



Planning Project Prioritization Policy C-322 Amendments

Electoral Division: All

File: Policy C-322

|             |                              |
|-------------|------------------------------|
| Date:       | October 8, 2024              |
| Presenter:  | Andrew Chell, Senior Planner |
| Department: | Planning                     |

REPORT SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present for Council’s consideration of revisions to the draft Area Structure Plan Priority Policy C-322. Administration presented proposed amendments to Council on July 23, 2024, and Council directed that Administration make several changes to the draft Policy. Administration has revised the draft Policy for Council’s consideration. A ranking list of future ASP projects and supporting implementation documents (master plans and bylaws) is also attached to the revised Policy, which was created using the new ranking criteria set out in the Policy. The revised Policy and ranking list are set out in Attachment A.

The revisions to the proposed Policy C-322 amendments include the removal of several procedural items from the Policy, including the detailed scoring matrix which Administration will use to assess projects by. The updated Policy is simplified to focus on project eligibility for ranking and the criteria which projects should be ranked against; procedural matters that were contained in the previous iteration of the revised Policy will be relocated to an administrative procedure.

Council is not bound by the ranking list in Attachment A, but may use this list to guide Administration’s workplan in 2025. A further motion is provided for Council to direct Administration to create terms of reference and budget requests for projects it wishes to see commence in 2025. Administration has determined that it initially has capacity to add one County-led ASP project and one developer-led ASP project to its 2025 workplan.

An alternative ranking list produced using the existing Policy C-322 was presented to Council on September 24, 2024, and the item was tabled pending further consideration of this revised Policy. If Council is not supportive of this revised Policy and ranking list, it may alternatively approve the tabled ranking list and direct Administration’s 2025 workplan based on that list.

ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council approve amendments to Council’s Area Structure Plan Priority Policy (C-322), and the associated ranking list established from the Policy’s criteria, as set out in Attachment A.

THAT Council direct Administration to create terms of reference and budget requests for the following:

- Conrich ASP Review project;
- Beacon AI Hub ASP project.

BACKGROUND

Area Structure Plan Priority Policy C-322 was originally adopted on June 10, 2014. The Policy outlines a process for evaluating the review and creation of Area Structure Plans, according to a set of evaluation criteria. Since 2014, changes to the County’s planning context and Council’s strategic priorities warrant an update to the way the County prioritizes its land use planning projects.

## Planning Project Prioritization Policy C-322 Amendments

---

Administration presented a draft amendment to Policy C-322 that updated the evaluation criteria and ranking process to better reflect the need for Planning projects and alignment with Council's strategic priorities. After considering the item, Council referred the proposed amendments back to Administration to revise the draft policy to reflect the comments made at the July 23, 2024, Council meeting.

At the same meeting on July 23, 2024, Council directed Administration to bring forward a ranking list under the existing Policy C-322. This was presented to Council on September 24, 2024, and subsequently tabled until a the revised Policy and ranking list in Attachment A has been presented for consideration.

### ANALYSIS

---

The intent of Policy C-322 is to provide a clear framework for evaluation and prioritization of the County's land use plans. The existing Policy C-322 prioritizes only Area Structure Plans. The proposed Policy C-322 update would prioritize not only Area Structure Plans, but all statutory plans, as well as County-initiated Land Use Bylaw amendments and other master plans and guidelines that inform the County's land use framework. This expanded scope will provide Council with a more holistic view of the County's entire land use framework, to guide its decisions about which projects the County should undertake. Ranking will occur annually prior to budget deliberations, so that Council can use the priority list to guide its annual budgeting decisions.

#### Revisions Made After July 23, 2024, Council Meeting

Following Council's direction from July 23, 2024, Administration has revised the proposed amendments as follows:

- The procedural aspects of the ranking process have been removed. The evaluation process will be kept in an administrative procedure to ensure year-over-year consistency.
- The Schedules to the policy have been simplified, to present only the linear ranking list in Schedule A. The evaluation matrix will be relocated to the administrative procedure, so that it can be referred to if necessary to identify nuances in two similarly-ranked projects when deciding whether a project should be undertaken.

#### Score weighting

At the July 23, 2024, meeting, Council discussed the matter of weighting of evaluation scores. Administration recognizes the challenge of determining how different criteria should be weighed when comparing different potential projects. For the purposes of ranking land use planning projects, it was determined that a weighting system with fewer gradations (0, 1, 2) would result in a more consistent and easily-comparable ranking system. The amended ranking system scores projects against ten criteria (compared to current seven), which allows for evaluation of a project against more specific and accurate measures of planning need and alignment with Council's strategic priorities.

#### 2025 Priority List

Administration has conducted an evaluation of upcoming planning projects as described in the proposed Policy, and has prepared a priority list for Council's consideration within the revised Policy (Attachment A).

### COMMUNICATIONS / ENGAGEMENT

---

No communication or engagement is required to approve the policy.

One of the primary objectives of this Policy is to improve communication about Planning initiatives to the public and other interest holders. The Policy is expected to do this in several ways:

- The Policy, along with its annually updated Schedule 'A', will be posted on the County website for public reference;

## Planning Project Prioritization Policy C-322 Amendments

- The Policy is intended to increase transparency in decision-making, as Council’s budget decisions regarding planning projects will be informed by consistent, measurable, and comparable criteria through the ranking process; and
- The Policy provides a clear and consistent avenue for the public to request a project to be added to the ranking list.

### IMPLICATIONS

#### Financial

There are no financial costs or revenues as a direct result of the approval of the ranking list; however, the approved ranking list will allow Council to improve its strategic allocation of County resources to priority projects, and will help to minimize variances and ad hoc decisions outside of the regular budget cycle by providing proactive structure to Council’s budget deliberations with respect to ASP projects.

As per the proposed Policy, project prioritization would occur in Q2 of each year so that budget can be allocated with the next year’s regular budget cycle. As this amendment is occurring late in the 2025 budget preparation schedule, any projects Council approves resulting from the prioritization at this time would be funded via a budget adjustment request when the project is ready to be initiated.

### STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

| Key Performance Indicators |   | Strategic Alignment   |  |
|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| Effective Service Delivery | SD3: Citizens are satisfied with Public Engagement opportunities and availability of information  | SD3.1: Citizens satisfied with the information provided by the County (newspaper, website, social media)  | This priority list will provide a clear sequence of priority for landowners, residents, and developers who have an interest in a parcel of land or a particular planning project.  |
| Financial Prosperity       | FP1: Successfully planning and managing tax revenues between residential and non-residential landowners                                   | FP1.1: Residential/Non-Residential Assessment Split Ratio as set out in the Assessment Diversification Policy   | The Policy includes a specific criterion to evaluate a proposed project’s impact on the County’s assessment ratio.   |
| Thoughtful Growth          | TG1: Clearly defining land use policies and objectives for the County –including types, growth rates, locations, and servicing strategies | TG1.2: Complete Area Structure Plans (ASPs) in alignment with the Regional Growth Plan and Council priorities   | The Policy includes criteria that will evaluate a proposed project against the objectives of the Regional Growth Plan, and Council priorities.   |
| Thoughtful Growth          | TG2: Defined land use policies and objectives are being met and communicated  | TG2.3: Statutory plans that align with the Regional Growth Plan and receive an approval recommendation from Calgary Metropolitan Regional Board (CMRB) Administration | The Policy includes aspects of evaluation process that consider the alignment of a proposed project with the Regional planning framework. Alignment and/or risks of proceeding with the project can be evaluated to determine whether a project should be prioritized. |

Planning Project Prioritization Policy C-322 Amendments

---

**ALTERNATE DIRECTION**

---

Administration does not have an alternative recommendation for Council’s consideration.

**ATTACHMENTS**

---

Attachment A: Proposed Planning Projects Prioritization Policy C-322  
Attachment B: Existing Area Structure Plan Prioritization Policy C-322

**APPROVALS**

---

|                               |                     |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| Manager:                      | Dominic Kazmierczak |
| Executive Director/Director:  | Matt Boscarol       |
| Chief Administrative Officer: | Byron Riemann       |

