

RVC AGGREGATE RESOURCE PLAN

In Alberta, sand and gravel are considered non-renewable resources and are preserved and protected by provincial policy direction through: Provincial Land Use Policies (1996), the Alberta Land Use Framework (2008) and the South Saskatchewan Regional Plan (2014). Rocky View County (RVC) has advanced this provincial direction through proactive aggregate resource planning and policy development as part of the Reeves Task Force on Growth Planning (2011) and the completion of the County Plan (2013). Collectively, this provincial and municipal policy direction has served as the starting point for the development and completion of the County Aggregate Resource Plan (ARP).

BEGINNING IN 2015, RVC COUNCIL BEGAN THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPING AN ARP FOR THE COUNTY.

As set out in the project terms of reference, the purpose of the ARP is to:



IDENTIFY different local conditions throughout the County and aggregate deposit areas;



SET policies, standards and requirements for aggregate extraction and processing development in RVC;



GUIDE the assessment of land use and development permit applications;



BALANCE the needs of residents, industry and society.



From the outset of ARP process, RVC has engaged the public, and key stakeholders including industry representatives, to build the plan. RVC has gathered and considered a range of feedback following two rounds of engagement and has developed a near-final draft ARP.

♣ ALBERTA SAND AND GRAVEL ASSOCIATION'S POSITION

The Alberta Sand and Gravel Association (ASGA) is focused on the orderly and responsible development of Alberta's aggregate resources, promoting high standards of workmanship and accountability to the environment and to the safety of related operations.

The ASGA applauds RVC's effort to-date on the ARP initiative. RVC has stated its intent is to develop a fair ARP that balances the perspectives of industry and landowners and the ASGA agrees with this approach. Based on the ASGA's final review of the draft ARP, the collective group has determined that they **cannot support the plan as proposed for the following reasons:**

- Unjustified residential and environmental setbacks;
- No relationship established between setbacks and ARP performance standards;
- Sterilization of non-renewable resources due to proposed setback requirements;
- Approval authority conferred by ARP to residents in order to vary proposed setbacks;
- Lack of notice provisions for non-aggregate development in deposit areas;
- Duration of development permit maximum period is deemed unreasonable;
- Exemption of County operated sites from ARP requirements;
- Scope of site production assessments and request for sensitive market information;
- 🔀 Requirement for interim reclamation after one (1) year of inactivity; and
- X Lack of grandfathering provisions for sites with current approvals.

