

General Comments		
Issue Raised	Discussion	Questions, Recommendations or Options
<p>Starting point of MDP Concern regarding how the draft MDP was started.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a new MDP, based upon both old MDP and CSP to create a whole new MDP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to the starting point.
<p>Redline version Requests for a redline version of changes since 1998 or CSP version.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per the above, a redline version is not possible as this is comprehensive review process, not an update. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redline version of draft 2 showing changes from version 1 will be provided.
<p>Out of scope Suggestions that the MDP should address issues beyond the scope of an MDP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to be clear and consistent about the purpose and function of an MDP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep the MDP as the guiding document for future land use. Don't weaken it and take away from it by being too inclusive or try to make it a Council strategic document.
<p>Language Concern that language used in the plan is "not enforceable", "pie in the sky", and "motherhood"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is typical language for a visioning document. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change in language. However, the tone and intent will be considered to ensure it is accurate and appropriate.
<p>Language Concerns around the proper use of should, shall, may, etc.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These words were thoroughly considered in preparing the draft MDP version 1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administration will consider every instance in the revised draft MDP version 2.
<p>Language Concerns regarding the language and tone of semi-permanent residents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are valid comments and concerns on both sides: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Semi-permanent residents want to be regarded as members of the community. Residents have concerns with the land use challenges that arise with semi-permanent residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and revise wording to ensure that references to semi-permanent residents are necessary and respectful.
<p>Input into the draft MDP version 1 Concern that the MDP has been driven by developers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MDP is the guiding document for how the Town grows. Mandated by the MGA specifically to address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the future land use within the municipality, the manner of and the proposals for future development in the municipality, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The same opportunities were available for input into the draft document for all stakeholders (community members, developers, BOWDA). To ensure alignment with Town goals, additional work was undertaken with CBT,

		CCHC and EARC in creating the draft.
<p>Scope and purpose of the MDP Concerns regarding specific development proposals or specific areas of town.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MDP is a high level guiding document and does not function as a zoning bylaw. Many concerns cannot be addressed as requested. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to the scope of the MDP. It has a separate function and purpose than a land use bylaw.
<p>Specific policy suggestions Many comments and suggestions for revisions to wording that will improve clarity of policy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many policy suggestions are very useful and thoughtful for improving intent and wording. The purpose of the special Council meeting is not to debate individual policy statements or wording, but to consider significant high level policy direction changes prior to revising the draft. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These policy suggestions will be considered by administration in the revised draft and presented to Council at first reading.

Section 1 Introduction		
Issue Raised	Discussion	Questions, Recommendations or Options
1.2 Vision		
<p>Vision Concern that the vision is not representative of the Canmore community and that the outcomes are not desirable.</p> <p>i.e. growth, affordable housing, diversity, change, not a small town anymore, does not protect existing residents</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the Town undertake another visioning process prior to revising and/or adopting the MDP? A visioning process is a significant process and can take 1 to 2 years. Is there a limit to growth that needs to be better recognized in the vision and outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue with the current MDP review process and undertake a visioning process at a future date which can be used to inform updates to the MDP if necessary.
1.4 Guiding Principles and Strategies to Achieve the Vision/ 1.6 Role of the Plan and Plan Organization		
<p>Goals Concerns expressed that the environment should be top priority in the MDP and in land use/development decisions.</p> <p>Others are concerned that affordability seems to be prioritized over all other community values in the MDP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The environment is only one of the considerations of land use/development decisions. Similarly with affordable housing. The MDP recognizes that there are a number of goals and priorities that ultimately are the decision of Council. Council will take all considerations into account to make decisions, but on a case-by-case basis, some decisions may result in Council holding one value higher than another. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change, but this may need to be better clarified in the introduction of the plan.
1.5 Principles of Change		
<p>Change Concerns that this section of the MDP is not clear in detailing how we are doing things differently.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the threat of change and the tone causing more fear than necessary? Should this section be deleted, or better clarify what this actually means? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove this section from the MDP. Option 2: Maintain the section because it could help in making bold decisions and emphasizes how change happens.

Section 2 Growth Management		
Issue Raised	Discussion	Questions, Recommendations or Options
Introduction		
<p>Limits to growth There is an emphasis in this section that Canmore will grow and change that is causing fear and discontent. Concern that there should be a hard cap on growth, such as a maximum population, maximum number of units, or via an analysis of carrying capacity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have likely already exceeded our ecologic carrying capacity. Population or unit caps are not effective for land use planning and do not speak to the quality of growth and character of neighbourhoods, which are very important to the community. The draft MDP regulates growth through quantitative measures (i.e. growth boundary, land use pattern, phasing) and a variety of qualitative measures (i.e. protection of the environment, economic development, housing, transportation). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to how growth is managed. Language could be modified to eliminate or reduce the emphasis on growth and change throughout the MDP.
Section 2.1 Urban Growth Boundary		
<p>Limits to growth Concern that too much development is allowed within the urban growth boundary, and what ‘urban’ means. There are many comments that Canmore just needs to stop growing at all. No new development, no infill, no redevelopment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May be a heightened reaction to recent events such as Peaks, the Daycare lands, flooding, undermining sinkholes, congestion in the Town Centre. Planning process does not allow the Town to refuse an application without consideration (i.e. public hearing). Once the limits of the urban growth boundary in the draft have been reached, there is very little opportunity for expansion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to current policy direction. ‘No development’ is not an option as approvals already exist. The purpose of the MDP is to direct this growth.
<p>Limits to growth Urban growth boundary for the Future Growth Area should be determined by the MDP, not the Smith Creek ASP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Town is working collaboratively with TSMV and the Province to determine the wildlife corridor through the Smith Creek ASP process, which will ultimately delineate the urban growth boundary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to current policy direction. Possibly rename the urban growth boundary for the Future Urban Growth Area to “Area to be Determined”.
Section 2.3 Growth Phasing		
<p>Priority of affordable housing Concern with the extent that affordable housing is supported in existing neighbourhoods. Concerns expressed that</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is affordable housing given too high a priority against other goals and values in the draft MDP? Is there too much emphasis throughout the plan? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change recommended as Council has made it clear that Affordable Housing is their number one priority.

<p>this will result in a loss of green space, reduction of property values, parking problems, etc.</p>		
<p>Location of growth Concern with the draft MDP attempting to balance growth in new and existing neighbourhoods (infill, redevelopment and intensification).</p> <p>Many comments that it should happen in new areas first and not in existing neighbourhoods, although a few comments do support infill and intensification.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If growth is primarily directed to new neighbourhoods, then the remaining lands for residential development include Spring Creek, Silvertip and TSMV. • Does the Town want to prioritize development on “greenfield” sites rather than allowing infill, redevelopment and intensification (more effective use of built up areas)? • Will this type of “greenfield” growth better protect or maintain the character of Canmore? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to current policy direction. • Council effectively controls new development of new and existing areas through zoning, and decisions are made on a case-by-case basis. • This allows Council to be responsive through implementation of the MDP.
<p>Location of growth Many concerns expressed that infill development should not come at the expense of greenspace.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft MDP does not specifically address this. There is varying understanding of what “greenspace” includes, from public open space to vacant private lands. • In the case of public open spaces, do we want to provide direction in the MDP as to what might be allowed and under what circumstances? • The current draft MDP contains a policy statement for Council to undertake a study to identify Town lands that may be suitable for infill of affordable housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to current policy direction.

Section 3 Hazard Lands and Development Constraints		
Issue Raised	Discussion	Questions, Recommendations or Options
3.5 Steep Creeks		
<p>Risk tolerance level Concern that the risk tolerance level is too high or too low.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A low risk tolerance could result in no or minimal development in hazard areas. A high risk tolerance could result in experiencing future loss beyond what is deemed to be acceptable. We have relied on extensive engagement undertaken by other jurisdictions, notably North Vancouver, to establish risk thresholds for the MDP. The application of these risk thresholds has resulted in what administration feels is a balanced, conservative approach to mitigating and developing hazard areas. • The process of establishing risk thresholds involves extensive engagement. The outcome of the process could result in higher or lower risk tolerance, or a risk tolerance that remains the same. • The Province has been consulted on all aspects of the MDP policy and is supportive of Canmore’s selection of risk thresholds. The Province has indicated that communities adopting prudent, conservative policy towards development in hazard areas are prioritized for support in addressing existing hazards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to policy direction. Maintain risk thresholds identified in the draft MDP.
<p>Hazard and risk assessment Concerns that the Provincial Guidelines for Steep Creek Hazard and Risk Assessment have not been formally accepted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Provincial guidelines are a technical document that outlines how consultants are to study steep creeks. The guidelines recognize that traditional approaches to studying steep creeks that treat them as low gradient rivers does not provide accurate information with which to base mitigation and development decisions. • The guidelines have been developed as part of a collaborative process between the Town and the Province. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to policy direction. Reference provincial guidelines in the draft MDP.

<p>Hazard and risk assessment Concerns regarding using a risk based process versus a hazard based process to create policy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a result of catastrophic losses communities, professional organizations, and countries are adopting risk based approaches to studying and mitigating natural hazards. • Recent examples of adoption of risk based approaches include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Risk-based Land-use Guide: Safe use of land on hazard risk assessment, Natural Resources Canada, Geological Survey of Canada ○ Adoption of Natural Hazard Risk Tolerance Criteria in the District of North Vancouver, BC ○ Flood Risk Assessment City of Calgary • The Auditor General identified Canmore as an example of good practice in the province for adopting risk based approaches. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to policy direction. Adopt the risk based process as outlined in the draft MDP.
<p>Hazard return period Concern with the return period for steep creek hazard assessments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studying higher return periods for earthquakes, and geo-hazards such as landslides, debris floods/flows is necessary to properly understand the potential for loss of life and property damage. • These natural hazards differ from river floods in that the processes can be exponentially higher for rare return periods and that long periods of inactivity can be punctuated by severe events. Thorough understanding of the hazards results in proper decisions with respect to mitigation, emergency response and land use planning. • Studying longer return periods does not obligate the municipality to mitigate for them. For example, Cougar Creek long term mitigation will provide protection for an event that has a 0.3-1% (1/100yr to 1/300yr) chance of occurring any given year. By studying higher return periods we know that the risk of a rarer landslide dam outbreak flood on Cougar Creek will be reduced sufficiently by the mitigation proposed and that the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to policy direction. Return periods studied in accordance with the Provincial Guidelines.

	<p>mitigation will be designed to effectively withstand the larger events.</p>	
<p>Steep Creek Hazard Mitigation Concerns regarding the reliance on engineered mitigation versus passive mitigation through avoidance</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally speaking, the higher the hazard and more intensive the development, the more expensive the mitigation, maintenance costs, and the higher the residual risks. While developers/purchasers bear upfront costs for engineered solutions, government and future land owners bears the costs of mitigation maintenance and residual risk. Therefore the MDP indicates a preference for passive mitigation approaches (i.e. lower intensity development in hazard areas). • That said, engineered mitigation solutions are allowed for in the MDP. Development in low hazard areas may be developed through local mitigation in accordance with engineering guidelines. In moderate hazard areas or for larger developments in low hazard areas, risk assessments and mitigation concepts developed in accordance with engineering guidelines will be required. • If the upfront costs for an appropriately mitigated development are too high then the development won't be viable. If the long-term costs and residual risks aren't palatable for Council, the development may not be approved. • What is important is that the true cost of developing in hazard areas is captured up front and not deferred to future land owners, the community and various levels of governments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to policy direction. Maintain preference for passive approaches while allowing for appropriately mitigated development in low and moderate hazard areas where deemed economical for the developer and of community benefit to Council.
<p>Steep Creek Study Area Concerns regarding the ability to easily update policy areas and the impact on several subdivided vacant lots.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study areas represent locations of potential but yet unquantified hazard. We suggest considering defining the policy for study areas in the MDP but delineating these areas in a separate policy that can be updated as hazard studies are completed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain Study Area policy in MDP • Delineate Study Areas at time of implementation in policy outside of the MDP to allow for easier map and policy updating

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major developments should not occur in study areas until the hazard and risks of that development are clearly understood. • Densification through land-use or policy changes also should not occur in these areas. • Subdivided lots in existing neighborhoods are impacted by this policy. There are approximately 3-4 parcels in Peaks of Grassi that are affected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake hazard studies for remaining developed study areas in Canmore during implementation phase to allow for potential land-use or policy changes that address affordability (e.g. suites) • Consider exceptions for existing subdivided lots within study areas at time of future land use regulation development if hazard studies are not yet complete
<p>Development Hold Zone Concerns with the ability to update MDP map, particularly with the Development Hold Zone (i.e. Hold Zone is not changed once mitigation is in place).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is expected that once long-term mitigation work is underway on Cougar Creek the development hold zone will no longer be required. • Policy should allow for ease of update as new information is acquired. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain a Development Hold Zone policy in MDP • Define the conditions under which a Development Hold Zone is updated to reflect a change in risk • Delineate Development Hold Zones during implementation in policy outside of the MDP to allow for easier map and policy updating
<p>Development Hold Zone Concerns that the proposed Development Hold Zone impacts all hazard zones, including the low hazard zone. Concerns that it also impacts industrial and commercial lots, which are lower risk developments. Significant concern that the hold zone impacts a number of existing vacant parcels.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development hold zone is intended to prevent putting more people in harm’s way in an area where there is high potential of multiple deaths during an event. • To prevent that, significant new development should not occur in moderate or high hazard areas where existing development exceeds loss of life risk thresholds. • Also, intensification of development through rezoning or policy change should not occur in moderate or high hazard areas where existing development exceeds loss of life risk thresholds. • Development in low hazard areas that is constructed in accordance with engineering guidelines does not significantly increase life loss risk. • Commercial and industrial development may not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change MDP to apply development hold zone in moderate and high hazard areas where acceptable life loss risk is exceeded. • Low hazard areas not included within development hold zone. Low hazard area policy applies. • Consider exceptions at time of implementation in land use regulation. Exceptions would be aimed at minimizing risk while avoiding major impacts for undeveloped lots. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – for appropriately locally mitigated development on vacant subdivided lots – for redevelopment to same density, for example in case of fire

	<p>increase loss of life risk significantly but could present a significant economic risk to both the property owner and the community through property loss, business loss, job loss, tax loss and increased insurance costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 10 vacant residential lots and 2 vacant commercial lots in the proposed Development Hold Zone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – for appropriately mitigated commercial/industrial developments
<p>3.7 Undermining</p>		
<p>Undermining history and mapping Concern that the undermining mapping and policies do not contain enough local history and expertise.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration spent numerous hours in discussion with a local expert and a mining consultant (NorWest). Conclusion was that the historical mapping is not sufficiently accurate or complete to use for land use decision-making purposes or mapping in a policy document. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to policy direction.
<p>Development on undermined lands Concern that the Town should not allow development in undermined areas or take on any liability.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under Provincial legislation, the Town does not have authority or responsibility in regulated areas. • New draft MDP policy clarifies Town will not assume any unacceptable undermining risk or liability outside of these designated lands, including risks on municipal infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to policy direction.

Section 4 Environmental Stewardship		
Issue Raised	Discussion	Questions, Recommendations or Options
<p>Adjacency Concern there is no definition of adjacency or specific distance to an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) in the MDP or the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) policy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft CSP identified a variety of distances that defined “adjacency” • Administration opinion is that regulation (i.e. distances) should not be contained within the MDP as it often poses challenges and has unintended consequences. • The preference is to determine adjacency and the applicability of the EIS policy upon receiving a development application. The BCEAG definition of adjacency can also be referred to when necessary and applicable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to policy direction.
<p>NRCB Decision Concern with the use of the term “exclusive jurisdiction”. Suggestions are to remove the reference to the NRCB decision.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town does not have jurisdiction that overrides an NRCB decision. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to policy direction.
<p>BCEAG Exemption Concern that TSMV lands should not be exempt from BCEAG.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BCEAG specifically excludes the TSMV lands. In addition, the draft MDP policy clearly articulates the need for an EIS to be prepared. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to policy direction.
EIS Policy		
<p>3rd party review Concern that the EIS policy should require a 3rd party review of an EIS mandatory.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mandatory requirement can result in an inefficient process and use of taxpayer dollars. • The draft EIS policy allows for the Town to be responsive to the scale and scope of development and to determine when referral of an EIS should be considered (to the Province, the EARC, or a qualified professional) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to policy direction.

Section 5 Affordable Housing		
Issue Raised	Discussion	Questions, Recommendations or Options
<p>Priority of affordable housing Concern that the draft MDP contains an entire section on affordable housing when the current MDP did not.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CSP had a significant focus on the provision of affordable housing recognizing it as the single most challenging issue to sustaining a permanent, diverse population of residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to policy direction.
Section 5.1 General Affordable Housing Policies		
<p>Location of affordable housing Concern over the integration of affordable housing throughout the community, with preference near the downtown and close to transit stops.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There seems to be a perception that walkability criteria for affordable housing essentially exempt Silvertip and TSMV from the need to provide it. One comment suggested affordable housing should be located on undermined lands. Should the Town change where the location of affordable housing is preferred? What is the acceptable level of change for existing neighbourhoods that we are willing to accept to accommodate affordable housing? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to policy direction.
Section 5.2 Non-Market Affordable Housing		
<p>Bold Steps Concern over the reference to taking 'bold steps' to achieve the non-market affordable housing target and that this should not be at the expense of other priorities. Concern that Council will approve anything if there is Perpetually Affordable Housing (PAH) in it.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change recommended as Council has made it clear that Affordable Housing is their number one priority.
<p>Town role in providing affordable housing Concern about public money being used to subsidize housing, in particular purchase PAH units. Concern with having</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is tempered somewhat where the housing is rental PAH rather than ownership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to policy direction, however the annual non-market housing target could be contained within an updated Comprehensive Housing Action Plan (CHAP) or affordable housing strategy

<p>a target of 15% of non-market affordable housing required per annum in the MDP. More support for incentivization rather than the Town providing affordable housing.</p>		
<p>Section 5.3 Market Affordable Housing</p>		
<p>Housing for employees Desire for businesses to provide employee housing rather than tax on residences for PAH</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stronger emphasis in the draft MDP on the need to develop an employee housing strategy
<p>Alternate designs Concern that “mega homes” conflict with affordable housing goals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restricting house size of “mega homes” has limited influence on affordability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft MDP could provide direction for maximum house size in addition to encouraging alternate lot and house designs.

Section 6 Neighbourhood Residential		
Issue Raised	Discussion	Questions, Recommendations or Options
6.1 Neighbourhood Residential		
<p>Limits to Growth Concern that existing neighbourhood character cannot be maintained if infill, redevelopment or intensification is allowed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood residential land use category does not distinguish different types of residential (low or medium density) or areas which may be identified for redevelopment or infill. • The CSP contained areas such as “traditional neighbourhood” or “compact development” that directed where infill, redevelopment or intensification could and could not occur. • While administration does not want to say that no change will ever occur anywhere anyhow, we acknowledge the community’s concern with ‘change’. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administration recommends that the revised draft MDP should explore: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ways to prioritize where growth could occur, such as identifying priority areas (ex. close to downtown, areas within walking distance to services or transit) ○ approaches to growth, such as the natural evolution of neighbourhoods and when infill, redevelopment and intensification is beneficial or acceptable ○ the public consultation or planning process that would be undertaken when change is being proposed
<p>Limits to Growth Concern that there is no definition of ‘significant change’. Should there not be a threshold for when an ARP is required for change in an existing neighbourhood?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should we define a threshold for ARPs, or at the very least goal posts for when an ARP may be required or not. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An ARP should be prepared when council deems necessary, but some criteria in the draft MDP may be desirable.

Section 7 Community Open Space, Recreation and Schools

Issue Raised	Discussion	Questions, Recommendations or Options
<p>Disposal of MR There is great concern in the community surrounding the disposal of MR lands for development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is not currently discussed in the draft MDP (excepting disposal must be done ‘in accordance with the Act’). • Do we want to address this in any other way? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MR will only be disposed for development purposes when there is definitive direction from Council and there is a clear community benefit?

Section 8 Private Recreation and Open Space

No comments that would suggest a significant policy shift.

Section 9 Economic Development

Issue Raised	Discussion	Questions, Recommendations or Options
Economic Development Goals		
<p>Role of MDP Confusion around the role of the MDP and its relationship to the economic development strategy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we really need this section of the MDP, or is it just a carryover from the CSP? • The Town now has the new economic development strategy of CBT that could stand on its own. • However, the draft MDP has used the basis of this strategy to create land use policy to act as a guide for achieving the economic development strategy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change to policy direction.
9.1 Economic Development Strategy		
<p>Impacts of growth In general, lots of comments regarding the impacts of growth on the Town.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What kind of growth are we courting? • The main issue seems to be traffic congestion, should we prioritize growth in certain areas outside of the town centre? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does council want to consider enhanced policies speaking to mitigating the impacts of growth?

Section 10 Commercial & Mixed Use		
Issue Raised	Discussion	Questions, Recommendations or Options
Introduction		
<p>Assessment split Concerns that the residential to non-residential assessment split is not attainable</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Essence of this concern is if the continuation of residential growth in absence of commercial growth is okay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the assessment split attainable, or would Council like to set a different number as a target?
<p>Complementary commercial Questions regarding what is meant by complementary commercial development? Concerns about not having a place where residents can go to buy socks and other affordable but essential goods.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To date, emphasis on the Town Centre isn't about business competition; it is about where community happens (cultural heart). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we need to include more language around essential services and neighbourhood commercial being spread throughout town?
10. 2 Town Centre		
<p>Congestion Concerns around traffic congestion and the emphasis on growth in the Town Centre.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the emphasis on the Town Centre need to be tempered? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make it more clear in the draft MDP that the Town Centre is the cultural heart of the community, not the only place where commercial growth can happen

Section 11 Resort Centre
No comments that would suggest a significant policy shift.

Section 12 Industrial
No comments that would suggest a significant policy shift.

Section 13 Urban Design and Historic Resources

No comments that would suggest a significant policy shift.

- Just an interesting note that there is no emphasis on urban design in the “community character” comments. Community character seems to be more reflected in comments on growth limits, infill, density, intensification, etc.

Section 14 Infrastructure and Services

No comments that would suggest a significant policy shift.

Section 15 Community Services

No comments that would suggest a significant policy shift.

Section 16 Municipal Finances

No comments that would suggest a significant policy shift.

Section 17 Civic Engagement and Cooperation

No comments that would suggest a significant policy shift.

Section 18 Regional Context Statement		
Issue Raised	Discussion	Questions, Recommendations or Options
<p>Calgary Regional Partnership (CRP) No concerns were expressed by the public, but administration notes that recent events highlight a significant change to the draft MDP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Town has backed out of the CRP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section should be deleted in its entirety and any references to the CRP in the draft MDP.

Section 19 Implementation and Monitoring
No comments that would suggest a significant policy shift.

Section 20 Appendices		
Issue Raised	Discussion	Questions, Recommendations or Options
<p>Mapping The maps should be in a statutory part of the document and not in the appendices</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The maps should be a statutory part of the MDP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create a new section for maps prior to the appendices section.
<p>Smith Creek area Concern of not knowing the UGB boundary or future growth area boundary for Smith Creek prior to adoption of the MDP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As noted above, the adoption of the MDP should not be held up by the Smith Creek ASP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to policy direction.