UPDATE ON THE SPRINGBANK ASP REVIEW PROCESS
Summary of Administration's Presentation to Policy & Priorities Committee:
December 4, 2018

Key Take-Aways from PPC Meeting
The draft land use scenario is largely based on the high-density option presented during the public consultations plus the addition of over 6,000 acres on the west side of the ASP.   This is in spite of the fact that more feedback supported the low-density option (45% versus 40%).

Population numbers are being downplayed by transferring the land immediately adjacent to Calgary on the east side of the ASP into a "future planning area". This change has been made to improve the odds that Calgary might support the ASP.

Cluster residential development at 1 upa is replacing half the 2 – 4 acre country residential development that had been proposed in the high density scenario and more than half of what had been proposed in the low density option.

Commercial/industrial land use has increased to 2,075 acres from 1,834 in the high density scenario and 1,073 in the low density option. The Trans Canada might be transformed into some version of a "gasoline alley".

Opinions from councillors on the appropriateness of the draft land use scenario for the Springbank ASP were mixed. Councillor McKylor, lead councillor for the ASP, clearly supports it. Councillor Hanson's position is less clear.

Summary of Staff Report to PPC
The staff report and presentation can be accessed here. Highlights include:

- The report presented a draft land use scenario – described as a "hybrid" by staff. The table below compares its proposed land uses with those presented earlier in the low and high density options. Key changes include:
    o Substantial shift from country residential to cluster residential
    o Increase in industrial/commercial, mostly around the Springbank airport
    o Addition of 6,210 acres on west side of ASP identified as a "future policy area".
    o Removal of specific development proposals for 1,763 acres of land immediately adjacent to Calgary on east side of ASP
    o Total population at full build out appears to be less than 1,000 higher than high density option. But, once agreement is reached with Calgary regarding development in border area, significantly more population may well be added.

Comparison of Alternative Land Use Scenarios (numbers of acres)

	Low-density	High-density	PPC Draft
County residential	10,411 (B)	8,424 (A)	4,309 (A)
Cluster residential	--	1,968 (I)	5,113 (H)
Mixed use	154 (G)	1,073 (B)	297 (B)
Business: industrial/commercial	304 (C)	460 (D)	926 (D)
Business transition	77 (D)	77 (E)	77 (E)
Public service	336 (E)	433 (F)	433 (F)
Business – commercial	615 (F)	615 (H)	770 (G)
Business – comm. (add to ASP)	--	146 (G)	154 (J)
Urban development	439 (I)	429 (J)	*
Mixed use (outside ASP)	--	142 (K)	
Country residential (outside ASP)	--	576 (L)	
Transition area (mixed use)	1,266 (H)	1,266 (M)	*
Future policy area	--	--	6210 (C)
Future policy area *			1,763 (I) *
Remove from ASP	1,454 (A)	299 (C)	
Total acreage in ASP	13,602	15,609	20,052 or 21,815 **
Total population at full build out	20,659	37,465	20,505
Less – population now in "future policy area" on east side of ASP	(5,761)	(17,630)	--
Comparable total population	14,898	19,835	20,505

Note: letters refer to each land use scenario map.
* The urban development area and the transition area adjacent to Calgary in the earlier land use scenarios are now a "future planning area" in the PPC draft land use scenario.
** The lower number is the total of the column; the higher number is from the table in the PPC presentation

- Next steps:
  - Servicing and transportation studies to be completed in early 2019, with opportunity for public input after that
  - Fjrst draft of revised ASP to be released in spring 2019.
  - Public hearing on ASP anticipated for fall of 2019.
- The report stated that there was an equal split between those supporting and opposing a higher level of development.
  - Not quite accurate – 45% supported low density option and 40% supported high density option
- The report acknowledged that there were "contrasting" views on different forms of housing in Springbank and concerns over servicing option.
- The report stated that there was "general support" for expanding the ASP boundaries west to allow for further business opportunities.

o It is not clear how they reached that conclusion – our review of the detailed engagement findings suggests that, while there was some support, most of it appears to come from landowners whose lands might be added to the ASP.
- The report discussed Calgary's feedback, which has not been positive:
  o Not prepared to support current or future servicing needs in Springbank
  o Concerned with impacts on source water, transportation and ag lands and over the scale of development proposed
- The report stated that the ASP will be reviewed by the Calgary Metropolitan Region Board and will need its approval before it can be implemented.

Questions from Councillors at PPC Meeting
The following highlights the main questions asked at the PPC meeting. For the full discussion, refer to the audio at INSERT LINK.

Reeve Boehlke
- Asked about what had happened to the option of splitting the ASP since he thought, given information presented to council on other occasions, isn't its area too big?
  o Staff indicated option had been raised in consultations, with feedback mostly supporting one ASP for entire area.

Deputy Reeve Schule
- Questioned why some of the area in area "C" – future policy area – are not just identified as industrial/commercial? Isn't there a risk that Council is giving landowners false hopes by including their land in ASP if no plans to approve development for long time into future?
  o Admin – have left this land as future policy area because landowners are not sure whether they prefer to use the land for commercial or for residential – working with landowners
- Commented that he sees PPC providing a better format than open houses for councillors to hear from the public directly before an ASP is finalized. Indicated that he didn't want to delay the Springbank ASP, but would like to see this change going forward.
  o Admin – did not answer the actual question, instead reviewed the public consultations that had been done to date and what would still be done.

Councillor Hanson
- Noted that results from consultations provided polarized results. Is there a difference on key issues between residents and other stakeholders?
  o Admin – there was no consensus in the feedback on any of the key issues.
    ▪ Note: this didn't really answer the question.

- Asked how the ASP's split between residential and commercial fit into the County's overall targets for increasing the percentage of assessment base accounted for by commercial.
  - Admin – no real answer other than this was a topic they could look at possibly adding to future ASP analyses.
- Suggested that it might be useful in assessing an ASP to have a business plan to determine the probable impact of its proposed development on the overall County finances.
- Asked about the difference in treatment for the land in area "C" (future policy area) being in the ASP versus remaining outside and governed by the County Plan.
  - Admin – answer will completely depend on what conditions are put on "C" in the ASP – could freeze all development until land uses are defined, could specify limited acceptable land uses in interim, could simply say County Plan rules apply in interim.

Councillor Wright
- Asked how the Springbank ASP and its population projections fit into the overall vision for growth in the County. emphasized how each ASP is a small piece and that they all need to add up to be consistent with the big picture / vision for the County. Does this ASP do that?
  - Admin – didn't really answer the question; talked about different time frames for County Plan and for ASPs.
- Drew attention to the differences between census population numbers for Div. 2 and the ASP current population number. Asked whether the difference meant that there was a much larger fraction of Springbank ASP that lives in Div 3 than most people realize.
  - Admin – ASP population comes from GIS municipal addresses – didn't compare with census numbers.
- Also asked about breakdown of feedback between residents, major landowners and developers. Asked if this information is available since it is useful to know if there are differences between preferences of each group.
  - Admin – feedback not categorized between groups
- Engagement summary indicated that 45% supported low density and 40% supported high density. How did Admin get from those results to a draft land use scenario that proposes higher density than the high density alternative? Wouldn't it have made more sense to say that the 45% "won" or at least to find a middle ground?
  - Admin – what is being proposed is a "hybrid" that also takes into account technical studies, direction in the Interim Growth Plan and other stakeholders such as the airport.
- Given that there were such polarized opinions on cluster development, why is the draft adding so much of it?
  - Admin – this is still a draft, subject to review; the technical studies will inform final land use proposals – cluster development is consistent with County Plan and with direction in Interim Growth Plan.

- Note: cluster development is only presented as an option for formatting country residential in County Plan, not encouraged. And, cluster development in draft land use plan is based on 1 upa while country residential is 2-acre parcels.
- Why is area "J" being added to ASP?
  - Admin – same landowner as Calway Park and they would like the land in the ASP.
- Didn't the Tate report conclude that there was already enough approved commercial development in the Springbank area?
  - Admin – for local use, yes; but area around airport could be regional commercial/industrial development
- Asked why the future policy area on the west side of the ASP was added since it hadn't been part of any of the land use scenarios in the consultations.
  - Admin – gave a variety of reasons for including it: there for consideration; feedback supporting expansion to the west; interest from Harmony for expansion; understanding how these lands might fit into Springbank in longer term, including servicing options – described as a longer term planning/development area.

Councillor Kissel
- Asked what controls would be put into the ASP to ensure orderly development (no leapfrog development) in the ASP, especially of concern with the addition of another 6,000 acres on west side of ASP.
  - Admin – didn't really answer the first part of her question. Stated that under existing ASPs, development can occur anywhere within the ASP area, no controls over sequencing of development. For the 6,000 acres in area "C", it would require an amendment to the ASP to change its status from "future policy area", which would require approval from CMRB.

Councillor Gautreau
- Expressed view that the ASP should be looking for ways to attract business to the area and, because of that, it would be better to identify area "C" that way. Concerned that labelling it as a future policy area will freeze its development potential.
- Asked whether staff had looked to landowners or other options for possible servicing solutions given that Calgary has said it won't service the area.
  - No answer from Admin.

Councillor McKylor
- Asked for confirmation that the draft land use scenario only adds 1,000 people relative to the earlier land use scenarios.
  - Admin confirmed this.

- Note – that is true relative to the high-density option. Also note that both have excluded 17,000+ by shifting areas immediately adjacent to Calgary into a "future policy area".
- Suggested that density and population numbers seem to be "throwing people off" and asked for a comparison to help visualize what the 1.05 upa in the cluster residential development would look like.
    - Admin – gave Elbow Valley at 1 upa as a good example.
- Suggested that cluster development needs to be more clearly defined and should focus on its advantages. Does it address concerns about septic fields and water wells?
    - Admin – cluster development may provide opportunities for alternative servicing options and for pathways and open space; it might help maintain the open, rural feel that feedback indicates was important.

Prepared by:
Rocky View Forward
December 6, 2018