

Resort Centre ASP Amendment CAG Sub-Group Meeting
Meeting Notes
June 16, 2016 from 6:00-7:00 PM
Stewart Creek Golf Course

In Attendance

- Kyla Connor, Canmore Resident
- Pat Kamenka, Canmore Resident
- Paul Lessard, TSMV Resident
- Andrew Nickerson, Canmore Business and Tourism
- Chris Ollenberger, Owners Representative for TSMV

CAG Support

- Lori Van Rooijen, Facilitator
- Tracy Woitenko, Town of Canmore
- Alaric Fish, Town of Canmore
- Michael Fark, Town of Canmore
- Jessica Karpat, QPD
- Kent MacDougall, QPD
- Jenn Giesbrecht, QPD

Agenda

1. Brief Update
2. Review Draft Resort Centre ASP including maps
3. Review Illustrative Plan and Discuss Land Use Areas
4. Next Steps

Agenda Item #1: Update

QPD Update:

- On June 14, 2016, Chris Ollenberger and Tracy Woitenko from the Town provided Council with an update on progress on Smith Creek ASP and on Resort Centre ASP Amendment. A link was shared with the group <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MYU0xCiM1DA>. The strategy was to publically share information about the project all at once rather than having a slow roll out.
 - The presentation indicated that the Resort Centre ASP amendment process is not part of the same collaborative process as Smith Creek, yet the information, ideas and principles established through the Smith Creek collaborative process are also being considered for the Resort Centre ASP amendment given that the issues are very similar if not identical.
 - **A CAG member** indicated that it was a good strategy to go to Council prior to engagement with the broader community to ensure that Council had the right information should they be asked about the two proposals.

- A draft illustrative map was shown to Council. The illustrative plan is *one version* of what could be done in alignment with the land use concept proposed in the ASP amendment
- **The Town** noted that when the draft Resort Centre map was shown, there was surprise to see development south of the cabin line on the golf course.
- Both **QPD** and the **Town** felt that Council benefited from seeing the wildlife corridor on the map as it made the proposal easier for them to visualize. It was also noted that the only concern was that the 2002 EIS emphasized soft edge corridor treatment and, as we have discussed at length, this is not the prevailing science now.
- **A CAG member** noted that the illustrative plan (shown at the CAG meeting) should show the wildlife corridor. They also noted that it would be nice to provide a visual showing what the wildlife corridor looked like prior to CAG discussions and what it looks like after.
- **QPD** noted that the wildlife corridor on the illustrative plan is deliberately blurred to show the recreational edge on Resort Centre.
- **QPD** noted that they are working on the wildlife corridor alignment application that was presented to Council on Thursday. With regards to Resort Centre, the Province says that no buffers are required for the functionality of the corridor and that the Province would support a fence if it was part of a more holistic solution. The Province has said that they will issue a letter stating this.
- **A CAG member** asked how soon the letter can be expected. This is unknown at this time.

CAG Update: What is the CAG Hearing?

- **A CAG member** noted that there is a plan to proceed with the undermining message to identify the facts necessary to educate the public on the process of undermining mitigation. We need to ensure the facts are front and centre.
- **A representative from the Town** noted that last week Municipal Affairs came to Canmore to update stakeholders on the changes to the MGA. Following the presentation, the MLA and the Minister met to discuss the following issues associated with the MGA and associated Provincial regulations:
 - Lack of indemnity (security or protection against loss) with regards to undermining
 - Lack of sunset clause on 6.19 (which is the clause in the MGA that says that if there is a decision of a piece of land [i.e. the NRCB decision], this trumps municipal approval]. It should be noted that once an ASP is approved and the Land Use Bylaw is amended the provisions outlined in the NRCB decision are mute.
 - The Province wants the Town to put together a value of the infrastructure that is vulnerable to damages related to undermining.
 - Province wants to know how long the Town thinks until the development can be insured. The Town is working through these requests for the Province
- **A CAG Member** asked how the Town is handling the overall image or reputation of the Town in the event of an undermining problem.
 - The Town noted that the likelihood of damages related to undermining are very slim.
 - The Town's perspective is that they want to develop infrastructure respectfully and ensure that infrastructure is well maintained.
 - The Town noted that perception of the community is very different from the reality of risk. The issue is both related to engineering and politics and there is disconnect between the perception of risk and the effectiveness of mitigations.
 - In the case of development on undermined land, it is necessary to demonstrate to the public that the infrastructure is safe and will be maintained.

- The public often points to the Dyrigas sinkhole as an example of damages related to undermining. The Town noted that while it would have been better if it hadn't happened, the fact that there was no development on this land actually reflects a cautious approach to developing in undermined areas. In the case of the Dyrigas sinkhole, there was no damage or risk or damage to development.
- The Dyrigas sinkhole also exposed the issue to the Province. These are messages that should be communicated to the public. Currently, the media focuses on the fact that the sinkhole is still there and it hasn't been dealt with effectively.
- **A CAG Member** noted that there was positive feedback following QPD's presentation to Canmore Business and Tourism. Businesses are generally excited about the direction commercial development is moving in Resort Centre. They also indicated that business was very happy that they were engaged.

Agenda Items 2 & 3: Review Draft Resort Centre ASP and Illustrative Plan

- Draft Resort Centre ASP including track changes and maps was distributed. QPD is looking for CAG feedback.
- The version of the ASP that was distributed at the meeting is a refinement of the policy approach to what is seen on Map 4 (the proposed land use concept map) and on the illustrative plan displayed at the meeting. The version is very similar to what was presented in the last sub-group meeting (on May 5, 2016).
- Area E (on Map 4- the land use concept) represents the entire former golf course land. The concept includes short-term and permanent residential development and could possibly include "age in place" accommodations.
 - Land owners currently investigating the idea of providing a continuum of care for seniors living that ranges from active living facilities to memory care.
 - Looking at permanent residential in Area E as well as some private recreational uses (this would be something like a private ropes course or a terrain park).
- **QPD** reiterated that the illustrative plan is only one possible way of how Resort Centre could be built out in accordance with the ideas identified in the policy amendments. The illustrative plan is a draft and is evolving and there will be changes likely after the meeting with the residents at Hubman Landing. For instance, the plan shows residential units behind Hubman Landing. In addition, the legend needs to be updated to more specifically describe residential areas (single family, townhouse, multi-family etc.).
- QPD and the Town currently working on negotiating steep creeks and where municipal reserve (MR) can be designated. Based on how these conversations go with the residents, the illustrative plan could change.
- **A CAG member** asked if the continuum of care would be the same as Origins? QPD suggested it was not exactly the same but the owners are currently investigating what this continuum of care would look like.
- **Another CAG member** asked if there is concern for affordability for that demographic.
 - Town noted that it is necessary to figure out what the market is for this type of care in Canmore
 - QPD stated that this is one of many possible uses for the land. The Resort Centre ASP was designed to give a lot of market flexibility as it was uncertain as to when the land would be developed.

- **A CAG member** thought that an extended care facility would be very welcome in Canmore as currently there is not a facility in Canmore. Older Canmore residents must first leave Canmore in order to be accommodated in the local facility (move outside the community by 100 km).
 - The proposed continuum of care facility would be privately operated and would provide community members of an option to stay in Canmore, however, it may not meet the affordability factor.
- **A CAG member** asked where the fence would go and what the visual impact on the community would be.
 - Imagery from Jackson Hole was shown to Council. This fence does not have a huge visual impact. Jackson residents know that the fence is there but the experience is that people take the fence for what it is.
 - The fence in the Resort Centre would run along the 35 m conservation easement edge. There will be two or three provincially approved gates where people could go through the corridor to access trails above the corridor. Additionally, the idea of allowing a gate in the right of way is also being considered.
 - Fence is designed with page wire with a buried apron, a designated height, and will look similar to the Jackson fence. The fence will not be electric.
 - As development is phased in, the fence would be enclosed at each phase of development.
 - Important to note that the Resort Centre fence is not just a solution in the Resort Centre but is part of a broader solution.
 - QPD has looked at a fence alignment through the Smith Creek Golf Course and together with SCGC, we have found something that we think can work with the operations of the golf course. SCGC has agreed to implement the fence so that it links in the fence in other TSMV areas. This was a key unknown that has now been resolved.
- **A CAG member** felt that the fence needs to be phased for the sake of the animals. Concerns with fence not bordering the river edge causing the river to be an access point for wildlife into the development essentially creating a “cul-de-sac”.
 - This is something that Golder will be looking into at future planning phases. At the ASP level we are working to identify where the fence line is. The specific implementation and logistics will be dealt with during future phases of development.
- **Another CAG member** asked how the fence would be maintained, who was going to pay for it, and whether there has been any work done to determine the overall cost of maintenance.
 - **Town** is currently participating in discussions to figure this out.
- **A CAG member** noted that this will likely result in a tax of some kind to all residents of Canmore.
 - **Town** noted that at this point Council has not approved the fence and so the conversation of maintenance will have to evolve over time.
- **QPD** noted that currently the highest risks to the fence are human cutting through the wires.
- **The Town** also indicated that in the National Parks, the greatest risk is trees falling through the fence.
- **The Town** stated that the fence needs to be understood by Council and the public as a critical piece of infrastructure. This is a value proposition that makes sense.
- **Another CAG member** asked a question about the cabin line and how we plan to explain to the community why we are choosing to develop south of the cabin line.
- **QPD** suggested that this is a discussion that will occur but that the reason for the line was not based on science.

Agenda Item #4: Next Steps

- QPD would like another meeting with Resort Centre Sub-Group members after they have had a chance to review the proposed amendments and maps in the ASP document in more detail. This meeting will be scheduled for July.