

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.

Municipal Development Plan (County Plan)	
Managing Residential Growth - Hamlets	
5.1	<i>Support the development of the Hamlets of Conrich, Harmony, Langdon, Balzac, and Glenbow Ranch as full service rural communities providing a range of land uses, housing types, and rural services to their residents and local area; in accordance with their area structure plan or conceptual scheme. These hamlets are identified as "Hamlet – Full Service" on Map 1.</i>
Inconsistent	The subject land is located within the Hamlet of Harmony. The application is inconsistent with the Harmony Conceptual Scheme.
Hamlets – Hamlets: Appearance and Function	
9.1	<i>Encourage and support the development of the Hamlets of Conrich, Harmony, Langdon, Balzac, and Glenbow Ranch as full service rural communities providing a range of land uses, housing types, and rural services to their residents and local area, in accordance with their area structure plan or conceptual scheme.</i>
Inconsistent	The subject land is located within the Hamlet of Harmony. The application is inconsistent with the Harmony Conceptual Scheme.
Hamlets – Hamlets: Planning and Design Considerations	
9.6	<i>Development in a hamlet shall be guided by, and conform to, the adopted area structure plan or conceptual scheme.</i>
Inconsistent	The application is inconsistent with the Harmony Conceptual Scheme.
9.10	<i>Support hamlets in providing: a. an attractive community and distinct identity; and b. a high quality built environment.</i>
Inconsistent	An attractive community design, distinct identity, and high quality built environment in Harmony is supported through the Harmony Conceptual Scheme and DC-129. As the application proposes a significant reduction to the minimum northern side yard setback requirement, it is inconsistent with the intent of DC-129.
Harmony Conceptual Scheme	
Appendix A to Harmony Conceptual Scheme – Stage 1 Neighbourhood Plan	
Policy and Implementation Strategy	
5.2	<i>Land Use Designation The application for the Harmony Stage 1 NP approval is supported by a proposed land use redesignation application. In order to implement the vision and guiding principles contained within the approved Harmony Conceptual Scheme and the Stage 1 Neighbourhood Plan, it is proposed that the lands be redesignated to a Direct Control land use district in accordance with the provisions of the MD of Rocky View Land Use Bylaw. The land use amendment provides the transition from broader governing policies to site specific regulations within the proposed Harmony Stage 1 NP.</i>

	<p><i>The Harmony Stage 1 NP seeks to redesignate the subject lands to accommodate a wide variety of land uses such as major open space amenities, a vibrant Village Core, distinctive residential villages, a marquee business campus and supporting infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>The Harmony Direct Control district will contain specific regulations related to development cells for the Village Core 1 (VC-1), Business 1 (B-1), Village Residential 1 (VR-1), and Future Development (FD) as illustrated in Figure 18 – Harmony Land Use Amendment. The Direct Control Bylaw defines the land uses that will be permitted within each development cell, as well as the associated regulations that will govern the operation of the uses.</i></p>
Inconsistent	<p>The subject land is designated as Village Residential (VR-1) and is located within Village A. There is an existing dwelling on the subject land with a covered deck that does not comply with the minimum northern side yard setback requirement of 3.35 m (11.00 ft) and the minimum southern side yard setback requirement 1.53 m (5.02 ft) in <i>Direct Control Bylaw C-6688-2008</i> (DC-129). As the Harmony Conceptual Scheme is implemented through DC-129, the application to amend DC-129 to reduce the minimum northern side yard setback requirement by approximately 59% is inconsistent with the intent of DC-129.</p>
5.2.2	<p><i>Village Residential (VR-1) Designation</i></p> <p><i>The purpose and intent of the Village Residential (VR-1) designation is to accommodate a variety of housing forms within a range of low to medium density housing units, specifically within residential Village A and Village B. The designation will allow for the clustering of housing, open space elements and community amenity space, as well as allow for the implementation of utility infrastructure.</i></p>
Inconsistent	<p>The subject land is designated as Village Residential (VR-1) and is located within Village A. There is an existing dwelling on the subject land with a covered deck that does not comply with the minimum northern side yard setback requirement of 3.35 m (11.00 ft) and the minimum southern side yard setback requirement 1.53 m (5.02 ft) in <i>Direct Control Bylaw C-6688-2008</i> (DC-129). As the Harmony Conceptual Scheme is implemented through DC-129, the application to amend DC-129 to reduce the minimum northern side yard setback requirement by approximately 59% is inconsistent with the intent of DC-129.</p>

Direct Control Bylaw C-6688-2008	
3.0.0 Development Regulations	
3.17.0	<p><i>The Development Authority may grant a variance to each site's minimum front yard, side yard and rear yards by a maximum of 25%, so long as the variance would not materially interfere with or affect the use, enjoyment or value of a nearby parcel of land, or adversely affect property access, safety, or utility rights of way.</i></p>
Inconsistent	<p>The application proposes to reduce the minimum northern side yard setback requirement by approximately 59% which exceeds the Development Authority's maximum 25% variance power in DC-129. A Development Permit to reduce the minimum southern side yard setback requirement by approximately 0.65% could be applied for as this is less than a 25% variance.</p>
8.0.0 Land Use Regulations – Village Residential 1 Development Cell (VR-1)	
8.5.0	<p><u><i>Minimum/Maximum Lot Area Requirements:</i></u> <i>Except for 8.5.2, all minimum and maximum limits shall be per Table 1 (8.5.1) of this Bylaw.</i></p>

Inconsistent	The existing Dwelling, Single Detached with a covered deck does not comply with the minimum northern side yard setback requirement of 3.35 m (11.00 ft) and minimum southern side yard setback requirement of 1.53 m (5.02 ft) in Table 1 (8.5.1).
8.5.1	<i>Table 1 (8.5.1) specifies the minimum lot area, minimum/maximum lot widths, minimum front, rear and side yard setbacks, and maximum lot average, and shall apply to all buildings within the Village Residential Development Cell (VR-1).</i>
Inconsistent	<p>The Housing Type for Lot 6, Block 6, Plan 1611385 is Rear Access – Single Detached. The minimum setback requirements a principal building are as follows:</p> <p><i>Minimum Front Yard Setback – 6.00 m (19.69 ft)</i> <i>Minimum Side Yard Setback – 4.88 m total/3.35 m one side (16.00 ft total/11.00 ft one side)</i> <i>Minimum Rear Yard Setback – 9.00 m (29.53 ft)</i> <i>g. Where a rear garage is attached to the principal building, the minimum rear yard setback shall be 6.00 metres (19.69 feet).</i></p> <p>The existing Dwelling, Single Detached with a covered deck does not comply with the minimum northern side yard setback requirement of 3.35 m (11.00 ft) and the minimum southern side yard setback on 1.53 m (5.02 ft). The application proposes to amend DC-129 to allow the dwelling with a covered deck on Lot 6, Block 6, Plan 1611385 to have a minimum southern side yard setback of 1.52 m (4.99 ft) and a minimum northern side yard setback of 1.38 metres (4.53 feet) while allowing for eaves to project 0.30 metres (0.98 feet), instead of the current required 3.35 metres (11.00 feet) to allow the existing covered deck to remain. As the application proposes a significant reduction to the minimum northern side yard setback requirement, it is inconsistent with the intent of DC-129.</p>
8.5.2	<i>Lot 78, Block 2, Plan 1810288 within SE-7-25-3-W05M shall have a minimum setback of 0.62m from the eastern side yard property line for the existing Landing measuring 1.54 sq. m (16.63 sq.ft.) in area. The existing requirement of 2.13m on one side shall remain in effect for the Dwelling, Single Detached.</i>
Not Applicable	Section 8.5.2 is not applicable to Lot 6, Block 6, Plan 1611385.