

Municipal District of Taber &

Lethbridge County

Intermunicipal Development Plan

Bylaw No. 1938 & Bylaw No. 18-019

September 2018



OLDMAN RIVER REGIONAL SERVICES COMMISSION

Intellectual Property – All Rights Reserved © Copyright

This document is protected by Copyright and Trade Secret Law and may not be reproduced or modified in any manner, or for any purpose, except by written permission of the Oldman River Regional Services Commission. This document has been prepared for the sole use of the Municipality addressed and the Oldman River Regional Services Commission. This disclaimer is attached to and forms part of the document.

MUNICIPAL DISTRICT OF TABER
IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA

BYLAW NO. 1938

BEING a bylaw of the Municipal District of Taber in the Province of Alberta, to adopt an Intermunicipal Development Plan between the Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County pursuant to sections 631 and 692 of the Municipal Government Act, Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, Chapter M-26, as amended;

WHEREAS municipalities are required by the province to expand intermunicipal planning efforts to address planning matters that transcend municipal boundaries through an intermunicipal development plan;

AND WHEREAS both the Councils of the Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County agree that it is to their mutual benefit to establish joint planning policies and this negotiation and agreement reflects a continuing cooperative approach between the two municipalities and the desire to see well-planned, orderly, and managed growth.

AND WHEREAS the municipality must prepare a corresponding bylaw and provide for its consideration at a public hearing.

NOW THEREFORE, under the authority and subject to the provisions of the Municipal Government Act, Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, Chapter M-26 as amended, the Council of the Municipal District of Taber duly assembled hereby enacts the following:

1. That the Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County Intermunicipal Development Plan, attached hereto, be adopted.
2. This plan, upon adoption, shall be cited as the Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County Intermunicipal Development Plan Bylaw No. 1938 and Bylaw No. 18-019.
3. This bylaw shall come into effect upon third and final reading thereof.

READ a First time this 14 day of August 2018.

READ a Second time this 11 day of September 2018.

READ a Third time this 25 day of September 2018.

SIGNED AND PASSED this 25 day of September 2018.

Reeve

Chief Administrative Officer

LETHBRIDGE COUNTY
IN THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA

BYLAW NO. 18-019

BEING a bylaw of Lethbridge County in the Province of Alberta, to adopt an Intermunicipal Development Plan between the Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County pursuant to sections 631 and 692 of the Municipal Government Act, Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, Chapter M-26, as amended;

WHEREAS municipalities are required by the province to expand intermunicipal planning efforts to address planning matters that transcend municipal boundaries through an intermunicipal development plan;

AND WHEREAS both the Councils of Lethbridge County and the Municipal District of Taber agree that it is to their mutual benefit to establish joint planning policies and this negotiation and agreement reflects a continuing cooperative approach between the two municipalities and the desire to see well-planned, orderly, and managed growth.

AND WHEREAS the municipality must prepare a corresponding bylaw and provide for its consideration at a public hearing.

NOW THEREFORE, under the authority and subject to the provisions of the Municipal Government Act, Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, Chapter M-26 as amended, the Council of Lethbridge County duly assembled hereby enacts the following:

1. That the Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County Intermunicipal Development Plan, attached hereto, be adopted.
2. This plan, upon adoption, shall be cited as the Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County Intermunicipal Development Plan Bylaw No. 1938 and Bylaw No. 18-019.
3. This bylaw shall come into effect upon third and final reading thereof.

GIVEN first reading this 16th day of August, 2018.

Lorne Hickey
Reeve

C Mitchell
Chief Administrative Officer

GIVEN second reading this 20th day of September, 2018.

Lorne Hickey
Reeve

C Mitchell
Chief Administrative Officer

GIVEN third reading this 20th day of September, 2018.

Lorne Hickey
Reeve

C Mitchell
Chief Administrative Officer

1st Reading Date	August 16, 2018
Public Hearing Date	September 20, 2018
2nd Reading Date	September 20/18
3rd Reading Date	September 20/18

Table of Contents

1 | INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Purpose of the Plan 1

1.2 Plan Goals 1

1.3 Legislative Requirements 2

1.4 Plan Preparation Process 4

2 | PLAN AREA 5

2.1 Key Characteristics of the Plan Area 5

3 | POLICIES 7

3.1 General 7

3.2 Land Use 8

Extensive Agriculture 8

Confined Feeding Operations (CFOs) 8

Rural Recreational & Grouped Country Residential 9

Resource Extraction 9

Industry and Energy Development 10

Telecommunications Towers / Utilities 10

3.3 Transportation and Road Networks 11

3.4 Natural Environment 12

3.5 Interpretation 13

4 | PLAN ADMINISTRATION & IMPLEMENTATION 14

4.1 Intermunicipal Development Plan Administrative Policies 14

4.2 Referral Policies 15

General 15

Municipal Development Plans 15

Other Statutory Plans 16

Land Use Bylaws 16

Conceptual Design Schemes 16

Subdivision and Development 16

Response Timelines 17

Consideration of Responses 17
4.3 Plan Validity and Amendment Policies 18

5 | DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICIES 19

5.1 General Dispute Process 19
General Agreement 19
Dispute Resolution 19
Filing an Intermunicipal Dispute under the Municipal Government Act 20
Dispute Resolution Flowchart 21

APPENDIX A | MAPS

Municipal District of Taber & Lethbridge County

Intermunicipal Development Plan

1 | INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of the Plan

The purpose of the Municipal District of Taber (MD of Taber) and the Lethbridge County (the County) Intermunicipal Development Plan (IDP or the Plan) is to foster ongoing collaboration and cooperation regarding planning matters and issues of mutual interest and address and clarify land use expectations within the agreed upon intermunicipal development plan area (Plan Area).

This IDP serves as a planning tool providing guidance to decision-makers through the agreed upon planning policies that apply to the land within the Plan Area. The IDP contains policy that is to be used as a framework for working cooperatively, communicating and making decisions in each municipality. Each municipality is ultimately responsible for making decisions within their own municipal jurisdiction.

1.2 Plan Goals

The intended goals of the IDP are:

- To promote consultation, coordination and cooperation regarding planning matters of joint interest within the Plan Area.
- To provide a framework for addressing land use concerns with regard to joint planning matters within the Plan Area.
- To provide a clear policy framework that serves to guide future planning decisions for land located within the Plan Area, affording enhanced coordination of development within the Plan Area.

The preparation and implementation of an IDP can result in many benefits to both municipalities including, but not limited to, the following:

- To establish an approach to identify possible joint ventures for infrastructure and service sharing to promote efficient planning and potential delivery of services.
- To reinforce and protect each municipality's development philosophies and goals while minimizing the potential for future intermunicipal conflict.
- To provide policy addressing plan administration, amendment and dispute resolution procedures.

1.3 Legislative Requirements

This Plan has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the *Municipal Government Act, Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, Chapter M-26, as amended (MGA),* and complies with the *South Saskatchewan Regional Plan.*

Specifically the *MGA* requires:

> *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.*
>
> *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 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, and*
>
> *vii any other matter related to the physical, social or economic development of the area that the councils consider necessary.*
>
> *and*
>
> *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.*

The South Saskatchewan Regional Plan (SSRP) came into effect September 1, 2014. The SSRP uses a cumulative effects management approach to set policy direction for municipalities to achieve environmental, economic and social outcomes within the South Saskatchewan Region through 2024.

Pursuant to Section 13 of the *Alberta Land Stewardship Act*, regional plans are legislative instruments. The SSRP has four key parts including the Introduction, Strategic Plan, Implementation Plan and Regulatory Details Plan. Pursuant to Section 15(1) of *ALSA*, the Regulatory Details of the SSRP are enforceable as law and bind the Crown, decision-makers, local governments and all other persons while the remaining portions are statements of policy to inform and are not intended to have binding legal effect.

The Regional Plan is guided by the vision, outcomes and intended directions set by the Strategic Plan portion of the SSRP while the Implementation Plan establishes the objectives and the strategies that will be implemented to achieve the regional vision. As part of the Implementation Plan, Section 8: Community Development includes guidance regarding Planning Cooperation and Integration between municipalities with the intention to foster cooperation and coordination between neighbouring municipalities and between municipalities and provincial departments, boards and agencies. Section 8 contains the following broad objectives and strategies.

Objectives

- *Cooperation and coordination are fostered among all land use planners and decision-makers involved in preparing and implementing land plans and strategies.*
- *Knowledge sharing among communities is encouraged to promote the use of planning tools and the principles of efficient use of land to address community development in the region.*

Strategies

8.1 *Work together to achieve the shared environmental, economic, and social outcomes in the South Saskatchewan Regional Plan and minimize negative environmental cumulative effects.*

8.2 *Address common planning issues, especially where valued natural features and historic resources are of interest to more than one stakeholder and where the possible effect of development transcends jurisdictional boundaries.*

8.3 *Coordinate and work with each other in their respective planning activities (such as in the development of plan and policies) and development approval process to address issues of mutual interest.*

8.4 *Work together to anticipate, plan and set aside adequate land with the physical infrastructure and services required to accommodate future population growth and accompanying community development needs.*

8.5 *Build awareness regarding the application of land-use planning tools that reduce the impact of residential, commercial and industrial developments on the land, including approaches and best practices for promoting the efficient use of private and public lands.*

8.6 *Pursue joint use agreements, regional services commissions and any other joint cooperative arrangements that contribute specifically to intermunicipal land use planning.*

8.7 *Consider the value of intermunicipal development planning to address land use on fringe areas, airport vicinity protection plan or other areas of mutual interest.*

8.8 *Coordinate land use planning activities with First Nations, irrigation districts, school boards, health authorities and other agencies on areas of mutual interest.*

The above strategies were considered by both municipalities when developing policy within this IDP and will be considered when rendering land use decisions pertaining to development within the Plan Area.

1.4 Plan Preparation Process

A background and study area analysis was undertaken which served as the foundation from which both municipalities could review the existing land use conditions and determine the relevant issues, goals and objectives. Once each municipality's perspectives were identified, a draft document was prepared for review by each municipality prior to consultation with affected landowners, stakeholders and the general public at an Open House.

Upon completing the consultation phase, a refined document was then prepared and final draft was forwarded to each Council for review. As required by the *MGA*, public hearings were held by each Council and subsequent to the public hearings, the IDP was adopted by each municipality under separate municipal bylaws.



2 | PLAN AREA

Given the vast size of the municipalities, in order to focus on the border area and potential impacts, a study area approximately 3 miles (4.8 km) on each side of the shared border was examined. The purpose was to identify opportunities and constraints, which may affect land use planning in the Plan Area. After consideration of social, economic and physical features listed below, it was determined that a Plan Area of approximately 1 mile (1.6 km) on each side of the municipal boundary, was adequate to achieve the goals of the Plan. The Plan Area is illustrated in Map 1.

Within the Plan Area the following features were examined:

- Residences and Urban Areas
- Land Use and Zoning
- Surface Water
- Confined Feeding Operations (CFOs)
- Active / Potential Sites for Surface Materials Extraction
- Roads and Transportation Corridors
- Environmentally Significant Areas (ESAs)
- Historical Resource Value (HRV) Sites

2.1 Key Characteristics of the Plan Area

The MD of Taber and Lethbridge County Intermunicipal Development Plan Area (Map 1) encompasses approximately 66,990 acres (27,110 hectares). Key characteristics of the Plan Area include the following, some of which are illustrated on Maps 2-7 in Appendix A:

- **Agriculture**
  - Almost the entire Plan Area is designated for agricultural use with the exceptions of the industrial node along Highway 3 near the Hamlet of Chin, the Hamlet of Chin and its surroundings, and a few grouped country residential developments along Stafford Reservoir in Lethbridge County and the MD of Taber.
  - A mix of agricultural operations exist, including grazing, irrigated and dry land farming, with a significant portion being irrigated crop land.
  - Confined Feeding Operations (CFOs) exist throughout the Plan Area.

- **Residential Development**
  - Residential development can be found throughout the Plan Area, with the largest concentration in the Hamlet of Chin. Two grouped country residential developments are located within the Plan Area adjacent to Stafford Reservoir – Doram Heights in Lethbridge County and Stafford Summer Resort in the MD of Taber.

- While small pockets of Crown and municipally owned land as well as land under the ownership of the St. Mary River Irrigation District and Bow River Irrigation District are found throughout the Plan Area, nearly all of the land is privately owned.

- **Transportation Infrastructure**
  - The Plan Area incorporates a portion of Highway 3, a major east-west transportation corridor, and a portion of the Canadian Pacific railway main line running along Highway 3.
  - There are also numerous municipal roads within the Plan Area providing transportation links between the two municipalities. Some of the municipal roads within Lethbridge County serve as haul routes.

- **Natural Resource Development**
  - Oil and gas activity is abundant throughout the Plan Area within both municipalities.
  - Based on Alberta Geological Survey information, there is a limited potential for sand and gravel development within the Plan Area.

- **Natural Environment**
  - Stafford Reservoir and Chin Lakes Reservoir, in the southern portion of the Plan Area, define the border between the two municipalities. Stafford Reservoir and Chin Lakes Reservoir are an important resource for irrigation and limited recreation uses.
  - The Oldman River intersects the central portion of the Plan Area and is recognized as an important natural feature by both municipalities.
  - Areas of environmental significance exist near the Oldman River and adjacent to Stafford Reservoir and Chin Lakes Reservoir.
  - Archeological and paleontological resources are concentrated throughout the central portion of the Plan Area near the Oldman River and around Stafford Reservoir and Chin Lakes Reservoir.



Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County Intermunicipal Development Plan

Plan Area Boundary

Map 1

Plan Area Boundary

M.D. of Taber/Lethbridge County Border

Provincial Highways

Waterbodies

Municipal District of Taber
(Bylaw No. 1938) &
Lethbridge County
(Bylaw No. 18-019)

Source:
Aerial Photo Date: 2015

0 1 2 3 4 5
Kilometers

N

3 | POLICIES

The policies contained in this Plan are intended to provide direction to the MD of Taber and Lethbridge County Councils, subdivision and development authorities and administrations to manage the lands contained within the Plan Area. The policies of this Plan apply to all land within the Plan Area boundary delineated in Map 1.

3.1 General

INTENT

To provide administrative policies within the Plan Area which foster intermunicipal communication, consultation and cooperation.

POLICIES

3.1.1 The MD of Taber and Lethbridge County will strive to engage in effective dialogue when considering land use and matters of joint municipal interest, while maintaining jurisdiction on lands within their own boundaries.

3.1.2 The municipalities will continue to build partnerships and foster a collaborative relationship with the adjacent municipality to promote regional interests, where deemed appropriate, including the support of mutually beneficial service agreements and shared environmental, economic and social outcomes.

3.1.3 Both municipalities agree to jointly discuss ways to cooperate with provincial and federal agencies and utility providers to help facilitate the efficient delivery of infrastructure and services that are of a mutual benefit.

3.1.4 The MD of Taber and Lethbridge County will strive, to the best of their ability and knowledge, to refer notices of government projects to each other.

3.1.5 Both municipalities are encouraged to share with each other the results of all publicly available technical analyses required by a Subdivision and Development Authority as part of an application, where there is the potential for impacts on lands and bodies of water.

3.1.6 The coordination of intermunicipal programs relating to the physical, social and economic development of the area will be managed through the Intermunicipal Collaborative Framework requirements and through separate agreements as deemed necessary and agreed to by both municipalities.

3.2 Land Use

INTENT

To provide policies on land use within the Plan Area which reflect the development philosophies of both municipalities.

POLICIES

Extensive Agriculture

3.2.1 Agriculture will continue to be the predominant land use in the Plan Area. The impact on agricultural uses should be a consideration when determining suitability of non-agricultural land uses in the Plan Area.

3.2.2 Both municipalities will strive to work cooperatively to encourage good neighbour farming practices, such as dust, weed and insect control adjacent to developed areas, through best management practices and Alberta Agriculture guidelines.

3.2.3 If disputes or complaints in either municipality arise between ratepayers and agricultural operators, the municipality receiving the complaint will direct the affected parties to the appropriate agency, government department or municipality for consultation or resolution wherever necessary.

Confined Feeding Operations (CFOs)

3.2.4 Existing CFOs will be allowed to continue to operate under acceptable operating practices and within the requirements of the *Agricultural Operation Practices Act and Regulations*.

3.2.5 If either the MD of Taber or Lethbridge County are in receipt of a notice of application from the Natural Resources Conservation Board (NRCB) for new or expanded CFOs, they will forward a copy of the notification to the other municipality.

3.2.6 Both municipalities recognize the importance of the CFO exclusion/restricted areas identified within the Plan Area. New CFOs will be prohibited or restricted in accordance with the respective municipality's Municipal Development Plan policies.

3.2.7 The MD of Taber recognizes the importance of the CFO exclusion area around the Hamlet of Chin in Lethbridge County and has agreed to establish a complementary confined feeding operation restricted area within their jurisdiction as illustrated in Map 4.

3.2.8 If either municipality proposes an amendment to a CFO exclusion/restricted area within the Plan Area or proposes additional CFO exclusion/restricted areas within the Plan Area, the

proposal will be circulated to the other municipality for comment in accordance with section 4.2.16 of this Plan.

3.2.9 Prior to issuing comment on a notice of application to the NRCB for a new or expanded CFO within the Plan Area, the municipalities will consult with one another regarding the applicant's proposed haul routes to and from the CFO.

Rural Recreational & Grouped Country Residential

3.2.10 Any proposal to designate or develop land within the Plan Area for rural recreational use will be referred to the other municipality for comment in accordance with section 4.2 of this Plan.

3.2.11 Any proposal to designate land, adopt and Area Structure Plan, or approve a conceptual design scheme within the Plan Area for grouped country residential use will be referred to the other municipality for comment in accordance with section 4.2 of this Plan.

3.2.12 The MD of Taber and Lethbridge County acknowledge that their municipal land use policies differ regarding land use in the vicinity of Stafford Reservoir (Stafford Lakes) and Chin Lakes and agree that municipal autonomy on land use matters within this area will continue.

3.2.13 With respect to grouped country residential development and rural recreational use in the vicinity of Stafford Reservoir and Chin Lakes, both municipalities agree to consider the potential impacts and cumulative effects of such development on the area prior to adopting an Area Structure Plan or approving a conceptual design scheme.

3.2.14 Applicants proposing grouped country residential and rural recreational developments adjacent to Stafford Reservoir or Chin Lakes should consult with the St. Mary River Irrigation District during preparation of their proposal.

Resource Extraction

3.2.15 The municipalities will consider the effects of visual intrusion, dust, noise, traffic, and air and water pollution when evaluating applications for new or expanded gravel pits, or other extractive activities, where they maintain jurisdiction.

3.2.16 Either municipality may require a road use agreement regarding the construction, repair, and maintenance of any municipal roads, which may be impacted by resource development, when the development requires access to come from the other municipality's road.

3.2.17 If either the MD of Taber or Lethbridge County are in receipt of a notice for a new or expanded Alberta Transportation gravel pit, they will forward a copy of the notice to the other municipality.

3.2.18 If either municipality is in receipt of a development application for a gravel pit within the Plan Area, the application will be referred to the other municipality for comment in accordance with section 4.2 of this Plan.

Industry and Energy Development

3.2.19 The municipalities may consider renewable energy developments (e.g., solar, wind, water, biofuel, etc.) and other industrial development where deemed compatible with existing land uses and will circulate development applications to one another in accordance with section 4.2 of this Plan.

3.2.20 If an application is received for a renewable energy project that transcends a municipal boundary, both municipalities agree to consult and coordinate with each other regarding the proposal, wherever possible. In such a circumstance, the applicant of the development is required:

a) to apply to each municipality separately for development approval and is subject to the respective development processes, fee schedules, and requirements of each municipality;

b) to report the findings to both municipalities of any public consultation activity, such as an open house or other public consultation meeting, conducted with respect to the proposal.

3.2.21 Both municipalities recognize the significance of the Chin industrial area north of Highway 3 and agree that uses deemed incompatible with industrial development should be avoided in this area.

3.2.22 Both municipalities agree that further multi-lot non-agricultural subdivision in the Chin industrial area will require adoption of an Area Structure Plan or approval of a conceptual design scheme by the municipality in which the subdivision is proposed.

Telecommunications Towers / Utilities

3.2.23 Where there is an application for a new, expanded or retrofitted telecommunications tower within the Plan Area, the MD of Taber and Lethbridge County will notify the other municipality to seek their comments, prior to the issuance of a letter of concurrence.

3.2.24 It is the preference of both municipalities that co-location of telecommunication facilities be undertaken where technically feasible.

3.2.25 The location of telecommunication towers in proximity of irrigated crop production should consider the potential impact to aerial application.

3.2.26 It is the preference of both municipalities that provincial and federal utility development be coordinated within multi-use corridors. Such preference should be forwarded by each municipality when providing comments to provincial and federal departments regarding utility development.

3.3 Transportation and Road Networks

INTENT

Both municipalities recognize the importance of maintaining an efficient and coordinated transportation network. The policies herein promote consideration of the impacts of development on municipal and provincial road infrastructure.

POLICIES

3.3.1 The MD of Taber and Lethbridge County will notify one another of any development or subdivision proposal that will result in access being required from an adjoining road under the other municipality's control or management in accordance with section 4.2 of this Plan.

3.3.2 When a new municipal road(s) is proposed within the Plan Area, the proposing municipality will send notification to the other, prior to construction of the road, providing an opportunity for comment on the potential impacts the new road may have on the existing road network, infrastructure and land use in the other municipality.

3.3.3 The importance of maintaining a coordinated system of haul routes and non-banned roads across the intermunicipal boundary is recognized. Both municipalities agree to consult with one another on any proposal to designate a road as a haul route or non-banned road within the Plan Area and cooperate to find mutually agreeable outcomes to road designations to the best of their ability.

3.3.4 When required by Alberta Transportation, developers shall be responsible for conducting traffic studies with respect to the impact and access onto provincial highways. Any upgrading identified by a traffic study conducted by a developer with respect to highways shall be implemented by the developer at their sole cost and to the satisfaction of Alberta Transportation.

3.3.5 Both municipalities agree to consult and work with Alberta Transportation regarding the implementation of this Plan and consider how development may impact provincial highways in the Plan Area.

3.3.6 The municipalities should endeavor to maintain open dialogue with Alberta Transportation regarding the provincial highways in the Plan Area, including any changes to the highways that may have impacts on the municipalities.

3.4 Natural Environment

INTENT

Both municipalities recognize the connection between the natural environment and quality of life and strive to protect, preserve and enhance natural systems and environmentally significant areas, while promoting appropriate development.

POLICIES

3.4.1 When making land use decisions, each municipality will:

a) utilize and incorporate measures which minimize possible impacts on Stafford Reservoir and Chin Lakes Reservoir;

b) determine appropriate land use patterns in the vicinity of significant water resources and other water features;

c) establish appropriate setbacks to maintain water quality, flood water conveyance and storage, bank stability and habitat.

3.4.2 For any development on lands that have been identified within a possible environmentally significant area (ESA) or where the municipality within which the development is proposed is of the opinion that the land may be within an ESA, the developer may be required to conduct an environmental impact assessment (EIA) and is responsible for contacting Alberta Environment and Parks.

3.4.3 For any development on lands that may contain a historic resource value (HRV), the developer may be required to conduct a historical resource impact assessment (HRIA) and is responsible for consulting the *Historical Resources Act* and contacting Alberta Culture and Tourism.

3.4.4 Each municipality is responsible for referring development applications and other land use activities within their respective jurisdictions to the appropriate provincial department to determine when an EIA or HRIA may be required.

3.4.5 Both municipalities should consider the provincial Wetland Policy when making land use decisions with the goal of sustaining environment and economic benefits. The developer, not the municipality, is responsible for ensuring compliance with the provincial policy and any associated regulations.

3.4.6 Each municipality encourages applicants of subdivision and development proposals to consult with the respective municipality, irrigation district, and provincial departments, as applicable, regarding water supply, drainage, setbacks from sensitive lands, and other planning matters relevant to the natural environment in advance of submitting a proposal.

3.5 Interpretation

INTENT

To ensure the policies and language within this Plan are communicated in the proper context so as to ensure the intent of the Plan is as clear and concise as possible.

POLICIES

3.5.1 Unless otherwise required by the context, words used in the present tense include the future tense, words used in the singular include the plural, and the word person includes a corporation as well as an individual. Unless otherwise stipulated, the *Interpretation Act, Chapter I-8, RSA 2000* as amended, shall be used in the interpretation of this bylaw. Words have the same meaning whether they are capitalized or not.

3.5.2 All references to a specific agency, body, or department were accurate at the time of writing. It is understood that agency, body and department names change from time to time. All references throughout the Plan shall therefore be considered to be applicable to the relevant agency, body or department.

3.5.3 The geographical or relative boundaries or any variable presented on the maps contained in this Plan, with the exception of the boundaries of the Plan Area, shall be interpreted as a rough approximation and not an accurate depiction of its actual or full extension.



4 | PLAN ADMINISTRATION & IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Intermunicipal Development Plan Administrative Policies

INTENT

The implementation of this Plan is intended to be an ongoing process to ensure it is maintained and remains applicable. The following policies have been agreed to by both municipalities to facilitate in the implementation and administering of the Plan. The purpose of these policies is to promote active cooperation and conflict resolution through a consensus-based approach.

POLICIES

4.1.1 For the purposes of administering and monitoring the IDP, the MD of Taber and Lethbridge County have agreed upon an administrative consultation based approach whereby administrative representatives from each of the municipalities may make comments and recommendations on referrals under section 4.2, issue administrative decisions under section 5, and address and discuss matters of joint municipal interest as authorized by their respective municipality. Each municipality is responsible for establishing their own protocols and internal circulation processes regarding the consultation process and will notify one another annually of who is authorized to act as an administrative representative(s) for the purposes of this section.

4.1.2 Where a matter has been referred to administration and a resolution cannot be found, the Dispute Resolution process in Section 5 of this Plan should be followed.

4.1.3 Despite section 4.1.1, at the request of either municipality, a joint council IDP meeting may be requested to discuss any or all of the following matters:

a) land use or planning matters within the Plan Area,
b) proposed amendments to the IDP,
c) issues regarding Plan implementation,
d) matters referred to administration of either municipality,
e) dispute resolution, and
f) any other intermunicipal issue or matter of interest or importance identified by either municipality.

4.1.4 A municipality may call a joint council IDP meeting at any time upon not less than fifteen (15) calendar days' notice of the meeting being given to administration of the other municipality and support personnel, stating the date, the time, purpose and the place of the proposed meeting. The fifteen (15) days' notice may be waived with consent of each municipality.

4.1.5 The municipality that called the joint council IDP meeting shall host and chair the meeting and is responsible for preparing and distributing agendas and minutes.

4.2 Referral Policies

INTENT

To establish a process for consistent and transparent sharing of information necessary to make decisions in accordance with the intent of the Plan.

POLICIES

General

4.2.1 Where an intermunicipal referral is required by the *MGA* or the policies contained in this Plan, both municipalities agree to share mailing address and property ownership information for circulation purposes with the adjacent municipality, and where applicable, the municipality's processing agency or designate.

4.2.2 Where a plan or bylaw, including amendments, or application, requires notifications to be sent to a municipality that is external to this IDP, the referring municipality shall follow the referral requirements outlined in the *MGA*, and where applicable, those contained in a relevant Intermunicipal Development Plan.

4.2.3 Administrative staff or representatives for the MD of Taber and Lethbridge County are encouraged to discuss, with one another, forthcoming Statutory Plans and Land Use Bylaws, including amendments, and other studies, projects or proposals that may impact the Plan Area.

4.2.4 Administrative staff or representatives for the MD of Taber and Lethbridge County are encouraged to discuss with one another forthcoming subdivision and development applications that may impact lands within the Plan Area.

4.2.5 The municipalities are encouraged to refer to each other for comment major land use or planning matters that have the potential to impact the other jurisdiction, even if it involves lands that may not be located within the Plan Area.

Municipal Development Plans

4.2.6 A newly proposed MD of Taber or Lethbridge County Municipal Development Plan amendment shall be referred to the other municipality for comment prior to a public hearing.

Other Statutory Plans

4.2.7 A newly proposed MD of Taber or Lethbridge County statutory plan (excluding a Municipal Development Plan) or amendment within the Plan Area shall be referred to the other municipality for comment prior to a public hearing.

Land Use Bylaws

4.2.8 All Land Use Bylaw amendments in either the MD of Taber or Lethbridge County within the Plan Area, shall be referred to the other municipality for comment prior to a public hearing.

4.2.9 All land redesignation applications within the Plan Area shall be referred to the other municipality for comment prior to a public hearing.

4.2.10 A newly proposed Land Use Bylaw from either municipality shall be referred to the other for comment prior to a public hearing.

Conceptual Design Schemes

4.2.11 All conceptual design schemes in support of a subdivision or development in either the MD of Taber or Lethbridge County within the Plan Area shall be referred to the other municipality for comment prior to Council resolution.

Subdivision and Development

4.2.12 All subdivision applications for lands within the Plan Area shall be referred to the other municipality for comment prior to a decision being rendered with the exception of:

a) an agricultural parcel subdivision of a quarter section that complies with the municipality's criteria for subdivision and does not take access from an adjoining road under the other municipality's control or management;

b) a single lot country residential subdivision that complies with the municipality's criteria for subdivision and does not take access from an adjoining road under the other municipality's control or management;

c) a cut-off parcel subdivision that complies with the municipality's criteria for subdivision and does not take access from an adjoining road under the other municipality's control or management;

d) an enlargement, reduction or realignment of an existing separate parcel that complies with the municipality's criteria for subdivision and does not take access from an adjoining road under the other municipality's control or management; and

e) subdivision applications in areas with an approved Area Structure Plan where no road access is required from the adjacent municipality and the proposal conforms to the plan

with no variances, different lot configurations or servicing proposals than what was provided and approved in the Area Structure Plan.

4.2.13 Each municipality shall refer all discretionary use development applications within the Plan Area to the other for comment prior to a decision being rendered.

4.2.14 Each municipality shall refer all development applications within the Plan Area that propose to take access from an adjoining road under the control or management of the other municipality for comment prior to a decision being rendered.

4.2.15 Any development application for a sand or gravel pit or renewable energy project (e.g., solar, wind, water, biofuel) shall be referred to the other municipality for comment prior to a decision being rendered.

Response Timelines

4.2.16 The responding municipality shall, from the date of mailing, have the following timelines to review and provide comment on intermunicipal referrals:

a) 15 calendar days for all development applications,

b) 19 calendar days for subdivision applications,

c) 15 calendar days for a redesignation application on land where an Area Structure Plan (ASP) has been adopted and the redesignation is consistent with the adopted ASP,

d) 30 calendar days for all other intermunicipal referrals.

4.2.17 In the event that either municipality does not reply within, or request an extension by, the response time for intermunicipal referrals stipulated in this Section, it is presumed that the responding municipality has no comment or objection to the referred planning application or matter.

Consideration of Responses

4.2.18 Comments from the responding municipality regarding proposed Municipal Development Plans, other statutory plans, and Land Use Bylaws, or amendments to any of those documents, shall be considered by the municipality in which the application is being proposed, prior to a decision being rendered.

4.2.19 Comments from the responding municipality regarding subdivision and development applications shall be considered by the municipality in which the application is being proposed, prior to a decision being rendered on the application.

4.3 Plan Validity and Amendment Policies

INTENT

This Plan may require amendments from time to time to accommodate unforeseen situations, and to keep the Plan relevant.

POLICIES

4.3.1 This Plan comes into effect on the date it is adopted by both municipalities.

4.3.2 Amendments shall be adopted by both Councils using the procedures outlined in the *MGA*. No amendment shall come into force until such time as both municipalities adopt the amending bylaw.

4.3.3 Applications for amendments to this Plan by parties other than the MD of Taber and Lethbridge County (e.g. landowners and developers) shall be made to both municipalities along with the applicable fee as established by each municipality for processing amendments to a statutory plan.

4.3.4 Administrative staff should review the policies of the Plan annually and discuss land use matters, issues and concerns on an on-going basis. Administrative staff may make recommendations to their respective Councils for amendment to the Plan to ensure the policies remain relevant and continue to meet the needs of both municipalities.

4.3.5 A formal review of the Plan will occur within 10 years from the date the IDP is adopted by both municipalities.

4.3.6 Either municipality may request that the Plan be repealed and replaced with a new IDP upon serving written notice to the other municipality. The dispute resolution process stipulated in Section 5 will be undertaken should the municipalities be unable to reach an agreement.

5 | DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICIES

5.1 General Dispute Process

INTENT

The intent of the dispute resolution process is to maximize opportunities for discussion and review in order to resolve areas of disagreement early in the process. Despite the best efforts of both municipalities, it is understood that disputes may arise from time to time affecting land use within the Plan boundary. The following process is intended to settle disputes through consensus and minimize the need for formal mediation.

POLICIES

General Agreement

The municipalities agree that:

5.1.1 It is important to avoid dispute by ensuring that the Plan is adhered to as adopted, including full circulation of any permit or application that may affect the municipality or as required in the Plan and prompt enforcement of the Plan policies.

5.1.2 Prior to a formal IDP discussion or meeting, each municipality through its administration, will ensure the facts of the issue have been investigated and clarified, and information is made available to both parties. Staff meetings are encouraged to discuss possible solutions.

5.1.3 Administration should discuss the issue or dispute with the intent to seek a recommended solution that is agreeable to both parties. Administration from each municipality (administration-to-administration) is authorized to initially attempt to resolve a matter or dispute that may arise.

Dispute Resolution

In the case of a dispute, the following process will be followed to arrive at a solution:

5.1.4 When a potential intermunicipal issue comes to the attention of either municipality relating to a technical or procedural matter (such as inadequate notification or prescribed timelines, misinterpretation of Plan policies, etc.) or a land use or policy issue affecting lands in the Plan area, it will be directed to the administration of each municipality. Administration will review the technical, procedural or policy matter and if both administrations are in agreement, take action to rectify the matter.

5.1.5 In respect of policy 5.1.4, the administrations shall discuss or meet within 15 calendar days of the matter being brought to each party's attention. The prescribed time period may be extended if both parties are in agreement to do so.

5.1.6 The two administrations may consult either by phone, electronic/digital means, or meet in person to discuss the matter; however, any resolution of an issue must be confirmed and acknowledged in writing, which may be in the form of a memo, email or formal letter.

5.1.7 In the event a matter cannot be resolved by the administration representatives or within timeframe prescribed, the administration of each municipality will schedule a joint meeting of the two Councils to discuss possible solutions and attempt to reach consensus on the issue. Each municipality, acting in good faith, agrees that they will attempt to schedule a joint Council meeting within a reasonable time-frame, which should not exceed 40 days.

5.1.8 Should the Councils be unable to resolve the matter, either municipality, shall be able to initiate a formal mediation process to facilitate a resolution of the issue.

5.1.9 Both municipalities agree that the formal mediation process available through Municipal Affairs may be used to facilitate mediation.

Filing an Intermunicipal Dispute under the Municipal Government Act

5.1.10 In the case of a dispute involving the adoption of a statutory plan, Land Use Bylaw or amendment to such, within 30 days of adoption, the municipality initiating the dispute may, without prejudice, file an appeal to the Municipal Government Board under section 690(1) of the *Municipal Government Act* so that the provincial statutory right and timeframe to file an appeal is not lost.

5.1.11 The appeal may then be withdrawn, without prejudice, if a solution or agreement is reached between the two municipalities prior to the Municipal Government Board meeting. This is to acknowledge and respect that the time required to seek resolution or mediation may not be able to occur within the 30 day appeal filing process as outlined in the *MGA*.

Note: Using section 690(1) of the MGA is the final stage of dispute settlement, where the municipalities request the Municipal Government Board to intercede and resolve the issue.



Dispute Resolution Flow Chart

The flow chart presented herein illustrates the dispute resolution process. This process is not intended to limit the ability of either municipality to explore other methods of resolution or to choose one method in place of another.



APPENDIX A | MAPS



Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County Intermunicipal Development Plan

Land Use Designations

Map 2

Plan Area Boundary

M.D. of Taber/Lethbridge County Border

Provincial Highways

Lethbridge County Land Use Designation[1]

- Rural Agriculture
- Rural Urban Fringe
- Rural General Industrial

M.D. of Taber Land Use Designation[2]

- Rural Agriculture
- Grouped Rural Industrial

Inset Map

1 - See Location Map 1
2 - See Location Map 2
3 - See Location Map 3
4 - See Location Map 4

Municipal District of Taber (Bylaw No. 1938) & Lethbridge County (Bylaw No. 18-019)

Source:

[1] Lethbridge County Land Use District Map Bylaw No. 1404, Amended to Bylaw 1502

[2] M.D. of Taber Land Use District Map Bylaw No. 1722, Amended to Bylaw No. 1902

Aerial Photo Date: 2012

0 1 2 3 4 5
Kilometers

N

SW36 9-19-4

SE36 9-19-4

NE25 9-19-4

Hamlet of Chin

SW25 9-19-4

SE25 9-19-4

3

3

NW24 9-19-4

NE24 9-19-4

SW24 9-19-4

SE24 9-19-4

Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County Intermunicipal Development Plan

Land Use Designations

Location Map 1

Municipal District of Taber
(Bylaw No. 1938) &
Lethbridge County
(Bylaw No. 18-019)

Plan Area Boundary

M.D. of Taber/Lethbridge County Border

Provincial Highways

Lethbridge County Land Use Designation[1]

- Rural Agriculture
- Rural Urban Fringe
- Rural General Industrial
- Hamlet Public/Institutional
- Hamlet Residential
- Hamlet Transitional Agriculture

Source:

[1] Lethbridge County Land Use District Map Bylaw No. 1404, Amended to Bylaw 1502

Aerial Photo Date: 2012

0 75 150 300
Meters

N



Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County Intermunicipal Development Plan

Land Use Designations

Location Map 2

Plan Area Boundary

M.D. of Taber/Lethbridge County Border

Provincial Highways

M.D. of Taber Land Use Designation[1]

Rural Agriculture

Grouped Rural Industrial

Municipal District of Taber
(Bylaw No. 1938) &
Lethbridge County
(Bylaw No. 18-019)

Source:

[1] M.D. of Taber Land Use District Map Bylaw No. 1722, Amended to Bylaw No. 1902

Aerial Photo Date: 2012

0 75 150 300
Meters

N



Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County Intermunicipal Development Plan

Land Use Designation

Location Map 3

Municipal District of Taber
(Bylaw No. 1938) &
Lethbridge County
(Bylaw No. 18-019)

Plan Area Boundary

Provincial Highways

Waterbodies

Lethbridge County Land Use Designation[1]

Rural Agriculture

Grouped Country Residential

Rural Recreational

Source:

[1] Lethbridge County Land Use District Map Bylaw No. 1404, Amended to Bylaw 1502

Aerial Photo Date: 2012

0 25 50 100 150
Meters

N



Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County Intermunicipal Development Plan

Land Use Designations

Location Map 4

Municipal District of Taber
(Bylaw No. 1938) &
Lethbridge County
(Bylaw No. 18-019)

- Plan Area Boundary
- M.D. of Taber/Lethbridge County Border
- Provincial Highways
- Waterbodies

M.D. of Taber Land Use Designation[1]

- Rural Agriculture
- Grouped Country Residential

Source:

[1] M.D. of Taber Land Use District Map Bylaw No. 1722, Amended to Bylaw No. 1902

Aerial Photo Date: 2012

N

0 20 40 80 120 160 200
Meters

Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County Intermunicipal Development Plan

Physical Characteristics

Map 3

Municipal District of Taber
(Bylaw No. 1938) &
Lethbridge County
(Bylaw No. 18-019)

- Plan Area Boundary
- M.D. of Taber/Lethbridge County Border
- Provincial Highways
- Residences and Other Addressed Parcels[1]
- Confined Feeding Operations[2]

Land Ownership[3]

- Private Ownership
- Crown Land
- Crown Land / St. Mary River Irrigation District
- St. Mary River Irrigation District
- Bow River Irrigation District
- M.D. of Taber
- Lethbridge County

Source:

[1] Alberta Municipal Data Sharing Partnership, July 2017
[2] NRCB, 2015
[3] Altalis, May 2017
Aerial Photo Date: 2015

0 1 2 3 4 5
Kilometers

N



Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County Intermunicipal Development Plan

Confined Feeding Operation Exclusion/Restricted Areas

Map 4

- Plan Area Boundary
- M.D. of Taber/Lethbridge County Border
- Provincial Highways
- Confined Feeding Operations[1]
- Lethbridge County Confined Feeding Operation Exclusion Areas Within Plan Boundary Area
- M.D. of Taber Confined Feeding Operation Restricted Areas Within Plan Boundary Area

Municipal District of Taber
(Bylaw No. 1938) &
Lethbridge County
(Bylaw No. 18-019)

Source:

[1] NRCB, 2015

Aerial Photo Date: 2015

0 1 2 3 4 5
Kilometers

N



Municipal District of Taber and Lethbrige County Intermunicipal Development Plan

Map 5

Road Network

- Plan Area Boundary
- M.D. of Taber/Lethbridge County Border
- Provincial Highways
- Municipal Roads
- Lethbridge County Haul Routes

Municipal District of Taber
(Bylaw No. 1938) &
Lethbridge County
(Bylaw No. 18-019)

Source:
Aerial Photo Date: 2015

0 1 2 3 4 5
Kilometers

N



Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County Intermunicipal Development Plan

Historic Resource Value Sites

Map 6

Plan Area Boundary

M.D. of Taber/Lethbridge County Border

Provincial Highways

Waterbodies

Historic Resource Values (HRV)[1]*

Land Contains an Archaeological and/or Paleontological Resource That May Require Avoidance (HRV 4 a, p)

Land Believed to Contain an Archaeological and/or Paleontological Historic Resource (HRV 5 a, p)

Municipal District of Taber
(Bylaw No. 1938) &
Lethbridge County
(Bylaw No. 18-019)

* Refer to AB Culture and Tourism "Listing of Historic Resources Instructions For Use" for HRV descriptions and categories.

Source:

[1] Alberta Culture and Tourism
Government of Alberta, April 2017

Aerial Photo Date: 2015

0 1 2 3 4 5
Kilometers

N



Municipal District of Taber and Lethbridge County Intermunicipal Development Plan

Natural Characteristics

Plan Area Boundary

M.D. of Taber/Lethbridge County Border

Provincial Highways

Environmentally Significant Areas[1]

Waterbodies

Municipal District of Taber
(Bylaw No. 1938) &
Lethbridge County
(Bylaw No. 18-019)

Map 7

Note:
Environmentally Significant Areas (ESAs) illustrated on this map are based on macro-scale provincial data and may not depict the full extent of ESAs within the Plan Area. This data is to be used for general information only and is supplementary to other more detailed sources of information the municipalities and province may have regarding ESAs.

Source:

[1] Environmentally Significant Areas in Alberta: 2014 Update, Alberta Parks

Aerial Photo Date: 2015

0 1 2 3 4 5
Kilometers

N