

# PLANNING

TO: Council

DATE: November 15, 2022

TIME: Afternoon Appointment

FILE: 03305005

DIVISION: 6

APPLICATION: PL20210190

**SUBJECT:** Redesignation Item: Residential Use

**APPLICATION:** To redesignate Lot 6, Block 6, Plan 9411296 within SW-05-23-28-W04M from Residential, Rural District (R-RUR) to Residential, Country Residential District (R-CRD) to facilitate future subdivision of one parcel.

**GENERAL LOCATION**: Located at the northwest junction of Range Road 284A and Township Road 230, approximately 1.61 kilometres (1 mile) north of Highway 22X.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:** Council gave first reading to Bylaw C-8259-2022 on February 8, 2022.

The application is to redesignate this  $\pm 2.38$  hectare ( $\pm 5.88$  acre) parcel in order to subdivide into one  $\pm 1.58$  hectare ( $\pm 3.90$  acre) lot and a 0.80 hectare ( $\pm 1.98$  acre) lot. There is an existing dwelling with an approach off Range Road 284A.

The application was assessed against Section 10.0 of the Municipal Development Plan (County Plan), which provides direction on Fragmented Country Residential Areas. Policy 10.11 states that redesignation of residential or agricultural parcels less than or equal to 24.7 acres in size to a new residential land use may be supported if a lot and road plan is provided, and if technical assessments are provided of on and off-site impacts are provided.

The application is consistent with 10.11 of the County Plan by providing a lot and road plan for the entire quarter section demonstrating potential roadways and including a rationale. Administration accepted the lot and road plan and technical report demonstrating servicing for the parcel as well as providing an update to the road approach. The application is also consistent with the regulations of the Land Use Bylaw.

**ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDATION:** Administration recommends approval in accordance with Option #1.

## **OPTIONS:**

- Option # 1: Motion #1 THAT Bylaw C-8259-2022 be given second reading.
  - Motion #2 THAT Bylaw C-8259-2022 be given third and final reading.

Option # 2: That application PL20210190 be refused.



## AIR PHOTO & DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT:



## **APPLICATION EVALUATION:**

The application was evaluated based on the technical reports submitted with the application and the applicable policies and regulations.

APPLICABLE POLICY AND REGULATIONS:	TECHNICAL REPORTS SUBMITTED:
<ul> <li>Municipal Government Act;</li> <li>Municipal Development Plan (County Plan);</li> <li>Land Use Bylaw; and</li> <li>County Servicing Standards.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Phase 1 Area Groundwater Study Report, by Strom Engineering Inc., dated March/April 2022</li> </ul>

## POLICY ANALYSIS:

### Rocky View County / City of Calgary Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP)

The City of Calgary was circulated the application as required by Policy 8.1.5 of the IDP. City administration provided comments and requested that the application be presented to the Intermunicipal Committee for information. The City noted that the lands are within the City's Residential Growth Area as identified in Map 4 of the IDP; therefore, The City is opposed to further fragmentation of the lands, suggesting this would create further challenges for converting these lands to a higher density urban form upon any future annexation of the Residential Growth Area.

The City's concerns over further fragmentation of lands within the City Growth area are acknowledged, as is Policy 27.17 of the County Plan, which states that applications shall be considered in consultation with the City and the IDP policies. However, there is no clear policy guidance within the IDP that refers to the fragmentation of lands within Growth Areas, and IDP Policy 8.1.4 states that applications within Growth Areas should be evaluated against the County Plan and County's Land Use Bylaw. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with the IDP as it complies with the County Plan.



This application was referred to the City of Calgary / Rocky View County Intermunicipal Committee where the impact of further subdivision within the Growth Areas was discussed. The contemplation of a minimum parcel size modifier was considered to limit future subdivision potential of the lands to the one lot being proposed; however, a modifier was not considered necessary as the minimum parcel size of the R-CRD District is 0.80 hectares (1.98 acres) and therefore would not permit further subdivision beyond one additional parcel.

#### Municipal Development Plan (County Plan)

The subject lands fall outside of an area with an Area Structure Plan. As such, the County Plan is the guiding policy document. The subject lands lie within a fragmented quarter section, which is defined in the County Plan as a quarter section of land within the agriculture area divided into six or more residential or agricultural lots.

Policy 10.11 of the County Plan requires a lot and road plan to comprehensively plan the subject and adjacent lands. Further, the Applicant is required to address lot layouts, design, and future development opportunities, to mitigate impacts on adjacent lands, and to address provisions for access, servicing, and stormwater.

The Applicant provided a lot and road plan for the quarter section and included a rationale as to why a road on the subject lands would not contribute to greater connectivity throughout the quarter section based on the canal and existing dwellings. Administration reviewed the plan and rationale and, considering the location of the subject lands and potential for internal roads, there would be little to no benefit planning a road through the subject lands. The Applicant also provided onsite technical requirements for groundwater and realigned proposed access to the parcel to address County infrastructure requirements. As such, the application meets Policy 10.11 of the County Plan.

#### Land Use Bylaw

The parcel sizes proposed to be created at the future subdivision stage would meet the minimum requirement of the Land Use Bylaw, which allows parcel sizes of 0.80 hectares (1.98 acres) or more on Residential, Country Residential (R-CRD) District parcels. The proposed R-CRD land use would permit the future subdivision of only one additional parcel.

## ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS:

The Applicant provided a Phase 1 Area Groundwater Study, which demonstrates that there would be adequate groundwater servicing for a potential dwelling. If Council is minded to approve this redesignation application, future servicing requirements would be controlled by conditions of subdivision.

Respectfully submitted,

Concurrence,

"Brock Beach"

"Dorian Wandzura"

Acting Executive Director Community Services Chief Administrative Officer

LC/rp



## ATTACHMENTS

ATTACHMENT 'A': Application Information ATTACHMENT 'B': Application Referrals ATTACHMENT 'C': Bylaw C-8259-2022 and Schedule A ATTACHMENT 'D': Map Set ATTACHMENT 'E': Public Submissions