under its control or management.”

3.2 IGP Section 2, Principle 2: Protect Water Quality and Quantity

The IDP is consistent with IGP Principle 2: *Protect Water Quality and Quantity*. The IDP identifies riparian policy areas, wetlands and key wildlife and biodiversity zones. As noted in IDP Section *Environmental Areas and Open Space Policies*, Policy 1, “applications affecting wetlands and/or riparian areas located within the Plan Area shall be circulated to the adjacent municipality.” As noted in the *Discussion of Proposed Amendments with Evaluation Criteria of Section 6.0 of the Interim Regional Evaluation Framework* document submitted by Rocky View County as part of IREF Application 2020-02, both municipalities have developed this IDP in accordance with the South Saskatchewan Regional Plan, the Alberta Land Stewardship Act and the Land Use Framework.

3.3 IGP Section 2, Principle 3: Encourage Efficient Growth and Strong and Sustainable Communities

As noted in IDP Section V, *Intermunicipal Land Use Policies*, Policy 1, “the primary land use in the Plan Area is predominantly agriculture and grazing. Non-agricultural uses should be aligned with each municipality’s municipal development plan and should consider interface or transition tools...” As noted on page 3 of the *Discussion of Proposed Amendments with Evaluation Criteria of Section 6.0 of the Interim Regional Evaluation Framework* document submitted by Rocky View County as part of IREF Application 2020-02, the IDP plan area is not anticipated to feature high density development or community nodes or other forms of intensive development. The policies and mapping presented in the IDP do not propose regionally significant development as defined in Section 4.0 of the IREF, which includes employment areas and/or 50 or more new dwelling units.

Non-agricultural uses may be considered through future statutory plans such as Municipal Development Plans or Area Structure Plans. Should this situation arise in the Rocky View County portion of the IDP plan area, an opportunity to review the proposed development would be provided to Kneehill County through the policies of the IDP and to members municipalities of the CMRB through the Regional Evaluation Framework.

3.4 IGP Section 3.2, Region-Wide Policies

Section 3.2.2 of the IGP requires, at a minimum, that municipalities “demonstrate collaboration to coordinate” on new Area Structure Plans or amendments to existing Intermunicipal Development Plans within 1.6 km of a neighbouring municipal boundary or an agreed upon notification area between member municipalities.” The IDP plan area is within 1.6 km of Mountain View County, which is not a member municipality of the CMRB, and the portion of Wheatland County that is not within the Calgary Metropolitan Region.

Although this is not an Area Structure Plan, and there are no lands located in the Calgary Metropolitan Region within 1.6 km of the plan area, as discussed in IDP Section *Purpose of the Plan*, “the purpose of the Kneehill County and Rocky View County Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP) is to foster a collaborative planning approach for lands along the common border between the two counties.”

3.5 IGP Section 3.4 Development Types

The plan area is predominantly agriculture and grazing, and the IDP reaffirms this as the intended land use. No development types, as defined in IGP Section 3.4, are proposed within the IDP.

4.0 IGP Section 3.5 Regional Corridors

Highway 9 and Highway 806 are the regionally significant mobility corridors within 1.6 km of the Rocky View County portion of the IDP plan area which are identified on IGP *Schedule 3: Mobility Corridors, Transportation and Trade*. The IDP does not propose development, but IDP Section *Transportation*, Policy 1 states that “each municipality shall be notified of any subdivision or development proposal in the other municipality that will result in access being required from a road under its control or management. The affected municipality may request to obtain any associated traffic studies and must give its comments in writing within the notification period.”

Oil and gas infrastructure transmission corridors are mapped within the IDP.

5.0 Recommendation

That the Board **APPROVE** IREF Application 2020-02, the Rocky View County and Kneehill County Intermunicipal Development Plan

January 22, 2020

Attention: Jordon Copping, Chief Officer

Calgary Metropolitan Region Board

305, 602 11 Ave SW

Calgary, Alberta T2R 1J8

Dear Mr. Copping:

Reference: IREF# 2020-02 for Bylaw C-7943-2019 Kneehill County and Rocky View County Intermunicipal Development Plan in Rocky View County

Please find attached the third-party evaluation of the Kneehill County and Rocky View County Intermunicipal Development Plan.

It is our opinion that the proposed plan is generally consistent with the objectives of the Calgary Metropolitan Region Interim Growth Plan being schedule A to Ministerial Order MSL 091/18.

Prepared by:

Stephen Oliver, CD, MA, RPP, MCIP

Planner

Stantec Consulting Ltd.

Calgary Metropolitan Region Board Interim Regional Evaluation Framework	
Member Municipality	Rocky View County
Application Name	Kneehill County and Rocky View County Intermunicipal Development Plan
IREF Number	2020-02
Type of Application	New Plan
Municipality Bylaw #	Bylaw C-7943-2019
Date of Application	December 19, 2019
Date of Third-Party Review Report	January 22, 2020
Findings	
That the Kneehill County and Rocky View County Intermunicipal Development Plan is consistent with the Interim Regional Evaluation Framework MSL: 091/18.	
Summary of Review	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An application to adopt a new statutory plan, Kneehill County and Rocky View County Intermunicipal Development Plan ("IDP"), was submitted by Rocky View County to the Calgary Metropolitan Region Board ("CMRB") for an Interim Regional Evaluation Framework ("IREF") review and evaluation. • The application is applicable to the administration of land adjacent to the municipal boundaries of Kneehill County and Rocky View County. • Land use within the study area is currently predominantly agricultural and grazing, and the policy identifies that that the future role of that area will remain consistent with these uses. • There are regionally significant transportation and service corridors within the plan area, which are to be specifically addressed, if required, at the Area Structure Plan stage. • The review found that the plan is generally consistent with the IREF MSL: 091/18 	
Review Prepared by	
Stephen Oliver, CD, MA, RPP, MCIP Planner Stantec Consulting Ltd.	

3.2 Region-wide Policies	
3.2.1 Principles, Objectives, and Policies	<p>Principle 1: Promote the Integration and Efficient Use of Regional Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan area is predominantly agriculture and grazing. The IDP reaffirms this as the intended land use. • Non-agricultural uses may be considered in areas identified through a relevant statutory plan. <p>Principle 2: Protect Water Quality and Promote Water Conservation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan area includes the Riparian areas, wetlands and other water features the presence of and adherence to the associated regulations is acknowledged. • The circulation of applications affecting wetlands and/or riparian areas within the Plan area is identified within the policy. <p>Principle 3: Encourage Efficient Growth and Strong and Sustainable Communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan area is primarily agricultural and not anticipated to support high density development or community nodes.
3.2.2 Demonstrate collaboration to coordinate with other member municipalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the plan is to create the Intermunicipal Development Plan for Kneehill County and Rocky View County, as such coordination has been demonstrated between these bodies. • The plan area is within 1.6km of Mountain View County and Wheatland County, as they border the plan boundary. There is no direct mention of circulation or review by these adjacent municipalities.

<p>3.2.3 Water, wetlands and stormwater</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan identifies the hydrology and environmental concerns within the area and acknowledges the need for circulation between both municipalities as it affects these areas.
<p>3.3 Flood Prone Areas</p>	
<p>3.3.1 Development in the floodways</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does not interact with any areas identified by the province as Floodway. • The plan does not propose any new development.

<p>3.3.2 Flood protection in flood fringe areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan does not interact with any areas identified by the province as Flood fringe.
<p>3.4 Development Types</p>	
<p>3.4.1 Intensification and Infill Development</p>	
<p>3.4.1.1 Intensification and Infill in existing settlement areas in cities, towns, and villages</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan does not identify areas for intensification or infill in existing settlement areas. The plan identifies that the primary land use is Agriculture and should remain that way, with consideration for other land uses only when they do not negatively impact agricultural use or grazing.

<p>3.4.1.2 Intensification and Infill of existing settlement areas in hamlets and other unincorporated urban communities within rural municipalities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does not incorporate intensification or infill in existing settlement areas.
<p>3.4.2 Expansion of Settlement Areas</p>	
<p>3.4.2.1 Expansion of settlement areas in a contiguous pattern</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does not propose expansion of a settlement area.

<p>3.4.2.2 Expansion of settlement areas with 500 or greater new dwelling units</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does not propose expansion of a settlement area.
<p>3.4.2.3 Rationale for expansion of settlement areas that do not meet all components of Policy 3.4.2.1 and 3.4.2.2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does not propose expansion of a settlement area.

3.4.3 New Freestanding Settlement Areas	
<p>3.4.3.1 New freestanding settlement areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does not propose freestanding settlement areas. • Attachment 4 of the submission identifies that the lands are intended to remain primarily agricultural, this is not stated in the IDP Intermunicipal Development Plan explicitly.
<p>3.4.3.2 New freestanding settlement areas with 500 or greater new dwelling units</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does not propose freestanding settlement areas.

<p>3.4.3.3</p> <p>Rationale for new freestanding settlement areas with 500 or greater new dwelling units that do not meet all components of Policy 3.4.3.2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does not propose freestanding settlement areas.
<p>3.4.4 Country Residential Development</p>	
<p>3.4.4</p> <p>Country Residential Development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does not identify any areas within the predominantly agricultural area for new residential areas. • The plan identifies that the primary land use will remain as agricultural and non-agricultural uses should only be considered where they will not negatively impact agriculture.

3.4.5 Employment Areas	
<p>3.4.5.1 New employment areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does not propose any new employment areas.
<p>3.4.5.2 Connections to transit stations and corridors</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does not incorporate connections to transit stations or corridors. • As the plan area is primarily agricultural Attachment 4 states that to the submission of the plan does not identify developments at high enough density to support transit.

3.5 Regional Corridors	
<p>3.5.1.1 Mobility Corridors</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan addresses the maintenance and management of roads within the area. • The plan does not identify regionally significant trails or roadways on a map, general policies are identified within the plan. • The plan does not address trails as corridors within the plan area, the area has the “Land Trail” identified in the GIS data set. This extends up Range Road 255. • Attachment 4 of the IREF submission identifies that the specific mobility corridors would require supplementary work through an Area Structure Plan, this is not specifically identified within the plan.
<p>3.5.2.1 Transmission Corridors</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan does not identify transmission corridors. • Attachment 4 of the IREF submission states that specific areas would be planned comprehensively through an Area Structure Plan at the time of proposed development.