



AGENDA ITEM

GULL LAKE INTERMUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (IDP)

THIRD READING

November 7, 2019

BACKGROUND

A Public Hearing was held for the draft Gull Lake Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP) on October 10, 2019. A copy of the draft plan is attached as Schedule 'A' and a copy of the Bylaw is attached as Schedule 'B'.

The IDP is a collaborative document between the County, Ponoka County and the Summer Villages of Parkland Beach and Gull Lake, which is intended to guide land use and development around Gull Lake while ensuring that the ecological health, recreational capacity, and scenic qualities of the lake are respected and enhanced.

A joint Public Hearing was held on September 3, 2019 at the Gull Lake Community Hall and there were approximately 35 people in attendance. A number of submissions and queries were made by the public at the meeting mainly around the definition for the old lake bottom; development and uses permitted within this area; the removal of the policy supporting pumping into the lake to maintain water levels; and the lack of clarity with the advertising. A full copy of the minutes from this meeting has been provided to Council. Two (2) changes have been made based on the feedback from the public and the Steering Committee. These are:

- 1) Definition for lake bottom lands included in the policy box as follows: "Former lake bottom lands will be considered all lands excluded from private title at the time of any historical survey, or all lands identified by a qualified professional as being below the 1:100 year flood plain level".
- 2) Inclusion of the policy supporting maintaining lake levels.

A second Public Hearing was held by all the municipalities due to a procedural error. The County held the Public Hearing on October 10th and one member of the public made a submission. Mr. McTavish requested that the Councils' consider amending the draft IDP imposing a regulation prohibiting development on old lake bottom lands once they have been accreted therefore removing the autonomy of the individual municipalities. Ponoka County, the Summer Village of Gull Lake and the Summer Village of Parkland Beach are

not in favour of amending the draft IDP. Ponoka County and the Summer Village of Parkland Beach have both given Third Reading of their bylaws adopting the plan.

LEGISLATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

Section 631 of the Municipal Government Act, RSA 2000 cM-26 (as amended) requires two or more Councils of municipalities with common boundaries to prepare and adopt an Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP) for the purpose of providing more detailed planning direction for development of lands within a common boundary.

An IDP is expected to provide the municipalities with a comprehensive long range land use plan that reduces potential development conflicts, addresses other community concerns and provides a framework for ongoing consultation in areas of mutual interest. An intermunicipal development plan must address:

- the future land use within the area,
- the manner of and the proposals for future development in the area,
- the provision of transportation systems for the area, either generally or specifically,
- proposals for the financing and programming of intermunicipal infrastructure for the area,
- the co-ordination of intermunicipal programs relating to the physical, social and economic development of the area,
- environmental matters within the area, either generally or specifically,
- the provision of intermunicipal services and facilities, either generally or specifically, and
- any other matter related to the physical, social or economic development of the area that the councils consider necessary.

OTHER PROPOSED AMANEDMENTS

The fundamental change to the document has been the reorganization of the sections. The 2010 IDP nested policies under three (3) main sections: 1) conservation issues, 2) development issues and 3) public input into decision-making. This made finding policy specific to a certain part of development, such as roads, difficult. The draft IDP now breaks the policy section of the plan into: 1) land use policies; 2) environmental and lake management; 3) public recreation; 4) infrastructure; and 5) plan implementation.

Plan objectives have been added to the draft to reflect the new requirements outlined in the MMGA. The introduction and public engagement sections were rewritten to reflect the new document and the existing conditions were updated to reflect today's situation.

The main body of the IDP contains the policies, which for the most part remain unchanged, just divided into the new sections. That said a number of policies were removed either

because they were unachievable, did not comply with current policy or did not fall under the jurisdiction of planning. In addition, other policies were removed as they were no longer required or were no longer the goal of the municipalities.

Lastly, new sections were added covering storm water management, road infrastructure and fire management. These are standard considerations for rezoning and subdivision applications and the policies in these new sections are reflective of other IDPs.

LEGISLATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

Section 631 of the Municipal Government Act, RSA 2000 cM-26 (as amended) requires two or more Councils of municipalities with common boundaries to prepare and adopt an Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP) for the purpose of providing more detailed planning direction for development of lands within a common boundary.

An IDP is expected to provide the municipalities with a comprehensive long range land use plan that reduces potential development conflicts, addresses other community concerns and provides a framework for ongoing consultation in areas of mutual interest. An intermunicipal development plan must address:

- the future land use within the area,
- the manner of and the proposals for future development in the area,
- the provision of transportation systems for the area, either generally or specifically,
- proposals for the financing and programming of intermunicipal infrastructure for the area,
- the co-ordination of intermunicipal programs relating to the physical, social and economic development of the area,
- environmental matters within the area, either generally or specifically,
- the provision of intermunicipal services and facilities, either generally or specifically, and
- any other matter related to the physical, social or economic development of the area that the councils consider necessary.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Lacombe County sees the value in engaging the public through a variety of mediums and is committed to open, accountable and responsive decision making, including different levels of engagement with the public as outlined in the Policy AD (40): Public Participation Policy. The appropriate level of engagement for each public participation opportunity should be selected on a project-to-project basis. The levels of engagement within the policy are as follows:

- *Inform*: To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, opportunities and/or solutions.
- *Consult*: To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decisions.
- *Involve*: To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered.
- *Collaborate*: To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.
- *Empower*: To place final decision making in the hands of the public.

A Public Hearing allows members of the public to provide additional input into the draft plan prior to it's adoption.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommend that Council give Third Reading to Bylaw 1302/19 adopting the draft Gull Lake IDP and repealing the current Gull Lake IDP adopted under Bylaw 1124/10.

PREPARED BY: Anita O' Driscoll, Senior Planner
REVIEWED BY: Dale Freitag, Director of Planning Services
REVIEWED BY: Tim Timmons, County Manager

