

# Municipal Government Act Review

## What We Heard: A Summary of Consultation Input

---

Planning and Development Technical Session

Held in Calgary on April 9, 2014

Released on June 24, 2014

Developed by KPMG for Alberta Municipal Affairs



## Contents

Introduction .....	1
Purpose .....	1
The Municipal Government Act Review .....	1
Session Overview .....	2
Regional Consultation Methodology .....	3
Summary of Input .....	5
General Comments about the MGA .....	5
Governance and Administration .....	6
Municipal Powers, Structures, Annexations and Other Changes .....	6
Municipal Finances .....	6
Municipal Accountability, Liability, and Risk Management .....	7
Municipal Services and Delivery .....	7
Planning and Development .....	8
Fees and Levies .....	8
Land Management and Planning Tools .....	10
Subdivision and Development Authorities and Processes .....	11
Land Dedication and Use of Reserves .....	12
Regional Approaches .....	14
Public Participation and Planning Appeals .....	16
Appendix A: Session Agenda .....	18

## Introduction

### Purpose

This document provides a summary of what was heard during a consultation session for the *Municipal Government Act* (MGA) review. The summary below includes the comments and opinions of the participants of the Planning and Development Technical Session held in Calgary.

These contributions have not been reviewed or edited for accuracy. Comments recorded here reflect the opinions of individuals offered in person and recorded by session facilitators; they do not necessarily represent the opinion of the Government of Alberta.

The input summarized below will be considered by Alberta Municipal Affairs as part of the review of the legislation. Municipal Affairs would like to thank the participants of this session, as well as all Albertans participating in the review of the MGA. Any inquiries related to this summary or to the consultation process should be directed by email to the MGA Review Team at [mga.review@gov.ab.ca](mailto:mga.review@gov.ab.ca).

### The Municipal Government Act Review

The MGA is designed to help build strong, prosperous and sustainable communities throughout Alberta. Alberta Municipal Affairs is reviewing and refreshing the MGA to address evolving circumstances and priorities in Alberta's many communities, and to ensure the MGA continues to meet its objective. A successful MGA review process will continue to position Alberta as the leading Canadian jurisdiction in terms of municipal legislation, having incorporated sound thinking, input and research into a clear Act that meets the needs of the Province and municipalities. In order to achieve this vision, an inclusive and comprehensive engagement process was developed to ensure stakeholders across the province have opportunities to provide input to the review.

As part of the MGA review, regional consultations were held in eleven locations around the province to give Albertans an opportunity to provide input face-to-face. In each location, different types of sessions were held, including Technical Sessions, a Business and Industry Session, a Municipal Administrators Session, an Elected Officials Session, and a Public Open House.

These engagements were conducted in February 2014 to April 2014 in 11 locations throughout the province. Each location was held over 3 days in the following locations:

- Brooks
- Calgary
- Edmonton
- Edson
- Fort McMurray
- Grande Prairie
- Lethbridge
- Medicine Hat
- Peace River
- Red Deer
- Vermilion

Sessions were promoted via news releases, direct email invitations, social media, and by the Minister of Municipal Affairs at stakeholder conventions. Information on regional session locations, dates and registration were on the MGA Review website.

Input to the MGA Review has also been provided through other channels, including the MGA Review website ([mgareview.alberta.ca](http://mgareview.alberta.ca)), the MGA Review Consultation Workbook, and official submissions.

## Session Overview

<b>Session</b>	Planning and Development Technical Session
<b>Location</b>	Radisson Hotel & Conference Centre Calgary Airport, Calgary
<b>Date</b>	April 9, 2014
<b>Number of Participants</b>	88

- This session was open to anyone who wished to attend. Participants were asked to register in advance in order to receive background materials before the session.

## Regional Consultation Methodology

### ***How sessions were organized***

Regional consultations were structured around one or more of the three themes of the MGA Review:

- Governance and Administration
- Assessment and Taxation
- Planning and Development

Participants were provided with agendas in advance, which identified a list of potential topics for discussion. These topics were taken directly from the MGA Review Consultation Workbook. Several of the topics for discussion appear under more than one of the three themes of the review because they are relevant to more than one theme (e.g. public participation). The agenda is attached as Appendix A.

At this session, participants provided input through facilitated table discussions. The goal of the facilitated conversations was to give the opportunity to all participants to discuss the issues that mattered most to them. Given the large size and scope of the MGA, participants at each table were asked to focus their discussion on those topics that they felt were most important to provide input on, using the list provided in advance. In addition, this session included time for “open discussion” during which participants could provide any additional input that they felt was important to the review. Table facilitators and note takers included staff from Municipal Affairs, KPMG and ADR Education.

### ***Capturing input and reporting***

Input from session participants was captured on flipcharts by facilitators during the discussion. It was explained to participants that:

- Comments were being recorded on flipcharts so that they could be captured and considered by Municipal Affairs as part of the review of the MGA.
- Comments would not be attributed to individuals or organizations.
- Other avenues were also available to provide written input to the review.

The summary below documents the input heard from participants and recorded on flipcharts. These comments have been transcribed and organized according to the list of topics for discussion; they have not been screened for accuracy and do not reflect consensus of participants. As a result, comments and opinions listed may be contradictory. Comments that apply to issues outside of the scope of the review (e.g., suggested changes to other legislation) have been removed.

It is important to emphasize that this summary reflects the input heard from participants, and does not necessarily reflect the position of the Government of Alberta.

**How the Summary of Responses is Organized**

*Input from session participants is organized according to the three themes for the review:*

- *Governance and Administration*
- *Assessment and Taxation*
- *Planning and Development*

*Within these themes, comments are organized according to the applicable topics for discussion, using the list provided to participants in advance. In some sessions, not all themes may have been discussed.*

## Summary of Input

### **General Comments about the MGA**

The following input was received and documented related to the MGA in general.

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA and associated regulations need to be “living documents” that adapt to changing environments.
- The MGA needs to be interpreted and applied consistently across the province.
- The MGA should be laid out in a more user-friendly format.
- Planning provisions should be separate into its own act, rather than being combined with the MGA.

## **Governance and Administration**

During the discussions surrounding planning and development, some discussion occurred on governance and administration. The following input was received and documented related to governance and administration.

### **Municipal Powers, Structures, Annexations and Other Changes**

#### ***Municipal powers***

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA should more clearly define municipal authorities.
- The MGA does not need to introduce city charters. Existing natural person powers are more than enough power for municipalities.

#### ***Municipal structures***

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA should consider First Nations reserves to be municipalities.

### **Municipal Finances**

#### ***Financial administration***

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA should, in all cases, ensure municipalities are transparent about the use of tax revenues.
- To encourage greater transparency and fairness, the MGA should require municipalities to use total cost accounting, which will better capture the cost of infrastructure repair.

#### ***Municipal revenue sources***

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA should enable municipalities to hold developers accountable for the costs of development, as opposed to passing fees and costs directly on the consumer. This would require providing municipalities with additional tools to lessen the cost gap between developers and consumers.
- Municipalities should have more revenue generation opportunities than the current fees and levies from developers and property taxes.
- Property taxes could increase without undermining the “Alberta advantage.”
- A one per cent increase in the sales tax could provide huge revenue for municipalities across the province, without creating competition across municipalities through different sales taxes.
- The MGA should allocate the capital portion of provincial income tax to municipalities.

- There could be a targeted infrastructure tax that disappears when the specific piece of infrastructure has been paid for, like in the United States.
- A provincial gas tax could be introduced, from which revenues could be exclusively dedicated to arterial roads. A gas tax is more effective than tolls in taxing transportation.
- Municipal bonds and municipal utility districts could work well in Alberta.
- Municipalities should be able to fund infrastructure through debentures.
- Revenue should be more user-based to put the burden of infrastructure on those who create the demand for it. Currently, revenue is separated from the services provided.
- If regional planning occurs, there needs to be a regional infrastructure tax to fund water, sewers and roads.
- “User-pay” approaches do not consider the municipal need to create public good and meet the needs of all citizens.

## Municipal Accountability, Liability, and Risk Management

### ***Compliance and accountability***

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA should design its legal protection of council like a board of directors, with councils being provided with no more or less protection. This would further ensure accountability for the decisions made by council.
- The MGA should outline stricter regulations to ensure councils do not break conflict of interest and pecuniary interest provisions.
- The MGA should legislate municipal transparency rules outright to ensure consistency across the province. The status quo of outlining the principles of transparency does not achieve the level of public accountability that Albertans want.

## Municipal Services and Delivery

### ***Service provisions***

Comments from participants included that:

- Water and wastewater should be a provincial responsibility or become a regional service. These services should not be a commodity. There are currently tensions between municipalities regarding water.
- Medium and small municipalities need a role in transit. Under the current MGA, these municipalities have to compete with the large municipalities for transit funding.

## Planning and Development

The following input was received and documented related to planning and development.

### Fees and Levies

#### ***Fees and levies***

Comments from participants included that:

- The language used in the *Principles and Criteria for Off-site Levies Regulation* is vague, confusing and can cause major delays for interpretation.
  - The offsite levies system should incorporate clear principles and criteria that would increase clarity while still maintaining flexibility.
  - Currently, the *Principles and Criteria for Off-site Levies Regulation* is not clear on what provisions are binding. For example, in Section 3 (3) (Principles and criteria specifically) of the *Principles and Criteria for Off-site Levies Regulation*, the term “degree of benefit” is subjective and not quantitative.
    - The ambiguity of this term is resulting in the offsite levies process relying on competing experts’ ad hoc reports to determine what is considered a “benefit.”
    - The MGA should outline reasonable timelines to debate and determine the “degree of benefit” of any off-site levy decision.
  - Competing interpretations of the *Principles and Criteria for Off-site Levies Regulation* do not necessarily have to be resolved in a litigious arena. A third party body, such as a moderator or arbitrator, may be useful.
  - The lack of clarity in the *Principles and Criteria for Off-site Levies Regulation* is making it unusable for the general public.
    - Greater certainty for citizens, developers and municipalities should be a driving principle when re-examining the *Principles and Criteria for Off-site Levies Regulation*.
- The MGA needs to clarify how levies are collected and what they are spent on.
  - There needs to be clear accountability on how levy revenue is applied. What is the benefiting area and for what services should both be clearly identified.
  - Clear reporting guidelines for fees and levies needs to be outlined in the MGA to ensure accountability and transparency.
    - Municipalities should share with developers how their taxes, fees and levies are used.
    - Municipalities should be given a reporting template that outlines how fees and levies are used. It is difficult to plan for future development when there is no consistent reporting mechanism.
  - Revenue from fees and levies should stay in the areas they were collected in.

- New developments should not necessarily be responsible for covering all costs of future development, as they are sometimes. There are many who benefit from a facility in an area. Fire halls, for example, provide benefits to many surrounding areas.
- There should be fixed rate limitations of what the municipality can collect for multi-phase developments.
- The *Principles and Criteria for Off-site Levies Regulation* is too prescriptive for municipalities in listing a “shopping list” of areas that are allowed to be levied.
  - Greater flexibility is needed in the regulation for the municipality to determine what levies are appropriate for their community.
  - The MGA should give municipalities the opportunity to levy to pay for “soft services” like fire halls, libraries and recreation facilities.
  - Municipalities should have the flexibility to collect infrastructure-specific levies based on municipal development plans.
- Municipalities should not have too much power to determine what they levy.
  - Provincial oversight could be beneficial to ensure municipalities are reasonable.
  - The MGA should allow for a peer review of offsite levy bylaws in terms of fairness, equity and transparency by someone like an ombudsman.
- The MGA should reflect consistent provincial standards and direction when it comes to levies.
  - For example, the evolution of the recreation levy imposed by one municipality was initially done informally within the community, with strict intent. Today, many municipalities are making similar requests, without clear intent for the levy.
  - Subdivision and development levy rates are inconsistent. There should be a consistent provincial rate.
- Levies should be able to be applied to a property more than once.
  - The MGA should be broadened to include the ability to claim offsite redevelopment levies if an area is changing and is being redeveloped after an initial subdivision.
  - The MGA should increase the uses for redevelopment levies to be similar to the uses of offsite levies.
- The cost recovery process for offsite levies needs to be stronger in the MGA. Municipalities should have more responsibility in the cost recovery process beyond the term “endeavor.”
  - The municipality should be allowed to collect levies from property owners.
  - Section 7 (General Jurisdiction to Pass Bylaws) of the MGA must indicate that levies are to be established at full cost recovery.
    - The MGA should ensure up-front costs are paid back by developers in a maximum of 10 years.
- The allocation processes for fees and levies are complex and expensive for small and medium municipalities.

- The MGA needs to allow for negotiation and discussion in determining levies.
- Fees and levies should be based on the number of units in a development, not the density of the development.
- Community aggregate levies should include forestry. There is nothing under the MGA that obligates forestry industry to pay levies.

## Land Management and Planning Tools

### ***Statutory plans and land use bylaws***

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA should define which plans are statutory and which are guidelines.
  - Conceptual schemes should not form part of a statutory plan.
  - The MGA should combine “concept plans” and “outline plans” into one term that refers to a semi-formal agreement with developers.
    - Many municipalities are unable to differentiate between the two types of plans, and combining them would result in systematic administrative savings.
    - Land-use plans and outline plans need to be connected.
- The MGA should state the objective and criteria for outline plans and neighbourhood plans so developers know what the requirements are.
  - There should be a statutory component to outline plans and neighbourhood plans to give more certainty to developers. These planning processes should not be at the whim of municipalities. It should be set by the Province.
  - These plans should be appealable.
  - It should be easier to make changes to existing outline plans and neighbourhood plans.
- The language in statutory plans needs to be prescriptive.
  - For example, the MGA shouldn’t use terms like “ought to,” but instead should use stronger language like “must.”
  - Municipalities need to be held accountable for compliance to their commitments in statutory plans.
- The MGA needs to provide more clarity about statutory and non-statutory regulations. Perhaps statutory and non-statutory plans should not be differentiated at all.
- Statutory plans could be a lot simpler, more flexible and have simpler supporting processes.
- The MGA should require statutory and non-statutory plans to expire in a given amount of time.
- The MGA should be aligned with all other acts that deal with statutory plans.
- Land-use bylaws should be treated as a statutory requirement.
  - Land-use bylaws should need to be aligned with municipal development plans.

- The MGA should require a mandatory review of municipal development plans by provincial and municipal leaders.
  - Municipal development plans should be reviewed every two years.
- Area structure plans should have a defined size, scale and lifetime.
- Area structure plans should be required to include how offsite levies are collected, and the formula used for calculating these levies.
- During the development of residential subdivisions, there should be mandatory dedication of land intended for affordable housing departments.
  - There should be a percentage of all housing developments that must be designated as affordable housing.
  - Requiring affordable housing would have a negative effect on the development industry since it would limit profit and growth capacity. These types of provisions add financial pressures on the development industry to subsidize affordable housing services.
  - The terms “inclusionary zoning” and “affordable housing” need to be more clearly defined in the MGA.
  - Municipalities need better mechanisms to manage social housing developments. Municipalities need tools to manage these properties, such as price restrictions and property liens.
  - The MGA needs to provide more definitions for social housing types.

## Subdivision and Development Authorities and Processes

### ***Planning authorities***

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA should be prescriptive about what planning commissioners can and should look at.
- The MGA should include a mechanism to allow a subdivision or development applicant to apply to an adjoining municipality if there is capacity in that adjacent municipality to provide servicing.

### ***Administrative decision-making processes***

Comments from participants included that:

- The current notification process outlined in Section 653 (Application for subdivision approval) of the MGA does not provide enough supporting documentation to landowners. There needs to be more open information provided.
- The length of written decisions regarding plans should be long enough to provide some content, but not too long so as to be onerous. For example, five pages is appropriate, one line is too short and 20 pages is too long.
- Section 654 (1 and 2) (Approval of application) of the MGA needs to be shifted so that application approvals occur prior to the subdivision process. The MGA is flexible in this regard, but earlier approval should be mandatory.

- Municipalities should be held accountable for compliance with the MGA’s decision timeframes for area structure plans, outline plans and development permits.
  - Tools are needed to compel municipalities to adhere to timelines for subdivision reviews.
  - Timelines can be a challenge for municipalities to meet, as sometimes they require provincial input on these decisions.
  - Municipalities should provide decisions on permits in a more timely way.
  - The timelines are inequitable for airports and developers. The ability to get decisions doesn’t have to be the same, but it should be similar.
  - Most municipalities are requesting more time than the 60-day subdivision decision timeline. Municipalities should not be automatically asking for time extensions when applications are being submitted.
  - Timelines for decisions should be 30 days for subdivisions by instrument, 90 days for tentative subdivisions and 180 days for “complex” development permits.
  - There needs to be more specific timelines for other items in subdivision applications that will be going forward for council approval.
  - There should be no time limitation on when an applicant can request a deemed refusal once the due date for decision has passed.
  - The consequence for missing a decision deadline should be stated in the MGA.
    - For example, municipalities should be fined for missing the timelines outlined in the MGA.

## Land Dedication and Use of Reserves

### ***Land dedication (reserves)***

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA should allow municipalities to take municipal reserves at the development stage.
- The MGA should consider adding municipal reserves to development permits as voluntary contributions.
- Municipalities are automatically taking the maximum 10 per cent amount of municipal reserve land, even though the MGA says the municipality “may” request the land dedication.
  - More clarity is needed on when it is appropriate to take the maximum allotment of land dedication.
  - Prior to reserves being allocated, municipalities should be required to perform a needs test.
- If the total 30 per cent of reserve that is dedicated for utilities is not completely used, the municipality should be able to allocate the remaining amount into municipal reserve.

- Reallocating utility reserve land to municipal reserve may potentially penalize developers and efficient development practices.
- The requirement for 10 per cent land dedication isn't enough for high-density developments.
  - Reserves should be scalable according to density.
  - The MGA need to be very clear about when the "additional five per cent" provision applies for high-density areas.
  - There should be a provision to ensure that the 10 per cent reserve land is useful land that can be developed.
- The MGA should ensure reserves do not "pile up" by legislating a "use it or lose it" approach for this land. This would involve:
  - Clearly defining timeframes for development of reserve land;
  - Outlining the nature within which a reserve is used as well as the proportion of which a municipal reserve can be dedicated to a given reserve type; and
  - Capping municipal reserves at five per cent.
- The MGA needs to provide municipalities with a way to revisit and review the scale and location of reserve lands that have previously been dedicated, based on the area and what it is being used for.
  - This is currently done through cooperation between municipalities and school boards.
- School and municipal reserves should be separate to encourage transparent use of land.
  - School reserve land takes up most of the land available to municipalities.
  - There should be a mandatory five per cent municipal reserve dedication that should not include school reserve dedications.
  - School reserve land doesn't get returned to developers or municipalities, so there are no incentives for school boards to make efficient decisions about the land.
- The MGA needs to provide a clear definition of environmental reserves.
  - Currently, the definition of environmental reserve is "land that is undevelopable."
    - There should also be consideration of environmental protection in the definition of environmental reserves. The definition should not just be based on development.
    - Environmental reserves should only apply to hazard lands that are not developable. Currently, municipalities are taking too much land.
  - There is a misconception that environmental reserve land is related to environmental protection.
    - The name should be changed to "conservation reserve".
  - The MGA should outline greater protection for lakes, watersheds and wetlands.
    - This may be achieved by including healthy lakes within the defined environmental reserves as well as providing a clear definition for environmental open space.

- Definitions of wetlands are needed within the MGA, as well as for water bodies, gullies and ravines.
- Environmental reserves should be consistent with the water body setbacks according to Environment and Sustainable Resource Development guidelines of 30 metres.
- Riparian lands should be included in municipal reserves.
- The MGA should expand the environmental reserve definition to include riparian lands.
- The MGA should not generalize environmental reserves.
  - For example, “slopes” all face the same regulation, when their stability varies significantly between municipalities (e.g., a mine shaft as opposed to a reinforced/engineered cliff face).
- If environmental reserve land is considered essential, the responsibility to cover the costs to preserve the land should not be the sole responsibility of developers, but of the whole community.
- Municipalities shouldn’t use environmental reserves to build up parkland. They should just be clear with developers about their need for parks.
- The MGA should not allow reserves to be taken more than the six metres from a body of water as specified in Section 644-1c (Acquisition of land designated for public use). This should be enforceable.
- Community services reserves aren’t working. This reserve needs to be more flexible to allow schools to contribute land.
- The MGA needs to clearly define the cash-in-lieu of reserve process.
  - The cash-in-lieu process should be standardized across the province.
  - Developers should have a say in whether they contribute land or money to reserves.
  - When annexation occurs, cash-in-lieu of reserve land should go to the annexing municipality, since they do not get the benefit of land to use.
- The MGA should require compensation to landowners when land is taken as reserve land.
- An appeal process should be established for land dedication.

## Regional Approaches

### ***Municipal relationships and dispute resolution***

Comments from participants included that:

- Currently, the MGA it is too competitive. The focus should be on planning regionally, rather than pitting municipalities against one another.
- The MGA needs to provide more tools and ways for municipalities to work together.
- Municipal development plans should be shared with bordering municipalities.

- The MGA should provide a timing mechanism to move inter-municipal disputes forward.

### ***Managing growth and development***

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA and *Condominium Property Act* should be consistent.
- The MGA should outline the legal recourse for poor planning.
  - There needs to be a focus on agricultural lands and the preservation of the lands.
  - When municipal planning fails to preserve these lands, the MGA should provide tools for recourse, such as transfer of development credits.
  - The MGA needs to provide more provincial guidance for infrastructure development to ensure wetlands are protected and density is encouraged.
- The MGA should ensure efficient land principles are utilized regionally.
  - The main concern with regional planning should be providing regional services, such as water and wastewater.
  - The MGA should have a process to plan utilities regionally.
- The MGA needs to outline Crown lands and what jurisdictional authority they have.
- The MGA needs to clarify how and when plans like the South Saskatchewan Regional Plan under the *Alberta Land Stewardship Act* can enforce regional compliance.
  - The MGA should ensure that regional and metropolitan plans align with municipal development plans to ensure sustainable development and planning.
  - The MGA needs to outline what regional plans are and how they should be used, implemented and enforced.
  - The MGA should require enforcement of regional plans when they are not followed voluntarily.

### ***Regional funding approaches***

Comments from participants included that:

- Allowing regional funding approaches to be voluntary is not strong enough. Municipalities should be required to coordinate and cooperate regionally.
  - Current cost sharing agreements are established on a voluntary basis and are dependent on the relationship between particular municipalities. As a result, these cost sharing agreements are not consistent or reliable.
- The MGA needs to establish a clear framework for cost sharing agreements between municipalities to ensure fairness.
  - There needs to be a regional process in the MGA to facilitate cost sharing between bedroom communities and municipalities.
  - Mandatory contributions or sharing of regional infrastructure costs (both capital and operating costs) from neighbouring municipalities should be considered.

## Public Participation and Planning Appeals

### ***Public participation***

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA needs to include a definition of the term “affected party.”
- The MGA should give municipalities more flexibility to consult in the ways that work best for their citizens.
- Public hearings are not the best way for the public to provide meaningful input. They are not the right tool to work through challenges between opposing views.
- The MGA should include a mechanism to ensure council hears the public. There should be a period of time between public hearing and the second and third readings to give an opportunity for feedback.
- Public consultation should happen throughout municipal decision-making processes.
- Public participation notification processes need to be updated to reflect current technology and best practices.
- Sections 231 (Petition for vote on advertised bylaws and resolutions) and 232 (Petition for bylaw) of the MGA inhibit the ability of the public to have a say.
- The threshold for petitions in the MGA should be higher. There should be more disclosure and transparency in the petitions process as outlined in the MGA.

### ***Planning and inter-municipal appeals***

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA should outline a provincially consistent appeals process, which must include standard response and decision-making timelines, and consistent processing fees.
- The MGA should allow adjacent landowners the right to appeal subdivision applications.
- Local subdivision and development appeal boards are not effective because they are not truly independent.
- The MGA should not allow elected officials to sit on any appeal bodies. After an individual is no longer an elected official, there should be a designated time before they can sit on boards again.
- Board members should not make decisions within another jurisdiction because there is no vested interest in the decision.
- Training for subdivision and development appeal board members should be mandatory to ensure they have an understanding of planning.
- The MGA should include an appeals process for area structure plans.

### ***Municipal Government Board***

Comments from participants included that:

- The Province needs to take more responsibility for addressing planning appeals.

- A provincial appeal board, such as the Municipal Government Board should be responsible for all appeals, not just those related to planning and development.
- Decision timelines for municipalities also need to apply to the Municipal Government Board decisions.

## Appendix A: Session Agenda

### *MGA Review: Planning and Development Technical Session*

Agenda Item	Timing
<b>1. Welcome and introductions</b>	4:00-4:10
<b>2. Potential topics for discussion:</b> <u>Subject 1: Fees and Levies</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fees and levies</li> </ul> <u>Subject 2: Land Management and Planning Tools</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statutory plans and land use bylaws</li> </ul> <u>Subject 3: Subdivision and Development Authorities and Processes</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning authorities</li> <li>• Administrative decision-making processes</li> </ul> <u>Subject 4: Land Dedication and Use of Reserves</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land dedication (reserves)</li> </ul> <u>Subject 5: Regional Approaches</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Municipal relationships and dispute resolution</li> <li>• Managing growth and development</li> <li>• Regional funding approaches</li> </ul> <u>Subject 6: Public Participation and Planning Appeals</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Municipal Government Board</li> <li>• Public participation</li> <li>• Planning and inter-municipal Appeals</li> </ul>	4:10-4:20
<b>3. Change tables (if needed)</b>	4:20-4:25
<b>4. Table facilitation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Up to three topics will be prioritized for discussion (~20 minutes each)</li> <li>▪ Discussion will focus on what is working well, desired changes, and potential impacts of changes to the legislation</li> </ul>	4:25-5:35
<b>5. Open discussion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are there any other relevant topics participants want to address?</li> </ul>	5:35-5:55
<b>6. Wrap-up</b>	5:55-6:00