



**LEDUC
COUNTY**

What we heard

Municipal Development Plan Interim Review

Created: 11/23/2023

Table of Contents

What we heard 1

Background 3

Public participation 3

What we asked..... 4

How we communicated 4

How you participated..... 5

What you told us..... 5

What we learned and what we’re doing 18

Appendix A: submission - MDP Wetlands and Grasslands Act Sheet..... 20

Appendix B: submission - Making Wetlands Work In Your Municipality (NAWMP) 23

Background

Leduc County is undertaking an interim review of its Municipal Development Plan (MDP), which was adopted by Council in June of 2019. The MDP guides future land use and policy decisions in the County for the next 25-30 years. The MDP aims to support growth and prosperity across all regions of the County by identifying and recognizing the County's unique assets and opportunities within both the rural and urban areas and builds upon them.

The *Municipal Government Act* (MGA) requires municipalities to adopt an MDP.

In addition to the requirements of the MGA, the MDP must also consider direction from other legislation, regulations and policies such as the provincial land use policies, the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board (EMRB), and Leduc County's Strategic Plan. Of particular note, is the Regional Agriculture Master Plan (RAMP) that EMRB began work on in 2018, which is a land use plan specifically for agriculture in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region.

RAMP was approved by EMRB on August 12, 2021, and by the Government of Alberta on December 21, 2022. All EMRB member municipalities, including Leduc County, are required to update their MDP to align with RAMP by December 21, 2024.

To meet this requirement, the County is undertaking an interim review of its MDP and is intended to be limited in scope. The objectives of the interim review are to:

1. Align the MDP with provincial legislative and regulations that have changed since the adoption of the MDP.
2. Align the MDP with plans and studies approved by the EMRB since adoption of the MDP (i.e. RAMP).
3. Identify and address inconsistencies between the MDP and plans adopted by the County or studies and strategies approved by the County since the adoption of the MDP.
4. Revise MDP policies identified through the implementation of the MDP in need of refinement to provide clarity.

There are three phases to the MDP Interim Review: *project start-up*; *build solutions*; and *project completion*. The project team has drafted revisions to the MDP to bring it into alignment with RAMP and other objectives of the MDP interim review in consultation with Council.

Public participation

The objective of the public participation campaign for this project is to give the public a clear understanding of the scope of decisions being made during the MDP interim review, to gather input on the proposed draft MDP, and to inform participants of how their input was used by reporting back to the community.

What we asked

Between **Nov. 16 and Nov. 30**, we presented a summary of the proposed changes to the MDP document and asked participants to consider the following question:

- ▶ **Do you have any comments about the proposed MDP revisions?**

How we communicated

HOW WE COMMUNICATED

 **14** e-newsletters sent |  **7,143** County Chronicles mailed
 **6** advertisements published |   **6** social media posts

We promoted the opportunities for input in the following ways:

- ▶ **County Chronicle:** we shared information about the project and how to get involved in Leduc County's quarterly publication, the County Chronicle, in the mid-September issue. In the mid-December issue, we thanked citizens for participating and informed them of next steps.
- ▶ **Engagement HQ page:** we published a MDP review webpage on Leduc County's public participation website – yoursayleducounty.com – which provided project details including a question-and-answer section, feedback boards, a comment form, a news feed and project updates.
- ▶ **Media release:** we sent a release to local media on Nov. 7, 2023, sharing information about upcoming MDP open houses, which took place on Nov. 20 to 22. Please note these open houses were combined with Land Use Bylaw open houses.
- ▶ **Newsletters:** we shared project information in the following e-newsletters to subscribers:
 - County Express newsletter (internal) – four editions
 - Land Use Bylaw project newsletter (external) – four editions
 - Public participation newsletter (external) – five editions
- ▶ **Print advertisements:** we placed six print advertisements in two local papers, the Leduc Representative and Connect 39, which promoted the opportunity to participate and directed readers to the project webpage yoursayleducounty.com/mdp.
- ▶ **Radio advertisements:** we ran a radio advertising campaign on 93.1 fm, The One, from Nov. 5 to 18. A commercial advertising the project ran four times per day over the course of the campaign.

- ▶ **Roadside signs:** we placed seven roadside sign advertisements throughout Leduc County. The signs were up from Nov. 2 to 23 and advertised upcoming open house dates.
- ▶ **Social media posts:** we shared six social media posts on Leduc County's Twitter and LinkedIn pages.
- ▶ **Website notices:** we posted two website notices on Leduc County's municipal website, leduccounty.com and one on Leduc County's business website, leduccountybusiness.com.

How you participated

HOW YOU PARTICIPATED

 **2** online form respondents |  **25** social media engagements

 **113** people attended three open houses |  **1** letter received

 **8** open house comments |  **5** emails received

We heard from respondents in the following ways:

- ▶ **Emails:** we received five project-related emails from participants.
- ▶ **Mailed submissions:** we received one mailed letter from a participant.
- ▶ **Open house comments:** we received eight comments from five participants on our feedback boards at three joint MDP and Land Use Bylaw open houses that had 113 attendees.
- ▶ **Online comments:** we received two online form submissions from participants.
- ▶ **Social media engagements:** we received 12 link clicks, five reactions, one repost and one retweet on our social media posts.

What you told us

Between Nov. 16 and Nov. 30, a total of thirteen participants submitted input about the Municipal Development Plan Interim Review project and some common themes were highlighted, as follows:

Protection of prime agricultural land

- ▶ Respondents want to protect prime agricultural land.
- ▶ Respondents felt that prime agricultural land should not be allowed to be divided into three or four parcels in a quarter section.

- ▶ Respondents want to restrict encroachment of urban municipalities onto prime agricultural land in Leduc County.
- ▶ Respondents want to preserve prime agricultural land for an extremely long period of time.

Agritourism

- ▶ Respondents want agritourism and recreational agriculture supported by the County and made easier and less costly to pursue.

Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan (EMRGP) and Regional Agriculture Master Plan (RAMP)

- ▶ Respondents want more information on what is being proposed for the land designated as Area A (Prime Agricultural Area) and Area B (All Other Agricultural Area) in the MDP.
- ▶ Respondents were concerned that the number of agricultural areas be reduced from four to two.
- ▶ Respondents also liked having Agriculture as just two policy areas.
- ▶ Respondents want more information on EMRGP or RAMP to understand what to look for, how these plans fit into the review process along with any potential impacts on growth and development in the County.
- ▶ Respondents want RAMP to retain and restore wetlands as part of environmental stewardship, as science shows wetlands can improve crop and livestock production.

Environmental and wetland management and protection

- ▶ Respondents want the County to retain and restore wetlands as part of environmental stewardship as science shows wetlands can improve crop and livestock production.
- ▶ Respondents want to protect the environment and strengthen wetland management and conservation within the County.
- ▶ Respondents want protection of environmentally-sensitive land like Ministik Lake.
- ▶ Respondents want to enhance the natural environment by adopting beneficial management practices and programs.
- ▶ Respondents want to protect existing natural areas along with restoring impacted natural features, as this contributes to biodiversity, climate adaptation and mitigation.

Home-based businesses

- ▶ Respondents felt home-based businesses should be secondary to the established principal residential use of the property and should not detract from the rural or residential character of the surrounding area.

Development on non-prime agricultural land and in designated urban areas

- ▶ Respondents want to see development restrictions in prime agricultural areas.

- ▶ Respondents want development to be around existing municipalities that already have services to attract people to the county.
- ▶ Respondents want to allow second acreage development on non-primary farmland.
- ▶ Respondents want development on lower soil quality lands in the eastern part of the County.
- ▶ Respondents want to limit the parcels of land allowed on a quarter section of land to two.
- ▶ Respondents want rural subdivisions to not be allowed in Area A and B when there is not working wastewater management and appropriate ground infrastructure.

New Sarepta development

- ▶ Development of New Sarepta should focus on making it a safe, warm, attractive place to live where commercial development in central New Sarepta attracts people and light industrial is on the periphery.
- ▶ Make the hamlet livable and attractive to people to live there.

Email submissions

Between Nov. 16 and Nov. 30, we received input from **five respondents** via email. The following are verbatim submissions and summaries of the response provided.

*Only comments containing **input** on the MDP review project are reflected below; questions are documented and answered outside of the public participation process.*

Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response
<p>In essence, while I know that planning needs to balance development vis-a-vis residential, commercial and industrial, I think the key to New Sarepta is making it an attractive place to live for families... who could be employed in larger nearby centres like EIA, Leduc, Nisku Beaumont... even south Edmonton.</p> <p>With our schools and utility infrastructure in place, I think we'd get more growth by making the community attractive and warm and a bit fun than to try to shoehorn a few jobs into the centre of town by allowing some questionable businesses (which write their proposals pretty well but then don't follow through with promises).</p> <p>With population growth, we'd likely gain a few more jobs in the community in the store and</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your feedback on how to make the hamlet a safe, warm and attractive place to live and for recognizing the work the County has done on the infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>Section 4.4.2 was updated to clarify that residential, commercial and institutional uses should be located in the core of New Sarepta, with light industrial uses supported around the periphery.</i></p>

<p>meadery and hair salon simply because there'd be more traffic.</p> <p>So... make the community a safe, warm, attractive place to live, raise a family and act as home to people in surrounding larger places. That's not to deny commercial opportunities that fit into that definition of making the core attractive and useful... and light industry on the periphery, but to really focus on the liveability and attractiveness of the hamlet... and sell it as that... a place to call home... with amenities and warmth where people can have a short commute to good jobs in the nearby communities, and to fuel growth that way rather than scrapping for every possible job in town at the detriment of an urban landscape that might be less attractive.</p> <p>I also recognize that Leduc County has done an outstanding job with our infrastructure to this point and the community is in far better shape that it was 10 years ago... so thank you for that.</p>	
<p><i>Excerpt: Leduc County LUB and MDP (Interim) Review; Ducks Unlimited Canada (DUC) – Alberta Operations Submission</i></p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide input for the development of Leduc County's updated MDP and LUB. The County's process on public engagement and appreciation for environmental considerations is appreciated.</p> <p>Alberta's wetlands and grasslands have been disappearing from the provincial landscape for over 150 years. In southern Alberta, up to 70% of wetlands and the benefits they provide have been lost to urban expansion, agricultural management practices and infrastructure development. Wetlands are essential natural assets that provide multiple benefits to Counties in a very cost effective and sustainable manner. These benefits, known as ecosystem services, include flood and drought mitigation, water quality improvement, carbon sequestration, groundwater recharge, biodiversity, and cultural and recreational use. These benefits are being</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your comments, Section 6.2 was modified to include a wetland objective which states "to protect wetlands in a manner that achieves a no net loss of wetlands through subdivision and development and, where possible, create a net gain. Similarly, a Policy was added under section 6.2.0.4 which requires identification of wetlands into statutory and non-statutory documents for protection of those areas through subdivision planning and development.</i></p>

increasingly recognized and incorporated into government and industry priorities at all levels. Balancing social and environmental goals in a context of increasing development pressure is complicated but can be done. The County is encouraged to consider the following comments to help ensure natural areas are protected for the benefit of service delivery and (future) residents.

Current MDP Comments

Regarding RAMP related revisions

The RAMP emphasizes the role agriculture can play in environmental stewardship. For example, section 4.2 states: *Ensure agricultural lands and associated landscapes are managed through the application of best management practices specific to soil, water and the environment.*

Retaining and restoring wetlands is a key BMP. Science also shows wetlands can improve crop and livestock production. Wetlands increase the number of pollinators in farm fields, which means better crop pollination and higher yields. Other beneficial insects found in wetlands are predators of common crop pests – flea beetles in canola, for example. DUC research shows wetlands can cool the air temperature in local fields by up to three degrees Celsius, reducing heat stress in vulnerable crops. Another DUC study found restoring drained wetlands can reduce nitrogen and phosphorus running off farm fields into creeks, rivers and lakes.

There are several opportunities to update the MDP in this light.

- Consider updating the introduction on page 51 to include not only protecting existing areas but also restoring impacted natural features. This contributes to biodiversity but also climate adaptation and mitigation. In addition, Objective 2.1 of the EMRB Growth Plan also sets out an objective to not only conserve but also restore.
 - o E.g. restoring wetlands can benefit not only biodiversity but

<p>also improve protection from flooding and drought.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To enhance resiliency of agricultural landscapes the County should consider including goals, objectives and policies related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Further encouraging adoption of beneficial management practices through further development, implementation and adoption of programs (County and external parties) focused on enhancing the natural environment. <p><u>General MDP Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please review the attached MDP Act Sheet and, as needed, the sample wording document for additional opportunities to strengthen wetland management and conservation within the County. <p><i>For further detail, please see Appendix A: MDP Wetlands and Grasslands Act Sheet and Appendix B: Making Wetlands Work In Your Municipality</i></p>	
<p>Specifically, in regards to the MDP portion; I reviewed the materials online to gain a better background of this initiative prior to attending the Rollyview open house. Under the header of R.A.M.P., there are 2 primary takeaways that I interpreted from my review.</p> <p>6.1 "<i>Identify and conserve an adequate supply of prime agricultural land ...</i>"</p> <p>6.2 "<i>minimize fragmentation and conservation of prime farmland ...</i>"</p> <p>Having interpreted that this meant prime farmland as #1 soil such as on the west boundary of city of Leduc, which was formerly land within Leduc County, I was pleased this might suggest no more of prime farmland to the west would be turned into development. Previously, I had submitted at a joint area structure plan meeting, that Leduc County and City of Leduc has a better</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your feedback on conserving prime ag land and where development is best suited.</i></p>

<p>choice at disposal to the eastside of City of Leduc on County lands with the following justifications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lands to the east are lower soil classification 2. The technical issues of limited transportation corridors having to cross QE2 would have suggested developing east would have mitigated these issues. 3. I understand that City development is a "city" issue, but keep in mind the prime lands the city is currently stripping are prime land that could have been protected by the County and this new MDP. 4. I am also aware the EIA development restrictions have finally been eased. This should have been fought for harder and earlier, which I also voiced to Ward 3 councilors, Schonewill and McDonald. <p>My property is zoned agricultural and has small amounts of #1 soil, but more #4 soil. Please do not interpret my interests for development to come my way and increase our property value as it genuinely disturbs me to watch development of prime land to the West when there are better options.</p>	
<p>██████████ has no objection to the proposed MDP described in the file mentioned above.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your feedback and letting us know that you have no objection.</i></p>
<p>4.5.4.1 Wording in the Rural County area should be changed to reflect the wording in 3.5.2.1 – in other words Home-based businesses shall be secondary to the established principal residential use of the property and shall not detract from the rural or residential character of the surrounding area.</p> <p>Concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is proposed that the number of agricultural areas be reduced from four to two, however since this is a significant deviation from the existing MDP, the proposed subdivision policies and criteria 	<p><i>Thank you for your input on the MDP and relationship to RAMP, along with your concerns.</i></p> <p><i>The wording for Home Based Business in 4.5.4.1 was updated to reflect the wording in 3.5.2.1.</i></p> <p><i>The Agricultural Areas were determined based on the Edmonton Metropolitan Region, Land Evaluation and Site Assessment model (LESA) used in the preparation of RAMP. The updated MDP will be aligned with the RAMP in protecting Prime Agricultural Lands by restricting subdivisions. Agricultural Area A, Area B and Agricultural Smallholding Overlay Area are proposed.</i></p>

<p>for both areas should be included for discussion purposes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. It is proposed that a significant portion of the Rural County be designated as Area A – Prime Agricultural and another similar portion of the Rural County designated as Area B – All Other Agricultural. This is a significant change from the existing MDP and there is no information on what criteria was used to assess the land or how the delineation of these areas was determined. 3. If the goal is to conserve valuable agricultural lands, why is more than 1 area being proposed when most of the land can support agriculture in some way – not just crops but pasture as well. It is vital that landowners have a much better understanding of what is being proposed for these two areas. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback to the Land Use Bylaw as well as the MDP however even after attending 3 open houses, I have found the process difficult to follow. Since the MDP is the long-range vision for growth and development, I would have thought this revision would occur first. In my opinion, this then should have been followed by revisions to the LUB which guides and controls development. 2. There is minimal reference to either the MGA and its relationship with municipalities or the EMRGP or RAMP that may impact growth and development in Leduc County. Other than referring people to the web site, it would have been useful to have a bit more information to understand what to look for, how these fit into the review process and any potential impacts on growth and development in the County. 3. Is there a timeline for providing proposed changes to the rest of the LUB? 4. I support this first step in the public consultation process and look forward to the public hearing process on this portion as well as 	<p><i>The criteria for various types of subdivision are addressed within the General and Specific policies under section 4.3.</i></p> <p><i>In Area A, four types of subdivision are provided, with no more than two (2) titled lots per unsubdivided quarter section.</i></p> <p><i>In Area B, five types of subdivision are provided with no more than three (3) titled lots per quarter section. The Smallholding Overlay Area will not allow more than three subdivisions (four titled lots) per quarter section.</i></p> <p><i>Agricultural Area A’s purpose is to conserve large, contiguous tracts of prime agricultural land with minimal fragmentation, while the intent of Area B is to conserve agricultural land on a comprehensive basis for a broad range of agricultural operations. The intent of the Smallholding overlay is to support diversification of agricultural operations and minimize potential impact on Beaverhills UNESCO Biosphere.</i></p>
--	--

<p>more opportunities to provide input into this important document.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The MDP proposes the two Agricultural Districts be known as Area A (Prime Agricultural Area) and Area B (All Other Agricultural Area). This is of great concern as it appears that Area B will become the dumping ground for any type of business that wishes to locate in the rural County. This will definitely impact the list of permitted and discretionary uses in these districts and must be addressed in the Land Use Bylaw review. 2. Also being proposed in the MDP is properties designated as Area A, B and C in the current MDP will be given consideration for three titled lots per quarter section. Since this is a significant change and the impact of such a change, such as permitted and discretionary use along with minimum parcel size, is unknown, it is difficult to comment on this section. 	
---	--

Mailed submissions

Between Nov. 16 and Nov. 30, we received input from **one respondent** via post mail. The following is the verbatim submission and a summary of the response provided.

*Only comments containing **input** on the topic are reflected below; questions are documented and answered outside of the public participation process.*

Comment <i>(verbatim unless otherwise noted)</i>	Response
<p>I attended the recent MDP open house at Rollyview. Ostensibly, Leduc County has declared it is championing preservation of prime farmland from urban and industrial development. I am not convinced that this is the case, as growth and resultant taxation income still seems to dominate most government bodies. Edmonton, Leduc, Beaumont and Devon have all spread out in recent times to cover prime agricultural land once under the domain of the County.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your input on preservation of farmland and restricting encroachment of urban municipalities onto prime agricultural land in Leduc County.</i></p>

<p>Canda still has the luxury of preserving food bearing lands.</p> <p>The global temperature rising is going to make food even tougher to grow.</p> <p>I also want to defend our wildlife populations which are suffering already and western Canada is only about 150 years old from a settlement perspective.</p> <p>Public input is necessary and thoughts about the future growth of the area are extremely important but individual concerns are not as everyone has a vested interest in what would gain them the most.</p> <p>I would very much want the County to commit extremely long term to protection of farmland and have a legal team appointed and able to block encroaching municipalities.</p>	
---	--

Open house comments

Between Nov. 16 and Nov. 30, we received **eight comments** from five participants via the feedback boards at our three joint MDP and Land Use Bylaw open houses, which had a total of 113 attendees.

Comment (<i>verbatim unless otherwise noted</i>)	Response
Support agri-tourism vs. oppose it. Have a clear path for farms. Less cost to pursue change to Recreational/Ag.	<i>Thank you for your feedback on agritourism.</i>
I love the detail and bringing ag things to just 2 levels. Good to see development restriction in prime areas. That changes/relaxations are opportunities not entitlements.	<i>Thanks for your input on your perspective on Ag levels and development restriction.</i>
Keep up the good work team.	<i>Your comments are appreciated.</i>
2 zones will not cut it. There has to be something to protect [environmentally] sensitive land. Ex. Ministik Lake Area.	<i>Thank you for your input on environmental protection in the plan. We believe that the protection of environmentally sensitive land is</i>

	<i>addressed in chapter 6 – Natural Environment. Environmentally Significant Areas are described on Map 6 and Ministik Lake is within the UNESCO Beaver Hills Biosphere Reserve. Policy 6.1.0.5 states that “Development within and adjacent to the Beaver Hills UNESCO Biosphere Reserve will incorporate conservation buffers and linkages and ecological design features to mitigate and minimize potential adverse impacts to the satisfaction of the County.”</i>
Happy to see County hosting these events throughout the area.	<i>Thanks for the feedback letting us know that you appreciate that we had the public participation events throughout the County.</i>
Very pleased with the work of the Planning department. Some drops but overall attempt to be fair is appreciated.	<i>Thank you, we appreciate hearing that.</i>
Rural subdivisions should not be allowed in A&B when wastewater management cannot work with the ground infrastructure.	<i>Thanks for the input on where subdivisions should not be allowed and the reasons why.</i>
<p><i>Verbal comment summary:</i></p> <p><i>“The central area of New Sarepta should be zoned for commercial/retail, with onsite manufacturing and other industry located on the periphery.</i></p> <p><i>[I am] particularly concerned about a vehicle repair service in the central area. Soup to Nuts as well is something that should be located outside of the central area.”</i></p>	<p><i>Thanks for your feedback on the central area of New Sarepta and your concerns about existing businesses.</i></p> <p><i>Section 4.4.2 was updated to clarify that residential, commercial and institutional uses should be located in the core of New Sarepta, with light industrial uses supported around the periphery.</i></p>

Online comments

Between Nov. 16 and Nov. 30, we received **two comments** through the project page at yoursayleducounty.com/mdp.

Only comments containing input on the MDP review project are reflected below; questions are documented and answered outside of the public participation process.

Comment <i>(verbatim unless otherwise noted)</i>	Response
--	----------

<p>I did take the opportunity to attend one of the open houses. My Comments are concerning the policies governing the designation of prime farmland.</p> <p>As stated in the proposed change that two parcels of land or two subdivision are allowed on a 1/4 section of land. Numerous times I have already seen 3 and 4 parcels of land on a 1/4 section. Where is the polishing implemented? Why is land that clearly has a prime agricultural land designation being allowed to be divided into 3 and 4 parcels.</p> <p>As a landowner and a dairy farmer I'm worried that these inconsistencies are going to affect our ability to continue to farm in a sustainable manner. If the policy is there use it, is there good reasons for the change from policy, is it because of politics. A policy is only as good as the paper it is written on if it's not implemented. These parcels are not designated unfarmable, they are directly adjacent to land that I farm. We need to be better not just for us but for the future.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your comments regarding policies around designation of prime farmland and specifically about the number of parcels you think should go onto a quarter section. As well, we hear your concern about consistently applying the policy.</i></p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. why our government requires a new MDP when the last one was done 4 years ago. our money could be better use elsewhere. 2. all farming land should be protected. allowing a second acreage development on non-primary farmland is not the best way to attract people to the county, development should be around existing municipalities who already have services to offer. 	<p><i>Thank you for your feedback on protecting farmland. Municipal Development plans are designed to be reviewed and updated every five years as a standard practice. As well there is a need to update the MDP to be consistent, align and be compatible with the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board (EMRB) Regional Agriculture Master Plan (RAMP). RAMP is a land use plan specifically for agriculture in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region. RAMP was approved by EMRB on August 12, 2021, and by the Government of Alberta on December 21, 2022. All EMRB member municipalities, including Leduc County, are required to update their MDP to align with RAMP by December 21, 2024.</i></p>

Phone submissions

Between Nov. 16 and Nov. 30, we received **no input** from respondents over the phone.

Social media comments

Between Nov. 16 and Nov. 30, we received **no input** through our social media posts and advertisements.

Other comments

Based upon some of the comments received by administration, it is clear that land-use governance is a controversial topic that evokes many emotions, opinions and conversations. Social trends and world affairs have contributed to misinformation and disinformation about Leduc County's Land Use Bylaw, and about municipal government processes and responsibilities in general.

The input below has been documented for transparency; however, as it is unrelated to Leduc County's Municipal Development Plan, it will not be used to influence the decision-making for this project.

*Only comments containing **input** are reflected below; questions are documented and answered outside of the public participation process.*

Comment <i>(verbatim unless otherwise noted)</i>	Response from administration
I would like to emphasize two global phenomena currently on the top of the news channels. The Palestine war is not truly religious or cultural. It is happening because overpopulation on a restricted land base means poverty. Similar problems plague island nations like Haiti. Where do people go? Into the sea?	<i>Thank you for sharing your perspective on global issues.</i>

Other questions

The questions asked below have been documented for transparency; however, only **input** relevant to the MDP is used to influence the decision-making for this project.

Question <i>(verbatim unless otherwise noted)</i>	Response from administration
What is the cumulative impact of sewage on adjacent properties (acreage developments) touching each other?	<i>Thank you for your question regarding the cumulative impact of sewage on adjacent properties. The Municipal Development Plan requires servicing plans for new multiparcel acreage developments to address these issues. Instances of new development in established multiparcel subdivisions are addressed by the Land Use Bylaw and the safety codes act.</i>

Is there a timeline for providing proposed changes to the rest of the LUB?	<i>Thank you for your question, it has been passed on to the Land Use Bylaw Update team.</i>
--	--

What we learned

After reviewing the input received from the public participation campaign, we've identified some key takeaways. Here's what we've learned from participants for this project:

1. Respondents want to protect and preserve prime agricultural land.
2. Respondents want to restrict encroachment of urban municipalities onto prime agricultural land in Leduc County.
3. Respondents want to limit the parcels of land allowed on a quarter section of land to two.
4. Respondents want to allow second acreage development on non-primary farmland.
5. Respondents want development on lower soil quality lands in the eastern part of the County.
6. Respondents want more information on what is being proposed for the land designated as Area A (Prime Agricultural Area) and Area B (All Other Agricultural Area) in the MDP.
7. Respondents want rural subdivisions to not be allowed in Area A and B when there is not working wastewater management and appropriate ground infrastructure.
8. Respondents want to see development restrictions in prime agricultural areas.
9. Respondents felt that prime agricultural land should not be allowed to be divided into three or four parcels in a quarter section.
10. Respondents want development to be around existing municipalities that already have services to attract people to the county.
11. Respondents were concerned that the number of agricultural areas would be reduced from four to two.
12. Respondents also generally liked the simplification of Agriculture policies into two policy areas.
13. Respondents want agritourism and recreational agriculture supported and made easier and less costly to pursue.
14. Respondents want more information on EMRGP or RAMP to understand what to look for, how these plans fit into the review process along with any potential impacts on growth and development in the County.
15. Respondents want RAMP to retain and restore wetlands as part of environmental stewardship as science shows wetlands can improve crop and livestock production.
16. Respondents felt home-based businesses should be secondary to the established principal residential use of the property and should not detract from the rural or residential character of the surrounding area.
17. Respondents want development of New Sarepta to focus on making it a safe, warm, livable attractive place to live.
18. Respondents want commercial development in central New Sarepta and to keep light industrial to the periphery to attract people to the hamlet.
19. Respondents want to protect the environment and strengthen wetland management and conservation within the County.
20. Respondents want protection of environmentally sensitive land like Ministik Lake.

21. Respondents want to enhance the natural environment by adopting beneficial management practices and programs.
22. Respondents want to protect existing areas and restore impacted natural features as this would contribute to biodiversity, climate adaptation and mitigation.

Next Steps

The following are the next steps in the review and revision of the MDP:

- ▶ The input and feedback provided in this What We Heard Report will be considered and a MDP bylaw will be drafted and given First Reading to adopt the revised MDP.
- ▶ A public hearing will be held to receive final feedback on the proposed revisions.
- ▶ The feedback received in the public hearing will be compiled and considered where applicable.
- ▶ A second reading of the bylaw to adopt the revised MDP will be held.
- ▶ Submission of the revised MDP will go to the Edmonton Metropolitan Board for evaluation of alignment with the growth plan.
- ▶ Any necessary changes will be made based upon the evaluation from the Edmonton Metropolitan Board.
- ▶ Third reading of the bylaw will be made to adopt the revised MDP.

Appendix A: MDP Wetlands and Grasslands Act Sheet



Conserving
Canada's
Wetlands

Municipal Development Plan Review

Wetlands & Grasslands - Act Sheet

This document is intended to be a resource and checklist for municipalities going through a review of their Municipal Development Plan. This document contains a main goal for wetland and grassland conservation with corresponding policies and actions to implement this goal. For extensive information and background consult the: *Making Wetlands Works in Your Municipality* guide by the Alberta North American Waterfowl Management Plan. While most wording is focused on wetlands the principle counts for grassland ecosystems as well. For information or a consult on how to specifically implement any of this in your specific municipality and policy review, contact:

Bart Muusse

Provincial Policy Specialist, Ducks Unlimited Canada – Alberta Operations

587-643-8439

b.muusse@ducks.ca

MAIN GOAL

Include a policy to manage the municipality in a manner that achieves a no net loss of wetlands and grasslands, and, where possible, creates a net gain. Consider inclusion of the corresponding policies set out below.

Actions / Sample Policy	Comments from internal discussion/for drafting
Include a wetland vision and objectives in the Municipal Development Plan to inform subsequent planning and future development activities that supports the main policy.	
Include an objective to inventory (built to Provincial Standards) wetlands within the municipality for use in directing development and to identify high value wetlands.	
Where possible, direct that integrate existing wetlands into programmed open space design, green belt planning, environmentally significant areas, etc.	
Determine setback requirements using tools like Stepping Back from the Water, Field Manual on Buffer Design for the Canadian Prairies,	

and riparian setback models to determine optimal buffers before development of lands near waterbodies.	
Incorporate wetland retention and restoration into flood and drought adaptation and management plans, source water protection, stormwater management, and water quality maintenance. Limit compensation credit for stormwater management wetlands to low quality/function wetlands.	
Restore and enhance (networks of) wetlands within municipal boundaries along with the ecological and hydrological function of wetland buffers.	
Establish larger protected/conservation areas, reserves, and buffers around wetland environmentally/ecologically significant areas (ESAs) along with establishment of Critical Function Zones established around wetlands based on knowledge of species present and their use of habitat types.	
Work with the province to ensure approvals given under the <i>Water Act</i> , <i>Public Lands Act</i> or <i>Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act</i> are consistent with municipal wetland goals and objectives.	
Encourage both urban developers and municipal planners to incorporate beneficial management practices in the development design, planning review, and construction stages such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Design plans and projects from the start such that they minimize overall footprint and wetland disturbance and maximize buffers around all waterbodies. - When reviewing plans and project proposals ensure full Municipal and Environmental Reserve is utilized to protect buffers, flood zones and riparian edges around wetlands and other waterbodies. Look for low-impact surface run-off systems. - During construction, enforce regulations for erosion and sediment control, as well as noxious and invasive species control around wetlands and other waterbodies. 	
Work with landowners and land trusts to protect significant wetlands using conservation easements (municipal or external party such as Ducks Unlimited Canada).	
Promote municipal wetland vision and objectives in public education documents as well as general knowledge about wetlands including seasonal, ephemeral wetlands.	
Consider and promote the tourism / recreational benefits of wetlands (e.g. birding, hiking, etc) to developers, homeowners, etc.	
Within the agricultural section of the plan include an objective to work with and reach out to producers on adoption of beneficial management practices to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retain and protect existing wetlands in their natural state. - Restore drained or otherwise impacted wetlands to provide on farm benefits such as improved water quality and reduced erosion as well as for wildlife habitat. - Avoiding cultivation near the edge of wetlands. - Fencing off wetlands and providing alternative water sources for livestock. 	

- (Make use of environmental programs to) maintain or restore permanent cover such as perennial forages near wetlands.	
Collaborate with governmental agencies, NGOs, and research institutions to access funding and technical expertise for wetland conservation projects and initiatives.	
Adopt natural asset management to integrate wetlands and grasslands into the municipal asset management processes. This assists in mitigating impacts of flooding and drought.	
Develop a municipal wetland and/or grassland policy to elevate conservation and direct restoration activities above and beyond the provincial policy recognizing the local context and planning role of the municipality.	
Establish a fund to purchase natural assets that are valuable to the municipality but are not available for acquisition through other means such as environmental reserve.	
Implement the wetland vision when developing Land Use (zoning) bylaws. <i>Alternatively, consider the type, location and density of development being proposed in each zone category and how it will affect the achievement of wetland and watershed objectives. Formulate objectives resulting from this exercise for the MDP to direct (future) policy.</i>	

Appendix B: Making Wetlands Work In Your Municipality (NAWMP)

INSERT PDF