



Parkland County Municipal Development Plan (MDP) Public Information Sessions Summary

On Wednesday September 13, Thursday September 14, and Wednesday September 20, 2006, from 4pm to 8pm, Parkland County, Lovatt Planning Consultants, and ISL Engineering and Land Services held Public Information Sessions at Parkland Village Community Centre, Jackpine Corner Hall, and Garden Valley Community Centre, respectively. The Information Sessions provided residents with an opportunity to learn about the Municipal Development Plan (MDP) project and provide their feedback on the three growth options.

At the Parkland Village Community Centre location, 35 people signed in, but actual attendance was approximately 38. At the Jackpine Corner Hall location, 36 people signed in, but actual attendance was approximately 41. At the Garden Valley Community Centre location, 84 people signed in, but actual attendance was approximately 90.

To create awareness for the sessions, a black and white advertisement (see Appendix A) was designed by ISL and placed in the Friday, September 1 and Friday, September 8 editions of the Spruce Grove Examiner and Stony Plain Reporter. A colour advertisement (see Appendix B) was posted on the Parkland County website. ISL also provided Parkland County with a copy of the colour ad, as well as a poster-sized copy of the colour ad, for their printing and distribution at locations throughout the County prior to the sessions. Stakeholders on the stakeholder mailing list and previous information session attendees were also mailed an invitation two weeks prior to the information sessions.

At the sessions, attendees received an agenda (see Appendix C) and Key Definitions sheet (see Appendix D). Attendees also received a Participant Response Sheet (see Appendix E) to provide their individual feedback and an Information Booklet (see Appendix F) to assist their participation in the small group discussions (see Appendix G) and completion of the participant response sheets.

The Public Information Sessions provided attendees with an opportunity to talk one-on-one with representatives of the project team and Parkland County. The information sessions featured a formal presentation outlining the MDP process and telephone survey results, as well as descriptions and static displays of the three growth options proposed for the County. The information sessions also featured a group discussion component followed by group presentations.

During the small group discussion component, groups rated each of the three growth options (see Appendix H) and recorded their collective response to their “likes” and “dislikes” of each option (see Appendix I).

Forty-three (43) comment forms were filled out and returned at the Public Information Sessions and, to date, twenty-eight (28) comment forms were received by the County after the information sessions. Five letters and emails were also received by the County after the information sessions.



**Parkland County
Municipal Development Plan (MDP)
Public Information Sessions Summary**

Information Session – Parkland Village – September 13, 2006

Choosing a Growth Option

Growth Management Goal	Growth Options			None do	Don't know
	Status Quo	Dispersed	Cluster		
1. Support Environmental Sustainability	1	2	11	1	1
2. Support Fiscal Sustainability		1	11		2
3. Support Social Sustainability	2	1	10		1
4. Emphasize Economic Development		2	11	2	
5. Respect Community Character	2	2	9	1	1
6. Land Use Certainty	2	3	10		

Your Comments:

- Need better enforcement when it comes to sewage disposal. When permit is granted to increase dogs/horses, etc. on acreage, is the permit being adhered to or do neighbours "act as enforcers"? Are there any requirements for disposal of manure and feces? Water quality and sloughs are a concern. All structures including towers to be applied for deed neighbours should have a say. County should have a communication tower policy. Industry Canada can help. Now there is "free for all" interference in radio waves problem so service could be less effective and small towers are a health issue (see World Health). Very concerned with pollution to our waters and would like to more sewage lines and stricter sewage disposal control.
- I feel that there is no interest in developing a future plan for hamlets. I think that people that own farm land should be able to subdivide their land any way they feel they want to and it should not just be an 80 acre parcel, but one to three acre. People that live in the west of the County feel that the County does not care about how the west feels; I think that we should have joined the County of Brazeau.
- Need far better County control of Sewage disposal, dog/cat/horse guidelines and air, water and land pollution control. Specifically we need stronger enforcement even if more money will have to be spent! Council needs to seriously study the implications of recent proposal to allow 72' unintelligible base unintelligible without permit. This is too serious. Fortunately, Council rejected the proposal, but this issue has both health and communications concerns. Council and administration needs to really become aware of what is at stake. This is really not a land issue. Consider an (unintelligible) an approval of towers in particular low (72') towers.

- It is necessary that good environmental conservation be practiced. Biophysical assessments must be done on all areas. Agricultural subdivision is desirable for agricultural use but must not be used to move to residential subdivision or non-agricultural use. Industrial subdivision should be looking at non-agricultural land and land having minimal ecological value.
- I do not agree with the present zoning as it stands on the lands on the south side of Highway 16 at the intersection of 16 and 43. I feel it puts an irresponsible strangle hold on the options that I have in regards to what I can or cannot do with my own land and the value of that land.
- Re: Parkland County - Dispersed Growth Option map shows a block of industrial/commercial core around highway 16 and 43 intersection area. Note: Proposed Area Structure Plan for sections 9&10-53-2-W5 for industrial/commercial land at the intersection of Highways 16 and 43 was rejected by all affected land owners and turned down by Parkland County Council, dated June 30/2004 file #680-5.
- Drainage is a big issue. Towns, villages and industrial areas causing large run-offs and sandy soil increasing, The water in soil will eventually cause major land erosion in hillsides from stormwater management pond and uncontrolled and poorly established ditches and willy-nilly drainage planning.
- Sustainability is the key word here! Protect our good farmland, wooded areas, wildlife corridors and habitats, water bodies. Make Parkland the #1 example of sustainable living with the smallest "foot print" possible in the Country of Canada (and the world for that matter).
- Favour cluster approach type pf development e.g. single detached, condo, stack-up must be considered. Set backs from major arterial roads, in my opinion is a major issue. Potential annexation by Edmonton and cost implications is a concern. Note: I am opposed to allowing the re-subdivision of existing lots in existing subdivisions.
- I would like to see innovative ideas for families that want to build homes together. A community for young parents and grandparents. Two generations helping each other. The community would focus on good old fashioned living. Two and three acre lots. A community hall and walking trails. Homes to have a central foyer with young parents living on one side and grandparents on the other. Privacy for both families. No more one kitchen!!! We want families to enjoy each other!

Respondent Profile

1. Which information session did you attend? (Check your response.)

Sept. 13	14
Sept. 14	
Sept. 20	

2. What is your interest in this project? (Check one)

An agricultural operator/landowner	5
A residential landowner in Parkland County	6
A commercial business operator/owner in Parkland County	2

An industrial business operator/owner in Parkland County	
Other (please specify):	1
An association/organization representative (please specify):	2

Other:

- Ecologically sensitive- Area Protection

An Association/organization representative:

- Wagner Natural Area Society (Leased Land)
- Community Hall

3. Are you a Parkland County resident?

Yes	10
No	2

If yes, how many years you have lived in Parkland County:

<5	1
5-10	1
11-16	1
17-22	1
23-28	
28+	9

4. Where do you live?

On a farm	6
Country acreage - serviced (piped sewer and water)	
Country acreage - unserviced (well and septic system)	3
Hamlet (please name):	1
Village (please name):	
Town (please name):	
Other (please specify):	3

Hamlet:

- Entwistle

Other:

- Edmonton (x2)
- Commercial Land

5. Please indicate your:

Age	
<19 yrs.	
20-44 yrs.	3
45-64 yrs.	3
65+ yrs.	6

Gender	
Male	6
Female	4



**Parkland County
Municipal Development Plan (MDP)
Public Information Sessions Summary**

Information Session – Jackpine Corner Hall – September 14, 2006

Choosing a Growth Option

Growth Management Goal	Growth Options			None do	Don't know
	Status Quo	Dispersed	Cluster		
1. Support Environmental Sustainability		15	5	1	1
2. Support Fiscal Sustainability		16	3	2	1
3. Support Social Sustainability		17	4		1
4. Emphasize Economic Development		16	4		
5. Respect Community Character		18	3	1	
6. Land Use Certainty		16	3	2	1

Your Comments:

- The dispersed growth option allows those who live in the “west County” more options. Farmland in the west is poor land i.e. clay, and protecting it doesn't make much sense. It would be better to protect the “better quality land” around Stony Plain if the true intention is to preserve farmland. However, most farmers aren't able to make a living on farm any longer anyway.
- I feel the west end of the County's' issues are being ignored. Being just a few miles from Brazeau County we should have the same opportunities regarding subdivision, recreation availability as east end ratepayers do.
- The hamlets in the west are too small to remain as is. They are fading. Opportunity must be equal (east vs. west). Best farmland should be protected, even if it's in the east.
- Quite often a concern was told to wait and listen to see if your question may be answered.
- Would like to see more growth in the west.
- If we are to grow with the surrounding areas we must be allowed to do this. We are not able to grow and the small towns in the west will die if we do not have growth in our areas. Most individuals would not choose to farm, why keep the farmland here when you have to work out to support the farm?
- Poor agricultural land should be able to subdivide.

- *See attached yellow sheet. County has to adhere to their enhancement.
- I am for a balanced County where what is good for the east is good for the west. Without a balanced County (dispersed) the west will go down and the east will become over populated.
- With more subdivisions we are creating of scan economic growth. Someone moving in may have children to go to our schools in the west. More rural people will help keep our small country halls together.
- The west county isn't considered "great" agricultural land thus land was purchased as "insurance". We would want our "insurance" to kick in if necessary, and being able to subdivide and/or diversify could help keep us on our own farms with help of family that builds on this property.
- It is important to have economical and growth in the western part of the county as well as the east. We are also tax payers and we should be included in all types of growth. It is not such an impossible or foreseeable task to make for a substantial residential or commercial growth in the west.
- More attention needs to be paid to west end of county over all. Dispersed is the only option allowing further development in west Parkland County, which is needed to sustain our schools, businesses and lifestyle here. Status quo discriminates against the west!! Residential properties are no longer available around Entwistle. More development is urgently required.
- See enclosed letter
- I think the cluster option has the most advantages and the hamlets can grow that way. It is justified to spend a lot of money on sewage disposal and even water.
- We need more country residential for quality of lifestyle, so children and families can have a safe environment.

Respondent Profile

1. Which information session did you attend? (Check your response.)

Sept. 13	
Sept. 14	22
Sept. 20	

2. What is your interest in this project? (Check one)

An agricultural operator/landowner	12
A residential landowner in Parkland County	10
A commercial business operator/owner in Parkland County	3
An industrial business operator/owner in Parkland County	2
Other (please specify):	
An association/organization representative (please specify):	2

An association/organization representative:

- Entwistle Business Association (x2)

3. Are you a Parkland County resident?

Yes	22
No	

If yes, how many years you have lived in Parkland County:

<5	1
5-10	
11-16	1
17-22	3
23-28	1
28+	16

4. Where do you live?

On a farm	12
Country acreage - serviced (piped sewer and water)	
Country acreage - unserviced (well and septic system)	4
Hamlet (please name):	5
Village (please name):	
Town (please name):	
Other (please specify):	1

Hamlet:

- Entwistle (x5)

Other

- Lakeside cottage

5. Please indicate your:

Age	
<19 yrs.	
20-44 yrs.	5
45-64 yrs.	11
65+ yrs.	6

Gender	
---------------	--

Male	8
Female	3

* We assume that after the adoption of the MDP, the growth study, with the subsequent amendments to the land use bylaws we will be assured that:

- 1) better agricultural lands to be protected for agricultural purposes
- 2) land use and the lifestyles will be protected from intrusive uses: ex. Country residential – class 3 business
- 3) growth, both residential and industrial will be directed to areas that are serviced with water and sewer, and secondary to clustered areas of poor agricultural lands
- 4) sensitive environmental areas will be protected

All of this is fine and noble. It is our option that the present statutes gave the County the means to achieve these goals. But what has happened?

Re: item 1) Council directed the consultant to designate some 8,000 acres of number 1, 3, and 3 soils as Country residential – the Atim Creek Structure Plan. Council subsequently adopted the plan. There are other examples where good agricultural lands have been subdivided. Remedy: include in the MDP and the land use bylaws that number 1, 2, and 3 soils remain agricultural. This will require a firm commitment from Council.

Re: item 4) we question Councils approval for 43 head of cattle per acre below the top of the North Saskatchewan and Pembina River Valleys. Skepticism arises as to the commitment by Council to obey there own enactments and policies. Then, there is the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (SDAB) consisting of three Councillors and three public members. This board is not bound by any Council statues as to subdivisions and developments, except for the specific land use designation. Rightly or wrongly there is a perception that decisions made by board Councillors may be politically motivated.

The lingering result; pass all the laws you want, we Council, and the SDAB will do whatever we please with little or no regard to existing statues.



**Parkland County
Municipal Development Plan (MDP)
Public Information Sessions Summary**

Information Session – Garden Valley Community Centre – September 20, 2006

Choosing a Growth Option

Growth Management Goal	Growth Options			None do	Don't know
	Status Quo	Dispersed	Cluster		
1. Support Environmental Sustainability	10	2	14		4
2. Support Fiscal Sustainability	6	4	12	1	5
3. Support Social Sustainability	11	5	11		3
4. Emphasize Economic Development	5	6	12	1	3
5. Respect Community Character	13	5	9		2
6. Land Use Certainty	9	6	9	3	5

Your Comments:

- Be able to subdivide a quarter into 40 acres or at least 80 acre parcels. To be allowed to have more cell towers or higher towers to help out on some of the extremely dead area.
- Not enough information to make any decision.
- I would like to see limited subdividing in agricultural areas of lots 20 acres or more to allow retiring or near retiring farmers to access extra money that can't be made farming. Also it could be made easier to divide land to children in the families.
- Most of this does not pertain to me at this time (too many uncertainties). All I want is to be able to subdivide parcels of farmland for retirement purposes as well as suitability to family members. The rules for subdivision now are not fair.
- 1. The County should be careful not to sterilize resources (gravel, etc) with subdivision location. 2. Small business should be allowed (especially home based) throughout the County. 3. Dispersed development will allow land owners to maximize income opportunities.
- The County should ensure subdivisions do not stop natural resource extraction or agriculture.
- Have to address how new "clusters" (population) are developed and the options of farmers to retire from proceeds of their properties. The intermingling of cluster and farmland should not lead to curtailing of farming operations.

- There is understandably a need to hybridize between the status quo and cluster options. There needs to be specific policies to allow the succession planning for aging/retiring farmers/agricultural land owners.
- Please revisit the issue of towers for high speed internet as to height and availability. We are in need of high speed internet and a lot of other residents believe the same thing in and around Beau-Rand and area, as 95% will require high speed internet. Cell phones don't even work there – no signal.
- High speed internet service has become a necessity in our society, as have cell phones. I live in Beau Rand Estates where neither is available primarily due to the geographic conditions. Kids need quick response for school researching and adults to carry on daily business. I would like the option available to us. No one has time to sit for an hour waiting for information for the net when it could be instantaneous.
- Landowners should be able to have or build a second dwelling on land to accommodate greater housing diversity to meet needs of aging population, also to allow for child care nanny or family member.
- Needs to be provision on dual residences to accommodate for family needs. Such as aging parents, grandparents, child care. (Mobile home not appealing as stick built home).
- Residential development – there must be a policy/bylaw developed to support and allow for greater housing diversity to meet immediate needs of the aging population and to support new family growth, such as stick dwellings, with options of a trailer (a house is aesthetically more appealing than a trailer – image is not great).
- I'm currently hooked up to high speed with Terra Byte. It would be in my own and our neighbour's best interest to leave or change County of Parkland regulations to leave the tower.
- My purpose in attending this meeting was the issue of high towers RE: broad band service. It is very important for rural land owners to be able to access high speed through these various towers. They must be allowed to be as high as necessary.
- My reason for attending was to support the use of higher towers for high speed internet service.
- I attended this meeting because I am concerned about receiving wireless internet. It is important that the height of the (unintelligible) tower is accurate to maintain good reception.
- Key feature regarding status quo (number 1). It seems to us that this point suggests that the County has enough land currently for the next 25 years to expand without having to pursue land else where. However, we feel strongly that allowances must be made for farmers who have owned and farmed land for a lengthy period of time, for example, for at least 10 years or more. We refer to farmers being given the liberty to provide legacies to their children, regardless whether it is a one acre parcel or more. 1. Introduce strong strict policies to ensure environmental sustainability.
- I am in support of raising height of communication towers in the County as required due to growth of needs, etc.
- The cluster is the best option although I would not like to see excessive development.
- I could only attend this from 4:00-5:00 pm, so I missed the information and workshop sessions. I was disappointed in that I thought the displays would show examples of future "projected" growth happenings as to areas for residential, industrial, etc. Concentration from the County's "eyes" this would help one in better helping in growth management goals.

- Clusters should have piped water and sewer with appropriate user fees, should have east access to a major highway and should not be located in environmentally sensitive areas, particularly riparian areas. Does the County have a riparian land management plan?
- There are a wide range of opinions in this County. Good management of any new plan is essential.
- The reason I attended the MDP Session was to relate our concerns for a change to the LUB in respect to the tower height issue. I am a customer of Tera-byte wireless and feel their concerns are justified. Their services are imperative in our areas no one else provides high speed internet service. Today this is a must.
- TAU wants to make it worse by closing roads. Emergency vehicles need to have better access in Keephills areas. Protect water well, river, lakes. Preserve all farmland.
- Agree with “clusters” where water and sewer is available. Would like to see more options for subdivision of agricultural land, especially that farmland from Highway 43 to the eastern edge of the County.
- We must keep agriculture land. Protect all potable water. Emergency vehicles need better access in Keephills area. Closing the roads TAU wants too will make it worse.
- Future water and septic lines to acreages. Review of land use policy i.e. subdividing acreage lots and building on parking lots. Review population in areas not having water or septic.
- Many of the proposed changes do not support our rural lifestyle. Would not like to see current acreage developments allowed to “re-subdivide” i.e. divided into smaller parcels and or existing municipal reserves to be subdivided. Maybe we need a review of current land use policies. Highly in favour of proposal put forth around seniors housing in rural area(s) of the County.
- 1. Meet your goals. Do not compromise goals #5 and #6 in an attempt to meet goal #2.
2. Revenue and tax generation should not unduly affect other considerations. 3. Subdivision authority must allow earlier notification to affected parties.

Respondent Profile

1. Which information session did you attend? (Check your response.)

Sept. 13	
Sept. 14	
Sept. 20	33

2. What is your interest in this project? (Check one)

An agricultural operator/landowner	14
A residential landowner in Parkland County	18
A commercial business operator/owner in Parkland County	
An industrial business operator/owner in Parkland County	3
Other (please specify):	4
An association/organization representative (please specify):	2

Other:

- Retail Country Store
- Land developer
- Residential (x2)

An association/organization representative (please specify):

- Chairman – Committee on Keephills Environment
- Keephills Community Association and Committee on Keephills Environment

3. Are you a Parkland County resident?

Yes	32
No	1

If yes, how many years you have lived in Parkland County:

<5	3
5-10	5
11-16	4
17-22	2
23-28	1
28+	16

4. Where do you live?

On a farm	12
Country acreage - serviced (piped sewer and water)	
Country acreage - unserviced (well and septic system)	16
Hamlet (please name):	1
Village (please name):	
Town (please name):	1
Other (please specify):	4

Hamlet:

- Duffield

Town:

- Stony Plain

Other:

- Spruce Grove
- Edmonton
- Acreage – cistern (x2)

5. Please indicate your:

Age	
<19 yrs.	
20-44 yrs.	3
45-64 yrs.	23
65+ yrs.	7

Gender	
Male	12
Female	6

***Other Comments from Letters and Emails Received:**

Due to the length of some letters that were received they were not included in this summary however all of the emails and letters that were received were distributed to Council for consideration.

- We have a small farm north of Drayton Valley. First of all, the reason we missed the meeting at the Jack Pine Hall on Sept. 14th, was because we didn't see an advertisement until later. When I inquired how people were notified, I was told that it was advertised in the Reporter 2 or 3 times. We now have to drive 10 miles out of our way to receive it, and then take a chance that there is one left - and to tell you the truth, it isn't worth my trouble, unless I want to know everything about Stony Plain or Spruce Grove. What about some advertising in the Reporter, on what is happening at the west end of Parkland - in Tomahawk, Entwistle, Seba Beach? Why not advertise some important events that might affect the west end of Parkland, in Drayton Valley's Western Review? Why not use e-mail to contact some of your west-end residents, if mailing is too expensive? We do live in your county, after all, and a lot of us have e-mail! Secondly, it is quite ironical that in the Stony Plain area there is a lot of development going on, in the way of acreages and yet at this end of Parkland, we are limited to agriculture and one 3-acre parcel being divided off. My husband and I were born and raised in the Keephills and Stony Plain area and both our families are still in the area. My mom and brother still live on a farm 6 miles South West of Stony Plain, and I know how many acreages have sprung up in the area in the last 10 or more years, in PRIME AGRICULTURAL LAND. Our land, at this end of Parkland, is not as fertile, in fact, according to "Alberta Agriculture" it is "poor agricultural land, suitable for forage". As well, our growing season is about 10 days shorter and we traditionally get 1 crop of hay, rather than 2. Also, because there is a housing crisis in Drayton Valley, people would like the opportunity to move out to acreages, in the country. Farmers would have a chance to make some money on their land, by subdividing, because farming is no longer a viable occupation. So, why are we being limited, in regards to subdividing? Why do we not have the same privilege to sub divide as other areas in Parkland, when our land is not as fertile and our growing season is shorter? Thirdly, we bought our land in 1977. It was already subdivided because Highway 22, going to Drayton Valley, runs right through the original quarter. Since then, more land has been taken when they straightened secondary highway 624, where it meets up with Highway 22. Therefore, are we entitled to subdivide our property further, if we want, even though it has had previous subdivisions? We have 3 daughters that might want to stay in the area - with the present policy; we can't even give them a piece of land, legally. Thank you for your attention to this matter and obviously we would like changes to the land use policy, especially as it pertains to the west end of Parkland. We would like the same opportunities to subdivide as in Graminia, Carvel, north of Hwy16A to Hwy 633, Rosenthal, Spring Lake areas etc.
- We currently own farmland west of Stony Plain. We would like to subdivide and were told by Planning and Development that this is not possible, as the section we are living on is zoned as agricultural, and has been subdivided once already. We would like you to consider rezoning this area. The economy is growing rapidly at this time, and we have many residential lands and subdivisions surrounding our property already. We would like the option of being able to subdivide in the future.
- The six 'Growth Management Goals' are well stated, however as evidenced in past history, goal four often seems to conflict with the other five goals. It is important for the County administration, Subdivision Authority and Council to accomplish these goals during decision making. As part of Parkland County's vision for the future the Subdivision Authority must be open and allow earlier notification to affected parties in order to allow for timely responses to be submitted. Our subdivision, established in 1978, is a pocket of

rural acreages with lots predominantly more than ten acres. The character of this subdivision is clearly established and this is acknowledged by the County of Parkland's stated General Regulations. It is important that known and accepted relationships be maintained. For example, respecting community character and land use certainty. Dividing existing lots does not meet these goals. Within concentrated areas of subdivision development water supply and private sewage systems are a real concern. Allowance of additional subdivisions (especially those with very small lot sizes) impacts on neighbours with existing water wells. Whatever key choice is option, or combination thereof is chosen, it is important that this choice does not negatively impact on existing residences.

*Please note that comments that may reveal the identity of the respondent have not been included in the above comments.