

Municipal Government Act Review

What We Heard: A Summary of Consultation Input

Planning and Development Technical Session
Held in Red Deer on March 12, 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
Public Participation and Municipal Relations	7
Assessment and Taxation	8
Exemptions from Assessment and Taxation	8
Industrial and Agricultural Property Assessment	8
Planning and Development	9
Fees and Levies	9
Land Management and Planning Tools	10
Subdivision and Development Authorities and Processes	11
Land Dedication and Use of Reserves	12
Regional Approaches	13
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 Red Deer.

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.

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), the MGA Review Consultation Workbook, and official submissions.

Session Overview

Session	Planning and Development Technical Session
Location	Westerner Park, Red Deer
Date	March 12, 2014
Number of Participants	40

- 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 needs to be consistent with other legislation. As part of the review, the Province needs to coordinate the different pieces of legislation that impact municipalities and define the hierarchy between them.
- The MGA and related acts should use common definitions to ensure consistency.
 - For example, the *Water Act* could be rewritten to mirror definitions in the new version of the MGA.
- The MGA is working well.
- The MGA should be structured in a more user friendly way.
 - Language is confusing throughout the MGA.
 - Themes within the MGA could be better organized.
 - The Province should create an executive summary of the MGA.
 - The Province should create a quick reference document or guide for the MGA.
- The index needs to be updated when the MGA is updated.
- In order to implement the new MGA, the Province should provide education to local councils.
- The MGA needs to address long-range, coordinated planning by looking at the vision for 20 to 30 years ahead, and setting stronger provisions.
- It would be helpful to do a review of the MGA more often than every 20 years.
- Consideration of changes and revisions to the MGA should be done very thoughtfully. Time is needed for municipalities to review and provide comments about inadvertent consequences and implementation considerations.
- The MGA needs to be accompanied by an entity, such as an ombudsman, that governs municipalities to help ensure they are following the correct interpretation of the MGA. Access to this kind of support could reduce frustration among municipalities.
 - Municipal Affairs should be responsible for informing municipalities of the proper interpretation of the MGA. It should not be left to municipalities to make legal interpretations.
 - The Province should establish some type of commission or “go-to” entity as a “one stop shop” for MGA interpretation and advice. A helpline could be created, as well.
- The MGA needs more clarity and more enforcement.
- Creating civic charters would risk the creation of “have” and “have-not” municipalities, because large urban municipalities would get charters and special powers.

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 revised MGA should support existing natural person powers to maintain local autonomy.
- There are positives and negatives related to tightening the MGA legislation through this review.
 - The MGA needs a balance between natural person powers and autonomy, and oversight, guidance, clarity and direction.
 - The MGA should reduce the latitude councils have in writing documents to ensure facilitate consistency.

Municipal Finances

Financial administration

Comments from participants included that:

- Municipalities should take asset depreciation into consideration to balance their budgets.

Municipal revenue sources

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA allows urban municipalities to get provincial funding for infrastructure, but does not provide the same opportunity to rural municipalities.

Fees and levies

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA could provide more guidance on how franchise fees relate to schools and other exemptions.

Municipal Accountability, Liability and Risk Management

Compliance and accountability

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA needs more enforcement, or “teeth,” to ensure municipalities comply with what MGA and authorities are saying. Municipalities should not be ignoring or disregarding legislation.

Municipal Services and Delivery

Service provisions

Comments from participants included that:

- Better coordination is needed between pieces of provincial legislation to define what a municipality’s responsibility is as the differences between the roles of the Province and municipalities are vague.
- Municipal governments have a role in meeting local needs, and the Province should address over-arching issues. For example, water should be a provincial resource and a provincial responsibility.
- The Province has been shifting responsibilities to municipalities, who manage services and infrastructure on behalf of the Province. This means municipalities end up paying for provincial infrastructure. The Province maintains ownership of an issue, but requires municipalities to provide service and cover costs.
- The Province subsidizes regional water lines, but it doesn’t help large urban municipalities with their infrastructure. This creates a fairness and equity gap.
 - Some compensation should be given to municipalities which run large infrastructure networks.

Public Participation and Municipal Relations

Public participation

Comments from participants included that:

- Current provisions for petitions are vague and impossible for citizens to achieve. The process needs to be revised.
 - If the purpose of petitions is to encourage public participation or to encourage municipalities to revisit a decision, provisions and requirements need to be reviewed.
 - The scope for petitions is appropriate.
 - There should be a checklist of requirements for petitions.
 - In other jurisdictions, online petitions are used.
- Clarification is needed around the definition of “affected party”.

Assessment and Taxation

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

Exemptions from Assessment and Taxation

Exemptions and other special tax treatment

Comments from participants included that:

- Provincial approval should not be required for a tax incentive bylaw to develop brownfields. The current timeframe to get these developments approved is too long.

Industrial and Agricultural Property Assessment

Farm property assessment

Comments from participants included that:

- Commercial farm buildings shouldn't be tax exempt because the exemption creates inequity with other types of industry.

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:

- Fees and levies should not be used as revenue generators. They should cover costs.
- The costs of offsite levies should be shared over a larger area.
- The scope of what offsite levies can cover is too limited.
 - The recent court decision on the Okotoks bylaw has narrowed the use of fees and levies too much.
 - The definition of off-site levies should include infrastructure and services driven by growth. For example, fire, recreation, police and bridges, storm sewers, roads, and water services should be included.
- Municipalities should be divided into divisions or districts, and different offsite levies should be set within those areas.
- It is good that the MGA sets out a percentage of levy costs.
- The Province should consider standardizing rates for offsite levies across the Province. The MGA should mandate some consistency in offsite costs. Currently, rates can vary significantly from one municipality to another.
 - Currently the range in levies for similar projects is huge between different municipalities.
 - Mandated rates could be restrictive for municipalities that have significantly higher costs. This would also limit municipal autonomy.
 - The Province should ensure the MGA allows municipalities to demonstrate why levies need to be higher, so they can reasonably charge higher levies.
- Rather than setting rules about what fees and levies can be charged, the MGA should let municipalities work with developers to determine what would work best for both parties. In this situation, there need to be rules on negotiating to ensure fairness and accountability.
- Offsite levies should be relevant to the project. The wording in the MGA should be tightened up to restrict councils from over-charging or including items that are less relevant to the project.
 - Municipalities should be required to show developers the relevancy of the offsite levies to the development project.
 - Bigger municipalities can afford to do the background work to prove relevancy, but this would be a challenge for small municipalities.

- Alternative funding mechanisms for municipalities, outside of fees and levies, are desired.
- There should be more clarity around ensuring levies are spent on what they were collected for.
 - The MGA should hold municipalities accountable for the commitments made on a new development. At present, nothing obligates the municipality to spend the money on what it was collected for.
 - The timing is not specified for municipalities to spend money collected through development levies.
 - Developers need predictability and certainty about what services will be provided for development projects.
- Municipalities may incur costs of the development up front, such as with bridges. The MGA should clarify the time, interest rates and obligations related to a municipality collecting this money for initial investments.
- Problems can be created when land that is annexed has already had offsite levies collected on it.

Land Management and Planning Tools

Statutory plans and land use bylaws

Comments from participants included that:

- The statutory plans available currently seem to be working well.
- The MGA should make land use bylaws consistent with statutory plans.
- The MGA needs to clarify a hierarchy of statutory plans, with the municipal development plan or inter-municipal development plan as the governing document, followed by area structure plans or land use bylaws.
- More consistency in writing planning bylaws would be useful.
- A more regional planning perspective should be encouraged, as opposed to an inward looking perspective.
- There is some value in some provincial oversight over long-term planning.
- Inter-municipal development plans and agreements require genuine accountability. If municipalities don't agree, mediation or binding arbitration is needed.
- Inter-municipal development plans are a good management tool, but the MGA needs to ensure they are updated regularly.
- There are concerns that land use plans might compromise power and authority within the MGA. This has more potential impact on rural than urban municipalities.
- An advantage of land use plans is there could be a certain amount of objectivity.
- Municipalities should be able to protect watershed and agricultural land in their plans.
- Stronger requirements are needed for environmental review of plans.

- Land development should not be done without servicing. For example, municipalities shouldn't separate water rights from statutory plans, as this makes regional planning difficult.
- Area Redevelopment Plans should be renamed, as the name intimidates residents. These plans could be called Neighborhood Plans instead.
- Social care areas should be built into area redevelopment plans. It is very difficult to find space for social care areas after development has occurred, due to public backlash.
 - Municipalities should consult with social agencies in regards to social care areas as they consider their area redevelopment plans.
- The MGA's wording needs to ensure that reclamation allows for multiple development possibilities.
 - Reclamation or site restoration should not be put in the hands of municipalities. Funding should also not be provided to the experts to deal with.

Subdivision and Development Authorities and Processes

Planning authorities

Comments from participants included that:

- Planning authorities should know what the municipal development plans say.
- Having councillors on a Municipal Planning Commission is acceptable.
- Council members should not comprise a majority of a Municipal Planning Commission.

Administrative decision-making processes

Comments from participants included that:

- The MGA should allow for temporary commercial and industrial use permits without requiring rezoning.
- Placing notices on titles for work done without permits should be allowed under the MGA. This would require the owner to rectify the issue or sell with the issue factored into the price.
- Feedback regarding provincial interests from agencies like Alberta Transportation should be provided on subdivision referrals.
- Clear definitions of a landfill and the setbacks are needed in the MGA.
- A risk-based process should be used to assess landfills. A scientific investigation should be allowed, and if there is no danger, the setback should be eliminated.
- To address flood fringes and floodways, the MGA should set additional setbacks to prepare for future river and creek meandering.
 - Sections of flood legislation should be transferred from Environment and Sustainable Resources Development to be administered under the MGA.
 - There needs to be clarity on how flood mitigation should be addressed in flood fringes.

- There is nothing in the MGA to protect agricultural land. For instance, no provisions consider soil quality instead they focus on just the market value of the land.
 - There are a lot of tools in place for municipalities to make judgments about protecting land and this is working well.
 - For example, municipalities can base development on soil type through bylaws, establish reserves and decide on development details, like sidewalks.
- The MGA should consider the use of assessed value rather than appraised value on subdivisions.
- Conservation easements have a huge impact on farm operations. Some are voluntary, but not all. The wording in the MGA should ensure that planning and development decisions do not negatively affect farmers.
- There is no recourse mechanism for subdivision decisions in the rare event that an error has been made. Currently, there is only judicial means of recourse. The MGA needs additional mechanisms to address errors.
 - Municipalities should have the ability to take back a decision of a Municipal Planning Commission if a procedural error is made.

Land Dedication and Use of Reserves

Land dedication (reserves)

Comments from participants included that:

- The tools for reserves are working well.
- Adjoining rural and urban or “rurban” boundaries should be set provincially. The urban municipality and rural municipality boundaries can be combined to create regional areas, such as Strathcona County.
- When money is taken in lieu of reserves for industrial areas, municipalities lose money because land has to be reserved at higher values than it is worth.
- In Section 668 (Additional municipal and school reserve) of the MGA, there is a condition where reserve land can exceed 10 per cent, but clarity is needed on this process to take this additional reserve.
- When school boards set land aside but do not use it for many years, it is troublesome for municipalities since it can’t be taxed or levied. The school boards then get money from selling the site, when the municipality should receive the site or money instead.
 - School sites that are obsolete should return to the community, not back to the school board.
 - The MGA should give municipalities the option to develop surplus school sites after a period of time has gone by, or to get someone else to develop them.
- The MGA should empower municipalities to implement a levy on public lands such as school sites.
- The Province should purchase high school sites.

- School reserves can take up a large per cent of the legally available municipal reserve land. This results in a lower number of parks.
- The terminology for environmental reserves needs to be corrected to call these reserves conservation easements.
- The Province should strengthen the MGA to provide more definition on setbacks for ravines and creeks. This would result in more consistency from one development to the next.
- The MGA should expand the definition for environmental reserves to include escarpment setbacks and sensitive areas, including tree stands, and to take into account a broader range of ecological factors.
 - There are differences of opinion about the elements of these environmental reserves. For instance, some see trees as a liability, as they can possibly fall down and damage neighboring property. On the other hand, however, trees prevent erosion and help prevent floods.
- The minimum six metre standard for environmental reserves needs to be increased.
- The MGA should link to direction provided by Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development.
- The Province should initiate engagement between Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development and municipalities to identify and possibly map major water bodies.

Regional Approaches

Municipal relationships and dispute resolution

Comments from participants included that:

- Inter-municipal agreements are working well, if agreed upon. However, there is not much recourse available if there is no agreement among the parties.
- The Province should bring in and maximize the availability and use of mediation and other alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. This would cut costs and reduce litigation, as well as reducing the load carried by the Municipal Government Board.
- Mediation can create different opinions which can contribute to conflict and dispute.
- Grants are competitive, which is not helpful. It would be better for regions and would encourage collaboration if grants were determined on a per capita basis.
- The MGA should encourage collaboration on long-term planning towards a coordinated vision.
 - The MGA could use tools and mechanisms that encourage this behaviour, but allow local autonomy to be maintained.

Managing growth and development

Comments from participants included that:

- There are disproportionate incentives to municipalities to promote new development. Offsite levies make suburban development more achievable than infill.

- Some kind of mechanism is needed to facilitate inter-municipal development, such as infill development or high rises. Incentives are needed to encourage re-development and higher density and to reduce sprawl.
 - The MGA should encourage municipalities to develop inside their boundaries, not on the outskirts, as building outward causes increased servicing costs.
- Compliance with regional planning is a concern. There needs to be appropriate enforcement, and accountability regarding following and complying with an established plan.
- The way that the MGA approaches regionalization works well because it creates the opportunity for regional engagement to occur without forcing it.
- Regionalization should not be forced upon municipalities. The MGA should allow municipalities to take the initiative regarding cooperation and regional boards, without legislated requirements. There are other ways for the Province to encourage regional collaboration, as opposed to legislating it.
- Establishing regional planning would take Alberta 20 years backwards to regional planning commissions, and would lead to loss of municipal empowerment.
 - Regionalization can take away local municipal empowerment. For example, a municipality could lose authority over water use and decisions like whether to add fluoride to their water.
- It is beneficial to look at regional planning as part of the MGA. The role of the government is to facilitate conversations on how to mitigate impacts.
 - There needs to be a clear definition of the role of municipalities within a regional framework.
 - Looking at environmental impacts and watershed management in the context of regional planning is important. The MGA should use Environment and Sustainable Resource Development's seven regions based on watersheds for regional planning.
- Regional planning requires trust. There is a lack of trust between municipalities, and between the Province and municipalities.
- There should be a limited role for regional planning. It is required where issues cross municipal boundaries.
 - For example, this should include water, sanitation, roads and mass transit.
 - To protect residents from local political agendas, there needs to be a mechanism in place to deal with local decisions that are not in the best interest of multiple municipalities.
 - The MGA should prescribe areas where there is a need for regionalization. If regionalization is needed, then it must be enforced. There needs to be a mechanism for non-compliance.
 - We don't want to create another level of government for regional planning, as there is in Ontario.
- Regional planning needs to work in an equitable manner for all. It will require an appeals mechanism in the MGA that is non-adversarial and relies on experts.

- Regional plans provide a good framework to cooperate, and also provide consistency between municipalities.
- The MGA should look to the Ontario Municipal Board or Alberta's Surface Rights Board as models for regional planning.
- The MGA should not use the Ontario Municipal Board model, because it is too expensive and results in too many appeals.
- Off-loading of services from the Province creates issues for regionalization. For example, the cost of bridges becomes a municipal and regional issue.
- The Province should identify in the MGA where Transportation Utility Corridors exist, then designate that land and make it clear.
- The issue of land banking needs to be addressed. This is land held for development and it should be assessed at fair market value.
- The MGA should set a radius for addressing incompatible developments.
- The MGA needs more "teeth" to force contaminated sites to be cleaned up and not just abandoned.
- Municipalities need guidance on where to grow. The Province should determine criteria. For example, sites with sandy soil may be preferable for development.
- Land development should be tied to water access.
 - Some provisions should be added to the MGA to address the reuse of water.
 - Clear links are needed between the MGA and water use policies.
- The Province should help to quantify the cost of development. Increased density could save money. Generally speaking, there should be more integration between resource planning and the MGA.
- The MGA needs to focus on integrating big cities with the region around them.
- Big cities are managing the Province at the expense of other municipalities through civic charters and the transportation funding the in recent budget.

Regional funding approaches

Comments from participants included that:

- There should be level playing fields for urban and rural development. There should be a good ratio of residential to non-residential development, and having regional revenue sharing agreements helps enable this.
- Cost sharing agreements don't always work, so the MGA should consider enabling these agreements based on benefits to residents and who uses what services.
- The Province should develop a mechanism under the MGA to deal with situations where costs are not being shared between municipalities. However, the Province does not need to intervene when there is voluntary cooperation.
- The Province should grant a percentage of linear revenue to urban municipalities to encourage collaboration.
- More support is needed for regional community amenities and housing. A better vision is needed generally on how to handle inter-municipal infrastructure.
- Better alignment is needed between municipal boundaries and other election boundaries. This could affect access to grants.

Public Participation and Planning Appeals

Municipal Government Board

Comments from participants included that:

- The Municipal Government Board is very good, and they have made good decisions.
- The Municipal Government Board is unbiased.
- The Municipal Government Board doesn't always uphold agreements between municipalities around annexations.
- The MGA should specify which cases are of provincial interest and should be handled by the Municipal Government Board. If the case is not of provincial interest, it should be sent to a local subdivision and development appeal board.
- Wetlands are under the jurisdiction of the Province. However, appeals are made to the Municipal Government Board. This needs clarification.
- The Municipal Government Board mandate has the discretion to defer to different appeal levels. This is working well.

Public participation

Comments from participants included that:

- Notification methods should change to reflect technological advances. The minimum notification requirement in the MGA should be through a website, not the newspaper.
 - Municipalities need to have notification options available through the MGA so they may choose the most appropriate way to notify their community. These options could include online notification and electronic receipt of information.
- Councils should hold a pre-consultation meeting before public hearings. This process should be spelled out and defined in the MGA.

Planning and inter-municipal appeals

Comments from participants included that:

- The wording in the MGA should be changed to "must" in cases dealing with subdivision and development appeal boards' decisions regarding subdivision appeals.
- There should be consistency between decisions made by subdivision and development appeal boards and the Municipal Government Board.
- Earlier intervention and input is needed by the regulatory bodies in the subdivision and development appeals process.
- The MGA should define a wetland versus a water body. More clarity is required to reduce uncertainty and conflict over interpretations.
- Smaller local subdivision and development appeal boards do not have the expertise needed. Subdivision and development appeal boards need qualification requirements and more education of their members to ensure consistency of decisions.
- Local subdivision and development boards are perceived to be biased.

- Having councillors on appeal boards is a conflict, which creates a bias and transparency issues.
 - There should not be elected officials on any subdivision and development appeal board. Subdivision and development appeal boards should be made up of all public and local representatives. This change would be unlikely to get councillor support, as councillors view themselves as looking out for municipal development plans.
- The roles of council and the subdivision and development appeal boards need to be separate. These are separate roles, and there should be no councillors on the boards.
- The Province should create regional pools of trained, expert board members to draw from, which would allow for consistency and may reduce bias. A pool of qualified members could mentor local subdivision and development appeal boards to build capacity, providing guidance and oversight.
 - The drawback of a regional pool of board members is that it makes it difficult to manage logistics, scheduling and other considerations for resources travelling across the province.
- The training requirements for subdivision and development appeal boards should be the same as for assessment review boards.
 - Training needs to cover municipal planning processes.
 - Subdivision and development appeal boards understand the education process, but need background in planning, assessment, and legal processes.
 - There needs to be standard training across the province for boards.
- Subdivision and development appeal boards require better direction regarding maintaining their scope.
- The MGA should reduce the hearing time of subdivision and development appeals.
- The subdivision and development appeals process needs to be less adversarial. Issues should be resolved before an appeal, if possible.
 - The MGA should have alternative dispute resolution in place before appeals.
- Regional government disputes and subdivision and development appeal boards need to be handled better. Local subdivision and development appeal boards need to have wider powers.
- The MGA should drive consistency of process between all appeal bodies.
- Appeal decisions should be binding. Municipalities sometimes choose to ignore a decision issued by the subdivision and development appeal board and Municipal Government Board.

Appendix A: Session Agenda

MGA Review: Planning and Development Technical Session

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