

**NRCB Hearing – Double H Feeders**  
**Lethbridge County Written Submission**

**January 27, 2022**

Questions from the Board:

1. Double H Feeders has made representations related to its operation on the NW 22-9-22-W4. The relevance of the operation at that site, which operated under a distinct NRCB permit, to the expansion application is not clear to the board. Parties, including the County and the Town, may wish to address this in their submissions.

Lethbridge County Response

- The County views the area as a whole and determined that the existing operation located in the NW22-9-22-W4 was relevant to the expansion of the NE 22-9-22-W4
  - The IDP policy states that an expansion may be considered if it is to upgrade and modernize, demonstrating changes that will reduce the negative impacts to rural and urban residents of the area. By closing the older, less efficient operation in the NW 22-9-22-W4 and consolidating that operation to the NE22-9-22-W4 they are in the County's opinion reducing the negative impacts of the operation in the NW 22-9-22W4 on the town and adjacent residential acreages. The consolidation of the operation to the NE quarter allows them to modernize and improve their operations while still meeting the MDS requirements and improving a less than desirable situation next to the Town of Coalhurst. Both the Town of Coalhurst and Lethbridge County who are the parties of the IDP, are in agreement and supportive of the consolidation of the operation to the NE22-9-22-W4.
2. What is the position of the County in relation to consistency of the Double H Feeders expansion, or the potential for future expansions, with the land use provisions in the MDP and IDP?

Lethbridge County Response

- Any future expansion would be considered on the merits of the proposed expansion and how it relates to the IDP policy including the following:
    - Does the application update and modernize the facility, are there noted improvements that will reduce or remove impacts to any affected landowners? If there is no reduction in the negative impacts or more impacts the county would not support an expansion.
3. What public consultation was conducted by the County and Town in the course of the MDP and IDP development?

Lethbridge County Response

- The County and Town held an open house (on June 25, 2014) for the IDP and advertised the date of the open house in the local newspaper and town/county websites. Every County landowner within the proposed IDP boundary was also notified by direct mail which included information where a copy of the plan could be reviewed in its entirety.

- The notice of public hearing with access to the proposed IDP was advertised as per the MGA requirements. The public hearing for the IDP was held on December 4, 2014 at the Lethbridge County offices and December 2, 2014 at the Town of Coalhurst office.
  - The Lethbridge County MDP (2010 version) there was an open house, a survey and opportunity for feedback during the planning process (prior to adoption of the MDP). As well as the public hearing which was advertised and held as per the MGA.
4. **What are the municipal planning objectives related to the establishment of the confined feeding operation exclusion zone on the lands associated with the Double H Feeders operation?**

Lethbridge County Response

- The exclusion zone is to ensure that no new operations are constructed within the exclusion zone. The MDP policy is as such:
  - *The County shall exclude the development of CFO's in the Urban Fringe land use district.*
  - It is noted that this policy does not explicit state if this is for new or expanding CFO's.
- For existing operations, with new best practices and technology there are upgrades that can be made that improve an operation but in order to make those upgrades cost effective a landowner would want to expand to bear the costs of those upgrades. In working with the town and other urban jurisdictions this is seen as an overall benefit to the region, the landowner gets to upgrade and expand their operation which the region and potentially affected landowners can see a reduction in impacts from the previous operation. This is reflected in the policies of the Intermunicipal Development Plan.
- Most of the County's Intermunicipal Development Plans have included policies with regards to the exclusion of new feedlot developments in the Urban Fringe Districts but discretion when it comes to expansion of existing CFO's (as noted above). It is recognized by the municipalities that CFOs exist in some areas prior to MDPs and IDPs being adopted and therefore some discretion should be applied to existing operations if the circumstances can be improved.
- The County is in the midst of updating the MDP which will more appropriately address the planning hierarchy and refer to the IDP's with regards to CFO operations. It will also provide a distinction between new and expanding CFO's. Public consultation has occurred, and first reading granted, and the new Lethbridge County MDP will be considered by Lethbridge County Council in March 2022.
- It is important to note that the current Lethbridge County MDP came into effect with the exclusion zones in 2010, and the IDP with the Town of Coalhurst and the applicable CFO policies and exclusion zone affecting the subject land was adopted later in 2014. The 2022 new MDP will bring both statutory plans into conformity. Policies of the new MDP define the paramountcy of the IDP policies in relation to the MDP and address this CFO situation.

5. What assistance can the Town and County provide the Board in determining the intent of the term “primarily agricultural” land referenced in the IDP?

Lethbridge County Response

- Primarily agriculture would mean that the main land use in the area is for agricultural purposes (as opposed to residential, commercial, or industrial). Secondary uses (to the primary agricultural use) would be such uses as a residence and associated accessory buildings, home occupations, and other non-agricultural uses noted in the Rural Urban Fringe district. The “Primarily Agricultural Land Use” area is regulated by the County’s agricultural policies contained with the MDP and Land Use Bylaw and other policies of the IDP (See policy 3.4.5 of the IDP). Unlike some other areas of the IDP with the Town of Coalhurst, the NE 22-9-22-W4 is not identified for future town growth or country residential development.