

## Michelle Mitton

---

**From:** Augustine Brannigan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** February 23, 2021 3:10 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings Shared  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Cochrane Lake Development Bylaw Bylaw-C7986-2019, Bylaw-C7987-2019

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

February 23rd

To the Reeve

I have just listened to the presentation. I do not believe the issues have resolved during this presentation.

The technical constraints have NOT been taken care of. There is no current capacity to abate the current problem of toxic algae formation which occurs annually, and the expected increased water burden from storm water from the proposed extensions to the new development, the further development in Monterra as well as the expected increased input from the Cochrane North Development.

All that "recreational advantage" of the project presupposes that the water quality problem has been abated. It has not. The lake is the responsibility of the Province of Alberta. The proposal does not clarify who will pay for the water upgrades.

The Master Drainage Plan from Stormwater Solutions suggests that the lake drainage system is inadequate. The Mackenzie Community Ltd water survey notes that

*"This system was always intended to be temporary and is acknowledged to be **undersized** to enable it to keep up with rapidly rising lake levels and the anticipated increased storm run-off from the planned development around the lake at build-out".* That's not taken care of.

The Water Quality Improvement Plan also says:

The other issue which merits consideration in the final decision is management of stormwater entering the Lake. Other work by Stormwater Solutions Inc., carried out for the Schickedanz North Cochrane Project, indicates that water level management in Cochrane Lake will require a pipeline capable of passing **500 L/s**. If this ultimately is the case then these requirements would override the needs of the phosphorus removal volumes from Cochrane Lake however the stormwater pipeline would need to be operated in a manner to maintain the phosphorous deficit requirements of the Lake Enhancement Plan.

A detailed design to achieve the best combination of capital cost/operating cost is needed, however for the purposes of this study, it was assumed that a new pipeline and pump station would be needed to supplement the existing system. The existing pumps could be upgraded to enable the existing system to pump 91 L/s. The new pipeline could be developed at cost of the order of \$2,500,000, the new pump station is estimated at \$300,000, while the pump upgrades may be of the order of \$200,000: **giving a total preliminary budget of \$3,000,000.**

Who is paying for this?

Another issue: The upcoming closure of traffic access to Hwy 22 from Gas Plant Road will overburden Cockrane lake Road since all the households, the Extraction Plant and the Southern Baptist Seminary will be diverted north without any analysis of the capacity of the roads to carry such traffic. There are NOT "three different points of access" as the promoter just suggested.

These issues should be resolved BEFORE approval of any further development.

Augustine Brannigan  
Mount View Estates  
Lot 15

## Michelle Mitton

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** February 23, 2021 11:17 AM  
**To:** Public Hearings Shared  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Hearing Bylaw C-7986-2019 and C-7987-2019 - Opposed  
**Importance:** High

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

From  
Barbara and E. Allan Richardson  
NE/21/26/04/05/PCL A/1206 JK  
43095 Cochrane Lake Road West  
Rockyview County

We oppose these two bylaws.  
Our Submission follows

We all moved here for the natural beauty and peace of this area.

Our family, the Richardsons moved here 59 years ago, in 1962, especially for the delightful, park-like setting among willows, poplars, wild flowers and berry bushes, open pastures , hidden coves, and a grand view of the Rockies overlooking all. How fortunate we are to live in a 25 acre natural park!

Now let me tell you what happens when city people intrude on a charming vista. This will definitely occur when the proposed development takes place:

- One hot windy day; a lawyer and his family, came to our property specifically for the beautiful view, to have an outdoor lunch. The wiener roast was fuelled by hay bales. The resulting fire they set before running away, brought neighbours from Horse Creek and around to help us eventually put it out.
- My husband built a tree house for our three children, which they loved dearly. The 2 local farms had children who were welcomed as playmates. They also loved the tree house. However, once all of these children were gone and two new adjacent subdivisions were built, the newcomers children took the trees and bushes and wildflowers and tree house for their own playground. They were climbing up the ten foot tree house and the rope ladder was fraying. So we cut down the tree and destroyed the tree house. A great disappointment to our own grandchildren.

- Our elderly horses were also entertainment. My husband I were working full time at our own business; we would arrive home to find horses frothing and sweating from being chased. We previously owned an Arabian Mare which had been chased into machinery by teenagers. Her front leg was ripped and broken, and she had to be destroyed. Now our beloved “Attractive Nuisances” had to be put down because we could not protect them from neighbouring swarms.
- Having removed any entertainment value from our own property. The “Children” now started to smoke cigarettes and light campfires around in the bushes. We went to various new neighbours and told them of the wildfire danger, and asked them to keep their children away from our property, as enticing as it might be. In return said “Children” smashed up 2 hidden antique cars awaiting restoration.

We love children. We have children and great grandchildren. However, our home and property for 60 years does not belong to the public. We understand our property is immensely attractive.

The value of the MacDonald development proposal has been enhanced by our adjacent property with its park like view. However, our enjoyment will be devalued for all the reasons above.

At the minimum, a suitable barrier/fence between our property and this large development is required. If not, we are open to offers to purchase before our property is devalued.

This ends our submission

Barbara and E. Allan Richardson  
Box 841  
Cochrane, AB T4C 1A9

## Michelle Mitton

---

**From:** Jeff Allan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** February 23, 2021 3:10 PM  
**To:** Public Hearings Shared  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-7986-2019

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Mr. Reeve and Counsellors,

I am a Rocky View County resident owning a property in an adjacent quarter section to the proposed development.

I oppose the proposed development for several reasons:

- The population and density size is disproportionate for the area.
- Cochrane Lake is a natural kettle that, based on past developments around the lake, will be damaged.
- The traffic load during construction and afterward will overload the surrounding infrastructure.
- Construction will cause excessive and prolonged noise, traffic, dust, and damage to roadways.
- Other concerns, including: wildlife habitat and movement corridors, schooling and increased crime.

Sincerely,

Jeff Allan  
31 Mount View Estates  
Cochrane AB T4C2B2  
[REDACTED]