

MINUTES

MUNICIPAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Mountain View County

Minutes of the **Municipal Planning Commission** held on **December 2, 2010**, in the Council Chamber, 1408 Twp Rd. 320, Didsbury, AB

PRESENT: G. Harris; Member-At-Large / Vice Chair  
K. Branter; Member-At-Large  
W. Davies; Member-At-Large  
L. Schafer; Member-At-Large  
B. Orr; Council  
P. Munro; Council  
K. Good; Council

IN ATTENDANCE: N. Petherick; Manager of Planning Services  
S. Madge; Manager of Development & Permitting Services  
S. McInnis; Director of Operational Services  
K. Bellamy; Technical Services Manager  
J. Ross; Development Officer  
C. Banack; Planner  
C. Keleman; Recording Secretary

CALL TO ORDER: G. Harris called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m.

AGENDA Moved by K. Branter  
MPC 10-205 That the Municipal Planning Commission adopt the agenda of the Municipal Planning Commission meeting of December 2, 2010 as amended to move item 8.1 to 9.2. Carried

ADOPTION OF MINUTES Moved by L. Schafer  
MPC 10-206 That the Municipal Planning Commission adopt the minutes of the Municipal Planning Commission meeting of November 18, 2010 as presented. Carried

PLSD20090000169  
Olds Didsbury Airport  
SE 5-32-1-5 Plan 0712617 Block 1 Lot 1;  
SE 5-32-1-5 Plan 0712617 Block 1 Lot 20-22;  
SE 5-32-1-5 Plan 0712617 Block 1 Lots 27-35

Planning and Development Services presented an overview of a proposed subdivision located at the Olds Didsbury Airport, This application was heard by the Municipal Planning Commission on November 18, 2010, where a motion was made to defer the application to the December 2, 2010 Municipal Planning Commission meeting, and that the Director of Operations for Mountain View County, and the Chairperson or representative for the Mountain View County Airport Committee be requested to attend that meeting.

Planning & Development Services provided a brief review of the application such as the site photos, proposed subdivision lots map and specific information to the application as follows:

- To create 24 parcels ranging in size between 0.13 acres and .37 acres contained within SE 5-32-1-5.
- The subject lands are currently designated Airport District (S-AP) in the Mountain View County Land Use Bylaw 10/10. The lands are also affected by the Airport Protection Zone Overlay of the land use bylaw.
- As requested at the November 18, 2010 Municipal Planning Commission meeting, additional information was presented regarding:
  1. Proposed interim servicing strategy and rationale
    - Applicant is proposing individual ground water wells with holding tanks to accommodate sewage.
    - Preferred servicing solution for long term is connections to regional water and waste water services.
    - This is supported by Municipal Development Plan and Airport Area Structure Plan.
    - Recommending as a condition of approval that necessary easements are obtained.
    - Should full services become available, existing landowners and development will be required to connect as specified in a restrictive covenant on title.
  2. Lot configuration and sizes
    - Market demand is for smaller lot sizes.
    - This design is represents significant size reductions from existing lot layout.
    - Each proposed parcels offers separate ground-side and air-side access which is important for safe airport operations.
    - Lot sizes are large enough to accommodate development and safe operation of Code B Aircraft.
    - Considering all setback requirements, no further reduction of lot sizes is recommended.
  3. Limitations on groundwater supply evaluation
    - After reviewing the evaluation again, it was noted that based on historical development patterns in typical hangar development, it is anticipated that ground water utilization will be relatively low.
    - General summation is that based on existing and projected demand, water availability will support users.
    - The Ground Water Supply evaluation is accepted by Planning & Development Services as submitted.
  4. Hazard Assessment
    - Airport hazards will be best addressed in the airport operations manual that is currently being developed by the Mountain View County Airport Advisory Committee.
    - What is required is outlined by Transport Canada.

5. Emergency Management Plan

- A Fire Protection Plan was prepared by the applicant and circulated to the local fire authority and has been accepted.
  
- Based on concerns of MPC, Planning & Development Services is recommending some adjustments to the conditions of approval.
- Review of changes to Conditions 2, 10, and 15.
- Planning & Development Services has deemed the property suitable for the intended use.

Municipal Planning Commission discussed the following:

- Clarification that there is room on each lot to accommodate a well, but a majority of landowners/users are not likely to drill/need a well.
- Having the infrastructure in place for future connections to regional services. Staff reiterated that an interim servicing plan and all the necessary right of ways exist to provide these utilities in the future, but at this time there is not be enough users or demand to warrant the cost of installing the infrastructure.
- Clarification that any development at the Airport is discretionary. Any applications that involve high usage of water will be dealt with at the development permit stage.
- Clarification that Ground Water Supply Evaluation is based on household demand of 1250 m3 per lot.
- Access to accommodate emergency vehicles. Staff pointed out that the approach to the east will be upgraded at outlined in Condition 2.
- Clarification that the handling of chemicals as per all applicable Federal and Provincial statutes is included in a restrictive covenant as outlined in Condition 15.

Applicant discussed the following:

- Steve McInnis of Operational Services, Mountain View County, stated that when examining the need for services, they looked at the requirement/demand of future owners/users and also looked at what comparable airports offered.
- There is currently a waiting list of over 60 potential customers for the site. 50% of potential customers indicated that they were not interested in servicing for lots, as it becomes unaffordable.
- Only one lot is fully serviced at this time.
- Clarification that fire water supply is depicted in the Fire Management Plan. At this time supply is through tank trucks. Disasters are a completely different scenario.
- Clarification that there are currently 25-30 individual hangars at the airport, and 4 washrooms – including one in the terminal. Only one building is occupied full time, while one is

used seasonally and the other approximately ten times per year.

- Currently De-icing is not a service provided or procedure practiced at the Olds Didsbury Airport. Aircraft de-icing is usually only performed on commercial aircraft with scheduled flights as it is cost prohibitive for recreational aircraft users. It is felt that an aircraft de-icing area is not needed at this time.
- Since the project is dealing with taxpayers dollars, the business plan is to recover cost investment for each phase.
- Clarification that there is a storm water management pond planned for the site.
- Clarification that containment of contaminants will be built into the Emergency Management Plan.
- Stated that regulations for airports are not much different than those of any industrial area.

MPC 10-207 Moved by K. Branter  
That the Municipal Planning Commission approve the proposed subdivision to create twenty four (24) parcels ranging in size between 536 m<sup>2</sup> (0.13 acres) and 1,490 m<sup>2</sup> (.37 acres) contained within SE 5-32-1-5 Plan 0712617 Block 1 Lot 1; SE 5-32-1-5 Plan 0712617 Block 1 Lot 27-35 as indicated in the Tentative Plan of Subdivision (Attachment 01) subject to the following conditions:

Standard Conditions:

1. The approval fee of \$9,600 shall be paid to Mountain View County within 30 days from the date of this notice of decision.
2. The applicant shall construct/upgrade approaches from the municipal road to the proposed and residual lots. All new and existing approaches shall be constructed/upgraded in accordance with the engineering plans and specifications as approved by Mountain View County Operational Services. The applicant shall construct/upgrade a secondary approach on Bergen Road for the purposes of emergency access to the proposed subdivision and the Olds-Didsbury Airport in accordance with Mountain View County standards.
3. n/a
4. Subdivision to be effected by an instrument acceptable to the Land Titles Office (Plan of Survey).
5. Cash in lieu of municipal reserves are to be paid to Mountain View County within 30 days from the date of this notice of decision. Approximately .68 acres are owing and at a rate of \$2,491.58 per acre, therefore \$1,694.27 is owing to the County. This figure will be subject to confirmation upon receipt of the final plan of survey.

Standard Conditions if Applicable:

6. n/a
7. A qualified surveyor shall prepare a Utility Right of Way Plan (UROW) and the applicant shall enter into a General Utility easement Agreement with Mountain View County for the purposes of accommodating shallow utilities, drainage improvements, backsloping on the proposed lots and the potential alignment of future water and wastewater services. The UROW Plan shall be in accordance with approved engineering plans and specifications.
8. N/A.
9. N/A
10. The applicant shall submit the following report(s), plans and specifications prepared by a qualified professional to the satisfaction of Mountain View County and relevant provincial authorities.

a. Final Engineering Plans and Specifications/Construction Drawings. These are required in support of your application to establish the parameters for the construction of improvements associated with the proposed development. Engineering plans and specifications must be completed by qualified professional engineer accredited by APEGGA and include following:

- Cover Sheet(s);
- Clearing and Grading Drawings;
- Roads, apron, and taxiway drawings;
- Traffic Control and Signage Drawing;
- Water Distribution Drawing (if applicable);
- Water Distribution Disinfection and Flushing Drawing (if applicable);
- Sanitary Wastewater Drawing (if applicable);
- Storm Wastewater Drawing - Major/Minor System;
- Storm Wastewater Drawing – Minor System;
- Shallow Utilities Drawing (power, gas, cable, phone, lighting etcetera);
- Building Grade Drawing;
- Erosion Control and Sedimentation Drawing.
- Emergency Access (approach and fencing provisions) from Bergen Road

These plans and specifications shall be prepared in accordance with Policy/Procedure 4009, the Olds Didsbury Airport and Mountain View County Airpark Area Structure Plan (Bylaw 26/06) and in accordance with the following reports and technical information (i) Preliminary plans and specifications (June 2010); (ii) Groundwater Supply Evaluation (iii) Fire Protection Plan; (iv) Stormwater Management Plan (v) Transport Canada 312 4<sup>th</sup> Edition –

Aerodrome Standards and Recommended Practices. Constructions Specifications can be found on our website at:

[http://www.mountainviewcounty.com/media/docs/Design\\_Guidelines\\_General\\_Construction\\_Specification.pdf](http://www.mountainviewcounty.com/media/docs/Design_Guidelines_General_Construction_Specification.pdf)

Circulation of the shallow utilities plan is required to appropriate utility companies for review and approval. All additional easements, right of ways, and restrictive covenants necessary to support approved plans and specifications shall be prepared and submitted by the applicant for concurrent registration with the subdivision. The review and approval of engineering plans and specifications in support of the proposed development shall be the responsibility of Mountain View County Operational Services.

11. n/a
12. The applicant shall make suitable arrangements with Corporate Services department of Mountain View County to acquire, assign and post rural addresses for the proposed and residual lots in accordance with the rural addressing bylaw. The applicant shall provide confirmation in this regard.
13. n/a;
14. n/a;

Additional Conditions:

15. The applicant shall enter into a restrictive covenant in accordance with Section 651.1 of the Municipal Government Act. The restrictive covenant shall affect all parcels as identified on the conditionally approved tentative plan. The restrictive covenant shall address:
  - Protection of apron and taxiway setback requirements
  - Protection of stormwater drainage improvements
  - Overview of interim servicing requirements and restrictions
  - Overview of interim servicing decommissioning responsibilities
  - Overview of fire protection requirements and responsibilities
  - Overview of building envelopes, lot grading requirements and height limitations
  - Required compliance with policies of Airport Operations Manual, Hazard Assessment, Emergency Management Plan.
  - Required compliance with all applicable Federal and Provincial Statutes pertaining to aerodrome operations and chemical storage/handling.

This agreement shall be registered via caveat on the affected titles.

MPC 10- 208 Moved by K. Branter

That the Municipal Planning Commission recommend to Council that a detailed hazard assessment and emergency management plan be prepared for those lands affected by the Olds Didsbury Airport and Mountain View County Airpark Area Structure Plan (Bylaw 26/06) as part of the 2011 budget process.

Carried

RDSD20100000041  
SE 15-32-2-5

Planning and Development Services presented an overview of a proposed subdivision located at SE 15-32-2-5, and provided information as introduced in the agenda package, such as the location map, aerial photos and site photos.

Planning and Development Services provided specific information to the application as follows:

- Subdivision to create one 39.7 acre parcel.
- Subject parcel contains a yard site that includes a dwelling, a shop with a suite, sheds and horse shelters. The balance of the quarter contains 3 small Country Residential parcels and the remainder is undeveloped.
- The reasons for the portion selected for subdivision:
  - The west boundary follows the Rosebud river and seasonally wet area.
  - Allows for access for north portion of quarter section.
- The parcel can be considered “fragmented” from the balance of the quarter due to the seasonally wet area running alongside the Rosebud River across the quarter.
- The seasonally wet area that has resulted in land that has pugging and hummocking occurring and therefore, not great farm land. This area is recommended for environmental protection as outlined in Condition 13.
- There is an unreclaimed gravel pit of approximately 8 acres located on the quarter, to the west of the proposed parcel. This pit has not been in use since at least 1990. Unfortunately there is no record of the operations of this pit in any historical files. Operational Services believes the County operated the pit for awhile at some point and time. Planning and Development Services is recommending that the Municipal Planning Commission make a motion to Council that Council adds the gravel pit to the County database for reclamation planning and accounting in order to ensure that the pit is properly reclaimed.
- Mountain View County can request a reclamation certificate, but ultimately, Alberta Environment will determine the need.
- There are no wells or pipelines of concern.
- No objections received from Adjacent Landowners or Referral Agencies during the circulation period, however 3 adjacent landowners did drop off an objection letter shortly before the redesignation Public Hearing. The main concerns of the

adjacent landowners include the fact that this quarter is not on a collector road, the area is good farm land, that the Rosebud should not be considered a fragmenting feature, and that there are already 3 subdivisions out of the quarter. Because the letter was received shortly before the Public Hearing, the letter was not circulated to the landowners for a response.

- Planning & Development Services has deemed the proposal suitable for the intended use.

Municipal Planning Commission discussed the following:

- Clarification of access point to gravel pit and north west portion of quarter – i.e. via south west portion and crossing over river.
- Clarification that construction of crossing and operation time of gravel pit is very unclear.
- Clarification that as per current bylaws, this is the last time this quarter could be subdivided.
- The multi-lot subdivision on the quarter was done in 2005 under the previous Municipal Development Plan.
- Fragmented Parcels. Planning & Development services provided a review of Policy 6008-01 regarding guidelines for consideration of fragmented parcels.
- Clarification of Condition 13 and the area to be protected by the restrictive covenant and what protection means – i.e. no development, no recreational ATV use, and use of riparian fencing if used for grazing.
- Follow-up of Condition 13. Staff stated that this is a challenge and often complaint driven.

Applicant discussed the following:

- Lawrence McLeod clarified the layout of the quarter section and its' wet areas.
- Besides the Rosebud River, there is another creek in the north section of the quarter.
- The north east section of quarter is all wet area.
- There is grazable land in the northwest corner of the quarter, but the land is very sandy.
- To the best of his knowledge, the culverted river crossing was put in by Mountain View County at the start of gravel operations.

Moved by L. Schafer

MPC 10-209

That the Municipal Planning Commission approve the proposed subdivision, one (1) thirty nine point seven (39.7) acre parcel within SE 15-32-2-5, submitted by MCLEOD, Lawrence & Mary Ann, RDS2010000041, subject to the following conditions:

Standard Conditions:

1. The approval fee of \$ 400.00 shall be paid to Mountain View County within 30 days from the date of this notice of decision.
2. The applicant shall construct/upgrade approaches from the municipal road to the proposed and residual lots. All new and existing approaches shall be constructed/upgraded in accordance with the construction specifications of Mountain View County.
3. Payment of property taxes in arrears shall be made to Mountain View County.
4. Subdivision to be effected by an instrument acceptable to the Land Titles Office (Descriptive Plan or/Plan of Survey).
5. Municipal Reserves
  - (1) Agricultural Parcels, Low Density Rural Residential Development (Less than five (5) titles per quarter section):
    - a. No reserves required pursuant to Section 663(b) of the Municipal Government Act; or
    - b. N/A
    - c. N/A
    - d. N/A
  - (2) N/A

Standard Conditions if Applicable:

6. N/A
7. N/A
8. A Real Property Report shall be prepared by a qualified Alberta Land Surveyor showing that the setbacks of main structures in relation to proposed and existing property lines are in compliance the County's current Land Use Bylaw.
9. The surveyor shall include on the Real Property Report, confirmation that the existing water well and the private sewage treatment system that services the existing development is completely contained and shown to be within the proposed property boundaries. If any portion of the existing private sewage treatment system is situated closer than 90 meters of an existing or proposed property line confirmation shall be provided from a Safety Codes Officer that the sewage system complies with the regulations as outlined in the current Alberta Private Sewage Systems Standard of Practice. Where not in compliance, the applicant shall undertake improvements to the sewage system to comply with the current Alberta Private Sewage Systems Standard of Practice and provide

confirmation in this regard to the satisfaction of Mountain View County.

- 10. N/A
- 11. N/A
- 12. The applicant shall make suitable arrangements with Corporate Services department of Mountain View County to acquire, assign and post rural addresses for the proposed and residual lots in accordance with the rural addressing bylaw. The applicant shall provide confirmation in this regard.
- 13. The applicant shall enter into a restrictive covenant in accordance with Section 651.1 of the Municipal Government Act. The restrictive covenant shall affect the area surrounding the Rosebud River as identified on the conditionally approved tentative plan for the purposes of Environmental Protection. Mountain View County shall draft the agreement and prepare supportive schedules,  
  
This agreement shall be registered via caveat on the affected titles.

Carried

MPC 10-210 Moved by L. Schafer

That the Municipal Planning Commission recommend to Council that the unreclaimed gravel pit and the access road, including the crossing over the Rosebud River, be included in the County's unreclaimed gravel pit database for reclamation planning and accounting purposes.

Carried

Recess at 10:32 am.  
Reconvene at 10:48 am.

K. Branter declared a pecuniary interest to application PLDP20100000305 because he has a business connection with the applicant. He left the table at 10:49 a.m. and then left Council Chambers and then joined the gallery.

PLDP20100000305  
SE 26-33-5-5

Planning and Development Services presented an overview of a proposed Natural Resource Extraction (gravel pit) development located at SE 26-33-5-5, and provided information as introduced in the agenda package, such as the location map, aerial photos and site photos.

Planning and Development Services provided specific information to the application as follows:

- The proposed pit size is 11 hectares (27.18 acres) and is intended to be operated on a seasonal basis over the next 10 to 20 years. The estimated annual sales volume is between 20,000 and 40,000 tonnes. It should be noted that when the

application was originally submitted the proposal was for a 63.63 hectares (157.25 acres) wet extraction pit, however the application became amended after original submission to decrease the size to the now proposed 11 ha (27.18 ac) dry extraction pit.

- Zoning is Agricultural. The proposed pit will remain Agricultural District should approval be granted and the applicant is also reclaiming the land back to agricultural use after the gravel is extracted.
- The proposed site area is predominantly flat.
- Site location is in Eagle Hill community.
- The proposed gravel pit area is not located within an ESA area. The proposed area for disturbance is located approximately 0.75 miles from the Red Deer River and after discussions with Alberta Environment is not a concern as it is not directly adjacent to the river and there is sufficient vegetative buffering.
- There are pipelines located on the property. The pipeline company (Bonavisa Petroleum Ltd.) directly adjacent to the pit area has provided an agreement with the applicant to provide a 30 meter buffer to the pipeline right of way.
- There is an existing burn pit of approximately 0.25 acres in size located on the property.
- It is anticipated that there will be a temporary weigh scale brought into the pit area in the second phase of extraction.
- The applicant was required to conduct a public consultation which consisted of landowners within a half mile radius of the proposed gravel pit. There were two adjacent landowner consultations as the applicant amended the original application submitted due to the first circulation's adjacent landowner objection responses received and additional requirements requested by Planning and Development. Both consultations were by mail out conducted by Mountain View County. There were a total of 70 signatures of opposition received as a result of the two adjacent landowner consultations. Concerns are the following:
  1. Contamination of Groundwater
  2. Flooding or river re-channelling
  3. Truck traffic along River Road
  4. Dust
  5. Noise
  6. Safety concerns with the development being too close to the
  7. Concerns with the development being abandoned before reclamation is complete
  8. Negative impact on wildlife
  9. Closest resident (Mr. & Mrs. Weatherbee)
  10. Loss of agricultural land
  11. Viability of project
  12. Decrease to property values
  13. Bond of \$500,000 - \$900,000 to ensure compliance of all conditions imposed requested by Mr. & Mrs. Weatherbee.
- Proposed Trucking/ Haul Route is as follows; from the existing approach, south along Range Road 51 to Township Road 334, then east to Range Road 45 then south to Highway 27. The

applicant states within their pit operations plan that the truck traffic generated by the pit will vary depending on the season and market demand. The summer months (June to September) will generate the majority of the traffic due to construction season.

- The applicant will be required to enter into a Road Use Agreement / Haul Route Agreement and provide security to ensure any road improvements of the subject roads.
- The Road Use Agreement also specifies that dust control shall be provided on all graveled surfaced roads during haul periods for the safety of the traveling public.
- The landowner will be required to enter into a Road Use Agreement with the County for the approved haul route. This Road Use Agreement requires the applicant to submit a Letter of Credit to be held in trust by the County until such time that it is required to be drawn upon to maintain any deficiencies with the roads caused by the pit operators.
- The hours of operation for the proposed pit are 12 hour days. It is recommended that the pit operations occur from 7am to 7pm to be consistent with previous recommended conditions. The Department would also recommend to the Municipal Planning Commission that no pit activities shall occur on Sundays and statutory holidays in an effort to balance the negative impacts from the pit within the existing community.

Municipal Planning Commission discussed the following:

- Clarification of location of existing gravel pits within a 5 mile radius.
- Reclamation plan – whose jurisdiction is it, elevation change at site (5:1 slope proposed as per Gravel Pit Code of Practice), and use of land after reclamation.
- Clarification of reclamation process. It is Alberta Environments responsibility when pit is over 12.5 acres.
- 2005 flood levels – did it reach this quarter the proposed gravel pit? No files indicate so.
- Type of dust control – Calcium chloride as recommended in Road Haul Agreement.
- Clarification of location and grade of burn bit.
- Clarification that approval conditions are forwarded to Alberta Environment.
- Mining of gravel to .3 metres above water table.
- The economic impact of this application on other pit operations. Staff reminded MPC that this is not their purview.
- Clarification that no Traffic Impact Assessment was completed.
- Clarification of proposed haul route and haul routes for other pits in the area.
- Cumulative effect of road use on route already being used by 2 other gravel pits. Safety of haul route.
- Type of road preferred for gravel haul routes – gravel is quicker and less expensive to maintain than chip seal.
- Acknowledgement of receipt of letters of objection.

Public commented on the following:

- Larry & Leslie Weatherbee commented on their experience of the effects of the 2005 Red Deer River flood near their property (acreage on the subject quarter).

Moved By W. Davies

MPC 10-211 That the Municipal Planning Commission refuse the proposed Natural Resource Extraction - Gravel Pit in accordance with the Land Use Bylaw and the submitted application, within SE 26-33-5-5 submitted by Rick Martin Trucking Ltd., Development Permit PLDP20100000305 for the following reasons:

1. Traffic Impact Assessment has not been completed.
2. Concern for possible contamination of Groundwater
3. Accumulative impact of truck traffic along proposed haul route.
4. Safety of users along proposed haul route
5. Proposed reclamation plan grade will not be conducive to future agricultural uses.
6. Impact on the nature and quality of life for surrounding land owners.
7. Impact on adjacent environmentally significant areas.

Carried

K. Branter re-joined the table at 12:14 pm.

CORRESPONDENCE

Information Items

MPC 10-212

Moved by K. Branter

That the Municipal Planning Commission receive the following items as information:

- a) SDAB Notice of Decision – Carlyle / Chong
- b) ASDAA Agenda from November 17, 2010
- c) Permitted Use Development Permits Approved

Carried

LAND USE & SUBDIVISION TRENDS

Information Item

As a request by a member of the Municipal Planning Commission, Planning and Development Services presented data which identifies subdivision trends and the types of land use pressures throughout Mountain View County.

Date shows the following general observations on land use and subdivision pressures since the inception of the Municipal Development Plan (Bylaw 17/07).

1. The majority of redesignation applications for the purposes of subdivision are primarily for agricultural uses and country residential development. Taken, together, these redesignation application types account for approximately 94 % of all redesignation applications that have been received since the adoption of the Municipal Development Plan. The largest amount of land use change has occurred as a result of land use redistricting to an Agricultural (2) district. This trend

highlights the significant pressures on the land base for the creation of small scale agricultural parcels.

2. The greatest amount of subdivision applications have been for the creation of country residential and agricultural parcels accounting for 97% of all subdivision applications received since the adoption of the Municipal Development Plan. The total amount of land approved for the subdivision of agricultural parcels has been 3,493.17 acres. The total amount of land approved for the creation of country residential parcels has been 1,036.26 acres. The average size of an approved agricultural parcel has been 35.64 acres. The average size of an approved country residential parcel has been 3.97 acres.
3. 175 country residential subdivision applications have been approved since the adoption of the Municipal Development Plans. The breakdown on approved country residential subdivision applications is as follows:
  - 74.86% were for single CR parcels
  - 7.43% were for two CR parcels
  - 11.43% were for three CR parcels
  - 5.14% were for four CR parcels
  - 1.14% was for greater than five CR parcels

Average parcel sizes on approved country residential subdivision approvals for two (2) to four (4) parcels are significantly smaller than average parcel sizes for approved single country residential parcels.

4. Land use and subdivision pressures vary throughout the County with increasing land use pressures and subdivision activity in proximity to urban centres, and major transportation corridors. The greatest amount of redesignation and subdivision activity is situated west of Highway 2.

Municipal Planning Commission discussed the following:

- The possibility of a similar report being done for development in Mountain View County.

ADJOURNMENT

MPC 10-213

Moved by K. Branter

That the Municipal Planning Commission of December 2, 2010 be adjourned 1:59 p.m.

Carried.

*Adopted on December 16, 2010.*

*Original signed copy at Mountain View County office.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

I hereby certify these minutes are correct.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Director of Planning and Development