Minutes of a Public Hearing in regards to By-law No. 931/11 held in the Clearwater County Council Chambers on February 22, 2011.

The Hearing was called to order at 1:17 P.M. with the following being Present:

Reeve: Pat Alexander Councillors: **Bob Bryant** Case Korver John Vandermeer Dick Wymenga Jim Duncan Ron Leaf Municipal Manager: Recording Secretary: Christine Heggart Keith McCrae Development Officer: Brad Insel Dori Westin Paul Davis Heather Morgan Mary Fox Chris Ullman Don Arthur Larry Cameron Terri Cameron Wendy Morrison Heather Thompson Richard Livingston Eva Livingston Mona Crocker Stan Johnston Darrel Kirstein Walter Harmer

Reeve Alexander outlined the process to be used for the Public Hearing.

Eileen Henna

Keith McCrae provided the background and planning considerations to the proposed Land Use By-law No. 931/11 and detailed how the Land Use Bylaw amendments will bring the bylaw in line with the recently adopted Municipal Development Plan (MDP) and the MDP's statutory nature. Consistency of terms, significant changes to the land use bylaw are from MDP.

Mr. McCrae summarized the suggested changes in the LUB for the public hearing and that the bylaw received first reading on January 11, 2011 and the public hearing was publicly advertised in local papers on the website, and copies available in the office.

## The Chair invited questions from Council.

There were no additional comments from Council.

## The Chair invited the public to speak regarding the proposed amendments to the bylaw.

Paul Devos stepped forward and asked a question about whether an area structure plan that has not be previously approved can be submitted and approved for a traditional multi-lot subdivision.

Mr. McCrae detailed that only previously approved Area Structure Plans can be submitted for consideration in terms of traditional multi-lot subdivisions. New applications must conform to the MDP's new Residential Estate Subdivision conditions.

The Chair asked for written comments from the public. There were no written submissions received.

The Chair asked for comments received from referral agencies. Mr. McCrae read the comments received from Agencies. February 22, 2011 Page 2 of 2

> Municipal District of Bighorn, Mountain View County and Lacombe County all responded with no objection or concerns with amendment.

> Alberta Agriculture responded that the Land Use Bylaw changes bring the LUB in line with Agriculture Operation Practices Act (AOPA). However the letter detailed the disagreement with statement that municipalities act simpy as referral agency as municipalities are always considered to be a directly affected party and have a more extensive role in the permitting process.

Public Hearing closed at 1:50 P.M.

MUNICIPAL MANAGER

REEVE