

**Bragg Creek ASP
Visioning Committee**

Meeting Minutes

August 1, 2024

Bragg Creek Community Centre

Members

B. Laskin (present)
C. Docken (present)
I. Greenhalgh (present)
L. Kindrat (present - online)
R. Delorme (present)
S. Bailey (present)
T. Overmars (present)
T-L. Duque (absent)

Also in attendance

N. LaMontagne (chair)
A. Chell (Rocky View County)
S. Altena (Rocky View County)

A. Call to Order and Related Business

- a. **Call to Order:** N. LaMontagne called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm
- b. **Adoption of July 18 minutes:** Minutes approved with amendments ([link](#))

B. Recap of Prior Meeting Discussion

Following on the theme of a plan vision, R. Delorme presented results from Bragg Creek Wild's public engagement at Bragg Creek Days. People were asked 'in 20 years, Bragg Creek is...' Common answers included the words 'community', 'nature', 'small', and 'keep'. R. Delorme also presented results from a similar event in May (a presentation by Brad Stelfox) with the question 'What 3 words sum up Bragg Creek and area for you?' Common answers included the words 'community', 'wildlife', 'nature', 'natural', 'scenery', 'trees', and 'wild'. Public input from the Bragg Creek Day event is attached.

L. Kindrat added that planning imperatives need to be at the forefront of the plan vision, emphasizing aspects for development to follow. Also that the human aspect needs to be there

B. Laskin added the importance of a community feel, getting to know each other and participating in community life. Also questioning why it's been 30+ years to have a substantial new development and how can the community navigate development.

C. Infrastructure and Servicing Issues Discussion

Steve Altena from Rocky View County provided an overview of issues and opportunities related to infrastructure and servicing. Key themes included:

1. Wastewater treatment plant built in 2013 and is at half capacity (not enough to service a development like Gateway). May need expansion as area grows. Expansion would be debt financed with a development levy on a per cubic foot of demand basis. Levies and servicing costs are high
2. Water licence requires 100 per cent return to the Bow River (Bow and Elbow are 'closed basins'). Water licences are very limited and County would look to new development to bring their own licence.
3. Water system more robust than wastewater. Upgrades needed for fire suppression (enable use of hydrants)
4. Technical studies will include a wastewater servicing study (estimate population capacity and costs)
5. Question: how many houses are not currently signed up for service and may in the future? Answer: ok for capacity in the hamlet (only infill development opportunity) but rest will depend on the ASP
6. What we know: we have systems that work for development but for larger development will need to upgrade and upgrade will need development to finance it

related: conversation shifted to density and future development, especially the minimum densities required by the regional plan (5 du/ac). Questions included:

- How to track if areas develop below minimum densities and 'defer' to future development to meet minimums
- Will protected habitat and corridors count in calculations

D. Other

As meeting wrapped up, there was conversation on the need for case studies and examples of vision statements and conservation standards in site planning. Examples could come from the Golden Horseshoe area of Ontario where there has been recent work.

E. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9 pm. Next meeting Aug 1, 2024.

Attachment: public input from Bragg Creek Day ([link](#))