ATTACHMENT E: POLICY REVIEW

Definitions		
Consistent	Generally Consistent	Inconsistent
Clearly meets the relevant requirements and intent of the policy.	Meets the overall intent of the policy and any areas of inconsistency are not critical to the delivery of appropriate development.	Clear misalignment with the relevant requirements of the policy that may create planning, technical or other challenges.

Rocky View County / Town of Cochrane Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP)		
Residential Development		
2.13.2.1	Any proposed residential developments within the Plan Area shall address compatibility with existing and future surrounding land uses, environmental impacts, infrastructure requirements, and, where appropriate, urban overlay design principles.	
Consistent	The application is consistent with surrounding country residential land uses and would not have a negative impact on agriculture in the area. The proposal is meeting infrastructure requirements of the County.	

Municipal Development Plan (County Plan) Managing Residential Growth - Country Residential		
Generally Consistent	The parcel is located within an identified country residential community and found to be generally consistent with the policies of the Bearspaw ASP.	
Country Re	sidential Development – Country Residential Communities	
10.1	Development within Greater Bragg Creek, Bearspaw, North and Central Springbank, Elbow Valley, Balzac East (Sharp Hills/Butte Hills), Cochrane North, and Glenbow Ranch shall conform to their relevant area structure plan.	
Generally Consistent	The parcel is located within the Bearspaw area and was found to be generally consistent with the policies in the ASP.	
Transporta	tion – Road Access	
16.13	Residential redesignation and subdivision applications should provide for development that: a. provides direct access to a road, while avoiding the use of panhandles; b. minimizes driveway length to highways/roads; c. removes and replaces panhandles with an internal road network when additional residential development is proposed; and	
	 d. limits the number and type of access onto roads in accordance with County Policy. 	
Consistent	The subdivision is proposing the construction of an internal road for each parcel to gain access.	

Bearspaw A	Bearspaw Area Structure Plan (ASP)		
Phasing Phasing			
7.2.2	The redesignation, subdivision and/or development of lands within the Plan Area should proceed in accordance with the priorities established in Figure 8. Notwithstanding the priorities established in Figure 8, development priorities for specific lands may be altered without amendment to this Plan, at the discretion of the Municipality, provided the consequences of development out of sequence are examined and the Municipality determines that any on-site or off-site planning issues have been resolved pursuant to the provisions of this Plan.		
Consistent	The parcel is located within Development Priority Area 1 of Figure 8.		
Concept Pla	ns		
8.1.9	Figure 3 identifies lands within the Plan Area where the preparation of Concept Plans is required prior to the redesignation of these lands for country residential land use.		
Inconsistent	The parcel is located within an area recommended for a concept plan. No concept plan was submitted as part of the application.		
8.1.11	Where lands are designated for country residential land uses and no Concept Plan has been prepared or adopted by Council, the Municipality may require a Concept Plan to accompany an application for country residential subdivision within the Plan Area.		
Consistent	The land uses are currently R-RUR and no concept plan has been prepared or adopted. However, Administration notes a concept plan for this area would have little benefit as the quarter section is heavily fragmented.		
Subdivision			
8.1.16	Applications for subdivision approval that propose country residential land uses shall be considered pursuant to the provisions of Figure 7 and attendant Plan policies.		
Consistent	The subject lands are within a County Residential area as identified in Figure 7.		
8.1.19	When considering applications for subdivision approval, the Municipality should evaluate tentative plans of subdivision in terms of the following considerations: a) the natural condition of the lands proposed for subdivision and the manner in which these conditions (ie. topography, environmentally sensitive areas, etc.) have been integrated into the design of the tentative plan of subdivision;		
	 b) the serviceability of the proposed parcels by private and public utilities; c) the suitability of each of the proposed parcels to accommodate a building site of sufficient area to permit the development of a residential building and ancillary structures; 		
	 d) the context of the lands proposed for subdivision and the compatibility of the proposed design with adjacent lands including, but not limited to, site conditions, parcel sizes, visual impact, etc.; 		
	 e) the intensification potential of the tentative plan of subdivision and the flexibility of the proposed design to accommodate future subdivision; f) the conformity of the tentative plan of subdivision with any Concept Plan 		
	prepared and/or adopted pursuant to the provisions of this Plan; g) the design of the proposed road system having regard for Municipal Engineering Standards and integration with the Municipal and Provincial road hierarchy;		
	h) conformity to this Plan, which may necessitate an amendment to the Plan;i) any other matter deemed appropriate by the Municipality.		

All considerations listed above were addressed during the review process through
supporting documents and technical studies.
8.1.20 Within the country residential areas identified in Figure 7, the minimum parcel
size should not be less than four (4) acres.
The proposal includes three lots that are 3.88 acres in size, slightly under the
minimum 4.0-acre requirement. The other four proposed lots are 4.18 – 4.28 acres in size.
Notwithstanding Policy 8.1.20 and Figure 3, the Municipality may consider
redesignation proposals and/or application for subdivision contemplating parcel
sizes of less than four (4) acres in size, provided these proposals are supported by
a Concept Plan that is prepared and adopted pursuant to the provisions of this Plan.
The parcel is not currently part of a concept plan and there is no proposed concept
plan. However, Administration acknowledges the adoption of a conceptual scheme
would provide limited benefit to the subject lands.
Where a tentative plan of subdivision proposes a dead end cul-de-sac, the design
and length of the cul-de-sac should sufficiently accommodate emergency vehicle
access, or alternate provisions for emergency vehicle access shall be provided.
The proposed internal road with a dead end cul-de-sac will be constructed to
County Standards to accommodate emergency vehicles.
Applications for subdivision approval shall be subject to the Municipal Reserve provisions of the Planning Act and this Plan.
The application includes cash-in-lieu dedication for outstanding MR.
d Utilities
The provision of water to subdivisions within the Plan Area shall be in accordance
with policy established by Council and the guidelines established by Alberta
Environmental Protection.
The proposal includes the use of private water wells for each parcel.
Sewage disposal and/or treatment shall be handled on a site-specific basis in
accordance with guidelines established by Alberta Labour and Alberta
Environmental Protection.
The proposal includes the use of private sewage treatment systems on each lot.
Shallow utilities (telephone, natural gas, etc.) shall be provided by the appropriate
public or private utility companies in the Plan Area.
The application was circulated to shallow utility companies. No concerns were
noted.

Land Use Bylaw C-8000-2020		
R-RUR (Residential, Rural District)		
319	 Minimum Parcel Size: a) 1.6 ha (3.95 ac) b) The minimum size of parcels designated with the letter "p" is the number indicated on the Land Use Map c) Notwithstanding b), the number following the "p" shall not be less than 1.6 ha (3.95 ac) 	
Generally Consistent	The proposal includes the creation of four lots ranging from 4.18 acres to 4.28 acres, and the creation of three 3.88 acre lots. The proposed 3.88 acre lots are under the minimum size requirement of the LUB. However, Council has the ability to vary the LUB in accordance with section 654(2) of the MGA.	