



# Summer Villages and Leduc County Intermunicipal Development Plan

Summer Villages of Itaska Beach, Sundance Beach, Golden Days  
and Leduc County

Originally Adopted August 27, 2019 Bylaw 17-19

Updated: 2024





This page intentionally left blank

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Guiding Principles .....</b>	<b>1</b>	
1.1 Guiding Principles of the IDP .....	2	
<b>2. Land Use and Built Form Policies .....</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Deleted: 5</b>
2.1 Resort Residential.....	2	<b>Deleted: 6</b>
2.2 Country Residential Developments .....	2	<b>Deleted: 8</b>
2.3 Lakeshore Environmental Development Area .....	2	<b>Deleted: 10</b>
2.4 Agricultural and Related Uses.....	2	<b>Deleted: 12</b>
2.5 Highway Commercial Node.....	1	<b>Deleted: 13</b>
2.6 Recreation Areas.....	2	<b>Deleted: 14</b>
2.7 Preservation Areas.....	1	<b>Deleted: 15</b>
<b>3. General Development Policies .....</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Deleted: 17</b>
3.1 Environmental Management.....	2	<b>Deleted: 18</b>
3.2 Transportation .....	2	<b>Deleted: 20</b>
3.3 Utilities and services .....	2	<b>Deleted: 22</b>
3.4 Social and Economic Development.....	2	<b>Deleted: 24</b>
3.5 Recreation.....	1	<b>Deleted: 25</b>
<b>4. Implementation .....</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Deleted: 27</b>
4.1 Planning Tools .....	2	<b>Deleted: 28</b>
4.2 Plan Administration Mechanisms.....	2	<b>Deleted: 30</b>
4.3 Review and Referral Process for Development Applications and Plans.....	2	<b>Deleted: 32</b>
4.4 Intermunicipal Dispute Resolution .....	2	<b>Deleted: 34</b>
4.5 Monitoring and Review .....	3	<b>Deleted: 37</b>
<b>5. Definitions .....</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Deleted: 39</b>



## List of Maps

Map 1. Future Land Use Concept.....	1	Deleted: 3
Map 2. IDP Plan Area.....	5	Deleted: 48
Map 3. Existing Land Use Districts.....	5	Deleted: 53
Map 4. Existing Environmental Conditions.....	7	Deleted: 55
Map 5. Development Constraints.....	9	Deleted: 57
Map 6. Existing Infrastructure.....	11	Deleted: 59

## Appendices

Appendix A: Project Background.....	43
Appendix B: Community Context.....	49
Appendix C: Stakeholder Consultation.....	61

**Deleted: Territory Acknowledgement**

This plan acknowledges that the lands within the plan area are located within the traditional territory of the Tsuu T'ina, Cree and Métis peoples of Alberta. These lands have long been a gathering place for many indigenous peoples whose presence and culture continues to enhance the diversity and vibrancy of the area.



# 1. Guiding Principles

The policies established by this IDP area are derived from a series of guiding principles which lay the foundation for the policy framework and aim to achieve the goals of the IDP. Along with the community engagement program undertaken during the IDP process, these principles have influenced the development of the IDP Future Land Use Concept.

## 1.1 Guiding Principles of the IDP

The following key principles were developed through consultation with stakeholders and municipal administration. They provide guidance for future developments and collaboration within the summer villages and Leduc County IDP area:

### 1. Responsible Development

New developments and renovations should be undertaken in a way that protects the long-term health of Pigeon Lake and its tributaries as natural and recreational areas.

### 2. Watershed Thinking

Given the importance of the lake on the surrounding communities it is important to holistically consider the study area's impacts on the water regardless of municipal boundaries.

### 3. Local Governance

Decisions regarding development and operation of the partner municipalities should continue to fall ultimately to the individual municipality in order to maintain individual autonomy and independence.

### 4. Summer Village Diversity

Policy and land use planning for the summer villages of Sundance, Itaska and Golden Days should reflect their unique characteristics and encourage continued distinction between the municipalities.

### 5. Diversity of Housing

The plan captures the desire of residents to have a range of lot sizes available for residents. This includes larger, country residential lots as well as smaller, resort residential lots fronting onto the lake.

### 6. Lake Access

Pigeon Lake is the main recreational amenity for residents and visitors to the area. It is important that recreational access to the lake be considered during the development process to provide adequate access and mitigate undesirable impact of additional development.


### 7. Existing Detailed Planning

The land use concept and policies were generally defined to generally align with the more detailed North Pigeon Lake Area Structure Plan. Given the more recent and higher-level planning where there is misalignment between these plans, the North Pigeon Lake ASP shall be amended to reflect the aspirations of this plan.

### 8. Municipal Capacity

The review and intermunicipal referral process should consider the capacity of the summer village administrations to undertake the processes created by the IDP.

# Map 1. Future Land Use Concept



## Legend

- Leduc County
- - - Summer Villages IDP
- Pigeon Lake Watershed
- Existing Development
- Summer Villages
- Infrastructure**
- Provincial Highway
- Local Roads
- Future Land Use**
- Agriculture
- Resort Residential Area
- Country Residential
- Lakeshore Environmental Development Area
- Preservation Area
- Recreation Area
- \* Highway Commercial Node
- Development Constraints**
- Landfills and Transfer Site
- Landfill 300m Development Buffer
- Landfill 450m Well Buffer

This page intentionally left blank



## 2. Land Use and Built Form Policies

The future land use concept for the IDP area identifies opportunities for additional growth including residential expansion while managing that expansion to consider impacts on the lake and existing communities.

The future land use vision established for this IDP was finalised through collaborative working sessions with stakeholders, municipal councils and the Local Advisory Committee.

The following section outlines policies related to the development of residential subdivisions, servicing, agriculture and related uses, highway corridors, and recreation areas within the IDP area. The policy framework also provides direction for preferred built form related to each land use type. The land use concept established for the IDP area is shown in Map 1. Future Land Use Concept.

## 2.1 Resort Residential

Resort Residential developments are the highest intensity of development considered for the IDP area. Existing resort residential style lots are present within the summer villages and some existing county developments. The IDP Future Land Use Concept outlines areas for potential expansion of resort residential style developments.



### Policies

#### Future Land Use Concept

- 2.1.1 Development of resort residential lots shall be considered in accordance with Map 1: Future Land Use Concept.

#### Single parcel country residential lifestyle

- 2.1.2 Subdivisions for single parcel country residential lots within the Resort Residential development area of the IDP shall be in accordance with Leduc County's MDP.

#### Resort Residential Area multi-lot developments

- 2.1.3 Multi-lot developments shall include any subdivision that includes more than two subdivisions of an agricultural quarter section (more than three titled lots per quarter section).

#### Servicing

- 2.1.4 Resort residential expansions shall be required to connect to municipal services including water, wastewater, gas, and electricity.
- 2.1.5 Resort residential expansions may be subject to levies or other cost sharing mechanisms in order to fund the expansion of municipal infrastructure.

#### Requirement for Area Structure Plan/Outline Plan

- 2.1.6 New resort residential subdivisions in the IDP area shall be proceeded by, and subject to, an approved Local Area Structure Plan.

#### Lake Access

- 2.1.7 New resort residential developments shall include indication of how the development will provide lake access for future residents and mitigation strategies to reduce the impact of new users on existing communities.
- 2.1.8 New public lake access may be established through the following:
- Provision of off-site direct lake access;
  - Agreements with local municipalities for lake access; or
  - Purchase of lakeside lands for public use.

#### Lot Sizes

- 2.1.9 Multi-lot residential developments shall have a maximum of 9.4 dwellings units per gross developable hectare (3.8 units per acre).

#### North Pigeon Lake ASP Concept

- 2.1.10 In addition to the above, development of new resort residential areas shall be subject



to the policies contained within Section 9.3  
Resort Recreation Area of the *North Pigeon  
Lake ASP* as amended from time-to-time.

## 2.2 Country Residential Developments

Country residential parcels are larger lots than the small, lakefront or backlot parcels found within the existing summer villages or lakefront subdivisions. Country residential developments provide an opportunity for low intensity subdivision of individual parcels out from an agricultural quarter sections as well as clustered multi-lot residential developments that are clustered around common servicing.



### Policies

#### Future Land Use Concept

- 2.2.1 Development of country residential lots shall be considered in accordance with Map 1: Future Land Use Concept.

#### Single parcel country residential lifestyle

- 2.2.2 Subdivisions for single parcel country residential lots within the Country Residential development area of the IDP shall be in accordance with Leduc County's MDP.

#### Country Residential Area multi-lot developments

- 2.2.3 Multi-lot developments shall include any subdivision that includes more than two subdivisions of an agricultural quarter section (three titled lots per quarter section).
- 2.2.4 New Multi-lot Country Residential developments shall be designed as Cluster Country Residential developments adhering to the following principles:
- Provision of communal wastewater systems;
  - Clustering of development away from environmentally significant areas; and
  - Preservation of publicly managed natural areas.
- 2.2.5 Multi-lot developments should be located:

- In close proximity to existing subdivisions to limit the fragmentation of agricultural parcels;
- On lesser quality agricultural lands (Classified as lands with CLI classes of 4, 5, 6, or 7); and
- In a way as to limit disruption of environmentally significant areas.

- 2.2.6 Notwithstanding Section 5.2.5, multi-lot country residential developments may be considered on a case by case basis regard to ensuring:
- Adequate on-site servicing,
  - Environmental management, and
  - Approval of an Outline Plan.

#### Lot Sizes

- 2.2.7 Multi-lot residential developments shall have lots between 0.4 hectares (1 acre) and 0.8 hectares (2 acres).

#### Development Buffers

- 2.2.8 New multi-lot developments should be separated from existing developments by a 9m naturalized buffer.

2.2.9 The naturalized buffer shall be designed as a visual screen between developments and shall provide opportunities for:

- a. Local and inter-community trails;
- b. Wildlife Corridors; and
- c. Emergency services access.

#### North Pigeon Lake ASP Concept

2.2.10 In addition to the above, development of new country residential areas shall be subject to the policies contained within Section 9.1 Cluster Subdivision Area of the *North Pigeon Lake ASP* as amended from time-to-time.

## 2.3 Lakeshore Environmental Development Area

The Lakeshore Environmental Development Area provides for larger residential lots and clustered developments that are located within 800m (0.5 miles) of Pigeon Lake. Multi-lot developments within the area are subject to heightened design criteria intended to preserve natural areas and protect water quality through their design.



### Policies

#### Future Land Use Concept

2.3.1 Development within the Lakeshore Environmental Development Area shall be considered in accordance with Map 1: Future Land Use Concept.

#### Single parcel country residential lifestyle

2.3.2 Subdivisions for single parcel country residential lots within the Lakeshore Environmental Development Area of the IDP shall be in accordance with Leduc County's MDP.

#### Lakeshore Environmental Development Area multi-lot developments

2.3.3 Multi-lot developments shall include any subdivision that includes more than two subdivisions of agricultural lands (three titled lots).

2.3.4 Multi-lot developments within the Lakeshore Environmental Development Area should be located:

- a. In close proximity to existing subdivisions to limit the fragmentation of agricultural parcels and remaining natural areas;

- b. On lesser quality agricultural lands (Classified as lands with CLI classes of 4, 5, 6, or 7); and
- c. In a way as to limit disruption of environmentally significant areas.

2.3.5 Notwithstanding Section 5.3.4, multi-lot residential developments shall be considered on a case by case basis with regard to ensuring:

- a. Provision of low impact water and wastewater servicing options,
- b. Preservation of existing environmentally significant areas; and
- c. Approval of an Outline Plan.

#### Lot Sizes

2.3.6 Within 800m of the lakeshore line, multi-lot residential developments shall be required to provide a minimum lot size of two (2) hectares (5 acres).

2.3.7 Lots in new multi-lot residential developments outside of 800m of the lakeshore shall be clustered and shall have lots between 0.4 hectares (1 acre) and 0.8 hectares (2 acres).

### Development Buffers

- 2.3.8 New multi-lot developments should be separated from existing developments by a 9m naturalized buffer.
- 2.3.9 The naturalized buffer shall be designed as a visual screen between developments and shall provide opportunities for:
  - a. Local and inter-community trails;
  - b. Wildlife Corridors; and
  - c. Emergency services access.

### North Pigeon Lake ASP Concept

- 2.3.10 In addition to the above, development of new resort residential areas shall be subject to the policies contained within Section 9.2 Lakeshore Conservation Area of the *North Pigeon Lake ASP* as amended from time-to-time.

## 2.4 Agricultural and Related Uses

Agricultural areas make up a large portion of the lands within the IDP area. While most lands within the IDP area have previously been identified as available for cluster residential subdivisions, the long-term viability of agricultural use in Leduc County is improved by ensuring appropriate levels of subdivision and encouraging clustering of residential subdivisions.



### Policies

#### Future Land Use Concept

- 2.4.1 Low intensity agricultural uses shall continue to be allowed where they currently operate in the IDP area and the preservation of prime agricultural land shall be encouraged throughout the IDP area until the appropriate time for subdivision and development of those lands.

#### Subdivision of prime agricultural lands

- 2.4.2 Subdivision of agricultural lands in the IDP area shall comply with Leduc County's Municipal Development Plan policies.
- 2.4.3 New development shall be undertaken in a way that minimizes the fragmentation of agricultural parcels.

#### Agricultural business focus

- 2.4.4 Home Based Business opportunities shall be encouraged on agricultural properties.
- 2.4.5 Operation of Home-Based Businesses shall be undertaken in a way that is compatible with existing agricultural practices and mitigates any negative impacts such as noise and dust.
- 2.4.6 Use of agricultural land in the IDP area for agricultural support services, agri-tourism

and rural industries shall be considered on a case by case basis subject to their location and potential impacts on existing land uses.

#### Intensive Agriculture Operations

- 2.4.7 Intensive use of agricultural land such as confined feeding operations that may restrict future residential expansion and have negative impacts on local water bodies shall not be supported within the IDP area.
- 2.4.8 Other intensive agricultural operations such as fur farms, greenhouses and similar uses shall be considered on a case by case basis subject to their location and potential impacts on existing land uses and the lake watershed.

#### Exploration of low impact agricultural practices

- 2.4.9 Opportunities to implement innovative, low-impact agricultural practices shall be explored in collaboration with local agricultural operators to minimize the impacts of agriculture on the lake watershed.

## 2.5 Highway Commercial Node

The IDP area contains several provincial highway corridors which provide access to the communities surrounding Pigeon Lake. These highways are governed and maintained by the Government of Alberta. The intersection of these highways is a potential location for the development of a high-quality Highway Commercial Node which can serve local residents and the travelling public.



### Policies

#### Future Land Use Concept

- 2.5.1 Future expansion of highway commercial areas shall be allowed in accordance with Map 1: Future Land Use Concept.
- 2.5.2 Development of commercial development shall be encouraged to establish a compact commercial node for the surrounding communities.

#### Highway commercial uses

- 2.5.3 Land uses for highway commercial areas may include but are not limited to:
  - a. Motels;
  - b. Hotels;
  - c. Gas or service stations;
  - d. Tourism oriented or speciality shops; or
  - e. Similar users to serve travelling public and regional population.

#### Development access

- 2.5.4 Roadway access to developments shall be in accordance with the appropriate Province of Alberta regulations regarding highway safety and access.
- 2.5.5 Design and location of future accesses should be addressed at time of Local Area

Structure Plan (LASP) development, subdivision application or development permit application, as applicable.

- 2.5.6 Service roads may be required subject to the intensity and scale of future developments.
- 2.5.7 Where the highway commercial development is adjacent to a residential area, it shall provide appropriate buffers and transition between the businesses and community.

#### Highway commercial servicing

- 2.5.8 New highway commercial developments within the IDP area shall be encouraged to connect to municipal water, storm and sewer infrastructure if available.
- 2.5.9 On-site servicing may be considered on a case-by-case basis subject to specific development constraints.

#### Gateways and entrance corridors

- 2.5.10 Highway commercial developments may be required to provide enhanced landscaping and architectural features along highway frontage in order to project an inviting image and character for the community as whole.

## 2.6 Recreation Areas

Active recreation areas within the IDP area are generally small-scale, community facilities that include playgrounds and small natural areas. Development of high-quality active recreation areas will help to reduce recreation impacts on Pigeon Lake and offer a more diverse set of recreational amenities to the residents and visitors of the area. Potential active recreation uses include baseball diamonds, soccer fields as well as cross country ski trails and skating areas in the winter.



### Policies

#### Future Land Use Concept

- 2.6.1 Expansion of recreational uses shall be explored in general accordance with Map 1: Future Land Use Concept.

#### Support expansion of recreational areas

- 2.6.2 The expansion of active recreation uses in the lands shown in Map 1: Future Land Use Concept as Recreation Areas shall be considered subject to the following conditions:
- Compatibility of recreational uses;
  - Approval of uses by Alberta Environmental and Parks;
  - Preservation of environmentally significant areas;
  - Inclusion of active recreation uses appropriate in the summer and winter; and
  - Inclusion of CPTED design principles.
- 2.6.3 Active recreation uses should be promoted on lands located within 300m around the abandoned landfill and waste transfer sites.



## 2.7 Preservation Areas

In addition to the preservation areas identified in the North Pigeon Lake Area Structure Plan, some additional lands were as preservation areas identified based on the Environmentally Significant Areas study completed for Leduc County in 2015.

### Policies

#### Preservation Areas

- 2.7.1 Expansion of preservation areas shall be explored in general accordance with Map 1: Future Land Use Concept.

#### Environmentally Significant Areas

- 2.7.2 Detailed mapping and conservation of Environmentally Significant Areas shall be encouraged within the preservation areas.
- 2.7.3 Clearing of beaver dams and other environmentally significant areas shall be discouraged.
- 2.7.4 Partially cleared sites adjacent to wetlands and other waterbodies shall be encouraged to be re-naturalized.

#### Preservation Area Multi-lot developments

- 2.7.5 Multi-lot residential development shall not be allowed in the Preservation Areas.

#### Recreation Uses

- 2.7.6 The establishment of low-impact recreation uses including walking and cycling trails within the preservation areas shall be encouraged.



#### North Pigeon Lake ASP Concept

- 2.7.7 In addition to the above, development of lands identified as preservation areas shall be subject to the policies contained within Section 9.4 Preservation Area of the *North Pigeon Lake ASP* as amended from time-to-time.

This page intentionally left blank.



### 3. General Development Policies

The future land use concept established for the IDP area needs to be complemented by social, environmental and utility infrastructure. The following general development policies are applicable to the entire IDP area and provide direction for:

- Environmental management
- Transportation
- Utilities and servicing
- Social and economic development
- Recreation

### 3.1 Environmental Management

The main environmental feature of the IDP area is Pigeon Lake and its surrounding watershed. Protecting and enhancing the health of Pigeon Lake and its surrounding watershed is the environmental imperative of this plan. Environmental features within the watershed area should be protected and enhanced in order to achieve the goals of the plan and maintain the long-term value of the communities and the lake.



#### Policies

##### Environmental Reserve, Environmental Reserve Easements, Conservation Easements and Development Setbacks

- 3.1.1 Development on lands identified as Environmentally Significant Areas (ESAs) by the 2015 Leduc County ESA study shall be required to conduct additional environmental research and mapping to ensure that important ecological features are maintained and protected.
- 3.1.2 New multi-lot subdivisions requiring a Local Area Structure Plan shall be required to undertake a biophysical study to identify areas for Environmental Reserve, Environmental Easements, and Conservation Reserve and measures to mitigate the impacts of development on local environmentally significant areas and the lake watershed as a whole. The applicant will be responsible for undertaking the Biophysical Study.
- 3.1.3 The Environmental Reserve, Environmental Reserve Easements, and/or Conservation Reserves shall be established in accordance with Section 664 of the MGA and a Biophysical Study at the Area Structure Plan

and may be refined at the Local Area Structure Plan stage.

- 3.1.4 Environmental Reserve and Environmental Easement designs shall follow minimum guidelines as provided in the Government of Alberta's Sustainable Resource Development Standard Recommendations to Municipal Subdivision Referrals (2007)
- 3.1.5 Development setbacks from wetlands and other environmentally significant areas shall be undertaken following guidelines from the Government of Alberta's *Stepping Back from the Water: A Beneficial Management Practices Guide for New Development Near Water Bodies in Alberta's Settled Region*.

### Wildfire Management

- 3.1.6 Where a wildfire risk may exist, wildfire mitigation strategies are encouraged to be created and implemented for the lands within the IDP area.
- 3.1.7 Implementation of wildfire mitigation actions shall be encouraged to be undertaken collaboratively between the partner municipalities, landowners, and service providers through the following actions including but are not limited to:
  - a. Education and engagement with local residents and landowners on the topic of wildfires and FireSmart practices;
  - b. Hosting meetings among stakeholders to verify and confirm emergency response plans; and
  - c. Work with landowners to identify opportunities to clear deadfall and underbrush where needed.

### Wildlife corridors

- 3.1.8 The IDP area consists of various existing environmental features such as watercourses, associated wetlands and seasonal riparian corridors which are used for wildlife movement. Future development of these corridor areas shall be designed to preserve connectivity between remaining natural areas.
- 3.1.9 The dedication of Environmental or Municipal Reserve within the IDP area should be coordinated to promote maintenance of these contiguous wildlife corridors.

### Open spaces and trail networks

- 3.1.10 Open spaces and trail networks shall be developed in a manner that promotes the protection of environmentally significant areas and establishes an interconnected network with existing trails within the IDP boundary.

### Retrofitting of existing communities

- 3.1.11 Communities within the IDP area shall be encouraged to consider more environmentally friendly practices and infrastructure systems in order to lower the overall impact of development on the lake including but not limited to:
  - a. Use of bio-swales and other low-impact development processes to reduce the amount of dissolved solids and contaminants entering the watershed;
  - b. Establishment of long-term runoff storage in stormwater management systems; or
  - c. Naturalization of the lakeshore area.

## 3.2 Transportation

Transportation into and out of the IDP area is facilitated by a variety of roads owned and administered by the partner municipalities and the provincial government. Effectively providing access to the area for all users is a critical step to ensuring the success of the area.



### Policies

#### Working with Alberta Transportation

- 3.2.1 The municipalities shall work with Alberta Transportation to prepare appropriate highway planning documents for specific locations within the IDP area including:
  - a. Vicinity management agreements; and
  - b. Access management plans especially along the along Highway 616.
- 3.2.2 The municipalities shall work with Alberta Transportation to ensure that ongoing design updates of provincial highways passing through the IDP area are compatible with the needs of the community in terms of access and use.

#### Provincial highway regulations

- 3.2.3 All developments will comply with Alberta Transportation regulations requiring provincial approval within 300 metres of a provincial highway right-of-way, or within 800 metres of the intersection of a provincial highway with another public road.

#### Access management guidelines

- 3.2.4 Development proposed along either Highway 616 or other corridors shall utilize existing access points. Any new access points

to existing roadways will require coordination with the appropriate municipality and Alberta Transportation.

- 3.2.5 A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) may be required as a part of any Area Structure Plan or Local Area Structure Plan application to coordinate appropriate access locations and safety measures.
- 3.2.6 For multi-lot developments requiring an Area Structure Plan and not requiring circulation to Alberta Transportation, the requirement for TIA may be waived at the discretion of the Development Authority subject to the complexity and intensity of the proposed development.

### Road Maintenance

- 3.2.7 Individual municipalities shall be responsible for maintenance of roads within their boundaries.
- 3.2.8 Cost sharing of road maintenance should be considered and be split based on mutually acceptable factors that acknowledge the ability of individual partners to pay.
- 3.2.9 Roads which provide access to other municipalities shall be considered for enhancement subject to the following criteria:
  - a. Cost;
  - b. Budget Availability;
  - c. Existing traffic use; and
  - d. Cost sharing agreements between the partners.
- 3.2.10 Partner municipalities may request enhancements to roads that provide community access, but the responsible municipality will make any final decisions about investment in road infrastructure.
- 3.2.11 Innovative financing, ownership or jurisdictional options shall be encouraged to be explored to provide high quality access to the different municipalities in a cost-effective manner.

### 3.3 Utilities and services

The provision of intermunicipal services and agreements between the partner municipalities is guided by the communities' Intermunicipal Collaboration Frameworks (ICFs). The ICFs capture the existing status of intermunicipal services and identify opportunities for future shared service provision. Existing shared services include Waste Transfer Site access, and individual road maintenance agreements.



#### Policies

##### Co-development of infrastructure and service plans

- 3.3.1 Intermunicipal cooperation with regard to service provision shall be guided by individual Intermunicipal Collaboration Frameworks (ICFs) between the partner municipalities.
- 3.3.2 The County and summer villages shall continue to communicate and cooperate with regard to service and program delivery including but not limited to:
  - a. Recreation and community services;
  - b. Road maintenance and grading,
  - c. Snow removal,
  - d. Fire services, and
  - e. Emergency services.

##### Cost and revenue sharing for intermunicipal services and infrastructure

- 3.3.3 Options for cost and revenue sharing shall be explored with regard to provision of services which meet the needs of both County and summer village residents.
- 3.3.4 The partner municipalities shall work together to fund key capital infrastructure investments within the IDP area. In addition,

emphasis should be placed on developing intermunicipal programs for efficient and cost-effective service delivery.

##### Extension of municipal services

- 3.3.5 Consideration for on-site water and wastewater servicing that meets relevant provincial and federal policy may be considered ahead of extension of municipal services. Other options which may be considered include but are not limited to:
  - a. Hauled water services;
  - b. Truck fill stations;
  - c. On-site sanitary sewers; or
  - d. Low-impact development practices.
- 3.3.6 Adequate system capacity shall be required prior to connection to municipal services for either the water and wastewater systems in the area.
- 3.3.7 A system capacity assessment may be required to be undertaken at the cost of the applicant prior to extension of municipal services.



### Stormwater management


- 3.3.8 New developments shall integrate stormwater management systems into their design to the satisfaction of the development authority.
- 3.3.9 Provisions should be made to control stormwater runoff to predevelopment rates through the use of on-site storage and stormwater management facilities.
- 3.3.10 The use of low-impact stormwater management facilities to control water quantity and quality shall be encouraged and best management practices shall be considered as measures to control stormwater amount and quality and reduce its impacts on the lake.

### Utilities and pipeline corridors

- 3.3.11 When considering plans of subdivision and development permits, Alberta Energy Regulator (AER) shall be consulted regarding setbacks.

### 3.4 Social and Economic Development

The area's stable access to services and recreational amenities have ensured that the residential communities surrounding Pigeon Lake have continued to be popular vacation and summer home destination for Albertans since the area was first developed.



#### Policies

##### Social and cultural development

- 3.4.1 Opportunities for celebration of local culture and social activities shall be supported and be encouraged to be residents from different municipalities.

##### Intermunicipal programs

- 3.4.2 Intermunicipal programs for physical, social and economic development shall be encouraged within the IDP area. This may include joint funding of services used by both County and summer village residents including:
- Libraries;
  - Waste Transfer Stations;
  - Boat Launches;
  - Recreation areas; and
  - Community centres.

##### Tourism

- 3.4.3 Unique tourism opportunities including but not limited to cycling tours or events, agri-tourism businesses, recreational and cultural events shall be encouraged by the partners.

### 3.5 Recreation

Pigeon Lake is the main recreation resource in the area. Maintaining its recreational and aesthetic value is an integral part of the IDP. In addition, its use is complemented by a range of secondary recreation options which support the area's sustained value.



#### Policies

##### Future Land Use Concept

- 3.5.1 Expansion of recreational uses shall be promoted in general accordance with Map 1: Future Land Use Concept.

##### Compatibility of recreational uses

- 3.5.2 Proposed recreational uses shall be sensitive to impacts on nearby residents and shall not cause a nuisance in the form of noise, dust or other impacts.
- 3.5.3 Mitigation may include controlling hours of operation and landscaping buffers.
- 3.5.4 Parking areas and accesses should be designed to minimize disturbance to lands within the IDP area through additional traffic or parking.

##### Support existing recreational areas

- 3.5.5 Expansion of recreational areas should complement the existing recreational and cultural uses found within the IDP area and enhance the overall appeal of existing facilities. Potential options for additional recreation opportunities may include:
  - a. Renovating the existing Mission Beach public lake access, or

- b. Expanding the recreational component of the lands managed by Camp Bar-V-Nok.
- c. Acquiring lands to support additional public recreational access to the lake.
- d. Connectivity between the existing and proposed recreation areas, including trails should be encouraged.

##### Trails development

- 3.5.6 The viability of a locally operated, interconnected trail system and open space network shall be explored to provide a range of recreational opportunities in the area.
- 3.5.7 New recreation trails shall be encouraged to be integrated into the summer villages to support residential access where feasible.

### Protection of environmentally significant areas

- 3.5.8 Development of recreation areas should promote the preservation of existing environmentally significant areas while providing opportunities for both active and passive outdoor recreational activities and related support facilities.

### Seasonal activities

- 3.5.9 Integration of recreation activities both in summer and winter seasons shall be promoted during the design of new recreational areas.



## 4. Implementation

Successful implementation of this Intermunicipal Development Plan will require a series of joint initiatives and a continuation of ongoing partnerships between both municipalities and the development industry. Policies within the IDP can guide future use of planning tools, provide mechanisms for administering the IDP area and managing disputes between the partner municipalities. In addition, the success of ongoing actions will need to be monitored on an ongoing basis.

The proposed implementation plan is described under the following themes:

- Planning tools
- Plan administration mechanisms
- Review and referral process for development applications and plans
- Intermunicipal dispute resolution; and
- Monitoring and review

## 4.1 Planning Tools

The IDP is intended as a broad policy framework regarding land use, transportation, municipal services, environmental management, recreation, parks and open spaces. More detailed plans such as Area Structure Plans (ASPs) and Outline Plans will need to be prepared for specific areas within the IDP that are expected to be developed in the near future. The ASPs must be prepared in accordance with the provisions of the MGA.



### Policies

#### Annexation

- 4.1.1 Annexation of County lands by the summer villages for residential uses shall not be considered until all developable parcels are utilized within the summer villages' boundary.
- 4.1.2 Any potential annexation shall be in accordance with the requirements outlined in the MGA and should only occur following an approved growth study.
- 4.1.3 Annexation of existing residential subdivisions within the County by adjacent summer villages may be considered subject to meeting the requirements outlined in the MGA.

#### Area Structure Plan requirements

- 4.1.4 Area Structure Plans and Local Area Structure Plans shall typically be initiated by individual developers or landowners and shall meet the policies contained in this IDP and other plans prepared by the municipalities.

- 4.1.5 A Local Area Structure Plan shall be prepared and approved by Council prior to, or in conjunction with, any application for subdivision or development approval for any new Resort Residential developments.
- 4.1.6 In addition to the requirements of the MGA, a Local Area Structure Plan shall include but not be limited to the following:
  - a. Conformity with the policies and objectives of the IDP, overarching ASP and the municipalities' MDPs;
  - b. Conceptual layout of future land uses proposed for the area and impacts on adjacent land uses;
  - c. Conceptual layout of internal roadways based on the County's municipal standards;
  - d. Conceptual provisions for stormwater management;
  - e. Conceptual provisions for potable water and where appropriate a site water distribution concept;
  - f. Conceptual methods of sanitary disposal and where appropriate a site sanitary sewage collection concept;
  - g. Conceptual location of public utility lots and corridors wherever possible

- to the satisfaction of the County and utility provider;
- h. Detailed provisions for municipal and environmental reserves including the protection and integration of natural areas, where applicable;
- i. Proposed phasing of development; and
- j. Any other information that both Councils deem necessary.

#### Outline Plan requirements

- 4.1.7 An Outline Plan shall be prepared and approved by Council prior to, or in conjunction with, any application for subdivision or development approval for any new Multi-lot Country Residential developments.
- 4.1.8 An Outline Plan shall include but not be limited to:
  - a. Development Concept Plan outlining site design, land uses, access, and open spaces;
  - b. Servicing approach; and
  - c. Any other supporting study at the discretion of the Development Authority.

## 4.2 Plan Administration Mechanisms

Section 631(2)(b) of the MGA requires an IDP to include provisions related to the administration of the plan including procedures to amend or repeal the plan.



### Implementation Actions

#### Adoption of the IDP

- 4.2.1 This Plan shall be adopted by Bylaw by the Councils of the Leduc County, the Summer Village of Sundance Beach, the Summer Village of Itaska Beach, and the Summer Village of Golden Days.

#### Amendment of the IDP

- 4.2.2 Amendments to the IDP may be initiated by:
- Recommendations from the Council of the municipalities; or
  - Property owners or members of the public through the municipality in which they reside.
- 4.2.3 Any amendments to this Bylaw by the Councils of the partner municipalities shall be circulated and adopted by all municipalities.
- 4.2.4 Amendments may include:
- Changes to policy (text amendments);
  - Boundaries; or
  - Other matters as may be determined.

#### Amendments to the North Pigeon Lake ASP

- 4.2.5 The North Pigeon Lake ASP shall be required to be amended in order to comply with the policies contained in this plan.

- 4.2.6 These amendments include but are not limited to:

- Amendment to the NPLASP Concept for Lakeshore Conservation Areas to match redefined areas for the Lakeshore Conservation Area as overlaid by the Lakeshore Environmental Development Area.
- Amendment to the NPLASP Concept for Resort Recreation Areas to match redefined areas for Resort Residential areas in the IDP.

#### Municipal Authority

- 4.2.7 Each municipality will administer the provisions of the IDP and act as the Approving Authority for lands within their jurisdiction within the IDP area.

#### Establishment of the Joint IDP Steering Committee

- 4.2.8 A Joint IDP Steering Committee will be established to provide opportunities for collaborative decision-making.



### Composition of the Joint IDP Steering Committee

4.2.9 The Joint IDP Steering Committee will be comprised of two (2) elected officials from each municipality. The CAOs or their designate(s) shall provide support to the Committee. Only the elected officials will have voting rights.

### Responsibilities of the Joint IDP Steering Committee

4.2.10 The mandate of the Joint IDP Steering Committee shall be to facilitate on-going sharing of information between elected officials and staff and provide a forum for review and comment on a range of topics identified within the IDP.

4.2.11 Responsibilities of the Joint IDP Steering Committee may include, but not necessarily be limited to the following:

- a. To make recommendations on intermunicipal matters to their respective Councils;
- b. To monitor the progress of the IDP including overseeing that implementation actions identified in the IDP Implementation Plan are acted upon;
- c. To review any proposed applications for annexation and make recommendations to their respective Councils;
- d. To review any proposed amendments to the IDP and make recommendations to their respective Councils;
- e. To act as an informal review body for any amendment, proposed Area Structure Plans or significant development and subdivision applications that may have a significant impact upon the IDP area;

- f. In the event that a subdivision or development application results in an appeal, the Joint IDP Steering Committee may provide written comments to the appropriate appeal body; and
- g. To provide a forum to develop and recommend for approval to their respective Councils about agricultural, land development, industrial, tourism, social and economic development initiatives within the IDP area.

### Administrative Procedures for the Joint IDP Committee

4.2.12 The administration of the Joint IDP Steering Committee will be held by Leduc County and rotate among the partner municipalities on an as needed basis.

4.2.13 Administrative procedures include:

- a. The establishment of dates and locations for meetings, production of agendas and other matters as deemed necessary;
- b. Keeping of minutes of the Joint IDP Steering Committee meetings;
- c. Making a decision to meet once annually and/or at the request of each municipality; and
- d. The chairmanship of the Joint IDP Steering Committee will alternate between the representatives from the partner municipalities.

### Committee schedule

4.2.14 Committee meetings on particular applications will convene after comments have been received as a result of an intermunicipal referral.

### 4.3 Review and Referral Process for Development Applications and Plans

Each Municipality will be responsible for the approval [and enforcement](#) of applications and plans within their boundaries. In addition, the partner municipalities agree to refer to each other those applications and plans for lands identified for the intermunicipal referral process.



#### Policies

##### Referral area

4.3.1 All parcels within the IDP Boundary shall be considered for intermunicipal referral.

##### Matters for referral

4.3.2 The partner municipalities shall circulate the following plans and specific development applications within IDP lands:

- a. Area Structure Plans, Local Area Structure Plans, Outline Plans and amendments;
- b. Rezoning applications that do not meet the vision established in the IDP Future Land Use Concept;
- c. Amendments to the municipal land use districts located within the IDP area; and
- d. Land uses that are not permitted uses under existing land use districts.

4.3.3 In addition to specific development plans identified for referral, municipalities shall be encouraged to also refer any matter which may be of interest, or may be relevant to this Plan and the land within the IDP area, and may include:

- a. Municipal Development Plan approval or amendments;

- b. Transportation, water, wastewater or stormwater management plans;
- c. Recreation and/or parks plans; and
- d. Tourism development.

##### Matters not for referral

4.3.4 The following development application types shall be exempt from circulation to the neighbouring municipalities:

- a. Subdivisions applications within the IDP area involving creation of maximum 3 parcels within a quarter section and be processed by the appropriate Development Authority in accordance with local policies;
- b. Residential re-development in existing subdivisions or summer villages including single lot subdivision, reconstruction of existing developments and minor development permits; and
- c. Residential developments in the summer villages which are aligned with their respective Municipal Development Plans.

#### Notice to impacted parties

- 4.3.5 The municipalities shall notify any affected individuals, organized groups within and surrounding, the Plan Area, regarding any development proposals which may have adverse impacts on affected parties, including development or activity that may generate smoke, smell, noise, aesthetics, traffic, storm runoff, or land use conflicts.

#### Response to submissions

- 4.3.6 The maximum time to provide comment by each municipality shall be 21 days.
- 4.3.7 Each municipality, at its discretion, may grant an extension to the maximum 21 days response time.
- 4.3.8 In the event that either municipality does not reply within, or request extension to the maximum response time, it will be assumed that the responding municipality has no comment or objection to the referred project or planning document.

## 4.4 Intermunicipal Dispute Resolution

The implementation of an intermunicipal dispute resolution mechanism is a requirement of all IDPs pursuant to Section 631(2)(b) of the MGA. In order to satisfy this requirement and to ensure that the principles of fairness and due process are respected, a dispute resolution process is established by the partner municipalities.

It is important to note that this process only applies to those areas where the Municipal Government Board has jurisdiction.



For the purposes of this Plan:

**"Initiating Municipality"** means the municipality in which the land that is the subject of a proposal is located;

**"Proposal"** means a planning document considered for referral, land use re-designation, subdivision application, development permit application, an Area Structure Plan or an Area Structure Plan amendment, or an IDP amendment; and

**"Responding Municipality"** means the other Municipality.

### Stage 1: Adherence to the Plan

4.4.1 The continued referral of planning applications, statutory plans and amendments and other studies and documents is essential to maintain proper communication and coordination between the two municipalities.

### Stage 2: Administrator review

4.4.2 If an issue arises, it is referred to the Municipalities' CAO's or designate for review. The administrators will determine if the proposal can be processed without referral to the Joint IDP Steering Committee for review.

4.4.3 In the event that a proposal cannot be resolved at the administrative level, either Municipality may refer that proposal to a sub-group of the Joint IDP Steering Committee for review.

### Stage 3: Joint IDP Steering Committee review

4.4.4 If a proposal is unable to be resolved at the administrator level, a meeting of a sub-group of the Joint IDP Steering Committee will be scheduled.

4.4.5 The sub-group of the Joint IDP Steering Committee shall be composed of representatives from representatives from only the initiating municipality and the responding municipality.

4.4.6 After consideration of a proposal the sub-group of the Joint IDP Steering Committee may:

- Provide recommendations back to the administrations with respect to revisions to the proposal that should be considered to make it more acceptable to both municipalities;
- If possible, agree on a consensus position of the Committee in

- support of or in opposition to the proposal, to be presented to both Councils; or
- c. Conclude that no initial agreement can be reached and that a consensus position of the Committee will not be presented to both Councils.

- c. Engagement, at equal cost to both municipalities, of an impartial and independent mediator agreed to by both municipalities; and
- d. Approval by both Municipalities of a mediation schedule, including the time and location of meetings and a deadline for the completion of the mediation process.

4.4.7 If a proposal cannot be satisfactorily processed following the sub-group of the Joint IDP Steering Committee review, then that proposal will be referred to the Councils of the initiating and responding municipalities.

4.4.13 If agreed to by both municipalities, any members of the Joint IDP Steering Committee or administrative staff from either Municipality who are not participating directly in the mediation process may act as information resources either inside or outside the mediation room.

#### Stage 4: Municipal Councils

4.4.8 After receiving the recommendations of the sub-group of the Joint IDP Steering Committee with respect to a particular proposal, each Council will establish a position on the proposal.

4.4.14 All participants in the mediation process will be required to keep details of the mediation confidential until the conclusion of the mediation.

4.4.9 If both Municipal Councils support a proposal, then the approval and IDP amendment processes can be completed.

4.4.15 At the conclusion of the mediation, the mediator will submit a mediator's report to both Councils.

4.4.10 If both the Councils cannot agree on a proposal, then the matter may be referred to a mediation process.

4.4.16 If a mediated agreement is reached, then that agreement will be referred to both Councils for action. Both Councils will also consider the mediator's report and the respective positions of the Municipal administrations with respect to the mediated agreement. Any mediated agreement will not be binding on either Municipality and will be subject to the formal approval of both Councils.

4.4.11 In the event that the two Municipalities resort to mediation, the Initiating Municipality will not give approval in the form of second and third readings to appropriate bylaws until mediation has been pursued.

#### Stage 5: Mediation

- 4.4.12 The following will be required before a mediation process can proceed:
- a. Agreement by both Councils that mediation is necessary;
  - b. Appointment by both Councils of an equal number of elected officials to participate in a mediation process;

4.4.17 If a mediated agreement cannot be reached or if both Councils do not approve a mediated agreement; then the appeal process may be initiated.

### Stage 6: Appeal to the Municipal Government Board

- 4.4.18 In the event that the mediation process fails, the Initiating Municipality may pass a bylaw to implement the proposal (e.g. a bylaw amending an Area Structure Plan) or issue a development permit or approve a subdivision application.
- 4.4.19 If the Initiating Municipality passes a bylaw to implement the proposal, then the Responding Municipality may appeal that action to the Municipal Government Board under the provisions of Section 690 of the MGA.
- 4.4.20 The Responding Municipality must file a notice of appeal with the Municipal Government Board and give a copy of the notice of appeal to the Initiating Municipality within thirty (30) days of the passage of the disputed bylaw.
- 4.4.21 Any appeals related to subdivision and development permit applications shall be referred to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (SDAB) of Leduc County.
- 4.4.22 Provisions for appealing a decision of the MGB to the Court of Appeal are provided in the MGA.

## 4.5 Monitoring and Review

The ongoing and periodic review of this IDP is necessary to ensure that it remains relevant and applicable to changing realities within the area.



### Policies

#### IDP review and update

- 4.5.1 The municipalities shall undertake a yearly review of the IDP at the appropriate administrative level and identify issues, if any, to be discussed at the Joint Intermunicipal Steering Committee.
- 4.5.2 In order to address changing economic and market trends, the municipalities should undertake a major update of the IDP every four years from the date of adoption of the IDP by means of municipal bylaws.

#### IDP amendment

- 4.5.3 The IDP may need to be amended subject to the review and agreements of the Councils of each municipal partner. An amendment to the IDP may be initiated by:
- Recommendations from the Council of the municipalities.
  - Property owners or members of the public through the municipality in which they reside.
  - Amendments to the Plan must be adopted by all municipalities via Bylaw, in accordance with Section 187 of the MGA.

- 4.5.4 Amendments could include changes to policy (textual amendments), boundaries, and other matters as may be determined by either municipalities or applicants.

### Repeal of the Intermunicipal Development Plan

4.5.5 If one municipality deems the IDP no longer workable, the bylaws adopting the IDP will need to be repealed by all municipalities in accordance with the MGA. In addition, the following procedures should be followed prior to the final actions of repealing the bylaws:

- a. One municipality will give the other notice in writing of the intention to repeal its bylaw adopting the IDP;
- b. Within 90 days of the date of the notice in writing to the other municipality, a Joint IDP Steering Committee meeting shall be held;
- c. Following the Joint IDP Steering Committee meeting, the municipality filing the notice of repeal may either withdraw its notice by providing a letter to the other municipality or proceed to give a bylaw to repeal the IDP First Reading; and
- d. A Bylaw to repeal will require a Public Hearing and three (3) readings in order to be fully adopted.





## 5. Definitions

All the terms and meanings in this IDP shall carry their normal definitions unless otherwise defined herein.

**Act** means the Municipal Government Act R.S.A. 2018 and Amendments thereto, and the Regulations passed pursuant thereto.

**Adjacent** means contiguous or would be contiguous if not for a river, stream, railway, road or utility right of way or reserve land; and any other land identified in this Bylaw as adjacent land for the purpose of notifications.

**Agri-tourism** means the use of agricultural land and / or buildings for events and activities related to agriculture that create tourism opportunities. Agri-tourism operations typically charge a fee for experiences that include, but are not limited to, u-pick patches, market gardens, greenhouses, farm tours, recreational activities, trail riding, country vacations and hosting of special/seasonal events.

**Albert Energy Regulator (AER)** means the independent agency regulating the safety and development of Alberta's energy resources: oil, natural gas, oil sands, coal, and pipelines.

**Area Structure Plan (ASP)** means a statutory plan adopted by Council as an area structure plan pursuant to Section 633 of the Act.

**Buffer** means an open greenspace or undisturbed natural area; row of trees, shrubs, earth berm, or fencing to provide visual or physical separation and/or noise attenuation between lots or a public roadway.

**Building** includes anything constructed or placed on, in, over or under land but does not include a highway or public roadway or a bridge forming part of a highway or public roadway.

**Highway Commercial Use** means the use of land or building for the operation of a business, either wholesale or retail with specific focus on providing services to motorists. Does not include home-based businesses, industrial operations, or other commercial land uses defined in this bylaw.

**Canada Land Inventory (C.L.I.) Soil Class Rating System** means a system for assessing the limiting effects of climate and soil characteristics on the land for growing common field crops. The CLI is used as a preliminary evaluation tool for classifying prime and marginal agricultural soils and landscapes to emphasize the potential capability of soils.

**Confined feeding operation** means an activity on land that is fenced or enclosed or within buildings where livestock are confined for the purpose of growing, sustaining, finishing or breeding by means other than grazing, but does not include seasonal feeding and bedding sites; as defined by the Agricultural Operation Practices Act, Chapter A-7, Revised Statutes of Alberta, 2000.

**Conservation** Refers to the activity of protecting from degradation the essential biological, physical and chemical characteristics of the natural environment.

**Cost Sharing** means that costs for an agreed upon mutually beneficial project or development would be funded by all municipalities based upon some mutually agreed-to basis.

**Country Residential** refers to a non-farm rural residence, normally on a site of 8.09 hectares (20 acres) or less in size.

**County Council** means the Council of the Leduc County.

**Development** means:

- a. an excavation or stockpile and the creation of either of them,
- b. a building or an addition to or a replacement or repair of a building and the construction of placing in, on, over or under land,
- c. a change of the use of land or a building or an act done in relation to land or a building that results in or is likely to result in a change in the use of land or building, or
- d. a change in the intensity of use of land or a building or any act done in relation to land or a building that results in or is likely to result in a change in the intensity of use of the land or building.

**Development Permit** means a document issued by the Development Authority or by Council in the case of a decision under a Direct Control District; authorizing a development issued pursuant to this bylaw.

**Discretionary Use** means the use of land or a building that may or may not be allowed by a Development Authority, with or without conditions, based upon the merits of the development permit application.

**Dispute Resolution** means interest-based dispute resolution processes outside of formal appeal or court settings.

**Environmentally Significant Area** means landscape elements or areas that have important and/or unique environmental characteristics that are essential to the long-term maintenance of biological diversity, soil, water or other natural processes, both within the Environmentally Significant Areas and in a regional context.

**Environmental Reserve** means land dedicated (given) to a municipality during the subdivision process because it is considered undevelopable for environmental reasons in accordance with Section 664 of the MGA. This may include, but not be limited to, areas such as wetlands, ravines, drainage courses, and steep slopes.

**Extensive Agriculture** means the use of land or buildings for the raising or production of crops, livestock, or poultry; but not restricting the generality of the foregoing, does not include feedlots, intensive hog operations, beekeeping, intensive poultry or fowl operations, sod farm, plant nurseries, livestock yards, or residences.

**Highway or Road** means:

- a. land used or surveyed for use as a public highway or road, and,
- b. includes a bridge forming part of a public highway or any structure incidental to the public highway, road or bridge.

**Intermunicipal Collaboration Framework (ICF)** means a collaboration framework among two or more municipalities to provide for integrated and strategic planning, delivery and funding of intermunicipal services, to steward scarce resources efficiently, and ensure municipalities contribute funding to services that benefit their residents.

**Industrial Use** means to provide for agricultural, forestry and rural-related services, storage, repair, processing and minor manufacturing uses on isolated sites, requiring minimal servicing, to serve primarily rural residents.

**Local Area Structure Plan (LASP)** means a plan adopted by Council which provides additional details of the planning and engineering, land uses, design and servicing arrangements of the development. Local Area Structure Plans must be consistent with all higher-level policies governing an area.

**Area Structure Plan (ASP)** means a statutory plan adopted by Council as an area structure plan pursuant to Section 633 of the Act.

**Municipal Development Plan (MDP)** means a Planning Document, adopted by Council that provides land-use policy direction for planning and development activity over a prescribed period of time as outlined in Section 632 of the MGA.

**Outline Plan** means a land-use planning document, adopted by Council resolution, that supports an overarching Area plan and provides specific content and detail to a localized site during the subdivision process.

**Owner** means a person entitled to any freehold or other estate or interest in land, at law or in equity, in possession, in futurity or expectancy. The owner of a parcel or lot within the County or summer village shall be the person(s) identified on the assessment roll.

**Parcel** means the aggregate of the one or more areas of land described in a certificate of title or described in a certificate of title by reference to a plan filed or registered in a Land Titles Office.

**Recreation Use** Refers to development including natural open space, improved parkland and active and passive recreational areas, and any facilities or buildings associated with recreation, serving the needs of a municipality, area or region.

**Revenue Sharing** means that "net" municipal tax generated within a designated geographic area would be shared between municipalities upon some mutually agreed-to basis.

**Subdivision** means the division of a parcel of land by an instrument and "subdivide" has a corresponding meaning.

**Subdivision Authority** means a subdivision authority established under Division 3 of the MGA.

**Development Authority** means a subdivision authority established under Division 3 of the MGA.

**Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (SDAB)** means a subdivision and development appeal board established under Division 3 of the MGA.

**Transportation Network** means the system of transportation uses (i.e. public transit, rail, air, pedestrian, etc.) that are interconnected.

**Summer Village Councils** mean the Municipal Councils of the Summer Village of Itaska Beach, Summer Village of Sundance Beach and Summer Village of Golden Days Beach.

**Summer Villages and Leduc County**

---

**Summer Village Council** mean the Municipal Council of either the Summer Village of Itaska Beach, Summer Village of Sundance Beach or Summer Village of Golden Days Beach which is referenced or of interest.



## Appendix A: Project Background

In the summer of 2018, Leduc County and the summer villages of Sundance Beach, Itaska Beach and Golden Days initiated a project to develop a vision and policies to manage growth in the lands along their shared borders through this Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP).

The purpose of the IDP is to ensure that there is common agreement and vision in place to guide the future development and use of land within the intermunicipal fringe area. The IDP also provides opportunities to address community concerns, share resources, and establishes a framework for on-going consultation and cooperation in areas of mutual concern and interest.

Alongside the creation of the IDP, the partner municipalities also undertook the creation of an Intermunicipal Collaboration Framework to identify and manage the provision of intermunicipal services between the partners.

## Plan Area

The IDP area is comprised of approximately 2,700 hectares (6,700 acres) of land including the present limits of the three summer villages, as shown on Map 2: IDP Plan Area.

Given the importance of Pigeon Lake on surrounding future land uses, the boundary was selected to include the entirety of the Pigeon Lake watershed in proximity to the summer villages.

Existing land use within the IDP area is a mix of agriculture, country residential and resort communities. Other uses of note include the natural areas surrounding the summer villages, Camp Bar-V-Nok in Golden Days, and the commercial uses at AJ's Trading Post. Access into the IDP area is provided by Provincial Highways 616 and 778.

## Legislative Requirements

The Municipal Government Act (MGA) provides direction for municipal and intermunicipal planning matters in the Province of Alberta. Specific regulations of relevance to Intermunicipal Development Plans are outlined in Section 631 of the MGA, which states:

*631.(1). Two or more councils of municipalities that have common boundaries that are not members of a growth region as defined in section 708.01 must, by each passing a bylaw in accordance with this Part or in accordance with sections 12 and 692, adopt an intermunicipal development plan to include those areas of land lying within the boundaries of the municipalities as they consider necessary.*

*(1.1) Despite subsection (1), the Minister may, by order, exempt one or more councils from the requirement to adopt an intermunicipal development plan, and the order may contain any terms and conditions that the Minister considers necessary.*

*(1.2) Two or more councils of municipalities that are not otherwise required to adopt an intermunicipal development plan under subsection (1) may, by each passing a bylaw in accordance with this Part or in accordance with sections 12 and 692, adopt an intermunicipal development plan to include those areas of land lying within the boundaries of the municipalities as they consider necessary.*

*631.(2). An Intermunicipal Development Plan*

*(a) must address:*

- i. the future land use within the area,*
- ii. the manner of and the proposals for future development in the area,*
- iii. the provision of transportation systems for the area, either generally or specifically,*
- iv. proposals for the financing and programming of intermunicipal infrastructure for the area,*

- v. the co-ordination of intermunicipal programs relating to the physical, social and economic development of the area,
- vi. environmental matters within the area, either generally or specifically,
- vii. the provision of intermunicipal services and facilities, either generally or specifically, and
- viii. any other matter related to the physical, social or economic development of the area that the councils consider necessary.

(b) must include:

- i. a procedure to be used to resolve or attempt to resolve any conflict between the municipalities that have adopted the plan,
- ii. a procedure to be used, by one or more municipalities, to amend or repeal the plan, and
- iii. provisions relating to the administration of the plan.

(3) The council of a municipality that is required under this section to adopt an intermunicipal development plan must have an intermunicipal development plan that provides for all of the matters referred to in subsection (2) within 2 years from the date this subsection comes into force.

(4) Subject to the regulations, if municipalities that are required to create an intermunicipal development plan are not able to agree on a plan, sections 708.33 to 708.43 apply as if the intermunicipal development plan were an intermunicipal collaboration framework.

The procedure for adopting an IDP is described in Section 692 of the MGA. Policies contained in the summer villages and Leduc County IDP will come into force once the County and Summer Village Councils have given Third Reading to this IDP Bylaw. It is intended that policies in the IDP Bylaw shall not be applied retroactively to subdivisions and/or development applications already in progress.

The policy framework for the IDP is referenced in Leduc County's Municipal Development Plan Chapter 9: Collaboration with Neighbours and Regional

Partners, which contains policies on intermunicipal cooperation.

## **North Saskatchewan Regional Plan**

In addition, the IDP area is also within the North Saskatchewan Regional Plan (NSRP). The NSRP is a regional land use plan to manage lands and natural resources under development by the Province of Alberta.

At time of writing, no legislation has been adopted and no drafts of the plan have been published. When the NSRP is adopted this document will be reviewed and amended to ensure compliance with the regional plan.

## **Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan**

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region *Growth Plan* (2016) was adopted to provide a long-range vision for land use, servicing, collaboration and economic development for the municipalities surrounding Edmonton. Leduc County is included in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board (EMRB) and is subject to the land use policies found in the *Growth Plan*.

The EMRB *Growth Plan* designates the lands within the IDP Area as part of the Rural Area and identifies the areas as being zoned and/or designated for Country Residential development.

## Leduc County Municipal Development Plan

Key goals from the Leduc County Municipal Development Plan (MDP) include:

- Protect agricultural land and support diversity in agriculture;
- Develop compact, mixed use, and walkable communities;
- Protect and enhance the natural environment;
- Develop opportunities for recreation;
- Promote an efficient and cost-effective system of transportation and utility service infrastructure; and
- Collaborate with neighbours and regional partners.

Relevant Policies from the MDP include:

*4.5.3.1 The approved Area Structure Plans for Pigeon Lake and Wizard Lake will guide subdivision and development in those areas.*

*6.2.0.9 The County will promote initiatives and organizations that seek to improve the health and function of Wizard Lake, Pigeon Lake, the North Saskatchewan River and other watercourses and water bodies.*

## North Pigeon Lake Area Structure Plan

The North Pigeon Lake Area Structure Plan (ASP) was adopted by Leduc County in 2010 following a comprehensive stakeholder engagement campaign. The ASP provides a high-level vision for the lands within Leduc County within the Pigeon Lake watershed. The plan provides a policy framework which allows for orderly and environmentally conscious development that responds to future subdivision and development proposals and establishes a preliminary servicing concept for the area. The ASP includes regulations about suitable development in the following policy areas which form the foundation of policy areas in this plan:

- Cluster Subdivision
- Lakeshore Conservation Area
- Resort Recreation Area
- Preservation Area





## Pigeon Lake Watershed Management Plan

The 2018 Pigeon Lake Watershed Management Plan (PLWMP) is a non-statutory document intended to provide a coordinated, science-based strategy to protect and improve the quality of water in Pigeon Lake, its shore lands and its watershed. The plan has been supported by the many municipalities and communities bordering Pigeon Lake. The Plan’s goals include:

- Reducing the frequency and severity of algal blooms;
- Improving the health of the watershed and the lake; and
- Improving the recreational value of the land and economic health of the region.

The PLWMP identifies managing phosphorous sources within the watershed as a key priority of the plan. The following excerpt from the PLWMP shows the relative breakdown of phosphorous into Pigeon Lake.

## Plan Scope

The IDP defines the strategic framework for land uses, future development, transportation systems, service extensions, intermunicipal programs and servicing, environmental matters, referral and dispute resolution processes and other mutually agreed-to policy directions within the IDP area for the next 10 years.

While the IDP is intended to be a long-range planning policy document, it should be subject to regular monitoring, review and periodic amendments to ensure that the IDP policies are up to date with evolving trends, innovations and growth in the area as well as the broader region.

The IDP will provide for an amendment process when it is in the mutual interest of Leduc County and the summer villages.

## Pigeon Lake Phosphorus Sources - 2013




Figure 1 Phosphorous Inputs into Pigeon Lake. Retrieved from Pigeon Lake Watershed Management Plan (2018).





## Appendix B: Community Context

Understanding the historic background and current trends within the intermunicipal fringe area provides an essential foundation for the IDP development process.

This section provides an overview of local history and culture, demographic trends, land use trends, existing land uses, environmental features, infrastructure and existing development constraints within the intermunicipal fringe area

## Local History and Culture

### First Nations in the Area

The lands within the IDP and surrounding areas are the traditional territory of the Cree, Tsuu T'ina, Blackfoot and Métis people.<sup>1</sup>

The area is part of Treaty No. 6, signed in 1876, and includes over 313,3000 square kilometres of land extending from Jasper, east towards The Pas in Manitoba and from Athabasca to Red Deer.

Today, Reserve No. 138A is located at the eastern shores of Pigeon Lake and is shared by the Samson Cree Nation, Montana Cree Nation, Louis Bull Tribe and Ermineskin Cree Nation.

### Rundle's Mission

Reverend Robert Rundle established his religious mission in the area in 1847. This marked the first western settlement near the lake and for a half-century the mission was a gathering place for travellers in the area. The site was sold in 1906 and homesteaded, however a revived interest in the history of Rundle's Mission started to grow in the 1950s. Today, Rundle's Mission is recognized as a National Historic Site of Canada for the site's significance in being the first missionary in the Prairies between the Pacific Ocean and Manitoba.

### Recreational Development

Starting in the mid-twentieth century, subdivision and development of lands in the IDP area began as Pigeon Lake became a popular recreation destination for people in central Alberta.

This led to the establishment of the original beaches along the borders of the lake including Sundance, Itaska, Johnsonia, Golden Days, and Sandholm. Of the three summer villages in the IDP area, Itaska Beach was the first to be incorporated, in 1953 followed by Golden Days in 1965 and Sundance Beach in 1970.<sup>2</sup>

Currently, Pigeon Lake is one of the most popular and intensely used recreational lakes in Alberta. The ease with which it can be accessed from major urban centres, such as Edmonton, Red Deer, Leduc, and Wetaskiwin, make the area a destination for many Albertans in the area.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://native-land.ca/>

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.municipalaffairs.alberta.ca/mc\\_municipal\\_profiles](http://www.municipalaffairs.alberta.ca/mc_municipal_profiles)

## **Demographic and Land Use Trends**

### **Recent Development Trends**

Interviews with municipal staff and reviews of recent development permit applications indicate that there has been a slow-down in the number of new residential communities planned. Prior to the 2015 economic slow-down several larger residential and recreation developments were planned although no development has been undertaken.

The population of each of the summer villages has remained relatively stable throughout the years although the resident population of the summer villages is highly variable given the mostly seasonal nature of the communities.

### **Outlook**

At this time, there are no multi-lot residential subdivisions planned within the IDP area although the majority of lands allow for future residential subdivision at the landowner's discretion.

The majority of future residential development is expected to occur on County lands. Much of the land within the IDP boundary is currently designated as cluster subdivision, lakeshore conservation or resort recreation areas.

### **Development in the summer villages**

The Summer Village of Golden Days Municipal Development Plan identifies the opportunity for the development of up to 15 additional 'back lots' within the municipality. This estimate is based on the availability of lakefront lots which can provide lake access to those back-lot developments.

At this time, there does not appear to be significant undeveloped lands within either the summer villages of Itaska or Sundance Beach that are suitable for development.

## Existing Land Use

The current land use districts in Leduc County within IDP area are identified in Map 3: Leduc County Land Use Districts.

### Agriculture/Residential

The majority of lands within the IDP area consist of agricultural quarter sections with some larger parcels having been subdivided for large-lot country residential acreages.

### Residential Subdivisions

There are a variety of residential subdivisions or 'beaches' within the IDP Area. These include the Itaska Beach, Sundance Beach, the four beaches making up the Summer Village of Golden Days including Johnsonia Beach, Sommerset Beach, Golden Days Beach, and Sandholm Beach as well as the Vasa Lodge condominium. On county lands there are also beachfront communities including Mitchell Beach, Moonlight Bay, Gilwood Beach, Mission Beach and Kerr Cape. Finally, there are several 'back lot' subdivisions off the beach front including Sundance Beach Estates and Kerr Cape Estates.

### Commercial

The IDP area contains a single commercial store, AJ's Trading Post, at the intersection of Highway 778 and Highway 616 which provides fuel and convenience retail for residents and local visitors. The nearest commercial areas include shops in Thorsby to the north or in Wetaskiwin County at Mulhurst Bay to the east.

### Recreation Areas

There is a single public recreation area in Mission Beach which provides lake access to members of the general public.

The other communities in the area also have access to local parks and green spaces within each community.


## Community and Institutional Uses

**Community Halls:** There are several community halls located within the IDP area including Sundance Hall and Sandholm Hall. These halls are often the site of local events and can be rented out by residents in the area.

**Camp Bar-V-Nok:** Camp Bar-V-Nok is a summer camp located in Golden Days. The camp is run for the youth of the Ukrainian Orthodox Community in Edmonton and surrounding areas.

**Rundle's Mission:** At the site of the first settlement in the area is the current Rundle's Mission Retreat Centre. The facility provides programming opportunities for students and community organizations throughout the IDP area.

### Map 3. Leduc County Land Use Districts



### Legend

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>--- Leduc County</li> <li>- - - Summer Villages IDP Boundary</li> <li>□ Summer Villages</li> <li>- - - Pigeon Lake Watershed</li> </ul> | <p><b>Leduc County Land Uses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ AG - Agricultural</li> <li>□ LW - Lake Watershed</li> <li>□ RA - Acreage Residential</li> <li>□ RC - Country Residential</li> <li>□ RR - Resort Residential</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

## Existing Environmental Features

Existing natural features including watercourses, wetlands and vegetation are shown in Map 4: Existing Environmental Conditions.

### Pigeon Lake

Pigeon Lake is the principal environmentally significant feature in the IDP area. Access to, and the recreational use of the lake is the primary reason why many of the communities in the area were developed. The health of the lake and its watershed is a top concern for many residents.

Recent work by the Pigeon Lake Watershed Association (PLWA) including a recent *Watershed Management Plan* and *Model Land Use Bylaw* (MLUB) were used to inform the development of the plan.

### Environmentally Significant Areas (2015)

As part of the work to update its Municipal Development Plan, Leduc County commissioned the creation of a report defining Environmentally Significant Areas (ESAs) within the county. That report identified additional lands as ESAs compared to previous studies. Two ESAs are identified within the IDP area: The Pigeon Lake ESA which includes the Pigeon Lake shoreline and a small portion of the Weed Creek ESA in the northwest corner of the IDP area.

The IDP area also contains scattered wetlands as identified in Map 4: Existing Environmental Conditions. Prime agricultural soils are also located throughout the IDP area, mostly falling within Canadian Land Inventory (CLI) classes 2 and 3, considered valuable in terms of agricultural capacity.

### Wildfire and Emergency Management

Proactive wildfire management and mitigation is crucial to ensuring the safety and sustainability of the summer village and county communities within the IDP area.

Recent emergency and wildfire planning and management work has been undertaken including the following:

- Summer Villages of Argentia Beach (not in the IDP area), Golden Days and Sundance Beach – Hazard and Risk Assessment (2016);
- Itaska Beach – Wildfire Mitigation Strategy (2015); and
- Sundance Beach – Fire Protection Plan (2012).

These documents stress the importance of considering wildfire risk not at an individual level but as a “community concern that requires community members to collectively work towards solutions”

The Itaska Beach - Wildfire Mitigation Strategy provides high-level recommendations and site-specific recommendations for managing wildfire risk in the community.


Of special interest for the IDP area, the Itaska Wildfire Mitigation Strategy highlights the Audobon lands as having an “Extreme Wildfire Threat Potential”. Management and mitigation of the wildfire risk of the Audobon lands is a central recommendation of the Wildfire Mitigation Strategy. The extension of these recommendations to other parts of the IDP area should be considered following additional study.

The Summer Village of Golden Days and Sundance Beach were part of a 2016 Hazard and Risk Assessment. The report highlights the concentrations of deciduous tree cover, grasses, local firefighting capabilities and low spring precipitation as being risk factors. The report concluded that the wildfire threat was highest during the spring.

In addition to the recommended wildfire mitigation strategies, the Sundance Beach Fire Protection Plan (2012) recommended several modifications to transportation infrastructure to improve fire response in the community.



## Map 4. Existing Environmental Conditions



### Legend

- |   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>--- Leduc County</li> <li>- - - Summer Villages IDP Boundary</li> <li>- - - Pigeon Lake Watershed</li> </ul> | <p><b>Environmental Features</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmentally Significant Areas (2015)</li> <li>    Pigeon Lake ESA</li> <li>    Weed Creek ESA</li> </ul> | <p>Land Cover Classification (2015)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>    Agriculture</li> <li>    Forest</li> <li>    Forest (Subdivision)</li> <li>    Open Natural</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>    Open Industrial</li> <li>    Water (Lake/River)</li> <li>    Wetlands</li> </ul> |
|---|--|---|---|

## Existing Development Constraints

As a part of the existing conditions analysis, development constraints such as lagoons, waste management sites, gas pipelines and wells have been identified. The location and associated development setbacks of the landfills, waste transfer sites, highways, energy pipelines, wells and railway tracks are identified in Map 5. Development Constraints.

### Transfer Sites

There are several solid waste management facilities located in the IDP area. These include the operational Mission Beach Transfer Station (Leduc County) located 0.8 km east of RR 15 on Hwy 616 as well as several past landfills located at:

- NE 15-47-1W5 (within the Summer Village of Golden days)
- Plan 9421191-1-1 within NW 29-47-1-W5 (within Leduc County)

Provincial legislation requires that schools, hospitals, food establishments and residential developments shall not be allowed within 300 meters of the existing transfer sites or former landfills.


Reduction in development setbacks from any waste management site may be possible subject to additional geotechnical and environmental testing and approval from Alberta Environment and Parks. A Phase II Environmental Assessment may be required before setbacks could be safely adjusted for this area.

## Oil and Gas Facilities

Throughout the IDP area there are a number of oil and gas pipelines as well as easements related to oil and gas extractions. These facilities and infrastructure are governed by provincial legislation and can be a significant constraint with regard to certain kinds of development within their setback boundaries. Existing operational/non-operational wells and oil gas pipelines are identified in Map 5. Development Constraints.

<b>Oil and Gas Well (AR 43/2002)</b>	No addition of overnight accommodation or public facility within 150m
<b>Abandoned Well (AR 43/2002; AER Directive 79)</b>	No building <5m of an abandoned well
<b>Sour Gas Facility (AER Directive 56)</b>	Notification of the Alberta Energy Regulator (AER) for developments within 150m Variable development buffer based on H <sub>2</sub> S output
<b>Oil and Gas Pipeline (AUC Rule 20)</b>	No permanent dwellings within the pipeline right-of-way.

## Map 5. Development Constraints



### Legend

- |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Leduc County</li> <li>■ Summer Villages IDP</li> <li>■ Pigeon Lake Watershed</li> <li>■ Summer Village Boundary</li> </ul> | <p><b>Infrastructure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Provincial Highway</li> <li>— Local Roads</li> <li>— Oil and Gas Infrastructure</li> <li>— Pipelines</li> </ul> | <p>Oil and Gas Wells</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Abandoned</li> <li>● Active</li> <li>○ Active Well Buffer (150m)</li> </ul> | <p>Landfills and Transfer Stations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Landfills and Transfer Stations</li> <li>▨ Development Buffer (300m)</li> <li>▨ Water Well Buffer (450m)</li> </ul> |
|---|---|---|---|

## Existing Infrastructure

Existing intermunicipal infrastructure within the IDP area is identified in Map 6. Existing Infrastructure.

### Highways

The IDP area also contains two provincial highways, 616 and 778, which provide access to the communities from other parts of the county and the region.

Development along provincial highways requires approval by Alberta Transportation within 300 metres of a provincial highway right-of-way, or within 800 metres of the intersection of a provincial highway with another public road.


### Water

Water servicing in the IDP area is provided through on-site water wells. These wells provide potable water for individual residences.

### Wastewater

Wastewater is primarily managed through on-site septic systems with individual owners being responsible for collecting and removing wastewater created on-site. Only the summer villages of Itaska Beach and Golden Days are connected to the Northeast Pigeon Lake Regional Wastewater Line. This line pipes wastewater from the summer villages to the wastewater lagoon located in Mulhurst Bay and managed by the County of Wetaskiwin. Extension of the regional wastewater line to existing or future communities may be desirable in the future. In those cases, collaboration with the County of Wetaskiwin as the manager of the receiving wastewater lagoon and regional line will be necessary.

## Map 6. Existing Infrastructure



### Legend

- Leduc County
- - - Summer Villages IDP
- Pigeon Lake Watershed
- Summer Village Boundary
- Infrastructure**
- Provincial Highway
- Local Road
- Regional Wastewater Line

Note: Regional Wastewater Line is conceptual only based on copy information from Wetaskiwin County No. 10. For additional details, please contact Wetaskiwin County No. 10.

This page intentionally left blank.



## Appendix C: Stakeholder Consultation

The summer villages and Leduc County Intermunicipal Development Plan was prepared in conjunction with the creation of Intermunicipal Collaboration Frameworks. The future development concept and policy framework for this IDP was established and confirmed through input received from existing property owners, residents, local business owners and other interested stakeholders within the IDP area. The targeted and inclusive stakeholder consultation approach used for this project is outlined in this section.



## Council Involvement

A key part of the process was to ensure that Council members and administrative staff were informed and engaged throughout the planning process. The project team attended multiple Joint Council sessions to seek ongoing direction and input from Council members from involved municipalities.

- December 2018 – Joint Council Session #1
- February 2019 – Joint Council Session #2

### Joint Council Session

#### DECEMBER 2018

Early in this document's development, project staff met with councils from the Leduc County, Summer Village of Itaska Beach, Sundance Beach and Golden Days to identify the preferred land use concept for the IDP area. The Joint Council Session gave councils the opportunity to provide direct input on the preferred land use concept and input on key administrative matters related to the plan.

#### FEBRUARY 2019

Project staff met with the councils from the four municipalities in late February 2019 to discuss the first draft of the IDP document. This session provided an opportunity to discuss the implementation of the land use concept through the draft policy framework and identify key points for future collaboration.

## Community and Stakeholder Engagement

Community members and stakeholders were meaningfully engaged throughout the development of the summer villages and Leduc County IDP in accordance with Section 692 of the MGA.

This involved a variety of engagement activities including the following key events and methods:

### Site Tour

#### AUGUST 2018

Early on in the project, the consultant team and municipal administrators took a site tour to visit key points of interest within the IDP area.

### Staff Interviews

#### AUGUST 2018

In August 2018 the consultant team undertook 6 staff interviews with members of each municipal administration to understand key administrative topics and about the existing status of infrastructure in the IDP area.





### **Multi-Stakeholder Workshop and Open House #1**

SEPTEMBER 2018

PARTICIPANTS - 16

A joint, multi-stakeholder workshop session was held in September 2018 to discuss issues, opportunities and land use vision for the IDP area. The multi-stakeholder session included members from the communities as well as local advocacy groups and administrators.

PARTICIPANTS - 30

A public open house was held in conjunction with the multi-stakeholder workshop to provide a public viewing of the work completed during the workshop session.

### **Local Advisory Committee**

APRIL 2019

PARTICIPANTS - 10

To help inform the study team about local topics of interest and concerns the project team convened a Local Advisory Committee (LAC). The LAC consisted of community members including local recreational residents, farmers and business owners and provided an opportunity for more detailed discussion of the impacts of policies on land development and the lake watershed.

### **Open House #2**

JUNE 2019

PARTICIPANTS - 15

A second public open house was held in June 2019 to gather final public input on the proposed land use concept and policy framework.

### **Public Hearing**

JULY 2019

A public hearing was held as part of the bylaw approval process in each municipality. This provided an opportunity for residents to discuss the final proposed plan and seek clarification or changes prior to final approval of the bylaw.

### **Key themes from the public engagement included:**

Key emerging themes from the multi-stakeholder meetings, public open house and other public engagement events covered a diverse range of expectations and concerns. The following emerging themes helped to guide the creation of the preferred land use concept and policy framework.

#### **Agriculture and Related Uses**

- Small-scale agricultural subdivision should align with the County's Municipal Development Plan.
- Recognition that there are impacts of agricultural runoff in the watershed area but that there is little appetite or ability to influence the agricultural use of fertilizers or run-off management.
- Stated desire to limit Confined Feeding Operations within the watershed boundary.
- Some participants indicated that they felt it was inappropriate for concerns of summer village residents to impact farming practice in the area.

#### **New Country Residential Developments**

- The North Pigeon Lake ASP identifies a need to consider lakeshore access during the design of new residential developments.

#### **Environmentally Significant Areas**

- While generally development was supported where it "made sense". There was concern from the public that development of environmentally significant lands would negatively impact the lake and local environment.
- The proposed policies in the Draft Leduc County MDP indicate that for any development on lands within an ESA will require additional geotechnical or environmental planning at the development/subdivision stage.
- Specific concerns were raised regarding the impact to land values if any area was identified as having an ESA on the land and future development rights.

- Other participants indicated that ESAs are already managed through the County's MDP.
- There was also some suggestion to establish policies to use easements or restrictions to protect riparian areas in the IDP.

#### **Wildfire Risk**

- Wildfire Risk was raised as a potential long-term consideration for this plan.
- Participants indicated several sites might be potential wildfire risks including the provincial park and Audubon lands in Itaska Beach.

#### **Health of the Lake**

- Participant comments were generally consistent that additional efforts should be taken to improve the health of the lake.
- Potential goals included protecting existing wetlands to buffer the lake from contaminants and runoff, limiting residential fertilizer use, or through adopting a 'no net new phosphorous' strategy that manages additional nutrient input into the lake.
- In addition, some participants were interested in seeing additional consideration given to mitigating other nuisance pests in the area including duck liver flukes and other parasites through land use policy.

#### **Lake Access**

- Residents were generally concerned that additional developments in the vicinity result in nuisances as additional users access the lake the lake through their communities and using the public utility lots designated.
- Some residents who participated at the open houses were clear that they were not interested in offering public access to the lake through their communities.
- There is currently a public access area located in Mission Beach which some residents noted was poorly maintained.

### **Trail Connections**

- There was some desire from the County to encourage the development and maintenance of a trail connection through the IDP area including the summer villages as part of a county-wide recreational trail network.
- In this area it would connect to the Trans Canada Trail and the Kiskayo Trail which run along the shore of Pigeon Lake.
- Trail development was proposed to be aligned with historical trails in the area.

### **Transportation Access**

- Transportation access into the IDP area is generally adequate.
- Golden Days has requested that Leduc County undertake maintenance work on Range Road 14 into the summer village.
- All three summer villages showed a clear preference to limit vehicle access between the communities to reduce shortcutting and speeding through the communities.

### **Future Infrastructure Servicing**

- Broadly, it was felt that the extension of municipal water services into the IDP area is outside of the aspirations of the municipalities and residents at this time.
- It was felt that private developers should be responsible for future infrastructure investment that would be needed to support higher density developments.

### **Stormwater Management**

- Generally, there was agreement that more could be done to manage and clean stormwater before it reached Pigeon Lake
- It is important to protect the quality of the lake by slowing runoff into the surrounding riparian areas There are also a number of streams and riparian areas in the IDP area.

### **Social and Economic Development**

- Some residents indicated a concern about the long-term viability of the commercial spaces in the area.
- While there was no ongoing economic or tourism development work going on in the area, parties felt that future initiatives should be shared collaboratively between the municipalities.

### **Plan Hierarchy**

- The IDP will be an overarching policy document to the MDPs in the area, the North Pigeon Lake ASP and other Local Area Structure Plans.

### **North Pigeon Lake ASP**

- Feelings were mixed about the success of the North Pigeon Lake ASP.
- The NPLASP was seen as having received significant engagement when it was created.
- Feelings were mixed about whether the land uses proposed in the ASP were appropriate to protect the health of the lake.

